

To: All Members and Substitute Members of
the Joint Planning Committee
(Other Members for Information)

When calling please ask for:
Ema Dearsley, Democratic Services Officer

Policy and Governance

E-mail: ema.dearsley@waverley.gov.uk

Direct line: 01483 523224

Calls may be recorded for training or monitoring

Date: 5 February 2016

Membership of the Joint Planning Committee

Cllr Peter Isherwood (Chairman)
Cllr Maurice Byham (Vice Chairman)
Cllr Brian Adams
Cllr Paddy Blagden
Cllr Carole Cockburn
Cllr Brian Ellis
Cllr David Else
Cllr Mary Forszewska
Cllr Pat Frost
Cllr Michael Goodridge
Cllr John Gray
Cllr Christiaan Hesse

Cllr Stephen Hill
Cllr Nicholas Holder
Cllr David Hunter
Cllr Anna James
Cllr Andy MacLeod
Cllr Stephen Mulliner
Cllr Stewart Stennett
Cllr Chris Storey
Cllr Bob Upton
Cllr Liz Wheatley
Cllr John Williamson

Substitutes

Appropriate Substitutes will be arranged prior to the
meeting

*Please note that in the event of the meeting being postponed due to adverse weather, it
will instead take place at 4pm on 24 February 2016*

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the JOINT PLANNING COMMITTEE will be held as follows:

DATE: WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2016

TIME: 7.00 PM

PLACE: COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, THE BURYS,
GODALMING

The Agenda for the Meeting is set out below.

Yours sincerely

ROBIN TAYLOR
Head of Policy and Governance

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 523351.

This meeting will be webcast and can be viewed by visiting www.waverley.gov.uk/committees

NOTES FOR MEMBERS

Members are reminded that contact officers are shown at the end of each report and members are welcome to raise questions etc in advance of the meeting with the appropriate officer.

AGENDA

1. **MINUTES**

To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 August 2015 (to be laid on the table half an hour before the meeting).

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTES**

To receive apologies for absence.

Where a Member of the Committee is unable to attend a meeting, a substitute Member from the same Area Planning Committee may attend, speak and vote in their place for that meeting.

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 of which notice has been given in accordance with Procedure Rule 10.

5. APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION - WA/2015/2261 - LAND WEST OF SWEETERS COPSE, LOXWOOD ROAD, ALFOLD (Pages 5 - 72)

Proposal

Outline application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 55 dwellings (including 22 affordable) with associated landscaping and open space, children's play area and private drainage system together with associated works

Recommendations

Recommendation A:

That permission be GRANTED, subject to conditions 1-16 and informatives 1-14 and completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing, management and maintenance of the SuDS, on-site foul water package treatment plant and public open space, and infrastructure improvements to the highway network and education provision within 2 months of the date of this resolution to grant permission.

Recommendation B:

That in the event that the requirements of recommendation A are not met, permission be refused.

6. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

To consider the following recommendation on the motion of the Chairman (if necessary):-

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 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.

7. LEGAL ADVICE

To consider any legal advice relating to any application in the agenda.

**For further information or assistance, please telephone
Ema Dearsley, Democratic Services Officer, on 01483 523224 or by
email at ema.dearsley@waverley.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5.

A1	WA/2015/2261 G Stevenson Catesby Estates Ltd 23/11/2015	<u>Outline application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 55 dwellings (including 22 affordable) with associated landscaping and open space, children's play area and private drainage system together with associated works at Land West Of Sweeters Copse, Loxwood Road, Alfold</u>
	Committee: Meeting Date:	Joint Planning 17/02/2016
	Public Notice Grid Reference:	Was Public Notice required and posted: Yes E: 504121 N: 134578
	Parish : Ward : Case Officer: 13 Week Expiry Date Neighbour Notification Expiry Date	Alfold Alfold, Cranleigh Rural and Ellens Green Peter Cleveland 22/02/2016 04/01/2016

RECOMMENDATION

That, subject to completion of a S106 legal agreement to secure 40% affordable housing, infrastructure contributions towards off-site highway improvements, early years and primary education, off-site highway works and the setting up of a Management Company for play spaces, open space, foul package treatment plant, SuDs and conditions, permission be GRANTED

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Site Location.....	2
Site Description	3
Proposal	3
Heads of Terms.....	3
Details of Community Involvement.....	5
Relevant Planning History	5
Planning Policy Constraints.....	6
Development Plan Policies and Proposals.....	6
Consultations and Parish Council Comments	7
Representations	18
Submissions in Support.....	18
Determining Issues.....	19
Planning Considerations	20
Principle of Development	20
Prematurity	22
Planning History	23
Environmental Impact Assessment.....	25

Loss of Agricultural Land	25
Location of Development.....	27
Housing Land Supply	30
Housing Mix.....	31
Affordable Housing	33
Highway Considerations.....	35
Impact on Countryside beyond the Green Belt	38
Impact on Landscape Character	40
Impact on Trees	41
Impact on Visual Amenity	42
Impact on Residential Amenity	43
Provision of Amenity and Play Space	43
Flood Risk and Drainage Considerations	44
Noise Impacts.....	47
Air Quality Impacts	48
Archaeological Considerations	49
Crime and Disorder	50
Infrastructure	50
Health and Wellbeing	52
Financial Considerations	53
Climate Change and Sustainability	53
Biodiversity and Compliance with Habitat Regulations 2010	53
Water Frameworks Regulations 2011	54
Accessibility and Equalities Act 2010 Implications	55
Human Rights Implications.....	55
Response to Parish Council and Third Party comments	55
Cumulative Effects/in-combination effects	56
Development Management Procedure Order 2015 - Working in a positive/proactive manner	56
Conclusion / Planning Judgement.....	57
Recommendation	58

Introduction

The application has been brought before the Joint Planning Committee because the proposal does not fall within the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

The planning application seeks outline permission for the development proposal with all matters reserved except access.

Access - covers accessibility for all routes to and within the site, as well as the way they link up to other roads and pathways outside the site.

All other matters are to be reserved for future consideration. An application for outline planning permission is used to establish whether, in principle, the development would be acceptable. This type of planning application seeks a determination from the Council as to the acceptability of the principle of the proposed development. If outline planning permission is granted any details

reserved for future consideration would be the subject of future reserved matters application(s).

Reserved matters include:

Appearance	aspects of a building or place which affect the way it looks, including the exterior of the development.
Layout	includes buildings, routes and open spaces within the development and the way they are laid out in relation to buildings and spaces outside the development.
Scale	includes information on the size of the development, including the height, width and length of each proposed building
Landscaping	the improvement or protection of the amenities of the site and the area and the surrounding area, this could include planting trees or hedges as a screen.

If outline planning permission is granted, a reserved matters application must be made within three years of the grant of permission (or a lesser period, if specified by a condition on the original outline approval). The details of the reserved matters application must accord with the outline planning permission, including any planning conditions attached to the permission.

Site Location



Site Description

The application site measures 2.78 hectares and is located to the south of the rural settlement of Alfold Crossways. The site extends eastwards from Loxwood Road and over half of an open arable field; and adjoins the southern boundary of the residential curtilage serving the property 'Mercedes', which fronts Loxwood Road. Sweeters Copse, which is classified as Ancient and Semi-Ancient Woodland, is located to the east of the site beyond open arable land.

To the south east of the site are open arable fields in part, which continue to an existing field boundary some 200 metres to the south. An existing nursery school is located to the south of the site, which fronts Loxwood Road.

An existing water course is located to the west of the site between Loxwood Road and the site boundary. The application site is generally flat, although there is some undulation.

The site is currently accessed from Loxwood Road via a five bar field gate in the south western corner. Immediately opposite this access is Sachel Court Drive.

Proposal

The application seeks permission in outline form for the construction of 55 dwellings, of which 40% are to be provided as affordable homes. The application is in outline form, with the only detailed matter for approval being the means of access. Landscaping, appearance, layout and scale remain as reserved matters.

The proposal also includes the provision of on-site open space, foul and surface water drainage features and a formal children's play space. The open/greenspace would total 0.97 hectares of the 2.78 hectare site.

The main vehicular and pedestrian access to the site would be formed via a new T junction which is to be located some 30 m south of the existing field access onto Loxwood Road. The new access would be wide enough to accommodate a bus service through the site, and a bus stop would be included within the indicative layout.

A pedestrian link is also proposed along Loxwood Road, across existing common land.

Heads of Terms

The following matters are offered to be subject to a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended):

Highway Contributions:

1. £20,000 for upgrading the bus stop infrastructure on Loxwood Road and at the Alfold Crossways.
2. £5,000 for improvements to Public Byway 407 and Public Bridleway 413 in Alfold.
3. £35,000 for speed reduction measures on Loxwood Road between the Alfold Crossways junction and the County boundary, located approximately 500 metres to the south of the Rosemary Lane junction with Loxwood Road.

Provision of pedestrians footpath links from the application site to the existing footpath network along Loxwood Road.

Affordable Housing:

22 (40%) affordable dwellings; comprising 50% shared ownership dwellings and 50% Affordable Rent units.

Education:

Early years education contribution - £37,018

Primary education contribution - £188,760

Services, Facilities and Environmental Contributions

- Future ownership, management and maintenance of on-site SUDS and package waste water treatment plant.
- Future ownership, management and maintenance of on-site Public Open Space and Play facilities

S278 Highway Works:

1. Prior to commencement of the development the proposed site access and 30 metres of the new access road shall be constructed and provided with visibility splays, in general accordance with RGP's Drawing No. 2014/2175/007 Rev D and subject to the Highway Authority's technical and safety requirements.
2. Prior to first occupation of the development, provide speed reduction measures in the vicinity of the site access, in general accordance with RGP's Drawing No. 2014/2175/007 Rev D and subject to the Highway Authority's technical and safety requirements.
3. Prior to first occupation of the development construct the Alfold Crossways junction safety improvement scheme, in general accordance with RGP's Drawing No. 2014/2175/003 Rev A and subject to the Highway Authority's technical and safety requirements.
4. Prior to first occupation of the development, provide accessibility improvements on Loxwood Road, comprising dropped kerbs and tactile paving, between the proposed site access and the Alfold Crossways junction.

Details of Community Involvement

The applicant has provided a Statement of Community Consultation which sets out details of the public and stakeholder consultation which took place prior to the submission of the application.

Community consultation comprised a public exhibition, which took place on 08 October 2014 between 14:30 and 19:30.

Over 250 individual invitations to the exhibition were sent out, including the following properties:

- All properties on Loxwood Road, including from the top of Alford Crossways at the junction of the A281 down to the village
- All properties in Chiltern Close
- All properties around the church and village notice board

The following groups and individuals were sent invitations:

- Alford Parish Council
- The Ward Councillor
- Cranleigh Parish Council
- Cranleigh West Ward Councillors

Public notices of the exhibition were put in the following local newspapers:

- West Sussex County Times
- Surrey Advertiser
- Get Surrey

The public exhibition was attended by 35 people, with 8 people returning comments forms.

Positive comments were expressed about the need for new housing and the introduction of traffic calming measures, whilst concerns were expressed about the level of housing proposed and the principle of development on a greenfield site.

The applicant has indicated that the feedback received was taken into account in the finalisation of the proposals for the site.

Relevant Planning History

WA/2014/2413	Outline application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 120 dwellings with associated shop (Class A1) and café (Class A3); provision of common land, surface and foul water treatment works; highway works and associated works; this application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement	Refused 29/06/2015 Appeal lodged
WA/2014/0022	Request for Screening Opinion for a development of up to 130 dwellings with associated community facilities, open space and access.	Screening Opinion Given 17/10/2014 – requires EIA
WA/2013/1617	Outline Application with all matters reserved for the erection of 104 dwellings (including 30 affordable dwellings), a primary school, retail and community health buildings, alterations to highway and associated works.	Withdrawn 19/12/2013

Planning Policy Constraints

Countryside beyond the Green Belt – Outside of any settlement area
Common Land

Development Plan Policies and Proposals

Saved Policies of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002:-

D1	Environmental implications of development
D2	Compatibility of uses
D3	Resources
D4	Design and layout
D5	Nature conservation
D6	Tree controls
D7	Trees, hedgerows and development
D8	Crime prevention
D9	Accessibility
D13	Essential infrastructure
D14	Planning benefits
C2	Countryside beyond the Green Belt
HE15	Unidentified Archaeological Sites
H4	Density and size of dwellings
H10	Amenity and play space
RD9	Agricultural land
M1	The location of development
M2	The movement implications of development

M4	Provision for pedestrians
M5	Provision for cyclists
M14	Car parking standards

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires all applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The adopted Local Plan (2002) therefore remains the starting point for the assessment of this proposal.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in the determination of this case. Paragraph 215 states that where a local authority does not have a development plan adopted since 2004, due weight may only be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. The report identifies the relevant Policies in the Local Plan, which relate to the proposals and each section concludes on the amount of weight that is afforded to those Policies.

The Council is in the process of replacing the 2002 Local Plan with a new two part document. Part 1 (Strategic Policies and Sites) will replace the Core Strategy that was withdrawn in October 2013. Part 2 (Development Management and Site Allocations) will follow the adoption of Part 1. The new Local Plan will build upon the foundations of the Core Strategy, particularly in those areas where the policy/ approach is not likely to change significantly. Public consultation on potential housing scenarios and other issues took place in September/October 2014. The timetable for the preparation of the Local Plan (Part 1) is currently under review.

Other Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- National Planning Policy Guidance (2014)
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2014 update)
- West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015)
- West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015: Waverley Addendum (2015)
- Settlement Hierarchy (Draft 2010 and factual update 2012)
- Climate Change Background Paper (2011)
- Open Space, Sport and Recreation (PPG17) Study 2012
- Statement of Community Involvement (2014 Revision)
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010)
- Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (Addendum 2010 and update 2012)
- Waverley Borough Council Parking Guidelines (2013)
- Density and Size of Dwellings SPG (2003)
- Residential Extensions SPD (2010)
- Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (Surrey County Council 2012)
- Waverley Local Plan Strategic Transport Assessment (Surrey County Council, September 2014)
- Natural England's Technical Information Note 049

Consultations and Parish Council Comments

Alfold Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council considers that this application does little to address objections to the previous applications for up to 104 dwellings (WA/2013/1617) and up to 120 dwellings (WA/2014/2413) despite the reduced number of dwellings.</p> <p>The Parish Council has taken into account the results of the Housing Needs Survey carried out by Surrey Community Action in December 2012, which showed that 67% of Alfold residents believe the current housing stock is serving Alfold well; 64% supported an Affordable Housing Project to meet the needs of local residents, however, an overwhelming 81% said they would not be in favour of a housing development in Alfold of 50 or more houses being a mixture of affordable and market houses.</p> <p>Alfold Parish Council and local residents are concerned about the increased traffic which would result in a development of this size, particularly on Alfold Crossways junction and the northbound A281 and when taking into account the additional traffic which will be generated from the Wildwood Golf Club development, which is soon to be implemented, and other proposed developments in the village and surrounding areas. Access by non-car modes of transport including public transport is extremely limited with very little scope to maximise viable sustainable transport, so by ways of its location, the proposal would result in an unsustainable form of development.</p> <p>The Parish Council is concerned about the impact of light pollution on the local amenity. There is currently no street lighting in Alfold and previous research has indicated an overwhelming objection to lighting in the village.</p> <p>Regarding foul water drainage, there is currently insufficient capacity within the existing foul drainage system to accommodate additional flows from the proposed development. The Parish Council notes that for this reason, foul</p>
-----------------------	--

	<p>water is proposed to be drained by way of a private on-site sewage treatment plant, which would discharge into the existing ditch. The Flood Risk Assessment states that the ditch currently drains surface water from the adjacent highway and how it discharges has yet to be determined. The Parish Council believes that water flowing through the existing ditch contributes to the surface water flooding experienced at Clappers Meadow and therefore it is likely that discharge of any treated foul water into that ditch would exacerbate existing surface water flooding. The parish council considers that there should be no development in Alfold until Thames Water and Southern Water agree a long-term solution to the capacity issues in the foul sewage system and that developers should contribute towards any proposed solution for the benefit of the whole village.</p> <p>Alfold Parish Council considers that the density of the proposed dwellings is out of keeping with the surrounding area and that the encroachment into open countryside would be inconsistent with the existing setting, form and pattern of the rural settlement.</p>
County Highway Authority	<p>The proposed development has been considered by the County Highway Authority who recommends an appropriate agreement should be secured before the grant of permission and should be subject to 5 recommended Conditions and 11 Informatives.</p> <p>Relevant Local and National Policy:</p> <p>National Policy: The National Planning Policy Framework requires all developments that generate significant amounts of to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure; <p>The Highway Authority is satisfied that the</p>

	<p>proposed package of transport mitigation measures does improve accessibility to the site by non-car modes of travel, therefore the planning application does meet the transport sustainability requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people <p>The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed access and movement strategy for the development would enable all highway users can travel to/from the site with safety and convenience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. <p>The Highway Authority is satisfied that the traffic impact assessment undertaken by the applicant provides a robust and realistic assessment of the likely impact of the development on the highway network. The applicant has agreed to provide a package of mitigation measures that directly mitigates the impact of traffic generated by their development.</p> <p>Local Policy: The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed development is in accordance with the relevant 'movement' Local Plan policies.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>The proposal is for residential development and the environmental risks in this area relate to foul drainage / wastewater.</p> <p>Foul Drainage New development should be connected to the public mains (with the prior written approval of the statutory undertaker) where possible. Proliferation of individual treatment plants can cause deterioration in local water quality (ground and surface water). This would be contrary to the principle of the EU Water</p>

	<p>Framework Directives.</p> <p>Other Consents The Environment Agency have a regulatory role in issuing legally required consents, permits or licences for various activities. The Environmental Agency have not assessed whether consent will be required under their regulatory role and therefore this response does not indicate that permission will be given by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Any works in, over or under or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of a designated Main River will also require formal consent.</p>
Natural England	<p>No comments to make on this application.</p> <p>The lack of comments from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts of statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the Local Planning Authority to determine whether or not this is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment.</p> <p>Protected Species If the proposed works, at any stage, have an impact on protected species, refer to Natural England Standing Advice.</p>
Forestry Commission	<p>Standing Advice provided which states that development that will result in the loss of Ancient Woodland, unless the development offers overriding public benefits, should be discouraged.</p>
Thames Water	<p>Surface Water Drainage With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage.</p> <p>When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not</p>

	<p>permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.</p> <p>Water Comments Thames Water do not have any objection to the above planning application with regard to water infrastructure capacity.</p>
Surrey Wildlife Trust	<p>The Trust would advise that the Ecological Appraisal Report by CLM dated November 2015, provides sufficient information for the Local Authority to be able to assess the potential status of protected and important species on the proposed development site and the likely effect of the development on them.</p> <p>SWT advises the Local Authority, that should they be minded to grant this outline planning application for this site, the applicant should be required to undertake all the recommended actions in the 'Evaluation and Recommendation' section of the Report, including the biodiversity enhancements as detailed, together with any additional recommendations detailed in the reptile and dormouse survey reports.</p> <p>This will help prevent adverse effect to legally protected species resulting from the proposed development works and help to off-set adverse effects to the biodiversity value of the site resulting from the proposed development.</p> <p>SWT advises that the Local Authority has the opportunity to approve a detailed 'Reptile Mitigation Strategy' for this site should the development proceed beyond this stage.</p> <p>SWT advises that the boundary habitat on this site is likely to provide the most biodiversity value on this site and it should be retained, enhanced and suitably protected from the proposed development works should this development proceed.</p> <p>SWT advises that the proposed public areas of</p>

	<p>the site are made subject to a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).</p> <p>This development may offer some further opportunities to restore or enhance biodiversity. The Trust's recommendations in this instance are outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing bird boxes (in addition to the proposed swift boxes, erected on the new buildings or on suitable trees on site; these should be for species likely to use this site. • Providing roosting opportunities for bats, either through bat boxes on suitable trees on site or by using bat bricks or tiles on the new buildings, which allow bats to use buildings for roosting without interfering with householder activities. • The applicant should consult a suitably experienced ecologist to determine the most appropriate provision of bird and bat boxes for this site. • Using native species when planting new trees and shrubs, preferably of local provenance from seed collected, raised and grown only in the UK, suitable for site conditions and complementary to surrounding natural habitat. The priority should be to source planting stock from the seed zone of the planting site, but with the inclusion of a proportion from other nearby seed zones, particularly from the south east. This will introduce some genetic variation which may allow woodland to adapt more easily to future climate change. Boundary planting is particularly important as native species hedgerows and tree lines can facilitate the movement of animals through a developed area. • Where cultivated species are selected, consider using those that provide nectar-rich flowers and/or berries as these can also be of considerable value to wildlife. Plantings of foreign species of invasive habit should be avoided adjacent to natural habitat. The use of peat-based composts, mulches and soil conditioners should be avoided due to the loss of important natural habitat. 	
County	Council	Comments made on WA/2014/2413 are still

Archaeologist

appropriate as follows:

The proposed development is large – well over the 0.4 hectare threshold which is recommended for archaeological assessment and possibly evaluation under Policy HE15 of the Waverley Borough Council Local Plan.

The Cultural Heritage Assessment produced by Archaeology South East reviewed all appropriate currently available sources. The report identifies that there are no designated heritage assets either on the site or in the immediate vicinity but states that the site is located within an area that should be considered to have a moderate archaeological potential for as yet uncharacterised remains dating to the prehistoric period and a high potential for the post medieval period, although the latter is likely to consist mainly of agricultural features such as field ditches. Based on the currently available evidence the potential for remains dating to other periods is considered to be low. It is also thought that a long history of ploughing on the site will have impacted somewhat on any remains that may be present.

Given the nature of the development proposals, it is suggested that the impact on any remains that may be present would be adverse, and that consequently, a programme of evaluation and if necessary further mitigation should be undertaken. The Assessment goes on to suggest that the impact on any other elements of the Historic Environment (Historic buildings, landscapes and/or known archaeological features) would be relatively small.

Further archaeological investigations in the form of a trial trench evaluation will be required in advance of development.

Due to the results of the work carried out so far, which suggest that remains of national importance are unlikely to be present, it is considered that, in this case, it would be reasonable to secure the recommended programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation works by Condition.

<p>Council's Air Quality Officer</p>	<p>Previous comments on WA/2014/2413 as follows:</p> <p>Concerns relating to potential emissions during any deconstruction and construction phases of the project, affecting existing receptors in the area through potential fugitive dust emissions and by increased traffic to the site during development. It should also be noted that the introduction of residential properties may expose the future occupants to air pollution associated with road traffic and is likely to increase road usage in the area by the occupants.</p> <p>It should be noted that the impact of dust and emissions from deconstruction and construction can have a significant impact on local air quality.</p> <p>As there is no safe level of exposure, all reduction in emissions will be beneficial. It is considered to be a medium risk proposal in terms of the Mayor of London, London Councils Best Practice Guidance, "The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition" 2006.</p> <p>Consideration is given for the development being in a semi rural location with less significant air quality impacts. However, the application site will increase vehicular traffic which will have a significant additional effect on the air quality in this location as occupants are likely to commute to their work, educational and shopping destinations.</p> <p>A report commissioned by Waverley, "The Farnham Traffic Management and Low Emission Feasibility Study" carried out by AEA Technology in April 2012, noted that the highest emissions affecting the air quality is directly related to diesel cars and not HGVs and buses. Therefore consideration has been given to the additional impact on this location of any vehicular use and mitigation measures will be required to offset the additional development.</p>
<p>Council's Environmental Health Officer</p>	<p>The National Planning Practice Guidance advises that noise needs to be considered when</p>

new developments may create additional noise.

Having reviewed the outline development proposal, it has been determined that noise from the construction of the development is likely to cross the lowest observed adverse effect level boundary above which the noise starts to cause small changes in behaviour and attitude, for example, having to turn up the volume on the television or needing to speak more loudly to be heard. The noise is therefore likely to start to have an adverse effect and consideration needs to be given to mitigating and minimising those effects.

The National Planning Practice Guidance advises odour and dust can be a planning concern because of the effect on local amenity. Consideration should be given to development that may potentially have an unacceptable impact (such as through dust) during construction for nearby sensitive locations.

It is considered that the proposed development will potentially give rise to unacceptable impact from dust during construction for nearby sensitive locations.

The National Planning Practice Guidance advises that by encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. The new development proposal has the potential to adversely affect the use or enjoyment of nearby buildings or open spaces during the construction phase due to poorly designed artificial lighting.

A Construction Environmental Management Plan is recommended to ensure that these issues are mitigated and reduced to a minimum during the demolition and construction phases.

The National Planning Practice Guidance advises that by encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. The new development

	<p>proposal has the potential to adversely affect the use or enjoyment of nearby buildings or open spaces when works are completed and the site is occupied, due to poorly designed artificial lighting.</p> <p>A condition is recommended to ensure appropriate lighting is installed within the development.</p>
Council's Waste and Recycling Officer	<p>The entrance to, and roads within, the development will need to be capable of allowing access for a collection vehicle 2530mm wide and 9840mm overall length, with a maximum gross weight of 26 Tonnes. Suitable turning provision to be included.</p>
Lead Local Flood Authority	<p>Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) reviewed the surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development and assessed it against the requirements under NPPF, its accompanying PPG and Technical Standards.</p> <p>The Government has strengthened planning policy on the provision of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for 'major' planning applications which was introduced from 6 April 2015 (Paragraph 103 of National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS). As per the guidance issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), all 'major' planning applications being determined from 6 April 2015, must consider sustainable drainage systems. Developers are advised to assess the suitability of sustainable drainage systems in accordance with paragraphs 051, 079 and 080 of the revised NPPF Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) for Flood Risk and Coastal Change. Sustainable drainage systems should be designed in line with national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS. Hydraulic calculation and drawings to support the design need to be provided along with proposed standards of operation and maintenance in accordance with paragraph 081 of National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The LLFA is satisfied that the proposed outline drainage scheme(s) meet(s) the requirements set out in the aforementioned documents.</p>

	<p>The LLFA would however recommend that should planning permission be granted, that suitably worded conditions are applied to ensure that the SuDS Scheme is properly implemented and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.</p>
--	---

Representations

In accordance with the statutory requirements and the “Reaching Out to the Community – Local Development Framework – Statement of Community Involvement – August 2014” the application was advertised in the newspaper on, site notices were displayed around the site and neighbour notification letters were sent on 02/12/2015.

15 letters have been received, raising objection on the following grounds:

- Development totally wrong as it would be on green fields, expanding the village when there are more worthy sites being considered.
- An application for this many houses is quite out of keeping for a village the size of Alfold.
- Proposal totally out of keeping and inappropriate.
- A281 and B2133 are already at full capacity. The extra cars will bring untold hold-ups and delays.
- There have been two accidents in the centre of the villages, one of them fatal.
- Entrance is on a dangerous bend and Loxwood Road is too busy now.
- Field is always wet and soggy. No guarantee that the measures proposed will make any difference, but more likely cause more flooding.
- Proposal will increase water runoff and will reduce the amount of ground available to soak up rainwater.
- Ditches around the field are completely full after a day of heavy rain.
- Sewerage system is overloaded. Are the proposed remedial plans guaranteed.
- Loss of wildlife and habitat, loss of dark night skies, loss of clean air, tumble driers being the most offensive.
- With no public transport to talk of, new inhabitants will use overcrowded and poorly maintained roads.
- Development in the village should be gradual and involve no more than a few houses at a time in keeping with the existing environment.
- Unnecessary use of valuable green field land.
- Private sewage treatment would cause pollution.
- No significant employment locally, accordingly residents of the development would have to travel by road to work, shop and access leisure facilities.

- Should hold any decisions on where to develop until the Waverley Local Plan has been agreed.

Submissions in Support

In support of the application, the application has made the following points:

- The development of the application site for new housing and open space facilities will help to meet an urgent need for both market and affordable homes in the Village of Alfold and wider area.
- The Borough has an urgent need to bring forward more land to provide more housing in order to meet the emerging housing requirement of a minimum of 519 year per annum. The Council has acknowledged that it cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply even when assessed against the previous lower target of 470 homes per annum.
- The proposal will make positive contributions to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development and, in the context of the NPPF and recent appeal decisions, the application should be approved on this basis alone.
- In view of the absence of a five-year land supply, and the provisions of paragraph 14 and 49 of the NPPF, policies relating to the supply of housing in the Waverley Local Plan 2002 are no longer up to date nor have any weight in the determination of housing applications in the Borough.
- This planning application demonstrates that there are no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting planning permission, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, and there are no specific policies in this NPPF that indicate development should be restricted. There are also no technical reasons why the development cannot proceed.
- This statement demonstrates that the proposal accords with national planning policy and will also provide the following key benefits:
 - A range of much needed market and affordable housing in a sustainable location
 - New open space and children's play facilities
 - Foul water treatment works
 - New investment and local jobs at the construction and post construction stages
 - New traffic calming measures on Loxwood Road to encourage slower vehicle speeds through the village
- The new housing and these benefits considerably outweigh any harm that may be identified in this case and the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied.

Determining Issues

- Principle of Development
- Prematurity

- Planning History
- Environmental Impact Assessment
- Loss of Agricultural Land
- Location of Development
- Housing Land Supply
- Housing Mix
- Affordable Housing
- Highway Considerations
- Impact on Countryside beyond the Green Belt
- Impact on Landscape Character
- Impact on Trees
- Impact on Visual Amenity
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Provision of Amenity and Play Space
- Flood Risk and Drainage Considerations
- Noise Impacts
- Air Quality Impacts
- Archaeological Considerations
- Crime and Disorder
- Infrastructure
- Health and Wellbeing
- Financial Considerations
- Climate Change and Sustainability
- Biodiversity and Compliance with Habitat Regulations 2010
- Water Frameworks Regulations 2011
- Accessibility and Equalities Act 2010 Implications
- Human Rights Implications
- Representations
- Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Order 2015
Working in a Positive/Proactive Manner
- Conclusion and Planning Judgement

Planning Considerations

Principle of Development

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;

- a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

The NPPF at paragraph 197 provides the framework within which the local planning authority should determine planning applications, it states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF defines the presumption in favour of sustainable development as approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless: *inter alia* any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, or if specific policies in the framework indicate development should be restricted.

The site is located within the Countryside beyond the Green Belt outside any defined settlement area.

Policy C2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 states that building in the Countryside beyond the Green Belt, away from existing settlements, will be strictly controlled.

The Key Note Policy of the Waverley Borough Local Plan aims, amongst other matters, to make provision for development, infrastructure and services which meet the needs of the local community in a way which minimises impacts on the environment. The text states that opportunities for development will be focused on the four main settlements (Farnham, Godalming, Haslemere and Cranleigh), mainly through the re-use or redevelopment of existing sites.

The NPPF states that, as a core planning principle the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside shall be recognised. The site is located within the Countryside beyond the Green Belt wherein the countryside shall be protected for its intrinsic character and beauty.

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

The High Court Judgement between Mark Wenman and (1) The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2) Waverley Borough Council considers Policy C2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 as a policy for the supply of housing within paragraph 49 of the NPPF and therefore concludes that it carried significantly less weight given that the policy is out of date and that the Council currently cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.

In light of the above considerations the countryside cannot therefore be safeguarded for its own sake and in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF, significant harm would have to be demonstrated that would outweigh the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The planning application seeks outline permission for the development proposal, with all matters reserved for future consideration except for access.

As such, the applicant is seeking a determination from the Council on the principle of the residential development and associated access.

The NPPF states that, where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.

Prematurity

Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework explains how weight may be given to policies in emerging plans. However, in the context of the Framework and in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than where it is clear that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, taking the policies in the Framework and any other material considerations into account. Such circumstances are likely, but not exclusively, to be limited to situations where both:

a) the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging Local Plan or Neighbourhood Planning, and

b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.

Refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a draft Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination, or in the case of a Neighbourhood Plan, before the end of the local planning authority publicity period. Where planning permission is refused on grounds of

prematurity, the local planning authority will need to indicate clearly how the grant of permission for the development concerned would prejudice the outcome of the plan-making process.

Officers conclude that the emerging Local Plan is not at an advanced stage and that the Alfold Neighbourhood Plan is at a very early stage in its development, with no time table for process having been made. The NPPG states that an emerging neighbourhood plan may be a material consideration in decisions on planning applications. It adds, however, that refusal of planning permission on grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified, in the case of a neighbourhood plan, before the end of the Local Planning Authority publicity period.

Having regard to the advice of the NPPG, Officers conclude that a reason for refusal based on prematurity could not be substantiated.

Planning History

The planning history for the site is a material consideration.

An outline planning application with all matters reserved for the erection of 104 dwellings (including 30 affordable dwellings), a primary school, retail and community health buildings, alterations to highway and associated works (WA/2013/1617) was withdrawn on 19 December 2013. Since no formal decision was made by the Council on this application, it cannot be attributed any weight for decision making purposes.

An outline application with all matters reserved except access for the erection of up to 120 dwellings with associated shop (Class A1) and café (Class A3); provision of common land, surface and foul water treatment works; highway works and associated works (WA/2014/2413) was refused under delegated powers on 29/06/2015. This application was refused for 7 reasons, which in summary were in relation to the harm to countryside and setting of the village of Alfold Crossways, the unsustainable location of the site; loss of agricultural land and the failure to provide an appropriate legal agreement to secure affordable housing, additional capacity within schools, highway improvements, open space provision and recycling. The refusal reasons comprised:

1. Reason
The proposal, as a result of its location and remoteness from Alford Crossways Rural Settlement, would constitute isolated new homes in the Countryside and constitute an unsustainable form of development. It is considered that there are no special circumstances to justify setting aside this policy, including those set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. Reason
The proposal, as a result of the number of dwellings, scale, urbanising impact and harm to the landscape character, would cause material and detrimental harm to the character and setting of the existing settlement and the intrinsic

character, beauty and openness of the countryside contrary to Policies C2, D1 and D4 of Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and paragraphs 17 and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

3. Reason

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and that the proposal would not result in the fragmentation of agricultural or horticultural holdings so as to seriously undermine the economic viability of the remaining holding, contrary to Policy RD9 of Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

4. Reason

The proposal constitutes an unsustainable form of development as a result of its location and would lead to a significant increase in trips to and from a location which would be heavily dependent on car borne travel. Access by non car modes including public transport is extremely limited with very little scope to maximise viable sustainable transport modes. The development fails to comply with Policy M1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and the aims of objectives paragraph 34 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

5. Reason

Notwithstanding the objection in principle to the proposal under Reasons for Refusal 1 and 2 and, taking into account the absence of a signed legal agreement, the proposal would fail to provide affordable housing within the meaning of the NPPF, appropriate to meet Waverley Borough Council's housing need. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 50 of the NPPF as the development does not provide a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community.

6. Reason

Notwithstanding the objection in principle to the proposal under Reasons for Refusal 1 and 2, it is the policy of the Local Planning Authority, as set out in Policy H4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002, to ensure an appropriate mix of dwellings and an appropriate provision of dwellings suitable for small households. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would meet local housing requirements as set out within the Draft West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014. As such, the proposal is contrary to paragraph 50 of the NPPF and Policy H4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

7. Reason

The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement to secure contributions towards secondary education, highways improvements, playing pitches and recycling containers and therefore the proposal conflicts with Policies D13 and D14 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

The principal differences between the previously refused scheme and current scheme are set out in the following table.

<u>Proposed</u>	<u>WA/2014/2413</u>	<u>WA/2015/2261</u>
No. of dwellings	120	55
Site area	7.3 hectares	2.78 hectares
Mix of dwellings	Not specified	Affordable mix: 8 x 1 bed rent 8 x 2 bed (4 rent and 4 share ownership) 6 x 3 bed (4 rent and 2 shared ownership) Market mix: To be provided in accordance with SHMA 2015 recommendations
Affordable Housing Provision	40% - 48 dwellings	40% - 22 dwellings
Agricultural assessment impact	Not provided	Provided and agreed by the Council's Agricultural Consultant

The test for Members is whether having regard to the changes proposed in the current scheme in comparison with the refused scheme, the application has overcome the Council's previous reasons for refusal and is acceptable in its own right.

Environmental Impact Assessment

The applicants submitted a request for Screening Opinion from the Council on 16/10/2015. The proposed scheme has been assessed in line with the EIA Regulations 2011 and Government guidance and it has been concluded that likely significant effects would not occur in EIA terms. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development does not constitute EIA development.

Loss of Agricultural Land

The application site comprises arable farmland fringed by grass buffers to the east and partly to the north and south, whereas the east is open to the remainder of the farmland. Officers are satisfied that this is likely to be the lawful use of the land.

Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is

demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.

Policy RD9 of the Local Plan outlines that development will not be permitted which would result in the loss or alienation of the most versatile agricultural land unless it can be demonstrated that there is a strong case for development on a particular site that would override the need to protect such land.

On all grades of agricultural land, development will not be permitted which would result in the fragmentation of agricultural or horticultural holdings as to seriously undermine the economic viability of the remaining holding.

Under the previously refused application WA/2014/2413, the applicants failed to provide any information regarding the quality of the land and the holding to which it relates. The current application is supported by a detailed Agricultural Assessment, which states that the agricultural land is in arable use. The site forms part of a holding extending to approximately 53 ha (circa 130 acres), of which approximately 40 ha (100 acres) are agricultural land and the remainder is woodland.

An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, undertaken in accordance with the agreed practice for England and Wales, has determined that agricultural land across the Site is classified as Subgrade 3b. The Site does not, therefore, contain agricultural land defined as 'best and most versatile' (National Planning Policy Framework), which includes Grade 1, 2 and 3a. The Assessment also concludes that the loss of this small area (circa 5% of agricultural land on the holding) would have no significant effect upon the continued viability of the occupying farm business.

The Agricultural Assessment has been assessed by the Council's Agricultural Consultants who have confirmed that the Agricultural Appraisal has been prepared to a high standard and is sound in its findings.

The ALC survey has been carried out by a qualified and competent soil scientist in accordance with the current methodology and guidelines for classifying the quality of agricultural land. The survey has observed soil profiles at three locations within the site, which is at a slightly higher density than recommended by Natural England's Technical Information Note 049 and which will therefore give an accurate assessment of land quality. Moreover, the survey extended beyond the boundaries of the proposed development site which has the land quality within the context of surrounding land.

The survey has identified that the soil quality is classified as Subgrade 3b according to the ALC guidelines. There is one soil profile identified that has a coarser textured topsoil (sandy loam) which would be classified as Subgrade 3a (which is amongst the best and most versatile land) but the convention in ALC surveys is not to form mapping units from only a single observation, as it is unknown whether one sample location on its own is representative of the wider area. Instead, mapping units should only be formed from two or more

adjacent or contiguous observations of similar grades. Therefore, the classification of the site as Subgrade 3b is correct. As such, in terms of Policy RD9, the proposed development will not involve the loss or alienation of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

The Agricultural Appraisal also sets out the farming circumstances and the impact on the farm holding occupying the site. It indicates that the 2.7ha application site represents about 5% of the land farmed by the business which supplies forage on a contract basis to a local dairy farm, and that the proposed development would not prevent or affect access to the remainder of the land farmed. As such, in terms of Policy RD9, the loss of this land would not fragment or seriously undermine the viability of this farm business.

Location of Development

As noted above, the site is located within the Countryside beyond the Green Belt outside of any defined settlement area.

Paragraph 55 of the NPPF states that, to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.

Paragraph 69 of the NPPF states, inter alia, that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. It continues that local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see.

Paragraph 70 of the NPPF states that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

- plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;
- sustainability of communities and residential environments;
- guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;

- ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and
- ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.

The site forms part of a site that was identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2014, as a site promoted for housing development (ID:692). The SHLAA provides an initial assessment of the site, its characteristics and suitability for development, using a wide range of sustainability criteria of bespoke methodology, as set out in the Council's Interim Sustainability Report (2014).

The SHLAA presents the assessment of the sustainability criteria in form of a Red/Amber/Green (RAG) score. The overall score for the site was scored 'amber'. It should be noted that the site only forms a small section to the western edge of the 17.23 hectare site promoted for housing development.

Although the site has been identified in the 2014 SHLAA, it has not been included within the calculations informing the 5 year housing supply, as such sites are required to accord with footnote 11 to paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Footnote 11 states that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. At the time of the Council's most recent land supply assessment, the site did not benefit from planning permission nor was it allocated for housing. For these reasons it has not been included within the Council's current assessment. This would of course change if outline permission is granted.

A key part of the Council's Interim Sustainability Report is the service appraisal, which is an assessment of a site's accessibility to different services, which is widely recognised as one of the many indicators of the sustainability of site.

The Waverley Settlement Hierarchy Factual Update (2012) refers to the level of different services available in Alford, comprising both St Nicholas's Church and Alford Chapel, three Public houses; the Three Compasses, the Alford Barn and The Crown Public house (closed since April 2009). The single village shop also contains a Post Office and the BP garage on the A281 also has a small convenience shop.

There is a community/sport centre and a play area surrounded by sports fields and pitches on the Loxwood Road. Alford School closed a number of years ago and is now used as a pre-school (sited on the southern boundary of the site). There are no Surrey County Council maintained infant, primary, junior or secondary school in Alford.

However, there are three primary schools and one secondary school in Cranleigh, about 5 miles away. Some children also attend the junior school in Loxwood, West Sussex.

Residents attend Loxwood Medical Centre for healthcare, or travel to Cranleigh.

The Sustainability Appraisal submitted in support of this application considers that the methodology used in the Council's Interim Sustainability Report appraisal is unsuitable for this site. The applicants have therefore applied their own methodology using National Best Practice Guidance.

Officers have carefully considered the case set out in the applicant's Sustainability Appraisal.

Officers accept that the methodology used to inform the Council's Interim Sustainability Report service appraisal is at a high level within a specific purpose to act as an evidence base for the Local Plan. It is therefore not site specifically detailed.

However, the methodology is informed by County Council guidance at a local level, taking into account the characteristics of the County.

Officers are therefore satisfied that the methodology used to inform the Council's Interim Sustainability Report service appraisal is sound and is considered to be specific in relation to the characteristics of the County, particularly in comparison to National best practice guidance.

The applicant's Sustainability Appraisal identifies a village store, post office and bus stops within 800 metres of the site. However, it must be noted that the village store only stocks basic provisions and the post office has limited operating hours.

The majority of trips to places of employment, schools, supermarkets, etc... would be reliant on the use of the private car. The existing bus service (route 42) runs approximately every 90-120 minutes between 08:00 and 19:00. However, the nearest bus stops providing access to this service are at Alfold Crossways, which is located 800 metres from the site. The site is therefore not located within a reasonable walking distance of a regular bus service.

The assessment of the earlier scheme for the larger development proposed under WA/2014/2413 was refused by the Council, partly on the basis that the location of the site would result in a heavy reliance on the private motor vehicle to access the services and facilities required to facilitate social interaction and create healthy, inclusive communities.

This decision was informed by the opinion given by the Inspector on appeal in respect of a residential and community development comprising up to 33 dwellings (30% of which were proposed as affordable housing) and 10 car parking spaces at Chapel Fields, Loxwood Road, Alfold (WA/2013/1744 and

WA/2014/0685). The Inspector concluded in that appeal that “Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), also advises against permitting new isolated homes in open countryside except in a number of special circumstances, none of which are applicable here. While it could be argued that this site is not isolated because it is close to other houses, it is in a small settlement with very few services.”

Notwithstanding the above, the Council’s Executive agreed the Waverley Borough Local Plan – Emerging Spatial Strategy on 15/12/2015. The Strategy sets out that development should be directed to the four main settlements, moderate development in larger villages and some limited growth in / around other villages, which is where the Strategy includes reference to Alfold.

It also confirms that where greenfield development is planned, this should avoid major development on land of the highest amenity value such as the Surrey Hills AONB. Whilst this decision by the Executive does not constitute Council Policy, it does indicate the likely direction of travel for the emerging Local Plan and is considered to constitute a material consideration in the determination of the current application. Importantly, this is a new material consideration to take into account since the Council determined the application under WA/2014/2413.

A further change in circumstance is the determination of WA/2014/2028, at appeal. This application related to the provision of 43 homes on land at Gardners Hill Road, Farnham. This appeal decision confirms that for an application to be considered unacceptable, any harm must significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme.

It is accepted that previous decision for a larger scheme at the site (WA/2014/2413), and that previously considered at Chapel Fields (WA/2013/1744 and WA/2014/0685) must be taken into account. However, weight must also be given to material changes in circumstance.

In addition and critically, the County Highway Authority has removed its objection to development on the site on transport sustainability grounds, subject to a contribution to the bus service infrastructure and improvements to the local footpath network.

These additional considerations have a material impact upon the planning balance, which must be applied to proposed development, as required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

It is considered that whilst the site is located within a relatively unsustainable location in terms of access to services and facilities, the scale of development, which is significantly smaller than that previously refused, is not such that would result in a significant level of vehicular movements. As such, the principle of development in this location is considered to be acceptable.

Housing Land Supply

Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area, they should, inter alia, prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs; and prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should use their evidence bases to ensure their Local Plan meets the full needs for market and affordable housing in the Borough, and should identify and update annually a five-year supply of specific and deliverable sites against their housing requirements. Further, a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth should be identified for years 6-11 and, where possible, 11-15. LPAs should also set their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances and to boost significantly the supply of housing.

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF continues that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework directs that in order to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should: inter alia plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that are required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.

The provision of new market and affordable housing will assist in addressing the Council's housing land supply requirements. Following the withdrawal of the Core Strategy from examination in October 2013, the Council agreed an interim housing target of 250 dwellings a year for the purposes of establishing five year housing supply in December 2013. That was the target in the revoked South East Plan and is the most recent housing target for Waverley that has been tested and adopted. However, as a result of court judgements, it is accepted that the Council should not use the South East Plan figure as its starting point for its five year housing supply and that the Council does not currently have an up-to-date housing supply policy from which to derive a five year housing land requirement.

It is acknowledged that the latest evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment points to a higher level of housing need in Waverley than that outlined within the South East Plan. The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment September 2015 indicates an unvarnished figure of at least 519 dwellings per annum. The latest 5 year housing land supply assessment shows a supply of 4.33 years, based on the unvarnished housing

supply figure above. This falls short of the 5 year housing land supply as required by the NPPF.

Should outline permission be granted, the proposed development would be included within the Council's housing land supply assessment, and therefore assist in meeting the identified shortfall. This is a material consideration to be weighed against the other considerations for this application.

Housing Mix

The NPPF states that in order to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends; identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that are required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and where it is identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution can be robustly justified.

Policy H4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002, in respect of housing mix, is considered to be broadly consistent with the approach in the NPPF. It outlines the Council's requirements for mix as follows:

- a) at least 50% of all the dwelling units within the proposal shall be 2 bedroomed or less; and,
- b) not less than 80% of all the dwelling units within the proposal shall be 3 bedroomed or less; and,
- c) no more than 20% of all the dwelling units in any proposal shall exceed 165 square metres in total gross floor area measured externally, excluding garaging.

The density element of Policy H4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 is given limited weight following the guidance in the NPPF which states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should set their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.

Rather than prescribing a minimum or maximum density, the NPPF sets out, at paragraph 47, that Local Planning Authorities should set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) provides an updated likely profile of household types within Waverley. The evidence in the SHMA is more up to date than the Local Plan. However, the profile of households requiring market housing demonstrated in the SHMA at Borough level is broadly in line with the specific requirements of Policy H4.

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2015 sets out the likely profile of household types in the housing market area.

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) sets out the likely profile of household types in the housing market area. The SHMA 2015 provides the following information with regards to the indicative requirements for different dwelling sizes.

Unit type	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4+ Bed
Market	10 %	30%	40%	20%
Affordable	40%	30%	25%	5%

In addition to the West Surrey SHMA, the recently published West Surrey SHMA: Waverley Addendum 2015 provides more specific information for the Borough. This includes indicative requirements for different dwelling sizes for both market and affordable housing.

Table 15: Estimated Need by Number of Bedrooms (2013 to 2033) – Affordable Sector

Area	1 bedroom	2 bedrooms	3 bedrooms	4+ bedrooms
Godalming	41.4%	34.7%	22.4%	1.5%
Farnham	45.0%	28.7%	24.3%	1.9%
Haslemere	51.6%	26.9%	19.9%	1.6%
Cranleigh	52.0%	27.9%	18.5%	1.6%
Rest of Borough	50.3%	26.9%	21.4%	1.5%
Waverley	47.3%	29.2%	21.9%	1.7%

Source: Housing Market Model

Table 18: Estimated Need by Number of Bedrooms (2013 to 2033) – Market Sector

Area	1 bedroom	2 bedrooms	3 bedrooms	4+ bedrooms
Godalming	12.2%	36.3%	37.4%	14.0%
Farnham	8.1%	31.9%	39.7%	20.4%
Haslemere	13.7%	32.6%	34.1%	19.7%
Cranleigh	9.1%	30.3%	38.0%	22.5%
Rest of Borough	5.9%	29.5%	39.2%	25.4%
Waverley	9.3%	32.1%	38.2%	20.4%

Source: Housing Market Model

It is noted that this provides an alternate requirement to the West Surrey SHMA 2015, and is considered to be the most appropriate evidence in terms of identifying local need.

The application has not specified the mix of housing proposed, advising in the Planning Support Statement that ‘the detailed design scheme will incorporate an appropriate housing mix in agreement with the Council that will reflect the headline needs emerging in the SHMA’. However, since the submission of the application, further details of an indicative affordable housing mix have been provided which would meet the Council’s need, as set out with the SHMA 2015.

It is therefore considered the proposal has adequately demonstrated that the site is capable of demonstrating an appropriate mix of housing to meet the Council's housing needs. If permission is granted, a future reserved matters application would be required to provide a detailed layout including an appropriate mix of housing.

In light of the above, the proposal has demonstrated that an appropriate housing mix could be achieved and therefore complies with Policy H4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and the up to date evidence with the SHMA.

Affordable Housing

The NPPF outlines that to deliver a wide choice of quality homes, local planning authorities should identify where affordable housing is needed and identify policies for meeting this on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution can be robustly justified.

The Local Plan is silent with regards to the delivery of affordable dwellings in locations such as this. Specifically, there is no threshold or percentage requirement in the Local Plan for affordable housing on sites outside of settlements. This is because, within an area of restraint, housing development under the current Local Plan is unacceptable in principle, including affordable housing.

If, however, the principle of housing on this site is supported, then the provision of affordable housing could be regarded as a benefit of considerable weight to justify releasing the site from the countryside.

There is a considerable need for affordable housing across the Borough and securing more affordable homes is a key corporate priority.

As a strategic housing authority, the Council has a role in promoting the development of additional affordable homes to help meet need, particularly as land supply for development is limited. Planning mechanisms are an essential part of the Council's strategy of meeting local housing needs.

Paragraph 50 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community, and should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that are required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.

As of 01 1 February 2016, there are 1,566 households with applications on the Council's Housing Needs Register, who are unable to access housing to meet their needs in the market. This has been broken down as follows:

	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4-bed	TOTAL
WBC Housing Register	966	410	161	N/A	1537

SHMA 2015 recommendation	40%	30%	25%	5%	100%
Suggested affordable mix for this application	8 (8 rent)	8 (4 rent 4 s/o)	6 (4 rent 2 s/o)	0	22

Table 1

Although there is a low local need for affordable housing in Alford, as the proposal comprises an exception to planning policy, there is no requirement for the provision of affordable housing to be prioritised for households with a local connection.

Given the significant need for affordable housing borough wide, Officers would expect this application to meet this need, the demand for which is reflected in the 1,588 households on the Council's Housing Need Register (Table 1).

Additionally, the West Surrey SHMA (2015) indicates a continued need for affordable housing, with an additional 337 additional affordable homes being required per annum.

Affordable housing is one of the Council's Corporate Plan priorities and the provision of on-site affordable housing is supported.

The Parish Council have raised concerns that there is not a significant need for housing within the village of Alford. Whilst their comments are noted, the Council's up to date SHMA data demonstrates a significant Borough wide need for housing. The Council is currently unable to meet its identified housing need. The proposed development would make a reasonable contribution, in taking account of both the local and Borough needs.

The application seeks to provide 40% affordable housing on the site, equating to 22 dwellings.

The Council's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (2012) provides evidence to support the policy approach in the now withdrawn Core Strategy, which was to secure 40% affordable on development sites of 15 or more dwellings.

This up to date evidence relating to affordable housing and viability will continue to inform the development of the Policy.

The applicants are confident that the proposed 40% affordable housing provision can be provided within the scheme. The applicant is willing to agree a mix of affordable housing as part of the S106 Legal Agreement, which closely reflects the SHMA recommendations as well as providing a suitable tenure mix of 50% shared ownership dwellings and 50% affordable rent units. Therefore, subject to the completion of a suitable Legal Agreement, the 40% affordable housing provision is considered to a matter that weighs significantly in favour of the proposal.

Highway Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 outlines that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. In considering developments that generate significant amounts of movements local authorities should seek to ensure they are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Plans and decisions should take account of whether improvements can be taken within the transport network that cost-effectively limit the significant impact of the development.

Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states: “All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”.

Local Plan Policy M4 states that the Council will seek to improve conditions for pedestrians by providing or securing safe and attractive pedestrian routes and facilities in both urban and rural areas. Developments should include safe, convenient and attractively designed pedestrian routes linking to existing or proposed pedestrian networks, to public open space, to local facilities and amenities, or to public transport.

The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) which assesses existing transport conditions in the area and assesses the impact of the proposed development.

The County Highway Authority is satisfied that the Traffic Impact Assessment undertaken and reported within the TA provides a robust and realistic assessment of the likely impact of the development on the highway network.

It is proposed to construct a new vehicular access from Loxwood Road to serve the development. The access would be provided at a point approximately 30 metres to the south of the existing field gate access, which would be stopped up. The access arrangements would take the form of a simple priority junction. Visibility splays of 90 metres would be provided from the site access.

The Trip Generation and Assessment section of the TA advises that the predicated traffic generation for the proposed development is based on a TRICS assessment for 55 privately owned houses, to reflect the maximum possible movements that could be possible from the site. In such assessments, the inclusion of an affordable housing percentage would reduce the predicted level of traffic movements.

The predicated traffic generation assessment demonstrates that the proposed development has the potential to generate 388 vehicular movements across a typical day. This would include 33 two way vehicle movements in the weekday morning peaks (between 08.00-09.00) and 36 two way vehicular movement in evening peaks (between 17.00-18.00). This would therefore mean the movement of approximately 1 vehicle every 2 minutes in peak hours.

The Traffic Counts provided indicate the movements existing along Loxwood during peak hours. On the basis that trips to / from the site would be distributed based on the existing profile of traffic on Loxwood Road, during each of the peak hours there would be approximately 20 additional vehicle movements at the Alfold Crossways junction to the north of the site, with the remainder of vehicle movements (approximately 15) travelling to / from the centre of Alfold to the south.

The Highway Capacity Assessment section of the TA has taken into consideration the impact of a future development scheme granted consent within the area, but not as yet implemented, such as the development at Wildwood Golf Course, comprising an 84 bedroom hotel, 39 golf lodges (accommodating 91 bedrooms), a golf academy building and ancillary facilities (WA/2010/1489).

It is considered that the Site Access/Loxwood Road junction would operate well post development, with no queueing. This was also considered acceptable for the significantly larger scheme proposed for 120 dwellings under WA/2014/2413, although it should be noted that this former assessment accounted for the provision of 140 dwellings.

In terms of the Alfold Crossways junction, in the 2019 assessment year, the maximum queue without development is predicted to be 3 vehicles, with a maximum Ratio Flow Capacity (RFC) of 0.722 being identified. This represents the junctions being at 72% of its capacity and only when it would reach 85% is mitigation considered. Assuming development (based on 140 dwellings) this is anticipated to increase to a RFC 0.776 (77%) with the maximum queue again being 3 vehicles. As such, even assuming traffic associated with 140 dwellings, it is considered that the operation of the Alfold Crossways junction would remain below the generally accepted threshold for free flow conditions of 0.85. As a result, it is not considered that the proposed scheme would result in any increase in vehicle queues on this junction.

Officers therefore conclude that the junction would not be subject to any capacity constraints that would be likely to lead to unacceptable periods of delay.

In this regard, it is considered that the proposals would not have an adverse effect upon the strategic road network.

The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed access and movement strategy for the development would enable all highway users to travel to/from the site with safety and convenience.

The County Highway Authority have requested the following highway safety improvements, in order to accommodate the proposed site access and betterment at the Alfold Crossways junction with the A281. These improvements have been agreed with the applicants:

1. Provide speed reduction measures in the vicinity of the site access, in general accordance with RGP's Drawing No. 2014/2175/007 Rev D and subject to the Highway Authority's technical and safety requirements;
2. Construct the Alfold Crossways junction safety improvement scheme;
3. Provide accessibility improvements on Loxwood Road, comprising dropped kerbs and tactile paving, between the proposed site access and the Alfold Crossways junction;
4. £35,000 contribution for speed reduction measures on Loxwood Road between the Alfold Crossways junction and the County boundary, located approximately 500 metres to the south of the Rosemary Lane junction with Loxwood Road.

As such, it is considered that the package of highway safety measures agreed would help to increase awareness of the junction and would assist in reducing/controlling vehicles speeds through the junction.

Having regard to the expert views of the County Highway Authority, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway safety and capacity considerations.

In addition to highway safety and capacity concerns, the scheme must also be acceptable in terms of sustainability.

The NPPF advises that plans and decisions for developments that generate a significant amount of traffic should take account of whether opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure.

The proposal includes two pedestrian access points into the site, ensuring connectivity and permeability through the site for pedestrians. Improvements to the local footpath / byway network is also proposed through a contribution to the County Highway Authority and improved crossing facilities across Loxwood Road, for pedestrians, would be provided

The County Highway Authority has not raised any objection to the scheme in this regard. This is in contrast to its response to the large scheme proposed

under WA/2014/2413, where an objection was raised on transport sustainability grounds. The reason for the County Highway Authority's change in approach is due to the reduced scale of development and the significantly less vehicle movements that would result.

As such, the proposal the proposal would comply with Policies M1 and M4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 as well as the transport sustainability requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on Countryside beyond the Green Belt

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out that within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking.

These 12 principles are that planning should: inter alia take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it.

Policy C2 of the Local Plan states that building in the countryside, away from existing settlements will be strictly controlled. Policy C2 is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF in that it seeks to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The two settlements of Alford and Alford Crossways are separated by open countryside. Development in Alford Crossways is mainly concentrated around Loxwood Road and its junction with the A281. Alford Crossways is more developed than the historic part of Alford to the south.

Although there are two small housing estates in Alford Crossways, the remaining development is spread in a linear fashion along each side of Loxwood and Horsham Road, with limited backland development.

The site forms agricultural land, which comprises a section of an open arable field that extends up to Sweeters Copse in the east.

To the north of the site are the residential properties in Chilton Close and the property 'Mercedes' which fronts Loxwood Road. Trees and hedgerows run along the northern, western and southern boundaries. Beyond the southern boundary is a former primary school, now used as a children's nursery school.

The proposal would replace part of an open field with substantial, urban built form. The earlier refused application for the larger development under WA/2014/2413 resulted in significant concerns about its impact upon the character and setting of the village due to its scale, and eastward projection.

As noted above, a feature of the layout of Alford Crossways is the absence of significant backland development, resulting in a linear form to the pattern of

the settlement. It is considered that the proposed layout and indicative siting of dwellings, which would not extend beyond existing built form to the north of the application site would reflect the linear form of the settlement.

Concern was also raised in relation to the previous application (WA/2014/2413) regarding the erosion of the gap between the historic core of Alfold and Alfold Crossways. This issue is also relevant to the current scheme. However, the impact would be far less harmful due to the scale of the development and the lack of any development extending beyond the eastern extent of development to the north.

Whilst it is fully accepted that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the open field, it the Officers' view that the significant reduction in the scale of the development would minimise the harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside beyond the appeal site. The indicative layout suggests open space and landscaping to the eastern side of the site where it adjoins the open countryside. This would help minimise the impact of the development upon the wider area.

Officers recognise the site forms part of the wider countryside immediately outside of the settlement of Alfold. It is further recognised that the proposals would have some impact in comparison to the existing site situation. The proposals by virtue of its reduced scale in comparison with the refused scheme WA/2014/2413, would have materially less harmful impacts on the character and appearance of the countryside. The impact on the designated countryside is, however, one of many material considerations in the assessment of this case. The impact upon the open character and beauty of the countryside should be weighed in the planning balance.

Impact on Landscape Character

The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. The level of effect on a landscape is derived by combining the sensitivity of the receptor (its value and susceptibility to change) and the magnitude of change likely to be experienced.

The site forms part of rural landscape which surrounds and forms the open countryside setting for the settlements of Alfold Crossways and Alfold.

County guidance 'The Future of Surrey's Landscape and Woodland' (1997) advises that the site is situated within the Low Weald Regional Countryside Character Area and at a more local level, within in the Wooded Weald County Landscape Area.

This landscape area is described as 'a low lying, undulating, small scale, intimate farmed landscape, enclosed by woodlands, hedges and shaws'.

The Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVA) submitted in support of this application has considered the effects of the proposed development and its landscape setting upon the settlement of Alfold Crossways.

Officers generally agree with the conclusions of the LVA that there would be limited long distance views of the built form of the proposal as a result of intervening fields, boundary hedgerows, wood land and undulating topography. Therefore, views of the site achievable from Bridleway BW405 to the south of the site and Footpath FP406 would be well filtered and restrictive.

The majority of the views of site would therefore be more localised, particularly from Loxwood Road and footpath FP415a (through Satchel Court Drive), where views of the proposed built form would be achievable through the existing boundary treatment, the proposed access to the site and through the boundary treatment aligning the highway.

The LVA considered that views of the proposal from Loxwood Road would be 'minor/moderate adverse' and could be mitigated by the retention of the highway boundary vegetation and trees and by aligning the new built form at the western edge of the application site with the existing building line to the north, behind the strip of common land, which would allow for the creation of green space parallel to the road.

In the determination of the previously refused scheme (WA/2014/2413), it was concluded the retention of established planting would be important from a visual and ecological viewpoint. However, it was considered that the existing highway boundary treatment was not of a height and density that would successfully screen the presence of built form of the proposal from Loxwood Road, particularly in winter months.

Whilst the above conclusion is noted, the proposed development is of a lesser scale to that previously refused under WA/2014/2413 and although harm would result, it is considered that the harm would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application in terms of landscape visual impact.

Further views of the built form of the proposal would be achievable from the publicly accessible areas of Chilton Close from the hammer head of Chilton Close and the gaps through the intervening houses.

The LVA considers that views achievable from Chilton Close public viewpoints to be minor/moderate and mitigated by hedgerow planting along the northern and western elevations of the wildflower meadow and the provision of a new pedestrian link footpath.

Given that there would only be restricted views in a southerly direction, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable visual harm when viewed from Chilton Close.

It is considered that the proposal would result in localised views of built form, although it is considered that it would reflect the layout of existing

development along Loxwood Road. Therefore, whilst there would be inevitable harm through the loss of an open field as a result of the development, the harm would not be so significant or demonstrable as to outweigh the other benefits of the scheme. In addition, the proposal would only impact upon localised viewpoints and the site is not subject to any specific landscape designation.

Impact on Trees

The NPPF states that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh the loss.

Policies D6 and D7 broadly support the aims of the NPPF stating that the Council will protect significant trees and groups of trees and hedgerows through planning control.

The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has assessed the supporting Arboricultural Development Report, prepared by Arbtech, dated November 2015.

It is regrettable that the prominent Maple tree (T7) would be lost to accommodate the access arrangements, and concern is raised that the Arboricultural Impact Assessment understates the realistic extent of tree removal required for an engineered road and culvert.

It is noted that Ancient and Semi Ancient Woodland exists to the east of the site, which forms Sweeters Copse. The proposed development is detached from this woodland, and is not considered to have any impact upon its visual and ecological value.

However, the Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has not raised objection in principle to the development, but has recommended a number of conditions to cover issues to be dealt with in a reserved matters application in the event the permission is granted. Officers consider that the proposal, subject to conditions, would preserve important trees and hedgerows and replacement / additional planting would ensure help mitigate the loss of Maple Tree at the site entrance.

Impact on Visual Amenity

The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment as a key part of sustainable development. Although planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes, they should seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 accord with the NPPF in requiring development to have high quality design and to be well related in size, scale and character to its surroundings.

Paragraph 58 of the Framework further directs that planning decisions should establish a strong sense of place, creating attractive and comfortable places to live in and respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings.

Whilst the application is in outline form, with all matters reserved except access, illustrative layout plans and a Design and Access Statement have been submitted, providing information to demonstrate how the design, character and layout have evolved.

The indicative plan gives some basic information about the parameters for development including the quantity and scale of the proposed development. Officers are satisfied that the site could adequately accommodate the number of dwellings proposed.

Alford Crossways is predominantly a linear settlement and the proposed layout reflects the layout of development immediately north of the application site. The mature hedgerow along the sites front boundary would also be retained and would help to soften the visual impact of the development, when viewed from Loxwood Road.

The Parish Council have raised concerns with the impact of street lighting on visual amenity, given the absence of such in the village. This matter is noted and a condition of approval, should outline permission be granted, would require the submission of a lighting strategy, to prevent any visual harm to the character of the area.

As a result the proposed scheme would not have a detrimental visual impact upon the character of the settlement and is therefore considered to be acceptable on these grounds.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The NPPF identifies that within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision making. These 12 principles include that planning should seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

These principles are supported by Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan and guidance contained within the Council's SPD for Residential Extensions.

The nearest existing residential properties to the proposed development lie along the north of the site.

The layout plan is only indicative at this stage, but given the proximity of the proposed dwellings from these boundaries and the presence of landscaping and open space buffering, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any detrimental loss of light or privacy to these properties.

The construction phase of the development has the potential to cause disruption and inconvenience to nearby occupiers and users of the local highway network.

However, these issues are transient and could be minimised through the requirements of planning conditions, if outline permission is granted.

Although in outline with all matters except access reserved, Officers consider that sufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that, subject to detailed consideration at a future stage, a scheme could be developed which would provide a good standard of amenity for future and existing occupiers.

Provision of Amenity and Play Space

On promoting healthy communities, the NPPF sets out that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve places which promote safe and accessible developments, with high quality public space which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. These should include high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation which can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.

Policy H10 of the Local Plan addresses amenity and play space in housing developments. Although there are no set standards for garden sizes, the policy requires that a usable 'outdoor area' should be provided in association with residential development and that 'appropriate provision for children's play' is required.

The Council uses the standard recommended by Fields in Trust (FIT) for assessing the provision of outdoor playing space.

The proposed indicative scheme identifies provision one an area of play with the public open space to the eastern part of the site. In accordance with Policy H10 of the Local Plan, the provision of a Locally Equipped Area of Play would be required. A LEAP comprises a play area equipped mainly for children of early school age (4-8 years old) and should be a minimum of 400 sq. metres. LEAPs should be located within five minutes walking time from every home (400m walking distance).

Officers consider that sufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that, subject to detailed consideration at a future stage, a scheme could be developed which would provide a good standard of play space for the future community.

The provision of areas of open public space in the layout would contribute to creating the sense of place and character of the area.

The plans show an indicative layout which indicates that individual garden sizes would be appropriate.

Flood Risk and Drainage Considerations

Paragraph 100 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at high risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Paragraph 101 of the NPPF states that the aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. A sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk from any form of flooding.

Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment following the Sequential Test, and if required the Exception Test, it can be demonstrated that:

- within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; and
- development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant.

In a Written Ministerial Statement on the 18th December 2014, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government set out the Government's expectation that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will be provided in new developments, wherever this is appropriate.

Decisions on planning applications relating to major developments should ensure that SuDS for the management of run-off are put in place, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. Under these arrangements, Local Planning Authorities should consult the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) on the management of surface water; satisfy themselves that the proposed minimum standards of operation are appropriate and ensure through the use of planning conditions or planning obligations that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development. The SuDS should be designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation requirements are economically proportionate.

The NPPG states that whether SuDS should be considered will depend on the proposed development and its location, for example where there are concerns about flooding. SuDS may not be practicable for some forms of development. New development should only be considered appropriate in areas at risk of flooding if priority has been given to the use of SuDS. When considering major development, SuDS should be provided unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. Whether a SuDS system is appropriate to a particular

development proposal is a matter of judgement for the Local Planning Authority and advice should be sought from relevant flood risk management bodies, principally the LLFA.

The application site, including the access, falls wholly within Flood Zone 1. However, the site overlies a 'Major Aquifer', as shown on the Environment Agency's ground vulnerability mapping.

Notwithstanding, the proposed development for residential purposes is classified as 'More Vulnerable', the use is consistent with the appropriate uses for Flood Zone 1, as outlined in Table 2 of the NPPF – Technical Guidance Document. It is not therefore necessary to consider the sequential or exception tests in this instance.

However, the application relates to a major development and the site area exceeds 1 ha in site area and there is known groundwater flooding issues off-site within the village of Alfold and insufficient capacity within the foul sewerage system. Therefore, a site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required and one has been submitted with the application.

The FRA outlines that the site has less than a 0.1% or 1 in 1,000 year annual probability of fluvial flooding, which is within acceptable limits for fluvial flooding.

The FRA goes on to confirm that sewer flooding occurs due to limited capacity or blockage in the sewer system causing backing up of storm water and effluent. In terms of groundwater and surface water flooding, the site is identified as being at a 'medium' risk of flooding, with only one small, localised area to the west part of the site being liable to flooding in the most extreme event from surface water.

The proposal would result in a significant amount of impermeable area. As such, methods to attenuate the increase in surface run off will need to be introduced.

The FRA suggests that the feasibility of SuDS on this site are low as a result of the poor levels of infiltration in the land and therefore recommends the use of two attenuation ponds and permeable paving to attenuate surface water on site to existing ditches.

Whilst the FRA does refer to the SuDS Hierarchy with regards to the proposed drainage design, further evidence is required to back the proposed solution. Infiltration should be considered before discharge to watercourse in accordance with the SuDS Hierarchy.

The LLFA has considered these proposals and have confirmed that there are records of Internal and External property flooding immediately offsite. This has not been considered within the FRA. The ditch the application proposes to connect to has historically breached capacity, i.e. it has resulted in surface water flooding, and may have contributed to the downstream flooding. Water

must not be discharged into this ditch at a greater rate than the Greenfield runoff rate.

In light of the above comments, the LLFA has recommended a condition that requires evidence to adequately demonstrate that infiltration is not a viable option to deal with surface water drainage.

Given that this is a technical matter, Officers and the LLFA are content that final details could be secured by condition, should outline planning permission be granted.

Notwithstanding, it is considered that the on-site attenuation system would improve the existing off-site surface water flooding issues within the locality, as during storm events there would be greater on-site storage of rain water, which at present leaves the site in an uncontrolled manner.

In terms of foul water drainage, the application proposes an on-site package treatment plant, as there is insufficient capacity within the sewer network. The Environment Agency have not raised any objection to the package treatment plant, although they have made a comment regarding the impact of a proliferation of such plant on water quality. However, they have not considered that application in detail. In addition, the use of package treatment plant will be subject to separate legislation in terms of its output and water quality to ensure that it does not harm existing water quality.

It is considered that the use of a Package Treatment Plant is acceptable in principle, and appropriate in the case of this application given the existing capacity issues within the sewerage system. Final details of the Treatment Plant will be secured by condition, should the application be approved and to on-going management, maintenance and financial responsibilities of both the SuDS and Package Treatment Plant is to be secured within the S106 Legal Agreement. This would ensure the ongoing ability for these systems to serve the development in perpetuity.

Having regard to the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, together with the comments and recommended conditions from the LLFA, it is considered that the proposal has adequately addressed flood risk, surface water and ground water flooding risk in accordance with the NPPF 2012.

Noise Impacts

Paragraph 123 of the NPPF states that Planning policies and decisions should aim to:

- avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development;
- mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions;

- recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and
- identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

The Council's Environmental Health Officers have confirmed that the noise from construction works would be likely to have an adverse effect upon surrounding land uses. Therefore it is necessary to mitigate against and minimise the impact of the noise levels. Environmental Health Officers are content that the impact could be minimised and mitigated through the imposition of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, which would be secured by Condition if the application is approved.

Air Quality Impacts

Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: *inter alia* preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location.

The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account.

Paragraph 124 states that planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan.

Policy D1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 states that the Council will have regard to the environmental implications of development and will promote and encourage enhancement of the environment. Development will not be permitted where it would result in material detriment to the environment by virtue of *inter alia* (c) loss of general amenity, including material loss of natural light and privacy enjoyed by neighbours and disturbance resulting from the emission of noise, light or vibration; (d) levels of traffic which are incompatible with the local highway network or cause significant environmental harm by virtue of noise and disturbance; (e) potential pollution of air, land or water, including that arising from light pollution and from the storage and use of hazardous substances

In the same vein, Policy D2 states that the Council will seek to ensure that proposed and existing land uses are compatible. In particular *inter alia* (a) development, which may have a materially detrimental impact on sensitive uses with regard to environmental disturbance or pollution, will not be permitted.

The introduction of residential properties to the area may expose the future occupants to air pollution associated with road traffic and is likely to increase road usage in the area by the occupants.

There are also potential concerns relating to local air quality through any potential emissions during the construction phases of the project, affecting existing receptors in the area through potential fugitive dust emissions and by increased traffic to the site during development.

It should be noted that the impact of dust and emissions from construction could have a significant impact on local air quality. As there is no safe level of exposure, all reduction in emissions would be beneficial.

The proposal would increase vehicular traffic which would have a significant additional effect on the air quality in this location as occupants would be likely to commute to their work, educational and shopping destinations.

Notwithstanding the above, in the event permission were to be granted, Officers are satisfied that air quality could be suitably controlled through conditions to include a Construction Site Management Plan, and the Council's Environmental Health Team has not raised any concern with regard to impact upon air quality through increased traffic movements.

Archaeological Considerations

Paragraph 128 of the NPPF sets out that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.

Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

The site is not located within an Area of High Archaeological Potential. However, due to the size of the site and pursuant to Policy HE15 of the Local

Plan, it is necessary for the application to take account of the potential impact on archaeological interests.

The application is supported with a Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, prepared by ASE, dated November 2015, which concludes that there is potential for archaeological remains to survive within the site and that a programme of archaeological evaluation works be undertaken to confirm the presence, or absence, and condition of survival of any archaeological remains, should they be present at the site, ahead of any ground works.

The County Archaeologist has agreed that remains of national importance are unlikely to be present on the site. The County Archaeologist has therefore recommended that archaeological interests could be controlled through the imposition of a condition securing a written scheme of investigation, which would be carried out prior to development commencing.

Crime and Disorder

S17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a duty to consider crime and disorder implications on local authorities. In exercising its various functions, each authority should have due regard to the likely effect of those functions on, and the need to do all that it can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area. This requirement is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that planning policies and decisions should promote safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

Paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 highlights that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities.

To this end, planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve places which promote inter alia safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.

The proposal is in outline form and the detailed design and layout would be considered at reserved matters stage if outline permission were to be granted.

The principle of development and proposed access would not be likely to give rise to crime and disorder in the area.

Infrastructure

Policy D13 of the Local Plan states that “development will only be permitted where adequate infrastructure, services and facilities are available, or where the developer has made suitable arrangements for the provision of the infrastructure, services and facilities directly made necessary by the proposed development. The Council will have regard to the cumulative impact of

development, and developers may be required to contribute jointly to necessary infrastructure improvements”.

Local Plan Policy D14 goes on to set out the principles behind the negotiation of planning obligations required in connection with particular forms of new development. The current tests for legal agreements are set out in Regulation 122 (2) of the CIL Regulations 2010 and the guidance within the NPPF.

The three tests as set out in Regulation 122(2) require s106 agreements to be:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The NPPF emphasises that to ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as infrastructure contributions should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

From 6th April 2015, CIL Regulation 123 was amended to mean that the use of pooled contributions under Section 106 of the Town Country Planning Act are restricted.

At that point, no more may be collected in respect of a specific infrastructure project or a type of infrastructure through a Section 106 agreement, if five or more obligations for that project or type of infrastructure have already been entered into since 6th April 2010 and it is a type of infrastructure that is capable of being funded by CIL.

In the light of the above change, the infrastructure providers have been requested to confirm that the identified contributions contained within the PIC calculator meet the tests of CIL Regulations 122 and 123. The final obligations to be included within the Section 106 agreement will need to satisfy the tests of the Regulations.

The highway infrastructure improvements identified specifically address the impacts of the development and are also considered to be proportionate in scale to the proposed development. The justification for these improvements is demonstrated in detail within the Transport section of this report.

In terms of the education contributions, the County Council have requested contributions to both early years and primary education. The early years contribution is to be spent on infrastructure in the Dunsfold and Cranleigh area. The developer contribution requested for this development would be applied to develop an existing early years setting near the proposed development to enable the setting to offer more early years places. At present, no other contributions have been secured for the infrastructure projects nominated.

The County have stated that there is a need for increased capacity at a number of primary schools in the local area. The developer contribution requested for this development would be applied to a project at Cranleigh Primary School, to provide Key Stage 2 (junior) classrooms to allow the school to accommodate more children. The school is within 1 mile of the proposed development, and is a popular choice for families in the area; it is therefore reasonable to assume that children from the development would apply for a place at the school. Three other developer contributions have already been sought for the infrastructure project nominated. This relates to the following planning applications; WA/2015/2127, WA/2015/1569 and WA/2014/1754.

This application proposes the erection of 55 dwellings and the Heads of Terms outlined earlier within the report are considered to be justified. Also, the proposed contributions would not result in the pooling of more than 5 contributions towards one specific piece of infrastructure. The infrastructure improvements required would therefore comply with CIL Regulations 122 and 123.

The applicant has drafted a S106 Legal Agreement to secure these works, which would ensure that appropriate mitigation could be secured to prevent adverse impacts resulting upon infrastructure and the development. Subject to the completion of the agreement, the development would accord with Policies D13 and D14 of the Local Plan 2002.

Health and Wellbeing

Local Planning Authorities should ensure that health and wellbeing, and health infrastructure are considered in local and neighbourhood plans and in planning decision making. Public health organisations, health service organisations, commissioners and providers, and local communities should use this guidance to help them work effectively with local planning authorities in order to promote healthy communities and support appropriate health infrastructure.

The NPPG sets out that the range of issues that could be considered through the plan-making and decision-making processes, in respect of health and healthcare infrastructure, include how:

- development proposals can support strong, vibrant and healthy communities and help create healthy living environments which should, where possible, include making physical activity easy to do and create places and spaces to meet to support community engagement and social capital;
- the local plan promotes health, social and cultural wellbeing and supports the reduction of health inequalities;
- the local plan considers the local health and wellbeing strategy and other relevant health improvement strategies in the area;

- the healthcare infrastructure implications of any relevant proposed local development have been considered;
- opportunities for healthy lifestyles have been considered (e.g. planning for an environment that supports people of all ages in making healthy choices, helps to promote active travel and physical activity, and promotes access to healthier food, high quality open spaces and opportunities for play, sport and recreation);
- potential pollution and other environmental hazards, which might lead to an adverse impact on human health, are accounted for in the consideration of new development proposals; and
- access to the whole community by all sections of the community, whether able-bodied or disabled, has been promoted.

The provision of open space in the scheme is considered to be positive in terms of the health and well being of future residents and also existing residents near the site.

The Council has sought the views of NHS England, Health Watch, Guildford and Waverley Clinical Commissioning Group and the Director of Public Health for Surrey. These bodies have not raised concerns against the proposed development.

Nonetheless, officers are satisfied that the scheme makes provision for access for the whole community and that any environmental hazards arising from the development would be minimised or sufficiently mitigated.

Officers conclude that the proposed development would ensure that health and wellbeing, and health infrastructure have been suitably addressed in the application.

Financial Considerations

Section 70 subsection 2 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) states that any local financial considerations are a matter to which local planning authorities must have regard to in determining planning applications; as far as they are material for the application.

The weight to be attached to these considerations is a matter for the decision maker.

Local financial considerations are defined as grants from Government or sums payable to the authority under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This means that the New Homes Bonus (NHB) is capable of being a material consideration where relevant. In the current case, the approval of the application would mean that the NHB would be payable for the net increase in dwellings from this development.

The Head of Finance has calculated the indicative figure of £1,450 per net additional dwelling, (total of £79,750) per annum for six years. A supplement of £350 over a 6 year period is payable for all affordable homes provided for in the proposal.

Climate Change and Sustainability

The Local Plan does not require this type of development to achieve a particular rating of the Code for Sustainable Homes or include renewable energy technologies. The lack of any policy backing in this regard, therefore, prevents conditions being added to require this.

Biodiversity and Compliance with Habitat Regulations 2010

The NPPF states that the Planning System should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts upon biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.

When determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for then planning permission should be refused.

In addition, Circular 06/2005 states 'It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before planning permission is granted.' The National Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 states that the Council as Local Planning Authority has a legal duty of care to protect biodiversity.

The application is accompanied by an Ecological Appraisal, Including Species Survey Reports, prepared by Complete Land Management LLP, dated November 2015.

This report and associated ecological appraisals consider the impact on the proposed development on; Amphibians, Reptiles, Birds, Badgers, Bats and Dormouse.

Surrey Wildlife Trust has assessed the reports and has advised that in the event of an approval, the applicant should be required to undertake all the recommended actions in the 'Evaluation and Recommendations' section of the Ecological Appraisal Report. This will ensure that no adverse effect upon legally protected species would result from the proposed development works

and will help to off-set adverse effects to the biodiversity value of the site resulting from the proposed development.

In addition, it is recommended that a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan be secured by Condition, if outline permission is granted, to allow the Council to meet its need in conserving and enhancing the natural and local environment and meeting the above obligation as well as offsetting any localised harm to biodiversity caused by the development process.

It is therefore considered that subject to recommended conditions, the proposed scheme would not adversely affect biodiversity and would also contribute to enhancing the natural and local environment.

Water Frameworks Regulations 2011

The European Water Framework Directive came into force in December 2000 and became part of UK law in December 2003.

It gives us an opportunity to plan and deliver a better water environment, focusing on ecology. It is designed to:

- enhance the status and prevent further deterioration of aquatic ecosystems and associated wetlands which depend on the aquatic ecosystems
- promote the sustainable use of water
- reduce pollution of water, especially by 'priority' and 'priority hazardous' substances
- ensure progressive reduction of groundwater pollution

The proposal would not conflict with these regulations.

Accessibility and Equalities Act 2010 Implications

Policy D9 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan encourages and seeks provision for everyone, including people with disabilities, to new development involving buildings or spaces to which the public have access.

Officers consider that the proposal complies with this policy. A full assessment against the relevant Building Regulations would be captured under a separate assessment should permission be granted.

From the 1st October 2010, the Equality Act replaced most of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). The Equality Act 2010 aims to protect disabled people and prevent disability discrimination.

Officers consider that the proposal would not discriminate against disability, with particular regard to access. It is considered that there would be no equalities impact arising from the proposal.

Human Rights Implications

The proposal would have no material impact on human rights.

Response to Parish Council and Third Party comments

A number of concerns have been highlighted in third party representations as well as in the Alfold Parish Council response. These comments have been very carefully considered by officers.

The majority of the concerns relate to the impact on the countryside, concerns that Alfold cannot accommodate this level of growth in terms of infrastructure, concerns regarding traffic and congestion; flooding and the site is within an unsustainable location.

Most of these issues are addressed within the main body of the report. In addition, the following response is offered:

- The concerns regarding drainage and sewerage have been carefully considered. Thames Water and Lead Local Flood Authority have reviewed the application documents from a technical point of view and have raised no objection to the proposed drainage strategy, subject to conditions.

Therefore, Officers advise that a refusal on technical grounds of impact on drainage could not reasonably be substantiated.

- The County Highway Authority has reviewed the proposed development, including a detailed assessment of the impact on the local highway network and the existing junctions. The County Highway Authority has not raised objection in terms of the highway safety of the proposed development. Therefore, Officers advise that an objection on technical highway safety and capacity grounds could not reasonably be substantiated.

Cumulative Effects/in-combination effects

It is important that the cumulative effect of the proposed development and any other committed developments (i.e. schemes with planning permission, (taking into consideration impacts at both the construction and operational phases), or those identified in local planning policy documents) in the area are considered.

Cumulative effects comprise the combined effects of reasonably foreseeable changes arising from the development and other development within a specific geographical area and over a certain period of time. The significance of cumulative impacts needs to be assessed in the context of characteristics of the existing environment. This is to ensure that all of the developments:

- Are mutually compatible; and

- Remain within the environmental capacity of the area and its environs.

It is noted that there is a scheme for development proposed at Wildwood Golf Club, however, this is set away from the development and the specific impacts of this development, have taken account of existing and planned development. As such, the proposed development would not cause cumulative harm to the character and amenity of the area or highway safety.

Development Management Procedure Order 2015 - Working in a positive/proactive manner

In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the NPPF. This included:-

- Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.
- Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.

Conclusion / Planning Judgement

The application is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved. Therefore, the detail of the reserved matters scheme will be critical to ensure that the proposed development is acceptable in planning terms.

In forming a conclusion, the NPPF requires that the benefits of the scheme must be balanced against any negative aspects of the scheme.

The site is located in the Countryside Beyond the Green Belt, and as such the development would encroach into the countryside. The Council's preference would be for previously developed land to be developed prior to green field sites.

The site is not located within a particularly sustainable location in terms of access to services and facilities, nevertheless, the scale of development is not such that would result in a significant level of vehicular movements nor is the site subject to any protected landscape designation.

However, the Council cannot currently identify a deliverable supply of housing sites from the identified sites which would sufficiently meet the housing demand for the next five years. This is a material consideration of significant weight in this assessment. Linked to this, Policy C2 is a housing land supply policies and given the lack of a 5 year supply of housing, Members are advised that Policy C2 can only be afforded limited weight in respect of constraints on development in principle. The recent appeal decision of Baker Oates, Farnham (WA/2014/2028) lends support to this view.

The proposal would not result in the loss or alienation of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and would not result in the fragmentation of an agricultural holding so as to seriously undermine the economic viability of the remaining holding.

The scheme would result in an increase in traffic movements. However, the County Highway Authority has assessed the Transport Assessment submitted and concludes that the access and highway improvements put forward would be sufficient to accommodate this increase in traffic.

The scheme would deliver a substantial level of both market and affordable housing, which would contribute significantly towards housing in the Borough. Furthermore, the proposal would provide for onsite affordable housing, an important consideration which weighs in favour of the scheme.

Having regard to the immediate need for additional housing and the lack of alternative deliverable sites to achieve the level of housing that is required, it is considered that the benefits of the scheme, primarily the significant delivery of housing, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the adverse impact on the character of the Countryside Beyond the Green Belt and Strategic Gap when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole or specific policies in the NPPF.

In terms of flood risk, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is not therefore at risk of flooding from rivers. It is noted there are local issues regarding surface and foul water flooding, partly due to the ground conditions and partly due to the capacity / condition of the sewerage system. The applicants have sought to overcome these concerns with an appropriate drainage design and the management of foul water through an on-site package treatment plant. No objection has been raised by the relevant statutory bodies on flooding or drainage grounds and the detailed arrangements could be adequately secured by condition. The Lead Local Flood Authority have also confirmed that the existing surface water drainage matters could be improved as a result of the development.

The proposal has adequately mitigated for its impact on local infrastructure and the proposal would comply with the requirements of the Local Plan and the NPPF with regards to infrastructure provision. In addition, the proposal would not result in harm to the natural environment.

In addition, a draft S106 has been submitted to secure a programme of highway improvement works to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by the development, an early years and primary education contribution; future ownership, management and maintenance of on-site SUDS and package waste water treatment plant and public open space. Should Members accept the Officer's recommendation to approve the application, the draft S106 will need to be first completed to secure the above obligations.

Officers therefore consider that there are no adverse impacts of the development that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Recommendation

Recommendation A:

That permission be GRANTED, subject to the following conditions and completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing, management and maintenance of the SuDS, on-site foul water package treatment plant and public open space, and infrastructure improvements to the highway network and education provision within 2 months of the date of this resolution to grant permission.

1. Condition

Details of the reserved matters set out below ('the reserved matters') shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within three years from the date of this permission:

1. layout;
2. scale;
4. landscaping; and
3. appearance.

The reserved matters shall be carried out as approved. Approval of all reserved matters shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Reason

To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. Condition

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason

To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

3. Condition

The plan numbers to which this permission relates are: Site location plan ref: 1035 LC/020; Topographical survey ref: 15425-1 & 15425-2; Proposed access arrangement ref: 2014/2175/007. 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 Policies D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

4. Condition

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority, for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking / turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason:

The condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users. In accordance with of Section 4 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

5. Condition

No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- (c) storage of plant and materials
- (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- (e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- (f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation
- (g) vehicle routing
- (h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
- (i) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
- (j) on-site turning for construction vehicles

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason

The condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users. In accordance with of Section 4 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. This is a pre-commencement condition as this detail is required ahead of any works taking place to ensure satisfactory arrangements are made to safeguard the local highway network during construction works.

6. Condition

No operations involving the bulk movement of earthworks/materials to or from the development site shall commence unless and until facilities have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to so far as is reasonably practicable prevent the creation of dangerous conditions for road users on the public highway. The approved scheme shall thereafter be retained and used whenever the said operations are undertaken.

Reason

The condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users. In accordance with of Section 4 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

7. Condition

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the following facilities have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority for:

- (a) The secure parking of bicycles within the development site. Such facilities to be integral to each dwelling/building.
- (b) Providing safe routes for pedestrians / cyclists to travel within the development site.

Reason

The condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users. In accordance with of Section 4 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

8. Condition

The approved Travel Plan Statement dated November 2015 shall be implemented prior to occupation of the first residential dwelling and for each and every subsequent occupation; the applicant shall thereafter maintain and develop the Travel Plan Statement to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority

Reason:

In accordance with of Section 4 “Promoting Sustainable Transport” in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

9. Condition

Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant must in their drainage strategy, provide evidence showing that infiltration has been considered as a viable option for discharge from the site, the following should be supplied:

- Infiltration testing results in accordance with BRE Digest 365
- Evidence of Groundwater levels onsite
- Details of local geology and soils
- Details of Ground Water Source Protection Zones
- Details of any contamination

The Sustainable Drainage System should then be designed in accordance with these results and shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason:

To ensure that infiltration has been fully considered as a discharge option and to show evidence of why infiltration is not feasible for the site in accordance with Section 10 of the NPPF 2012 and the NPPG. This is a pre-commencement condition as the matter goes to the heart of the permission.

10. Condition

Prior to the commencement of the development, the applicant must in their drainage strategy, provide evidence that discharging offsite into an ordinary watercourse is feasible this should include:

- Details of the outfall location and flow restrictions
- Evidence that there will be no increase to flood risk downstream
- Evidence that during exceedance events all storm water remains onsite
- Runoff calculations produced for the Greenfield, Q1, Q30 and Q100+30%CC storm events
- Revised storage volumes for the site that consider the revised run off calculations and results from infiltration testing

Reason:

To ensure flood risk is not increased on or offsite in accordance with Section 10 of the NPPF 2012 and NPPG. This is a pre-commencement condition as the matter goes to the heart of the permission.

11. Condition

Before the commencement of the construction of the dwellings hereby approved, details of how the Sustainable Drainage System will be protected and maintained during the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with those approved details

Reason:

To ensure that the construction works do not compromise the functioning of the agreed Sustainable Drainage System in accordance with Section 10 of the NPPF 2012 and the NPPG. This is a pre-commencement condition as the matter goes to the heart of the permission.

12. Condition

No development shall take place until the applicants or their agents or successors in title have secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason

In the interests of protecting the historic environment in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF and Policy HE15 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002. This is a pre-commencement condition as the matter goes to the heart of the permission.

13. Condition

The development hereby permitted shall be carried in strict accordance with the measures details in the 'Evaluation and Recommendations' section of the Ecological Appraisal Report by CLM dated November 2015.

Reason

In the interests of the ecology of the site and to accord with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Regulation 40 of the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010 and to comply with Policy D5 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and the NPPF 2012.

14. Condition

No development shall commence until a detailed scheme of external lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development should be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details. The scheme shall be maintained and shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The floodlighting shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to the variation. The intensity of the illumination permitted by this consent shall be no greater than that recommended by the Institution of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01.

Reason

In the interest of the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policies C2, D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002. This is a pre-commencement condition as the matter goes to the heart of the permission.

15. Condition

No development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the existing and proposed ground levels of the site and proposed ground levels and finished floor levels of the development hereby permitted. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason

In the interest of the character and amenity of the area in accordance with Policies C2, D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002. This is a pre-commencement condition as this matter goes to the heart of the acceptability of the development.

16. Condition

No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Plan shall provide for:

- i. An indicative programme for carrying out of the works
- ii. The arrangements for public consultation and liaison during the construction works
- iii. Measures to minimise the noise (including vibration) generated by the construction process to include hours of work, proposed method of piling for foundations, the careful selection of plant and machinery and use of noise mitigation barrier(s)
- iv. Details of any floodlighting, including location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination
- v. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- vi. loading and unloading of plant and materials
- vii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- viii. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- ix. wheel washing facilities
- x. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- xi. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason

In the interest of the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policies C2, D1 and D4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002. This is a pre-commencement condition as the matter goes to the heart of the permission.

Informatives

1. Design standards for the layout and construction of access roads and junctions, including the provision of visibility zones, shall be in accordance with the requirements of the County Highway Authority. The alterations to the retaining wall to facilitate access to the site will require technical approval from the Highway Authority's Structures Team.

2. The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development, subject to the above conditions but, if it is the applicant's intention to offer any of the roadworks included in the application for adoption as maintainable highways, permission under the Town and Country Planning Act should not be construed as approval to the highway engineering details necessary for inclusion in an Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. Further details about the post-planning adoption of roads may be obtained

from the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council.

3. Details of the highway requirements necessary for inclusion in any application seeking approval of reserved matters may be obtained from the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council.

4. All bridges, buildings or apparatus (with the exception of projecting signs) which project over or span the highway may be erected only with the formal approval of the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council under Section 177 or 178 of the Highways Act 1980.

5. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme>. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice.

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

7. When access is required to be 'completed' before any other operations, the Highway Authority may agree that surface course material and in some cases edge restraint may be deferred until construction of the development is complete, provided all reasonable care is taken to protect public safety.

8. The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above conditions, the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

9. Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any

excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage.

10. The applicant is advised that the S278 highway works will require payment of a commuted sum for future maintenance of highway infrastructure. Please see the following link for further details on the county council's commuted sums policy: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/environment-housing-and-planning/planning/transport-development-planning/surrey-county-council-commuted-sums-protocol>

11. The applicant is advised that in providing each dwelling with integral cycle parking, the Highway Authority will expect dedicated integral facilities to be provided within each dwelling for easily accessible secure cycle storage/garaging.

12. The Environment Agency have a regulatory role in issuing legally required consents, permits or licences for various activities. The Environmental Agency have not assessed whether consent will be required under their regulatory role and therefore this response does not indicate that permission will be given by the Environment Agency.

13. Any works in, over or under or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of a designated Main River will require formal consent.

14. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Recommendation B:

That in the event that the requirements of recommendation A are not met, permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. Reason

The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement to secure a programme of highway improvement works to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by the development. As such the proposal would fail to effectively limit the impacts of the development on existing infrastructure. The application therefore fails to meet the transport requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies M2 and M14 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002.

2. Reason

The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement to secure contributions towards education and the ongoing management and maintenance of SuDS and on-site Foul Water Package Treatment Plant and

public open spaces. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies D13 and D14 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and paragraphs 7 and 17 of the NPPF.

3. Reason:

The applicant has failed to enter into an appropriate legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing within the meaning of the NPPF, appropriate to meet Waverley Borough Council's housing need. The proposal would therefore fail to create a sustainable, inclusive and mixed community, contrary to the requirements of paragraph 50 of the NPPF.