To: All Members of the EASTERN PLANNING 2020/21 (Other Members for Information)

When calling please ask for:

Georgina Hall, Democratic Services Officer

Policy and Governance

E-mail: Georgina.Hall@waverley.gov.uk
Direct line: 01483 523224
Date: 16 February 2021

Membership of the EASTERN Planning 2020/21

Cllr Richard Cole (Chairman)
Cllr David Else (Vice Chairman)
Cllr Steve Cosser
Cllr Martin D’Arcy
Cllr Kevin Deanus
Cllr Patricia Ellis
Cllr Paul Follows
Cllr Maxine Gale

Cllr Michael Goodridge
Cllr John Gray
Cllr Joan Heagin
Cllr Ruth Reed
Cllr Trevor Sadler
Cllr Liz Townsend
Cllr George Wilson

Substitutes

Cllr Mary Foryszewski
Cllr Christine Baker
Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass
Cllr Val Henry
Cllr Chris Howard

Cllr Nick Palmer
Cllr Paul Rivers
Cllr Richard Seaborne
Cllr Steve Williams

Dear Councillors

A meeting of the EASTERN PLANNING 2020/21 will be held as follows:

DATE: WEDNESDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2021
TIME: 6.00 PM
PLACE: ZOOM MEETING - VIRTUAL MEETING

The Agenda for the meeting is set out below.

The meeting can be viewed remotely in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, via the Council’s YouTube page.

Yours sincerely
Agendas are available to download from Waverley’s website (www.waverley.gov.uk/committees), where you can also subscribe to updates to receive information via email regarding arrangements for particular committee meetings.

Alternatively, agendas may be downloaded to a mobile device via the free Modern.Gov app, available for iPad, Android, Windows and Kindle Fire.

Most of our publications can be provided in alternative formats. For an audio version, large print, text only or a translated copy of this publication, please contact committees@waverley.gov.uk or call 01483 523226.

Please be advised that there is limited seating capacity in the Public Gallery; an overflow room will be available where possible. This meeting will be webcast and can be viewed by visiting www.waverley.gov.uk/webcast.

---

**NOTE FOR MEMBERS**

Members are reminded that Contact Officers are shown in each report and members are welcome to raise questions, etc. in advance of the meeting with the appropriate officer.

**AGENDA**

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

   To receive any apologies for absence and substitutions.

   Where a Member of the Committee is unable to attend a substitute Member may attend, speak and vote in their place at that meeting.

   Members are advised that in order for a substitute to be arranged a Member must give four (4) clear working days notice of their apologies.

   For this meeting the latest date apologies can be given for a substitute to be arranged is Wednesday 17 February 2021.

2. **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

   To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2021, which are published on the Council’s website.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

   To receive from Members declarations of interests in relation to any items included on the Agenda for this meeting in accordance with the Waverley Code
of Local Government Conduct.

4. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman to respond to any questions received from members of the public in accordance with Procedure Rule 10.

The deadline for submission of questions is 17 February 2021.

5. QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

The Chairman to respond to any questions received from Members in accordance with Procedure Rule 11.

The deadline for submission of questions is 17 February 2021.

6. ANY RELEVANT UPDATES TO GOVERNMENT GUIDANCE OR LEGISLATION SINCE THE LAST MEETING

Officers to update the Committee on any changes to the planning environment of which they should be aware when making decisions.

7. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Background Papers

Background papers (as defined by Section 100D(5) of the Local Government Act relating to reports are listed under the “Representations” heading for each planning application presented, or may be individually identified under a heading “Background Papers”.

The implications for crime, disorder and community safety have been appraised in the following applications but it is not considered that any consideration of that type arises unless it is specifically referred to in a particular report.

7.1 APPLICATIONS DECIDED BY DELEGATED AUTHORITY

Chairman to advise committee of any applications decided under the new delegated power, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Ward councillor(s).

8. APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC SPEAKING

8.1 A1 - WA/2020/1823 - 123 Binscombe, Godalming, GU7 3QL (Pages 5 - 26)

Proposal

Erection of a dwelling following relevant demolition of an unlisted bungalow within a conservation area (revision of WA/2020/1207).

Recommendation
That permission be GRANTED subject to conditions 1 to 11 and informatives 1 to 3.

8.2 A2 - WA/2020/0965 - Land South of John Wiskar Drive on East Side of Knowle Lane, Cranleigh (Pages 27 - 64)

Proposal

WA/2020/0965 - Erection of a building to provide a 64 Bed Care home including 16 Community Beds together with a building to provide 14 Health Workers accommodation units with access from Knowle Lane, associated parking and ancillary work (revision of WA/2018/1966 and as amplified by letters received 14/12/2020 and 15/12/2020).

Recommendation

That permission be REFUSED.

9. APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC SPEAKING

10. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

To consider the following recommendation on the motion of the Chairman:

Recommendation

That, pursuant to Procedure Rule 20 and in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the item, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information (as defined by Section 100I of the Act) of the description specified at the meeting in the revised Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

11. LEGAL ADVICE

To consider any legal advice relating to any applications in the agenda

For further information or assistance, please telephone Georgina Hall, Democratic Services Officer, on 01483 523224 or by email at Georgina.Hall@waverley.gov.uk
WA/2020/1823 - Erection of a dwelling following relevant demolition of an unlisted bungalow within a conservation area (revision of WA/2020/1207) at 123 Binscombe, Godalming GU7 3QL

Applicant: S Mariner
Ward: Godalming Binscombe
Case Officer: Tracy Farthing

Committee Date: 24/02/2021
Neighbour Notification Expiry Date 31/12/2020
Extended expiry date 25/02/2021

RECOMMENDATION
That, subject to conditions, permission be GRANTED

1. Summary

The application has been brought before the Area Committee at the request of a Councillor Wilson due to the location of the proposal and to explore matters relating to residential amenity.

Councillors will be familiar with the site from a previous appearance at Committee in October 2020.

The application seeks permission for the erection of a replacement dwelling, outbuilding and alterations to the vehicular access.

Location Plan
2. **Site Description**

The application site is located on the south western side of Binscombe, straddling the Conservation Area.

The site currently features a detached 1970s bungalow with attached car port. The roof is pitched and the site benefits from an area of off-street parking and garden area to the front of the dwelling in addition to rear amenity space.

The level of the site increases from the highway towards the rear of the plot at the south west where the site backs on to open fields beyond. The site is semi-rural.

3. **Proposal**

Permission is sought for the erection of a replacement dwelling, outbuilding and alterations to the vehicular access.

The proposed dwelling would be a two storey, 3 bedroom detached dwelling. The roof would be fully gabled with an eaves height of 4.5m and a ridge height of 8.7m. The dwelling would have a footprint of 14.8m in length and 8.2m in width.

The first floor would be cantilevered and the dwelling is proposed to be finished in brick at ground floor level with the first floor and the roof finished in tile.

The proposed detached outbuilding to the rear of the property adjacent to the southeast common boundary, would have a mono pitched roof with an overall height of 2.38m, an eaves height of 1.73m and would measure 4.7m in length and 2m in width.

**Existing Plan**
Existing Elevations

3 EXISTING NORTH-EAST ELEVATION

4 EXISTING SOUTH-EAST ELEVATION
Proposed Plans

Proposed Block Plan

Ground Floor
First Floor

Proposed Elevations
1: PROPOSED FRONT // NORTH EAST ELEVATION

2: PROPOSED SIDE // SOUTH EAST ELEVATION

5: PROPOSED SIDE // NORTH WEST ELEVATION
Section Plans

Proposed Site Section A (Short Section)

Proposed New Dwelling Visual Images

4. Relevant Planning History
WA/2020/1207  |  Erection of a dwelling following relevant demolition of an unlisted bungalow within a conservation area (as amended by plan received 05.10.2020)  |  Refused 29/10/2020  
WA/1978/1648  |  Erection of 3 bedroomed bungalow  |  Full Permission 06/12/1978  

5. **Relevant Planning Constraints**

Developed Area of Godalming  
Conservation Area (the boundary bisects the plot into equal halves lengthways with the north western section falling within the Conservation Area)  
Area of High Archaeological Potential  
Adjacent to Listed Building (125 and 127 Binscombe – Grade II Listed)

6. **Relevant Development Plan Policies and Guidance**

- Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1): Strategic policies and sites (adopted February 2018): SP1, TD1, NE1, NE3, HA1  
- Godalming and Farncombe Neighbourhood Plan (made August 2019): GOD5  
- Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (retained policies February 2018): D1, D4, HE3, HE5, HE8, HE14

Other guidance:
- The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF)  
- The National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG)  
- Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD)  
- Council’s Parking Guidelines (2013)  

7. **Consultations and Town Council Comments**

| Godalming Council | Town | Objection on the grounds of over development |
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8. **Representations**

12 letters have been received raising objection on the following grounds:

- Harm to visual amenity
  - The proposal is not in keeping with the area
  - The proposal is too large, particularly in height
  - Harm to the Conservation Area
  - No justification to demolish the existing bungalow

- Harm to residential amenity
  - Negative impact upon light to 121
  - Negative impact upon light to 125 (more so now the property is relocated 0.4m closer to the boundary)
  - Overbearing upon 121 and 125 Binscombe

**Planning Considerations:**

9. **Planning history and differences with previous proposal**

The planning history is a material consideration.

Planning permission has been previously refused under planning reference WA/2020/1207. The Officers recommendation of approval was overturned and the reason for refusal is stated below:

1. The proposal, by reason of its scale, bulk and siting, would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the adjoining property at 121 Binscombe. The proposal would therefore conflict with the Residential Extensions SPD 2010, Policy TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

The differences between the current proposal and that application are that the proposal, whilst identical in design terms, has been moved 400mm from the common boundary with no.121.

In addition, comprehensive documentation and justification relating to light levels available to 121 have been included.

The test is whether having regard to the changes, the proposal has overcome the objections to the previously refused scheme and is acceptable in its own right.
10. **Principle of development**

The application site is within the developed area of Godalming wherein the principle of development is acceptable subject to design and neighbouring amenity considerations.

11. **Impact upon Listed Building**

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering applications which affect Listed Buildings, Local Planning Authorities must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Policy HA1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 outlines that the Council will ensure that the significance of heritage assets are conserved or enhanced to ensure the continued protection and enjoyment of the historic environment. Retained Policies HE3 and HE5 of the Local Plan 2002 are afforded significant weight owing to their consistency with the NPPF 2019.

125 &127 Binscombe is a 17th century timber-framed house with mainly painted brick infill. It was altered in the 18th and 19th centuries which included its subdivision into two dwellings. In the late 1980s, two slightly taller bays were added to each end.

The proposed development preserves the principle by widening the distance between the new dwelling and the Listed Building and retaining only one storey on this side as well. The contemporary design brings something new whilst also reflecting the character and appearance of the area through the material choices and details.

In light of the above, the proposal would preserve the special interest and setting of the Listed Building and would not harm its significance. As no harm has been identified, it is not necessary to weigh up the public benefits against any identified harm. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy HA1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained Policies HE3 and HE5 of the Local Plan 2002.

12. **Impact upon the Conservation Area**

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering applications within a Conservation Area, Local Planning Authorities must pay special attention to the desirability of
preserving, or enhancing the character and appearance of the area.

Policy HA1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 outlines that the Council will ensure that the significance of heritage assets are conserved or enhanced to ensure the continued protection and enjoyment of the historic environment.

Retained Policy HE8 of the Local Plan 2002 is afforded substantial weight due to its level of consistency with the NPPF and seeks to ensure that the development preserves or enhances the character of Conservation Areas.

The Conservation Area comprises a relatively small number of historic buildings reflecting the early hamlet around Binscombe Farm, a large 16th century farm complex. A strong element of the significance of the Conservation Area is the former agricultural nature of the buildings and this connection with the countryside and surrounding fields to which it was associated. The relative isolation of the hamlet also forms a key part in its historic interest as it facilitated non-conformist worship, evidenced by the former Quaker burial ground and its association with George Fox, one of the founders of the Quaker movement. The application site does not contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal is to replace the existing 20th century bungalow with a two-storey dwelling. It appears that historically the method applied to new development within and around the Conservation Area was to infill with bungalows. This has retained the more open feel and connection with its surroundings but has also brought a more suburban appearance.

Although not a bungalow the new dwelling does keep to this principle by widening the distance between the new dwelling and the Listed Building and retaining one storey on this side as well. The contemporary design brings something new whilst also reflecting the character and appearance of the area through the material choices and details. Conditions are recommended to ensure that the details proposed are carried through to the completed works.

In light of the above, the proposal would not harm the significance of the Conservation Area and would preserve its character. As no harm has been identified, it is not necessary to weigh up the public benefits against any identified harm. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy HA1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained Policy HE8 of the Local Plan 2002.

13. Design and impact on visual amenity
The proposed new dwelling would sit in a similar position, to the existing
dwelling, within the application site. Space would be retained at the front of
the dwelling that would ensure that the development would not project in front
of an established build. The proposed scheme increases the separation
distance between the north elevation and the common boundary of 125
Binscombe from 0.6m to 1.2m. At the front of the proposed dwelling, a
minimum distance of 0.65m is kept between the southern elevation and the
boundary (this distance has increased from 0.25m as proposed under
WA/2020/1207), at the rear of the proposed dwelling this increases to 1.75m
between the boundary (increased from 1.35m) and the main house, although
a single storey cycle store is proposed towards the rear of the dwelling
extending up to the shared boundary. Nonetheless, there would be no
terRING effect as a result of the proposal.

The proposed new dwelling would be taller than the bungalow it seeks to
replace. The proposed ridge height would be 8.7m, a 4m increase on the
existing building’s ridge height. It must be noted however, that whilst the
bungalow would be taller in height to its adjacent neighbours, there is a variety
of styles and sizes of dwellings that contribute to the streetscene of
Binscombe, from modest bungalows and dwellings with steeply pitched roofs
incorporating accommodation within, to two storey terraced and detached
dwellings. The gabled roof design of this property is not dissimilar to other
properties on the street, most notably that of 122 and 118 and the dwelling
would not appear larger than some of the detached dwellings on the street.
Similarly, the relationship between single storey and two storey dwellings has
been established within the immediate area. As such, it is not considered that
the proposed dwelling would be an incongruous feature within the streetscene
or that it would cause significant harm to the character of Binscombe.

The proposed dwelling is modern in design. The first floor appears to have
been manipulated or slid so that it cantilevers over the ground floor at the front
whilst providing a balcony area at the rear. On the northern side the width of
the roof ends before the junction of the side elevation. An area of flat roof
provides opportunity for light to enter the ground floor in addition to mitigating
against potential amenity issues with No 125 Binscombe.

The proposed clay hanging tiles and roof tiles would be in-keeping with the
traditional materials found locally. The proposed brick, although the colour of
which is not widely found within the location, responds well to the existing
character of the area and the lighter finish of buildings that have been
rendered. The locality offers a wide palate of materials utilised on properties
and it is considered that the proposed dwelling would strike a balance of
harmonising with the existing design aesthetics whilst introducing elements of
modern design.
The proposed outbuilding is situated to the rear of the property. The size and scale of the outbuilding is in-keeping with the plot size and that of the proposed dwelling. The proposed use as an ancillary outbuilding for a study or suchlike is acceptable. It is also noted that the outbuilding would in itself, constitute permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). The open character of the subject site would be preserved.

The proposal is therefore acceptable and in accordance with Policies TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and the Residential Extensions SPD.

**Upon No.125:**
The proposed replacement dwelling would be 0.6m further from the boundary at a distance of 1.2m than the existing dwelling. 125 Binscombe has 2 ground floor and one first floor windows on this elevation.

The proposed dwelling on the northern side closest to the boundary is single storey at a width of 1.35m. The first floor side wall would therefore be at a distance of 2.55m from the boundary, however it must be noted that the side elevation would be a maximum of 4m in height from the ground level of 125 Binscombe, considerably lower than an average 2 storey dwelling and akin to 1 ½ storeys, at a height of 4m the roof pitches away from the boundary. The full height of the propose dwelling, the ridge, is approximately 6m from the shared boundary. Officers do not consider that the proposal would significantly reduce light available to the side facing windows of 125, given that the roof slopes away from the common boundary, a greater distance of separation is introduced and also as the single storey element would act as a buffer to the first floor beyond.

The proposed replacement dwelling would extend a further 1.3m from the existing rear elevation of the existing property. This would be 7.3m beyond the rear elevation of No.125. The dwelling would be two storey and therefore would have a greater impact than the existing bungalow, however, plans demonstrate that the 45° rule is met, signifying that light would not be significantly affected by the proposed development. It is noted however that the development is likely to affect the levels of sunlight to No. 125, this would however be limited to the morning sunlight.

**Upon No.121:**
The proposed replacement dwelling would retain similar separation distances as the existing dwelling. This application moves the dwelling 0.4m away from
the shared boundary in comparison to the previously proposed dwelling under WA/2020/1207.

The dwelling proposes an eaves height of 4.5m which is an increase of 1.6m over that of the existing eaves height close to this shared boundary. This area of 121 Binscombe, the most north easterly part of the plot, serves as a walk through to the rear amenity space, as such, the increase in height is not considered to significantly impact an area used as amenity space. However, there are windows on this North East elevation serving a garage and a living room. The Residential Extensions SPD states that where a principal window to a habitable room is located on the side of a neighbour’s dwelling the impact on the daylight can be assessed by drawing two 45° lines at a distance of 12m. In this instance, the 45° rule would be breached. However, it is also stated within the SPD that where the side window is a secondary window or one to a non-habitable room then the loss of light would be less important. In the case of No 121 Binscombe, the garage window is not one serving a habitable room and the window serving the living room is considered to be a secondary window as there is a primary window on the rear elevation. In terms of the 25 degree rule, it is acknowledged that the current arrangement would not accord to this, particularly as the side walkway is bound by fencing 2m in height, impacting upon the light to the availability of light to the window currently. It must also be acknowledged that the Residential SPD is guidance, and that it is considered that this 25 degree rule is mainly aimed at front and rear windows as is shown on the example on page 14 of the guidance. Indeed, the relationship of side windows and built form is typical within the developed area, where many ground floor side windows face towards a common boundary.

In addition to the above, the applicants have submitted extensive supporting documents and lighting reports which go above and beyond the guideline requirements. Whilst Officers do not dispute that the proposal will have some impact upon the light available to the ground floor side window and the room of which it serves, officers concur with the conclusions of the submitted documents and consider that the loss of light to this secondary window would not be significantly harmful to warrant the refusal of this application.

The proposed replacement dwelling would not extend past the existing rear elevation of No.121 at first floor level. At ground floor the rear will extend minimally past the rear of No.121. The 45 degree rule is accorded with in relation to all rear windows.

**Proposed Balcony:**
Plans submitted detail a balcony at the rear of the replacement dwelling. Aesthetically this is an attractive design feature, however, officers express
concern regarding the neighbouring amenity of both No.125 and No.121. The visualisations provided show that the roof would provide a certain amount of screening at each side and a screen that is annotated as 1.7m from the finished floor level has been shown. By screening the sides of the balcony, views would be directed down the lengths of the gardens and not directly into areas closest to the rear elevations of neighbouring properties where it is reasonable to expect a more private level of amenity space. This detail would be secured to ensure screening to a height of 1.7m is achieved upon any approval of this planning application.

Therefore acceptable and in accordance with Policies TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and the Residential Extensions SPD.

Standard of Accommodation

Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 seeks to maximise the opportunity to improve the quality of life, health and well-being of current and future residents through the provision of appropriate private, communal and public amenity space, appropriate internal space standards for new dwellings, on site playspace provision, appropriate facilities for the storage of waste and private clothes drying facilities.

The Government Technical Housing standards – nationally described space standards (2015) requires dwellings to meet certain internal space standards in order to ensure that an appropriate internal standard of accommodation has been provided for future occupiers. Until the Council has a Local Plan Policy in respect of these standards, they should only be given limited weight and used as guidance to inform the decision on this proposal.

The table below sets out the minimum gross internal floor areas and storage (m2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4p</th>
<th>5p</th>
<th>6p</th>
<th>7p</th>
<th>8p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floorplans provided indicate that the dwelling would be 3 bedrooms. The proposed dwelling would provide approximately 186m$^2$ of internal space. The internal space exceeds that required. The proposal would also accord to minimum bedroom sizes as set out in the guidance.
The amount of external space is similar to the existing outside space and is considered ample space relative to the dwelling for outdoor play and to undertake tasks such as hanging washing and sitting outside.

14. **Biodiversity and compliance with Habitat Regulations 2017**

The application is accompanied by a Phase 1 Daytime Bat Assessment (S.G.Dodd, June 2020).

The ecological report considers the building to offer negligible potential for roosting bats. Therefore roosting bats do not appear to present a constraint to the removal of this building. A single gap at the eaves was noted (through to the roof void), though no evidence of use by bats was found at the time of the survey. However, bats are highly mobile species and are known to move roost sites frequently. As per the ecological report it is therefore recommended that a precautionary approach to works is implemented. In addition, the proposal should not result in an increase in net lighting and that if a bat or evidence of bats is found on site prior to or during works all works should cease immediately and advice sought from Natural England or a suitably qualified ecologist. These detail will be secured by condition upon the approval of any permission.

The building and vegetation offer potentially suitable habitat for nesting birds and it is noted that some scrub vegetation will be removed. The developer should be made aware that Part I of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird, or intentionally to damage, take or destroy its nest whilst it is being built or in use. The developer should take action to ensure that development activities such as vegetation or site clearance are timed to avoid the bird nest season of early March to August inclusive. If this is not possible and only small areas of dense vegetation are affected, the site could be inspected for active nests by an ecologist immediately prior to clearance works. If any active nests are found they should be left undisturbed with a buffer zone around them, until it can be confirmed by an ecologist that the nest is no longer in use. This detail will be secured by condition upon the approval of any permission.

There is suitable habitat for other protected and notable species, including badgers, reptiles and hedgehogs in the local area and species may therefore move through the site. Therefore, as per the ecological report, precautionary measures should be implemented during clearance and construction to avoid harm to species that may move through the site and again a condition will secure this detail.
This development offers opportunities to restore or enhance biodiversity. Ecological enhancements should be incorporated into the proposals, including those recommended in Section 5.0 of the Phase 1 Daytime Bat Assessment.

15. **Accessibility**

Policy AHN3 of the Local Plan Part 1 (2018) states that the Council will require the provision of new developments to meet Building Regulations M4 (2) Category 2 standard: “Accessible and adaptable dwellings” to meet the needs of older people and those with disabilities.

The supporting text to the policy states that this will be delivered through the implementation of planning permissions. As such, this will be picked up by the building control process when planning permission is implemented.

16. **Sustainability**

Policy CC2 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to ensure all new development includes measures to minimise energy and water use. The Policy goes on to say that new dwellings shall meet the requirement of 110 litres of water per person per day. A condition is recommended requiring the submission of details to confirm that the dwellings have been designed and completed to meet the requirement of 110 litres of water per person per day, prior to the occupation of the dwelling.

Conditions are also attached to ensure that the proposed dwelling is provided with the highest available speed broadband infrastructure and an Electric Vehicle Charging Point in order to promote sustainable patterns of development in accordance with Policy CC2 of the Local Plan 2018.

17. **Representations**

Objections have been received from neighbours and these comments have been acknowledged. Many of the points raised have been addressed within the body of this report in relation to visual and residential amenity. It must also be noted that the Council can only assess the application as submitted on its own merits; whilst it may be conceivable to retain the bungalow rather than replace it, this is not what the application is seeking permission for.

18. **Conclusion**

The planning balance assessment concludes that the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan. The proposed development would not cause harm to ecology or to the Conservation Area or adjacent Listed
Building. Visual and residential amenity would not be significantly affected and as such, planning permission is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

1. Condition:
The plan numbers to which this permission relates are: BA075_03_001, BA075_04_: 000, 002, 003, 004 and 006. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. No material variation from these plans shall take place unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason:
   In order that the development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in complete accordance with the approved plans and to accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy GOD 5 of the Godalming and Farncombe Neighbourhood Plan and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

2. Condition:
No variation of the type and colour of the external materials to be used in the construction of the development as shown on the approved deposited plan shall be made without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason:
   In order that the development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in complete accordance with the approved plans and to accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

3. Condition:
Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows or other openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed in the south eastern or north western elevations of the roof extension hereby permitted without the written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason:
In the interests of neighbouring residential amenity, in accordance with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

4. Condition:
Works affecting the roof tiles should be done by hand to ensure any bats which may be sheltering beneath them will not be harmed. These works should ideally be timed to avoid the hibernation season (November to February inclusive). Immediately prior to the start of works, a pre-commencement check for bats should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist. It will also be important to advise roofers removing the tiles to lift each tile carefully before removal and to check the underside does not have a bat clinging to it before moving the tile away. Tiles should be lifted rather than slid along. Workers should keep watch for fur and should be informed that bats take up to half an hour to rouse from the deep sleep that they enter each day called torpor and hence can easily be damaged before they are able to move when disturbed. If a bat is seen work should cease immediately and advice sought from Natural England or a qualified specialist.

Reason:
To ensure that protected species under Schedules 1 and 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and their roosts are not endangered or disturbed by the development in accordance with Policy NE1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.

5. Condition:
Any external lighting installed on this development should comply with the recommendations of the Bat Conservation Trusts’ document entitled "Bats and Lighting in the UK - Bats and The Built Environment Series."

Reason:
To ensure that protected species under Schedules 1 and 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and their roosts are not endangered or disturbed by the development in accordance with Policy NE1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.

6. Condition:
The developer should take action to ensure that development activities such as vegetation or site clearance are timed to avoid the bird nest season of early March to August inclusive. If this is not possible and only small areas of dense vegetation are affected, the site could be inspected for active nests by an ecologist immediately prior to clearance works. If any active nests are found
they should be left undisturbed with a buffer zone around them, until it can be confirmed by an ecologist that the nest is no longer in use.

Reason:
To ensure that protected species under Schedules 1 and 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and their habitats are not endangered or disturbed by the development in accordance with Policy NE1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.

7. Condition:
The development should only proceed in a precautionary manner to avoid the killing or injuring of any individual reptiles and other protected species that may be identified during development. Precautionary working methods should follow best ecological practice and should include:

- All clearance works will be undertaken when common reptiles are likely to be fully active i.e. during the April to September period
- Clearance of logs, brash, stones, rocks or piles of similar debris will be undertaken carefully and by hand.
- Clearance of tall vegetation should be undertaken using a strimmer or brush cutter with all cuttings raked and removed the same day. Cutting will only be undertaken in a phased way which may either include:
  o Cutting vegetation to a height of no less than 30mm, clearing no more than one third of the site in anyone day or;
  o Cutting vegetation over three consecutive days to a height of no less than 150mm at the first cut, 75mm at the second cut and 30mm at the third cut
- Following removal of tall vegetation using the methods outlined above, remaining vegetation will be maintained at a height of 30mm through regular mowing or strimming to discourage common reptiles from returning.
- Ground clearance of any remaining low vegetation (if required) and any ground works will only be undertaken following the works outlined above.
- Any trenches left overnight will be covered or provided with ramps to prevent common reptiles from becoming trapped.
- Any building materials such as bricks, stone etc. will be stored on pallets to discourage reptiles from using them as shelter. Any demolition materials will be stored in skips or similar containers rather than in piles on ground.

Reason:
To ensure that protected species under Schedules 1 and 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and their habitats are not endangered or disturbed by the development.

8. Condition
Prior to the first occupation of the development the proposed balcony shall be screened on the south eastern or north western elevations to a level of 1.7m from the finished floor level of the balcony in accordance with plan No. BA075_03_003 Rev A. The screening shall be obscure glazed to the extent that intervisibility is precluded and retained in perpetuity.

Reason:
In the interests of neighbouring residential amenity, in accordance with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1 2018 and Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

9. Condition:
The roof windows shown in the north-western and south-western roof slopes shall be constructed at a minimum height of 1.7m from the internal finished floor level and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason:
Having regard to the relationship with neighbouring properties and to accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1 2018 and Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

10. Condition:
Prior to the occupation of the dwellings, details shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to confirm that the dwellings have been completed to meet the requirement of 110 litres of water per person per day.

Reason:
To ensure sustainable construction and design in accordance with Policy CC2 of the Waverley Local Plan Part 1 (2018).

11. Condition:
Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings here by permitted the highest available speed broadband infrastructure shall be installed and made available for use unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:
To ensure sustainable construction and design in accordance with Policy CC2 of the Waverley Local Plan Part 1 (2018).
1. Should any protected species be discovered during works, which are likely to be effected by the development, works will cease immediately. The developer will then seek the advice of a suitably qualified ecologist and works will only proceed in accordance with the advice they provide.

2. 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 Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

3. This development offers opportunities to restore or enhance biodiversity and such measures will assist the Local Authority in meeting the above obligation and also help offset any localised harm to biodiversity caused by the development process. Ecological enhancements should therefore be incorporated into the proposals, including those recommended in Section 5.0 of the above referenced Phase 1 Daytime Bat Assessment.
WA/2020/0965 - Erection of a building to provide a 64 Bed Care home including 16 Community Beds together with a building to provide 14 Health Workers accommodation units with access from Knowle Lane, associated parking and ancillary work (revision of WA/2018/1966 and as amplified by letters received 14/12/2020 and 15/12/2020). at Land South Of John Wiskar Drive On East Side Of Knowle Lane, Cranleigh

Committee Meeting Date: Eastern Planning Committee 24/02/2021
Ward: Cranleigh West
Case Officer: Kate Edwards
Expiry Date: 26/02/2021
Neighbour Notification Expiry Date: 05/02/2021
RECOMMENDATION That permission be REFUSED

1. Summary

The application has been brought before the Area Committee at the request of the Local Member. The reasons for referral were:

- It is felt that the reasons for refusal of the previous application may now have been addressed
- It is believed the facility would bring an important health care facility
- Consider the community beds would enhance the existing services available
- The healthcare workers accommodation would provide invaluable affordable accommodation

The planning balance assessment of the proposal concludes that the development of two very large-scale buildings on a Greenfield site would continue to lead to harm to the ASVI, the landscape and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Notwithstanding the reduction in scale from the previously refused application, a substantial degree of harm would remain. Whilst the overall floor area of the proposed development would be reduced from that of the previously consented Village Hospital and Health Centre scheme, the overall visual impact would not be reduced, given the significant spread of development proposed across the site with the current application.

It is acknowledged the scheme would bring some public benefits, in the form of care home provision, housing provision with an affordable element for key workers and 16 care home beds which would be let at a lower rate for selected residents of the Cranleigh area.
The scale of the public benefits proposed, however, would be lessened from the previously refused care home scheme, where there was an identified need for public beds and informal partnership with the Integrated Care Partnership (ICP). The public benefit would also be substantially reduced from that which would have been provided by the previously consented Village Hospital and Health Centre scheme, which would have provided essential infrastructure of significant benefit to a large number of people.

It is not considered, overall, that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the substantial resultant harm to the ASVI and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. On this basis, it is recommended that permission be refused.

2. Location Plan
3. **Site Description**

This triangular-shaped site has an area of 1.36 hectares, is located on the western side of Knowle Lane, Cranleigh, just south of its junction with the High Street, and lies outside, but adjoining, the settlement boundary on the southern/south-western side of this part of the village.

The site has frontages to Knowle Lane, Snoxhall Fields (to the south) and the Downs Link public footpath, which runs down the north-eastern boundary of the site, beyond which are residential properties fronting the southern side of John Wiskar Drive.

The site is undeveloped, roughly flat in character, is laid to grass and is enclosed by established hedgerow and trees.

4. **Proposal**

Full planning permission is sought for: Erection of a building to provide a 64 Bed Care home including 16 Community Beds together with a building to provide 14 Health Workers accommodation units with access from Knowle Lane, associated parking and ancillary work (revision of WA/2018/1966 and as amplified by letters received 14/12/2020 and 15/12/2020).

The proposed new care home would be sited in a central position within the site and would have a cruciform footprint. It would be part 2/part 3 storeys with the 60 care beds and living accommodation on the lower two floors and staff and laundry facilities, plant and storage accommodated on the top floor. The building would have a total width, to the end of two opposite wings of 60m and a total depth of the same. Each of the 4 wings would be 16m in width. The building would be a maximum of 6.6m to eaves level and 12m in height at the maximum ridge.

The proposed healthcare workers accommodation block would be a maximum of 37.2m long by a maximum of 20.2m wide. The building would be 5.4m to the maximum eaves level and 10.7m to the uppermost ridge. It would contain 7 flats on each of the two floors with a total of 10 one bedrooms flats and 4 two bedroom flats. Each flat would be fully self contained with a bathroom, living room and kitchen facilities. The units would all exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards.

Vehicle access to the development is proposed from Knowle Lane by the formation of an access directly into the site, opposite the entrance into the new Berkeley Homes housing. Parking and access for both buildings would be provided in a central position between the two proposed buildings.
wildflower meadow, dementia garden and seating areas would be provided on the remaining land to the south.

**Proposed plans**

**Proposed site layout**
Proposed care home ground floor detail showing 1 of 4 wings

Proposed care home elevations
Key worker accommodation block ground floor plan
Key workers accommodation block elevations

Elevation A

Elevation B  Elevation D
5. **Relevant Planning History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Permissions Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA/2018/1966</td>
<td>Erection of a building to provide an 80 bed care home, including 20 community beds, together with a building to provide health workers accommodation, with access from Knowle Lane, associated parking and ancillary works.</td>
<td>Permission refused 04/12/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA/2010/1328</td>
<td>Application for a new planning permission to replace extant permission WA/2003/1779 (change of use of land to provide sports playing field) (as amplified by letter and indicative plan received 19.08.10, Flood Risk Assessment received 04/10/10 and email received 05/10/10).</td>
<td>Full Permission 03/06/2011 Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA/2010/0773</td>
<td>Application for a new planning permission to replace extant permission WA/2003/1778 (outline application for the erection of a replacement community hospital and health centre with associated vehicular and pedestrian access and car parking). (As amplified by letter dated 10.08.10 and information received 11.08.10).</td>
<td>Full Permission 03/06/2011 Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA/2006/0095</td>
<td>Erection of a replacement community hospital and health centre with associated access and car parking together with associated works (details pursuant to WA/2003/1778) (as amended by letters dated 15/02/06 and 03/03/06 and plans received 17/02/06 and 03/03/06).</td>
<td>Full Permission 16/03/2006 Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA/2003/1779</td>
<td>Change of use of land to provide sports playing field (as</td>
<td>Full Permission 23/08/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Site</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the application site</td>
<td>amended by letters dated 17/12/03 and 19/01/04; plans received 22/12/03 and 21/01/04 and arboriculturalist report dated 19/01/04.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA/2003/1778</td>
<td>Outline application for the erection of a replacement community hospital and health centre with associated vehicular and pedestrian access and car parking (as amended by plans received 22/12/03, letter dated 17/12/03 and documents received 8/3/04).</td>
<td>Outline Approval 23/08/2005 Expired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Planning Policy Constraints

ASVI (Area of Strategic Visual Importance)
Long Distance Footpath (Downs Link)
Countryside Beyond Green Belt (outside any defined settlement)
Bridleway
Within 20 metres of River Bank
Flood Zones 2 and 3

### 6. Development Plan Policies and Guidance

The relevant development plan policies comprise:

- Waverley Borough Local Plan, Part 1, Strategic policies and sites (adopted February 2018):
  - SP1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development;
  - SP2 Spatial Strategy;
  - ST1 Sustainable Transport;
  - ICS1 Infrastructure & Community Facilities;
  - RE1 Countryside Beyond the Green Belt;
  - TD1 Townscape and Design;
  - NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation;
  - NE2 Green and Blue Infrastructure;
  - CC1 Climate Change;
  - CC2 Sustainable Construction & Design;
CC4 Flood Risk Management.

- Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (retained policies February 2018):
  - D1 Environmental Implications of Development;
  - D4 Design and Layout;
  - D6 Tree Controls;
  - D7 Trees, Hedgerows & Development;
  - D8 Crime Prevention;
  - C5 Areas of Strategic Visual Importance;
  - C7 Trees, Woodlands & Hedgerows;
  - CF2 Provision of New Community Facilities;
  - M5 Provision for Cyclists;
  - M7 Footpaths & Cycleways.

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) due weight has been given to the relevant policies in the above plans.

Other guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019;
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 2014 (as updated).
- Cranleigh Design Statement (2008)
- Draft Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan (Unadopted at time of writing)
- Planning Infrastructure Contributions SPD (2008)
- Surrey Vehicular & Cycle Parking Guidance (2012)

7. **Consultations and Town/Parish Council Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cranleigh Parish Council</th>
<th>04/02/2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continues to object to the proposal in response to the amended information with regards to how community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beds would be provided.
- The ICP has withdrawn their support for uptake of the community beds and they would not provide a significant community benefit which is such as to outweigh the harm to the ASVI.
- The terms of the legal agreement as to how the beds would be allocated has not been shared with the PC.
- No infrastructure contributions provided.
- The terms of the community benefit could be varied and removed by the applicant.
- There would be a negative impact on residents of John Wiskar Drive.
- Flood risk, noise and disturbance and highway safety concerns.

21/10/2020
- Surrey County Council (SCC) has confirmed that it would no longer be able to commit to block booking beds due to the Discharge to Access scheme. SCC has confirmed that the beds would not be free at the point of access. The Parish Council can no longer support the proposal.
- The accommodation block would not be linked to the care home only (ancillary) and on this basis cannot be supported.

24/07/2020
- Clarification sought in relation
to nature of care to be provided, the nature of the financial benefit the beds would provide to the community, the viability position, how beds would be allocated and how the accommodation block would be linked to the care home.

- As owner of adjacent land and beneficiary of restrictive covenant, concerns expressed in relation to impact on the ASVI, offsite cumulative flooding impact, cumulative transport impact and environmental pollution (e.g. noise, light and smell pollution).

17/07/2020 – no objection

| Ewhurst and Ellens Green Parish Council | 12/08/2020 | Support the application as the overall community benefit outweighs the opposition |
| Surrey Wildlife Trust | | No protected species identified on site but suitable habitats found. Recommendations made with regards to numerous protected species for precautionary working and pre-commencement walk overs. |
| Surrey County Council Highway Authority | S106 obligations, conditions and informatives recommended. |
| Waverley Environmental Health team | Conditions recommended in relation plant noise, internal and amenity noise environment and a CEMP. Sustainable transport proposals have not been included within the application. A condition is recommended with regards to EVCP. |
Stated that previous survey works confirmed that there is a low risk of contamination issues on the site and therefore no conditions or informatives in this regard are recommended.

| Environment Agency | - A condition recommended to ensure compliance with FRA  
|                    | - A licence may be needed for works near the river  
|                    | - The access is in an area with a 1 in 100 years risk of flooding and the LPA should ensure that safe access and egress in times of flood is demonstrated. |

| Thames Water      | - No objection with regards to foul water  
|                   | - Inability of the existing water infrastructure to meet the needs of the development has been identified and a condition is therefore recommended to ensure this is addressed.  
|                   | - Drains passing through the site – these cannot be built over  
|                   | - Informative recommended notifying of Thames Water underground assets within 15m of the site. |

| Local Lead Flood Authority | - The proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements of the relevant policy and guidance documents.  
|                            | - There is an outflow into the Littlemead Brook which could more easily be drained into the ordinary water course (Officer comment – this matter}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>- Referred to standing advice with regards to impact on ancient woodland and highlighted the importance of ancient woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Police</td>
<td>- Recommend a condition to achieve Secure by Design accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Returned a letter stating no comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Watch Surrey</td>
<td>None received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
<td>None received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>None received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council – Adult Social Care</td>
<td>- SCC cannot commit to block purchasing beds within the scheme and has sufficient capacity for residential care beds through existing block bookings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Were SCC referrals to be made, they would have to be open to all residents of the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CVHT statement regarding topping up fees isn’t clear and SCC are therefore unable to comment on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SCC’s strategic priority is to develop and deliver alternatives to residential care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Affordable accommodation for health and social care staff would support their wider workforce recruitment and retention objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Representations**

In accordance with the statutory requirements and the “Reaching Out to the Community – Local Development Framework – Statement of Community Involvement – August 2019” the application was advertised in the newspaper on 10/07/2020, site notices were displayed around the site on 08/07/2020 and neighbour notification letters were sent on 01/07/2020.

Further notifications were sent to neighbours and parties who had submitted comments on 22/01/2021 in response to further information received from the applicant.

As of 10/02/2021, 426 letters raising objection, 246 letters expressing support and 3 letters expressing neither support or objection have been received.

Objections have been expressed on the following grounds:

- This proposal is not for a hospital
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of views
- Construction noise and disruption
- Several care homes already in the area and Longfields care home which is now vacant and could be redeveloped if needed.
- Poor quality accommodation provided with no gardens for children living in the accommodation block.
- Concerns regarding human and care waste
- Flooding concerns
- Concerns regarding potential failure of the business and re-use of the building for residential purposes.
- Residents have been misled with regards to community funding;
- HC1 are no longer a development partner and should not be listed as applicant
- The ICP has no demand for the beds
- Short-sighted and commercially-driven project
• This is not the right development to meet the needs of the community
• The land is allocated for a new hospital, not a nursing-home
• Cranleigh cannot accommodate any more new buildings without harm to peaceful character
• Proposal will harm the village
• Additional traffic in Knowle Lane and greater congestion at the junction of Knowle Lane with Cranleigh High Street, adding to the hazard for both pedestrians and drivers and increasing journey-times;
• No need for 14 new homes or this type of affordable accommodation in Cranleigh
• The LVIA is out of date.
• Not a benefit for the whole community
• May reduce further development potential of playing fields for leisure uses as occupants may make noise complaints.
• Health care workers working outside of Cranleigh would have problems accessing their workplaces due to poor public transport connectivity.
• Concern regarding HC1 quality of care.
• Lack of consultation by the applicant.
• The buildings are too big
• Should be single-storey only
• Concern regarding proposed fence
• Unsatisfactory layout
• High density over-development
• Contributing to urbanisation of Cranleigh
• Unsatisfactory road access
• Insufficient car parking
• Disturbance due to the 24 hour operation
• Over-looking, loss of privacy and light
• Pollution – noise and smells, vermin
• Loss of trees and wildlife
• Will exacerbate poor internet speeds and water supply issues

Support has been expressed on the following grounds:

• Has addressed previous refusal reasons and is reduced in scale from that proposal
• Would be employment generating
• The current field is overgrown land of no benefit
• The proposals are much needed
• Long-awaited replacement of hospital beds lost long ago
• The health-care worker accommodation is much needed
• The location is accessible and convenient
• The design is acceptable
• All the new development in Cranleigh justifies the proposals
• The Council needs to see the project forward to completion as soon as possible
• The proposals will relieve the pressure in other hospitals in the area, including the Royal Surrey County Hospital
• Will improve resident and family well-being as they will not have to travel to Guildford hospital. This would also reduce travel.
• The Cranleigh population is increasing and aging. Precedence has already been set for the development of the site.
• The scale and mass of the proposed buildings are in keeping with an architectural design which is more locally appropriate than the hospital consent.
• The only viable way to return community beds to the village.
• Has the backing of the NHS and Adult Social Care who have confirmed a demand.
• Cranleigh Chamber of Commerce supports the proposal.
- Would be designed to meet current standards.

**Planning Considerations**

Key determining planning considerations include:

1. Principle of development;
2. Planning history & differences from previous proposals for the site;
3. Community benefits and whether the whole care home is required to viably facilitate this
4. Housing type and tenure
5. Impact on the Countryside and visual amenity;
6. Access, parking & highway impact;
7. Impact on residential amenity;
8. Flood risk & foul drainage;
9. Trees;
11. Archaeology;
12. Other considerations;

9. **Principle of development**

The site lies within the countryside beyond the Green Belt outside the developed area boundary for Cranleigh.

Policy SP1 of the Local Plan, Part 1, 2018, states that, when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development (contained within paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)).

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that, as a core planning principle, the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised in decision-making. This national policy is reiterated within Policy RE1 of the
Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 which states that “the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and safeguarded”.

In practice, this means development outside defined settlements will be controlled to protect the beauty and character of the countryside, a key element of which is its open, undeveloped nature.

The Council has previously permitted the site to be developed for a new community hospital, notwithstanding the policies of restraint that apply to the site, given its rural location, through now-expired permissions WA/2003/1778 and WA/2010/0773.

The principle of developing the site for modest health-related purposes of significant public benefit, has, therefore, been accepted by the Council in the past.

The protection of the countryside from new development that does not need to be located there is paramount. Even if there is a case to accept development in the countryside - for example, because it is essential to serve a “bona fide” rural use or because there is no other suitable location for it in the built-up area and what is sought would deliver an essential community benefit - the amount and scale of development should be no more than is necessary to achieve the purpose.

It is also necessary to consider if there are other sites available in the built-up area that would lend themselves to development at this scale.

It was accepted under previous planning permissions for the site’s development that there were no other suitable sites within the village where those developments could be accommodated.

There are no other known sites in the village today that could satisfactorily accommodate this amount of development. The site is also an edge of settlement location with easy access to the village services, including on foot, and to public transport.

In summary the starting point is the protection in national and local policy for planning decisions to recognise and safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside (beyond the Green Belt). Any development on the site must seek to protect and safeguard the countryside setting, the extent of any community benefit delivered by the development must be proportionate to the impact for the principle to be considered acceptable.

10. **Planning history and differences with previous proposal**
The planning history is a material consideration.

Planning permission has been previously refused under reference WA/2018/1966 for a similar development. Prior to this, the application site has been the subject of previous planning permissions for development for health-related uses. More specifically, outline planning permission was granted in 2005 (WA/2003/1778) for the site’s development for a replacement community hospital and health-centre, followed by approval of reserved matters in 2006 (WA/2006/0095). This was then followed by a new full planning permission granted in 2011 (WA/2010/0773) for a community-hospital and health-centre, which in effect renewed planning permission WA/2003/1778.

The Officer’s report for WA/2003/1778 makes clear that significant weight was attributed in the planning decision to the provision of a new hospital as proposed, stating: “officers are satisfied that the proposal provides the best possible location for a hospital in Cranleigh at the present time and that no other suitable site exists within the developed area of the village. It is felt that given the need for improved health facilities it is appropriate to encroach into the countryside….The material considerations are considered to outweigh the policy objections.”

The site layout and floors areas for the current proposal and two key historic applications are provided below –
The most recent application (WA/2018/1966) was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its location within Countryside beyond the Green Belt would result in the loss of a Greenfield outside of a defined settlement boundary. The proposed development would therefore be in conflict with the Council’s spatial strategy and the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP2, RE1 and TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and the NPPF 2019.

2. The site lies within an Area of Strategic Visual Importance within which the landscape character is to be conserved and enhanced. The proposal is inconsistent with this aim and conflicts with national, strategic and local Policies set out in Policy C5 of the retained Policies of the Waverley Local Plan 2002.

3. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure a Travel Plan such to maximise the use of sustainable transport modes, the proposal would conflict with Policy ST1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and section 8 of the NPPF (Promoting Sustainable Travel).

The primary differences between the current proposal and that application are:

- The quantum of development has been reduced by 1439m², including a reduction in the footprint of the proposal by 856m².
- The previous application proposed an 80 bed care home with a provision of 20 community beds and 26 health care worker rooms. The current application proposes a 64 bed care home with 16 community beds and 14 key worker accommodation units.
- The key workers accommodation block is now proposed to be positioned in the northern part of the site rather than the southern part.
- The parking is now proposed centrally, unlike the previous proposal where it was divided into that serving the care home and the accommodation block.
- The health care worker accommodation previously proposed was not self-contained, with single bedrooms and communal cooking facilities.
It is now proposed that all accommodation units would be fully self-contained and with 4 two bedroom units. This would represent a material change of use within the proposal from *sui generis* as previously to C3 (housing) as currently proposed.

Detailed comparison of this and previous schemes in relation to the current application is considered thematically below and within the planning balance assessment.

The test for Members is whether having regard to the changes, the current proposal has overcome the objections to the previously refused scheme and is acceptable in its own right in accordance with the provisions of the development plan and all other material planning considerations.

11. **Community benefits and whether the whole care home is required to viably facilitate this**

The planning benefits of the proposal need to be fully understood in order to assess, in particular, whether the harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside caused by this level of development is outweighed by other public benefit.

Part of this assessment centres around whether the full 64 bed care home is required to viably support the central public benefit of the scheme – the 16 proposed community beds. In order to consider this fully, a viability assessment has been submitted by the applicant and subjected to independent review by a development surveyor appointed by the Council (Dixon Searle). Following a detailed review of the scheme, Dixon Searle has returned a report concluding:

“We consider that the scheme is on the margins of viability and is unlikely to be able to support any further planning contributions. With reference to the scheme previously submitted and reviewed (WA/2018/1966) the viability position here is similar. The currently proposed scheme is for a lower quantum of housing but with a higher proportion of private care beds. Overall a lower development value but also with lower build costs. In our opinion, the scale of the proposed development is likely to be necessary in viability terms based on our review of the figures provided and the scheme as presented and it is unlikely that the affordable element of the scheme could be discounted further.”

On this basis, it is considered that the care home at this scale would be necessary to viably deliver the discount to the occupiers of the community beds.
However, the level of community benefit that the 16 community beds would provide in practice has been questioned in representations. The planning agent has indicated that the beds would be available to members of the community on the following basis –

- 16 beds would be made available at Local Authority rates, which can represent a significant discount on the rate which would be charged for private beds.
- When these beds become available, they would be offered to the Integrated Care Partnership (ICP, a partnership between the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Surrey County Council) for a set time.
- At the same time as being advertised to the ICP it would be advertised online locally as being available at the discounted rate and members of the public would be given the opportunity to apply.
- A decision as to which applicants should be a priority for the beds would be taken by a new panel to be formed, which may include representatives from GPs and the Parish Council. The selection criteria has not been defined but would include need for care and a need for lower cost care.
- The agent indicates that all potential candidates would need to apply for local authority funding to determine the level of contribution they would need to make.
- Priority would be given to people who live in and around Cranleigh.
- If no placement comes forward, the bed would be used as a private care home bed. If the number of care home beds falls below 16 through this process, when any bed within the whole care home becomes available this would again be advertised to the ICP and locally online (i.e. the 16 beds would not be within a designated wing). A commensurate proportion of funds from beds which have not received a placement at the discounted rate would be passed to CVHT for use on other health and social care initiatives within the Cranleigh area.

It is not fully clear how this proposed system would work in practice or how this matter would be secured via a legal agreement. The state funding structure for care is highly complex and the interaction between state funding and charitable discount may be hard to operate in practice in such a way that there would be a quantifiable legitimate benefit to residents occupying the proposed community beds rather than placements where they have been referred through the ICP. As highlighted within the comments of SCC outlined above, any SCC purchased beds would need to be available to residents throughout the County. The proposed situation could therefore complicate funding for individuals who had been locally selected for the charitable care
beds on the basis of their postcode (i.e. being limited to residents of the Cranleigh area). It is however noted that the system could clearly work to provide a potentially sizable discount to fully self-funded patients, benefitting the individuals concerned significantly.

It is noted that SCC have stated that they have sufficient capacity for residential care beds through existing contracts. The CCG have not come forward to identify a deficiency in nursing beds for meeting their demands in the area.

It was also further noted that the ICP, which had made a minimum 5 year commitment to block-book beds within the previous scheme, is no longer able to make this commitment. This is due to developments in how care is provided, such as a move to assessing people’s care needs in their own homes following discharge from hospital, rather than within ‘step down’ beds in care homes. As mentioned above, there are other potential considerations around a Local Authority allocating beds only to Cranleigh residents.

On the basis of the above uncertainties, officers afford the provision of discounted beds within the scheme additional weight beyond the community benefit which would be provided by private care home beds, but at a lower level to the weight afforded the previous method of provision where an ICP demand and minimum 5 year commitment had been achieved.

It is also of note that the provision of private care beds would provide a community benefit in itself.

The proposed housing would make a contribution towards the Council’s housing land supply which is of public benefit. Whether general needs affordable housing for individuals on the Council’s waiting list would be provided by this remains in question. However, the provision of key worker accommodation in itself may be of further public benefit beyond private housing given that it has potential to provide affordable accommodation which could support the workforce of local services.

The site has previously gained consent for a new community hospital and health centre. Were that scheme to have come to fruition it would have provided a substantial community benefit in line with needs that were evident at that time. Since this time, an alternative location within the village has been found for the Health Centre, which focuses around diagnostics. It has also become clear that the current method of providing care within the NHS is now such that there is no demand for a new village hospital which would operate in the same way as the previous hospital. The weight officers attribute to the
community benefits of the current scheme overall when compared to this previous scheme is substantially reduced.

12. **Housing type and tenure**

The purpose is to provide affordable housing for rent for workers in the health and social-care services, in recognition of the high cost of housing in the area and the difficulties in attracting and retaining staff.

The Council, however, has historically had a duty to secure “general needs” affordable housing for rent in discharging its statutory duty to provide for those on its waiting list, which has meant that until recently it cannot prioritise any one group over another, whatever the needs of particular groups.

Under the paragraph 62 of the latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019) the definition of eligible groups has, however, been expanded to include “essential local workers”, as defined within Annexe 2 of the NPPF. The definition of “essential local workers” is as follows:

> “Public sector employees who provide frontline services in areas including health, education, and community safety - such as NHS staff, teachers, police, firefighters and military personnel, social care and childcare workers.”

The adopted Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1 (February 2018), however, predates the latest NPPF. Policy AHN1 of the Plan (Affordable Housing on Development Sites) was framed in terms of securing “general needs” affordable housing only, which was correct at the time that the Plan was adopted.

However, following the introduction of the February 2019 version of the NPPF, the situation today is changed, insofar as the housing needs of “essential local workers” now need to be provided for too when considering the provision of affordable housing.

The nursing home/community beds part of the development falls within Class C2 of the Use Classes Order. Contrary to the *sui generis* provision proposed in the previous application, the health care workers block, with 14 units to be provided, would trigger a requirement for affordable housing provision under Policy AHN1 of the Council new Local Plan, Part 1, which should be 30% or 5 units. It is not, however, the developer’s intention to provide local needs
affordable housing given that the block overall would be dedicated to providing low cost key worker accommodation.

An NPPF compliant affordable housing provision would, nonetheless, need to be secured in a legal agreement were the application recommended for approval. As it is not recommended for approval, the failure to provide a legal agreement to secure this matter represents a reason for refusal in itself.

With regards to the proposed mix of unit sizes within the housing element of the scheme, the provision is compared to that outlined in the SHMA below –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>1 bedroom</th>
<th>2 bedroom</th>
<th>3 bedroom</th>
<th>4+ bedrooms</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Need</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scheme would therefore not meet the requirements of the SHMA in terms of general needs affordable housing. However, given that the scheme would be developed as key worker accommodation, the SHMA cannot be relied upon as a demonstration of need for this specific group. The accommodation proposed would be of a higher quality than that previously proposed, albeit reduced in number, and would contain some larger units which could potentially be occupied by families. On this basis, the proposed housing mix is, on balance, considered satisfactory.


Policy TD1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) requires development to be of high quality design and to be well-related in size, scale and character to its surroundings. Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 are attributed substantial and full weight respectively due to their level of consistency with the NPPF 2019.

Policy RE1 states that "the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and safeguarded".

Retained Policy C5 of the Local Plan (2002) states that: "The Council will seek to ensure that the appearance of Areas of strategic Visual Importance, as shown on the proposals map, is maintained and enhanced. Development inconsistent with this objective will not be permitted."
The proposed development is accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Assessment. This concludes that “The proposal site is well contained by trees, settlement and topography and there will be minimal visual intrusion beyond the site itself with no effects to the views from the wider rural landscape which affect the character and setting of Cranleigh.”

With reference to the historic schemes, the visual impact of the site in relation to layout, landscape impacts and mass/detailed design each need to be considered.

Site layout and building footprint

The submission material notes that the floor area of the proposed development has been reduced from both the consented reserved matters scheme for a three-storey hospital and from the previous refused scheme for a care home and health care workers accommodation. This is noted and it accepted that the scheme has reduced from the previous scheme in footprint. However, it is not considered that the visual harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside of the scheme is substantially reduced by this reduction in scale.

Both proposed buildings would continue to be extremely large and elongated in scale, at 60m in length on both axis for the care home and 37m by 20m for the healthcare worker accommodation block. Further, the built footprint would continue to be very spread across the site with little meaningful negative space remaining due to the necessary separation of the two large buildings and the cruciform design of the proposed care home.

In the officers’ view, notwithstanding that the floor area of the proposed building on site would be reduced from that of the consented 3 storey hospital building, the current proposal would actually have a greater visual impact given the proposed spread of built form across the site.

The siting of access points, in a central position to the site off Knowle Lane for vehicles and near to the entrance to John Wiskar Drive, are a continuation of the previous scheme in terms of visual impact.

The car parking was previously separated into two area for the different uses but in the current proposal is indicated to be sited centrally within the site in the form of one large car park. This would result in a very significant expanse of hard surface concentrated in one area, which would be visually detrimental.
The overall visual impression of the proposed built footprint and layout would be one of significant urbanisation of what is a greenfield site outside of the developed area boundary.

**Landscape impacts**

The submitted LVIA states that site forms part of the surrounding settlement landscape and does not form part of the rural landscape. Further, it states that the visual landscape impact of the scheme when viewed from Snoxhall playing fields is reduced by the re-siting of the health care workers block and parking when compared to the previous scheme. Mitigation against visual impact is proposed by landscaping around the site, enhancing the tree line at the boundaries (particularly to Knowle Lane) and encouraging biodiversity. The report states that the established tree line surrounding the site would substantially contain the landscape impacts of the scheme.

It is acknowledged that the tree line does limit some views in some directions of the site but it does not provide total screening and the development would remain highly visually perceptible from Knowle Lane, including from the access road. Whilst the playing field use of the site has now ceased and been re-accommodated, the site continues to adjoin and visually read as part of the adjacent open park land which is both an appropriately open countryside use and a containment of the landscape sprawl of the settlement. The development of the site would substantially impinge upon this currently tranquil space. Night time illumination of the site would represent a substantial change from the current night time darkness which would be perceptible from some distance.

The site is within a designated Area of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI). The applicants indicates that they disagree that the area should be identified as such and indicate that they consider the designation out of date. However, this is a Local Plan designation and is extant and not outdated. The buildings would undoubtedly lead to harm to the open nature of the site and lead to harm to the ASVI.

The urbanising impacts of 4,741m² of development up to 12m in height would be highly perceptible and represents a substantial change from the current green field status. This would be exacerbated but the sheer scale of the two buildings proposed. It would be highly perceptible for users of the Downs Link, which is the major key public footpath within the borough. Whilst the re-siting of the accommodation block to the north may reduce clear views from the playing field, it would make it more visually prominent from Knowle Lane and the Downs Link, which are both key public views. On this basis, it is considered that the development would continue to lead to landscape harm
and the loss of a greenfield site. This is not ameliorated by the reduction in scale from the previous development.

**Visual impacts of mass and detailed design**

The proposed care home would have a neo-gothic design, with multiple projections and alterations in the building line and a varied roof form. Whilst this would provide appropriate visual interest within the design and work towards breaking up the visual mass of the building, it would not disguise the fact that the mass of the buildings would be exceptionally large, particularly for the care home which would be 60m in span in each direction.

The architectural treatment of the key worker accommodation block would be similar with projecting elements and multiple gables within the roofspace. Whilst this approach would add visual interest and support the established Surrey vernacular, it would again not ameliorate the visual mass of the solid line of development it would create.

On this basis, whilst the architectural treatment is satisfactory, the visual impact of the buildings would remain harmful to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside given the bulk of the buildings proposed.

15. **Access Parking & Highway Impact**

Policy ST1 states that development should encourage sustainable travel. Both Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council have adopted standards with regards to parking.

Surrey County Council has raised no objection to the proposal in terms of highway safety and efficiency. The provision of the main vehicular access from Knowle Lane has previously been accepted with regards to the 2018 application.

With regards to parking, 46 parking spaces would be provided centrally within the site between the two proposed buildings. 14 of these spaces would serve the accommodation block and the remaining 32 would serve the nursing home. Surrey’s Vehicular and Parking Guidance 2018 states that 1 parking space should be provided per two care home residents and 1 space should be provided per 1 or 2 bedroom flat. The development complies with this guidance. The local guidance within Waverley, where there is a known greater level of car ownership than within Surrey overall, states that 1 space should be provided per one bedroom unit and 2 per two bedroom unit. In this respect, the scheme would fall short by 4 spaces given that 4 two bedroom units are proposed. On balance, given that the Surrey Guidance is the newer policy and
that the deficiency is comparatively small, it is not considered that this represents a reason for refusal.

It is noted that a Travel Plan was required to be secured by legal agreement in relation to the previous scheme, in particular to ensure its implementation and monitoring. Compliance with a suitable Travel Plan is a key element of meeting the need to encourage sustainable travel as outline in Policy ST1. Whilst the applicant has indicated that they will look to provide this, there is not currently a signed legal agreement in place to meet this requirement and on this basis, this matter represents a reason for refusal.

16. Impact on Residential Amenity:

Policy TD1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part1) seeks to ensure that new development is designed to create safe and attractive environments that meet the needs of users and incorporate the principles of sustainable development. Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 are given substantial and full weight respectively due to their consistency with the NPPF 2019.

The location of the proposed accommodation block would be amended from the previous scheme, and would now be sited to the north of the site, bringing built form much closer to the nearest residential properties on John Wiskar Drive. A minimum distance of 25m would remain between the proposed building and these properties. Part of this distance would be the Downs Link footpath. On balance, given the intermediary footpath, it is considered that this distance is such that there would be a significant material harm to the light, outlook or privacy of the existing John Wiskar Drive occupiers as a result of the proposal.

The care home would be well distanced from this nearest residential road, and it is not considered that there is a likely adverse impact on the light, privacy or outlook of any other adjoining residential occupier.

Future residents of the proposed accommodation block would, on balance be provided with sufficient living conditions. All units would exceed the Nationally Described Spaces Standards for units of their respective number of rooms. Whilst no garden space would be provided to serve the units, this is on balance considered acceptable given the proximity to the Snoxall fields which can be easily accessed via the Downs Link.

Representations have raised concerns to the generation of pollution, in the form or noise and smells, from the development. Given the separation distances and the proposed mitigation with regards to plant noise, it is not considered that the development is likely to result in a level of noise and other pollution which would be such that it would harm residential amenity.
Nonetheless, were permission to be granted the impacts of the construction process would need to be carefully controlled in order to prevent harm.

17. Flood Risk & Foul Drainage

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted as part of the planning application submission. The site was initially shown on the Gov.uk flood maps as having a large central part of the site (from north to south) being at risk of flooding, albeit being at ‘low’ risk. A review of the Flood Maps for the site however suggested that the Flood Zone classification of the site may be inaccurate and that the Flood Zone 2 overland flowpath through the site may be removed through refinements to the hydraulic model in the area, and submission of a ‘Flood Map Challenge’ to the Environment Agency.

The modified model was re-run for all flood events, including the updated climate change allowances. The results show that the 1 in 1000 flood extent does not cross as an overland flow through the site. An updated Flood Map has been produced for the site and agreed with the EA. The developed parts of the site are therefore considered to be within Flood Zone 1.

The site is shown to be largely in Flood Zone 1, with Flood Zone 2 now contained within the Downs Link corridor (outside of the site boundary) and immediately adjacent to the watercourse. A Sequential Approach has been adopted for the site layout and proposed residential development is located entirely within Flood Zone 1, outside of the area at risk. Therefore, the Sequential Test does not apply.

All residential development on site would remain dry during the 1 in 100 year (1% AEP) event, including an allowance for climate change of 70% over the lifetime over the development.

The Environment Agency has reviewed the FRA and confirmed that it is satisfied with the Flood Zone reclassification to Zone 1 and has raised no objection to the development subject to measures as detailed in the FRA: Finished flood levels for both residential buildings will be set to a minimum of 600mm above the nearest modelled flood water level or 300mm above typical ground levels, whichever is greater.

The EA states that the LPA should ensure that the development provides suitable access and egress for future residents in times of flood. It is noted that the footway to either side of the vehicular access would have a level of flood which would be considered unsafe for passage by vulnerable elderly people during 1 in 100 year flood events. The application proposes that, in such circumstances, safe pedestrian egress would be provided via the foot
link to the north of the site. They also indicated that they recommend that the care home operator signs up for the EA’s flood alert service. These arrangements are considered sufficient given the relatively low level of risk.

LPP1 policy NE2 imposes an 8m undeveloped buffer zones to main rivers. This has been achieved in the layout, and no development is proposed within 8m of the river.

SCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority have been consulted on the proposals and are satisfied that the drainage strategy is appropriate, to be controlled by condition.

The proposed development would comply with Policy CC4 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.

18. **Trees**

Policy NE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that development should not lead to harm to biodiversity, including trees.

The Tree Officer has reviewed the proposed scheme and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and raised no objection subject to conditions requiring approval of a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and the related Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and a Landscape Scheme that includes protection and enhancement of existing landscape features. Tree loss as a result of the proposal would be minimised and new planting is proposed. No trees which are worthy of a TPO would be lost as a result of the proposal. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policy NE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained Policies D6 and D7 of the Local Plan (2002).

19. **Biodiversity and Compliance with Habitat Regulations 2010.**

Policy NE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that the Council will conserve and enhance biodiversity within Waverley. Development will be permitted provided that it retains, protects and enhances features of biodiversity and geological interest and ensures appropriate management of those features.

The application site includes semi-improved neutral grassland, dense scrub, tall ruderal, dense scrub/tall ruderal mosaic, and a ditch on the western boundary of the site. The applicants have commissioned a Preliminary (‘Phase 1’) Ecological Appraisal’, Reptile Survey, Bat Preliminary Ground Level Roost Assessment of Trees, and a Biodiveristy Check List assessment prepared by Ecology Services, Surrey Wildlife Trust.
The Phase 1 report main conclusions:

- **Amphibians** – The development is unlikely to impact any aquatic or terrestrial great crested newt habitat given the distances and dispersal barriers between potential breeding ponds and the development site. Nest-practice vegetation clearance methods are recommended.

- **Reptiles** - No reptile species were recorded during the seven survey visits.

- **Birds** - The survey recommends that any clearance of vegetation should occur outside the breeding bird season, namely between March and August, inclusive. Any clearance of vegetation within the breeding bird season to be undertaken under supervision of a suitably experienced ecologist, protection measures put in place if necessary.

- **Badgers** - No evidence of badgers was found on site, best-practice construction methods recommended; including covering any holes or trenches overnight.

- **Bats** - The survey area supports suitable bat foraging and commuting habitat including woodland, dense scrub, tall ruderal and longer grassland. Within the woodland, a number of trees have features such as rot holes, cracks and cavities that have potential to support roosting bats. Records of Noctule, Common Pipistrelle and Brown Long-Eared bats were returned as part of the desk study. The loss of three trees and unsympathetic lighting has potential to impact any bats foraging or commuting along the woodland edges, appropriate mitigation and licences to be used to manage impacts.

- **Hazel Dormouse** - limited potential to impact hazel dormouse, recommended that a pre-construction check of the areas affected, the woodland to the east of the site could be enhanced to provide additional habitat.

- **Otter** – Potential for otters, additional surveys pre-construction should they be using the woodland as a resting place a strategy in the ecological recommendations is set out. The brook is to be protected with an 8m buffer zone as required by planning policy.

- **Water Vole** - Potential to impact on water vole during construction, unlikely that water vole is present within the ditch to the west of the site – additional pre-construction survey of Littlemead Brook to be undertaken. Care to be taken and a strategy followed during construction as well as habitat enhancement post construction.
The applicants Ecological Appraisal made recommendations for a range of protection and enhancement measures including: bat and bird boxes, planting of native flora and fauna, grass management, dead wood habitat, fencing to be permeable, use of grass create.

Surrey Wildlife Trust have reviewed the submitted information and found that the survey and proposed mitigation is satisfactory, subject to being secured by condition. The conditions relate to additional surveys and mitigation measures to protect bats, breeding birds, reptiles, badgers, dormice, and water vole, measures such as sensitive lighting and landscape management are required.

The development is therefore considered satisfactory with regards to impact on wildlife.

20. **Heritage considerations**

The site has no heritage designations on or adjacent to it. The site is not within a Conservation Area and is not immediately adjacent to any listed buildings. The submitted Heritage Assessment considers heritage assets over a wider area. There is a total of 22 Listed Buildings within the search area, all but one of which are Grade II Listed, with the church of St. Nicholas the only Grade II* Listed Building. These buildings will not be affected by the development as they are some distance away from site and will be screened by intervening topography, vegetation and buildings.

The proposal will cause no harm to heritage assets and will therefore comply with the Local Plan policies referred to in the Heritage Statement as well policy HA1 of LLP1 2018 and paragraphs 189, 190 and 192 of the NPPF 2018.

21. **Other Planning Considerations**

An Environment Impact Assessment was not considered necessary to determine the impacts of the proposed development. The site does not fall within the EIA Schedule 2 triggers and the site is not within the zone of influence of a protected site that would otherwise require an EIA on sites outside Schedule 2.

With regards to land contamination, Waverley’s Environmental Pollution Control Officer has reviewed the Phase 1- Desk Study and Phase 2 Site Investigation Reports submitted pursuant to the previous application and is satisfied with the findings that no potential ground contamination is evident on the site. No further testing or mitigation has been recommended.
With regards to waste management, as the Nursing Home’s waste would be dealt with by a private contractor Waverley’s Waste and recycling team have no objection to the proposed development. Conditions in relation to recycling and waste disposal facilities and practices would have been applied had officers been recommending planning permission be granted.

With regards to sustainable development, measures such as the Travel Plan, EVCP and fabric first approach to reduce the energy demand of the development are proposed. In addition the conceptual energy strategy is to provide a small Combined Heating and Power (CHP) plant solution on site that would generate 20% of the total thermal energy demand and contribute to electricity generation. The development would meet Building Regulations and comply with LPP1 Policies CC1 and CC2.

22. Conclusion and planning balance

The proposed development of two very large-scale buildings on a greenfield site would continue to lead to harm to the ASVI, the landscape and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Notwithstanding the reduction in scale from the previously refused application, a substantial degree of harm would remain. Whilst the overall floor area of the proposed development would be reduced from that of the previously consented Village Hospital and Health Centre scheme, the overall visual impact would not be lessened, given the significant spread of development proposed across the site with the current application.

The scheme would bring some public benefits, in the form of care home provision, housing provision with an affordable element for key workers, and 16 care home beds which would be let at a lower rate for selected residents of the Cranleigh area.

The scale of the public benefits proposed, however, would be reduced from the previously refused 2018 care home scheme, where there was an identified need for public beds and informal partnership with the Integrated Care Partnership (ICP). The public benefit would also be substantially reduced from that which would have been provided by the previously consented Village Hospital and Health Centre scheme, which would have provided essential infrastructure of significant benefit to a large number of people.

It is not considered, overall, that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the substantial resultant harm to the ASVI and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. On this basis, it is recommended that permission be refused.
23. **Recommendation**

It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **Reason.**
The proposed development by reason of its location within the Countryside beyond the Green Belt would result in Greenfield loss and urbanisation outside of a defined settlement boundary. This would lead to significant harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside by reason of scale, height, bulk, mass, spread across the development site and the incongruous appearance of the very large area of hardstanding proposed in a visually prominent location. The proposed development would therefore be in conflict with the Council's Spatial Strategy and the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP2, RE1 and TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 and the NPPF 2019.

2. **Reason**
The site lies within an Area of Strategic Visual Importance within which the landscape character is to be conserved and enhanced. The proposal is inconsistent with this aim and conflicts with national, strategic and local policies set out in Policy RE3 of the Waverley Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.

3. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure a Travel Plan and the provision of affordable housing in perpetuity, the proposal would conflict with Policies ST1 and AHN1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018.
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