

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6a

PLAN/2019/0753

WARD: Mt Hermon

LOCATION: **New Central Development, Guildford Road, Woking, GU22 7PU**

PROPOSAL: **Erection of rooftop extensions to existing apartment blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D and F) (known as Nankeville Court, Bradfield House and Cardinal Place) ranging in height from 1 to 2 storeys to provide x37 apartments (x24 studio/1 bed and x13 2 bed) together with private and shared roof terraces. Associated alterations to existing basement level to provide cycle and refuse/recycling storage.**

APPLICANT: **Connolly, Crowther & Hofbauer**

OFFICER: **Benjamin Bailey**

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The proposal is for development which falls outside the Scheme of Delegation.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Erection of rooftop extensions to existing apartment blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D and F) (known as Nankeville Court, Bradfield House and Cardinal Place) ranging in height from 1 to 2 storeys to provide x37 apartments (x24 studio/1 bed and x13 2 bed) together with private and shared roof terraces. Associated alterations to existing basement level to provide cycle and refuse/recycling storage.

Site Area:	1.124 ha (11,240 sq.m)
Existing units:	481
Proposed units:	518 (+ 37)
Existing density:	428 dph (dwellings per hectare)
Proposed density:	461 dph

(Officer Note: All figures given above are calculated on the basis of the entire New Central development and exclude the proposal at No.7 York Road, which is pending decision)

Block Ref	Block Name	Storey Height(s)	Extension level(s)	1 bed units	2 bed units	Total units	
A	Bradfield House	1 storey	6th Floor	0	3	3	As previous
B	Nankeville Court	1 storey	6th Floor	1	1	2	As previous
C	Nankeville Court	1 storey	8th Floor	4	2	6	Reduced
D	Nankeville Court	1 - 2 storeys	10th - 11th Floors & 12th Floor	7	5	12	Reduced
F	Cardinal Place	2 storeys	9th - 10th Floors	12	2	14	As previous

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Total				24	13	37	Reduced
				(65%)	(35%)	(100%)	

PLANNING STATUS

- Urban Area
- Woking Town Centre
- Adjacent to Surrey Minerals Plan - Rail Aggregate Depot (Partial)
- Adjacent to High Density Residential Area (Partial)
- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) (Zone B 400m-5km)

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to recommended conditions and SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution, and car club provisions and late stage viability review, secured by S106 Legal Agreement.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to three buildings (forming five Blocks - A, B, C, D and F) (known as Nankeville Court, Bradfield House and Cardinal Place) within the New Central development. The site is within the Urban Area and Woking Town Centre. Blocks B, C and D (known as Nankeville Court) extend along the north-west of the New Central development and are interlinked to form one building. Block A (known as Bradfield House) occurs opposite Block B. Block F (known as Cardinal Place) conjoins with Block E and Block K. A central square occurs principally between Cardinal Place and Orion Gate/Olympic Heights.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (ENTIRE 'NEW CENTRAL' DEVELOPMENT)

PLAN/2018/1344 - Change of use from Classes A1/A3 (retail/restaurant and cafe) at ground floor level to residential (Class C3) to provide x4 one bedroom dwellings. Formation of new first floor level internally to provide x2 one bedroom dwellings (x6 dwellings total). Associated elevational alterations.

Refused (12.02.2019) for the following reasons:

01. *The permanent loss of ground floor level floorspace within A and B class uses, would harm the viability and vitality of Woking Town Centre, and erode its functionality and competitiveness, contrary to Policy CS2 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018).*
02. *The proposal would result in the permanent loss of active ground floor frontages and pedestrian-level engagement, the loss of which would undermine the fundamental original uses and design intent of the New Central 'quarter' within Woking Town Centre, undermining the function and vitality of this part of Woking Town Centre and of the main New Central square contrary to Policies CS2 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018).*
03. *It has not been demonstrated that a high standard of amenity would be provided for future residential occupiers, in terms of daylighting provision, taking into account the height and proximity of opposing Block H (Orion Gate). Furthermore the proposal would fail to provide a high standard of amenity for future residential occupiers at*

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

ground floor level, through a restriction in terms of outlook and daylight to the sole bedrooms within the proposed ground floor level flats. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018) and SPD 'Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)'.

04. *In the absence of a Legal Agreement or other appropriate mechanism to secure contributions towards mitigation measures, the Local Planning Authority is unable to determine that the additional dwellings would not have a significant impact upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) contrary to Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the Thames Basin Heaths Avoidance Strategy, Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan (2009) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (SI No.1012 - the "Habitats Regulations").*

PLAN/2018/1174 - Change of use of existing ground floor level management suite (sui generis) within Block A (Bradfield House) to residential (class C3) to accommodate x1 studio apartment with external amenity space and associated alterations to fenestration. Associated change of use of existing commercial unit at ground floor level within Block F (Cardinal Place) to provide relocated management suite (sui generis).

Permitted subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement (07.02.2019)

PLAN/2018/0596 - Erection of rooftop extensions to existing apartment blocks (Blocks A, B, C, D and F) (known as Nankeville Court, Bradfield House and Cardinal Place) ranging in height from 1 to 3 storeys to provide x43 apartments (x24 studio/1 bed, x18 2 bed and 1 x3 bed) together with private and communal roof terraces. Associated alterations to existing basement level to provide cycle and refuse/recycling storage (amended plans).

Refused (15.11.2018) for the following reasons:

01. *By cumulative reason of its excessive bulk and mass, and in failing to represent exceptional design quality, the proposal would fail to respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the area in which it would be situated and fail to make a positive contribution to the townscape and skyline of Woking Town Centre. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and SPD Design (2015).*
02. *The proposal would provide insufficient on site car parking provision and has failed to demonstrate that the level of on site parking provision proposed would not result in the displacement of vehicle parking onto nearby streets, thereby exacerbating existing pressure for on-street car parking. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS18 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and SPD Parking Standards (2018).*

PLAN/2016/0562 - Conversion of the vacant double-height commercial space (formerly the marketing suite) at ground level of Block I, into 7 residential apartments involving the creation of a mezzanine floor level, elevational alterations, and associated alterations.

Permitted subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement (15.09.2016)

PLAN/2015/0732 - Application for change of use of existing Unit 3 to 5 (Block F) from a commercial unit to 3 no. residential units at first floor level and A1 & B1 use on the ground floor level.

Permitted subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement (13.01.2016)

PLAN/2014/0407 - Change of use of A1 retail space within Block E to create 4No residential units.

Permitted subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement (16.03.2015)

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PLAN/2012/1129 - Re-Plan to previously approved Block L to provide 13 apartments (7 x 2 bed, 6 x 1 bed), in place of the 6No approved town houses plus additional hard and soft landscaping to amenity area to rear of block L.

Permitted subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement (05.12.2013)

PLAN/2012/0720 - Relocation of approved gym facility to ground floor of approved block G and introduction of a total of 11No additional apartments into ground floor areas of approved blocks A, B and C.

Permitted subject to conditions and S106 legal agreement (05.12.2013)

PLAN/2012/0328 - Installation of a total of 31 solar panels Block E, F, K and I.

Permitted subject to conditions (19.06.2012)

PLAN/2007/0857 - Mixed use redevelopment comprising of 445 studio, 1 bed and 2 bed apartments, 4 bed town houses, live / work units, 4719m² of office (class B1(a)) and 1278m² of mixed commercial uses comprising of A1 retail, A3 food and drink. (Reserved matters)

Permitted subject to conditions (26.10.2007)

PLAN/2005/1229 - Mixed use redevelopment comprising of 446 studio, 1 bed and 2 bed apartments, 4 bed town houses, live / work units, 4719m² of office (class B1(a)) and 1247m² of mixed commercial uses comprising of A1 retail, A3 food and drink following demolition of existing offices. (Outline application: siting and means of access).

Permitted subject to conditions (06.07.2006)

7 York Road:

PLAN/2016/0834 - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a six storey building comprising 46x self-contained flats (26x one bed & 20x two bed), including 30x off-street parking spaces at basement level and associated landscaping (amended plans and description).

Resolution to grant planning permission subject to S106 legal agreement and conditions made at Planning Committee on 26.09.2017 – Pending decision

CONSULTATIONS

County Highway Authority (CHA) (SCC): The proposed development has been considered by the County Highway Authority who having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds, recommends Condition 05.

Environmental Health: Provided there are no significant changes from previous ‘similar’ application please refer to previous EH comments.

Previous EH comments: *Having considered supporting information, including W.A. Hines acoustic report, can confirm agreement with their findings. Appropriate measures for glazing and ventilation required to ensure success of the scheme for noise* (Condition 11 refers).

Network Rail: Various comments regarding the safety, operation and integrity of the railway and its infrastructure (Informative 09 refers).

Drainage and Flood Risk Team (WBC): Following a review of the submitted information would recommend approval on drainage and flood risk grounds as the proposed development complies with NPPF and Policy CS9. As stated in letter ‘PP-08033903 – New Central Development, CC&H Additional Rooftop Units’ (Dated 06 August 2019) there will be

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

no increase in the footprint of the building and therefore surface water discharge rates will not be increased.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (Surrey CC): Subject to your Flood Risk Engineer being satisfied with the proposal, we would have no further comments to make.

Thames Water Development Planning: Thames Water would advise that with regard to waste water network and sewage treatment works infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection, based on the information provided.

Surrey Wildlife Trust: No comments received.

Previous Surrey Wildlife Trust comments: We note that the following document has been submitted as part of this planning application; 'Ecological Appraisal', author Enims, dated April 2018. Having reviewed the application documents and studied our records, we have the following comments and recommendations; we advise that the Council require any development to proceed only in line with the precautionary measures for breeding birds as detailed in the above referenced Ecological Appraisal. The development should proceed in line with the enhancement measures detailed in the Ecological Appraisal, which include erection of bird and bats boxes and the sowing of wildflower seed (conditions 09 and 10 refer).

Kempton Carr Croft (Council's Viability Consultant): Conclude that the scheme remains unable to provide any element of affordable housing. Consider however, that it would be prudent for a late stage viability review to be undertaken once 70% of the scheme is sold in order to cover the event that there is an improvement in market conditions.

Surrey County Council Minerals and Waste Planning: Any comments received will be reported at Planning Committee.

REPRESENTATIONS

x92 letters of objection have been received raising the following main points:

- Should have been included in the initial build / No mention of plan when purchased property
- Similar to previously refused application
- Does not overcome the reasons for refusal for the previous scheme
- Disturbance whilst completing the work (noise, dust, disruption)
(Officer Note: This is not a reason to refuse planning permission and can be managed and mitigated as far as possible)
- Increased noise pollution following build, including from communal roof terraces
- High-over density of development
- Inadequate parking
- Increase in traffic
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Loss of light
- Out of character
- Strain on infrastructure (doctors, dentists, roads, rubbish and sewage)
- Security risk
- No affordable housing
- Issues with existing lift reliability
(Officer Note: This is a building management, as opposed to a planning, issue)
- Issues with upkeep of the current building and communal areas

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

(Officer Note: This is a building management, as opposed to a planning, issue)

- Increased traffic through communal areas and gym
- Fire safety
 - (Officer Note: Fire safety is addressed through other regulatory measures)
- Adverse impact on property prices
 - (Officer Note: Potential impact on property prices does not constitute a material planning consideration)
- Will encourage more buy-to-let investment
- Considerable development going on elsewhere in Woking
- Potential breach of lease
 - (Officer Note: Potential breach of lease(s) and/or covenant(s) are a civil matter and do not constitute a material planning consideration)
- Loss of solar panels
 - (Officer Note: The submitted plans show the existing solar panels to be relocated)
- Potential adverse impact upon foundations
 - (Officer Note: This would be addressed under other regulatory measures)
- Existing issues with bin and refuse stores
- Council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land
- Council has submitted Site Allocations DPD for adoption, which allocates housing land
- Application reference PLAN/2018/1344 was refused
 - (Officer Note: PLAN/2018/1344 application proposed a materially different form of development. This proposal must be assessed on its own merits)
- Apartments facing train line are subject to noise from the trains
- Flat prices as a whole in Woking are falling which is due to a saturation of 1 and 2 bedroom flats
- Some flats do not meet the Government's Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard

Where relevant, these matters are addressed below.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Decision-making

Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Section 7 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport

Section 11 - Making effective use of land

Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Woking Core Strategy (2012)

CS1 - A spatial strategy for Woking Borough

CS2 - Woking Town Centre

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

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

CS18 - Transport and accessibility

CS20 - Heritage and conservation

CS21 - Design

CS22 - Sustainable construction

CS24 - Woking's landscape and townscape

CS25 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DMP DPD) (2016)

DM7 - Noise and light pollution

DM16 - Servicing development

DM20 - Heritage assets and their settings

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)

Design (2015)

Parking Standards (2018)

Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008)

Climate Change (2013)

Affordable Housing Delivery (2014)

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

Heritage of Woking (2000)

Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011)

MC1 - Spatial strategy - location of mineral development in Surrey

MC6 - Safeguarding mineral resources and development

MC16 - Rail aggregate depots

Other Material Considerations

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

South East Plan (2009) (Saved policy) NRM6 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy

Woking Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2015)

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2015)

Waste and recycling provisions for new residential developments

Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)

COMMENTARY

Minor drawing inconsistencies have been corrected during the application process through the submission of amended plans. Given their minor nature, further public consultation on amended plans was not necessary and the public consultation undertaken was not prejudiced.

BACKGROUND

The present application has been submitted in an attempt to overcome the previous two reasons for refusal of PLAN/2018/0596, which were as follows:

By cumulative reason of its excessive bulk and mass, and in failing to represent exceptional design quality, the proposal would fail to respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the area in which it would be situated and fail to make a positive contribution to the townscape and skyline of Woking Town Centre. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and SPD Design (2015).

The proposal would provide insufficient on site car parking provision and has failed to demonstrate that the level of on site parking provision proposed would not result in the displacement of vehicle parking onto nearby streets, thereby exacerbating existing pressure for on-street car parking. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS18 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and SPD Parking Standards (2018).

With the exception of the changes listed as following the development remains as previously proposed under previous PLAN/2018/0596:

- Reduction of extension proposed to Blocks C and D by between 1 and 2 storeys – resulting in 6 fewer additional dwellings
- Change in facing material of proposed extensions from previous high pressure laminate panel to a metal standing seam cladding
- Change in balustrading design from previous metal to structural glass
- Omission of communal roof terraces (with exception of that within Block A)
- On-site parking ratio of 0.54 spaces per dwelling (for net additional dwellings), as opposed to 0.45 previously
- Provision of one year free membership of Enterprise Car Club for the first occupiers of each additional dwelling (funded by the developer through S106)
- Provision of £200 credit towards use of Enterprise Car Club for the first occupiers of each additional dwelling (funded by the developer through S106)

The main issues in this application are therefore whether the above changes sufficiently overcome the previous two reasons for refusal. It is necessary to re-state the other planning issues, although a number of these remain unchanged from the previous application.

PLANNING ISSUES

01. The key planning issues for consideration in determining this planning application are:
- Principle of development
 - Housing mix
 - Design and impact upon the character of the area
 - Heritage
 - Impact upon neighbouring amenity
 - Noise
 - Wind
 - Sunlight impact upon main square
 - Amenities of future occupiers
 - Parking, highways implications and alternative modes of travel
 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)
 - Affordable housing
 - Biodiversity and protected species
 - Energy and water consumption
 - Flooding and water management
 - Adjacent rail aggregate depot
- having regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, other relevant material planning considerations and national planning policy and guidance.

Background

02. The applicant is the freeholder of the New Central development and has signed Certificate B within the planning application form, confirming that Notice 1 (otherwise known as an Article 13 Notice) has been served on all leaseholders within the New Central development. This is the correct and lawful procedure in terms of the planning application process. It should be noted that any planning permission granted would not override any requirements which may exist under other forms of regulation, such as the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 and the Building Regulations, for example. Any matters between the freeholder and any leaseholder are civil in nature, outside of the remit of the Local Planning Authority, and do not constitute material planning considerations in the determination of this planning application. The impact of construction works is not, in itself, a reason to potentially refuse planning permission although, taking into account the somewhat unusual nature of this proposal (in being located above existing apartments) this matter will be discussed within the report.

Method of construction

03. The Design and Access Statement ('DAS') submitted with the application sets out that it is proposed to utilise pre-fabrication construction methods delivered as a combination of pre-fabricated modular units and panellised steel frame that can be assembled and connected on site. It is also stated that the accommodation will be inset from the existing parapets to facilitate construction safely at roof level without the need to scaffold the outside of the existing blocks, and that this removes the need to disturb the existing facade fabric. The DAS states that the mechanical engineering consultant has checked that there is sufficient capacity in the riser to serve the additional units and that the structural engineer has also confirmed that the existing structures are able to take the additional loading without the need for strengthening works below; these matters would, in any case, be subject to the Building Regulations.
04. The DAS contains a construction method statement, setting out that, in order to minimise disturbance to the existing occupants of New Central, off-site manufacture of a pre-fabricated modular system will be utilised. It is also proposed to locate the site facilities, and mobile crane, within part of the adjacent aggregate yard.
05. Key points from the construction method statement within the DAS are:
- All site deliveries and operative access are proposed via the existing 'haul' road between New Central and the railway
 - Access to work areas for operatives will be via hoists on the building exterior which, where possible, will be positioned above stair cores and ancillary spaces away from existing residential windows and balconies
 - Material access to the rooftop will be via mobile crane and hoist
 - Dust control measures will be utilised
 - The existing waterproof membrane is to be kept intact with only the need to site drill and fix the steel grillage into the roof
 - The existing PV panels will be disconnected, made safe and stored off site until works are complete, when they will be re-positioned and re-connected
06. Whilst it is acknowledged that existing New Central residents will experience some disruption during the construction process it is considered that potential disruption will

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

be transient in nature and can be mitigated as much as possible through recommended Condition 04. It is also a consideration that construction works are subject to various British Standard Codes of Practice, and fall within the remit of the Health and Safety Executive in terms of safety.

Principle of development

07. The application site falls within the Urban Area within Woking Town Centre. The National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) ('NPPF') and Policy CS25 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) promote a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy CS10 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) identifies that the Council will make provision for an additional 4,964 net additional dwellings in the Borough between 2010 and 2027, with an indicative number of net additional dwellings within Woking Town Centre of 1,980.
08. Policy CS10 sets out an indicative density range of in excess of 200 dph within Woking Town Centre, although states that the density ranges set out are indicative and will depend on the nature of the site and that higher densities than the guidelines will be permitted in principle where they can be justified in terms of the sustainability of the location and where the character of the area would not be compromised. Taking the New Central development as a whole the existing density is 428 dph (dwellings per hectare) (on the basis of 481 existing dwellings); the proposal would increase this density to 461 dph (on the basis of 518 resulting dwellings). This resulting density is considered to be justified in this instance through the sustainability of the location, albeit subject to an assessment of character impacts.
09. The reasoned justification text to Policy CS10 sets out that Woking Town Centre is one of the broad locations for long-term residential development in accordance with the overall spatial approach of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), helping to minimise the impact on important biodiversity and landscape features and offers the greatest scope to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle because of the proximity to existing services, jobs and public transport. Furthermore, the use of Woking Town Centre sites will help minimise the amount of land that will be needed to be released from the Green Belt to meet housing need.
10. Policy CS2 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that the Council will support the development of Woking Town Centre as the primary centre for economic development in the Borough and as a primary economic centre in the South East and that Woking Town Centre is the preferred location for town centre uses and high density residential development, that new development proposals should deliver high quality, well designed public spaces and buildings, which make efficient use of land, contribute to the functionality of the centre and add to its attractiveness and competitiveness.
11. Policy CS2 sets out that proposals within Woking Town Centre will be achieved through, inter alia:
 - intensification of existing sites
12. The proposals take the form of rooftop extensions to an existing residential-led mixed use development within Woking Town Centre, representing intensification of an existing site. In providing x37 net dwellings the proposal would make a meaningful contribution to housing supply within both Woking Town Centre and the wider Borough and to meeting the indicative net additional dwelling thresholds set out by Policies CS2 and CS10 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

13. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF states that "*planning...decisions should:...support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In particular, they should allow upward extensions where the development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers*". Furthermore paragraph 68 of the NPPF states that "*small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly*", and that "*to promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should [inter alia]...support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions - giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes*".
14. Overall therefore, subject to the further planning considerations set out within this report, there is a strong policy presumption in favour of development of this nature and the principle of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable.

Housing mix

15. Policy CS11 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that all residential proposals will be expected to provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes to address the nature of local needs, as evidenced in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment, to create sustainable and balanced communities. Policy CS11 does, however, state that the appropriate percentage of different housing types and sizes for each site will depend upon the established character and density of the neighbourhood and the viability of the scheme. In this case the proposal would result in 65% of 1 bed units and 35% of 2 bed units.
16. Whilst it is noted that the proposed mix provides a higher number of 1 and 2 bed units than as stated within Policy CS11, it is acknowledged that not every development site will deliver the complete mix of unit sizes. It is also noted that Policy CS11 operates, and is monitored, Borough wide. In addition the reasoned justification notes that lower proportions of family accommodation (2+ bedroom units which may be houses or flats) will be acceptable in locations in the Borough such as the town and district centres that are suitable for higher density developments. The application site lies within Woking Town Centre and provides flatted dwellings as existing. The proposal is considered to provide a good split between 1 and 2 bedroom units and, taking into account the location of the application site and the considerations of design and access, the flatted nature of the units proposed is considered to be acceptable. Overall the mix of dwelling types and sizes is considered to be acceptable and to accord with Policy CS11 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).

Design and impact upon the character of the area

17. The NPPF sets out that one of the fundamental functions of the planning and development process is to achieve the creation of high quality buildings and places and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that development should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land. Policy CS2 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that new development proposals should deliver high quality, well designed public spaces and buildings which make efficient use of land,

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

contribute to the functionality of the centre and add to its attractiveness and competitiveness. Policy CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that all development proposals will provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character, and local distinctiveness.

18. The New Central development consists of a framework of linked open-spaces reinforced by buildings of an appropriate height and key buildings on important corners. A landmark building (Olympian Heights) marks the north-western corner of the development. The New Central development layout was based on a pre-existing informal pedestrian route through the site from the York Road area to the Town Centre. A curved apartment block (Chataway House) fronts onto Bradfield Close making this part of Bradfield Close into a more conventional 'street' opposite the domestic-scale buildings of Waverley Court. Bradfield Close is continued between Blocks A (4, 5 and 6 storeys) and Blocks B and C (4, 5 and 7 storeys), opening out into the main square framed by Blocks C, D (9 and 11 storeys) and the secondary tower Block E (15 storeys), framing the main square to the south.
19. The secondary tower (Block E) is cantilevered at the fifth floor so that it over-sails the main pedestrian/cycle route through the development. Block G is located in the centre of the main square; a pavilion-type building. The main square is framed by Block H to the north (7 and 8 storeys of commercial accommodation) and Blocks F (8 storeys) and K (6 storeys) to the south. The return to Block K provides the main frontage to Guildford Road. Blocks F and K contain some retail and restaurant (Class A1 and A3) uses at the ground floor and residential within upper floors. Block I (Olympian Heights), the main 21 storey tower, is located on the north-western corner of the development, close to Victoria Arch.
20. The architectural approach of the New Central development is contemporary. The residential elements vary greatly in scale and shape, but are contained within horizontal grids reflecting storey levels, which provides an element of consistency through the development, including the commercial elements where the glazing is more limited. The main square is predominantly surrounded by render, cladding and dark brick at the lower levels with glazed balustrades and recessed balconies. The buildings addressing Bradfield Close are also in dark brick at lower levels with render above. The main square is a large area with a contemporary hard-landscaped, urban approach to the landscaping. The New Central development created what was essentially a new 'quarter' for Woking Town Centre with its own distinct character.
21. There is a great deal of ongoing change and redevelopment within this area of Woking Town Centre. The construction of the Victoria Square development is ongoing and includes development of between x23 and x34 storeys approximately 150 metres north-east of the New Central development. Furthermore a resolution to grant planning permission subject to a S106 legal agreement (Ref: PLAN/2016/0742) was made at Planning Committee on 18.10.2016 at Nos. 20-32 Goldsworth Road for the construction of development ranging between ground plus x34 storeys and ground plus x10 storeys. The site of Nos. 20-32 Goldsworth Road is located approximately 85 metres from the New Central development, on the northern side of the railway.
22. It is proposed to utilise pre-fabrication construction methods delivered as a combination of prefabricated modular units and panellised steel frame that can be assembled and connected on site. The new 'rooftop' units adhere to the descending arrangement of the existing New Central development, which step down from the taller blocks facing onto Guildford Road, down to the low rise housing along Bradfield Close.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Block A

23. Existing Block A is located on Bradfield Close and steps down in height from six, to five and then to four storeys, enclosing the 'urban street' in conjunction with opposing Block B. The proposed extension would occur at sixth floor level and remains as per the previous refusal (Ref: PLAN/2018/0596) in terms of bulk and mass, abutting the existing six storey element and leaving the existing four storey element intact. Whilst this extension would reduce the 'stepped' nature of Block A it would be set back by approximately 2.8m from the north-west elevation, 1.0m from the south-east elevation and would remain approximately 14.0m from the south-west elevation. Block A would subsequently step down from six storeys to four storeys however the combination of the set-backs and differentiation in external materials would assist in 'recessing' the proposed sixth floor extension. This additional floor would not result in significant additional bulk and mass to Block A overall and would not appear prominently on the skyline due to its comparatively limited height and its location in respect of the greater heights of other blocks.

Block B

24. Existing Block B steps down in height from five to four storeys, enclosing the 'urban street' in conjunction with opposing Block A. The proposed extension would occur at sixth floor level, and remains as per the previous refusal (Ref: PLAN/2018/0596) in terms of bulk and mass, leaving the existing four storey element intact such that the extension would not reduce the existing 'stepped' nature of Block B. The proposed extension would be set back by between approximately 5.0m and 10.0m from the south-east elevation (that presented to the 'urban street'), by between approximately 1.0m and 1.4m from the north-west elevation and would remain approximately 8.0m from the south-west elevation. Block B would subsequently step down from six storeys to four storeys although again the combination of the set-backs and differentiation in external materials would assist in 'recessing' the proposed sixth floor extension. As would be the case with the Block A extension this additional floor would not result in significant additional bulk and mass to Block B overall and would not appear prominently on the skyline due to its comparatively limited height and its location in respect of the greater heights of other blocks.

Blocks C and D

25. Blocks C and D are interconnected and sited adjacent to the railway. As existing these blocks range in height between eleven and seven storeys. The proposed extensions would occur at 8th floor level above Block C (the refused application proposed 8th - 10th floor levels above Block C) and at 10th - 11th, and separately at 12th, floor levels above Block D (the refused application proposed 10th - 13th floor levels above Block D). The proposed extensions would thus vary between one and two storeys in height above both blocks, constituting a reduction in comparison to the refused application which varied between two and three storeys in height above both blocks.
26. Blocks C and D have been subject to significant reduction in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596. The proposed extension to the element of Block C which serves as the backdrop to the main square (when viewed from Guildford Road) has been reduced in height from the previous two storeys to a single storey. The proposed extension to Block C has also been reduced in height from the previous three storeys to a single storey where it adjoins Block D. Furthermore, the proposed extension to Block D now staggers in height between two storeys and a single storey, in

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

comparison to the refused proposal which staggered in height between three storeys and two storeys.

27. As was the case with refused PLAN/2018/0596 at 8th floor level the Block C extension would be set back approximately 1.0m from all elevations (with the exception of the stair/lift core which would abut Block B). The previously proposed 9th and 10th floor levels to Block C do not form part of the present proposal.
28. The Block D extension would be set back by approximately 1.0m from all elevations (with the exception of a small part adjacent to Block C), and would abut the existing 10th floor element of Block D. The 11th floor of the Block D extension would be set back by approximately 3.2m from the existing south-east elevation (that facing into the main square) and, as with the 10th floor extension, would abut the existing 11th floor element of Block D.
29. At 12th floor level the single storey element of the Block D extension would step back by approximately 1.0m from both the south-east and north-west elevations and the 'corner' of this block (adjacent to Block H) would be utilised for the provision of private balconies. The previously proposed 13th floor level to Block C does not form part of the present proposal.
30. Whilst PLAN/2018/0596 was refused because, inter alia, by cumulative reason of its excessive bulk and mass, it would have failed to respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the area in which it would be situated and fail to make a positive contribution to the townscape and skyline of Woking Town Centre the significant reductions to the extensions proposed to Blocks C and D are considered to represent a clear reduction in terms of bulk and mass and therefore a clear betterment, in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596, in terms of the resulting overall contribution of the present proposal to both the character of the area and the townscape and skyline of Woking Town Centre. The impact of the present proposal upon the main square would also be reduced in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596, with the reduction to Block C in particular reducing the additional massing which would be apparent 'behind' the main square when viewed from Guildford Road.

Block F

31. Existing Block F is eight storeys in height (the ground floor commercial units are double height) and abuts fifteen storey Block E (the 'secondary' tower) and part eight storey, part six storey Block K (which presents to Guildford Road). The proposed extension would occur at 9th and 10th floor levels, leaving the part eight storey, part six storey element of adjacent Block K intact. At both 9th and 10th floor levels the proposed extension would be set back by approximately 1.0m from both the north (facing into the main square) and south elevations and set back by approximately 7.0m from the Guildford Road elevation of adjacent Block K.
32. The proposed extension would abut the 'secondary' 15 storey tower of Block E although would remain five storeys below the height of Block E such that it would remain clearly subordinate to this 'secondary tower' and is not considered to materially reduce the prominence of Block E in townscape and urban design terms. Whilst the Block F extension would be clearly apparent from Guildford Road it would remain set back approximately 7.0m from the adjacent Block K elevation fronting Guildford Road and its appearance within this street scene would therefore be primarily limited to obliquely angled views in which it would be viewed in context with

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

the larger (15 storey) adjacent Block E. It would retain the ‘stepped’ form of Blocks EFK and is not considered to appear out of context with its surroundings.

Conclusion on design and character

33. The significant reductions to the extensions proposed to Blocks C and D are considered to represent a clear reduction in terms of bulk and mass and therefore a clear betterment, in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596, in terms of the resulting overall contribution of the present proposal to both the character of the area and the townscape and skyline of Woking Town Centre. The impact of the present proposal upon the main square would also be reduced in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596, with the reduction to Block C in particular reducing the additional massing which would be apparent ‘behind’ the main square when viewed from Guildford Road.
34. In addition to the overall reduction in the number of dwellings (and therefore overall mass and bulk), the facing material has been changed from the previously proposed high pressure laminate panel to a metal standing seam cladding. The use of a darker colour hints at the traditional mansard approach, albeit in a contemporary context. In turn this improves the contrast with the white render on the storeys below, creating more interest and a traditional treatment to the ‘crown’ of the buildings. The previously proposed metal balustrading has also been changed to structural glass, removing unnecessary contrast. The approach to bulk and massing, particularly the recessed facades and the contrast in materials, represents a classic approach to adding mass and bulk to buildings while observing the requirement to be subservient.
35. The proposed ‘rooftop’ extensions would integrate into the existing New Central development and respect the design intent of the initial development, retaining the townscape prominence of the primary 21 storey tower and the secondary 15 storey tower. It is not considered that a harmful sense of enclosure would occur to the main square due to the recessed nature of the ‘rooftop’ extensions, combined with the stepped arrangement of the taller elements. Overall the proposal is considered to respect and make a positive contribution to the character of Woking Town Centre, paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land in accordance with Policies CS2, CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the NPPF.

Heritage

36. There are no statutory listed buildings within, or within proximity of (such that a material impact would occur), the site and the site is not located within, nor within close proximity of (such that a material impact would occur) any Conservation Area. However, nearby The Sovereigns Public House, Guildford Road and Nos.1-11 Guildford Road are Locally Listed.
37. For the purposes of the NPPF Locally Listed buildings are a non-designated heritage asset. In relation to non-designated heritage assets Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect 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. Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) both relate to heritage assets.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

38. The Sovereigns Public House (PH) is Locally Listed as a Building of Architectural Significance and Nos. 1-11 Guildford Road as a Building of Townscape Merit. The proposal would not directly affect these non-designated heritage assets, nor would the substantive proportion of the proposal have the potential to affect the setting (an indirect effect) of these Locally Listed buildings. Whilst this is the case the proposed extensions to Block F and Block A do have the potential to affect the setting (an indirect effect) of these non-designated heritage assets.
39. The proposal would be apparent in combination with The Sovereigns PH in only two key views. The proposed extension to Block F would be viewed behind The Sovereigns PH in obliquely angled north-westerly views obtained from Guildford Road. Whilst this is the case existing Blocks K, F and E are apparent behind The Sovereigns PH in these views, with the x15 storey height of Block E and the x21 storey height of Block I readily apparent. The proposed extension to Block F would add an additional two storeys however these additional two storeys would be viewed behind The Sovereigns PH in combination with existing Blocks K, F and E, such that a minor effect would occur to the setting of The Sovereigns PH in comparison to the existing situation. Whilst the Block F extension would also be apparent directly from the east in combination with The Sovereigns PH in these views it would be set back behind Block K, which would remain the dominant block in these views. Existing Block K is greater in scale than The Sovereigns PH and the Block F extension would add, in a minor manner, to this existing effect in these views.
40. Similarly the Block F extension would be apparent in combination with Nos. 1-11 Guildford Road, which forms the Edwardian Shopping Parade on the opposite side of Guildford Road. This would principally be in southerly and northerly views achieved when moving along Guildford Road. The Block F extension would be set back approximately 15.7m from the existing Block K elevation fronting Guildford Road and would represent an increase in height of a relatively modest approximate 5.6m. These combined factors would ensure that only a minor effect would occur to the setting of Nos.1-11 Guildford Road in comparison to the existing situation.
41. Furthermore, in comprising a relatively recent development, the existing New Central development does not have a strong economic, social or historical relationship with the heritage assets of either The Sovereigns PH or Nos.1-11 Guildford Road.
42. Overall the proposal would indirectly affect the non-designated heritage assets of both The Sovereigns PH and Nos.1-11 Guildford Road, through development within their setting. However the harm to the existing setting of these non-designated heritage assets is considered to be minor, and to be clearly offset by the public benefit of x37 net additional dwellings within a sustainable location within Woking Town Centre, and would not reduce the significance of these heritage assets. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the NPPF with regard to heritage.

Impact upon neighbouring amenity

43. 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, daylight or sunlight, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook. More detailed guidance on assessing neighbouring amenity impacts is provided within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008).

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Daylight impacts

44. The impact of the proposed development upon nearby existing residential properties has been assessed by the applicant within a Daylight and Sunlight Report dated April 2019 (hereafter referred to as 'D&SR') carried out in compliance with the methodology outlined within the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guide 'Site Layout Planning for Sunlight and Daylight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)', a recognised industry tool for assessing these effects (hereafter referred to as the 'BRE Guide'). The BRE guide is, however, a guide and compliance is not mandatory, since the actual effect can be influenced by other factors. The BRE Guide is referred to within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008).
45. Where the BRE guidelines are exceeded then daylighting and/or sunlighting may be adversely affected. The BRE Guide provides numerical guidelines although emphasizes that advice given is not mandatory and the BRE Guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy; the (numerical guidelines) are to be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout and design. The BRE Guide also sets out that in special circumstances the developer or Local Planning Authority may wish to use different target values. For example, in a historic city centre, or in an area with modern high rise buildings, a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings.
46. It is also a material consideration that Paragraph 123(c) of the NPPF states that "*local planning authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in this Framework. In this context, when considering applications for housing, authorities should take a flexible approach in applying policies or guidance relating to daylight and sunlight, where they would otherwise inhibit making efficient use of a site (as long as the resulting scheme would provide acceptable living standards)*".
47. Rooms in adjoining or nearby housing where daylight is required include living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms. Windows to bathrooms, toilets, storerooms, circulation areas and garages need not be analysed as daylight is not required to these rooms. Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and Daylight Distribution ('DD') are the primary tests used to assess the impact of new development upon the daylighting of existing buildings.

Vertical Sky Component (VSC)

48. Vertical Sky Component (VSC) quantifies the amount of skylight falling on a vertical wall or window, measured on the outer pane of the window. According to the BRE Guide if the VSC, with the new development in place, is both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times (ie. a greater than 20% reduction) of its former value (pre-development), occupants of the existing building will notice the reduction in the amount of skylight. The maximum VSC value obtainable at a flat window in a vertical wall is effectively 40%. Clearly 'noticeable' is a different test than that set out within Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), which refers to 'significant' harm rather than a 'noticeable' effect.

Daylight Distribution (DD)

49. Where room layouts are known, the impact on the daylighting distribution in existing buildings can be found by plotting the 'no sky line' in each of the main rooms. For housing this would include living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens; the BRE Guide

states that bedrooms should also be analysed although they are less important. The no sky line divides points on the working plane (in housing assumed to be horizontal and 0.85m high) which can and cannot see the sky. The BRE Guides states that if, following construction of a new development, the no sky line moves so that the area of the existing room, which does not receive direct daylight, is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value (ie. a greater than 20% reduction) this will be noticeable to the occupants, and more of the room will appear poorly lit. However the BRE Guide also states that the guidelines need to be applied sensibly and flexibly; if an existing building contains rooms lit from one side only and greater than 5.0m deep, then a greater movement of the no sky line may be unavoidable.

Sunlight impacts

Sunlight impact to windows

50. Unlike daylight, which is non-directional and assumes that light from the sky is uniform, the availability of sunlight is dependent on the orientation of the window, or area of ground, being assessed relative to the position of due south. The BRE guide recommends that all main living rooms facing within 90° of due south (ie. facing from 90° to 270°) should be checked for potential loss of sunlight. Kitchens and bedrooms are less important.
51. The BRE Guide states that sunlight availability may be adversely affected if the centre of the window receives less than 25% of annual probable sunlight hours (APSH), or less than 5% of APSH between 21 September and 21 March (for ease of reference this period is referred to as ‘winter months’) and receives less than 0.8 times its former sunlight hours during either period and has a reduction in sunlight received over the whole year greater than 4% of APSH. In this context ‘Probable sunlight hours’ means the total number of hours in the year that the sun is expected to shine on unobstructed ground, allowing for average levels of cloudiness for the location in question.

Overshadowing to gardens and open spaces

52. The BRE Guide sets out that the availability of sunlight should be checked for all open spaces where sunlight is required, including gardens and sitting out areas (such as those between non-domestic buildings and in public squares) and recommends that at least 50% of the area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March, stating that, if, as a result of a new development, an existing garden or amenity area does not meet the 50% criteria, and the area which can receive two hours of sunlight on 21st March is less than 0.8 times its former value (ie. a greater than 20% reduction), then the loss of sunlight is likely to be noticeable.

Privacy / Loss of outlook

53. SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) sets out minimum recommended separation distances for achieving privacy of 15 metres for three storey and over front to front elevation relationships. Concerns have been raised by some residents regarding the potential loss of views from existing New Central properties. The potential loss of enjoyment of a view is not a ground on which planning permission can be refused. However, the impact of a development on outlook is a material planning consideration and stems on whether the development would give rise to an undue sense of enclosure or overbearing effect to neighbouring/nearby residential properties. There are no established guidelines for what is acceptable or unacceptable in this regard, with any assessment subjective as opposed to empirical,

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

with key factors in this assessment being the existing local context and arrangement of buildings and uses.

Blocks A and B

- 54. Blocks A and B face each other across the 'urban street' towards Bradfield Close. An existing separation gap measuring approximately 12.0m exists between the facing elevations of these two blocks. The proposed sixth floor extensions to each of these two blocks would be set back by approximately 2.8m (Block A extension) and by between 5.0m and 10.0m (Block B extension) from the facing elevations. Whilst the extensions are likely to be visible from the existing third and fourth floor levels of these blocks the relatively modest heights, combined with the relative setbacks from the facing elevations, of these extensions is considered to preclude any significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook to Blocks A and B. Taking into account that the extensions would achieve greater levels of separation than currently exists between the facing elevations of these two blocks, combined with the setbacks from the facing elevations, it is not considered that a significantly harmful loss of privacy would occur to Blocks A and B.
- 55. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable room windows within Blocks A (ground floor to fifth floor) and B (ground floor to fourth floor) would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that daylighting would not be significantly adversely affected, with the exception of the following windows within Block A:

Floor	Window Ref	Room Ref	Room Type	VSC Reduction	Other factors
Fourth	W1	R1	Bedroom	24%	N/A
Fourth	W10	R9	Living Room	33%	Dual aspect room with Window W9 which experiences only 1% reduction

- 56. The extent of VSC reduction (24%) to window W1 at fourth floor is considered to result in a noticeable loss of daylight to this room however does not significantly exceed the 20% BRE Guide target criteria, such that no significantly harmful loss of daylight is considered to occur. Furthermore the reduction in VSC to W1 remains as per refused PLAN/2018/0596, for which neighbouring amenity impact did not form a reason for refusal and W1 serves a bedroom; the BRE Guide sets out that living rooms and kitchens need more daylight than bedrooms.
- 57. The VSC reduction to window W10 at fourth floor level is more significant (33%) however this window serves a dual aspect living room, with the other living room window (W9) experiencing only a 1% VSC reduction, such that no significantly harmful loss of daylight is considered to occur to this living room overall. Furthermore refused PLAN/2018/0596 would have resulted in a 35% reduction in VSC to W10; the present proposal therefore results in lesser impact than the refused proposal.
- 58. With the exception of the single room addressed below the submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable rooms within Blocks A (ground floor to fifth floor) and B (ground floor to fourth floor) would experience 'no sky line' reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction). Therefore daylight distribution within all Block A and Block B habitable rooms would not be

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

significantly adversely affected with the exception of the following single room within Block A:

Floor	Room Ref	Room Type	DD Reduction
Fifth	R2	Bedroom	26%

59. In terms of daylighting distribution the BRE Guide states that bedrooms should be analysed although they are less important than living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens; therefore the reduction to room R2 (Bedroom) is not considered to be significantly harmful and also represents a minor improvement in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596, which would have resulted in a 27% DD reduction.
60. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant habitable room windows within Blocks A (ground floor to fifth floor) and B (ground floor to fourth floor).

Block C

61. Although Block C has a relatively close relationship as existing with Blocks A and E the rooftop extension to Block C would be single storey and relatively limited in height such that no significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, is considered to occur to Blocks A and E. Taking into account that the extension would achieve the same level of separation as currently exists between the facing elevations of these blocks, combined with the set-backs from the facing elevations, it is not considered that a significantly harmful loss of privacy would occur to Blocks A and E.
62. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable room windows within Block C (ground floor to fifth floor) would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that daylighting would not be significantly adversely affected and that all habitable rooms within Block C (ground floor to fifth floor) would experience no 'no sky line' reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction). Whilst windows within the sixth floor of Block C have not been included within the submitted D&SR the sixth floor room layout is identical to that at fifth floor. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that the most adverse VSC reduction to habitable windows at fifth floor level would be 4%, and the most adverse daylight distribution reduction would be 3%. Taking into account that the receipt and distribution of daylight improves the further up the building it can be concluded that daylighting would not be significantly adversely affected at sixth floor level of Block C. Overall, therefore daylight distribution within all Block C habitable rooms would not be significantly adversely affected.
63. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant habitable room windows within Block C (ground floor to fifth floor).

Block D

64. At 10th floor level the Block D extension would be situated approximately 26.5m from the closest point of Block E (ie. the cantilevered element). The stepped formation of the Block D extension is such that the 11th floor would 'step back' from Block E and therefore retain approximately 28.7m separation to Block E. Taking account of the existing high density nature, and Woking Town Centre location, of Block E, combined with the considerations previously outlined, it is considered that the Block D

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

extension would achieve a satisfactory relationship with Block E, avoiding significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook. Whilst the Block D extension would be apparent from north-east facing windows within adjoining Block C the relative heights, stepped arrangement, and 90° formation of the Block D extension in relation to these windows, are considered to preclude any significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, or a significantly harmful loss of privacy, to Block C.

- 65. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable room windows within Block D (ground floor to fifth floor) would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that daylighting would not be significantly adversely affected.
- 66. With the exception of nine rooms addressed below the submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable rooms within Block D (ground floor to fifth floor) would experience 'no sky line' reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction). Therefore daylight distribution within all Block D habitable rooms would not be significantly adversely affected with the exception of the following nine rooms:

Floor	Room Ref	Room Type	DD Reduction
Second	R10	Bedroom	23%
Third	R8	Bedroom	21%
Third	R10	Bedroom	28%
Fourth	R8	Bedroom	28%
Fourth	R10	Bedroom	24%
Fourth	R11	Living Room	26%
Fifth	R6	Living Room	26%
Fifth	R8	Bedroom	22%
Fifth	R11	Living Room	27%

- 67. Six of these nine rooms are bedrooms; in terms of daylighting distribution the BRE Guide identifies that bedrooms should also be analysed although they are less important than living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens. Furthermore the reductions in daylight distribution to four of these six bedrooms range between 21% - 24%, and therefore not significantly in excess of the BRE Guide target criteria of 20%. Taking into account the bedroom use and level of reductions the daylight distribution reductions in these rooms are not considered to be significantly harmful.
- 68. Whilst the reductions to the other two bedrooms (at 28%), and the three living rooms (26% - 27%), would be more significant taking into account the Woking Town Centre location of Block D, combined with the existing high density nature of the New Central development, and the fact that these reductions are not significantly in excess of the BRE Guide target criteria of 20%, it is not considered that the reduction in daylight distribution to these rooms would be significantly harmful. It is also a significant material consideration that all habitable room windows within Block D would maintain VSC in accordance with the BRE Guide target criteria. Furthermore, the DD reductions to Block D remain as per refused PLAN/2018/0596, which was not refused on neighbouring amenity grounds.
- 69. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant habitable room windows within Block D (ground floor to fifth floor).

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

70. Whilst the submitted D&SR does not assess Block D windows at sixth floor level and above this is because at these levels the proposed extension to Block C does not breach the 45° angle 'rule of thumb'. The BRE Guide sets out that where this 'rule of thumb' is not breached further detailed daylight and sunlight tests are not required.

Block E

71. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable room windows within Block E (ground floor to seventh floor) would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that daylighting would not be significantly adversely affected with the exception of the following single window:

Floor	Window Ref	Room Ref	Room Type	VSC Reduction	Other factors
Third	W1	R1	Bedroom	27%	N/A

72. Whilst the VSC reduction to W1 would be 27% this would nonetheless be lower than the 29% VSC reduction which would have occurred as a result of refused PLAN/2018/0596, which was not refused on neighbouring amenity grounds.
73. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable rooms within Block E (ground floor to seventh floor) would experience 'no sky line' reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction). Therefore daylight distribution within all Block E habitable rooms would not be significantly adversely affected. Whilst the submitted D&SR does not assess Block E windows at eighth floor level and above this is because, at these levels, the proposed extensions to Blocks C and D do not breach the 25° and 45° angle 'rules of thumb'. The BRE Guide sets out that where these 'rules of thumb' are not breached further detailed daylight and sunlight tests are not required.
74. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant habitable room windows within Block E (ground floor to seventh floor).
75. In terms of the external amenity space partly to the rear of Blocks E, F and K (identified as Amenity A2) the submitted D&SR demonstrates that there would be effectively no reduction in existing sunlight, such that no harmful impact would arise to this external amenity space in this regard.

Blocks G and H

76. Blocks G and H (ground floor to fifth floor) contain only commercial floorspace and therefore the impact of the development upon Blocks G and H does not need to be further considered.

Block I

77. Block I is the main 21 storey tower located within the north-western corner of the New Central development. Existing Block H intervenes between part of Block I and the Block F extension up to fifth floor level. It should also be noted that the Block F extension would not encroach onto adjacent Block K, which occurs directly opposite the majority of the Block I tower. A separation distance measuring approximately 51.0m would be retained between the Block F extension and Block I. Taking into account these combined factors it is considered that the Block F extension would

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

achieve a satisfactory relationship with Block I, avoiding significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight, or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook.

78. Due to the current stepped form of Block D the two storey element of the Block D extension would be screened from Block I by the existing form of Block D. At 12th floor level the Block D extension is likely to be visible from the western elevation of Block I however at this level approximately 35.0m separation would be retained between the closest points of the Block D extension and the western elevation of Block I. Furthermore the Block D extension would be entirely offset from the western elevation of Block I due to the existing obliquely angled relationship between these two blocks. Taking into account these combined factors it is considered that the Block D extension would achieve a satisfactory relationship with Block I, avoiding significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight, or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook.

Block L

79. Block L is a four storey curved apartment block to the south of Block A providing x13 flats. To the rear is a communal garden area, predominantly laid to lawn with some planting. There is an existing, established, relatively close and almost perpendicular relationship between Block A and Block L. The extension to Block A would result in an additional storey across part of the building, although it would leave the four storey element of Block A (the element with the closest relationship to Block L) intact. The extension would also be set back approximately 1.0m from the south-east elevation of Block A (which faces into the communal garden area), which would reduce its impact when viewed from both the communal garden area and the rear elevation of Block L. Taking account of the existing, established relationship between Block A and Block L the proposed extension to Block A is not considered to give rise to significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook to either Block L or the communal garden area.
80. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable room windows within Block L (ground floor to third floor) would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that daylighting would not be significantly adversely affected.
81. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable rooms within Block L (ground floor to third floor) would experience 'no sky line' reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction). Therefore daylight distribution within all Block L habitable rooms would not be significantly adversely affected.
82. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant habitable room windows within Block L (ground floor to third floor).
83. In terms of the external amenity space to the rear of Block L (identified as Amenity A1) the submitted D&SR demonstrates that there would be effectively no reduction in existing sunlight, such that no harmful impact would arise to this external amenity space in this regard.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

New Central Daylight/Sunlight conclusions

84. Of the 313 windows assessed for VSC within the existing New Central development only 2 single aspect windows ((i) Block A - Fourth - W1 and (ii) Block E - Third - W1), both serving bedrooms, (less than 1% of the windows reviewed) would experience VSC reductions greater than the BRE target value of 20% (excluding the 1 dual aspect living room which would experience a VSC reduction of greater than 20% to one window although the average VSC reduction to the living room would still fall within the BRE target values). This is a very high level of VSC compliance for a high density Woking Town Centre development.
85. With regard to daylight distribution of the 265 rooms assessed within the existing New Central development 7 bedrooms and 3 living rooms (4% of the rooms assessed) would experience reductions in excess of the BRE Guide target value of 20%. However these reductions would remain relatively close to the BRE target criteria and are considered to qualify as 'minor adverse', as opposed to significantly harmful referred to within Policy CS21. Furthermore the majority of daylight distribution reductions in excess of the BRE target criteria (7 of 10) relate to bedrooms, whereby daylighting distribution is considered less important than to living rooms. Furthermore the 3 living rooms which would experience daylight distribution reductions in excess of the BRE target criteria are typically deep on plan and lit from a single aspect, in which circumstances the BRE Guide states that target reductions may be unavoidable. Overall, taking into account the high density Woking Town Centre nature of the site the resulting daylight distribution is considered to be acceptable.

Waverley Court

86. Waverley Court consists of two storey dwellings located on the opposing (south-western) side of Bradfield Close to Blocks A and B. Block A is sited directly opposite Nos.27-32 Waverley Court, which are set back from the footway, on the opposite side of the carriageway, by small gardens. The Block A extension would remain in excess of 30.0m from the facing elevations of Waverley Court. Taking this retained separation distance into account, combined with the single storey height of the Block A extension, no significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, is considered to occur to Waverley Court as a result of the Block A extension. The Block A extension complies with the 25° angle 'rule of thumb' for daylight such that no harmful loss of daylight would arise to Waverley Court.
87. Block B is offset from properties within Waverley Court, being sited to the north-east. Approximately 42.0m separation would be retained between the closest points of the Block B extension and Waverley Court properties. Taking this retained separation distance into account, combined with the single storey height of the Block B extension, no significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, is considered to occur to Waverley Court as a result of the Block B extension. The form, scale and location of the Block B extension in relation to Waverley Court is such that no harmful impact upon daylight is considered to arise to Waverley Court.

Oliver House, No.30 Guildford Road and Consort Court, No.5 York Road

88. Oliver House / Consort Court are part four storey, part three storey buildings located to the south. Oliver House is attached to the north-western corner of the (northern) Consort Court building and provides x9 flats. Consort Court is split across a northern

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

and southern building; the northern building provides x36 flats and spans from east-to-west and attaches to No.31 Guildford Road and the southern building is sited between No.3 York Road and No.7 York Road and provides x15 flats. The Block A and F extensions are the only elements which would potentially impact upon Oliver House / Consort Court; the other elements would be screened by the intervening, existing New Central development.

89. The Block F extension would retain approximately 50.0m separation to the closest facing elevation of Oliver House and in excess of 60.0m separation to the closest facing elevation of Consort Court (the northerly building). Taking these retained separation distances into account, combined with the relatively modest height of the Block F extension, no significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, is considered to occur to Oliver House / Consort Court as a result of the Block F extension.
90. The Block A extension would remain approximately 26.0m from the closest point of Oliver House (north-west corner) and approximately 37.0m from the closest point of Consort Court (the northerly building). Taking these retained separation distances into account, combined with the single storey height of the Block A extension, no significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, is considered to occur to Oliver House / Consort Court as a result of the Block A extension.
91. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable room windows within Oliver House and Consort Court (ground floor to third floor) would either retain VSC of 27% or greater, or of not less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that daylighting would not be significantly adversely affected.
92. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that all habitable rooms within Oliver House and Consort Court (ground floor to third floor) would experience 'no sky line' reductions of less than 0.8 times their former values (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction). Therefore daylight distribution within all Oliver House and Consort Court habitable rooms would not be significantly adversely affected.
93. The submitted D&SR demonstrates that no adverse loss of sunlight (as defined within the BRE Guide) would be sustained to any relevant habitable room windows within Oliver House and Consort Court (ground floor to third floor).

Nos.20-32 Goldsworth Road

94. Nos.20-32 Goldsworth Road is a large site on the opposite, northern side of the railway. Although this site currently contains no residential development on 18.10.2016 the Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission (Ref: PLAN/2016/0742), subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement, for the erection of, inter alia, x560 residential units. The proposed development ranges in height between ground plus 34 storeys and ground plus 10 storeys. The requisite S106 legal agreement has not yet been completed and therefore planning permission has not been granted for this proposed redevelopment. However, the potential redevelopment of this site still represents a material planning consideration in determination of the current application.
95. A separation distance measuring approximately 84.0m would be retained between the northern elevation of the Block BCD extension and the southern elevation of the proposal (primarily Block B / Podium – sited opposite Blocks BCD) at Nos.20-32

Goldsworth Road. The resulting maximum height of Block BCD, as a result of the proposed extensions, would measure approximately 35.0m. The lowest proposed finished residential floor level (Block B / Podium) of the Nos.20-32 Goldsworth Road proposal (44.70) is approximately 7.9m above the finished ground floor level of the relevant parts of Block BCD (36.75). Taking into account these differences in finished residential floor levels the proposed extensions to Blocks BCD comply with the 25° 'rule of thumb', as set out within the BRE Guide and SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008), such that further checks in relation to daylight impacts to the proposal at Nos.20-32 Goldsworth Road are not required.

96. Taking into account the previously stated differences in finished residential floor levels, combined with the retained separation distances and the resulting 35.0m maximum height of Block BCD, no significantly harmful impact, by reason of potential loss of privacy or overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or loss of outlook, is considered to occur to the Nos.20-32 Goldsworth Road proposal as a result of the Block BCD extension.

Noise

97. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions "*should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of...noise pollution*". Paragraph 180 of the NPPF sets out that planning decisions should "*mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life*".
98. A noise and vibration assessment (rail and road traffic) has been submitted with the application. The existing New Central development is located on the western side of Guildford Road and immediately south of the main railway lines from London Waterloo to the south-west. At this point Guildford Road is one way with traffic travelling north only. The New Central development also adjoins The Sovereigns PH and car park and, to the north-west, railway depots and an aggregate site. A noise survey established that the predominant source of noise was due generally to road traffic although there was also transient noise from the trains on the adjoining railway lines and from the movement of vehicles along the access road to and from the aggregate site adjacent to the railway.
99. The Environmental Health Service has reviewed the submitted noise and vibration assessment (rail and road traffic) and concurs that the impact of rail and road traffic noise upon the additional apartments could be addressed via planning condition (condition 11 refers), with appropriate internal noise criteria achievable using conventional constructions. The additional apartments are therefore considered capable of providing a suitable noise environment for future occupiers.
100. A relatively small communal roof terrace is proposed at fifth floor level within Block A (approx. 39 sq.m). The communal roof terraces which were previously proposed at twelfth floor level within Block D, and at tenth floor level within Block F, do not form part of the present application. It is considered that the issue of potential noise and disturbance arising from use of the communal roof terrace within Block A can be addressed via the submission of a management plan secured by recommended condition 08. Such a management plan would need to include (i) hours of access to the communal roof terraces (ii) means of controlling access to the communal roof terraces and (iii) signage regarding hours of use and any activities which are prohibited (ie. barbeques / late night gatherings etc).

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wind

101. A pedestrian level wind desk based assessment has been submitted with the application. Whilst this assessment relates to the development proposed under previous PLAN/2018/0596 the present application proposes less development to Block BCD than PLAN/2018/0596, such that wind effects would be lesser than those stated within the assessment. The prevailing wind direction throughout the year is from the south-west, with a secondary peak from north-easterly winds, especially during the spring (March, April and May) which tend to be cold winds.

Main square

102. The wind desk based assessment establishes that the proposed rooftop extensions are not expected to have a significant impact on wind conditions in the main square; the additional height to the building massing is not expected to result in a significant increase in down washing, due to the generally stepped formation of the additional floors. Wind conditions within the main square would therefore remain suitable for a mixture of sitting and standing use during the summer (June, July and August).

Terraces/balconies

103. The pedestrian level wind desk based assessment assesses the wind conditions likely to be experienced on the proposed private roof terraces/balconies (with the exception of that proposed to Block A the communal roof terraces previously proposed under PLAN/2018/0596 have been omitted from the present application), and establishes that the wind conditions at the south-eastern private terraces of Block A are likely to be suitable for standing use during the summer; due to the restricted size of these terraces seating is not expected to be provided and therefore wind conditions are suitable for the intended use. The north-western terraces of Block A are expected to be suitable for a mixture of sitting and standing use. Within Block B the private terraces are generally expected to be suitable for sitting use due to the shelter provided by Block A.
104. The private terraces within Block C are expected to have standing use conditions due to their exposure to south-westerly winds, and therefore mitigation measures are required to achieve sitting conditions; these can be secured via recommended condition 12. Within Block D the private terraces are considered to be suitable for a mixture of sitting and standing use. As is the case with Blocks A and B the smaller private terraces within Block D are not expected to provide seating and are therefore suitable for the intended use. Within Block F the private terraces to the north are expected to be suitable for sitting use during the summer season. The private amenity terraces to the south and west of Block F are expected to be suitable for standing; due to the restricted size of these terraces seating is not expected to be provided and therefore wind conditions are suitable for the intended use.
105. Overall, subject to mitigation measures to some of the larger private terraces, to be secured via recommended condition 12, the impact of wind upon both the main square and the private and communal terraces, is considered to be acceptable.

Sunlight impact upon main square

106. In terms of the main square (identified as Amenity A3) the submitted D&SR demonstrates that, as a result of the proposed development, the area of the main square which can receive two hours of sunlight on 21st March, would not be less than 0.8 times its former value (ie. would sustain a less than 20% reduction), such that the

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

loss of sunlight (a 7% reduction in this instance) is unlikely to be noticeable. No harmful impact would arise to the main square by reason of loss of sunlight/overshadowing in this regard.

Amenities of future occupiers

107. With the exception of the apartments specified below, all proposed apartments would comply with, or exceed, the relevant minimum gross internal floor areas set out by the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (March 2015):

Plot no. on plans	Number of bedrooms (b) and bed spaces (persons)	Gross internal area (GIA) proposed (sq.m)	Technical housing standard GIA (sq.m)	Shortfall (sq.m)	External amenity provision
4	2B4P	67	70	-3	Terrace (43 sq.m)
26	1B1P	35	37	-2	Balcony
27	1B1P	35	37	-2	Balcony
34	2B4P	67	70	-3	Terrace (20 sq.m)

108. As can be seen from the preceding table the shortfalls in gross floorspace are minor (2 - 3 sq.m). In the case of plots 4 and 34 (both 2B4P) the minor 3 sq.m shortfalls are considered to be clearly outweighed through the provision of 43 sq.m and 20 sq.m private terraces to serve these respective apartments. Similarly, the minor shortfall of 2 sq.m in the case of plots 26 and 27 (both 1B1P) are considered to be sufficiently mitigated through the provision of private balconies to serve these apartments. Taking these factors into account, combined with the fact that the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (March 2015) are not locally adopted, the proposal is considered to provide a good standard of amenity, in terms of the size of accommodation, to future occupiers.
109. SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) states that “*dwellings specifically designed not to be used for family accommodation do not require any specific area to be set aside for each as private amenity space. This would apply to one and two bedroom flats and any other forms of dwelling less than 65sq.m. floorspace together with specified forms of non family tenure...however, all forms of dwelling should seek to incorporate some modest private sunlit area...at higher levels, particularly in the case of flats, a simple terrace or balcony might be incorporated*”.
110. SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) also states that “*in the most dense urban locations of Woking Town Centre...where multi storey developments including flats, duplex apartments and townhouses are intended for family accommodation (for this purpose all flats or duplex apartments with two bedrooms or more and exceeding 65 sq.m. gross floor space) alternative forms of on-site amenity provision may be permitted in lieu of a conventional private garden...use of a communal amenity space or, where it is safe to do so, a suitable area of landscaped roof garden or terrace, may be acceptable for this purpose if it provides an equivalent area of amenity value*”.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

111. All x37 proposed apartments would benefit from either a balcony or a private terrace. Of the x9 apartments which would provide two bedrooms or more and in excess of 65 sq.m gross floor space (and therefore constitute 'family accommodation') x6 of these apartments would benefit from private terraces varying between 14 sq.m and 43 sq.m in area, with the remaining 'family accommodation' apartments, providing private balconies. Taking into account that the site is located within Woking Town Centre, and would provide flatted development, the overall approach to external amenity provision is considered to be of a good standard and acceptable.
112. Good levels of outlook and daylight are considered to be provided to all proposed apartments. Overall the proposed apartments are considered to provide a good standard of residential amenity for future occupiers.

Parking, highways implications and alternative modes of travel

113. The application has been submitted with a Transport Statement ('TS') dated January 2019. The present proposal also represents a reduced number of apartments (x37), in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596 (x43).
114. The NPPF promotes sustainable transport through locating development in sustainable locations, limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 109 sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) aims to locate most new development within the main urban areas, served by a range of sustainable transport modes, such as public transport, walking and cycling.
115. Vehicular access is via the existing access from Bradfield Close, which provides direct access into the existing basement car park. This would be unaffected by the proposal.

Car Parking

116. SPD Parking Standards (2018) sets out the following minimum residential parking standards:

Number of bedrooms	Vehicle parking spaces per flat, apartment or maisonette (i)	Number of flats, apartments or maisonettes in proposal (ii)	Overall vehicle parking standard (ie. i x ii)
1 bedroom	0.5	24	12
2 bedroom	1	13	13
Total			25

117. Applying the minimum parking standards the proposed development would be required to provide x25 parking spaces. However SPD Parking Standards (2018) sets out that on-site provision below minimum standards will be considered for developments within Woking Town Centre, as is the case in this instance.
118. The applicant proposes to reallocate x20 existing parking spaces within the basement level of the New Central development to some of the apartments proposed. Whilst letters of representation make reference to all existing basement level parking spaces being allocated to existing leaseholders, the applicant (the

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

freeholder of the New Central development) has provided details of the parking spaces allocated to leaseholders and contends that the x20 existing parking spaces in question (which have been coloured on the basement plan) are not allocated to leaseholders and therefore, as freeholder, the applicant is able to allocate the x20 parking spaces in question to some of the new apartments proposed.

119. It is acknowledged that some leaseholders may utilise the x20 parking spaces in question although they may not be allocated to their leasehold. However, if this is the case, it is within the applicant's capacity as freeholder to prevent such unauthorised use of parking spaces. No cogent evidence has been provided within letters of representation, to demonstrate that all existing parking spaces are allocated to leaseholders, and therefore the presumption is in favour of the evidence provided by the applicant, which indicates that x20 existing parking spaces are unallocated and can therefore be allocated to some of the apartments proposed.
120. The submitted TS sets out that a car parking survey was undertaken within the existing basement car park at 05:05 on Wednesday 13th April 2016 and at 04:45 on Thursday 14th April 2016, in order to determine existing car parking demand within the basement car park, and that the existing car park comprises x77 commercial car parking spaces and x265 residential car parking spaces, equating to x342 car parking spaces in total.
121. The parking survey within the TS assumes that when the parking surveys were carried out the x77 commercial car parking spaces were empty (due to the hours of survey). Therefore 67% of the x265 residential car parking spaces were occupied and the car parking demand associated with the existing residential units equates to 0.4 spaces per unit. The reallocation of x20 existing parking spaces to the apartments proposed would equate to a car parking provision of 0.54 spaces per unit, which exceeds the car parking demand (0.4 per unit) associated with the existing residential units as established by the parking survey and would provide a higher ratio compared to the 0.45 spaces per unit within refused PLAN/2018/0596. The provision of x20 parking spaces to the x37 units proposed is therefore considered to be acceptable having regard to the Woking Town Centre location of the site.
122. Furthermore, to assist in reducing parking demand associated with the additional dwellings, the applicant has agreed to fund the following:
 - Provision of one year free membership of Enterprise Car Club for the first occupiers of each additional dwelling
 - Provision of £200 credit towards use of Enterprise Car Club for the first occupiers of each additional dwelling
123. These provisions would be secured as part of the S106 Legal Agreement. Enterprise Car Club has a selection of vehicles available within 250m walking distance of the site; 2 vehicles at Guildford Road (GU22 7PX), 2 vehicles at 32 Goldsworth Road (GU21 6JT), 1 vehicle at Quadrant Court (GU22 7QQ) and 1 vehicle at Montgomery Road (GU22 7SP).
124. The surveys reported upon in the 'Carplus Annual Survey of Car Clubs' (England and Wales (excluding London)), identified that if not joining a car club 32% of individuals would have bought a private car. This report demonstrates the active role in car club provision in reducing car ownership and thus in contributing to residential parking provision.

125. Overall the increased on-site parking ratio (in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596), combined with the provisions relating to membership of Enterprise Car Club, to be secured through S106 Legal Agreement, are considered to overcome the second reason for refusal of PLAN/2018/0596.

Cycle Parking

126. SPD Parking Standards (2018) requires x2 cycle parking spaces per dwelling, regardless of bedroom provision. This requires the provision of x74 spaces (ie. 37 x 2). The submitted plans make provision for an additional x84 cycle parking spaces and an additional x6 motorcycle parking spaces within the basement level. The provision of cycle parking exceeds the requirements of SPD Parking Standards (2018) and can be secured via recommended condition 05.

Alternative modes of travel

Walking and cycling

127. Walking and cycling provide important alternatives to the private car and should also be encouraged to form part of longer journeys via public transport. The local highway network benefits from good quality footways and pedestrian crossing facilities, which connect to the centre of Woking and public transport connections.
128. There are a range of cycle routes within the vicinity of the site, including the Surrey Cycleway, which is accessible from the centre of Woking and continues through Ripley and Clandon to the south and Horsell and Egham to the north. National Cycle Road 221 is accessible via Victoria Way and operates along the Basingstoke Canal as a traffic-free route between Brookwood and West Byfleet. A range of additional interconnecting local cycle routes are available within Woking, namely the 'Planet Trails'. In particular, the 'Pluto' cycle trail operates along Goldsworth Road / Poole Road close to the site as a formal cycle route between the centre of Woking and Knaphill / Wych Hill and incorporates a range of on-carriageway and off-carriageway sections.

Rail

129. Woking railway station is located a walking distance of approximately 360 metres (Station Approach entrance) and 435 metres (High Street entrance) from the site (a circa 3 - 5 minute walk) and is accessible from the site via the existing network of footways and pedestrian crossings. These distances are both well within the 800 metre 'acceptable' walking distance to railway stations, as recommended by the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT). Woking railway station provides access to a wide range of high-frequency South Western Railway services to various local and regional destinations, which includes fast, direct services to Clapham Junction and London Waterloo and services to Guildford, Surbiton, Weybridge, Alton and Portsmouth Harbour.

Bus

130. The nearest bus stop to the site is on Woking High Street, approximately 200 metres to the north-east, and well within the CIHT's recommended 400 metres walking distance to a bus stop. The 'High Street Link Road' bus stop was recently implemented and provides high quality waiting and accessibility infrastructure, including a shelter, seating, raised kerbing and real time bus information. It is directly

accessible from the site via the existing footways and crossing provision. This bus stop serves many local bus routes.

131. Overall it is evident that there are a wide range of alternative modes of travel to the private car available within the local area, including public transport services.

Vehicle trip generation

132. The submitted TS establishes, informed by the TRICS database, that the proposal has the potential to generate approximately 9 and 11 vehicle movements in the weekday morning (08:00-09:00) and evening (17:00-18:00) peaks respectively, and approximately 95 vehicle movements across a typical weekday (07:00-19:00). This represents a slight increase in vehicle movements in comparison to the existing situation, however not an increased level which would give rise to a detrimental impact upon the wider highway network. The trip rate generation is also lower than refused PLAN/2018/0596 due to the lower number of apartments proposed. Therefore the proposals are not considered to prejudice highway safety or the free-flow of traffic. The County Highway Authority (Surrey CC) raises no objection to the application on highways grounds.

Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA)

133. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) has been identified as an internationally important site of nature conservation and has been given the highest degree of protection. Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that any proposal with potential significant impacts (alone or in combination with other relevant developments) on the TBH SPA will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment to determine the need for Appropriate Assessment. Following recent European Court of Justice rulings, a full and precise analysis of the measures capable of avoiding or reducing any significant effects on European sites must be carried out at an 'Appropriate Assessment' stage rather than taken into consideration at screening stage, for the purposes the Habitats Directive (as interpreted into English law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the "Habitat Regulations 2017")). An Appropriate Assessment has therefore been undertaken for the site as it falls within 5 kilometres of the TBH SPA boundary.
134. Policy CS8 of 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), to avoid impacts of such development on the SPA. The SANG and Landowner Payment elements of the SPA tariff are encompassed within the Community Infrastructure Levy(CIL), however the SAMM element of the SPA tariff is required to be addressed outside of CIL. The applicant has agreed to make a SAMM contribution of £21,434 in line with the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy (April 2019 update) as a result of the uplift of x37 dwellings as set out within the following table. This would need to be secured through a S106 Legal Agreement. For the avoidance of doubt, sufficient SANG at Heather Farm has been identified to mitigate the impacts of the development proposal.

Size of dwelling (bedrooms)	SAMM contribution per dwelling (i)	Number of dwellings in proposal (ii)	Overall SAMM contribution (ie. i x ii)
Studio / 1 bedroom	£515	24	£12,360
2 bedroom	£698	13	£9,074

Total SAMM contribution	£21,434
--------------------------------	----------------

135. Subject to securing the provision of the SAMM tariff (through a S106 Legal Agreement) and an appropriate CIL contribution, and in line with the conclusions of the Appropriate Assessment (as supported by Natural England), the Local Planning Authority is able to determine that the development will not affect the integrity of the TBH SPA either alone or in combination with other plans and projects in relation to urbanisation and recreational pressure effects. The development therefore accords with Policy CS8 of Woking Core Strategy (2012), the measures set out in the Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy, and the requirements of the Habitat Regulations 2017.

Affordable housing

136. Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) 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. 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 and is supplemented by SPD Affordable Housing Delivery (2014).
137. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF sets out that it is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage and that the weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force.
138. 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 a viability appraisal to demonstrate why the development cannot provide affordable housing and remain financially viable. The Council has retained specialist advisors to assess the submissions made in this respect. Kempton Carr Croft ('KCC') have analysed the submitted viability appraisal, including an interrogation of build costs, and have undertaken further research into the Gross Development Values, Benchmark Values, Build Costs and other inputs adopted for the development.
139. Kempton Carr Croft have concluded that the scheme remains unable to provide any element of affordable housing although consider that it would be prudent for a late stage viability review to be undertaken once 70% of the scheme is sold in order to cover the event that there is an improvement in market conditions. A late stage viability review can be secured through the Section 106 agreement. On this basis, it is considered that Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) would be addressed.

Biodiversity and protected species

140. 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

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Conservation also requires the impact of a development on protected species to be established before planning permission is granted. This approach is reflected within Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).

141. An ecological site assessment has been submitted with the application, which identifies that existing Blocks A, B, C, D and F are of modern design and constructed relatively recently. The site assessment identifies that as the existing buildings are in an urban area and the impacts of the proposal will only be present at the top most floors of the buildings no other ecological receptors outside of the building footprints are considered relevant. Inspection of the buildings found that the roofs were all well sealed with no point of entry that could be accessed by any bat species, consisting of flat roofs with a shingled surface, and that no internal voids exist between the roofs and the buildings and no overhanging edges exist.
142. The surrounding habitat has only a low suitability for commuting bats with the only suitable habitat being a thin strip of woodland that leads away to the west of the site, running adjacent to the railway. The absence of mature vegetation on the site, and presence of permanent street lighting, means it is unlikely bats would commute through the site or over it in preference of the woodland corridor nearby. The provision of additional storeys is not considered to adversely impact any use of the nearby woodland corridor by bat species. The site assessment therefore concludes that the existing buildings have negligible potential to support roosting bat species and that the shingle roofs have only a low potential for use by birds, although a few urban species, such as feral pigeon, herring gull and lesser black-backed gull, may make use of the flat roofs. Birds are therefore not considered to represent a material planning constraint although recommended condition 10 will ensure that a nesting bird check is undertaken 24 hours before the start of works if the works begin within the bird breeding season (March to August). Recommended condition 09 will secure ecological enhancement measures.

Energy and water consumption

143. Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), relating to energy and water consumption, does not explicitly state that it relates to extensions to existing buildings. Therefore it is not considered reasonable or necessary to recommend any planning conditions relating to energy and water consumption. The site does not fall within either the existing or potential District Heat Areas identified within SPD Climate Change (2013).

Flooding and water management

144. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, as identified on the Flood map for planning, and therefore no fluvial flood issues are raised. The applicant has submitted a supporting statement setting out that there will be no increase to the existing area receiving rainwater because the development would occur on the existing roofs with no alterations to the current building footprints. The supporting statement sets out that the development would be raised on a steel grillage to enable connections to be made to all existing rainwater downpipes, ensuring there is no disturbance to the existing apartments below, and that the rainwater flow rates will remain the same as existing.
145. The Council's Drainage and Flood Risk Team have been consulted and raise no objection, or requirements, in terms of flood risk and water management stating that, due to the nature of the proposed development, there will be no increase in surface water runoff and therefore no increase in flood risk to the site or the surrounding

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

area. The application therefore complies with Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the NPPF with regard to the flooding and water management.

Adjacent rail aggregate depot

146. Part of the application site (Blocks BCD) is located adjacent to an existing rail aggregate depot, currently operated by the Day Group. Rail aggregate depots allow the importation of minerals such as crushed rock and marine-dredged aggregate into Surrey from other parts of the country. The adjacent rail aggregate depot is identified on the Council's Proposals Map and the Surrey Minerals Plan ('SMP') Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) applies to the land designated. Policy MC1 of the SMP states that "*sites...such as rail aggregate depots, will be safeguarded to enable supply of alternatives to land-won minerals*".
147. Policy MC6 of the SMP states that "*infrastructure and sites used, or proposed to be used, for minerals development - rail aggregate depots and sites for production of recycled and secondary aggregate - will be safeguarded. Local planning authorities will be expected to consult the mineral planning authority on proposals for non-mineral development in the consultation area around such sites*". Policy MC16 of the SMP states that "*the rail aggregate depots at Salfords and Woking will be safeguarded from development*".
148. The present proposal would not directly affect the rail aggregate depot. Whilst the existing adjacent residential development of New Central would be subject to some intensification the present proposal would nonetheless not introduce a new sensitive land use (ie. residential) and therefore would not prejudice the use of the rail aggregate depot over and above the existing situation. Furthermore, taking account of the 'rooftop' nature of the extensions proposed in this instance, the additional apartments would be subjected to less potential noise, dust and general disturbance (including from traffic), by reason of height and therefore increased separation from activities at ground level, than existing apartments located at lower levels within Blocks BCD. In this regard Blocks A and F are located further away from the rail aggregate depot than Blocks BCD and benefit from some screening provided by Blocks BCD.

LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

149. The development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to the sum of £226,831 (2,427 sq.m net floorspace) (including the April 2019 Indexation).

CONCLUSION

150. In conclusion the significant reductions to the extensions proposed to Blocks C and D are considered to represent a clear reduction in terms of bulk and mass and therefore a clear betterment, in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596, in terms of the resulting overall contribution of the present proposal to both the character of the area and the townscape and skyline of Woking Town Centre. The impact of the present proposal upon the main square would also be reduced in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596, with the reduction to Block C in particular reducing the additional massing which would be apparent 'behind' the main square when viewed from Guildford Road.
151. In addition to the overall reduction in the number of dwellings (and therefore overall mass and bulk), the facing material has been changed from the previously proposed

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

high pressure laminate panel to a metal standing seam cladding. The use of a darker colour hints at the traditional mansard approach, albeit in a contemporary context. In turn this improves the contrast with the white render on the storeys below, creating more interest and a traditional treatment to the 'crown' of the buildings. The previously proposed metal balustrading has also been changed to structural glass, removing unnecessary contrast. The approach to bulk and massing, particularly the recessed facades and the contrast in materials, represents a classic approach to adding mass and bulk to buildings while observing the requirement to be subservient.

152. The proposed 'rooftop' extensions would integrate into the existing New Central development and respect the design intent of the initial development, retaining the townscape prominence of the primary 21 storey tower and the secondary 15 storey tower. It is not considered that a harmful sense of enclosure would occur to the main square due to the recessed nature of the 'rooftop' extensions, combined with the stepped arrangement of the taller elements. Overall the proposal is considered to respect and make a positive contribution to the character of Woking Town Centre, overcoming the first reason for refusal of PLAN/2018/0596.
153. Furthermore the increased on-site parking ratio (in comparison to refused PLAN/2018/0596), combined with the provisions relating to membership of Enterprise Car Club, to be secured through S106 Legal Agreement, are considered to overcome the second reason for refusal of PLAN/2018/0596.
154. In addition the principle of development is considered to be acceptable and the housing mix is considered to be appropriate given the Woking Town Centre location of the site. Furthermore, subject to recommended conditions and S106 Legal Agreement, the development is considered to result in acceptable impacts with regard to heritage, neighbouring amenity, noise, wind, sunlight to the main square, amenities of future occupiers, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA), affordable housing, biodiversity and protected species, energy and water consumption and flooding and water management. Overall, the proposals strongly reflect the intentions of the NPPF and the Development Plan by meeting housing demand in well-located, previously developed, sustainable town centre sites.
155. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Sections 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 of the NPPF, Policies CS1, CS2, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS18, CS20, CS21, CS22, CS24 and CS25 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM7, DM16 and DM20 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DMP DPD) (2016), Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) Design (2015), Parking Standards (2018), Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008), Climate Change (2013) and Affordable Housing Delivery (2014), Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) Heritage of Woking (2000), the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), South East Plan (2009) (Saved policy) NRM6 - Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy and Woking Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (November 2015).

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Site visit photographs

Letters of representation

Site Notice (Major Development - dated 07.08.19)

Consultation response from County Highway Authority (CHA) (SCC)

Consultation response from Environmental Health

Consultation response from Network Rail

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Consultation response from Drainage and Flood Risk Team (WBC)
 Consultation response from Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (Surrey CC)
 Consultation response from Thames Water Development Planning

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

Obligation	Reason for Agreeing Obligation
1. £21,434 SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution.	To accord with the Habitat Regulations, Policy CS8 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) Avoidance Strategy
2. Provision of one year free membership of Enterprise Car Club for the first occupiers of each additional dwelling	To accord with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the NPPF
3. Provision of £200 credit towards use of Enterprise Car Club for the first occupiers of each additional dwelling	To accord with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the NPPF
4. Late stage viability review in relation to affordable housing provision	To accord with Policy CS12 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Affordable Housing Delivery (2014) and the provisions of the NPPF

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to recommended conditions and SAMM (TBH SPA) contribution, and car club provisions and late stage viability review, secured by S106 Legal Agreement:

01. The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

02. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in this notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the requirements of the conditions of this planning permission:

Proposed Drawings

PL(02)100 Rev P2 (Site Location Plan), dated 14.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(51)100 Rev P1 (Basement Level Proposed Refuse and Cycle Storage), dated 14.07.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)001 Rev P2 (Block A FP05 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PL(03)013 (Block A Roof Plan Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 09.09.2019.

PL(05)200 Rev P2 (Block A North West Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)201 Rev P2 (Block A South East Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)202 Rev P3 (Block A South West Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 19.09.2019.

PL(03)002 Rev P2 (Block B FP05 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)003 Rev P2 (Block C FP07 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)004 Rev P2 (Block C FP08 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)005 Rev P3 (Block D FP09 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 09.09.2019.

PL(03)006 Rev P3 (Block D FP10 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 19.09.2019.

PL(03)007 Rev P3 (Block D FP11 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 05.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 19.09.2019.

PL(03)008 Rev P3 (Block D FP12 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 19.09.2019.

PL(05)203 Rev P2 (Block BCD North East Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)204 Rev P2 (Block BCD North West Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)205 Rev P2 (Block BCD South East Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)206 Rev P2 (Block BCD South West Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)010 Rev P2 (Block F FP08 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 05.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)011 Rev P2 (Block F FP09 General Arrangement Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)012 Rev P3 (Block F Roof Plan Proposed Layout), dated 07.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 19.09.2019.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PL(05)208 Rev P3 (Block F North Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 19.09.2019.

PL(05)209 Rev P3 (Block F East Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 09.09.2019.

PL(05)210 Rev P2 (Block F South Proposed Elevation), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(04)100 Rev P2 (Proposed Section AA - BB), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(04)101 Rev P2 (Proposed Section CC), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(04)102 Rev P2 (Proposed Section DD), dated 08.02.19 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

Existing Drawings

PL(03)100 (Block A FP00 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)101 (Block A FP01 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)102 (Block A FP02 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)103 (Block A FP03 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)104 (Block A FP04 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)105 (Block A FP05 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)106 (Block A Roof Plan Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)100 (Block A North West Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)101 (Block A South East Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.17 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)102 (Block A South West Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)107 (Block BC FP00 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)108 (Block BC FP01 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PL(03)109 (Block BC FP02 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)110 (Block BC FP03 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)111 (Block BC FP04 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)112 (Block BC FP05 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)113 (Block BC FP06 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)114 (Block BC Roof Plan Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)115 (Block D FP00 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)116 (Block D FP01 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)117 (Block D FP02 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)118 (Block D FP03 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)119 (Block D FP04 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)120 (Block D FP05 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)121 (Block D FP06 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)122 (Block D FP07 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)123 (Block D FP08 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)124 (Block D FP09 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)125 (Block D FP10 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)126 (Block D Roof Plan Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PL(05)103 (Block BCD North East Existing Elevation), dated 10.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)104 (Block BCD North West Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)105 (Block BCD South East Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)106 (Block BCD South West Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)127 Rev P1 (Block EFK FP00 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)128 Rev P1 (Block EFK FP01 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)178 (Block EFK FP02 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)129 (Block EFK FP03 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)130 (Block EFK FP04 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)131 (Block EFK FP05 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)132 (Block EFK FP06 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)133 (Block EFK FP07 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)134 (Block EFK FP08 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)135 (Block EFK FP09 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)136 (Block EFK FP10 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)137 (Block EFK FP11 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)138 (Block EFK FP12 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)139 (Block EFK FP13 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PL(03)140 (Block EFK FP14 General Arrangement Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(03)141 (Block EFK Roof Plan Existing Layout), dated 06.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)108 Rev P1 (Block F North Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)109 (Block F East Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

PL(05)110 Rev P1 (Block F South Existing Elevation), dated 07.09.18 and received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

Documents

Planning Statement by Rolfe Judd Planning dated July 2019 (Ref: RJP P6866), received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

Design and Access Statement by KDS Associates Ltd dated 12th March 2019, received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

Daylight and Sunlight Report by Schroeders Begg (UK) LLP dated April 2019 (Rev-A. Ref 200/U), received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

General Noise and Vibration Assessment (Rail and Road Traffic) by W.A. Hines and Partners dated 2 May 2018 (Ref: PWH/jas/1359R/4317/A), received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

Pedestrian Level Wind Desk Based Assessment by RWDI dated May 18th 2018 (Ref: RWDI #1803236 - REV A)

Transport Statement by Motion dated 23.01.2019 (Ref:140817/ccwoki), received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

Site Assessment prepared by enims Ltd dated 24th April 2018 (Ref: EN043-02), received by the Local Planning Authority on 29.07.2019.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

03. ++ Notwithstanding the external material details annotated on the approved plans/documents listed within condition 02 of this notice, or within the submitted application form, prior to the application/installation of any external facing materials to the development hereby permitted details and a written specification of the standing seam metal cladding to be used in the external elevations of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The intended RAL colour(s) for window/door frames shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter permanently retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the character, appearance and visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies CS2 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the NPPF.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

04. ++ The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include details of the following relevant measures:

- i. An introduction consisting of construction phase environmental management plan definitions and abbreviations and project description and location;
- ii. A description of management responsibilities;
- iii. A description of the construction programme which identifies activities likely to cause high levels of noise or dust;
- iv. Site working hours and a named person for residents to contact;
- v. Detailed site logistics arrangements;
- vi. Details regarding parking, deliveries, and storage;
- vii. Details regarding dust and noise mitigation measures to be deployed including identification of sensitive receptors and ongoing monitoring;
- viii. Details of other measures to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area and safety of the highway network; and
- ix. Communication procedures with residents regarding key construction issues – newsletters, fliers etc.

The construction shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the details and measures approved in the CEMP, unless the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority is first received for any variation.

Reason: Development must not commence before this condition has been discharged to avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and to safeguard the residential amenity of existing New Central occupiers during the construction period in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the NPPF. This condition is required to be addressed prior to the commencement of development in order that construction and associated works do not prejudice highway safety, cause inconvenience to other highway users or cause significant harm to residential amenity by reason of noise and vibration.

05. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted cycle storage and car parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved plan numbered titled PL(51)100 Rev P1 (Basement Level Proposed Refuse & Cycle Storage) and the Design and Access Statement by KDS Associates Ltd dated 12th March 2019. Thereafter the cycle storage and car parking areas shall be permanently retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with the objectives of Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the NPPF.

06. ++ No fixed plant and/or equipment associated with air moving equipment, compressors, generators or plant or similar equipment shall be installed within the development site until full details, including acoustic specifications and measures to attenuate noise and vibration have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any fixed plant and/or equipment associated with air moving equipment, compressors, generators or plant or similar equipment shall thereafter be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details.

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reason: To protect the general amenities of the area and the residential amenities of neighbouring and nearby properties from undue noise and disturbance in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the NPPF.

07. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the refuse/recycling storage areas shall be provided in accordance with the approved plan numbered titled PL(51)100 Rev P1 (Basement Level Proposed Refuse & Cycle Storage) and the Design and Access Statement by KDS Associates Ltd dated 12th March 2019. Thereafter the refuse/recycling storage areas shall be permanently retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage and recycling of refuse and to protect the general amenity of the area in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the NPPF.

08. ++ Prior to the first beneficial use of the communal roof terrace (within Block A) hereby permitted a communal roof terrace management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall set out:
- (i) hours of access to the communal roof terrace
 - (ii) means of controlling access to the communal roof terrace
 - (iii) signage regarding hours of use and any activities which are prohibited (ie. barbeques / late night gatherings etc)

The measures approved shall be implemented upon first beneficial use of the communal roof terrace and thereafter be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the general amenities of the area and the residential amenities of neighbouring and nearby properties from undue noise and disturbance in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the NPPF.

09. ++ Prior to the application/installation of any external facing materials to the development hereby permitted a scheme for the enhancement of biodiversity on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme of biodiversity enhancements shall be in general accordance with the provisions outlined within the Site Assessment prepared by enims Ltd dated 24th April 2018 (Ref: EN043-02) and shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with a timeframe to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority with the details of biodiversity enhancements. Thereafter the biodiversity enhancements shall be permanently retained in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To contribute towards and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the NPPF.

10. ++ In the event development works commence during the bird breeding season (March to August) a nesting bird check of the shingle roofs shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist 24 hours prior to the commencement of

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

works. In the event that an active bird nest is found then an appropriate exclusion zone shall be put in place and works must not take place within the appropriate exclusion zone until the young birds have fledged and the nest is no longer in use.

Reason: To prevent birds being injured or killed during works in accordance with Policy with CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Circular 06/05 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and the provisions of the NPPF.

11. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the Noise Mitigation Measures (Paragraph 5.04) set out within the general noise and vibration assessment (rail and road traffic) prepared by W.A. Hines and Partners dated 2 May 2018 (Ref: PWH/jas/1359R/4317/A).

Reason: To ensure an appropriate residential environmental for future occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the NPPF.

12. ++ Prior to the application/installation of any external facing materials to the development hereby permitted a scheme of mitigation measures for wind conditions to the terraces set out as requiring mitigation within Section 7 of the Pedestrian Level Wind Desk Based Assessment prepared by RWDI dated May 18th 2018 (Ref: RWDI #1803236 - REV A) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall incorporate the relevant recommended mitigation measures set out within the Pedestrian Level Wind Desk Based Assessment prepared by RWDI dated May 18th 2018 (Ref: RWDI #1803236 - REV A). The scheme of mitigation shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and mitigation measures shall be fully installed prior to occupation and permanently retained and maintained for the duration of the use and their operation.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate residential environmental for future occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2008) and the provisions of the NPPF.

13. Works to construct the development hereby permitted shall only take place between the hours of 08:30 and 17:30 Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) and not at all on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of existing New Central occupiers from noise and disturbance during the most sensitive hours during the construction period in accordance with Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Informatics

01. The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of the NPPF.
02. The applicants attention is specifically drawn to the planning conditions above marked ++. These condition(s) require the submission of details, information, drawings, etc. to the Local Planning Authority PRIOR TO THE RELEVANT TRIGGER POINT. Failure to observe these requirements will result in a contravention of the terms of the planning permission and the Local Planning

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Authority may serve Breach of Condition Notices (BCNs) to secure compliance. The applicant is advised that sufficient time needs to be allowed when submitting details in response to planning conditions, to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the details and discharge the condition(s). A period of between five and eight weeks should be allowed for.

03. The applicant is advised that the development hereby permitted is subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liability. The Local Planning Authority will issue a Liability Notice as soon as practical after the granting of this permission.

The applicant is advised that, if he/she is intending to seek relief or exemptions from the levy such as for social/affordable housing, charitable development or self-build developments it is necessary that the relevant claim form is completed and submitted to the Council to claim the relief or exemption. In all cases (except exemptions relating to residential exemptions), it is essential that a Commencement Notice be submitted at least one day prior to the starting of the development. The exemption will be lost if a commencement notice is not served on the Council prior to commencement of the development and there is no discretion for the Council to waive payment. For the avoidance of doubt, commencement of the demolition of any existing structure(s) covering any part of the footprint of the proposed structure(s) would be considered as commencement for the purpose of CIL regulations. A blank commencement notice can be downloaded from:

http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/1app/forms/form_6_commencement_notice.pdf

Claims for relief must be made on the appropriate forms which are available on the Council's website at:

<https://www.woking.gov.uk/planning/service/contributions>

Other conditions and requirements also apply and failure to comply with these will lead to claims for relief or exemption being rendered void. The Local Planning Authority has no discretion in these instances.

For full information on this please see the guidance and legislation here:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy>

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/all?title=The%20Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy%20Regulations%20>

Please note this informative provides general advice and is without prejudice to the Local Planning Authority's role as Consenting, Charging and Collecting Authority under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

The applicant is advised that Council officers may undertake inspections without prior warning to check compliance with approved plans and to establish that all planning conditions are being complied with in full. Inspections may be undertaken both during and after construction.

04. The applicant is advised that adequate control precautions should be taken in order to control noise emissions from any fixed plant, including generators, on site during demolition / construction activities. This may require the use of quiet plant or ensuring that the plant is sited appropriately and / or adequately attenuated. Exhaust emissions from such plant should be vented to atmosphere such that fumes do not ingress into any property. Due to the proximity of residential accommodation there should be no burning of waste material on site. During demolition or construction phases, adequate control precautions should be taken in order to control the spread

12 NOVEMBER 2019 PLANNING COMMITTEE

of dust on the site, so as to prevent a nuisance to residents within the locality. This may involve the use of dust screens and/ or utilising water supply to wet areas of the site to inhibit dust.

05. The provisions of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 may be applicable and relates to work on an existing wall shared with another property; building on the boundary with a neighbouring property; or excavating near a neighbouring building. An explanatory booklet, prepared by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, and setting out your obligations, is available at the following address:
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/party-wall-etc-act-1996-guidance#explanatory-booklet>

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

07. With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company, The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

08. Due to the proximity of the proposed development to the operational railway, Network Rail recommends the developer contacts AssetProtectionsWessex@networkrail.co.uk prior to any works commencing on site, and also to agree an Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail to enable approval of detailed works. More information can also be obtained from the Network Rail website <https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/looking-after-the-railway/asset-protection-and-optimisation/>

The developer is also requested to refer to the comments of Network Rail, which are available to view on the Council's website (<https://caps.woking.gov.uk/online-applications/>) by searching for reference PLAN/2019/0753 and clicking on the Documents tab.

09. This decision notice should be read in conjunction with the related S106 Legal Agreement.
10. The applicant's attention is drawn to Sections 60 and 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and the associated British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228: 1984 "Noise Control on Construction and Open Sites" (with respect to the statutory provision relating to the control of noise on construction and demolition sites).