

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

5e 17/0153 Reg'd: 27.02.17 Expires: 29.05.17 Ward: HV
Nei. 19.10.17 BVPI Smallscale Number > 13 On No
Con. 19.10.17 Target major of Weeks Target? No
Exp: dwellings (07) on Cttee'
Day:

LOCATION: Ian Allan Motors, 63 - 65 High Street, Old Woking, GU22 9LN

PROPOSAL: Outline planning application (reserving matters of appearance and landscaping) for the demolition of all existing buildings and erection of 1No. part four, part three storey building, 1No. part three, part two storey building and the erection of 1No. two storey terrace, providing 24No. residential units (7No. 1 bedroom units, 8No. 2 bedroom units and 9No. 3 bedroom units) together with car parking, landscaping and incidental works (amended proposed site plan and flood risk assessment received 20.09.2017)

TYPE: Outline Application

APPLICANT: Ian Allan Group Ltd

OFFICER: Benjamin Bailey

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The proposal is for 'Major' development which falls outside the Management Arrangements and Scheme of Delegations.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Site Area: 0.2817 ha (2817 sq.m)
Existing units: 0
Proposed units: 24
Existing density: 0 dph (dwellings per hectare)
Proposed density: 85 dph

PLANNING STATUS

- Urban Area
- Adjacent to Grade II Statutory Listed Building (Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street)
- Proximity of Locally Listed Building (Shackleford House, Nos.71-73 High Street)
- Area of High Archaeological Potential
- Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 (Each Partial)
- Contaminated Land suspected
- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) Zone B (400m-5km)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT outline planning permission subject to recommended conditions and Section 106 Legal Agreement.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is adjacent to a petrol station fronting Old Woking High Street and spans the area between Old Woking High Street to the south and Priors Croft to the north. The site is entirely hard surfaced where not encompassed by existing buildings. There are two existing buildings on the site, including a two storey predominantly dual-pitched building towards the High Street frontage which is attached to a shallow dual-pitched building to the rear with a substantial footprint. There is a further dual-pitched building to the north-west section of the site adjacent to the site boundary with Priors Croft. The site was, until January 2017, used as a car sales showroom and the apron of hardstanding was utilised for the external display of cars.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The application site has a relatively comprehensive planning history relating to its use as a car sales showroom with ancillary garage however none is relevant to the current application.

CONSULTATIONS

Historic England:	In our view you do not need to notify or consult us on this application under the relevant statutory provisions.
Heritage & Conservation Consultant:	The High Street terrace has a traditional frontage reflecting the street character with a good level of space between Hale Lodge given over to tree planting and soft landscaping. Also the necessary large area of surface car parking is contained within the site, part being in under croft form, the effect of this hard area on the surrounding streets will thus be minimalized. I have no further adverse comments at this stage.
Archaeological Officer (SCC):	No objection subject to condition 18.
County Highway Authority (CHA) (SCC):	No objection subject to recommended conditions 19, 20, 21 and 22.
Environment Agency:	No objection subject to recommended conditions 11 and 12.
Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (SCC):	Subject to the Council's Drainage Flood Risk Engineer being satisfied with the proposal, we would have no further comments to make.
Drainage & Flood Risk Engineer (Initial):	Raised objection.
Drainage & Flood Risk Engineer (Second):	Objection still stands.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Drainage & Flood Risk Engineer (Third):	Objection still stands.
Drainage & Flood Risk Engineer (Fourth):	Objection still stands.
Drainage & Flood Risk Engineer (Fifth):	No objection subject to recommended conditions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12.
Thames Water Development Planning:	Thames Water would advise that, with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the planning application. Comments regarding surface water drainage and recommends condition 13 to secure submission of piling method statement.
Surrey Wildlife Trust (Initial):	Recommend that, prior to determination of the planning application; the development site is surveyed by a qualified ecologist to help determine the status of any legally protected species on site, with a particular focus of the likelihood of presence of active bat roost(s).
Surrey Wildlife Trust (Second):	To be updated verbally at Planning Committee.
Environmental Health Service:	No objection subject to recommended condition 16.
Scientific Officer:	No objection subject to recommended condition 17 and post remedial monitoring to be secured via the Section 106 agreement to allow for uncertainties and provide flexibility in remedial approaches whilst ensuring the agreed remediation standards have been achieved and continue to demonstrate this following remediation and development of the site post occupation.

COMMENTARY

The application has been amended since initial submission. Amendments have included:

- Minor alterations to the footprint of Building A, fronting High Street to wholly within Flood Zone 1
- Minor alterations to the footprint of Building B, fronting Priors Croft to wholly within Flood Zone 1
- Minor alterations to cycle storage

Additional information has also been submitted during consideration of the application, including:

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Flood Risk Assessment Addendum
- Topographical Survey
- Bat Assessment and Walkover Survey

Following the submission of amended plans and additional information a further period of x21 days public consultation was undertaken on the application, including the re-sending of neighbour notification letters and re-publication of site and press notices (Major Development and Development Affecting a Listed Building or its setting).

REPRESENTATIONS

Initial Submission representations

The below summarises the representations received during the public consultation following initial submission of the planning application. For clarity this is the period up to and including 23rd March 2017.

x3 letters of objection received raising the following main points:

- Would bring increased traffic to Priors Croft
- Already an issue with parking within Priors Croft, aggravated by additional cars parking in resident allocated bays to access shops and cafes in Old Woking High Street
- Weekends are particularly bad for parking in Priors Croft and many resort to parking on the grass verges
- Concerns regarding height and position of the buildings proposed and overlooking and loss of light to adjacent Copthorne, No.58 Priors Croft
- Impact upon status of adjacent Grade II Listed Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street as a building of architectural and historical significance
- Impact upon stability of Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street
(Officer Note: This matter would be controlled under the provisions of the Building Regulations and Party Wall Act (as applicable))
- Concerns regarding height and position of buildings proposed and overlooking and loss of light to Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street

x1 letter received, neither supporting or objecting, raising the following main points:

- Current parking facilities for residents of Priors Croft are in short supply, particularly at evenings and weekends (previous issues during the day were removed upon closure of the Ian Allan business).
- Therefore it is a regular occurrence that local residents need to park along the existing boundary of the former Ian Allan property.
- The existing entry point on Priors Croft will remain, which is fine, but with the creation of the refuse points and pedestrian entry points concerned that parking will no longer be available along this boundary for Priors Croft residents to use.
- Please can you confirm that no parking restrictions would be introduced with this proposal that would impact the external area?

Amended plans and additional information re-consultation representations

The below summarises the representation received during the public consultation following the submission of amended plans and additional information. For clarity this is the period from 21st September 2017 (inclusive) onwards.

x1 letter of objection received raising the following main points:

- Current drainage system in place is already not sufficient and is easily overwhelmed

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- even after a short, heavy downpour which causes chaos on the High Street
- With all the extra roofs, drains and gutters the water run-off speed and volume will be considerably increased
- Both High Street and Priors Croft are already unable to provide sufficient parking with parked cars already causing obstructions to pavements, footpaths, driveways and road junctions
- Old Woking High Street is a major trunk road and has long been inadequate to cater for the current volumes of traffic
- Possibility of four storey buildings overshadowing already dimly-lit, north-facing properties and gardens to the east of the proposed development
- Dampness is a big issue for all the properties on the immediate east side

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Promoting sustainable transport

Section 6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Section 7 - Requiring good design

Section 10 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

South East Plan (2009) (saved policy)

NRM6 - Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Areas

Woking Core Strategy (2012)

CS1 - A spatial strategy for Woking Borough

CS7 - Biodiversity and nature conservation

CS8 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Areas

CS9 - Flooding and water management

CS10 - Housing provision and distribution

CS11 - Housing mix

CS12 - Affordable housing

CS15 - Sustainable economic development

CS18 - Transport and accessibility

CS20 - Heritage and conservation

CS21 - Design

CS22 - Sustainable construction

CS25 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Development Management Policies DPD (2016)

DM1 - Green infrastructure opportunities

DM2 - Trees and landscaping

DM7 - Noise and light pollution

DM8 - Land contamination and hazards

DM16 - Servicing development

DM20 - Heritage assets and their settings

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

Design (2015)

Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)

Parking Standards (2006)

Affordable Housing Delivery (2014)

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Climate Change (2013)

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPGs)

Heritage of Woking (2000)

Other Material Considerations

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

EU Habitats Directive and the UK Habitat Regulations 2010

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010

Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas Act 1990

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy

Circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Historic England – The Setting of Heritage Assets (2015)

WBC - Waste & Recycling Provisions for New Residential Developments

Woking Character Study (2010)

Woking Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2015)

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

PLANNING ISSUES

1. The main planning considerations in determining this application are:
 - The planning policy context
 - Principle of the change of use
 - Access
 - Parking strategy
 - Refuse/recycling strategy
 - Density and the mix of dwellings proposed
 - Impact upon the character of the area
 - Impact upon trees
 - Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity
 - Amenities of future residential occupiers
 - Impact upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)
 - Biodiversity and protected species
 - Impact upon heritage assets (including Hale Lodge, Shackleford House and Archaeology)
 - Land contamination
 - Flood risk and drainage (including sequential test and SuDS)
 - Affordable housing
 - CO2 and water consumption
 - Local finance considerations
 - Legal agreement requirements
 - Balancing exercise and conclusions

The planning policy context

2. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that *“if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”*.
3. The Development Plan comprises Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 (which is relevant to residential development), the policies contained within the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the Development Management Policies

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Development Plan Document (DMP DPD) (2016). A number of other Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) and Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG's) are also relevant to the consideration of this application and these generally provide more detailed information on topic based matters.

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) comprises an overarching set of planning policies and details how the Government expects them to be applied. The fundamental aim of the NPPF is to deliver sustainable development and the document sets a strong presumption in favour of development which is economically, socially and environmentally sustainable. The NPPF provides policy guidance on a variety of planning topics and, where relevant, reference to the NPPF is given in the relevant section of the planning considerations for this application in the sections below. The NPPF is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
5. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) is a web-based resource and provides detailed Government advice on matters which relate to the operation of the planning system in practice. The guidance in the NPPG supports the policies contained within the NPPF.

Principle of the change of use

6. The NPPF states that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment as well as in people's quality of life (paragraph 9). The NPPF seeks to boost housing supply significantly and local planning authorities should aim to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create mixed, inclusive and balanced communities (paragraph 50).
7. Policy CS1 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) makes provision for the delivery of 4,964 net additional dwellings, with an overall affordable housing provision target of 35%, between 2010 and 2027.
8. The application site falls within the Urban Area of Old Woking between the Kingfield Local Centre (circa 163 metres to the west) and Old Woking Neighbourhood Centre (circa 341 metres to the east).
9. The existing site contains a car sales showroom, with ancillary vehicle workshops, and therefore constitutes a sui generis land use. Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that the Council will safeguard land within the employment areas for B Class Uses, except in certain exceptions, and will permit the redevelopment of B Class Use sites elsewhere in the Borough for alternative uses that accord with other policies in the Core Strategy where (i) the existing use of the site causes harm to amenity and/or (ii) it can be demonstrated that the location is unsuitable for the needs of modern business.
10. The application site is not designated as an Employment Area and does not contain a B Class use. There is therefore no conflict with Policy CS15 in terms of the loss of the existing land use to residential purposes. Notwithstanding this the application site has been vacant since the relocation of the former car dealership to a site in Virginia Water in January 2017. The applicant states that the previous car dealership on the site suffered from dealership competition within the Slyfield area of Guildford, that the site had made a significant financial loss within the past five years and that the number of staff employed on the site had been reduced to eleven at the point the dealership ceased trading from the site. The applicant also states that the facilities on the site are

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

ageing and that there are a lack of franchises to make the site viable as a car dealership.

11. The application site is situated within the Urban Area, outside of the 400m (Zone A buffer) of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA). The proposed development would make a meaningful contribution towards the Core Strategy requirement to provide at least 4,964 dwellings within the Borough between 2010 and 2027, providing 24 net dwellings.
12. The application site has not been identified within either the latest published Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) nor the draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) although these factors do not preclude planning applications being brought forwards to be considered on their merits.
13. Policy CS10 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) sets an indicative density range of between 30 - 40 dwellings per hectare (dph) for infill development in the rest of the Urban Area (ie. those areas outside of Woking Town Centre, West Byfleet District Centre, Local Centres and Employment Areas and major sites identified within the Core Strategy), as in this instance, although does state, within the policy text, that *"the density ranges set out are indicative and will depend on the nature of the site. Density levels will be influenced by design with the aim to achieve the most efficient use of land. Wherever possible, density should exceed 40 dwellings per hectare and will not be justified at less than 30 dwellings per hectare, unless there are significant constraints on the site or where higher densities cannot be integrated into the existing urban form. Higher densities than these guidelines will be permitted in principle where they can be justified in terms of the sustainability of the location and where the character of an area would not be compromised"*.
14. The residential density of the proposal would be 85 dph (dwellings per hectare). Whilst this is above the indicative density range of 40 dph for infill development in the rest of the Urban Area density itself is not determinative of overdevelopment of the site. The impact upon the character of the area, in terms of siting, mass and scale, the level of parking provision and the relationship formed with neighbouring dwellings, must also be considered.
15. Furthermore the reasoned justification text to Policy CS10 states that *"the locations and proportions of new dwellings listed in the policy are intended to be broad proportions that can be varied in relation to the availability of suitable land for development, so long as the basic relationships in the settlement hierarchy are not undermined"*, that *"the density ranges set out in the policy are not intended to be prescriptive, but a guide to inform development proposals"*, that it is *"important to ensure that a balance is achieved between making efficient use of land and delivering the right type of housing to meet the needs of the whole community"* and that *"the Borough's Local and Neighbourhood Centres offer community facilities and local services and are within a reasonable distance of the town and district centres via public transport"*.
16. In addition to the factors above the mix of housing proposed is an important consideration, as is the fact that the application site is situated between, and within walking distance of both, the Kingfield Local Centre (circa 163 metres to the west) and the Old Woking Neighbourhood Centre (circa 341 metres to the east). These Local and Neighbourhood Centres offer community facilities and local services and are within a reasonable distance of the town and district centres via public transport.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

17. Therefore, subject to the detailed considerations to follow, no 'in principle' objection is raised to the proposed residential development quantum and densities proposed.

Access

18. The NPPF promotes sustainable transport (Chapter 4). Decisions should take account of whether:
 - the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
 - safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
19. The application site currently comprises approximately 1,178 sq.m of sui generis floorspace, in the form of a car sales showroom and ancillary vehicle workshops, alongside a large apron of hardstanding, which encompasses the entire area of the site not encompassed by buildings. This external apron of hardstanding has been used for the external siting of cars for sale alongside customer and staff vehicle parking.
20. There are two existing vehicular crossovers serving the application site, onto High Street and Priors Croft respectively. It is proposed that the existing vehicular crossover onto High Street is removed and that the existing vehicular crossover onto Priors Croft is improved and widened to serve the proposed development. The proposed development has been considered by the County Highway Authority (CHA) (SCC) who, having considered any local representations, and having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds, raise no objections.

Parking strategy

21. SPD 'Parking Standards (2006)' sets maximum parking standards, with the objective of promoting sustainable non-car travel. It advises that where car parking provision falls below the stated maximum standard the scheme needs to be examined to ensure it does not have an adverse impact upon highway safety, the free flow of traffic or parking provision in the locality. More recently, Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) highlights the Council's commitment to sustainable transport modes. With this in mind new development is steered to urban locations, such as the application site, that are served by a range of sustainable transport options.
22. Whilst Policy CS18 states that the Council will move towards minimum parking standards for residential development, SPD 'Parking Standards (2006)' remains in place and the NPPF states that in setting local parking standards local planning authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development; the type and mix of the development; the availability and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and the need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles.
23. SPD 'Parking Standards (2006)' sets maximum residential car parking standards of 1 car space (1 bedroom unit), 1.5 car spaces (2 bedroom unit) and 2 car spaces (3 or more bedroom unit) outside of the High Accessibility Zone, as in this instance, although states that "*for car parking the standards define the maximum acceptable provision for the most common forms of development. Provision above this level will not normally be permitted*".
24. The proposed development would provide 7no. 1 bedroom units, 8no. 2 bedroom

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

units and 9no. 3 bedroom units. The maximum car parking standard, applying the standards within SPD 'Parking Standards (2006)', would therefore be 37 parking spaces, excluding any visitor parking spaces. In terms of visitor parking spaces SPD 'Parking Standards (2006)' states that *"if on street visitors parking is not considered feasible, at the discretion of the Council, extra car spaces allocated for visitors parking may be provided up to a maximum rate of 10% of the total number of car spaces provided for the development"*. The maximum number of visitor parking spaces, rounded up, would therefore be 4 spaces. Whilst the proposed development would not provide 4 visitor parking spaces the maximum number of parking spaces (37 spaces) to serve the proposed residential units would be achieved and on this basis the impact upon car parking provision is considered to be acceptable.

Refuse/recycling Collection

25. Communal bin stores are proposed at ground floor level within both Buildings B and C fronting Priors Croft. These bin stores would house a 1,100 litre refuse bin per every 5 apartments, a 1,100 litre recycling bin per every 5 apartments and a 140 litre bin for every 15 apartments, with access to the waiting vehicle on Priors Croft within the required 10 metres for refuse/recycling operatives. The communal bin stores would also be located close to, but separate from, the common stair within Building B and the common stair/lift core within Building C such that future residential occupiers would not have to carry refuse/recycling more than 30 metres from their dwelling to the relevant communal bin store. The 4no. dwellings fronting High Street would store refuse/recycling bins within their front gardens within a suitable enclosure, details of which would be considered at reserved matters (appearance) stage.

Density and the mix of dwellings proposed

26. Delivering an appropriate density of development is essential as it ensures the best and most efficient use of land; delivering higher densities on redevelopment sites ensures that less land is required to meet housing need. Increasing densities also promotes sustainable development as more buildings, residences, shops, and services can be provided closer together for ease of walking, to enable a more efficient use of services and resources.
27. The density of the proposed development is 85 dwellings per hectare. Whilst this is above the indicative density range of 40 dph for infill development in the rest of the Urban Area density itself is not determinative of overdevelopment of the site. Consideration should also be afforded to the result of this density such as how it is manifest in the proposed building heights and the impact upon the character of the area. This will be considered further in later sections of this report.
28. The mix of dwelling sizes within Policy CS11 was informed by the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and the information in the more recently published SHMA (September 2015) is broadly similar. The table below shows the comparison between the need for different sizes of homes across the West Surrey SHMA (September 2015), and the number and percentage of the housing by bedrooms size as proposed in the application.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Unit Size	2015 SHMA split of all dwellings by size	Proposal – Total number of dwellings by size	% of dwellings proposed by size
1 bed	20%	7	29.0%
2 bed	30%	8	33.5%
3 bed	35%	9	37.5%
4 bed	15%	0	00.0%
5 bed		0	00.0%
Total	100%	24	100.0%

Note: 2010 is the year referred to in Policy CS1 for the housing delivery policy.

29. It can be noted from the table above that there is some difference between the mix proposed as part of the application, in terms of 1 bedroom units, and the housing mix of Policy CS11. However the policy allows for flexibility in the mix, having regard to density and character of different areas of the Borough, and therefore not every development site will deliver the mix stated in the SHMA. It is also necessary to note that Policy CS11 is a Borough-wide policy and, as stated in the reasoned justification for the policy, the Council will monitor the effectiveness of the policy against the SHMA target.
30. Overall the mix of dwelling sizes within the proposed development accords very closely to the need for different sizes of homes identified within the West Surrey SHMA (September 2015) and therefore is considered to be acceptable.

Impact upon the character of the area

31. One of the core principles of planning as identified in the NPPF is securing high quality design. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF refers to the need to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development. Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy states that new development should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area within which it is located. The Woking Character Study and SPD 'Design (2015)' also provide design considerations.
32. Old Woking is located to the south-east of Woking Town Centre. Open areas to the north-east and south form part of the Green Belt and include the Hoe Stream to the north. Old Woking was the original Woking village although the arrival of the railway saw Woking move away from the old village and develop around the railway station. Old Woking grew significantly during the Inter-war and Post World War II period. It was a major area of council housing, which was a new feature of this period. Private development followed in the Inter-war period as farms were sold off to house builders, often creating ribbon developments along new roads. More recent infill development has occurred within Old Woking, with commercial and industrial areas redeveloped as housing, including a large housing development in the north-east of Old Woking which was originally the Hoebridge Works Factory, granted planning permission in 2006.
33. The predominant typology within this area of Old Woking is Inter-war/Immediate post war development. There is also a substantial area of Post War development and some areas of modern infill and redevelopment. There are also large areas of other development, including playing fields, schools, commercial and retail. The buildings along the High Street vary in age. There are several older Pre-Victorian properties, many Late Victorian/Edwardian properties and other residential properties of all the remaining time periods.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

34. Housing within the wider Old Woking area is generally red or brown brick and two storeys with the upper storey often rendered or pebble dashed and painted in pale colours, although some properties demonstrate hung tiles. Properties are generally semi-detached or in short terraces of around four houses and roofs are generally brown concrete tiles and pitched.
35. Roads are generally quite wide with verges and footpath on both sides. Properties also have front gardens, often with boundaries marked by low brick walls or hedges. Parking was originally on street and still is in many locations. Some properties, however, have converted front gardens into parking provision. Roads are often cul-de-sacs off distributor roads, most of which are relatively straight. Houses generally front on to the road, with a distinct building line visible.
36. The application site is adjacent to a petrol station fronting High Street to the east and spans the area between High Street and Priors Croft, which is entirely hard surfaced where not encompassed by existing buildings. There are two existing buildings on the site which include a two storey predominantly dual-pitched building towards the High Street frontage which is attached to a shallow dual-pitched building to the rear with a substantial footprint. There is a further dual-pitched building to the north-west section of the site adjacent to the site boundary with Priors Croft. The site was, until January 2017, used as a car sales showroom and the apron of hardstanding was utilised for the external display of cars.
37. The application site bounds the street scenes of both High Street and Priors Croft. The southern side of Priors Croft, to the west of the application site, demonstrates intermittent detached two storey dwellings, which have been historically constructed at the terminus of rear gardens of properties fronting High Street. There is no consistent pattern and grain of development to the southern side of Priors Croft, and the existing intermittent dwellings demonstrate some variations in architectural approach and are interspersed by the terminus of rear gardens fronting High Street, some of which have been laid to hardstanding and utilised for the provision of car parking. On the southern side of Priors Croft to the east of the application site there are both single storey and two storey dwellings although the greater height of buildings at Westminster Court and Grosvenor Court are visible towards the east.
38. The northern side of Priors Croft demonstrates a two storey block of flats with semi-detached pairs of dwellings and terraces of dwellings of a similar form and design. The predominant area to the north opposite the application site contains off-street parking bays laid to tarmac with a large area of open space laid to lawn.
39. The prevailing character to both the northern and southern sides of High Street to the east and west of the application site is of detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings, although there is a sub-station on the southern side of High Street opposite the eastern side of the application site. Immediately adjacent to the application site to the east is a petrol station.
40. Sound urban design principles are that, where possible, proposals should aim to re-establish a perimeter block format, building footprints should not be oversized and that private space and servicing should not address a public streetscape.
41. The layout of the proposed development takes the form of two 'tiers', one 'tier' fronting High Street and one 'tier' fronting Priors Croft. Building A, fronting High Street, takes the form of a two storey terrace of 4no. dwellings, with two separate buildings

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

(Buildings B and C) fronting Priors Croft, ranging in height from two storeys to four storeys. There are examples of two 'tiers' of development along High Street to the east and west of the application site and the proposed development would result in a perimeter block format, providing an appropriate relationship to the street scenes of High Street and Priors Croft, introducing frontage development which would increase natural surveillance. Car Parking would be provided in the centre of the site, accessed from Priors Croft, in order to make efficient use of the land and to result in the perimeter block format. The introduction of such linear forms of development along both the High Street and Priors Croft frontages would also serve to reinforce these street scenes.

42. The two storey scale of the terrace block fronting High Street is considered consistent with the existing building form and scale along High Street with the use of dual-pitched roofs to each terraced dwelling producing gabled forms to the frontage of the terrace.
43. Building B, fronting Priors Croft to the west of the application site, would be part three storey, part two storey, and would provide a transition in height between adjacent No.58 Priors Croft and proposed Building C, fronting Priors Croft to the east of the application site, which would be part three storey, part four storey in scale. Whilst it is acknowledged that Buildings B and C would be greater in height than the two storey dwellings on the northern side of this section of Priors Croft it must be borne in mind that there are larger scale buildings a short distance to the east at both Grosvenor Court and Westminster Court, both former office (Class B1(a)) buildings which have been, or are in the process of being, converted to residential use. Furthermore the greater height of Buildings B and C has been restricted to the Priors Croft frontage, which is considered to be less sensitive to change, and less consistent in terms of building scale, height and proportion than that of High Street.
44. Furthermore the fourth storey of Building C would be recessed from both the Priors Croft (north) and west (side) elevations, which would reduce the prominence of this fourth storey when viewed from ground level. Additionally, the maximum height above ground level of Building C would be 12.0m, which is some 2.0m lower than the maximum height (14.0m) of Grosvenor Court a short distance to the east. It is considered that the application site is an example of an appropriate site to consider higher densities than the surrounding area and that this increase in density would be appropriate to the context, with building heights reflecting examples within the local context.
45. The terrace block fronting High Street would demonstrate a depth of frontage varying slightly between 7.4m and 7.9m. Whilst this terrace would occur within closer proximity to High Street than the existing showroom building to be demolished it is considered that this depth of frontage would integrate into the street scene. A separation gap, varying between 7.7m and 9.3m, would be retained to the common western boundary with adjacent Hale Lodge. Again, whilst the terrace block would occur within slightly closer proximity to this common boundary than the existing showroom building to be demolished, it is considered, having regard to the scale and form of the terrace block, that this level of separation would result in an acceptable impact within the street scene and prevent the development along the High Street frontage from appearing unduly 'cramped'.
46. Building B would be set back between 1.8m and 2.5m from the application site boundary with Priors Croft and would maintain a separation gap varying between 8.9m and 5.7m from the common boundary with No.58 Priors Croft. Building C (to the east) would be set between 10.0m and 10.6m from Building B, and between 5.3m and

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

13.5m from the eastern application site boundary. Building C would largely cantilever over the vehicular access from Priors Croft and part of the central car parking area although 1no. flat, and the central stair/lift core would front onto Priors Croft.

47. Matters of appearance and landscaping would be considered at reserved matters stage, should outline planning permission be granted. However it is considered that adequate soft landscape margins would be provided within the application site, both to provide buffers to the site boundaries and defensible buffers to ground floor habitable room windows, such as to offset the impact of the central car parking area, which would be largely screened from public vantage points by the massing and siting of the buildings regardless. This factor also has to be considered in light of the existing application site, which is laid entirely to either building footprints or asphalt and contains no meaningful soft landscaping. It is also considered that the appearance of the proposed buildings would be capable of resolution at reserved matters stage.

Impact upon trees

48. Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) states that development proposals should allow for the retention of the best tree specimens, should not result in the loss of trees or groups of trees of significant amenity value and that trees to be retained will be required to be adequately protected to avoid damage during construction. Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy also requires the retention of any trees of amenity value.
49. There are no trees on the application site although trees exist on adjoining sites to the east and west. The application proposes no buildings within close proximity to adjacent sites. Furthermore the entirety of the existing application site is laid to impermeable asphalt, or building footprints, and therefore the rooting environment of trees on adjacent land is likely to be heavily constrained within the application site. It is considered, taking into account the entirely impermeable nature of the existing application site and the location of proposed buildings in relation to site boundaries, that any potential adverse impact upon the rooting environment of nearby off-site trees would be capable of being addressed at reserved matters stage and via planning condition (at reserved matters stage).

Impact upon neighbouring residential amenity

50. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) advises that proposals for new development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy, light, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook. Further guidance, in terms of assessing neighbouring amenity impacts, is provided within SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)'.
51. The key residential properties to assess are Copthorne, No.58 Priors Croft (to the west), Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street (also to the west), Shackleford House, No.71 - 73 High Street (to the east) and properties on the opposing northern side of Priors Croft and southern side of High Street.

Copthorne, No.58 Priors Croft:

52. Copthorne, at No.58 Priors Croft, is a detached two storey dwelling situated to the west. Building B would be sited to the east of No.58 and would vary in separation to the common boundary between 8.9m and 5.7m. The closest part of Building B,

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

projecting beyond the rear elevation of No.58, would be two storeys in height, measuring approximately 6.5m above ground level and terminating in a flat roof. The three storey elements of Building B would occur opposite the side (east) elevation of No.58 between approximately 7.0m and 9.0m from the common boundary. Whilst Building B would clearly be visible from No.58, including its rear garden amenity area, it is considered that the combination of the staggered building height, retained separation distances, and the oblique angle of orientation of Building B in relation to No.58, would avoid a significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook.

53. In terms of privacy, whilst the position of window, and other openings, would be considered at reserved matters stage, the submitted plans indicate that the area of Building B closest to the common boundary with No.58 would contain a staircase with the principal outlook of the flats proposed at first floor level and above directed towards the south and north.
54. Whilst the terrace block (Building A) fronting High Street would result in new first floor windows facing north the orientation of this terrace block would direct this outlook away from the residential curtilage of No.58 and would occur at distances sufficient to avoid a significantly harmful loss of privacy notwithstanding this.
55. The side (east) elevation of No.58 demonstrates a first floor window which is obscure-glazed and appears to be high-level opening only (eg. 1.7m from FFL), and is therefore likely to serve non-habitable space (such as a staircase or bathroom/wc). At ground floor level a side-facing (east) window, towards the front (north) elevation, is also obscure-glazed and appears to serve non-habitable space (such as entrance hallway/wc). Whilst a side-facing (east) window towards the rear elevation appears to be clear-glazed this window serves a secondary function to openings within the rear (south) elevation. Overall, therefore is not considered that a significantly harmful loss of daylight would occur to openings within the side (east) elevation of No.58 contrary to Policy CS21.
56. In terms of daylight to the front (north) and rear (south) elevations of No.58 SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' identifies that "*significant loss of daylight will occur if the centre of the affected window (or a point 2m in height above the ground for floor to ceiling windows) lies within a zone measured at 45° in both plan and elevation*". Building B passes this 45° angle test in terms of the front (north) and rear (south) elevations of No.58 and therefore no significant loss of daylight, contrary to Policy CS21, is considered to occur to openings within these elevations of No.58.

Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street:

57. Hale Lodge is situated to the west and is a two storey detached dwelling. Whilst the terrace block fronting High Street would be set forwards of the front building line of No.58 separation distances varying between 7.7m and 9.3m would be retained to the common boundary with Hale Lodge with the terrace block also angled obliquely in relation to Hale Lodge. Furthermore the western elevation of the terrace block would demonstrate an approximate 7.2m eaves height with the roof form pitching away from the common boundary with Hale Lodge to a maximum height of 9.0m, occurring a minimum of 10.0m away from the common boundary.
58. In terms of privacy, the position of window, and other openings, within the terrace block would be considered at reserved matters stage (appearance) however the main outlook to these terraced dwellings would be achieved via the front and rear

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

elevations with any windows proposed within the western elevation of the terrace block likely to serve non-habitable rooms (ie. bathroom), or as secondary aspect, and could therefore be obscure-glazed and of high-level (1.7m above FFL) opening.

59. Building B, fronting Priors Croft, would be sited to the north-east of Hale Lodge, and its rear garden area. It is considered that the combination of the staggered building height and retained separation distances of Building B would avoid a significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, to Hale Lodge, including its rear garden area.
60. It is acknowledged that second and third floor openings within the rear (south-west) elevation of Building B would face towards the rear elevation, and rear garden amenity area, of Hale Lodge. Whilst the position of windows, and other openings, within Building B would be considered at reserved matters stage (appearance), it is likely that windows within the rear (south-west) elevation of Building B would serve habitable rooms and therefore be clear-glazed and openable. The closest potential first floor level rear (south-west) openings would achieve approximately 10.0m separation to the terminus of the rear garden amenity area serving Hale Lodge, and approximately 19.0m separation to the rear elevation of Hale Lodge. Because the third storey of Building B would step away from the common boundary with Hale Lodge the closest potential second floor level rear (south-west) openings would achieve approximately 20.0m separation to the rear elevation of Hale Lodge although would also occur at a more oblique angle than the first floor level openings, which would reduce the level of overlooking towards Hale Lodge which could likely be achieved.
61. SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' sets out recommended minimum separation distances for achieving privacy, at first floor level, of 20.0m for rear elevation-to-rear elevation relationships, and of 10.0m for rear elevation-to-boundary relationships. For second floor level relationships the SPD sets out recommended minimum separation distances for achieving privacy of 30.0m for rear elevation-to-rear elevation relationships and of 15.0m for rear elevation-to-boundary relationships. The resulting separation distances, at first floor level, between likely windows within the rear (south-west) elevation of Building B and Hale Lodge generally accord with the guidance set out within the SPD. Whilst 20.0m would be achieved at second floor level to the rear elevation of Hale Lodge it is considered that the oblique angle of this relationship would avoid a significantly harmful impact upon Hale Lodge by reason of potential loss of privacy contrary to Policy CS21. This factor also has to be balanced with the overall public benefits of the proposal, particularly in providing 24no. net dwellings within the Urban Area.

Shackleford House, No.71 - 73 High Street:

62. Shackleford House, at No.71 - 73 High Street, contains 6no. flats across two storeys and consists of a central, southerly, two storey building fronting High Street with rear projections to the east and west of the rear. The central two storey building, fronting High Street to the south, contains 2no. flats (1no. flat at ground and 1no. flat at first floor) with openings facing towards the south (front) and north (rear). A further attached two storey building extends along part of the western boundary (the common boundary with the petrol station) of Shackleford House, from the building fronting High Street, to within approximately 19.0m of the boundary with Priors Croft. This western building contains 2no. flats, with the more northerly flat wholly at ground floor level, and the more southerly flat set across ground and first floor levels. Openings within this western building face towards the east with the exception of a single north-facing ground floor window which appears to serve as secondary aspect to a living room

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

(which also benefits from an east-facing window).

63. A detached two storey building extends along part of the eastern boundary of Shackleford House containing 2no. flats; 1no. flat at ground floor level and 1no. flat at first floor level. Openings within this building face south, west and north. The area to the north of the buildings at Shackleford House is laid to gravel and utilised for car parking purposes, accessed from the vehicular crossover with Priors Croft. The northern boundary of Shackleford House, with Priors Croft, is demarcated by a brick wall with a central 'railing' style vehicular access gate. The common western boundary with the application site is also demarcated by a brick wall.
64. Building C would be sited distances varying between 5.3m and 13.5m from the common boundary with Shackleford House. It is also a material consideration that the buildings within Shackleford House do not bound the application site, but rather bound the adjacent petrol station. The area of Shackleford House, opposite which Building C would be sited, is laid to gravel and utilised for car parking purposes with the common boundary with the application site demarcated by a brick wall.
65. Building C would not occur directly opposite the western-facing openings within the detached two storey eastern building at Shackleford House, being offset at an oblique angle from these western-facing openings. Whilst it is acknowledged that Building C would be visible from the first floor, and potentially the ground floor, west and north facing openings within the eastern building at Shackleford House this factor, in itself, does not give rise to significantly harmful impact. The closest corner (south-east) of Building C would be situated approximately 24.0m north-west of the closest corner of the eastern building at Shackleford House. Taking account of the maximum 12.0m height of Building C this resulting relationship is not considered to result in significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy, light, or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, contrary to Policy CS21.
66. It is also acknowledged that Building C would be visible from the ground floor north-facing window within the western building at Shackleford House however this window appears to serve as secondary aspect to a living room, which also benefits from an east-facing window which would be unaffected by the proposed development. The closest corner (south-east) of Building C would be situated approximately 13.5m north-west of the closest corner of the western building at Shackleford House. Taking account of the maximum 12.0m height of Building C this resulting relationship is not considered to result in significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy, light, or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, contrary to Policy CS21.
67. Overall the impact upon the residential amenity of dwellings at Shackleford House is considered to be acceptable and accord with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPDs 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) and 'Design (2015)' and the provisions of the NPFF (2012).

Properties north of Priors Croft:

68. SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' sets out a recommended minimum separation distance of 15.0m for achieving privacy in three storey front elevation-to-front elevation relationships. The SPD also sets out that suitable daylight to an existing dwelling is achieved where an obstructed vertical angle of 25° can be drawn from a point taken from the middle of the each of the existing window openings. Both Building B and Building C comply with the 25° angle test and therefore suitable

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

daylight would be retained to dwellings on the northern side of Priors Croft.

69. Properties on the northern side of Priors Croft are two storey in scale and are generally sited at an oblique angle, with elevations facing towards the south-east. Building B would demonstrate a maximum height of 11.2m, and of three storeys, and remain a minimum of approximately 19.0m from the closest property on the northern side of Priors Croft.
70. Building C would demonstrate a maximum height of 12.0m, and of four storeys, and remain a minimum of approximately 22.0m from the front elevation of the closest property on the northern side of Priors Croft. Taking account of these cumulative factors, combined with the resulting 'across the street' relationship, it is considered that the proposed development would achieve a satisfactory relationship to properties on the northern side of Priors Croft, avoiding significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy, light, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook.

Properties south of High Street:

71. SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' sets out a recommended minimum separation distance of 10.0m for achieving privacy in two storey front elevation-to-front elevation relationships. The SPD also sets out that suitable daylight to an existing dwelling is achieved where an obstructed vertical angle of 25° can be drawn from a point taken from the middle of the each of the existing window openings. Building A would comply with the 25° angle test and therefore suitable daylight would be retained to dwellings on the southern side of High Street.
72. Properties on the southern side of High Street are two storeys in scale and present front elevations facing north towards the application site. Building A would demonstrate a maximum height of 9.0m, and of two storeys, and remain a minimum of approximately 20.0m from the closest property on the southern side of High Street.
73. Taking account of these cumulative factors, combined with the resulting 'across the street' relationship, it is considered that the proposed development would achieve a satisfactory relationship to properties on the southern side of High Street, avoiding significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy, light, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook.

Amenities of future residential occupiers

74. Because the application is in outline form, with appearance not for consideration at this stage, the final internal room layouts of the proposed dwellings are not yet known with the exact location and size of window and other openings to be considered at reserved matters stage under appearance.
75. The part three storey, part four storey nature of Building C would produce a three storey (9.0m high) elevation approximately 13.0m north of the rear garden boundaries of the terraced dwellings within Building A, and approximately 19.0m from the two storey rear elevations of Building A, at their closest points. The fourth storey of Building C would step back from Building A by a further approximate 5.0m. It is considered that these levels of separation would be sufficient to achieve a good standard of residential amenity for future occupiers in terms of levels of privacy and avoiding any potentially harmful overbearing effect by reason of bulk, proximity or loss of outlook.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

76. SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' sets out that suitable daylight to new dwellings is achieved where an obstructed vertical angle of 25° can be drawn from a point taken 2 metres above floor level of the fenestrated elevation. Building C would not obstruct a vertical angle of 25° drawn from 2 metres above floor level of the rear (north) elevation of the 4no. terraced dwellings within Building A at its closest point and therefore suitable daylight would be achieved to the rear (north) elevation of Building A. Overall it is considered that good levels of daylight would be capable of being achieved to all proposed dwellings, subject to detailed consideration of window positions and sizes at reserved matters stage.
77. Buildings B and C are multi-storey, providing flats. In such circumstances SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' sets out that, where intended for family accommodation (all flats with two bedrooms or more and exceeding 65 sq.m in gross floorspace), alternative forms of on-site amenity provision may be permitted in lieu of a conventional private garden, with use of a communal amenity space or a suitable area of landscaped roof garden or terrace acceptable for this purpose if it provides an equivalent area of amenity value.
78. All dwellings within Buildings B and C would be provided with either a private terrace or communal roof garden with the exception of 2no. 1 bedroom ground floor level dwellings (which would not meet the definition of family accommodation set out above) and 1no. ground floor level 3 bedroom dwelling within Building B, which may be capable of benefiting from a small semi-enclosed patio area, although the provision of such would be considered at reserved matters stage under landscaping. The 4no. 3 bedroom two storey dwellings within Building A would be provided with areas of private rear garden.
79. Overall it is considered that sufficient areas of external amenity space, achieved both through the provision of private gardens, private terraces and communal roof gardens would be provided.
80. Paragraph 123 of the NPPF (2012) sets out that "*planning...decisions should aim to...avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development...recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established*".
81. The application is supported by an environmental noise survey and noise impact assessment by Hann Tucker Associates, which identifies that the main noise sources in the area are traffic along Old Woking High Street and the petrol station adjacent to the application site. Fully automated environmental noise monitoring was undertaken. At the beginning and end of the noise survey period the dominant noise source was noted to be road traffic from Old Woking High Street. In terms of the existing petrol station it is noted that there are currently residential properties located to the east of the petrol station approximately 12 metres from the pumps, which are shielded by the petrol station building, and that there are also properties located to the south of the petrol station, approximately 17 metres from the pumps, with no apparent shielding.
82. The Council's Environmental Health service have reviewed the submitted environmental noise survey and noise impact assessment and concur that the impact of road traffic noise upon the proposed development could be dealt with via planning condition (condition 16 refers) with appropriate glazing and ventilation measures utilised to achieve the proposed noise criteria. Although matters of appearance,

including the position and size of window openings, would be considered at reserved matters stage it is considered that the position of habitable rooms within the most easterly of the terraced dwellings fronting High Street would need to be carefully considered at reserved matters stage to avoid the likelihood of noise complaints from future residential occupiers arising from the operation of the adjacent petrol station. There would be potential at reserved matters stage to ensure that no habitable rooms containing windows are positioned on the east elevation of Building A to address this matter.

Impact upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)

83. The application site is located within 400m - 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA). This is a European designated site afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended (the Habitats Regulations). The Habitats Regulations designate the Local Planning Authority as the Competent Authority for assessing the impact of development upon European sites and must ascertain that the project will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site, alone or in combination with other plans and projects, either directly or indirectly, before granting planning permission.
84. The TBH SPA is designated for its internationally important habitat which supports breeding populations of three rare bird species: Dartford Warbler, Woodlark and Nightjars. The Conservation Objectives of the TBH SPA are to ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and to ensure that the site contributes to achieving the aims of the Wild Bird Directive, by maintaining or restoring:
 - The extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features, the structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features
 - The supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely
 - The population of each of the qualifying features, and,
 - The distribution of the qualifying features within the site.
85. Natural England are currently advising that all residential development within 5km of the TBH SPA has the potential to impact upon these species, either alone or in combination with other development, through increased recreational use of the sites by people. Natural England also advises that development within a 400m to 5km zone around the site is likely to be capable of being mitigated while residential development within 400m cannot be mitigated. The application site falls outside of this 400m area.
86. The Council has an adopted TBH SPA Avoidance Strategy. This seeks to provide a framework to secure mitigation against the impact of residential development and to allow development to take place where otherwise it would be restricted by the TBH SPA requirements. The Strategy advocates development providing or contributing to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to attract people away from the TBH SPA, access management measures and monitoring of the TBH SPA to reduce the impact of people who visit the SPA, and Habitat management of the TBH SPA which will improve the habitat for the ground nesting birds.
87. Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires new residential development beyond a 400m threshold, but within 5 kilometres, of the TBH SPA boundary to make an appropriate contribution towards the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM).

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

88. The Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) element of the TBH SPA avoidance tariff is encompassed within the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) however the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) element of the TBH SPA avoidance tariff is required to be addressed outside of CIL. The applicant has agreed to make a SAMM contribution of **£16,501** in line with the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy (TBH SPA).
89. In view of the above, the Local Planning Authority is able to determine that the development would have no significant effect upon the TBH SPA and therefore accords with Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the 'Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy'.

Biodiversity and protected species

90. The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Circular 06/05 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation also requires the impact of a development on protected species to be established before planning permission is granted and in relation to habitat types of principal importance to assess the impact of development upon these as part of the planning application process. This approach is reflected within Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.
91. Surrey Wildlife Trust is the Council's retained ecologist, who provide advice to the Council in respect of the impact of development on protected species and biodiversity, and initially commented that the existing application site is likely to have negligible ecological value for habitats although recommended that, prior to determination of the application, the development site was surveyed by a qualified ecologist to help determine the status of any legally protected species on site, with a particular focus of the likelihood of presence of active bat roost(s), which could be adversely affected by the proposed development works, including the demolition of all existing buildings.
92. Following this consultee response the applicant commissioned an assessment for roosting bats achieved via a walkover survey, and internal and external inspection for bats, undertaken on 3rd July 2017 by chartered ecologists from The Ecology Partnership.
93. The surveys undertaken did not find any evidence of bats using any of the buildings proposed to be demolished as an active roost. No droppings, staining or feeding remains were found. Externally, the warehouse and single garage unit were considered to be suboptimal for roosting bats with negligible crevice opportunities, lack of enclosed voids and flush roof tiles or felt. The roof tiles of the main pitched roof unit were flush with external lighting, creating suboptimal conditions within the pitched void above the show room. No internal evidence was found in this pitched void. No further emergence or activity surveys were recommended on any of the buildings and the development is not considered to be constrained by the presence of bats.
94. The submitted bat assessment and walkover survey makes recommendations for the enhancement of biodiversity within the proposed development, including the inclusion of bat boxes for external walls and a native planting scheme. Whilst this is the case the potential enhancement of biodiversity would be considered during the course of reserved matters applications (landscaping and appearance) although it is nonetheless clear that the proposed development presents an opportunity to enhance the biodiversity and habitat value of the site by providing tree, shrub and herbaceous

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

planting including good species diversity and plants for pollinators and to connect into the wider green infrastructure of the area.

95. A further consultee response is currently awaited from Surrey Wildlife Trust with regard to the submitted bat assessment and walkover survey although any comments received will be verbally updated at Planning Committee.
96. Overall, subject to the receipt of a further consultation response from Surrey Wildlife Trust, it is considered that the proposal would result in the loss of no existing biodiversity assets, and would provide opportunity to enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Impact upon heritage assets (including Hale Lodge, Shackleford House and Archaeology)

Background

97. The application site is located adjacent to the Grade II Statutory Listed Hale Lodge and within an Area of High Archaeological Potential.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:

in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses

98. The NPPF provides a number of definitions with regard to assessing the impact upon heritage assets:

Heritage asset: A building, monument site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest;

Setting of heritage asset: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surrounding evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral; and

Significance (in relation to heritage): The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting" (Annex 2. Ref 9.3).

99. It is one of the core principles of the NPPF that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), at paragraph 129, sets out that the Local Planning Authority should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Paragraphs 131-135 set out the framework for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets and this application takes account of the relevant considerations in these paragraphs.

100. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application and that *“in weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”*.
101. Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that *“non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets”*.
102. In terms of heritage impacts it is the degree of harm, rather than the scale of development that must be assessed. Harm may arise from works to the asset itself or from development within its setting. The application proposes no works to heritage assets and therefore the only heritage harm that may potentially arise would be as a consequence of development within the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed property of Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street and the Locally Listed Building of Shackleford House, No.71 - 73 High Street to the east.

Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street

103. Adjacent Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street, is Grade II Listed (first listed in 1984) and dates from the early 18th Century. The property is two storeys in height and timber framed, with a brick exterior and a plain tiled roof, with a ridge stack to the right. The property demonstrates three casement windows across the first floor, with those in the outer gable front bays under cambered heads. A central 20th Century half glazed door occupies the brick gable porch and the timber frame is exposed in the gable to the rear left.
104. Existing development to the east and west of Hale Lodge post-dates Hale Lodge, which dates from the early 18th Century, and has therefore permanently altered the immediate setting of this heritage asset. The existing setting of Hale Lodge also consists of the previous, albeit still lawful in planning terms, use of the application site for the display and sale of cars, including the external display of cars on the apron of hardstanding immediately adjacent to Hale Lodge. Therefore it is not considered that the existing setting of Hale Lodge makes a significant contribution to the significance of this heritage asset. However the absence of buildings on the application site, within close proximity to the common boundary with Hale Lodge, and the generally low height of existing buildings on the application site, does permit views of Hale Lodge at oblique angles from the public realm and does allow the form of this heritage asset to be appreciated in some isolation from development to the east, albeit the existing apron of hardstanding and lighting columns etc. do detract from the setting of this heritage asset to some degree.
105. Overall therefore, some of the significance of Hale Lodge is derived from the absence of buildings on the application site, within close proximity to the common boundary with Hale Lodge, and the generally low height of existing buildings on the application site.
106. The proposed development has been designed to retain levels of separation varying

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

between 7.7m and 9.3m between the proposed terrace block (Building A), fronting High Street, and the common boundary with Hale Lodge, with the height of this terrace block also having been restricted to two storeys. Whilst the proposed terrace block would move further south towards High Street, and slightly closer west towards the common boundary with Hale Lodge, than the existing showroom building to be demolished, and would therefore reduce existing views from High Street achieved at an oblique angle to the south-east, the replacement of the existing apron of hardstanding, adjacent to the common boundary, with soft landscaping and planting, and the removal of the external display of cars adjacent to the common boundary, would be positive factors which it is considered would enhance the setting of Hale Lodge and outweigh the siting of the terrace block closer to the south and west than the showroom existing building.

107. The proposed development would result in Building B, fronting Priors Croft, at heights of between two and three storeys and Building C, also fronting Priors Croft, at heights of between three and four storeys. The siting, height and massing of Building B in particular would appear visually apparent in the context of Hale Lodge when viewed from High Street and would be apparent above the building profile of Hale Lodge when approached along High Street from the west. Although views of Hale Lodge itself would not be obscured from direct views from High Street to the south, nor from more oblique views from High Street when travelling from the west, the height and massing of Buildings B and C would compete with Hale Lodge in these views. Although the existing apron of hardstanding and commercial buildings on the application site are later additions to the setting of this heritage asset (Hale Lodge), the siting, scale and massing of Buildings B and C, are considered to cause less than substantial harm to the setting of Hale Lodge.
108. Even though the harm identified would be less than substantial, it is considered that the proposed development would fail to preserve the setting of Grade II Hale Lodge. In accordance with Paragraph 132 of the NPPF great weight must be afforded to the conservation of designated heritage assets. It is considered that the harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed Building of Hale Lodge would be less than substantial however this is a matter to which must be attached considerable importance and weight. In this case, however, public benefits, as identified in Paragraph 134 of the NPPF, are included within the proposed development. This harm will be considered in the Planning Balance at the conclusion of the report.

Shackleford House, No.71 - 73 High Street:

109. Shackleford House, No.71 - 73 High Street is Locally Listed, as a Building of Architectural Significance, (a non-designated heritage asset) and is situated to the east of the adjacent petrol station. The proposed development must be judged against the advice within Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) which states that the *“effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”*.
110. The proposed development would not directly affect the non-designated heritage asset of Shackleford House however Building C would be apparent in context with the rear elevation of Shackleford House when viewed from Priors Croft to the north, and the height and siting of Building C would likely result in this building being apparent above the roof profile of Shackleford House, albeit at some distance, when viewed

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

obliquely from High Street to the south-east. Any potential harm to the setting of Shackleford House as a result of these two factors is however considered to clearly qualify as less than substantial. Coming to a balanced judgement, and having regard to the less than substantial scale of any harm to the setting of Shackleford House, and the architectural significance (as opposed to townscape merit) of the heritage asset of Shackleford House, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in harm to the architectural significance of Shackleford House, which is identified as the reason for its inclusion on the Local List.

Archaeology

111. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF (2012) requires that “*where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit and appropriate risk based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation*”. The application site is located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential related to the Historic Core of Old Woking and Shackleford. For development proposals within Areas of High Archaeological Potential Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires the submission of an archaeological assessment of the site.
112. The potential impact of the proposed development upon below ground archaeological assets has been considered by the applicant, with the application supported by a Desk Based Assessment, produced by Allen Archaeology Ltd. The Assessment identifies that the site lies to the west of the main focus of Old Woking but nonetheless the area has been within the settlement of Shackleford from at least the 14th century. As such the site has moderate potential for remains of medieval date, and high potential for remains of a post medieval date, which are likely to contain information about the origins and development of the settlement.
113. The Archaeological Officer at Surrey County Council (SCC) has considered the application and has recommended, given the archaeological potential of the site, and taking into account that any surviving archaeological horizons are likely to be destroyed by the proposed development, that further archaeological work is required, which, in the first instance should take the form of an archaeological evaluation which will likely involve the excavation of a number of trial trenches across the site. This will aim to determine, as far as is possible; the location, extent, date, character, condition, significance and quality of any Archaeological Assets that may be present on the site, and the results of the evaluation will enable suitable mitigation measures to be developed if necessary.
114. However, in the absence of any evidence to suggest that remains of a significance to necessitate preservation in-situ may be present, the Archaeological Officer at Surrey County Council (SCC) has recommended that the work be secured by a condition requiring a scheme of archaeological work (condition 18 refers).
115. Subject to this recommended condition the application is considered to accord with Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Land contamination

116. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF (2012) requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by managing the risk from unacceptable levels of soil or water pollution or land instability. Paragraphs 120 - 122 require

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

planning policies to ensure that, as a minimum, land should be suitable for its next use and not be capable of being determined as 'contaminated land' under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The guidance also states that responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer.

117. The application is supported by a Phase I Environmental Review, which identifies that the application site has been used for the servicing and repair of cars for many years and that the adjacent site has operated as a petrol station. The Phase I Environmental Review suggests a low to moderate risk of contamination affecting the proposed development.
118. The Council's Scientific Officer has been consulted on the application, and has also carried out a documentation search within planning history files, and found some of the assumptions made in the submitted Phase I Environmental Review to be incorrect. The Council's Scientific Officer comments that hydrocarbon contamination, such as petrol, diesel, kerosene, paraffin and oil, are all mobile in the environment and as such pollution, through spillages and leaks and historic disposal of waste oils, is transboundary and as such the site will need to be investigated thoroughly, followed by risk assessment to formulate a Remediation Action Plan. Other contaminants from the service and repair of vehicles are likely and there is also a high likelihood that asbestos will be present in buildings and within underlying soil with records showing that asbestos was used in many of the buildings constructed and demolished over the long history of the site.
119. However the Council's Scientific Officer is satisfied that, whilst there is the potential for significant contamination, such contamination would be capable of being remediated, with wider benefit to the local environment, via recommended condition 17 and post remedial monitoring secured via the Section 106 agreement.
120. The recommendation to secure post remedial monitoring via the Section 106 agreement arises from the existence of the adjacent petrol station and the consideration that sites with historical uses such as the application site can sometimes prove difficult to remediate without 'rebound', which is where significant historical releases of hydrocarbons have led to plumes of contamination moving offsite (into surrounding soils) with this contaminant plume then being mobilised once more and returning to site during, following and post remediation/development. Post remedial monitoring, secured via the Section 106 agreement, will allow for uncertainties, and provide flexibility in remedial approaches, whilst ensuring agreed remediation standards have been achieved, and continue to demonstrate agreed standards, following remediation and development of the site post occupation.
121. Overall, subject to recommended condition 17 and post remedial monitoring secured via the Section 106 agreement, it is considered that the application complies with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), in terms of land contamination.

Flood risk and drainage (including sequential test and SuDS)

Sequential test

122. Parts of the application site fall within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3, taking into account the 100 year flood level plus climate change allowance. Land within Flood Zones 2 and 3 is considered by the NPPF as being at risk from flooding. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF sets out that, when determining planning applications, it should be ensured that flood

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

risk is not increased elsewhere and development should only be considered appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment following the 'sequential test', and if required the 'exception test', it can be demonstrated that: within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and that any residual risk can be safely managed, including by emergency planning.

123. Paragraph 101 of the NPPF sets out that development should not be permitted in areas at serious risk from flooding if there are reasonably available sites, appropriate for the proposed development, in areas with a lower probability of flooding, as identified through a 'sequential test'. This general approach is designed to ensure that areas at little or no risk of flooding from any source are developed in preference to areas at higher risk, with the aim to keep development out of medium and high flood risk areas (Flood Zones 2 and 3) where possible. As parts of the application site, although not the location of any of the proposed buildings themselves, fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3 it is considered necessary to apply the 'sequential test' in this instance.
124. National Planning Practice Guidance provides that the area to apply the 'sequential test' across will be defined by local circumstances relating to the catchment area for the type of development proposed, acknowledging that, for some developments, this may be clear but that in other cases other criteria may apply and that, overall, a pragmatic approach on the availability of alternative sites should be taken.
125. In conducting the 'sequential test', the applicant has been informed by the latest published version of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Council's latest published Five-Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement (April 2016) on the basis of site capacity (eg. number of dwellings) because the applicant considers that this is appropriate for a predominately flat-led development proposal within an urban area where the proposed development ranges in height from two to four storeys, as opposed to a house-led scheme where site area may be more relevant, and development would likely be restricted to two to three storeys. Taking into account that the development proposed is for 24no. dwellings, the applicant has examined comparable sites in the range of 22no. - 26no. dwellings, located wholly within Flood Zone 1. Using these parameters the applicant has identified three sites for further investigation; (i) Globe House, Lavender Park Road, West Byfleet (ii) Roxburghe House, Lavender Park Road, West Byfleet and (iii) Rose Lodge, Barton Close, Knaphill.
126. The site identified at Globe House, Lavender Park Road, West Byfleet has been the subject of redevelopment from office use to residential use, which has been completed by Jemada Homes, and 21no. of the 23no. dwellings having been sold. The site identified at Roxburghe House, Lavender Park Road, West Byfleet has also been the subject of redevelopment from office use to residential use, to provide 22no. dwellings, with further planning permission having been granted for a further 5no. dwellings within a two storey extension. The developer, Magna Homes, is presently marketing dwellings with the conversion largely complete and works appearing to have commenced with regard to the two storey extension. The site identified at Rose Lodge, Barton Close, Knaphill is in the ownership of Alpha Hospitals, as part of a complex providing various mental health services, and it is clear that the premises is being fully used and is not available for disposal at the current time.
127. Overall therefore, it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that there are

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

no reasonably available sites wholly within Flood Zones 1 and 2 which could accommodate the proposed development and, accordingly, the 'sequential test' is satisfied, subject to further consideration as to whether the proposed development would be safe and not lead to increased flood risk elsewhere.

128. The 'exception test' is a method to demonstrate and help ensure that flood risk to people and property will be managed satisfactorily, while allowing necessary development to go ahead in situations where suitable sites at lower risk of flooding are not available. Because the submitted Flood Risk Assessment Addendum demonstrates that all proposed buildings, for the 100 year flood level plus climate change allowance, would be located wholly within Flood Zone 1, in which Table 3 (Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'compatibility') of the Planning Practice Guidance identifies that 'more vulnerable' development (eg. dwelling houses) is appropriate, it is not considered necessary to apply the 'exception test' to the proposed development.

Flood risk

129. The applicant has also undertaken a site specific Flood Risk Assessment as required by the NPPF and Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012). All proposed buildings (A, B and C) would be located within Flood Zone 1, taking into account the 100 year flood level plus climate change allowance. Whilst two areas of the application site would fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3 only landscaped, and permeable areas, are proposed within areas of the application site falling within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is not proposed to increase the ground levels within areas of the application site falling within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Overall therefore no loss of flood water storage capacity would occur as a result of the proposed development.
130. Furthermore the proposed development includes the demolition of an existing building, currently partially located within Flood Zone 2; the demolition of which will provide an improvement in the flood water storage capacity on the application site and reduce the displacement of flood water onto adjacent sites. Furthermore, due to the reduction in impermeable surfacing on the application site, there would be a further minor reduction in the displacement of flood water onto adjacent sites.
131. The proposed finished floor level (FFL) of the development has been set based on the allowance for 100 year flood level plus climate change, with an additional 300mm freeboard. This results in the finished floor level being 23.720 metres above Ordnance Datum and a condition is recommended to secure this (condition 11 refers). It should be noted that freeboard is used in setting the finished floor level of a property, to take into account uncertainties in flood risk data, estimates and irregularities in ground and water surfaces (eg. waves resulting from wind or traffic), and that the Environment Agency requires that finished floor levels are set 300mm above the 100 year flood level plus climate change allowance, for river flooding, as in this instance.
132. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment Addendum demonstrates that means of escape in a flood event would be achieved via Priors Croft with a pedestrian means of escape route situated entirely within Flood Zone 1, therefore providing a safe and dry access/egress route to future residents to evacuate in a flood event. Vehicular access/egress, including that of emergency vehicles, would be capable of being achieved via Priors Croft with the submitted Flood Risk Addendum demonstrating that the depth of flood water on Priors Croft, for the 100 year flood level plus climate change allowance, would be less than 250mm, with flood water velocity therefore being close to nil, due to being located at the outer edge of the flood zone extent.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Such 250mm flood water depths, and almost nil flood water velocity, would be traversable by vehicles, including emergency service vehicles, if required during a flood event.

SuDS

133. Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires all significant forms of development to incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and states that *“all new development should work towards mimicking greenfield run-off situations”*.
134. The proposed development would reduce the existing totally impermeable site area from approximately 2,820 sq.m to approximately 950 sq.m, a reduction of approximately 1,870 sq.m. SuDS within the proposed development would take the form of sealed permeable paving to the car parking and vehicular manoeuvring areas, providing water storage within the sub-base to be collected in a central sump before discharging via a hydrobrake control device, which would limit the discharge rate to 5 litres per second.
135. The Council's Drainage and Flood Risk Engineer assesses applications for and on behalf of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (Surrey County Council) and raises no objections, in terms of drainage and flood risk, subject to recommended conditions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. Furthermore the Environment Agency has also confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed development, on flood risk grounds, subject to recommended conditions.
136. Overall, subject to recommended conditions, the proposed development is considered to accord with the provisions of the National Planning Framework (NPPF) (2012), Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the SuDS Regulations in terms of flood risk and SuDS.

Affordable housing

137. Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy states that all new residential development on previously developed (brownfield) land will be expected to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing and that, on sites providing 15 or more dwellings, or on sites of over 0.5ha (irrespective of the number of dwellings proposed), the Council will require 40% of dwellings to be affordable.
138. Policy CS12 also sets out that the proportion of affordable housing to be provided by a particular site will take into account, among other factors, the costs relating to the development; in particular the financial viability of developing the site (using an approved viability model). The policy provides a clear set of considerations that will be taken into account in determining the final proportion of on-site affordable housing.
139. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF makes viability an important consideration, noting that development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

140. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that where the viability of a development is in question, local planning authorities should look to be flexible in applying policy requirements wherever possible.
141. With this in mind, the applicant has set out in the planning application form that no affordable housing is being proposed and has supported the application with an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment to demonstrate why the proposed development cannot provide affordable housing and remain viable. The Council has retained specialist advisors to assess the submissions made in this respect. Kempton Carr Croft have analysed the submitted Affordable Housing Viability Assessment and undertaken their own research into the Gross Development Values, Benchmark Land Values Build Costs and other inputs and outputs adopted for the proposed scheme.
142. Kempton Carr Croft have concluded that overall the inputs and outputs included within the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment are reasonable and that, by deducting the costs of the development from the Gross Development Value and then assessing the resulting Residual Land Value against the Benchmark Land Value, the proposed development cannot viably support any level of affordable housing contribution.
143. Whilst this is the case it is considered that the viability should be reviewed on an open book basis at agreed point(s) tied into the progression of the development. The process for this would be secured through the Section 106 Legal Agreement. There would be a provision within the Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure an affordable housing contribution if development viability improves over the passage of time to the point where such affordable housing contributions would be triggered, up to a maximum of the requirement of Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy.
144. On this basis, it is considered that Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) would be addressed.

CO2 and water consumption

145. Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires that all new residential development on previously developed land will be required to meet the energy and carbon dioxide and water components of the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. This equates to a minimum 19% improvement in the Dwelling Emission Rate (DER) over the Target Emission Rate (TER), as defined in Part L1A of the 2013 Building Regulations, and an indoor water consumption requirement of 105 litres per person per day. The Code for Sustainable Homes was superseded in April 2015 but these requirements were covered under the New Technical Standards for Housing. The standards require the CO₂ reduction target to remain at 19%, the water usage is 105 litres per person per day, plus an additional 5 litres for external use. Conditions 14 and 15 are recommended to secure further details and compliance with these requirements.

Local finance considerations

146. The proposed development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to the sum of **£145,107**. However Regulation 8 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 states that "*in the case of a grant of outline planning permission, planning permission first permits development on the day of the final approval of the last reserved matter associated with the permission*". Therefore the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liability of the proposed development may change depending upon the timescale for the submission, and approval, of the last of the reserved

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

matters. This is because the existing 1,165 sq.m gross floorspace would not be able to be offset against the proposed 2,213 sq.m gross floorspace if the existing buildings had not been in use for their lawful purpose for 6 continuous months of the 36 previous months following the approval of the last of the reserved matters.

Furthermore CIL is index linked to the BCIS All-in Tender Price Index, with indexation changes taking effect from 1st April each year, which may increase prior to the approval of the last of the reserved matters.

Legal agreement requirements

147. The following would be secured via the Section 106 Legal Agreement:

- Provision of a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) (TBH SPA) contribution of £16,501 in accordance with the Habitat Regulations and Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).
- The securing of an overage review(s) in respect of the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) at agreed points.
- Post remedial contaminated land monitoring in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Balancing exercise and conclusions

148. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) sets out that it is the Government's clear expectation that there is a presumption in favour of development and growth except where this would compromise key sustainable development principles and be contrary to local planning policies, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The role of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. This often involves balancing the economic, social and environmental aspects of a proposal, particularly in medium scale developments such as the application proposal.

Harm arising from the proposal

149. As a result of the proposed development some harm has been identified to the setting of the Grade II Listed building of Hale Lodge, No.61 High Street, due to the siting, height and massing of Building B, which would appear visually apparent in the context of Hale Lodge when viewed from High Street and would be apparent above the building profile of Hale Lodge when approached along High Street from the west. Although views of Hale Lodge itself would not be obscured from direct views from High Street to the south, nor from more oblique views from High Street when travelling from the west, the height and massing of Buildings B and C would compete with Hale Lodge in these views. Although the existing apron of hardstanding and commercial buildings on the application site are later additions to the setting of this heritage asset (Hale Lodge), the siting, scale and massing of Buildings B and C, are considered to cause less than substantial harm to the setting of Hale Lodge.

150. Even though it has been identified that this harm would be 'less than substantial', and towards the lower end of 'less than substantial harm', considerable weight and importance must nonetheless be afforded to this heritage harm. It must therefore be assessed as to whether there are other material considerations which would outweigh

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

this less than substantial harm.

Benefits of the proposal

151. In terms of public benefits, the proposed development would make a meaningful contribution towards the Core Strategy requirement to provide at least 4,964 dwellings within the Borough between 2010 and 2027, providing 24 net dwellings within the Urban Area. This public benefit should be afforded significant weight in favour of the proposed development. In addition the provision of residential floorspace within the proposed development has the potential to enhance overall activity within the Kingfield Local Centre and Old Woking Neighbourhood Centre, to the west and east respectively. This factor should be afforded moderate weight in favour of the proposed development.
152. The proposed development would reduce existing flood risk to adjacent sites through the removal of existing built development within Flood Zone 2, result in a significant reduction in existing impermeable area and provide a sustainable urban drainage system to dispose of surface water drainage. These cumulative factors would have wider local environmental benefits and should be afforded more than moderate weight in favour of the proposed development. The proposed development would also remediate a site which is the subject of some land contamination. Again this factor would have wider local environmental benefits and should be afforded more than moderate weight in favour of the proposed development. The existing site contains no soft planting or biodiversity features. The proposed development has potential to enhance biodiversity and this factor should be afforded more than moderate weight in favour of the proposed development.
153. Furthermore, there would be some economic benefits from the proposed development through employment provided during the construction phase, additional spending power resulting from the construction phase and from future residential occupiers of the proposed development within the Borough. To these economic benefits, overall, moderate weight should be afforded in favour of the proposed development.
154. To all of the benefits of the proposed development, it is considered that more than considerable weight should be afforded. They represent public benefits as referred to within Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012), which in the circumstances of this application, are considered to outweigh the considerable weight and importance that is attached to the heritage harm identified. Further, they are material considerations, considered sufficient in this case to outweigh the less than substantial heritage harm identified and therefore the application is recommended for approval.

Conclusion

155. Subject to the avoidance and mitigation measures ie. payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and contributions to SAMM (TBH SPA), it is concluded that the proposed development would not have any adverse effects upon the integrity of protected international sites from recreational disturbance. As such it is considered that the presumption in favour of development is not restricted by the considerations relating to protected international ecological sites (Paragraph 119 of the NPPF).
156. The planning considerations section of this report has assessed all of the material planning considerations relating to this application. The recommendation has been made in compliance with the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

(NPPF) (2012) to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Consultation response from Historic England
Consultation response from Heritage & Conservation Consultant
Consultation response from Archaeological Officer (SCC)
Consultation response from County Highway Authority (CHA) (SCC)
Consultation response from Environment Agency
Consultation response from Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (SCC)
Consultation responses from Drainage & Flood Risk Engineer
Consultation response from Thames Water Development Planning
Consultation response from Surrey Wildlife Trust
Consultation response from Environmental Health Service
Consultation response from Scientific Officer
x5 Letters of representation
Site Notices (Major Development)
Site Notices (Development Affecting a Listed Building or its Setting)

LEGAL AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS

	Requirement
1.	Provision of a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) (TBH SPA) contribution of £16,501 in accordance with the Habitat Regulations and Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).
2.	The securing of an overage review(s) in respect of the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) at agreed points.
3.	Post remedial contaminated land monitoring in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

RECOMMENDATION

Grant outline planning permission subject to the following recommend conditions and the above secured by way of Section 106 Legal Agreement:

Time Limits

1. Application for the approval of the first reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than three years from the date of this permission, and the application for approval of all remaining reserved matters shall be made within five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 92(2) of The Town and Country

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than two years from the date of approval of the first reserved matters.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 92(2) of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

Reserved Matters

3. Details of appearance and landscaping (“the reserved matters”) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To comply with Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

4. All Reserved Matters application(s) shall accord with the following approved plans:

16-070-YZ(P)-001 Rev A (Site Location Plan), dated 01.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AZ(P)-010 Rev C (Proposed Site Plan), dated 19.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 20.09.2017.

16-070-AZ(P)-020 (Existing Site Layout Topographical & FRA Overlay), dated 19.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 20.09.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-G10 Rev A (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), dated 22.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.09.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-110 (Proposed First Floor Plan), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-210 (Proposed Second Floor Plan), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-310 (Proposed Third Floor Plan), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-R10 Rev A (Proposed Roof Plan), dated 22.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.09.2017.

16-070-AX(P)-001 Rev B (Proposed Sections), dated 22.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.09.2017.

16-070-AE(P)-001 (Building A & B Existing & Proposed Elevations), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.02.2017.

16-070-AE-002 (Building C Existing & Proposed Elevations), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.02.2017.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development accords with the outline planning permission in accordance with Policies CS1, CS4, CS5, CS7, CS9, CS13, CS16, CS17, CS18, CS19 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Approved Plans and Documents

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

Approved Plans

16-070-YZ(P)-001 Rev A (Site Location Plan), dated 01.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AZ(P)-010 Rev C (Proposed Site Plan), dated 19.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 20.09.2017.

16-070-AZ(P)-020 (Existing Site Layout Topographical & FRA Overlay), dated 19.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 20.09.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-G10 Rev A (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), dated 22.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.09.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-110 (Proposed First Floor Plan), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-210 (Proposed Second Floor Plan), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-310 (Proposed Third Floor Plan), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

16-070-AG(P)-R10 Rev A (Proposed Roof Plan), dated 22.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.09.2017.

16-070-AX(P)-001 Rev B (Proposed Sections), dated 22.09.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 27.09.2017.

16-070-AE(P)-001 (Building A & B Existing & Proposed Elevations), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.02.2017.

16-070-AE-002 (Building C Existing & Proposed Elevations), dated 07.02.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.02.2017.

157140 (Existing Floor Plans), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

8161222/6204 (Swept Path Analysis Large Car), dated January 2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

Approved Documents

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Flood Risk Assessment Addendum - Issue 3 by Frankham Consultancy Group Ltd (Ref: NP/MT/911852), Issue Date: Sept 2017, and received by the Local Planning Authority on 20.09.2017.

Design & Access Statement by B+R Architects (Ref: 16-070.22.005b Outline Planning App), undated and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.02.2017.

Model Surface Water Drainage Statement (including Appendices and Site Drainage Strategy (Ref: 911852-FCG-ST-XX-DR-C-3201-S2 Rev PL2)) by Frankham Consultancy Group Ltd, dated 18.01.2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 10.02.2017.

Environmental Noise Survey & Noise Impact Assessment, by Hann Tucker Associates (Ref: 23887/NIA1), dated 22nd February 2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 24.02.2017.

Bat Assessment & Walkover Survey by The Ecology Partnership, dated 10th July 2017 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 12.07.2017.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development accords with the outline planning permission and to comply with Policies CS1, CS4, CS5, CS7, CS9, CS13, CS16, CS17, CS18, CS19 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Surface water drainage (SuDS) and flood risk

6. ++ No development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme should demonstrate the surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 plus climate change critical storm will not exceed the agreed run-off of 5l/s up to and including the 1 in 100 (%) annual probability plus 40% climate change event for the critical storm duration.

The drainage scheme details to be submitted for approval shall also include:

- i. Calculations demonstrating no increase in surface water runoff rates and volumes discharged from the site compared to the existing scenario up to the 1 in 100 plus climate change storm event.
- ii. Calculations demonstrating no on site flooding up to the 1 in 30 storm event and any flooding between the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 plus climate change storm event will be safely stored on site ensuring no overland flow routes.
- iii. Detailed drainage plans showing where surface water will be accommodated on site

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS16 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

7. ++ No development shall commence until construction drawings of the surface water drainage network, associated sustainable drainage components, flow control mechanisms and a construction method statement have been submitted to and

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings, method statement and Micro drainage calculations prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved. No alteration to the approved drainage scheme shall occur without prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS16 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

8. ++ The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until details of the maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and thereafter permanently managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. The Local Planning Authority shall be granted access to inspect the sustainable drainage scheme for the lifetime of the development. The details of the scheme to be submitted for approval shall include:
- i. a timetable for its implementation,
 - ii. Details of SuDS features and connecting drainage structures and maintenance requirement for each aspect
 - iii. A table to allow the recording of each inspection and maintenance activity, as well as allowing any faults to be recorded and actions taken to rectify issues; and
 - iv. A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and continues to be maintained as agreed for the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS16 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

9. No dwelling shall be first occupied until a verification report, (appended with substantiating evidence demonstrating the approved construction details and specifications have been implemented in accordance with the surface water drainage scheme), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The verification report shall include photographs of excavations and soil profiles/horizons, any installation of any surface water structure and control mechanism.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS16 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

10. Any existing hard surface and its associated sub-base within any area of the application site to be utilised as gardens or open space shall be demolished and all debris removed from that area of the site prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted. A verification report, appended with substantiating evidence shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within 3 months of the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS16 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

11. All development shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Addendum Issue 3 Residential Development 63-65 High Street, Old Woking, Surrey, GU22 9LN by Frankham Consulting Group Limited NP/MT/911852 September 2017 and dwg 16-070-az (P) 020. For the avoidance of doubt this includes that all new residential dwellings are to have finished floor levels set no lower than 23.720 metres above Ordnance Datum and that there shall be no raising of existing ground levels on the application site unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All flood risk mitigation measure(s) shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed for each new dwelling and not increased in accordance with CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

12. All walls and fences proposed to be within the 1 in 100 appropriate allowance for climate change extent, will be designed to be permeable to flood water. If a solid wall or fence is proposed there must be openings below the 1% annual probability (1 in 100) flood level with an appropriate allowance for climate change to allow the movement of flood water. The openings should be at least 1 metre wide by the depth of flooding and there should be one opening in every 5-metre length of wall.

Reason: To ensure the flood risk is adequately addressed for each new dwelling and not increased in accordance with CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Use of piling

13. ++ No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.

Energy and water consumption

14. ++ As part of the Reserved Matters application(s) written evidence shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the residential elements of the development will:
 - a. Achieve a minimum of a 19% improvement in the dwelling emission rate over the target emission rate, as defined in the Building Regulations for England Approved Document L1A: Conservation of Fuel and Power in New Dwellings (2013 edition). Such evidence shall be in the form of a Design Stage Standard

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Assessment Procedure (SAP) Assessment, produced by an accredited energy assessor; and,

- b. Achieve a maximum water use of no more than 110 litres per person per day as defined in paragraph 36(2b) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended), measured in accordance with the methodology set out in Approved Document G (2015 edition). Such evidence shall be in the form of a Design Stage water efficiency calculator.

Development shall be carried out wholly in accordance with such details as may be agreed and these details shall be permanently maintained unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with Policies CS21 and CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).

15. ++ The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until written documentary evidence has been submitted to and approved by, the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the development has:
 - a. Achieved a minimum of a 19% improvement in the dwelling emission rate over the target emission rate, as defined in the Building Regulations for England Approved Document L1A: Conservation of Fuel and Power in New Dwellings (2013 edition). Such evidence shall be in the form of an As Built Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) Assessment, produced by an accredited energy assessor; and
 - b. Achieved a maximum water use of 110 litres per person per day as defined in paragraph 36(2b) of the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended). Such evidence shall be in the form of the notice given under Regulation 37 of the Building Regulations.

Such details as may be agreed shall be permanently maintained unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).

Noise Mitigation

16. ++ The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a fully detailed scheme for protecting the proposed development from traffic noise from Old Woking High Street and noise from the adjacent petrol station, based on the Environmental Noise Survey and Noise Impact Assessment Report dated 22nd February 2017 by Hann Tucker Associates, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted mitigation scheme shall comprise double glazing with acoustic ventilation and any other means necessary to protect the building(s) from noise and vibration and shall be carried out concurrently with the development of the site and implemented in full as agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect future residential occupiers from noise disturbance in accordance

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

with Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Land contamination

17. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme to deal with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- (i) The above scheme shall include :-
- (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;
 - and (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
- (ii) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out and completed wholly in accordance with such details and timescales as may be agreed.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land before development commences and to make the land suitable for the development without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment generally in accordance with Policies CS9 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).

Archaeology

18. ++ No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during development.

Reason: To enable the site to be investigated for archaeological purposes in accordance with Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Highways

19. ++ The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed modified access to Priors Croft has been constructed and provided with visibility splays in accordance with the a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction measured from 0.6m above the road surface.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor inconvenience other highway users in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

20. The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans (Drawing No. 16-070 AP(P)-001, Rev A) for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor inconvenience other highway users in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

21. ++ No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP), to include details of:
- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
 - (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - (c) storage of plant and materials
 - (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
 - (e) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
 - (f) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
 - (g) on-site turning for construction vehicles
- has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor inconvenience other highway users in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

22. ++ The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied unless and until facilities for the secure parking of bicycles within the development site have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved secure bicycle parking facilities shall be provided and permanently retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor inconvenience other highway users in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Ecology

23. As part of the landscaping reserved matters application a scheme of biodiversity enhancement of the site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The scheme of biodiversity enhancement shall include details of the features to be created and managed for species of local importance. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of any part of the development or otherwise in accordance with a programme first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reason: To ensure the provision of suitable biodiversity enhancement of the site in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), Circular 06/05 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Dwellinghouse (Building A) 'permitted development' rights removal

24. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no building, structure or other alteration permitted by Class A, B, D, E and F of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of that Order shall be erected on, or within the residential curtilage(s) of, any of the four dwellinghouses within Building A (as identified on the approved plans listed within this notice) hereby permitted without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority of an application made for that purpose.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority considers that further development could cause detriment to the residential amenities of existing adjacent properties, to the residential amenities of the proposed dwellings within Buildings B and C (fronting Priors Croft), to the character of the area and provision of an appropriate level of private garden amenity space to serve the four terraced dwellings within Building A (fronting High Street) hereby permitted and for this reason would wish to control any future development in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Supplementary Planning Documents 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)' and 'Design (2015)' and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012).

Informatives

1. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover to install dropped kerbs. Please see: www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs
2. The applicant 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).
3. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. The contact number is 0800 009 3921.

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

4. Thames Water would recommend that petrol/oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol/oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.
5. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0800 009 3921 to discuss the details of the piling method statement prior to submission to the Local Planning Authority pursuant to the planning condition.
6. The applicant is advised that, with regard to water supply, the development comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.
7. For the avoidance of doubt, the following definitions apply to the above condition relating to contaminated land:

Desk study- This shall 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 shall 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 discovered during the course of construction

Validation strategy: This shall include : -

- (i) documentary evidence that all investigation, sampling and remediation has been carried out to a standard suitable for the purpose; and
- (ii) confirmation that the works have been executed to a standard to satisfy the planning condition (closure report).

All of the above documents, investigations and operations should be carried out by a qualified, accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a quality assured

14 NOVEMBER 2017 PLANNING COMMITTEE

sampling, analysis and recording methodology.