

**LOCATION:** LAND NORTH OF, BELDAM BRIDGE ROAD, WEST  
END, WOKING, GU24 9LP

**PROPOSAL:** Application for the approval of reserved matters  
(appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to  
outline planning permission SU/16/0323 to provide for the  
erection of 85 dwellings into new access, landscaping and  
green space. (Additional plans and information recv'd  
30/3/17). (Amended and additional plans, and additional  
information recv'd 10/5/17).

**TYPE:** Reserved Matters

**APPLICANT:** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.

**OFFICER:** Duncan Carty

**RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions**

## 1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application relates to the approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline permission SU/16/0323, relating to the erection of up to 85 dwellings on land to the north of Beldam Bridge Road, with a new access, landscaping and open space. With the access details approved under the outline permission, the proposal relates to the approval of the appearance, scale, layout and landscaping. The development of 85 dwellings includes the provision of 8 no. one bedroom flats, 17 no. two bedroom houses and 6 no. two bedroom flats, 12 no. three bedroom houses, 24 no. four bedroom houses and 2 no. five bedroom houses. The housing element of the proposal is proposed to be built upon a housing reserve site with the open space provided within the Green Belt.
- 1.2 In terms of the principle, access, traffic generation, archaeology, surface water drainage and flood risk and ecology, these matters were considered at the outline stage. Contributions towards local infrastructure and SANG provision would be provided under the CIL scheme, and provision for SAMM and affordable housing were secured through a legal agreement attached to the outline permission. On this basis, the impact on local infrastructure, affordable housing provision and Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area were considered at the outline stage.
- 1.3 The reserved matters application proposal has been the subject to a Design Review and the recommendations have been taken into consideration in the revised proposal.
- 1.4 In terms of the impact on the local character, trees/hedgerows, Green Belt, residential amenity, parking, highway safety, housing mix, and crime, no objections are raised. As such, the current proposal is recommended for approval.

## **2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 The application site relates to former nursery land to the north of Beldam Bridge Road on land which is predominantly defined as Countryside (beyond the Green Belt) but this element has been retained as a part of a housing reserve site. The land falls from north to south and the majority of trees are located to site boundaries. The remainder of the site, close to the east boundary, lies within the Green Belt.
- 2.2 The settlement of West End lies to the west and south west of the site with the nearest residential properties, in Beldam Bridge Road, of mixed age and size, but are traditional in design with a range of materials (e.g. brick/tile hanging/render).
- 2.3 The site measures 3.1 hectares in area. The land to the east of the application site, principally woodland or former nursery land, is within the Green Belt. Land to the north of the application site is also sited within the housing reserve site. Thurdon, fronting Beldam Bridge Road, lies to the west boundary of the site Oak Farm House, set within the aforementioned woodland, lies to the east of the site, within the Green Belt.

## **3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY**

- 3.1 SU/14/0594 Outline application for the erection of up to 85 dwellings with new access and change of use of land to publicly accessible recreation space (SANG), car parking, landscaping and open space. Non-determination appeal was withdrawn in June 2016.
- 3.2 SU/15/0884 Outline application for the erection of up to 85 dwellings with new access and change of use of land to publicly accessible recreation space (SANG), car parking, landscaping and open space. Approved in March 2016.
- 3.3 SU/16/0323 Outline application for the erection of up to 85 dwellings with new access, landscaping and open space. Approved in July 2016.

*This proposal relates to the same development as per the earlier schemes SU/14/0594 and SU/15/0884, with the exception of the deletion of the proposed SANG.*

*A copy of the officer report and decision notice is provided at Annex 1.*

## **4.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 The current proposal relates to the approval of the reserved matters (appearance, scale, layout and landscaping) pursuant to the approval of the outline permission SU/16/0323 for the erection of up to 85 dwellings with its proposed access provided from Beldam Bridge Road.

The housing includes 8 no. one bedroom flats, 17 no. two bedroom houses and 6 no. two bedroom flats, 12 no. three bedroom houses, 24 no. four bedroom houses and 2 no. five bedroom houses, with 40% affordable provision, split between intermediate and socially rented housing. A total of 214 car spaces are proposed.

- 4.2 The application proposal provides a curved spine road with frontage development (behind the heavy vegetation screen to the site frontage) and cul-de-sac or mews development, taking into consideration the shape of the site.
- 4.3 The proposal for housing, and associated residential plots, falls within the housing reserve site, with open space to the east (within the Green Belt) and based upon the schematic layout provided at the outline stage. The sole access would be, as approved at the outline stage, from Beldam Bridge Road. The open space includes utility accommodation such as a pumping station and surface water attenuation pond (which are being considered under the surface water drainage details pursuant to the outline permission SU/16/0323, and shown on the schematic outline layout to be provided in this area of the site) with play space and footpath links.
- 4.4 The proposal would provide a two storey development form, arranged in detached, semi-detached and terraced forms, with typically traditional designs. The ridge heights of these dwellings would be between 7.7 and 8.7 metres, with eaves heights at 5 metres. The dwellings would face the main highways and the layout has been split into component parts which have different design philosophies which include:
1. The Beldam Bridge Road frontage (the south part of the site)
  2. The Green Belt edge (the north and east part of the site)
  3. The Central Mews (the central part of the site)
  4. The Primary Road (the remainder of the site).
- 4.5 The application has been supported by:
- Design and Access Statement;
  - Tree report; and
  - Statement of Community Involvement.

## **5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

- |     |                          |                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-----|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.1 | County Highway Authority | No objections.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 5.2 | Surrey Police            | No objections.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 5.3 | West End Parish Council  | Concern raised about the cumulative impact of the development and its sustainability; the lack of elderly housing (i.e. bungalows) and that the site should not automatically be |

released for housing because of a lack of a five year housing supply. Careful consideration of parking provision, lack of trees within the site, style and density of housing, visibility splay at the site entrance, gateway, and speed limit restriction. If approved, suggest conditions regarding controls on house extensions to prevent roof conversions, the additional of a floor or create a terracing effect. No further objections, to the amendments.

## **6.0 REPRESENTATION**

At the time of preparation of this report, no representations in support have been received and nine letters of objection, including one from the West End Action Group have been received which raise the following issues:

- 6.1 Impact on infrastructure [*See paragraph 7.3*];
- 6.2 Independent studies on traffic flow and volume required. There is excessive traffic at peak times on local roads (including the A322 Guildford Road) [*See paragraph 7.3*];
- 6.3 Loss of woodland and impact on wildlife [*See paragraph 7.3*];
- 6.4 Profit making for developer and Council (e.g. Council Tax) and the local residents are ignored [*Officer comment: this is not a material planning consideration*];
- 6.5 Access unsuitable and speed limit reduction scheme will not work [*See paragraph 7.3*];
- 6.6 No footpath access and poor connections to village [*Officer comment: There is footpath and footway access into the site which would link to footway network on Beldam Bridge Road*];
- 6.7 Loss of Green Belt [*See paragraph 7.3*]; and
- 6.8 Use of black weatherboarding is inappropriate for West End [*See paragraph 7.5*].

## **7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 The application site is located primarily within a site which has been part of a housing reserve site, adjoining the settlement of West End, but is defined as Countryside (beyond the Green Belt), and partly within the Green Belt, and has received outline permission SU/15/0323, for which the access has been agreed under this permission. This application seeks the approval of the remaining reserved matters – including the appearance, scale, layout and landscaping.
- 7.2 As such, the National Planning Policy Framework and its associated Planning Practice guidance as well as Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP5, CP6, CP11, CP12, CP14, DM9, DM10, DM11, DM16 and DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP); Policy NRM6 of the South

East Plan 2009 (as saved) (SEP); and, Policy H8 of the Surrey Heath Local Plan 2000 (as saved) are relevant. In addition, advice in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2012; Infrastructure Delivery SPD 2014; and West End Village Statement SPD 2016 (VDS) are also relevant. Regard will also be had to the Hart, Rushmoor and Surrey Heath Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) and the Housing Needs Survey Paper 2017-2022 (February 2017).

7.3 Since the decision for the outline planning permission, there has not been any significant change in circumstances. For completeness a copy of the officer report and decision notice, including the conditions, is attached (Annex 1) and for reference purposes, the main issues and conclusions in this decision, which also apply to this submission, are summarised below:

- The principle of the development has been approved [See *paragraph 7.4 of the officer report for SU/16/0323*];
- The access arrangements (with the vehicular access from Beldam Bridge Road) and site access visibility has been approved. The cumulative impact of the proposal on the highway network, in combination with other reserve housing site proposals, has been considered to be acceptable. [See *paragraph 7.4 of the officer report for SU/16/0323 and Conditions 8, 11 and 15 of SU/16/0323*];
- No objections in principle to the impact of the proposal on residential amenity grounds, particularly in relation to any increase in noise whilst noting the outline nature of the approved scheme [See *paragraph 7.4 of the officer report for SU/16/0323*];
- No objections to the impact of the proposal on ecology and archaeology [See *paragraph 7.4 of the officer report for SU/16/0323 and Conditions 7, 13 and 14 of SU/16/0323*];
- No objections to the impact on surface water drainage, land contamination and flood risk [See *paragraph 7.4 of the officer report for SU/16/0323 and Conditions 9, 10, 11 and 16 of SU/16/0323*];
- No objections to the impact of the proposal on local infrastructure with the proposal being CIL liable. The contribution towards education previously requested by the education authority, Surrey County Council, was not justified during the consideration of the outline permission (and other housing reserve sites) because the need justification provided by the County Council was generic and insufficient evidence was provided to meet the obligation tests set out in Paragraph 204 of the NPPF [See *paragraph 7.4 of the officer report for SU/16/0323*]; and
- No objections to the impact of the proposal on affordable housing provision and open space provision. A level of affordable housing (32 units) will need to be provided on site and this has been provided under a legal agreement attached to the outline decision and, as such, no objections are raised on these grounds. [See *paragraph 7.4 of the officer report for SU/16/0323*].

7.4 However, it is considered that all the following matters need to be considered. The main issues to be addressed in considering this application are:

- Impact on local character, crime, Green Belt, trees and hedgerows;
- Impact on parking capacity and highway safety; and
- Impact on residential amenity.

Other matters including:

- Impact on housing mix; and
- Open space provision; and
- Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

## **7.5 Impact on local character, crime, Green Belt, trees and hedgerows**

7.5.1 Policy DM9 of the CSDMP indicates that development should respect and enhance the local, natural or historic character of the environment and provide high quality design layouts which maximise the opportunities for linkages to the surrounding area and local services. Paragraph 56 of the NPPF indicates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF indicates that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality design and inclusive design for all development. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF indicates that permission should be refused for development of poor design which fails take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and how it functions.

7.5.2 As indicated above, the provision of open space to serve this development is within the Green Belt. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF indicates that new development would be considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to a number of exceptions including the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor recreation so long as they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF outlines the purposes of the Green Belt, which includes safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The provision of open space, including play space, would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

7.5.2 The application site falls within Character Area 3 of the West End Village Design Statement SPD 2016 (VDS). The VDS indicates that this Character Area has an open and rural feel with larger rear gardens and vegetation between properties. The relationship of the proposed development with this Character Area is addressed below (Paragraphs 7.5.6 to 7.5.13).

7.5.3 The proposal would provide a cul-de-sac form of development formed off a main access road from Beldam Bridge Road, with open space provided towards the east edge of the site (in the Green Belt). Whilst the applicant has no control over the land to the north, scope for a connection to this site would be provided. The proposed development would be set back from the Beldam Bridge Road frontage, behind the existing vegetative screen, but would be seen as a continuation of

development from the settlement to the west. The provision of traditional dwellings in form and design is considered to be the correct design response for this location.

- 7.5.4 The majority of the site, behind the road frontage, would not be clearly visible from the existing public domain, and views of the frontage properties limited by the aforementioned vegetative screen, but with the exception of the access, clearly visible from Beldam Bridge Road. The application site is relatively self-contained, when viewed from the woodland to the east (in the Green Belt). The north boundary (with another part of the housing reserve site) is predominantly open land, with the north west corner bounding land that has been used for commercial purposes.
- 7.5.5 The proposed layout is broadly in a similar form to that shown at the outline stage (as a schematic layout), for which objections were not raised. However, the current proposal has been the subject of a Design Review process at the pre-application stage. Following the receipt of comments from the Design Review Panel, the design has been amended to take account of these comments. The main conclusions of the Panel and how those issues have been addressed follow.

#### The design response to the wider context

- 7.5.6 The Design Review Panel considered that there were aspects of the wider context which could be better reflected in the design of the proposal, such as how the pedestrian routes around the site were brought through the layout and how the edges of the site worked with their immediate context. The Panel acknowledged that the main vehicular entrance to the site was well-resolved and supported the general approach to the frontage to Beldam Bridge Road; in particular the lowering of the speed limit along this stretch of the public highway reducing the amount of landscape loss to the site frontage. There was concern over the pedestrian linkages within and outside the site. The Panel encouraged the use of the contextual analysis of the wider landscape setting to generate a strong rationale for how the site was to be developed.
- 7.5.7 In response, the applicant has revised the scheme to improve the pedestrian linkages within the site. This includes a reinforcement of the pedestrian link from the south west corner of the site, onto Beldam Bridge Road, in front of the residential properties, and accessing the open space to the east. An access road, with pavement, is provided to the north boundary north of the site, adjoining another part of the housing reserve site, which would assist future connectivity.

#### The layout and public realm

- 7.5.8 The Panel indicated that the layout was too homogenous with little to distinguish the site from one part to another. A hierarchy of spaces and streets, each with its own character and identity, was therefore recommended. It was also recommended that the road network should reinforce this movement hierarchy intention by use of materials and providing a less standardised street network. The Panel encouraged the applicant to consider the retention of some of the existing trees within the site which, in the near future, could provide real maturity to the site, help connect the design to the site and enable the transition to the Green Belt to be handled more subtly. The surface water drainage scheme could play a

bigger role in supporting the character and identity of the scheme, including the use of swales and a better integration of the pond into the open space. Hedging to the east residential boundary, rather than fencing, would further assist the transition to the Green Belt. The pedestrian links with the open space, from the main street and the main pedestrian access (at the south west corner) could be improved. Plot 85 should be re-orientated so that it adds natural surveillance over the open space.

- 7.5.9 The proposal has provided four character areas, as indicated in Paragraph 4.4 above. These areas are distinctive in terms of their role in the overall development, whether they are proposed to reflect the development edge (the Beldam Bridge Road frontage or Green Belt edge) or reinforce the character within the site (the Primary Road or Central Mews). The revised submission has included an amendment to the categorising of these areas, with the whole of the frontage facing the open space provided as a complete character area (the Green Belt edge). The surfacing of the road layout has shown differing treatments between character areas, so that the access road within the Primary Road area is predominantly tarmac with the roads in the other character areas having different coloured block paving treatments (e.g. red block paving for the Central Mews).
- 7.5.10 The proposal has re-orientated some of the properties, including Plot 85, within this character area so that they either front or have dual aspect and as such have a more active frontage with the open space. The pedestrian link extends to the west edge of the open space in front of these properties. This provides this character area with a more distinctive and cohesive character, with soft landscaping including hedging to this edge, softening the appearance of the development when viewed from the open space (and the Green Belt).
- 7.5.11 Trees within the site are poor in condition, and whilst the Panel's views are noted, only a small number of trees are proposed to be retained. This will provide the opportunity to provide a landscaping for the site include more appropriate species and improved provision, an approach supported by the Council's Tree Officer. However, the major trees to the site boundaries, particularly within the Green Belt, are to be retained. The provision of landscaping within the site including hedging and other soft landscaping to the frontages of properties particularly to the Beldam Bridge Road frontage, Primary Road and Green Belt edges to reflect the VDS character area. This provision, along with its long term management, will be secured by condition, as set out below which would provide greater certainty of control over these spaces.
- 7.5.11 A plot boundary plan has been provided to more clearly define the future ownership and control of all spaces within the site, defining the public and privately controlled spaces. The revised submission also included an indication of a range of different boundary treatments. However, the consideration of boundary treatments and the long term management of the land outside of private ownership/control would be undertaken by condition.

#### The built form and materials

- 7.5.12 The Design Review Panel indicated that there was little to distinguish the design approach of one part of the site from any of the others. The edges of the site should be designed so they reflect their differing contexts. The edge of the Green



Belt should have its own design approach that uses buildings, materials and landscape detailing to manage the transition from urbanised village to the Green Belt beyond. The main frontage to the Beldam Bridge Road is distinct from the rest of the scheme as it has the potential to have a strong relationship with the existing houses opposite, but could become hidden from the village and would not support the streetscene. The approach to the design detailing should reflect its location, rather than just being a repetition of the approach to the approach found in the site interior. The mews streets could work well as a type, but more work was needed to be done to make these distinct spaces. At that time, the distribution of unit types was overly complex, making many parts of the site indistinguishable from another. More order and logic to house types was required to aid legibility and wayfinding, and it could help express the Green Belt location within the layout. The approach to “fabric first” to energy performance (i.e. to provide performance in the building e.g. insulation, to reduce the requirement for the addition of renewable technology) was welcomed by the Panel, but measures to allow passive solar gain was recommended.

- 7.5.13 The proposal has been amended to provide a more coherent material palette to reinforce, with the proposed changes to the character areas (as indicated in Paragraph 7.5.10 above). The revised submission has provided a design strategy with four distinct character areas, as confirmed in paragraph 4.3 above. Each character area has a more distinctive material palette. The Green Belt edge and Central Mews character areas will be finished in wood cladding, with black cladding to the Green Belt edge, particularly reflecting the traditional Surrey barn finish, and white cladding to the Central Mews. The Beldam Bridge Road frontage and the Primary Road character areas would be finished predominantly in tile hanging and brick, respectively, with some minor variations to add interest, particularly at more prominent locations (e.g. Plots 76 and 77). This would provide each part with a more distinctive character and this approach is considered to be acceptable. The applicant has advised that each new building would be subject to a SAP assessment to ensure energy efficiency within each building and the orientation of the buildings, where this is possible, to provide sufficient levels of daylight and natural ventilation to habitable rooms.
- 7.5.14 The Surrey Police have provided comments that the scheme has considered crime prevention measures to meet the key principles of “Secured-by-Design” including natural surveillance from the single vehicular point of access and footpath links, with active frontages and routes are wholly integrated within the scheme, so long as the open space and visitor parking spaces are maintained in the longer term. There are some concerns about surveillance of all of the parking spaces but it is considered that this limited impact would not have a detrimental impact on the overall scheme.

### Conclusion

- 7.5.15 The current proposal would provide a design strategy to clearly define and separate out different parts of the site which would provide a form of development which helps reinforce the characteristics of the neighbouring settlement edge, including the nature of the adjoining Character Area as set out in the VDS, and through the Design Review process genuine improvements have been provided. The proposal would provide landscaping and has been arranged around the retention of

the significant trees on the site, particularly the line of trees on the existing field boundary within the site, and soft landscaping to the property frontages, especially to the plot edges, which is a positive feature of the development. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not only integrate into its village setting but also genuinely enhance and improve the character and quality of the local area, so complying with Policies CP2 and DM9 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

## **7.6 Impact traffic generation, parking capacity and highway safety**

- 7.6.1 The proposal would provide a sole access from Beldam Bridge Road, which was approved at the outline stage, for which the County Highway Authority raised no objections on traffic generation and highway safety grounds, subject to conditions, subsequently provided for the outline scheme.
- 7.6.2 The proposal would provide 214 garage or parking spaces, of which 11 spaces would be unallocated, would be provided to serve this development. This level of parking would meet parking standards and no objections are therefore raised on these grounds. No objections are raised to the proposal by the County Highway Authority.
- 7.6.3 As such, the proposal complies with Policies CP11 and DM11 of the CSDMP and the NPPF.

## **7.7 Impact on residential amenity**

- 7.7.1 The existing property, Thurdon, is positioned to the north west boundary of the site. Noting the relationship of the proposed dwellings with this property, with the front and rear walls of the dwelling serving plot 1 roughly in line with this dwelling (fronting Beldam Bridge Road) and the dwellings (serving plots 19-32) positioned a minimum of 10 metres from the flank boundary of this property and with some retained soft landscaping/trees on or close to this boundary, no adverse impacts on the residential property are envisaged. These levels of separation are considered to be acceptable.
- 7.7.2 Beyond the long rear garden of Thurdon is the mixed residential/commercial site of 24 & 26 Benner Lane (beyond part of the north west boundary of the application site), which has been the subject of a residential redevelopment proposal under planning permission SU/15/0375 (not implemented). For either the existing development or the approved development on this site, the relationship with the current proposal is acceptable noting the levels of separation provided, including about 10 metre rear garden depths for the nearest plots (plots 32-38), the vegetation on the mutual boundary, and the orientation/set-in of the existing/proposed dwellings on that site (set perpendicular to, and about 10 metres from, the mutual boundary).
- 7.7.3 Oak Tree Farm lies to the east of the application site. The garden of this property also extends towards the boundary with the application site. However, the proposed development would be set over 70 metres from the proposed dwellings, with a small part of the open space in between, and with landscaping close to the site boundary, no adverse impact on this property.

- 7.7.4 The frontage properties will face dwellings on the south side of Beldam Bridge Road, within the settlement of West End. Noting the levels of separation, and the heavy landscaping in between, no adverse impact to these residential properties is envisaged.
- 7.7.5 The proposal would lead to an increase in traffic noise from increased movements and general activity. In this respect, the applicant had provided an acoustic report for the outline scheme to which the Council's Senior Environmental Health Officer had confirmed the level of increase would not be sufficient to make any significant impact on residential amenity. No objections are therefore raised on these grounds.
- 7.7.6 The current proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable on residential amenity grounds, with the proposal complying with Policy DM9 of the CSDMP.

## **7.8 Impact on housing mix**

- 7.8.1 Policy CP6 of the CSDMP promotes a range of dwellings across the Borough which includes for market housing a provision equally weighted between smaller (1 and 2 bed units) with larger properties (3 bed units plus) with affordable housing weighted towards the smaller units. The current proposal is weighted towards the larger units which is acceptable in this settlement edge location. The proposed is considered to be acceptable, complying with Policy CP6 of the CSDMP.

## **7.9 Impact on local infrastructure**

- 7.9.1 Surrey Heath's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule was adopted by the Full Council in July 2014. As the CIL charging schedule came into force in December 2014, an assessment of CIL liability has been undertaken. Surrey Heath charges CIL on residential development where there is a net increase in residential floor area, the development is CIL liable.
- 7.9.2 The CIL charging schedule includes payments, which do not need to be relevant to the development proposal in all cases, towards SANG, open space, local/strategic transport projects, play areas and equipped spaces, indoor sports, community facilities (e.g. libraries and surgeries), waste and recycling, and flood defence/drainage improvements. The Inspector for the appeal decision indicated, at paragraph 38, that the CIL tariff can include highway improvements to benefit the local highway network if future capacity issues arise.
- 7.9.3 At the time of writing of this report, the required CIL forms were submitted and the Council was able to calculate the liable sum, which is estimated to be about £332,500. CIL is a land charge that is payable upon commencement of works. As such, no objections are raised to the proposal on these grounds, with the proposal complying with Policy CP12 of the CSDMP 2012 and the NPPF.

## **7.10 Open space provision**

- 7.10.1 Policy DM16 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 requires the provision of open space (including play space) within new residential developments to meet the needs of future residents. The proposed layout indicates the provision of open space of about 3,800 square

metres (including play space of about 200 square metres) proposed towards the east of the site (within the Green Belt). As such, no objections are raised to the proposal on these grounds with the proposal complying with Policy DM16 of the CSDMP.

### **7.11 Impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area**

- 7.11.1 The application site falls about 0.8 kilometres from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (as saved) seeks to protect the ecological integrity of the SPA from recreational pressure, through increased dog walking and an increase in general recreational use, which occurs from the provision of new (net) residential development. Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2012 builds on this approach. The SPD identifies that the impact on the SPA from residential development can be mitigated by the provision of contributions towards Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) to offset any potential harm to the SPA.
- 7.11.2 As indicated in Paragraph 7.9 above, the CIL charging schedule incorporates SANGS funding. The site falls within the Chobham SANG and the release of SANG capacity has been provided for this scheme meeting the tests set out in The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. No objection is therefore raised to the proposal on these grounds.
- 7.11.3 Policy CP14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 also requires a contribution towards the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures, which supports the on-site protection of the SPA. As this is not included with the CIL scheme, a separate contribution is required, which will be provided under the requirements of the legal agreement attached to the outline permission SU/16/0323, and, as such, no objections are raised on these grounds.
- 7.11.4 The current proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the SPA, complying with Policy CP14 of the CSDMP, Policy NRM6 of the SEP and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD 2012.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 No objections are raised to the impact of the proposal on trees/hedgerows, residential amenity, traffic generation, parking, highway safety, ecology, archaeology, land contamination, drainage, flood risk, local infrastructure, housing mix, crime and the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The outline permission provided a legal agreement to secure the provision of sufficient amount of affordable housing and a SAMM contribution.
- 8.2 The current proposal has been the subject to a Design Review process with significant benefits gained to local character building on the original outline planning permission SU/16/0323.

The development would integrate with the residential properties in Beldam Bridge Road and the wider area and improve the character and quality of the area. As such, this application is recommended for approval.

## **9.0 ARTICLE 2(3) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ORDER 2012 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER**

In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of Paragraphs 186-187 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 proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

## **11.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**GRANT** permission subject to the following conditions:

1. No development shall take place until details and samples of the external materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Materials to be agreed will include the proposed brick, tile, wood cladding, guttering and fenestration. 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.

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 6356/01 Rev. L, 6356/04 Rev. C, 6356/06 Rev. A, 6356/10 Rev. E, 6356/12 Rev. C, 6356/15 Rev. C, 6356/17 Rev. C, 6356/18 Rev. C, 6356/20 Rev. C, 6356/22 Rev. C, 6356/30 Rev. C and 6356/31 received on 10 May 2017; unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which should build upon the provided landscape drawings CSA/2943//102 Rev. A, CSA/2943//103 Rev. A, CSA/2943//104 Rev. A, CSA/2943//105 Rev. A and CSA/2943/107, and these works shall be carried out as approved, and implemented prior to first occupation.

The submitted details should also include an indication of all level alterations, hard surfaces, walls, fences, access features, the existing trees and hedges to be retained, together with the new planting to be carried out and shall build upon the aims and objectives of the supplied **BS5837:2012 – Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction** Arboricultural Method Statement [AMS]. It would be expected that the soft landscaping shall include plant material which would reflect and enhance the landscape character of the wider area as opposed to the use of high ornamental species.

All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All plant material shall conform to **BS3936:1992 Parts 1 – 5: Specification for Nursery Stock**. Handling, planting and establishment of trees shall be in accordance with **BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape**. A landscape management plan including maintenance schedules for all landscape areas other than small, privately-owned domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before first occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its permitted use. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. The landscape areas shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed landscape management plan for a minimum period of [ten](#) years.

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.

4. No development including demolition shall take place until a detailed arboricultural method statement, with tree protection plan, has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement, which should build upon the Arboricultural Impact Assessment by Ian Keen Limited (Ref: JTK/8169/APP2/so), will be in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 “Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and

Construction” and shall contain details of pruning or removal of trees, specification and location of tree and ground protection (for both pedestrian and vehicular use), all demolition processes, details of construction processes for hard surfaces. The statement should also contain details of arboricultural supervision and frequency of inspection along with a reporting process to the Tree Officer. This site supervision should include a mechanism to include a pre-commencement meeting with the Council’s Arboricultural Officer (or other nominated officer) to agree the tree and ground protection required for the duration of the construction period. All works to be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and to accord with Policy DM9 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Details of the play area accommodation, including details of the surfacing, play equipment, surrounding fencing and seating, building upon the details shown on Drawing No.CSA/2943/106, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory play area is provided for the occupiers of the development and in accordance with Policy DM16 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Informative(s)

1. Party Walls (etc) Act 1996 DE3
2. CIL Liable CIL1
3. The applicant is reminded that the conditions and legal agreement attached to outline permission SU/16/0323, remain in force for the approved development.