

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>LOCATION:</b>  | Princess Royal Barracks, Brunswick Road, Deepcut, Camberley, GU16 6RN                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>PROPOSAL:</b>  | Application for the approval of Reserved Matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) pertaining to phase 2a for the erection of 127 dwellings (of which 35% are to be affordable units) pursuant to permission reference 12/0546 (as amended) (hybrid permission for a major residential led development totalling 1,200 new dwellings) and consideration of details to comply with planning conditions 9 (Affordable Housing), 16 (Ecological Mitigation and Management), 23 (Vehicle and Cycle Access), 25 (Car Parking), 26 (Electric Vehicle Charging Points), 29 (Trees), and 37 (Refuse) in so far as they pertain to phase 2a. (Additional plan recv'd 13/2/19). (Amended & additional plans & information rec'd 03/06/2019). (Amended & additional plans & information rec'd 31/07/2019). (Amended & additional plans & information recv'd 5/9/2019). (Amended plans recv'd 01/11/2019.) (Additional & amended plans recv'd 11.11.2019.) |
| <b>TYPE:</b>      | Relaxation/Modification                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>APPLICANT:</b> | Caroline Green                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <b>OFFICER:</b>   | Mrs Michelle Fielder                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

## **RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions**

### **1.0 SUMMARY**

1.1 The application site comprises the Newfoundland and Alma Character Areas as defined by planning documents supporting the approval of 12/0546 (as amended by 18/0619 and 18/1002) for the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Princess Royal Barracks MOD site in Deepcut (PRB). The land parcel is also known as parcel/phase 2a and the Northern Residential Parcel. This application is the fourth reserved matters application for the site and the second seeking to deliver housing. This application also seeks to part discharge a number of planning conditions imposed on 12/0546 (as amended) as detailed below:

- Condition 9 – affordable housing
- Condition 16 – ecological mitigation and management
- Condition 23 – Vehicle parking and cycle access
- Condition 25 – Vehicle parking
- Condition 26 – Electric charging points
- Condition 29 – Tree retention
- Condition 37 – Refuse

1.2 The proposal was subject to review by Design South East (DSe) at pre-application stage. The scheme was not supported by the Panel. This objection was maintained when the proposal was reviewed by the Panel for a second time. However, the applicant team has met regularly with officers and, in particular, with the Council's Urban Design Consultant. As a result of this a series of amendments to the scheme (and the design of the flats blocks completely changed) have been secured and the proposal is now considered acceptable.

## 2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site comprises an area of land approximately 4.1ha in size of which around 3.51ha is (as set out in the agreed design code) expected to be developed. The design code sets out that around 125-155 dwellings are expected to come forward from this parcel. This level of delivery sits within the agreed framework of 325 units from phase 2 (the first residential phase of development).
- 2.2 The land parcel comprises two character areas with Newfoundland Road area being bordered to the far west by Deepcut Bridge Road and to the north by Newfoundland Road. The site area does not extend as far as including the Director of Logistics Building (to the west) which is being retained and has detailed planning permission under 12/0546 (as amended) for conversion to 15 units of residential accommodation. There are significant land level changes across the site with levels falling from Newfoundland Road to the Royal Way and to the central SANGS interface which forms the southern boundary of the site.
- 2.3 The remaining part of the application site extends to the north, north east and is formed by the Alma character area. This area is mainly laid to open grass, trees and scrub. It is bordered to the west by the Deepcut Village Centre / Spar and to the north / north east by Canada and Malta Road.

## 3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 12/0546 Hybrid planning application for a major residential-led development totalling 1,200 new dwellings. Approved.
- 3.2 12/0546/1 NMA application to allow for the approved roundabout access at Deepcut Bridge Road; Blackdown Road and Newfoundland Road and the spine road to be re-aligned. Approved.
- 3.3. 12/0546/2 NMA application to allow for the insertion of the word 'residential' into conditions 2 and 3. Approved.
- 3.4 12/0546/3 NMA application to allow for a change to the wording of condition 35 – code for sustainable homes – reducing level from 5 to 4. Approved.
- 3.5 12/0546/4 NMA application to allow for a change in wording of conditions 35, 48, and 50. Condition changes to 35 and 48 agreed as these were minor changes not affecting code compliance (35) or the requirements of the s106 pertaining to library provision (48). The proposed change to wording of condition 50 which would double the size of the church hall was not considered to be non-material and this element was refused.
- 3.6 15/1062 Reserved Matters for Infrastructure (Spine Road), Central SANGS, and Village Green as amended by 17/0774. Approved. Application 19/0735 is pending – this seeks to amend the s.73 approval.
- 3.7 17/0871 Reserved Matters for Phase 2B – erection of 215 dwellings on the Brunswick Wood character area. Approved. A MMA application reference 19/0411 for altered access arrangements to plots on the eastern parcel has been approved.
- 3.8 17/1141 Reserved Matters for Phase 3A – erection of primary and nursery school. Approved. Amended by two NMA's (one to revise materials and the other to remove an additional 6 tree's).
- 3.9 18/0619 Application under s.73 to vary condition 51 of 12/0546 to allow pub and site to increase from 220m<sup>2</sup> to 1000m<sup>2</sup> and 0.12 and 0.4ha. Approved.

- 3.10 18/1002 Application under s.73 to vary condition 50 of 12/0546 to allow the church hall to increase from 125m<sup>2</sup> to 250m<sup>2</sup>. Approved.
- 3.11 19/0440 Reserved matters application for the Public House. Approved.
- 3.12 There have also been four deeds of variation to the s.106 agreement. The first of these dealt with changes to the sequencing of the SANGS delivery and the second allowed for the spine road and northern access roundabout to be delivered at the same time and amended the triggers for the delivery of school and nursery. The 3<sup>rd</sup> linked 18/0619 back to 12/0546, while the 4<sup>th</sup> linked 18/1002 back to 12/0546 such the s106 requirements were carried forward.

#### 4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This application seeks detailed planning permission for 127 new build dwellings on part of the PRB site. This wider site has a hybrid approval for its redevelopment and this application seeks to gain approval for the detailed design and layout of the second residential phase of development to come forward. This phase is known as Phase 2a.
- 4.2 The site location is part of the Newfoundland and the whole of the Alma character area. The submitted plans do not follow these character designations and instead, as originally submitted, split the site horizontally into a Northern Neighbourhood and Southern SANGS Neighbourhood. Overall the development seeks to deliver:

| Unit size        | Total | Private | Affordable |
|------------------|-------|---------|------------|
| 1 bed apartments | 21    | 3       | 18         |
| 2 bed units      | 29    | 10      | 18         |
| 3 bed houses     | 57    | 51      | 6          |
| 4 bed houses     | 19    | 17      | 2          |
| 5 bed houses     | 2     | 2       | 0          |
| Total            | 127   | 83      | 44         |

The proposed affordable provision equates to 35% and the split is to be 50/50 between social rented and intermediate. The proposed parking levels to service this development are set out at section 7.9 of this report.

- 4.3 The application is supported by the following documents:
- Planning Statement
  - Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan
  - Landscape Design Report
  - Design and Access Statement
  - Affordable Housing Strategy

#### 5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 SCC Transportation Development Control No objection subject to conditions (See Annex A).
- 5.2 SHBC Environmental Health Officer No objection.

|      |                               |                                                             |
|------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.3  | SHBC Arboricultural Officer   | Concern raised over some species proposed in replanting.    |
| 5.4  | Surrey Wildlife Trust         | No objection.                                               |
| 5.5  | Natural England               | No objection subject to compliance with outline permission. |
| 5.6  | Guildford Borough Council     | No objection.                                               |
| 5.7  | Woking Borough Council        | No objection.                                               |
| 5.8  | Rushmoor Borough Council      | No objection.                                               |
| 5.9  | West End Parish Council       | No comments received.                                       |
| 5.10 | Windlesham Parish Council     | No objection.                                               |
| 5.11 | Crime prevention officer      | No comments rec'd.                                          |
| 5.12 | Waste Team                    | No comments rec'd.                                          |
| 5.13 | SHBC Housing Services Manager | No objection.                                               |
| 5.14 | Urban Design Consultant (UDC) | No objection – fully supportive of amended scheme.          |

## 6.0 REPRESENTATION

6.1 At the time of preparation of this report 4 representations have been received (2 from the same author) which raise the following issues:

- Was led to believe the site would house 120 dwellings. The proposed 131 will create cramped and unneighbourly relationships and parking and traffic issues *[Officer comment: It is not clear where / when reference / agreement to 120 dwellings was made and this was not part of the hybrid approval, however the proposal has been amended to 127 dwellings – the quantum of development is discussed at section 7.3, it should be noted that this objection is maintained to the reduced figure of 127 dwellings]*
- Three storey buildings exceed the 2 storey we were led to believe would take place on the site and will be overbearing and over dominant *[Officer comment: See section 7.5]*
- Too many trees being removed without due attention to biodiversity issues or the rural wooded character *[Officer comment: See section 7.6. It should also be noted that the approved density plan and height plan show no meaningful tree retention in developable areas such as this land parcel within the PRB site]*
- Parking provision, allocated and visitor parking is too low *[Officer comment: See section 7.9]*

## 7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

7.1 This application seeks planning permission for 127 dwellings as part of the 1,119 new builds granted planning permission under 12/0546 (as amended).

7.2 The planning policy considerations have not materially changed since the determination of the hybrid approval in 2013 and there has been no change, as is relevant to the determination of this application, in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or the suite of documents forming the Council's Development Plan. The Council has, however, adopted a Residential Design Guide 2017 (RDG) and this along with site and parcel specific design guides for the site are material considerations. In light of this the principal consideration in the determination of this application is conformity with the hybrid permission and the specific requirements of Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the Deepcut SPD and approved design codes with regards to the following main topic headings:

- The principle of the development and the quantum proposed;
- Proposed Layout (Design Principles, Design Solution, Connectivity, Density);
- Scale and Appearance (including heights and land levels, built form and materials);
- Tree retention and landscaping;
- Amenity considerations;
- Housing Mix and Affordable Housing;
- Parking, highways, movement and access;
- Ecological considerations;
- Impact on land contamination, flooding and drainage; and,
- Other matters (including sustainability, refuse, wildfire, CIL and impacts on heritage assets).

### **7.3 The principle of the development and the quantum proposed**

7.3.1 Overall, the redevelopment of the PRB site is set to deliver 1,200 dwellings in addition to a care home. Of the 1,200 new homes, 1,119 are to come forward as new builds and 81 from conversions. The hybrid approval in place pursuant to 12/0546 (as amended) has a number of approved plans and documents to guide the scale, massing and density of each phase / character area such that the development overall makes the best and most efficient use of land. It is considered the most relevant plans listed as approved plans on the 12/0546 decision notice are:

- Indicative scale;
- Indicate character area; and,
- Indicative density.

7.3.2 There have been detailed approvals since the grant of 12/0546 which further guide the development, like for instance the design codes and the phasing plans. The approved design code for this land parcel indicates that between 125 and 155 dwellings may come forward on this parcel. In principle, therefore, the delivery of 127 units at a density range of 15 to 45+ dwellings per ha (dph) is in accordance with the parameters set out in the approved documents for the site. However, the acceptability of the development as actually submitted remains subject to detailed considerations set out in the remainder of this report.

7.3.3 It should also be noted that the two Phase 2 residential parcel's (that being this site and the Cala parcel) are expected to deliver a minimum of 325 dwellings. This means that combined with the Cala parcel (17/0871 (as amended) at 215 dwellings), this parcel should deliver a minimum of 110 dwellings.

### **7.4 Proposed Layout**

7.4.1 The design principles for the development coming forward from the Newfoundland Road and Alma character areas are set out in pages 38-65 of the Deepcut SPD and section 10 pages 57-42 of the site wide code. The site-specific code summarises these as:

*Newfoundland Road:*

- Accommodate a mix of uses;

- Address the existing northern edge problems associated with the Dettingen Park development and engage with the street to solve the current issues of dead frontages;
- Provide a green link from Minden Valley North to Dettingen Park and the sport hub;
- High density development in this area is acceptable.

*Alma:*

- Primarily deliver residential uses and to reflect existing densities;
- Development to positively engage with the street and provide soft landscaping to principal elevations to prevent an overly urban development;
- Dead frontages due to blank elevations and high fencing are not acceptable;
- Development to reinforce and enhance the location as a focal point for the community.

Design Solution

- 7.4.2 A principal aim of the Newfoundland Road frontage is to mitigate the existing poor environment which arises from the Dettingen Park development turning its back on this road and the resulting blank expanse of boundary fences fronting the public realm. Initially the applicant proposed a traditional response to this and proposed that dwellings be sited close to the highway with a secondary road puncturing this. Design South East (DSe) did not support this approach and advised that the objectives of the Deepcut SPD and the design code would be better met by pushing the development back from the frontage and securing the retention of more trees and replacement planting. The applicant has positively responded to this advice and the dwellings now have a greater set back and the public realm is softened by existing and proposed planting. The frontage will also maintain human activity with the entrances to the dwellings facing the highway and an element of front of plot parking. The Urban Design Consultant (UDC) further comments that the changes made will allow for an avenue feel with well defined front and back build lines with generous space for retained and new planting.
- 7.4.3 The layout to the Alma Character area has also been amended following DSe input with a number of garages being removed from dwellings fronting Canada Road. The Panel suggested the displaced parking would be better served by front of plot parking. This suggestion has been taken forward. Two dwellings fronting this road do, however, have their side boundaries to this frontage and the dwellings themselves then form two runs of 4 dwellings facing a parking and turning area. In urban design terms this gives rise to a rather blank facade to this part of the public realm which is resisted in the design code and SPD. However, as the distance involved is relatively short and is located between two runs of dwellings facing the highway it is not considered this would give rise to significant harm. It is also noted that a suitable boundary treatment can be secured by planning condition. Moreover, the need to carefully consider and agree boundary treatments to all public realms is noted, and indeed is a requirement of the design code. As this level of information has not been provided it would be reasonable to secure this by condition on any approval.
- 7.4.4 The Design Panel also advised the applicant to consider a finer urban grain than might otherwise be considered by simply applying the principle of there being two character areas as set out in the SPD and design codes. One of the ways the Panel suggested this might be done is by grouping house types rather than dispersing these through the site. The Panel also suggested other areas where the plan form could be looser and the applicant has sought to provide this by reducing the number of units from 131 as originally proposed to 127, and by removing some detached garages. The detached garages have been replaced with integral garages or on plot/ front of plot parking. In a number of locations properties have also been grouped as suggested and small areas of landscaping introduced to soften the look and feel of the development (plots 48 – 51, 25 to 29 provide examples of this grouping while the area to the rear of plot 7 and the side of plot 40 show where the built form has been removed as a result of the number of

dwelling being reduced). In addition, the introduction of small pockets of landscaping and generally a more green and landscape led design response all lend themselves to delivering a high quality scheme. The Design and Access Statement Addendum and revised plans seek to further explain how the Panel's comments have been addressed and provides a commentary on 5 sub character areas. A short summary of this is given below:

1. *Woodland Edge* – this area borders the SANG and provides a series of predominately detached dwellings which will feature a rustic, muted palette of materials, block paved roads and private drives. Elements of tile hanging will add interest.
2. *Newfoundland Frontage* - This is a key area fronting the rear fence line of Dettingen Park (at its western end) and Newfoundland Road to the eastern end. The built form will comprise a mix of terrace, detached and flatted development with the latter being stated as being a key marker building at the junction of Royal Way with Newfoundland Road. Materials will comprise a mix of brown tiles and red multi bricks, black doors and elements of white render.
3. *Union and Canada Road interface* - This area has a tighter urban grain reflecting the existing pattern of development in the area. Properties have been orientated to address the streetscene and the materials will comprise softer toned bricks, rustic red roof tiles and black front doors.
4. *Cyprus Flats* - This provides the frontage to Cyprus Road and is set behind a 3m cycle / pedestrian link required as part of the Green Link. The apartments are 3 storey, flat roofed and of a contemporary design. The built form is to be set back behind a row of trees. The design of the flats has been revised in line with detailed advice from the Council's Urban Design Officer. The materials to be used have also been the subject of discussion with that officer and the use of off white render and red brick is supported. Parking is to the side of the centrally located courtyard access and softened with landscaping. Detailed consideration has been given the design of all blocks in this frontage, however further consideration has been given to the corner block (61-69) at the junction of Newfoundland Road as a landmark building.
5. *Apple Close* - This is small cluster of 8 dwellings, formed by 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings facing a parking area from both sides. This area is similar to that of the main Canada Road frontage save for a very subtle change in materials. This close punctures the main Canada Road frontage.

7.4.5 The Urban Design Consultant advises that the changes made fully address the concerns previously raised regarding a lack of wayfinding and local distinctiveness. She adds that the five character areas, together with the layout changes made, provide clarity and transition between the higher and lower density areas.

7.4.6 As is noted above the applicant was advised to reduce the visual impact of garages where possible and the site design code sets out a limited number of parking typologies that would be considered acceptable on this site. These include on site garages as well as between plot tandem parking, on road parking, parking courts and front of plot. The proposal includes a number of these and is considered to satisfactorily balance the need to limit the visual impact of parked vehicles while still addressing the advice of DSe. Married with the treatment of parking is the requirement for there to be a distinct road hierarchy. The Deepcut SPD explains that this is to be achieved by varying road widths and by the absence or otherwise of foot / cycle ways. The very constrained nature of this site and the extent and form of the existing highway network stymies the ability to deliver a number of varied road widths, however the proposal includes the provision of roads to an adoptable standard and shared surfaces. This will provide sufficient variation to meet this SPD objective.

7.4.7 A number of revisions have been made to the development along the Central SANG edge (some of these pertains to levels and this is discussed in sections 7.5.3 to 7.5.11) following officer and DSe advice. In terms of the layout along this edge, access / road arrangements have been extensively changed, in particular in the southern corner, where

the properties and plots have been re-orientated such that this area now provides a more rural, feathered edge to the SANGS. Taken as whole this contrasts with the active, well defined higher density streets to the Newfoundland Road and Cyprus Road frontages.

#### Connectivity

- 7.4.8 The site layout is also required to provide a green link / secondary cycle / pedestrian link through from the Royal Way through to the north of the site. The cycle and pedestrian access element of this requirement is to be delivered as part of the standard highway network. The greening of this route has been the subject of very detailed discussions. The set back of the flats from Cyprus Road allows for a strong, formal greening of this part of the site/route. This is considered acceptable, both in terms of providing a strong verdant route, and as an edge condition. The green route linking from here along Newfoundland Road, down Royal Way has been a challenge. However, more tree planting along here is now proposed which, subject to the detailed considerations under condition 32 and 33 (of the hybrid approval pertaining to landscape and landscape management), is acceptable. The latest revisions have been reviewed by the UDC who concludes that the scheme will now deliver a robust landscape structure as required by the relevant guidance. She further notes that the proposal incorporates well designed landscape courtyards to the flats which will provide valuable amenity space. In light of the above it is considered the proposed layout is acceptable and complies with the aims and objectives of the policy framework in place.

#### Density

- 7.4.9 A density plan has been submitted to show compliance with the density plan listed as an approved plan in the hybrid approval. The approved plan indicates the site should accommodate a range of densities between 15-25dph along the SANG edge to in excess of 45dph along Newfoundland Road and Cyprus Road. The plan submitted indicates this density range has been achieved across the site with the high /medium/ low density areas broadly complying with those shown on the hybrid approved density plan. This generates an average on site density of 36dph if the open space is excluded, or, 31dph if it is included in the calculation.

### **7.5 Scale and Appearance**

#### Heights and land levels

- 7.5.1 As might be expected some of the higher densities have been achieved through the use of flatted development and given the constrained nature of the site this has resulted in taller development than was originally proposed. In this regard it is noted the site code brought forward the SPD (and approved plan) height limit of 8.1m for two storey dwellings and the occasional use of landmark buildings to a max of 2.5 storeys and 8.5m in height. The proposed flatted blocks do not comply with this and these have the appearance of 3 storey buildings standing between 8.6 and 9.7m high. The height of the flatted blocks is, however, considered acceptable with DSe advising that the frontage to Cyprus Road in particular can accommodate this height. This is similar to DSe's advice on the Cala scheme (17/0871 as amended) wherein support was given for flatted development to exceed the height plan and be 9.6m high. It is also noted that the maximum height of the flat blocks proposed is at the corners and is in direct response to advice from the UDC who has sought to add interest and a high quality, contemporary design response in these locations.
- 7.5.2 The Deepcut SPD advises that plot ratio will also be important measure of a development's acceptability in terms of scale and advises that very intense development as provided at Dettingen Park will not be supported. The SPD advises that a plot ratio (garden space to floor space) of 1:1 or less is a means of achieving this. However, the SPD also provides for flexibility dependant on the plot location with ratios 1.5:1 to 0.5:1 also being acceptable. This variation is reflected in the proposed layout and, it is also noted that the SPD objective that built coverage not exceed 75% of the plot is also met.



- 7.5.3 The site has extensive level changes with, by way of example, the frontage with Newfoundland Road being some 6m+ higher than the level at the southern interface with the Central SANG boundary. There are also more subtle, yet still fairly substantial levels changes within the body of site, such that within the space of a few metres there are significant depressions in isolated locations. The bulk of the level changes are located within the southern part of the site forming the Newfoundland Character Area and the interface with the Central SANGS, however, there is also a significant depression in the area behind the retained Army Cadet Compound.
- 7.5.4 The original pre-application submission detailed substantive level increases along the site boundary / interface with the Central SANGS and relied, in part, on an approved landscape scheme for the Central SANGS to justify this. The weight given to the approved landscape scheme for the Central SANGS and, how the detail of this plan has been interpreted by the respective teams, has been debated. Officers have however advised that this does not set a developable level for this site and accordingly this application assesses the principle of such changes.
- 7.5.5 The site-specific design code advises that buildings should respond to slopes and not rely on significant re-profiling with built form stepping down these. As originally proposed the extensive level alterations proposed along the length of the SANG boundary resulted in both DSe and officers objecting to the scheme.
- 7.5.6 The revised scheme has reduced level changes in the area of plot 1 and along the eastern part of the site interface with the Central SANGS (plots 42 to 45). As revised plots 42 to 45 front the Central SANGS and largely utilise the existing levels with the dwellings backing onto these (plots 46- 55) having a finished floor level between 1.2 and 1.8m higher than 42-45. This is in line with the site-specific design code. While visually this arrangement will deliver the stepped form of development sought by the code it is not without problems. This is because the changing levels require some garden re-profiling (needed if the garden space is to be as usable as possible and not require extensive terracing) and retaining walls in addition to the normal domestic boundary treatments one would expect to find. Care also has to be taken to ensure those properties set at a higher level do not dominate those on lower levels (considered in the amenity at section at 7.7).
- 7.5.7 The submitted detail also shows some level alterations to the area along the western site boundary (formed with the Director of Logistics Building). By way of example, one of the most significant shown in the submission in this location is that associated with the finished floor level of plot 7 wherein this is set around 0.9m higher than the existing lowest level in the area of this plot. Despite this, the finished floor level of this dwelling would be approximately 0.5m lower than plot 8 it will face which in turn will be around 0.75m lower than plots 30-33 to the rear. This would also allow for some stepping down in built form and would, it is considered, sufficiently respect the existing site levels and objectives of the design codes.
- 7.5.8 The levels increases are more significant to the dwellings and gardens proposed to the south of the LEAP where plot 35 would have a finished floor level approximately 0.85m above the existing ground level and plot 34 between 1 -1.5m. To the south of these are proposed plots 36 to 38 (a run of three terraced dwellings) whose finished floor levels would be in the region of 1-2m above the existing ground level. Plot 36 would sit side elevation facing the rear elevation of plots 34 and 35 and the side boundary of its garden would form the shared rear boundary of plots 34 and 35. One of the submitted sections showing the level changes proposed shows the relationship between the garden areas and this shows how the proposed level changes will help deliver usable garden space to the dwellings.

- 7.5.9 The proposed change in levels in this area also links into the most extensive proposal across the site, namely those proposed to the rear of the retained Army Cadets Compound. In this location the applicant proposes infilling an existing bowl like depression. This will require a level increase reaching a maximum of around 4.8m along the site boundary with the Central SANG. The applicant has stated that this will meet one of the design code objectives of providing a manageable access through the development to the Central SANGS, and it is stated, allows for the area of open space to be more useable. The applicant further justifies this level change by advising that the alternative is a heavily engineered retaining wall. While it is possible that there may be other alternatives than this, it is conceded that a heavily engineered retaining wall would not be an acceptable interface along this edge. It should also be noted that there are land contamination issues connected to these land levels changes and for consideration of this please see section 7.11 of this report.

#### Built form and materials

- 7.5.10 The dwellinghouses are by themselves fairly standard products delivered by large national house builders. However, the applicant has responded to the Panel's advice and grouped these in a number of areas across the site, with the use of materials to zone the site into the five character areas. This is supported by the UDC. This also builds on the work described at para 7.4.4 and 7.4.5 of this report. The material selection accords with the design code and proposes a mix of white render and more, earthy, warm brick work and tile hanging. A large proportion of the affordable housing is located within the proposed flat blocks wherein a more contemporary design response has been sought by the UDC. It should also be noted that a private block of flats is being treated in the same manner such that as affordable housing within the flat blocks, the AH flats are tenure blind.
- 7.5.11 There are a number of locations where a dwelling has to address two frontages and the application proposes the Spruce house type to achieve this. These units are wide in their frontage and shallow in depth and the main entrance is located on the front, wide elevation with the dual aspect of the dwelling, its side elevation, articulated by the provision of windows. A similar arrangement was accepted on the Cala scheme, however, the articulation to the units on that scheme was strengthened by the ground floor window being changed to a simple bay. The applicant was invited to make a similar amendment and change the relevant units in this scheme. This was not taken forward and accordingly it is considered that the dwellings proposed to plots 3, 10, 15, 34, 46, 57, 80, and 102 and to a lesser extent plots 1, 11, 58, 106 and 107 provide a weaker frontage than is ideal. However, given the substantial amendments to the scheme to date and the support the proposal as a whole receives from the UDC, it is not considered this is so harmful as to warrant the refusal of the application.
- 7.5.12 Reference has already been made to the detailed discussions and extensive revisions made to the proposed form of the flatted blocks. These discussions have been led by the Council's UDC. The blocks now propose a flat roof design with a stepped height, as suggested by that officer. This allows for a more contemporary design response which will be reflected in the use of materials featuring render and brick detailing. The UDC comments:

*'The three-storey flatted development has been redesigned in a contemporary design approach with a crisp palette of building materials such as off white render, dark grey metal cladding and orangey-red brickwork following officers' advice. Balconies are now also better integrated as a design element. The distinctive corner element at the junction of Cyprus Road and Newfoundland Road is considered to be particularly important in order to address the interface between the existing and new Deepcut in this prominent corner location and to create a much required landmark announcing the arrival at the local centre and the way to the southern gateway. It adds positive interest in the street scene and is important for the orientation in the area. In order to achieve a well-balanced, elevational design a slight increase in building height for the corner element itself has been proposed, which should be considered in relation to the proportions and massing of*

*the building as a whole. The amended building design is fully supported from an urban design point of view. High quality materials and appropriate details of the flatted building design, such as recessed brickwork details in relation to the fenestration, will be vitally important for a successful result.*

*The variation of built form within the flatted development in relation to the relative location within the site is welcomed. A generous opening with chamfered corners marks the interface with the existing Deepcut centre whilst strong edges define the beginning and end in prominent corner locations. The variation on the theme is further supported the by the use of materials. The simplicity and calmness of the proposed elevations for this part of the development will be complimented by colour accents at the main entrances (to be conditioned).*

- 7.5.13 In light of the above it is considered that the design of the dwellinghouses and flats, together with the material palette are acceptable and will comply with the relevant guidance. Samples of the materials will be required for review and agreement prior to their use.

## **7.6 Tree retention and proposed landscaping**

- 7.6.1 The density, character area and height plan detailed as approved plans in the hybrid approval show no meaningful tree retention on this parcel of land. As with the detailed consideration of the Cala application for the Brunswick Wood Character Area this, and the subsequent approved Design Code is the starting point for the assessment of this reserved matters application.

- 7.6.2 The submitted tree survey places the trees into two groups, those that are self-seeded and those planted as part of past planting schemes. Those that are self-seeded tend to be of poorer quality and are mainly C category and comprise a multi stem form of Sycamore, Birch and Sweet Chestnut. Those that were planted include young amenity plantations of Pine and Cyprus, Sycamore and Norway Maple, Birch and Horse Chestnut. These tend to B and C classification trees. This information is provided as part of the submission to satisfy condition 29 (tree removal /retention of the hybrid approval) and provides details of proposed tree removal to facilitate the proposal.

- 7.6.3 In light of the above, it is considered the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of the policy framework in place and no objection is raised on tree retention and landscaping grounds.

## **7.7 Amenity considerations**

- 7.7.1 The Council has a number of planning documents seeking to ensure residential amenity is not compromised. Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 and the Residential Design Guide 2017 are relevant considerations as is the Site Wide Design Code (SWDC) and the Design Code approved specifically for this northern land parcel (Phase 2a).

- 7.7.2 In general terms there is a requirement (10.7 of the SWDC) to provide minimum back to back distances of 20m. The RDG also has this requirement and also provides an indication that a separation distance of 15m between rear and side elevations is acceptable. The RDG also provides amenity space standards for dwellings with a 1 bed unit requiring between 40-50sqm, a 2/3 bed 55-65sqm and 4+ 70-85sqm the variance being dependant on the orientation of the space. The RDG seeks private amenity space for each unit and seeks to ensure this provision is accessible from the flat it serves and is clearly identified. Ground floor units are to be provided with an area that is a minimum 3m deep and as wide as the unit it serves. Privacy screens should be provided as needed. Flats above ground floor should be provided with balconies that are a minimum of 1.5m deep and wider than they are deeper. Privacy should be taken into account and screens, recesses and orientation used to provide this.

### Relationships with existing neighbouring properties

- 7.7.3 The proposed plots facing Newfoundland Road (25-33) respect the required separation distances to existing residential dwellings in Dettingen Park with the rear or side elevations of these dwellings being in excess of 20m from the proposed front elevations of the proposed plots. The flat block proposed (plots 16-24) would face the front elevation of 114 Swordsman Road at a distance of approximately 15m. The front facing balconies to the ground, first and second floor in this flat block would, in addition to the front facing windows in the block, have views of this dwelling, its windows and its private amenity space. However, it is noted that there is no set separation distance in the RDG for front elevations, and in addition the amenity space of this dwelling is already heavily overlooked. Against this backdrop it is not considered the proposed arrangement would be significantly harmful to the amenity (overlooking, loss of privacy or be overbearing) to the existing occupiers of properties along this site boundary interface.
- 7.7.4 Plots 33, 8, and 7 would share a side boundary with the retained Director of Logistics building to the west. This building has detailed planning permission for conversion to apartments, and is set lower than the proposed levels to the aforementioned properties. However, this building is sited at a slight angle to the shared boundary and has a separation distance in excess of 25m (at its closest point) from the boundary. This distance and the fact only 3 side elevations would face this building is considered sufficient to prevent any harmful impacts arising.
- 7.7.5 The side elevation of plot 57 and the front elevation of 56 would have views of the side garden area of 18 Newfoundland Road and an oblique relationship with the side elevation of this dwelling. This arrangement is not unusual and indeed the separation of to the boundary fence of 16m is acceptable. This existing dwelling would also have an oblique front to side elevation relationship with plot 46, this elevation would however be separated by 16m. Plots 56, 81, 80, 106, 105, 104 and 103 all have a front to front relationships with existing dwellings fronting Union Road. The separation distance between the respective front elevations would be a minimum of 15m which is considered acceptable. The front elevation of Plot 102 would face the side elevation of 9 Canada Road at a distance of around 15m, again this distance is considered acceptable and it is noted that the siting of the two properties relative to one another would provide only oblique views of this neighbour's garden.
- 7.7.6 No's 9 to 21 Canada Road (odds) would have either a front to front or side / front relationship with proposed plots 119 to 127, however the separation distances are considered acceptable.
- 7.7.7 The only other existing residents sharing a direct site boundary to the proposed development are 1 – 19 (odds) Malta Road. The side elevation of plot 107 and the rear elevations of plots 108 – 115 would be separated from the rear elevations of the relevant neighbours in Malta Road by 20m+. The separation distance between the side elevations of plot 116 to the rear elevation of 17 Malta Road would exceed the 15m set out in the RDG (approximately 17m).

### Internal site / plot amenity relationships

- 7.7.8 There are, however, some pinch points within the site where separation distances fall below that ordinarily sought. Examples of this with plot 52 and 42 where there is a distance of around 19m between the rear elevations and 50 to 44 where there is around 19.5m. It is also noted there is a difference in levels between the plots with the SANGS facing dwellings being around 1.2-1.8m lower than the dwellings to the rear (which front Newfoundland Rod). However, the rear elevation of the affected dwellings would all have a staggered relationship, which coupled with the fact only 1 habitable room window to plots 48-51 is proposed at 1st floor level (rear) is considered, on balance, to be acceptable.

- 7.7.9 The use of the Spruce house type also gives rise to some unconventional amenity relationships and internal configuration. This is because the use of this property, when paired with other dwelling types to form semi-detached dwellings, (on plots 15 and 80 by way of examples) means the landing and en-suite are windowless. It is, however, noted that the landing and en-suites are not habitable rooms and as such, no objection is raised. This property is also used as a detached dwelling and its rear elevation is set close to the side elevation of the neighbouring plot. In this instance the landing and ensuite windows will look out on the side elevation of the neighbouring property. However, this would simply be akin to a standard side to side relationship.
- 7.7.10 Plot 79 would be sited with its side elevation facing the rear of the flatted block 70-78 at a separation distance of approximately 19m to habitable accommodation. The rear facing windows in the nearest rear elevation of the block of flats has been removed and the main rear elevation of the block is set 25m off the shared rear/side boundary. This is considered acceptable in privacy / overbearing terms. Plot 79 also shares a side boundary with plots 80 and 81 to the east and the separation distance between the side to side/ rear is around 15m, which is acceptable. The front elevation of this plot would be set around 10m off the front elevation of plot 106, albeit the elevations would be staggered, the garden space of 106 would however be overlooked by the front facing windows of this plot. Whilst the resulting relationship would be visually cramped and the amenity relationship which would result is at the outer limits of what can reasonably be supported, it is considered, on balance, to be acceptable.

#### The proposed flats

- 7.7.11 Plots 61-69, 70-78, 82-90 and 91-99 are 3 storey flatted blocks. These are all L shaped and provide accommodation over 3 floors. The front elevation of each block would face Cyprus Road. The return of block 61-69 would front Newfoundland and the return of 91-99 would face Canada Road. The returns of 70-78 and 82-90 would run along the centrally located access / parking area. The plan form shows a centrally located access off the front elevation of each block with a flat to either side and a further flat to the rear return. None of the front elevations would front existing dwellings at a close enough distance for any harm to arise. The floor plans show 3 flats per floor (2x2 bed and 1x1bed) over 3 floors.
- 7.7.12 The side elevation of plots 61-69 facing Newfoundland would not directly face any neighbouring dwelling and nor would the front elevations. The flank facing 70-78 at its nearest point (around 4m) contains no windows (nor does this part of the elevation of block 70-78), while the inside flank of the elevation facing Newfoundland Road would mirror the flank elevation of block 70-78 at a distance of approximately 25m. This is considered to be acceptable to prevent harm. The 3 storey rear elevation of plots 61-69 would be sited around 16m off the flank wall of plot 60. This is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.7.13 The rear elevation of block 70-78 has a similar arrangement with plot 79 as 61-69 does with 60 and again this is considered acceptable. Block 70-78 would also flank the access and part of the parking area to the flats and would be separated from the flank elevation of 82-90, which mirrors its plan form. This means that side facing windows

serving living accommodation and bedrooms would be set between 19 and 23m off each other. The 3 storey form, and the provision/location to balconies to the rear flats is noted. However, this arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

- 7.7.14 The rear elevation blocks 82 – 90 has a 3 storey separation to the rear elevation of plot 104 of approx. 28m. This part of the elevation does not contain windows. The main part of the rear elevation of this block also faces the rear boundary of plot 103 and contains a number of windows, however the separation distance of 33m is acceptable. The side elevation facing block 91-99 would be set between 4 and 25m off the side of this block. Those parts of the respective elevations set 4m contain no windows. That part set 25m off contains windows serving habitable rooms, however the distance is considered acceptable.
- 7.7.15 The rear elevation of block 91-99 would face plot 100 at a minimum distance of just under 12m (for the 3 storey element) and at a distance of just under 19m to the shared boundary (plot 100's side boundary), this is again considered acceptable. The side elevation of this block facing the new dwellings in Canada Road features windows and balconies. At its closest point, this elevation would be set approximately 15m off the side elevation of plot 107. It is considered this distance would be sufficient to prevent harmful impacts rising to the ground floor flat windows and the ground floor and 1st floor bedroom windows to plot 107. The remaining part of this elevation would face the front of plots 108 and 109 at a distance of approx. 17.5m, it is considered this sufficient to prevent significant unneighbourly impacts arising from mutual overlooking from bed/ living areas and balconies shown on the plans.
- 7.7.16 The midpoint of a number of windows serving habitable rooms in the flat blocks just breach the 45 degree line of sight. The breach is either very minor, or the affected window is a secondary opening to a large kitchen / living area. Accordingly, this is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.7.17 A total of 9 of the 2 bed flats have no balcony as these have been removed as part of the redesign of the blocks. Where a balcony is proposed it is considered to be of an acceptable size. Those proposed on the front elevation of the blocks facing Cyprus Road will be set back from the footpath edge by approx. 3.5m with this 3.5m depth forming the landscaped green link. This is considered acceptable. Those facing Newfoundland Road (located on the return wing of block 61-69) and those facing Canada Road (on the return wing of block 91-99) are set back by approx. 2.5m from the footpath. Again, this is considered acceptable and will provide reasonable private amenity space. The balconies on the return wing of blocks 70-78 and 82-90 area sited approx. 2.5m back from the edge of the parking area and at ground floor in particular this arrangement is less than optimal. However, the applicant team have responded positively to requests to improve the quality of the landscape setting around the block of 4 flats and the advice of the UDC has been taken on board with landscape courtyards now featuring. This serves to provide high quality communal amenity space and soften the setting. It is considered this is a reasonable compromise and balances the lack of balcony provision to the 9 units previously mentioned, and the proximity of parking area to others.

7.7.18 The flatted block containing plots 24-32 features balconies facing Newfoundland Road and Royal Way. Again, there are set backs (3.2m and 1.8m respectively). There is a small area of communal amenity space to the rear and side of this block. This level of amenity space provision for the flats is considered acceptable, especially given the wider 69ha of public open space being delivered as part of the PRB development. This block is bordered by proposed dwellings (plots 25,12-15) however elevations / elements of this block containing windows are in excess of 23m off the nearest dwellinghouse elevation.

7.7.19 In light of the above it is considered the proposed development will not impact significantly impact on the amenity of existing residents and will provide an acceptable level of amenity to future occupiers in compliance with CSDMP Policy DM9.

**7.8 Housing Mix and Affordable Housing**

7.8.1 The affordable housing requirements for the development are encapsulated in condition 9 of permission 12/0546 and the s106. The former requires the submission of an Affordable Housing Strategy as part of the reserved matters submission while the latter sets a mix and tenure to be delivered.

7.8.2 Members may recall that as part of the requirements of condition 9 the Planning Application Committee agreed that the first residential phases of development (phase 2a and 2b) would deliver 35% affordable housing in line with the policy objectives for the site with the unit size in compliance with the s106.

7.8.3 The s106 mix and tenure requirements are provided below:

| Bed/ unit size | Social Rented | Intermediate |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1              | 30%           | 40%          |
| 2              | 30%           | 50%          |
| 3              | 25%           | 10%          |
| 4              | 15%           | 0            |

7.8.4 The proposed development would deliver 127 dwellings. This means that 44 dwellings are required as affordable housing. Based on policy objectives and s106 this provision is to be split 50/50 between social rented and intermediate. This gives rise to a split of 22 units across the two tenures. The development proposed would deliver:

|   | Social rent                                    | Intermediate – shared ownership              |
|---|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 1 | 6 (27 % compared to s106 requirement of 30%)   | 12 (54% compared to s106 requirement of 40%) |
| 2 | 10 (45% as opposed to s106 requirement of 30%) | 8 (37% opposed to s106 requirement of 50%)   |

|              |                                                |                                              |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 3            | 4 (18% as opposed to s106 requirement of 25% ) | 2 (9% as opposed to s106 requirement of 10%) |
| 4            | 2 (9% as opposed to s106 requirement of 15% )  | 0                                            |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>22</b>                                      | <b>22</b>                                    |

7.8.5 The above mix is not s106 compliant and will delivered a higher percentage of smaller units. However, in so far as the rented accommodation is concerned it is noted this will deliver social rented as opposed to affordable rented. The former is generally considered to be more affordable and because of this the mix/ tenure prescribed is supported by the Council's Housing Manager. A condition is proposed to ensure this is what is delivered.

7.8.6 The background policy documents also require the affordable housing to be tenure blind and provided in small clusters. The materials used for the AH are considered to be appropriate to the character areas within which they sit. The dwellinghouses to be delivered as AH are located to north east corner of the site off Canada Road (plots 120 to 127), while block 91-99 at the junction of this road with Cyrus Road, along with block 61-69 and the junction of Cyprus Road and Newfoundland Road and the adjacent block 70-78 and block 16-24 will provide the flatted elements. These units are considered to be sufficiently dispersed across the site to be meet the pepper potting objective.

7.8.7 Turning to the private housing mix, the proposal would deliver 83 private homes and there is a policy requirement as set out in the SPD that the unit sizes provided will comply with the general requirements of Policy CP6 of the CSDMP 2012. However as detailed in the table below the Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014-2032 (SHMA, November 2016) identifies a different market housing mix need for the Borough. The primary difference between the two mixes is the 2016 SHMA identifies a need for fewer small units. The table below sets out both mixes and that proposed:

|    | CP6 requirement | SHMA 2016 | Proposed (% of 83) |
|----|-----------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 1  | 10%             | 6.7%      | 4% (3 units)       |
| 2  | 40%             | 28%       | 12% (10 units)     |
| 3  | 40%             | 44.3%     | 61% (51 units)     |
| 4+ | 10%             | 21%       | 23% (19 units)     |

7.8.8 This proposed mix is considered a little top heavy on the provision of private 3 bed units, even considered against the SHMA mix. This is mainly due to an under provision of 1 and 2 bed units. These smaller units tend to be the bulk of the units delivered in office to residential conversions and as such it is considered this need is currently being met. On this basis the proposed mix would be acceptable.

## 7.9 Parking, highways, movement and access

7.9.1 The traffic impacts associated with the re-development of the PRB site were considered in full in the assessment and determination of 12/0546. A number of highway improvements have been secured to mitigate the impact of the development on the local and wider highway network as set out in the s106. On site requirements for the



development are also set out in a number of planning conditions imposed on this permission. This mitigation cannot be revisited in this application. The reserved matters application is, however, supported by swept path analysis plans, movement plans and a parking strategy.

- 7.9.2 The submitted statement advises that in addition to demonstrating compliance with the design codes and general highway requirements, this application also seeks to discharge conditions 23 (visibility splays for vehicles and cycles), 25 (off street parking for non – residential uses), 26 (electric charging points), 27 (dedicated cycle parking) and 37 (refuse).
- 7.9.3 The submitted plans show that 127 dwellings will be served by 246 parking spaces. The 1 and 2 bed units will be provided with 1 parking space and, in the main 3 bed units are to be provided with 2 spaces and, 4 bed units with either 3 or 4 spaces. The 5 bed units will have 4 parking spaces. The level of provision accords with County parking guidance and would be delivered in a mix of allocated parking spaces (208) and garages (23). There would also be 15 visitor parking spaces of which 8 would be in close siting to the flatted development. This is considered sensible given these smaller units tend to have the lower parking provision associated with them. The remaining visitor parking spaces are spread through the southern portion of the site with the higher concentration being located to the south west element. As set out previously the SPD and design codes require parking to be dealt with a sensitive manner. There is limited variation in the typology used in this application, and in some respects, this follows the advice given by DSe. What is shown is considered to be acceptable.
- 7.9.4 The proposal utilises the existing road network formed by Newfoundland Road, Canada Road etc. The new adoptable standard highways proposed do, however, include the element running from the spur off Royal Way through the south western part of the site to a new junction with Newfoundland Road. The other is the short cul-de-sac to be formed off the end of Newfoundland Road to access plots 42 to 45 facing the Central SANGS. The applicant has been required to show that these new elements will link seamlessly into the existing highway network. The information provided has shown to the Highways Authority satisfaction that no conflict will arise.
- 7.9.5 The surrounding roads are currently private and the wider applicant team are in discussions with County Highways about these being adopted. Such discussions include a change in the priority of the Cyprus Road and Newfoundland Road junction. Condition 18 has been drafted to ensure that if those works come forward the application proposal does not stymie the delivery of those works and the proposed dwellings not occupied until the works are complete. The proposal has been tested under both the existing road layout and the revised road layout if the change in the priority of this junction comes forward and is compatible in either scenario.
- 7.9.6 The planning application seeks to discharge various highway related conditions on the hybrid permission. In general terms the information provided is detailed enough to show that the condition requirements can be met, however a finer layer of detail is required before these can formally be agreed. Accordingly, a number of planning conditions are sought. These are contained within the conditions section of this report.

- 7.9.7 In summary, the proposal is considered acceptable in highway terms and, subject to the conditions set out it is considered no conflict would arise with Policy CP11, DM11 and CP4 of the CSDMP2012, the Deepcut SPD, site design codes or NPPF.
- 7.10 Ecological considerations**
- 7.10.1 The wider PRB redevelopment is to provide SANGS land to mitigate the development's impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA. This is secured through the s106 agreement pursuant to 12/0546 (as amended) as is the SAMM payment.
- 7.10.2 Condition 16 of planning permission 12/0546 also requires detailed consideration of ecological considerations as part of the reserved matters application process by requiring the submission of an Ecological Management and Mitigation Strategy. The submitted strategy builds upon the work undertaken in 2009, 2011, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2018. This survey notes the presence of the various designations including the SPA, along with Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the SSSI and the SNCI. An enquiry was received by an interested party as to whether the application site had extended into this area and or beyond the scope of the hybrid approval. A review of the relevant plans and maps revealed this was not the case.
- 7.10.3 The site is comprised of maintained amenity grass land with scattered trees and submitted survey characterises it by splitting it into 3 areas. Area 1 being primarily maintained amenity grass land with scattered trees; Area 2 is scattered scrub and areas of longer, less maintained, grass; and, Area 3 includes wooded land bordering the centrals SANGS. Area 3 also contains a few buildings and these will be demolished. Some of these support low status common pipistrelle bat roosts. The submitted report also notes that the proposal gives rise to the potential severance of flight corridors and roosting features (trees and buildings). There is also a loss of breeding habitat for birds and a potential loss of habitat for slow worms, common lizards and grass snakes.
- 7.10.4 It is noted that breeding birds are most likely to be located along the site interface with the Central SANGS. Clearance works here will be undertaken outside of the breeding season however where this cannot be avoided a nesting bird check must be undertaken by an ecologist. In the event a nest is located as a minimum a buffer will be established and no works undertaken until the young has fledged. The report advises that replacement bird nesting habitat should be included in buildings along the SANGS boundary.
- 7.10.5 The report advises trees to be removed have been inspected from ground level and most have a low potential to support roosting bats. There is, however, a small number where a soft fell approach is recommended with a licensed bat worker being in attendance. A toolbox talk will also be delivered to all contractors, by a licensed ecologist, prior to felling works starting.
- 7.10.6 Three of the buildings to be demolished have been confirmed as having bat roosts present. It is stated mitigation will be secured as part of the Natural England licence (European Protected Species Licence) requirements and will include the use of 2no. bat tubes within 5 of the dwellings. The existing buildings will require soft demolition techniques and a bat box will be installed on nearby retained trees to provide an alternative roosting space. Care will also need to be taken to ensure bat corridors and the interface between the site and the SANGS do not suffer light spill / pollution.

- 7.10.7 The report further notes that there is limited habitat attractive to reptiles, however spoil mounds are present and these may have limited habitat potential. For this reason, it is considered that the mounds should be removed under supervision.
- 7.10.8 On the basis of the information provided and in the absence of any objections raised by statutory and non-statutory consultees it is considered the proposal would not give rise to harm to ecological features or to the biodiversity of the area. However, it is considered the mitigation described within the submitted ecological and mitigation management plan requires further detail. Subject to a condition (drafted as condition 13) to require this be submitted it is considered the proposal would not be contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy CP14 of the CSDMP 2012 and the NPPF.

## **7.11 Impact on land contamination, flooding and drainage**

- 7.11.1 The levels increase to the area to be used as open space and the bowl like depression (see paragraphs 7.5.9 above) is to facilitate the movement of asbestos contaminated materials excavated from elsewhere on site. Much of this information has been /will need to be submitted under the cover of condition 55 of the hybrid approval. This condition is a standard contamination condition and the detail of this is not being considered under this submission. Notwithstanding this, a number of submitted plans and documents submitted make reference to this. The sections' plans provided show how soil containing asbestos will be used to infill the depression and how this would then be capped with 200mm of crushed concrete, a deter to dig membrane and a further 500mm of subsoil and 300mm topsoil. This detail extends beyond the application red line site boundary into the Central SANGS boundary slope. Officers have advised the applicant that a condition will be imposed on any approval for this submission to make clear that the use /relocation of any contamination on the site does not form part of the LPA's assessment of these reserved matters, and the provisions of condition 55 remain. The applicant has also been advised that the reuse of the soil would only be considered acceptable if the asbestos were removed and the soil remediated to such a condition that it is safe and suitable to remain on site. The asbestos screened from the soil would need to be removed to an appropriate facility.
- 7.11.2 Wider flooding and surface water drainage matters were considered at outline stage under application 12/0546 and indeed a number of planning conditions were imposed on that decision notice to deal with those matters. While there has been some information submitted under the cover of this application consideration of the relevant conditions is not sought and the provisions / requirements of the relevant conditions require agreement prior to commencement of development. The applicant has been reminded of this.

## **7.12 Other matters**

- 7.12.1 Condition 35 of permission 12/0546 (as amended) requires the residential units to achieve at least Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes or equivalent and states that no dwelling shall be occupied until a final code certificate for the relevant dwelling has been issued confirming compliance. A copy of the certificate must be provided to the Council.

- 7.12.2 This application seeks to agree details for condition 37 of 12/0546 (as amended). This condition seeks to ensure adequate, discreet refuse storage is provided. The submitted details show how bins can be stored in the rear gardens of dwellings and the location of communal bin stores for the flats. The access route to the rear garden of some dwellings where the bins are to be stored is considered to be a little contrived in some instances (plot 37 perhaps being the worst example). In the absence of any objection from any consultee being raised it is considered this is acceptable. A condition is recommended to ensure that the bins to be provided are of an appropriate size, in accordance with the Council's Residential RDG, and that access rights are conveyed to future homeowner's / occupiers such that compliance with the submitted detail can be secured.
- 7.12.3 The submitted plans show a firebreak at least 10m deep incorporating hard surface or low risk vegetation (predominately deciduous shrubs such as hawthorn). This accords with the design code. Details of the landscaping itself will be required under condition 32 of 12/0546 (as amended).
- 7.12.4 The application site is, in accordance with the s106, to deliver a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP). Ideally a LEAP is required to be 0.4ha (20m by 20m) and should be set at least 10m from the boundary of any residential dwelling and 20m from the façade of any habitable room. It should be able to encourage independent play. The side elevation of the flat block 16-24 is set approx. 19m to the west of the proposed LEAP while the nearest elevation of plots 34 and 35 are located 19m from the nearest activity zone. The submitted site plans and the detailed plan showing the location of play equipment contain some discrepancies, however, the equipment listed and shown is considered appropriate. The applicant has advised this area, along with all open space not sold to homeowners is to be managed via a management company. Accordingly, subject to a condition to secure an accurate layout plan, details of and provision of bins, fencing, surface materials, signage (and contact details in the case of an emergency), details of the management company, it is considered this is appropriate. A further condition requiring the maintenance of the area/equipment in perpetuity is also required (conditions 6 to 10 as drafted deal with this).
- 7.12.5 The application site is located a significant distance from either the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area or the Grade II listed St Barbara's Church. The retained Director of Logistics buildings shares the western boundary of the site and is noted as being a building of merit. However, the proposed development would not be harmful to the setting of that building in light of the separation distances, and the nature and quantum of development proposed in this location. Alma House, a locally listed property, lies approximately 99m to the north west of the application site. However, the distance and the intervening development present is such that it the proposal would not harm this heritage asset. The development would not therefore undermine the objectives of Policy DM17 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies or the NPPF.
- 7.12.6 The proposal is not CIL as it benefits from the s106 secured at outline stage (12/0546 as amended). This secured a raft of monetary contributions and, on and off-site infrastructure. The s106 secured on site SANGS and is also the mechanism by which SAMM monies are secured. There is no impact on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as a result.

## **8.0 POSITIVE/PROACTIVE WORKING**

- 8.1 In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive, creative and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF. This included 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 proposal would provide appropriate amenity standards to future occupiers and would not have an adverse impact on existing neighbouring residents. It is considered the parking and highways solutions are acceptable subject to the conditions requested by County Highways. Detailed discussions have been held with the applicant and the layout has been amended, dwellings grouped and a finer urban grain and material palette secured. As a result, the proposal will give rise to 5 subtly different character areas as sought by the Design Panel. In addition, the applicant has responded positively to the views of the Council's Urban Design Consultant and fundamentally changed the design and form of the proposed flat blocks. Taken as whole the resulting proposal is considered to comply with the Deepcut SPD, the Design Codes, the CSDMP2012, RDG, NPPF and the NDG.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans:

### Technical Plans

5577:01 Q & 02 P - Engineering layouts  
5577:05 B - Tree protection setting out  
5577:06 D - Section drawing  
5570:09 C - Visibility splays  
5577:10 D - Longitudinal sections  
5577:11 D, 12 H, 13 G, 15B, 16 B 17 A - Section plans  
5577:40 K and 41 L - External Works - does not match masterplan  
5577:90 H, 91 H 92 and 93 - Tracking

### Site layout plans

16.1174.P1.400 AG - Site layout  
16.1174.P1.403 V - Material plan  
16.1174.P1404 P - Height plan  
16.1174.P1.405 N Refuse Strategy Plan  
16.1174.P1.406 R -Parking Layout Plan  
16.1174.P1.407 M - House Type Distribution Plan  
16.1174.P1.409 N - Affordable Distribution Plan  
16.1174.P1.412 E - Movement Network Strategy  
16.1174.P1.420 H - Street Scenes  
16.1174.P1.440 AE- Accommodation Schedule

#### Others

174.P1.430 & 431 - Design and Access Statement & Addendum  
TD907-07 M - Landscape Masterplan  
20729 Pic Sheet - LEAP Pictures  
20729rev1/SUR - LEAP Plan  
TD907\_01 Tree survey plan  
TD907\_02 J Tree retention and removal plan  
TD907\_09B Garden and Amenity Area Details  
Tree survey and Arboricultural Assessment  
16.1174.P1.800 E- Garages: Plans and Elevations

#### Dwellinghouse plans

16.1174.P1.500 F- HT HAZEL (5): Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.501 D -HT HAZEL (5) V1: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.502 B - HT HAZEL (5) V2: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.503 -HT HAZEL (5) V3: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.510 J - HT SPRUCE (7): Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.511 E - HT SPRUCE (7) V1: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.512 - HT SPRUCE (7) V2: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.520 H - HT CYPRESS (8): Plans & Elevations Render  
16.1174.P1.521 H - HT CYPRESS (8): Plans & Elevations Tile  
16.1174.P1.530 G - HT JUNIPER (12): Plans & Elevations Brick  
16.1174.P1.531 D - HT JUNIPER (12): Plans & Elevations Tile  
16.1174.P1.540 G - HT CHESTNUT (13): Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.542 A - HT CHESTNUT (13) V1: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.560 E - HT MAPLE (16): Plans  
16.1174.P1.561 G - HT MAPLE (16): Elevations Hanging Tiles  
16.1174.P1.570 D - HT BIRCH (18): Plans  
16.1174.P1.571 E - HT BIRCH (18): Elevations Hanging Tiles  
16.1174.P1.590 D - HT APPLE (25): Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.591 B - HT APPLE (25) V1: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.600 D - HT SHL4: Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.710 C - HT HOLLY(04): Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.730 D - HT ALDER(15): Plans  
16.1174.P1.731 C - HT ALDER(15): Elevations Brick  
16.1174.P1.733 B HT ALDER(15): Elevations Tile

#### Flat Plans

16.1174.P1.650 L - Affordable Flats Plots 16-24 : Floor Plans & Elevations  
16.1174.P1.700 F - SALES Flats Plots 82-90: Floor Plans  
16.1174.P1.701 E - SALES Flats Plots 82-90: Elevations  
16.1174.P1.702 J - Affordable Flats Plots 70-78: Floor Plans  
16.1174.P1.703 J - Affordable Flats Plots 70-78: Elevations  
16.1174.P1.704 E - Affordable Flats Plots 61-69: Floor Plans  
16.1174.P1.705 E - Affordable Flats Plots 61-69: Elevations  
16.1174.P1.706 A - Affordable Flats Plots 91-99: Plans  
16.1174.P1.707 A - Affordable Flats Plots 91-99: Elevations

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

2. Notwithstanding the detail shown on any submitted or approved plan details of all boundary treatments facing any public highway or any area of public realm shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their erection / installation. Only the approved details shall be erected / installed.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with permission 12/0546 (as amended), Policy CP4, DM9, DM16 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

3. No external facing materials shall be used on or in the development hereby approved until samples and details of them have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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. The finished floor levels / ground level of all properties, roads, driveways, gardens and areas of open space shall be in accordance with levels plans 5577-01Q and 5577-02P.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development in Policy CP4, DM9, DM11 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

5. Notwithstanding the detail shown on any submitted or approved plan details of the surface material to be used on all private drives, shared surfaces, parking spaces and parking courts shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their use. Only the approved details shall be used.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance Policy CP4, and DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

6. Within 6 weeks of the commencement of the development hereby approved details of the means of enclosure(s), signage (which shall include emergency contact details of the management company with responsibility for the LEAP), the surface treatments, all equipment, benches and bins to be delivered as part of the LEAP shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented in full.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with the S106 pursuant to 12/0546 (as amended), Policy CP4, DM9, DM16 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

7. Within 6 weeks of the commencement of development hereby approved details of the long term management arrangements for the LEAP shown on the approved plans shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

The details to be provided shall include full details of the management company the area will be transferred to together with details of the inspection frequency for the maintenance, repair and or replacement of equipment, lighting, surfaces, benches, bins and all and any means of enclosure and signage.

The details to be provided shall also provide timescales for the maintenance, repair and or replacement of equipment, lighting, surfaces, benches, bins and all and any means of enclosure and signage identified as requiring attention during the scheduled inspections or as identified / reported outside of such inspections.

All works of maintenance, repair and replacement shall meet the standards and specification of RoSPA (or any industry standard superseding or replacing that standard). The LEAP shall be retained in accordance with those standards and shall not be used for any other purpose.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with the S106 pursuant to 12/0546 (as amended), Policy CP4, DM9, DM16 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

8. Prior to the LEAP being opened for first use a RoSPA post installation survey confirming its suitability for use shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with the S106 pursuant to 12/0546 (as amended), Policy CP4, DM9, DM16 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

9. The approved LEAP shall be delivered in full and made available for use prior to the occupation of the 25th dwelling approved under this reserved matters application.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with the S106 pursuant to 12/0546 (as amended), Policy CP4, DM9, DM16 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

10. The affordable housing hereby approved as part of this reserved matters application shall comprise the following social rented and shared ownership properties:

22 Social Rented:

6 x 1 Bed  
10 x 2 Bed  
4 X 3 Bed  
2 X 4 Bed

22 Shared Ownership:

12 x 1 Bed  
8 x 2 Bed  
2 X 3 Bed  
0 X 4 Bed

The location of the accommodation to be provided will be as set out in plans / documents ref: Accommodation Schedule 16.1174.P1.440.AE and Affordable Housing Distribution Plan 16.1174.P1.409 N.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with the hybrid permission reference 12/0546 (as amended), Policy CP4, DM5 and DM6 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies, the Deepcut SPD, Design Codes and NPPF.

11. Notwithstanding any detail shown in / on any plan or document listed as being approved in this decision notice, or any plan or document submitted to the Council pursuant to the assessment and determination of this reserved matters application no agreement or approval is given for the reuse / relocation or re-siting of any contaminated material / soil / spoil or arising's anywhere on or adjacent to the application site. Moreover the applicant is reminded of the need to comply in full with condition 55 on permission 12/0546 (as amended by (18/619 and 18/1002)).

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development, to conserve and enhance the natural environment and to ensure the site, and land adjacent, is suitable and safe for use in accordance with Policy CP4, DM9 and CP14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the NPPF.

12. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with all precautionary measures set out in the submitted Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (NPA November 2018).

In addition within 6 weeks of the date of the development hereby approved being commenced full details of the measures to be undertaken to mitigate the loss of any habitat of ecological value, any disruption to protected species or features of merit arising as a result of the development shall be submitted to the Local Planning



Authority. The measures to be provided shall make provision for a minimum of 10% net gain in biodiversity value and shall include a phasing plan for the delivery of the measures to be employed.

There shall be no occupation of any dwelling unless and until the details have been agreed in full and in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be implemented in full in accordance with the agreed phasing plan.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to conserve and enhance the natural environment in accordance with Policy DM9 and CP14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the NPPF.

13. The details to be provided pursuant to condition 32 and 33 of the hybrid approval ref: 12/0546 (as amended by 18/0619 & 18/1002) shall make provision for all replacement tree planting to have a minimum girth of 30-35mm and shall also address the Arboricultural Officer comments dated 2/12/2019.

The details to be submitted shall also incorporate the agreed details shown on plan TD907\_09B for the garden and amenity areas for the flat blocks.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with the Design Code, the Deepcut SPD, Policy DM4 and DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.

14. Each dwelling hereby approved shall be provided with a bin / refuse storage area as shown on plan 16.1174.P1.405 N. Each area shall provide space for the range and size of refuse / recycling bins detailed on page 49 of the Residential Design Guide 2017.

Prior to the occupation of plot 36 and 37 details of the access arrangements conveyed to plot 37 across the rear garden of plot 36 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with the Design Code, the Deepcut SPD, Policy DM4 and DM9 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the NPPF.

15. The garages hereby approved shall not be converted to ancillary residential accommodation and shall be retained for the purposes of parking vehicles. In addition the parking bays, parking courts and open parking spaces hereby approved shall be retained for the purpose of parking vehicles.

Reason: To ensure adequate parking provision on the site in the interest of visual amenity and the safe and free flow of traffic in accordance with Policy DM9, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012, the Deepcut SPD, the Design Codes, the RDG, the NPPF and the NDG.

16. Visibility splays shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans, Drawing No. 5577:09 C, and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 1m high.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

17. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until each of the proposed accesses is provided with a pedestrian inter-visibility splay of 2m by 2m on each side of the access to be in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The depth measured from the back of the footway and the widths outwards from the edges of the access. No fence, wall or other obstruction to visibility between 0.6m and 2m in height above ground level shall be erected within the area of such splays.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

18. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until the adjustments to the indicative highway kerbing layout as broadly identified by the Skanska/Waterman's road adoption proposals, Drawing Nos DC2-WTM-CH-121-XX-DR-03-0102 Rev P03 and DC2-WTM-CH-121-XX-DR-03-0101 P03, have be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the proposed highway layout shall be implemented as per the approved design.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

19. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until a revised vertical curve is provided in general accordance with the approved plans, Drawing No. 5577-10 D, at the location where the southern section of the site (Road 2) ties in with Royal Way and thereafter such agreed tie in details shall be constructed and permanently retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

20. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until a vehicular tracking plan has been provided and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing two Light Motor Vehicles passing each other on all corners within the site. Once approved the agreed kerb layout shall be constructed in accordance the approved details.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

21. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until a continuous shared 3m wide pedestrian/cycle link connecting the LEAP to the SANG connection is provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This 3m link shall include all parts of the route, including the space fronting the LEAP. Thereafter the shared 3m pedestrian/cycle link shall be permanently retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport

in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

22. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until a shared 3m wide cycle/footway is provided connecting Royal Way to Newfoundland Road in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the shared 3m pedestrian/cycle link shall be permanently retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

23. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until each of the proposed houses are provided with a metal cycle shed, and each of the proposed flats are provided with a communal cycle storage block, for the secure, covered parking of bicycles within the development site, all in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

24. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until each of the proposed dwellings together with at least 8 visitor parking bays are provided with a fast-charge Electric Vehicle charging socket (current minimum requirement for all sockets - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) to be evenly distributed amongst the entirety of the proposed visitor parking bays within the development in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter permanently retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

25. No part of the development shall be commenced unless and until details of the required vehicular visibility at the junction of Newfoundland Road and Cyprus Road has been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once agreed the visibility splay/s shall be provided upon commencement of development free of any obstruction between 0.6m and 2m in height above ground level.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

26. All proposed footways, cycleways, roads and carriageways within the development shall remain open and accessible to all highways users including pedestrians cyclists and motorised traffic for permanent use, free of any impediment at all times. Once

constructed such routes shall be permanently retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason The ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and provides for sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies, CP4, CP11 and DM11 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy 2012, the Deepcut SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

### **Informative(s)**

1. The applicant is advised that with reference to condition 11 above, and condition 55 of 12/0546 (as amended by 18/0619 and 18/1002) the re-use of any contaminated soil / material on site will only be supported where it has been remediated to such a level that it is safe and suitable to remain on the site.
2. The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development, subject to the above conditions but, if it is the applicant's intention to offer any of the roadworks included in the application for adoption as maintainable highways, permission under the Town and Country Planning Act should not be construed as approval to the highway engineering details necessary for inclusion in an Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. Further details about the post-planning adoption of roads may be obtained from the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council.

The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works (including Stats connections/diversions required by the development itself or the associated highway works) on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works (including Stats connections/diversions required by the development itself or the associated highway works) on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme>. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see [www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/floodingadvice](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/floodingadvice).

The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Please refer to: <http://www.beama.org.uk/resourceLibrary/beama-guide-to-electric-vehicle-infrastructure.html> for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types.

3. The applicant is advised that the indicative change in priority at the junction of Newfoundland Road as indicated on Watermans Drawing, numbers DC2-WTM-CH-121-XX-DR-03-0102 Rev P03 and DC2-WTM-CH-121-XX-DR-03-0101 P03) remain subject to detailed design by Skanska Construction for those roads and the

detailed analysis and checking by the Highway Authority as part of the proposed adoption process of these existing private roads. In the event that this design and analysis is unable to support the change in priority, the existing give way arrangement shall be retained and improved by Skanska to current highway design standards.