

2019/0004

Reg Date 02/01/2019

Frimley

LOCATION: 22 GROVEFIELDS AVENUE, FRIMLEY, CAMBERLEY, GU16
8PA

PROPOSAL: Erection of two semi-detached dwellings, following demolition of existing dwelling. (Amended plans and additional information rec'd 03.04.2019). (Amended plans & documents rec'd 01.05.2019)

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: Mr Parmar & Kalyani

OFFICER: Amy Myer

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it has been called in for determination at the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr Sams because of the impact on parking and traffic congestion in the area.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions and a SAMM payment being secured.

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application site is on the corner of Grovefields Avenue and The Grove, opposite Frimley Park Hospital and within the settlement area of Frimley and Camberley. The application site currently features one single storey bungalow and large rear garden, a front garden area, with a garage to the side and parking to the front and side of the dwelling. The proposal is to erect a two-storey building comprising 2 semi-detached 3 bedroom properties. Each would have parking provision within an integral garage and front driveway, private rear gardens and cycle and refuse storage provision.
- 1.2 The current scheme follows a previous planning application which was for four flats and refused in April 2018 (ref. 17/1078) due to the scale of the development being excessive for the size of the site and being harmful in character terms. This application was also refused due to insufficient private amenity space and bin storage for future occupiers and due to the unneighbourly relationship of the proposed access road to the neighbouring properties; and, a failure to demonstrate no harm to protected species, namely badgers. This current application's reduced built form and revised design has overcome the character and amenity reasons and ecology information has now been submitted with Surrey Wildlife Trust raising no objection. The previous application was not refused on highway grounds, despite significant concerns raised by residents about parking problems in the vicinity. Given that this proposal represents a reduction in units compared to the refusal, and meets the County Highway parking guidance, again, no objections are raised on highway grounds. The application is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application property is a single storey, detached bungalow, located on the eastern side of Grovefields Avenue, at the northern end on the corner with The Grove. The site lies within the settlement area of Frimley and Camberley. The property has a driveway to the side and front garden laid to hardstanding with flower beds, enclosed by a low brick wall and gates. There is a hedge running along the extent of the northern

boundary and beyond this, an open area of grass with pedestrian paths between the boundary and The Grove. The property has a detached garage to the side/rear and a garden to the rear.

- 2.2 Surrounding properties are varied in architectural style and in Grovesfields Avenue mostly comprise two-storey semi-detached dwellings, or single storey detached dwellings. Directly opposite the site is Middle Gingers which is a Grade II listed detached property. The application site lies in the Historic Routes (Lanes) Housing Character Area, as set out in the Western Urban Area Character SPD. This type of area is characterised by short dead-end roads running off historic routes, mixed architectural styles, hedges and walls as boundary treatments, mature hedges, trees and vegetation, and on street and on plot parking.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 17/1078 Two storey building comprising 2 x 1 bed flats, 2 x 2 bed flats, including gates, parking areas, and landscaping.

The application was refused 12/4/2018 for the following summarised reasons:

1. *The in-combination effects of the depth, height, bulk and massing of the building, would have resulted in an over-dominant and prominent addition to the street scene of The Grove, out of keeping with the existing scale of development. The loss of the front boundary wall and garden would also have resulted in a harsh and urban appearance to the front of the building, and dilution of the existing Historic Routes (Lanes) Character Area.*
2. *By reason of the size of the proposed flats and the lack of private amenity space, the proposal would have provided a poor standard of amenity for the future occupiers of the dwellings; and by reason of the location of the parking area and side driveway access would have been unneighbourly to 21 Grovesfields Avenue and 12 The Grove. In addition, no bin and cycle storage had been provided.*
3. *In the absence of ecology information (in particular, badges), the applicant failed to demonstrate that there would be no harm to protected species*

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This proposal seeks to overcome refusal 17/1078 and is for 2 x two storey semi-detached properties to replace the existing single storey bungalow. The building would have a width of approximately 10.5m at the front, stepping out to 11.5m at the rear. It would have a depth of approximately 16m. It would have a hipped roof form with an eaves height of approximately 5.2m and a ridge height of 7.9m. It would have a gable end element at the front with an eaves height of 5.1m and a ridge height of 6.9m. The overall building mass would be wider than the existing bungalow by around 2.5m at the front and 3.5m at the rear. It would be deeper and project further into the rear garden by around 4m.
- 4.2 Both of the new properties would have 3 bedrooms. The proposal includes an integral garage at ground floor level to both properties, and each property would have one parking space within the front driveway. There would be provision for bin and cycle storage within the rear garden. Each property would have a side access gate and passage leading to the rear garden.

4.3 The differences between this current proposal and the previous refusal are as follows:

Refused application (17/1078)

Current proposal

Two storey building containing 4 flats.

2 x semi-detached two storey properties (each 3 beds).

Building deeper at two storey level (15m deep).

Less deep at two storey level (two storey = 10.6m deep), steps down to a single storey at the rear (4.8m deep).

Proposed building 7.2m wide across front elevation.

Proposed properties would have a total width of 10.5m across the front elevation - wider than previous scheme.

Gable end feature to northern/side elevation.

Hipped roof with front gable end on eastern/front elevation.

No front boundary wall. Hardstanding and no soft planting to frontage.

Enclosed by front boundary wall with vehicular access, and mixture of hardstanding and soft planting to frontage.

Parking area located at the rear of the site with an access road running alongside no.21.

Parking provision is within an integral garage and the front driveway to each property.

Insufficient internal and outside private amenity space.

Accords with the national internal space standards and the local outside amenity space standards for houses.

Bin and cycle storage not shown.

Refuse and cycle parking provision would be in the rear garden.

No Ecology information provided.

Ecology Reports provided, dealing with matters of badgers, bats and birds.

4.4 During the course of the application, and following advice received from the Council's Urban Design Officer, amendments have been made to the design. This includes greater articulation to the frontage to create a greater sense of depth and glazed openings at ground floor level to create a more open, active frontage. In addition, additional sections of front boundary wall have been included to better enclose the front garden/driveway area, and soft landscaping is shown to soften the appearance of the development within the street scene.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|
| 5.1 | Council's Heritage Officer | No objection. No harm to the setting of the nearby listed building. |
| 5.2 | Council's Urban Design Officer | Suggested amendments included improvements to design of front façade, introduction of low front boundary wall and soft planting and reduction in width and proximity to no.21. Recommended planning conditions requiring sample building materials and detailed drawings of windows/doors and chimney. |
| 5.3 | County Highway Authority | No objection, subject to conditions |
| 5.4 | Surrey Wildlife Trust | No objection. |

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report, six letters of objection and one letter of support (no reasons given) have been received. The letters of objection are summarised below:

Character [See section 7.3 of report]

- Development will be out of character with other properties in the road.
- Replacement of existing bungalow with two semi-detached properties represents overdevelopment of a narrow site – over double the existing floor space and additional storey – will be visually prominent in street scene and when viewed from The Grove.
- Loss of the front boundary wall – detrimental impact on the existing character of the Historic Routes/Lanes Character Area.
- Loss of front garden to provide car parking - detrimental impact on the existing character of the street scene.
- Visuals shows trees/vegetation which does not exist and scale of landscaping has been deliberately enhanced.

Residential Amenity [See section 7.4]

- Significant overlooking toward no.21 Grovefields Avenue from proposed first floor bay window on south eastern elevation.
- Proposed units will be undersized and not accord with space standards – compromised internal layout with only garage and combined kitchen/diner/living room at ground floor level. Will not be accessible for those with disabilities or elderly, WCs will not be accessible, does not accord with Part M of the Building Regs. Poor quality lighting/window solution to bedroom 2 of southerly property.
- The proposed units would not accord with London Housing Design Guide requirements [*Officer comment: The site is not located within London, these guidelines do not apply*]

Highways, Parking and Access [see section 7.6]

- Garages/doors not sufficient width and size to accommodate modern day vehicles or for users to access and egress car within the garage. Not sufficient storage within properties so garage may be used for storage and not parking which would lead to parking overspill onto street.
- Already parking and traffic congestion issues in this area, primarily due to proximity of Frimley Park Hospital. Proposals would not provide sufficient level of parking for owners and visitors of the new properties. Existing property provides 4 parking spaces for 1 house whereas there would be only 2 spaces per property under this proposal, which represents a 50% reduction in the amount of parking with a significant increase in the amount of floor space. Development would result in illegal parking, danger to pedestrians, significant traffic congestion and restrict emergency vehicle access.
- When garage doors are open, vehicles parked on front driveway may protrude over adjacent footway resulting in an obstruction and presenting a hazard to pedestrian and highway safety.
- Vehicles would enter site in forward gear to park in garage and driveway so would have to reverse out of site which would be dangerous reversing out at this corner junction with The Grove.
- Lamp post to front of site likely to impede access to the driveway of the northerly property and be damaged street lamp by cars trying to manoeuvre.

Other issues

- Lack of sufficient consultation – only four neighbouring properties consulted, when many more residents would be impacted by the proposals [*Officer comment: For this type of application, the statutory requirement under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended) is for either a site notice to be displayed, or notice given to adjoining owners/occupiers*].
- Request to extend consultation period to allow 4 weeks to comment [*Officer comment: The consultation period complies with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended)*].
- Incorrect/inaccurate documents - Parking Provision Document and Telecoms Supplementary Information is dated Oct 2017 and refers to refused planning application (ref. 17/1078). Application form refers to 'ground floor apartments' (as per previous application description of development). CIL form refers to incorrect application reference. [*Officer comment: amendments to these documents have subsequently been requested and the appropriate documents are now on file*]
- Significant disruption during demolition and construction [*Officer comment: Construction works would be temporary and would not in and of itself constitute a reason for refusal. SCC Highways have not recommended the need for a Construction Traffic Management Plan in this instance*].

- Designs would not meet Building Regulations – sliding door shown to garage door and no secondary access door for fire escape [*Officer comment: This is a matter for building control*].
- Concern plot width shown on plans is inaccurate [*Officer comment: The width of the plot as measured on the Council's GIS/OS mapping system is approximately 12.5m in width. The site location plan submitted matches this. The submitted block plan was inaccurate, however a revised accurate block plan has now been provided. The width of the building would be 10.5m at the front and as such 1m would be retained either side to the boundary*].
- Recycling and cycle storage has been positioned arbitrarily in rear garden with no consideration about access past the large hedge on the boundary with no.21 [*Officer comment: The hedge appears to be on the shared boundary with no.21. Any part of the hedge which falls within the boundary of the application site itself can be trimmed by the applicants and sufficient access (around 1m) would be provided between the boundary and the side of the new property. Any damage to the party boundary itself would be a civil/legal matter*].

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 7.1 The application proposed is considered against the policies within the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 (CDSMP), and in this case the relevant policies are Policy CP1, CP2, CP5, CP6, CP12, CP14A, CP14B, DM9, DM11 and DM17. It will also be considered against the Guiding Principles of the Historic Routes (Lanes) Character Areas, the Surrey Heath Residential Design Guide 2017 (RDG) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 7.2 Refusal 17/1078 is a material consideration. The principle of development of this site was established under this previous application i.e. the site would deliver housing in a sustainable location. Therefore, the main issues to consider with this submission is whether this proposal would overcome the previous reasons for refusal, namely:
- Impacts on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Residential amenity impacts; and,
 - Ecology impacts

Regard must also be had to the following issues:

- Highways, parking and access; and,
- Impact on Infrastructure and the Thames Basin Heaths SPA

7.3 Impacts on the character and appearance of the area

- 7.3.1 Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Paragraph 58 goes on to say that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments respond to local character and history, reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture. Policy DM9 of the CSDMP states that development should respect and enhance the local, natural and historic character of the environment, paying particular regard to scale, materials, massing, bulk and density and Policy CP2 requires development to respect and enhance the character of the environment.

- 7.3.2 Guiding Principles L1 and L3 of the Historic Routes (Lanes) Character Area state that buildings should be small scale, up to 2 storeys with pitched roofs, historic plot dimensions, architectural detail, scale and massing should be reflected, buildings should be softened with vegetation; and, that proposals that seek to introduce development that is out of keeping with the strong historic character of the Lanes will be resisted, with particular attention paid to massing, scale, roofscapes, architectural detailing and materials. Principle 7.1 of the RDG states that setbacks should complement the street scene, and Principle 7.4 states that new residential development should reflect the spacing, heights and building footprints of existing buildings, especially when these are local historic patterns.
- 7.3.3 The proposal would replace a single storey bungalow with a two-storey building comprising a pair of semi-detached properties. Whilst there would be a significant change in the scale of the building on site, given that two-storey and semi-detached properties (including nos. 20 & 21 adjacent) form part of the character of this road, and given the mixed scale and style of buildings on the road, the proposed pair of two-storey semi-detached properties would not appear out of character in this context. The height of the building and hipped/gabled roof form would reflect that of neighbouring properties.
- 7.3.4 The new building would be set in 1.1m from the side boundary adjacent to no.21. It would also be set in 1m (tapering to 2.5m) from the side boundary abutting the communal amenity land on The Grove. There is also an existing break in the built environment on this side of the site given the corner plot location on the junction and the presence of this grassy area. This would ensure the width of the new building across the plot would not appear cramped and that sufficient space and gaps between buildings would be retained, maintaining the character of the area. In addition, the retention of a gap either side of the properties would accord with the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD, which advises a minimum gap of 1m between the building and side boundary should be retained to provide for access and servicing.
- 7.3.5 The building would extend deeper back into the plot than the existing bungalow, and this coupled with the increased height, and the lack of vegetative screening to the side boundary, would lead to the flank elevation of the building being highly visible in the street scene when viewed from the north along The Grove. Under the previous refusal it was concluded that this flank elevation, with its sizeable two storey depth and gable, would have appeared visually prominent and dominated the appearance of the streetscene of The Grove. The current scheme addresses this by stepping down from two-storey to single storey at the rear and there would be a reduction in depth at two storey level of almost 5m in comparison to the previous scheme. This would reduce the visual impact of this side elevation and the overall mass and bulk of the building when viewed from The Grove. This reduction in depth at two storey level, in combination with its simple domestic design, means that the building would appear acceptable in scale within its plot and would maintain the character and appearance of the street scene when viewed from The Grove.
- 7.3.6 Under the previous refusal it was considered that the loss of the front boundary wall would have appeared out of character and would not accord with the guidance in the WUAC SPD which states front boundary enclosure is an important feature of the Historic Lanes Character Areas. The current scheme has addressed this issue, with the inclusion of a low brick wall providing enclosure to the new properties, and in keeping with the character of the street. Whilst the front garden area would mainly be lost to a driveway for parking, given that a front boundary wall and some soft planting would be retained, and given that many other properties in the road use their front areas for parking, the proposal would not appear out of character and would have an acceptable visual impact on the street scene in this regard.

- 7.3.7 The property opposite (no.11 The Grove, 'Middle Gingers') is Grade II listed but the Council's Heritage Officer raises no objection, stating that the existing boundary to the listed building appears to be well screened and the proposal would not cause harm to the setting of this listed building.
- 7.3.8 The proposed development would be of an acceptable scale, form, design and materials. It would respect the appearance of the surrounding street scenes, would integrate sufficiently within the Historic Lanes Character Area and would not significantly affect the setting of the nearby listed building. As such, the proposals would comply with the NPPF, CSDMP policies CP2 and DM9, Principles 7.1 and 7.4 of the RDG and Guiding Principles L1 and L3 of the Western Urban Area Character SPD.

7.4 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.4.1 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy DM9 of the CSDMP states that development will be acceptable where it respects the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and uses. It is necessary to take into account matters such as overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and an overbearing or unneighbourly built form. Principle 8.1 of the RDG states that developments which have a significant adverse effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted and Principle 8.3 states that developments should not result in occupants of neighbouring dwellings suffering from a material loss of daylight and sun access.
- 7.4.2 The proposed building would be closest to 21 Grovefields Avenue, which shares a boundary with the site on the southern side. The distance from the proposed building to the boundary with no.21 would be 1.1m and no.21 itself is set in around 6m away from this shared boundary. Having reviewed planning history records, it is not clear what the nearest side facing windows at ground floor level to no.21 serve and whether these rooms are habitable or not. Nevertheless, the guidance in the RDG has been applied. This shows that a 25 angle taken from the ground floor side facing windows at no.21 would only minimally be breached by the proposed change in height to two-storey. This indicates that the proposed development would not result in significant overshadowing effects to the nearest side facing windows to no.21. Similarly, given the separation distance between the properties it is considered that there would be no adverse overbearing impacts.
- 7.4.3 At the rear, the new building would extend approximately 8m beyond the rear elevation of no.21. However, given the development drops down to a single storey at the rear and taking into account the separation distance (over 7m) between the proposed development and the neighbouring building, it would not result in any significant overbearing or overshadowing impacts to no.21 in this respect.
- 7.4.4 There are a number of windows proposed on the upper floor side elevations. Concern was raised by an objector that the proposed first floor bay window on the southern elevation would result in significant overlooking toward no.21. As a result, during the course of the determination period of the current application, the drawings have been amended. The layout has been altered and now all upper floor side facing windows would be obscure glazed, as they serve bathrooms. As such, the proposal would not result in any overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants.
- 7.4.5 Under refusal 17/1078 the flats had a lack of private amenity space and a poor standard of amenity for future occupiers by failing to meet the national internal space standards. This formed part of the reasons for refusal by being contrary to principles 7.6 and 8.6 of the RDG. By contrast the size of the dwellings proposed under this submission would exceed the space standards (i.e. GIA 84-102 m² for a two storey 3 bed dwelling) with a total GIA of 119 m² and 113 m², respectively. In addition, each private garden proposed would

significantly exceed the RDG minimum outdoor amenity space (i.e. 55-64 m² for a 2/3 bed house) by having garden sizes of 203 m² and 127 m² respectively. Furthermore, the previous refusal's bin storage arrangement was ill-conceived. Each dwelling with this proposal would have appropriate bin storage at the rear with side access to allow for refuse bins to be wheeled to the front for collection, and this would comply with the advice in the RDG.

- 7.4.6 The parking and side driveway access which was deemed to be unneighbourly under the previous refusal is not proposed with this application. As such, and given the reasons outlined above, the proposed would comply with CSDMP Policy DM9 (iii).

7.5 Ecology impacts

- 7.5.1 The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimising the impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Policy CP14A of the CSDMP states that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity and development that results in harm to or loss of features of interest for biodiversity will not be permitted.
- 7.5.2 A precautionary reason for refusal was added to the previous refusal given concerns raised by a neighbour about badger activity and given the absence of any survey information to demonstrate no harm to protected species. As a consequence, under this submission, an Ecology Report was initially submitted. This concluded that there was no evidence of badgers to be found on the site, however, badger evidence was found in the surrounding area. The Report recommended that the site be securely fenced such that badgers cannot access the site. Surrey Wildlife Trust were consulted and they advised that should the LPA be minded to grant permission, then the applicant would be required to undertake the recommendation within the Ecology Report of installing secure fencing around the site to protect badgers from harm.
- 7.5.3 The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing bungalow on site, and the local area appears to have significant tree presence and there is a waterbody close to the site. As such, SWT advised that prior to determination of the application, a bat survey be undertaken to help identify if there are any bats on site and any proposed mitigation measures. During the course of the determination period of this application, a Preliminary Roost Assessment and nesting bird check has been submitted by the applicants. The ecologists concluded that the building and outbuildings have negligible potential to support roosting bats. SWT have been consulted and have advised that bats do not appear to present a constraint to the proposed development.
- 7.5.4 Subject, therefore, to advisory informatives and conditions being imposed as recommended by SWT, including protective fencing, no net increase in external artificial lighting and bat/bird boxes, no objection are raised on ecology grounds, with the proposal complying with CSDMP policy CP14A.

7.6 Highways, parking and access

- 7.6.1 The NPPF states that planning decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. Policy DM11 of the CSDMP states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented.

- 7.6.2 The proposal would provide 2 car parking spaces at each of the 3 bedroom properties. This is in accordance with the SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance 2018, which advises that for a 3 bed home in a 'suburban' location such as this a minimum of 2 parking spaces on site should be provided. Concern has been raised by objectors that the garage doors and garages would not be a sufficient width and size to accommodate modern day vehicles or for users, however, County Highways have confirmed that the garage doors and parking space within the garages would accord with their guidance for a parking bay of 2.4m in width and 4.8m in length. As such, the garage does represent a functional and available parking space on site, and each property provides 2 on-site parking spaces. Cycle parking would also be provided within the rear garden of each of the two properties. This would be easily accessible to occupants and users, as advised in the RDG.
- 7.6.3 Similar to concerns raised by objectors under the previous refusal, concerns have again been raised by residents that the development would result in increased on-street parking pressure, illegal and dangerous parking, traffic congestion and restrictions to emergency vehicle access. It is noted there are double and single yellow lines along The Grove, Grovefields Avenue and Partridge Close. However the parking provision proposed accords with the SCC Parking Guidance and there is no reasonable mechanism available to the LPA to require an increase level of on site parking.
- 7.6.4 Concern has been raised in objections that vehicles would need to reverse out of the site, and that this would be dangerous given the proximity of the site to this corner junction between Grovefields Avenue and The Grove. The existing access arrangements from the site onto Grovefields Avenue likely involve vehicles leaving the site in reverse gear. This could occur in the case of the proposed scheme too. However, County Highways have confirmed that due to the nature of the street and the provision of on-street parking, speeds are likely to be reduced in this location and no objection is raised on highway safety grounds. In addition concerns about cars or vehicles overhanging the public highway are not supported by County Highways and similarly the concern raised regarding the location of the lamppost have led County Highways to advise that the location of this (at the back of the footway) would not hinder movements.
- 7.6.5 Under the previous application significant concerns were raised by objectors about the existing parking situation in the vicinity of the application site, and concern that the proposal would worsen localised highway problems. Similar concerns have been raised with this proposal. Whilst it was not disputed that there are existing parking problems around the site, due to the proximity of Frimley Park Hospital amongst other factors, the previous refusal for four flats was not refused on highway grounds. Given that this proposal reduces the number of proposed units compared to this refusal and only represents a net increase of one dwelling over and above the existing site situation, there are clearly no justifiable grounds to object this time. The proposal complies with Policy DM11.

7.7 Impact on Infrastructure and the Thames Basin SPA

- 7.7.1 This development would be CIL liable and the final figure would need to be agreed following the submission of the necessary forms, however is likely to be in the region of £21,960. An informative will be added to the decision advising the applicant of the CIL requirements.

- 7.7.2 All of Surrey Heath lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and this site is approximately 3km from the SPA. Consistent with the Council's adopted SPD all new development is required to either provide SANG on site (for larger proposals) or for smaller proposals such as this one, provided that sufficient SANG is available and can be allocated to the development, a financial contribution towards SANG provided, which is now collected as part of CIL. There is currently sufficient SANG available and so a contribution would be payable on commencement of development, which is likely to be in the region of £25,050.
- 7.7.3 The development would also be liable for a contribution towards SAMM (Strategic Access Monitoring and Maintenance) of the SANG, which is a payment separate from CIL and would depend on the sizes of the units proposed. This proposal is liable for a SAMM payment of £1,422 which takes into account the existing floorspace.
- 7.7.4 It is therefore considered that, subject to the payment of SAMM, the proposal complies with Policy CP14B and Policy NRM6, and the Thames Basin Heaths SPD. Informatives relating to CIL would also be imposed. No record of the SAMM payment has been received at this time and updates will be provided to Committee in this regard.
- 7.7.5 In addition to CIL the development proposed will attract New Homes Bonus payments and as set out in Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by Section 143 of the Localism Act) these are local financial considerations which must be taken into account, as far as they are material to the application, in reaching a decision. It has been concluded that the proposal accords with the Development Plan and whilst the implementation and completion of the development will result in a local financial benefit this is not a matter that needs to be given significant weight in the determination of this application.

8.0 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER

In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF. This included 1 or more of the following:

- a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.
- b) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.
- c) Have suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.
- d) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The principle of the redevelopment of the site for two dwellings is considered to be acceptable and it is considered that this proposal overcomes the previous reasons for refusing 17/1078, subject to receipt of a SAMM payment. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing & Proposed Site Plans (101 Rev C) received 01/05/2019, Proposed Floor Plans (103 Rev B), Proposed Elevations (104 Rev B) and Proposed Elevations (105 Rev B) received 03/04/2019, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.

3. No development shall take place until details and samples of the external materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Materials to be agreed will include the proposed brick, render, tile, guttering, fenestration and front boundary wall. Once approved, the development shall be carried out using only the agreed materials.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

4. No development shall take place until details of the surface materials for the driveways shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the agreed surfacing materials shall be used in the construction of the development.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

5. No development shall take place until detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:50) of the front boundary treatment, windows, doors and chimney shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the development shall be constructed in accordance with these approved drawings.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

6. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until the proposed access between the site and Grovfields Avenue has been constructed and in accordance with the approved plans, and thereafter shall be permanently maintained.

Reason: The condition above is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to accord with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until the proposed dwellings are provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The condition above is required in recognition of Section 9 'Promoting Sustainable Transport' in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and to meet the requirements of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.

8. The garages hereby permitted shall be retained for such purpose only and shall not be converted into living accommodation without further planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of on-site parking accommodation and to accord with Policy CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

9. No development, including any site clearance or demolition works, shall take place until secure fencing/hoarding has been erected around the site shown on the red line plan (Site Location Plan drawing number 17-253-100), and thereafter be retained until completion of the development.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species in accordance with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. The development hereby approved shall not result in any net increase in external artificial lighting, and shall thereafter be so maintained.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species in accordance with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. No development shall take place until a site plan outlining biodiversity enhancements to include the provision of bird and bat boxes on or integral to the new building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the development shall be undertaken in accordance with this approved plan.

Reason: To contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative(s)

1. Decision Notice to be kept DS1
2. The decision has been taken in compliance with paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. Further information on how this was done can be obtained from the officer's report.
3. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover or to install dropped kerbs. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs.
4. The applicant is reminded that if during development, including site clearance or demolition works, a bat is seen then work should cease immediately and advice sought from Natural England or a qualified specialist. There is a requirement to apply for a European Protected Species derogation Licence for any activity that may adversely impact on a potential bat roost or disturb bats, in order to avoid contravention of Section 9(1) and Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
5. The applicant is informed that if the proposed development would involve the removal of dense shrubbery/vegetation, then this should be done outside of the main bird nesting season (March-August) to avoid adverse effect on nesting wild birds. Alternatively, if this is not possible and only a small area of dense vegetation would be affected, an ecologist could inspect the site for active nests immediately prior to clearance, and if any are found they should be left undisturbed with a buffer zone around it until it can be confirmed that the nest is not in use. This is in order to avoid contravention of Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Countryside and Right of Way Act 2000.
6. CIL Liable CIL1