

LOCATION:	Deepcut Business Centre, 123-127 Deepcut Bridge Road, Deepcut, Camberley, Surrey, GU16 6SD,
PROPOSAL:	Erection of 3 x 3-bedroom terraced dwellings with associated parking and amenity space.
TYPE:	Full Planning Application
APPLICANT:	Fraser & Barry Shorey & Woods
OFFICER:	Miss Patricia Terceiro

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it is being reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Cllr. Helen Whitcroft due to concerns regarding overdevelopment, mass and scale of the development and being out of keeping with the streetscene.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Full planning application is sought for the erection of 3x 3-bedroom terraced dwellings with associated parking and amenity space.
- 1.2 The principle of the development is considered acceptable and the development is also considered to result in no adverse harm to the character of the area (including trees), on the residential amenities of the adjoining neighbours or on highway safety. The proposal is recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 Deepcut Business Centre is a detached building comprising office accommodation to the rear and flats on the building to the front. Recently, consent was granted to convert the remaining of the building to residential use. This building, which benefits from a small frontage laid to lawn, faces towards Deepcut Bridge Road.
- 2.2 The property benefits from a parking area to the rear, which is accessed off Blackdown Road via a gated access road. The application site is located in the rearmost area of this parking area. The properties that surround the application site are mixed in character with a range of retail, commercial and residential properties.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 18/0807 Application for Prior Approval for a proposed change of use from offices (Class B1a) residential (Class C3) under Class O, Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). Approved, 2018. Implemented.
- 3.2 18/0902 Erection of 3 no. two storey detached office accommodation following demolition of existing buildings and alterations to fenestration. Approved, 2018.

- 3.3 19/0203 Erection of 1 no detached 4-bedroom detached dwelling and 1 pair of semi-detached 3-bedroom dwellings with associated parking. Application withdrawn, 2019.
- 3.4 19/0543 Changes to fenestration and external wall materials on front block, canopy over main entrance and wall to front boundary. Approved, 2019. Implemented.
- 3.5 19/2325/FFU Removal of existing flat roofs, change of material of existing first floor walkways from block and beam to stainless steel with glass panels, part removal of external walls and replace with 1.8m high obscure glazed screens, new entrance door on rear elevation. Approved, 2019.
- 3.6 20/0236/GPD Application for Prior Approval for a proposed change of use from offices (Class B1a) residential (Class C3) (16 no flats) under Class O, Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). Approved, 2020. Not implemented.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of 3x 3-bedroom terraced dwellings with associated parking and amenity space.
- 4.2 The terraced row would have a hipped roof and measure 17.8m in width, 11.9m in depth, 5.5m in height to the eaves and 8.5m in maximum height. The three dwellings would have a similar internal layout comprising the following:
- Ground floor: sitting room, kitchen, cupboard, WC.
 - First floor: 3 no bedrooms (one of which with an en-suite), family bathroom.
- 4.3 The building would be externally finished in Weinerberger Cassandra Multi-Red bricks, Marley modern grey smooth roof tiles and Elephant grey PVC to the windows and doors.
- 4.4 Each dwelling would be provided with a rear garden (depth ranging between 6.3m and 15.1m) and contain a shallow frontage. There would be 6 no parking spaces located in a courtyard to the front of the building (2 no spaces per dwelling).
- 4.5 As a result of the proposed development, 17 no parking spaces would remain on site to serve the existing offices.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|
| 5.1 | Surrey County Highway Authority | No objections, subject to planning conditions (See Annex A) |
| 5.2 | Joint Waste Solutions | Provided advice regarding the number of bins |
| 5.3 | Tree Consultant | No objections, subject to planning conditions |
| 5.4 | Scientific Officer | No objections, subject to planning conditions |

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of preparation of this report 23 representations have been received which raise the following issues:
- The proposal would appear cramped back land development, close to adjoining properties, therefore out of keeping with the character of the area [*Officer comment: see section 7.3*];

- A sweet chestnut tree has been removed *[Officer comment: this tree was not subject to a tree preservation order, so there is no mechanism to protect its removal];*
- The proposal would harm the residential amenities of the nearest neighbours, by giving rise to loss of privacy, overshadowing, being overbearing, noise and disturbance, increased air pollution as well as extra light pollution *[Officer comment: see section 7.4];*
- The proposed accommodation would be too small and cramped to support four or five residents implied by the three-bedroom nature of the properties *[Officer comment: see section 7.4];*
- The extra housing, combined with the new flats being constructed in the old Business Centre, would have a significant impact on the availability of parking for residents and visitors, therefore causing overspill to the surrounding roads *[Officer comment: see section 7.5];*
- The proposal would result in an increase in traffic *[Officer comment: see section 7.5];*
- There has been no provision of the height of the buildings in the plans *[Officer comment: the plans contain a scale bar, so it would not be a requirement for the measurements to be annotated];*
- Impact on infrastructure, community & other services *[Officer comment: the proposal would be a minor development of three dwellings and, as such, its impact on this would be very limited].*

6.2 The following matters have been raised, however they do not constitute material planning considerations and weight has not been afforded to these:

- There is also nothing stating how they plan to connect to the main sewer *[officer comment: for this minor scheme, this would be dealt with under building regulations];*
- Loss of site security, in respect of both the properties adjacent to the access road and of the office building, as this road would no longer be gated;
- The positioning of the proposed houses will dramatically change the view out of the rear of numerous properties.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

7.1 The application site is located in a residential area within a defined settlement, as set out in the Proposals Map of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP). In this case, consideration is given to Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP6, CP12, CP14B, DM9 and DM11 of the CSDMP. The Residential Design Guide (RDG) SPD 2017 also constitutes a material planning consideration.

7.2 The main issues to be considered within this application are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area, including trees
- Residential amenity
- Transport and highways considerations
- Impact on infrastructure
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA
- Other matters – contaminated land

7.3 Principle of development

7.3.1 Policy CP1 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (CSDMP) 2012 seeks sustainable development within the Borough. This Policy states that new development will come forward largely through redevelopment of previously developed land in the western part of the Borough. Policy CP3 sets out the overall housing provision targets for the Borough for the period 2011-2028 and Policy CP6 promotes a range of housing types and tenures.

7.3.2 The site is located in a residential area that is within a defined settlement. The Council can currently demonstrate a 5.52 year housing land supply and the proposal would provide three additional dwellings to contribute to this. As a result, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle, subject to no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, amenity of neighbouring occupiers, highway safety etc. These matters are assessed below.

7.3.3 It is therefore considered that the proposal would be acceptable in principle and would be in line with Policies CP1, CP3 and CP6 of the CSDMP.

7.4 Impact on character of area, including trees

7.4.1 Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (CSDMP) 2012 promotes high quality design. Development should respect and enhance the character of the local environment and be appropriate in scale, materials, massing, bulk and density. Policy CP2 states that new development should use the land efficiently within the context of its surroundings and respect and enhance the quality of the urban, rural, natural and historic environments.

7.4.2 The RDG provides further guidance relating to the design of residential developments. In particular, Principle 6.6 recommends that new residential development responds to the size, shape and rhythm of surrounding plot layouts. Principle 7.1 states that setbacks in new developments should complement the streetscene and allow for suitable landscaping and open space. Principle 7.4 advises that new residential development should reflect the spacing, heights and building footprints of existing buildings.

7.4.3 With regards to vehicle parking, Principle 6.7 goes on to say that parking layouts should be softened with generous landscaping. Principle 6.8 references that where front of plot parking is proposed, this would be enclosed with soft landscaping.

7.4.4 Due to its siting within the existing parking court serving Deepcut Business Centre, the proposed development would not be readily visible when travelling alongside the nearest highway network. Nevertheless, applications for housing developments should have regard to the character and quality of the streetscene, taking into account the contribution the application site and immediate surroundings currently make, as well as the contribution the proposal will make if implemented. Current planning policy, as outlined in the above paragraphs, seeks to prevent overdevelopment of plots and guides development to respect the existing patterns and layout of development.

7.4.5 The surrounding area is varied in type, size and architectural style of dwellings. The proposal would a row of terraced dwellings of a traditional design and, having regard to the building form of the adjoining dwellings, it is considered that the proposed design, scale and form would be appropriate for its immediate setting.

7.4.6 The surrounding application plots, on the other hand, are very much similar and are generally rectangular, long and narrow. There are however exceptions to this, the most obvious being no 6 Wooden Road, directly to the south of the proposed development, which is irregular shaped, wide and spacious. Recently, planning application 17/0872 approved the re-development for housing of nos 99-103 Deepcut Bridge Road to the south of this property and the approved plots are small and of limited depth, some of which present an irregular shape. This added variety to the historical plots and, owing to this, it is not considered that the proposal to provide 3 no dwellings placed within irregular plots with limited depth would be out of keeping with its surroundings.

7.4.7 The proposal would be adjacent to no 6 Wooden Road and therefore form part of existing second tier of development that is formed by this property and by the dwellings granted under application 17/0872 further to the south of 6 Wooden Road. These properties face towards Wooden Road, whereas the proposed development would face the opposite way. Although this would appear somehow at odds with the character of the area, back land development is already established in the vicinity and, as such, it is not considered that this would warrant a refusal of the application.

- 7.4.8 The proposed row of terraces would retain a separation distance of about 0.8m to the common boundary with no 6 Wooden Road to the south and of about 0.9m with no 19 and 21 Blackdown Road to the north. Albeit these distances would be short, owing to the relationship and separation distance to the dwellings at these properties, it is considered that this would not give rise to a cramped appearance.
- 7.4.9 The frontage of the proposed properties would be shallow and be adjacent to the parking court, laid to hardstanding. The plans submitted with this application indicate that planting would be provided to enclose the parking court and this would soften the built up appearance of the proposed development. A landscape plan could therefore be secured by planning condition.
- 7.4.10 There are a number of trees on site and the tree consultant advises that the submitted Tree Report accurately reflects the necessary tree protection measures. As such, a planning condition requiring construction works to be undertaken in accordance with the tree survey has been added to this recommendation.
- 7.4.11 Therefore the overall layout and design of the proposal would be considered to satisfactorily integrate into the established streetscape, without adverse harm to the character of the area. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in character terms compliant with the RDG, and Policies CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP in this regard.

7.5 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.5.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 states that development should respect the amenities of the adjoining properties and uses. Principle 8.1 states that new developments which have a significant adverse effect on the privacy of neighbouring properties will be resisted. Principle 8.3 goes on to say that developments should not result in the occupants of neighbouring dwellings suffering from a material loss of daylight. Principle 8.4 sets out the minimum outdoor amenity size standards for houses whereas Principle 7.6 recommends that as a minimum new residential developments should comply with the national internal space standards.
- 7.5.2 The row of terraces would contain flank windows on both elevations. However, these would both serve en-suites and, as such, could be secured by planning condition to remain obscure glazed and fix shut below an internal height of 1.7m at all times, in the interests of protecting the privacy of the adjacent residents. The proposed front windows would face towards the application site. Any views towards the adjoining properties would be in oblique angles and, as such, these windows would be considered to sufficiently respect the privacy of the adjoining residents. The common boundary with the neighbours to the rear (nos 14-20 Wooden Road) would be angled and the separation distances between the row of terraces and this boundary would vary between approximately 5.9m and 17m. These neighbouring plots are long and, as such, the separation distances to the dwellings would be in excess of 20m, which is the guideline recommended by Section 8 of the RDG for rear to rear relationships between buildings so that privacy is protected.
- 7.5.3 Owing to the relationship and separation distances to the neighbours to the north and southwest (rear of the development) it is not considered the proposed building would be unduly overbearing or overshadow these residents. Although the proposal would retain a short 0.8m separation distance to the common boundary with no 6 to the south-east, given the relationship between the proposal and the first floor flank windows at no 6 (it is noted that the single storey feature of this property does not contain any flank fenestration) it is not considered that the proposal would be unduly overbearing towards these neighbours. Given that no 6 is to the south of the proposed row of terraces it is not considered that the development would be detrimental to these neighbours in terms of light loss.
- 7.5.4 Although concerns regarding noise, disturbance and light impacts from the proposal have been raised, it is not considered that the additional dwellings would cause a significant noise increase to the adjoining residents, out of keeping with what is expected in a residential

area. It is acknowledged the proposal would contain parking spaces adjacent to the neighbouring properties rear gardens, however this would be a similar arrangement to the existing situation.

- 7.5.5 Turning into the amenities of the future residents of these properties, the internal space of the dwellings would be compliant with the national internal space standards and all windows serving habitable rooms would be provided with appropriate outlook. The overall size of all gardens would be provided in accordance with Principle 8.4 of the RDG. Plot 1 is the most shallow, however as it would contain garden area to the side, it would be acceptable. The proposed terraced arrangement would give rise to an acceptable relationship in terms of the residential amenities of its future occupiers with regards to overlooking, overbearing and privacy. Notwithstanding this, the constrained nature of the application site is noted, namely the shallow gardens and window proximity in the rear elevation. As such, a planning condition has been imposed removing permitted development rights in respect of classes A (extensions), B (roof extensions) and E (outbuildings). This is in the interests of protecting the residential amenities of the future occupiers and to prevent overlooking towards the neighbours to the rear.
- 7.5.6 As such, the proposal would not be considered to affect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties and would be in accordance with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP and the RDG.

7.6 Parking and access

- 7.6.1 Policy DM11 states that development which would adversely impact the safe and efficient flow of traffic movement on the highway network will not be supported by the Council, unless it can be demonstrated that measures to reduce such impacts to acceptable levels can be implemented.
- 7.6.2 The proposed development would sit on the car park that serves the office buildings at 123-127 Deepcut Bridge Road and therefore would result in the loss of parking spaces that serve these buildings.
- 7.6.3 The site's planning history shows that the front of the building has already been converted into 8 flats, by virtue of prior-approval 18/0807. Parking for these flats is provided towards the front of the business centre, on the opposite side of Deepcut Business Road. As planning permission 18/0902 would overlap with 18/0807, constructing 3 no office blocks as approved by 18/0902 can no longer be implemented on site in accordance with the approved plans. Therefore the middle and central areas of the building remained in office use and, more recently, prior approval to change their use from office to residential (ref 20/0236/GPD) has been granted. As such, this application will have to demonstrate that there would be sufficient parking capacity on site should the middle and rear of the areas remain in office use or be converted to residential in accordance with 20/0236/GPD.
- 7.6.4 Office space was reduced by one third following approval of 18/0807 (to about 1,229m₂) and the current application would nonetheless leave the remaining offices with 17 car parking spaces and all of these would measure the standard 4.8m x 2.4m. This would result in a ratio of 1 parking space per 72.3m₂ of office space. The current parking guidance talks about a range of 1 car space per 30m² to 1 car space per 100m₂ depending on location and the proposal would fall within the maximum threshold.
- 7.6.5 The parking plan is the same as that submitted under application 20/0236/GPD. As such, this proposal would not impact on the parking spaces to serve the flats approved under 20/0236/GPD.

7.6.6 The table below summarises the above paragraphs. The application site refers to the red line, whereas 123 -127 Deepcut Bridge Road refers to the blue line, as shown on the site plan submitted with this application.

	RESIDENTIAL SPACES	OFFICE SPACES	TOTAL	COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT STANDARDS
Existing parking situation				
Application site	0	50	50	Yes
123 -127 Deepcut Bridge Road	8	0	8	Yes
If extant prior approval 20/0236/GPD is implemented				
Application site	23 (6+17)	0	23	Yes
123-127 Deepcut Bridge Road	8	0	8	Yes
If extant prior approval 20/0236/GPD is not implemented				
Application site	6	17	23	Yes
123-127 Deepcut Bridge Road (other land)	8	17	23	Yes

7.6.7 The access to the site is from Blackdown Road, which is private, and therefore would fall outside the jurisdiction of County Highways. The access is in place and, in addition, the applicant has submitted a tracking overlay to demonstrate that vehicles turning (including a refuse vehicle) are able to turn within the site so they exit in forward gear.

7.6.8 The proposal would provide 2 no parking spaces per each dwelling, which would be in line with the County Highway Authority's parking standards. While no visitor parking has been provided, given the small number of units, the impact of any additional parking would not be considered to be significant. In terms of this, the County Highway Authority suggests that a planning condition regarding charging spaces for electric vehicles is added to any granted consent.

7.6.9 The proposal is therefore in line with Policy DM11 of the CSDMP.

7.7 Impact on infrastructure

7.7.1 Policy CP12 states that the Borough Council will ensure that sufficient physical, social and community infrastructure is provided to support development. In the longer term, contributions will be via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule, in order to offset the impacts of the development and make it acceptable in planning terms. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Supplementary Planning Document (2014) sets out the Council's approach to delivering the infrastructure required to support growth.

- 7.7.2 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted on 16 July 2014 and the CIL Charging Schedule came into effect on 1 December 2014. Regulation 123 CIL sets out the list of infrastructure projects that may be funded (either entirely or in part) through CIL. These include, for example, open spaces, community facilities or play areas. It is noted that these projects do not have to be directly related to the proposed development.
- 7.7.3 As the proposed development would involve the provision of three additional residential units totalling 349m² of floorspace, the development would be CIL liable. The site falls within the Western Charging Zone, for which the charge is £180 per m², for residential development that does not provide its own SANG. As such, an informative has been added to this recommendation, should planning permission be granted for the proposal.
- 7.7.4 It is therefore considered that the proposal would be in accordance with Policy CP12 of the CSDMP.

7.8 Impact on Thames Basin Heaths SPA

- 7.8.1 Policy CP14B of the CSDMP states that the Council will only permit development where it is satisfied that this will not give rise to likely significant adverse effect upon the integrity of the Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) sited within the Borough. Furthermore, it states that no new net residential development will be permitted within 400m of the SPA. Proposals for all new net residential development elsewhere in the Borough should provide or contribute towards the provision of SANGs and shall also contribute toward strategic access management and monitoring (SAMM) measures.
- 7.8.2 The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD (2019) identifies Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) within the Borough and advises that the impact of residential developments on the SPA can be mitigated by providing a financial contribution towards SANGS.
- 7.8.3 The proposed development would lie within the 5km buffer of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Provided that sufficient SANG capacity is available in the Borough, it can be allocated to minor development proposals and the financial contribution towards SANG is now collected as a part of CIL. There is currently sufficient SANG available and this development would be CIL liable, so a contribution would be payable on commencement of development.
- 7.8.4 Following an Executive resolution which came into effect on 1 August 2019, due to the currently limited capacity available for public SANGs in parts of the Borough, applications for development which reduce SANG capacity, as in the case of this application will be valid for one year (rather than three years).
- 7.8.5 The development would also be liable for a contribution towards SAMM (Strategic Access Monitoring and Maintenance) of the SANG, which is a payment separate from CIL and would depend on the sizes of the units proposed. This proposal is liable for a SAMM payment of £2,133 which has been paid by the applicant.
- 7.8.6 It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with Policy CP14B of the CSDMP and with the Thames Basin Heaths SPD.

7.9 Other matters

- 7.9.1 The Scientific Officer notes that the development would sit on land formally used for light engineering and as such it is a site with historic contaminative uses. Given these issues and that the proposal is for residential properties, a planning condition and informative is recommended to address these issues.

- 7.9.2 An informative has also been added regarding the Joint Waste Solutions advice for the number of bins that should be provided on site. The maximum pulling distance (distance from presentation to tipping point) would be 25m for the two wheeled bins proposed. Although the pulling distance would be longer for the mid terraced dwelling it is not considered that this would warrant a refusal of the application.

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 be considered acceptable in principle. It is considered that it would not result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area (including trees), nor on the residential amenities, highways, and contaminated land. Therefore, the proposal would comply with Policies CP1, CP3, CP6, CP12, CP14B, DM9, and DM11 of the CSDMP, the RDG SPD, and the Thames Basin Heaths SPD. The application is therefore recommended for conditional approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within one year of the date of this permission.

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

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
 - Drawing no FLU.803.HS.02 rev R - proposed site plan, received 22 April 2020
 - Drawing no FLU.803.HS.04 rev G - Plots 1 & 3 Floor Plans & Elevations, received 22 April 2020

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

3. No 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. Prior to development above slab level details of soft and hard landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be carried out as approved and implemented prior to first occupation. The scheme shall include indication of all hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out and the details of the measures to be taken to protect existing features during the construction of the development. Any landscaping which, within 5 years of the completion of the landscaping scheme, dies, becomes diseased, is removed, damaged or becomes defective in anyway shall be replaced in kind.

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

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out wholly in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report prepared by Bucks Plant Care Ltd ref 20460 received 17 June 2020. Within 7 days of commencement of development, digital photographs shall be provided by the retained Consultant and forwarded to and approved by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. This should record all aspects of any facilitation tree works and the physical tree and ground protection measures having been implemented and maintained in accordance with the Arboricultural Report. The tree protection measures shall be retained until completion of all works hereby permitted.
Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

6. Before first occupation of the development hereby approved the first floor en-suite window(s) in both side elevations shall be completed in obscure glazing and any opening shall be at high level only (greater than 1.7m above finished floor level) and retained as such at all times. No additional openings shall be created in this elevation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring residents and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

7. The parking spaces serving the proposed development shown on the approved plan FLU.803.HS.04 shall be made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles.

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

8. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until each of the new dwellings have been provided with a fast charge socket (current minimum requirement: 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230 v AC 32 amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

9. Development shall not begin until a scheme to deal with contamination of the site including the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) a contaminated land desk study and suggested site assessment methodology;
- (b) a site investigation report based upon (a);
- (c) a remediation action plan based upon (a) and (b);
- (d) a "discovery strategy" dealing with unforeseen contamination discovered during construction;
- (e) a "validation strategy" identifying measures to validate the works undertaken as a result of (c) and (d)
- (f) a verification report appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the agreed remediation has been carried out..

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with such details as may be agreed.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby approved without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment generally in accordance with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as amended (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no extensions, roof extensions or outbuildings shall be erected on any plot without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the enlargement, improvement or other alterations to the development in the interests of visual and residential amenity and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Informative(s)

1. This Decision Notice is a legal document and therefore should be kept in a safe place as it may be required if or when selling your home. A replacement copy can be obtained, however, there is a charge for this service.
2. Whilst it would appear from the application that the proposed development is to be entirely within the curtilage of the application site, care should be taken upon commencement and during the course of building operations to ensure that no part of the development, including the foundations, eaves and roof overhang will encroach on, under or over adjoining land.
3. The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Walls (etc) Act 1996.
4. The applicant is advised that this permission is only pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and is advised to contact Building Control with regard to the necessary consents applicable under the Building Regulations and the effects of legislation under the Building Act 1984.
5. The development hereby permitted is a chargeable development liable to pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008 and the CIL Regulations (as amended).

In accordance with CIL Regulation 65, the Council will issue a Liability Notice in respect of chargeable development referred to in this decision as soon as practicable after the day on which this decision first permits development. The

Liability Notice will confirm the chargeable amount calculated by the Council in accordance with CIL Regulation 40 (amended) and in respect of the relevant CIL rates set out in the adopted Surrey Heath Charging Schedule. Please note that the chargeable amount is a local land charge.

Failure to pay CIL in accordance with the CIL Regulations and Council's payment procedure upon commencement of the chargeable development referred to in this decision may result in the Council imposing surcharges and taking enforcement action. Further details on the Council's CIL process including the assuming, withdrawing and transferring liability to pay CIL, claiming relief, the payment procedure, consequences of not paying CIL in accordance with the payment procedure and appeals can be found on the Council's website.

6. - 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-infrast ructure.html> for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, the following definitions apply to the above condition 10 relating to contaminated land:

Desk study: This will include:

- (i) a detailed assessment of the history of the site and its uses based upon all available information including the historic Ordnance Survey and any ownership records associated with the deeds;
- (ii) a detailed methodology for assessing and investigating the site for the existence of any form of contamination which is considered likely to be present on or under the land based upon the desk study.

Site Investigation Report: This will include:

- (i) a relevant site investigation including the results of all sub-surface soil, gas and groundwater sampling taken at such points and to such depth as the Local Planning Authority may stipulate;
- (ii) a risk assessment based upon any contamination discovered and any receptors.

Remediation action plan: This plan shall include details of:

- (i) all contamination on the site which might impact upon construction workers, future occupiers and the surrounding environment;
- (ii) appropriate works to neutralise and make harmless any risk from contamination identified in (i).

Discovery strategy: Care should be taken during excavation or working of the site to investigate any soils which appear by eye or odour to be contaminated or of different character to those analysed. The strategy shall include details of:

- (i) supervision and documentation of the remediation and construction works to ensure that they are carried out in accordance with the agreed details;
- (ii) a procedure for identifying, assessing and neutralising any unforeseen contamination discovered during the course of construction;
- (iii) a procedure for reporting to the Local Planning Authority any unforeseen contamination.

Verification of Remediation Report: This shall include:

- (i) Design, implementation and verification of remediation;
- (ii) Validation testing;
- (iii) Substantiating evidence;
- (iv) Agreement with the Local Planning Authority on verification requirements.

8. The total number of bins (and the associated price) required at this site is as follows:
 - 3 x 240ltr recycling bins (£45/bin)
 - 3 x 180ltr general waste bins (£45/bin)
 - 3 x food sets, including 3 x 23ltr kerbside caddies and 3 x 7ltr kitchen caddies (£20/set)The applicant is advised to contact the waste collection contractor, Amey, by calling 03332 340978.

9. The decision has been taken in compliance with paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. Please see the Officer's Report for further details.