Erection of 2 dwellings and an ancillary outbuilding together with associated landscaping following demolition of existing structures and buildings at Keepers Cottage, Farnham Road, Tilford GU10 2AZ

Committee: Southern Area
Meeting Date: 09/05/2018

Public Notice: Was Public Notice required and posted: Yes
Grid Reference: E: 487436  N: 145624

Parish: Tilford
Ward: Frensham, Dockenfield and Tilford
Case Officer: Rachel Kellas
Expiry Date: 22/03/2018
Time Extended Date: Not agreed
Neighbour Notification Expiry Date: 21/02/2018

RECOMMENDATION
That permission be REFUSED

Introduction
The application has been brought before the Area Committee because more than 5 letters of objection have been received and in light of the planning history of the site.

Location Plan
Site Description

The application site measures 1.9 hectares and is located on Farnham Road, to the north of Tilford and south of Runfold. The site is in a rural location and is accessed by a single track leading from Farnham Road. The site comprises a mix of wooded areas and open grassland and is undulating in character with the land form naturally rising up across the northern aspect.

A detached compact 2-storey dwelling is sited to the north western corner of the site and is surrounded by a number of associated outbuildings and areas of enclosure together with areas of debris, including some machinery. The outbuildings include some low-key stables and kennels with runs as well as timber sheds, pole barns and aviaries. Most are close to the boundaries of the western third of the site. There is an infilled area of potential contamination located in the north eastern corner of the site.

The site is surrounded by a significant amount of woodland, in particular to the north, south and to the west (this area being classed as ancient woodland). The majority of the site (excluding the house and its very immediate surrounds) is covered by a tree protection order which covers the surrounding woodland within and beyond the site area.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of 2 detached dwellings and an ancillary outbuilding together with associated landscaping following demolition of existing structures and buildings.

The two dwellings would be of 2 different sizes. The first, unit 1 would be 2 storeys in height and would contain 5 bedrooms. This would be built into sloping ground. The building would be an ‘L’ shape and would measure:
- 729sqm – internal floor area
- 32m – width
- 27m – depth
- 10.85m – max ridge height

The second, unit 2 would be single storey, rectangular in shape and would have a detached home office. The building would measure:
- 8.46m – width
- 28m – depth
- 7.2m – ridge height
- 285sqm - internal floor area
The following associated works also form part of the proposal:

- Demolition of existing detached dwelling
- Demolition of existing outbuildings and associated debris
- Alterations to access track
- Landscaping and site re-modelling including alterations to create new areas of hardstanding
- Alterations to existing boundary treatments and creation of new boundary treatment

Proposed Plans

Proposed Block Plan:
Unit 1 West Elevation:

Unit 2 West Elevation:

Unit 2: South elevation (showing Unit 1 in the background):
Relevant Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA/2016/1894</td>
<td>Erection of 2 dwellings with associated garaging and landscaping following demolition of existing dwelling, outbuildings and other structures (revision of WA/2016/0705) (as amended by plans received 11.01.2017)</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>02/03/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA/2016/0705</td>
<td>Erection of 3 dwellings with associated garaging and landscaping following demolition of existing dwelling, outbuildings and other structures (additional information received 10/06/2016).</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>12/07/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/03/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Policy Constraints

Green Belt – Outside of any Recognised Settlement
Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) & Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV)
Wealden Heaths I SPA 5km Buffer Zone
Thames Basin Heath 7km Buffer Zone
Tree Protection Order HM/R4

Development Plan Policies and Proposals

The development plan includes:

- Waverley Borough Local Plan, Part 1, Strategic policies and sites (adopted February 2018)
- Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (retained policies February 2018)
- South East Plan (saved policy NMR6)
- Farnham Neighbourhood Plan (made May 2017)

In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) due weight has been given to relevant retained policies in the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002

The relevant development plan policies are:

- Waverley Borough Local Plan, Part 1 (2018): ALH1, AHN3, SP1, SP2, ST1, RE2, RE3, TD1, NE1 and NE2.
- Retained Policies D1, D4, D6, D7, D8 and HE15 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002
Other guidance:

- National Planning Practice Guidance (2014)
- Land Availability Assessment (2016)
- West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2015)
- Statement of Community Involvement (2014 Revision)
- Council’s Parking Guidelines (2013)
- Residential Extensions SPD (2010)
- Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (Surrey County Council 2012)

Consultations and Town/Parish Council Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Archaeologist</th>
<th>No objection subject to condition to secure a Written Scheme of Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Highway Authority</td>
<td>No objection on safety, capacity or policy grounds subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council’s Waste &amp; Recycling Officer</td>
<td>No objection subject to provision of appropriate waste &amp; refuse containers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Refer to standing advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilford Parish Council</td>
<td>Support the application subject to Waverley Borough Council establishing whether the construction of two dwellings will create an unsatisfactory development of Green Belt land. We wish to draw attention to item 1.1.5 which incorrectly states two previous dwellings as only one detached building existed, albeit this building had several unapproved constructed outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Recommend that prior to determination of this planning application, the development site is surveyed by a qualified ecologist to help determine the status of any legally protected species on site which could be adversely affected by the development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 19/01/2018 site notices were displayed around the site on 26/01/2018 and neighbour notification letters were sent on 16/02/2018.

17 letters have been received raising objection on the following grounds:
• Inappropriate development in the Green Belt and overdevelopment of site
• Volume of the planned houses would have a detrimental effect on Green Belt land and would look out of character with other local properties within this rural setting.
• Proposal would result in light pollution within a designated Dark Village.
• There should be no external lighting and no street lamps bearing in mind that the village of Tilford is designated as a “dark village”
• Majority of existing buildings on site to be demolished are single storey and do not have significance within the site
• Lack of security on site has resulted in persons trying to gain access to the site, however this is a separate issue to the planning application and concerned building works on site would also cause security risk
• Concerned the proposal would lead to creeping development and the Countryside would be lost forever
• Area is covered in wildlife which should be protected
• Keepers Cottage site is in a prominent position on an incline, therefore the destruction of the woodland and erection of the two properties will be visually harmful
• Report by Dr Roger Buisson on March 19th identifies harm to wildlife
• Stripping back of the paddock and felling of trees protected by TPOs in 2016 is still a concern and has not been enforced
• The appeal decision should be upheld and proposal should be limited to one replacement dwelling
• New builds as proposed are not part of the Local Plan
• Enforcement team at Council should carry out inspections at all stages of the build
• There should be no development of the paddocks or woodland
• Fire Hazard concerns with increase of dwellings in woodland, bonfires etc.

3 letters have been received expressing support for the following reasons:
• Given the terrible nature of the history of the site anyone prepared to invest in building two sustainable dwellings should be congratulated
• Given slow down in economy the creation of jobs should be welcomed
• There are excellent sight lines into/out of the drive onto the main road.
• The visual impact of the 2 properties is of little impact to the neighbours.
• The addition of 2 family homes of outstanding innovative architectural design will in our opinion, significantly improve the area and provide much needed additional, quality homes.

1 letter has been received making a general observation:
• Dwellings are reduced in volume slightly and have part pitched roofs which is an improvement
• Enforcement team should monitor the site
• Wildlife should be protected
• CCTV or security could address security concerns
• No further development be permitted to the site. Especially to the adjacent paddocks and woods
• Request that the planning office provide very strict rules that change would not be permitted under any circumstances.
• Window slats should be added to reduce light pollution

Submissions in support

In support of the application the applicant has made the following points:
• Proposal is for two quite different but both high quality designed dwelling which would be energy efficient
• Development would see removal of all previous buildings, hardstanding, walls and other structures from the site. This would lessen the anti social behaviour taking place on site
• Proposal would see loss of historic uses and residential development in its place
• Proposal would restore lost beauty of site designed to blend in with landscape
• Development offers an opportunity to enhance and protect the openness of the Green Belt, and to significantly improve the landscape character of the site.
• The buildings, structures and associated hardstanding and tracks at Keepers Cottage fall within the category of 'previously developed land' (PDL).

Determining Issues

• Principle of Development
• Lawful Use of Land
• Planning History and Differences with Previous Proposal
• Impact on Green Belt
• Location of Development
• Landscape Considerations and Visual Amenity
• Impact on Residential Amenity
• Amenity Space and Standard of Accommodation
• Affordable housing
• Impact on Highways and Parking Provision
• Archaeology
• Environmental Considerations
• Financial Considerations
• SuDS
• Impact on the SPAs
Planning Considerations

- **Principle of Development**

  Policy SP1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

- **Lawful Use of Land**

  The site comprises a detached dwelling with a large number of outbuildings and structures positioned to the western area of the site. Officers are satisfied this portion of the site is in a lawful residential use and the existing buildings on the site are all ancillary to the dwelling and lawful through the passage of time.

  The remainder of the site is otherwise undeveloped and consists of open paddock land. This is therefore considered to be agricultural, undeveloped land.

  This conclusion was shared by the Inspector in the assessment of WA/2016/0705.

- **Planning History and Differences with Previous Proposal**

  The planning history is a material consideration.

  Planning permission for residential development on the site has been previously refused on two occasions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA/2016/1894</td>
<td>Erection of 2 dwellings with associated garaging and landscaping following demolition of existing dwelling, outbuildings and other structures (revision of WA/2016/0705) (as amended by plans received 11.01.2017)</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/03/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both of the above applications are of relevance, however, the smaller 2 house scheme WA/2016/1894 refused on 02/03/2017 is most comparable to the current proposal. That application was for the same number of dwellings and the same site area – this was a revision of WA/2016/0705.

WA/2016/1894 was refused for the following reasons:

1. **Reason**
   The proposal by reason of its unacceptable scale, bulk and form would have a harmful impact on the character of the site and surrounding area by reason of its urbanising impact and spread of built form. As such it would fail to satisfactorily conserve the landscape character of the AGLV and AONB, and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies D1, D4 and C3 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002, Policy RE3 of the Draft Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2016 and paragraphs 17 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

2. **Reason**
   The proposal would amount to an unsustainable form of development as it would constitute one new isolated dwelling in the countryside where no special circumstances have been provided to justify the proposal. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the key note Policy of the Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 and paragraphs 17 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

The differences between the current proposal and that application WA/2016/1894, as well as the refused appeal scheme, are summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dismissed Appeal WA/2016/0705</th>
<th>Refused application WA/2016/1894</th>
<th>Current scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>6897.59m³</td>
<td>4589.8m³</td>
<td>4026 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint of all buildings</td>
<td>1358.2m²</td>
<td>923.75m²</td>
<td>930.12 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison drawings:

WA/2016/1894:  
![Comparison drawings: WA/2016/1894:](image1)

Current proposal:  
![Comparison drawings: Current proposal:](image2)

WA/2016/1894 Unit A:  
![Comparison drawings: WA/2016/1894 Unit A:](image3)

Current proposal Unit 1:  
![Comparison drawings: Current proposal Unit 1:](image4)
The test for Members is whether having regard to the changes, the current proposal has overcome the objections to the previously refused scheme (delete as appropriate) and is acceptable in its own right.

- **Impact on Green Belt**

  The site is located within the Green Belt outside any defined settlement area. Policy RE2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 outlines that the Green Belt will continue to be protected from inappropriate development. Inappropriate development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

  Certain forms of development are considered to be appropriate, and will be permitted provided they do not conflict with the exceptions listed in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF.

  Local planning authorities are required to give substantial weight to any harm which might be caused to the Green Belt by the inappropriate development.

  The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

  Paragraph 89 allows for the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.
It is accepted, in line with the previous appeal decision and the previous refusal on the site, that the existing dwelling and its private residential garden area would constitute Previously Developed Land.

The following table provides a comparison between the current proposal, and the existing built form on site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Current proposal</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume (cbm)</td>
<td>4170.89</td>
<td>4026</td>
<td>144.89</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint of all buildings (sqm)</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>930.12</td>
<td>342.88</td>
<td>26.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area of all buildings (sqm)</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>23.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardstanding area (sqm)</td>
<td>2572.9</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>565.9</td>
<td>21.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum ridge height of dwellings/buildings</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>10.85m</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>46% (increase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table demonstrates that there would be net reductions in terms of the volume, footprint, floor area and amount of hardstanding. The maximum ridge height of the dwelling would however increase. Whilst the reduction in volume is noted, the built form on site would also be more consolidated, taking the form of 3 buildings (two dwellings and an outbuilding), one of which would be 2 storey in form. In comparison, the existing position on site sees the total built form broken up in a number of small outbuildings with a greater spread.

Both dwellings would be set into the landscape which would minimise the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt.

In this case, the benefits of the reduced volume, footprint and spread of development, are considered to be significant benefits over and above the existing position on site despite the increase in height. The proposal would allow for increased landscaping which is of further benefit to the openness of the Green Belt.

In overall terms, the proposed buildings are considered to have a lesser impact on openness than the current position. The proposal would therefore comply with paragraph 89 of the NPPF, and would amount to an appropriate form of development in the Green belt.
• **Location of Development**

The site is located outside any defined settlement area. Policy SP2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1 (2018) states that development will be focused at the four main settlements and moderate levels of development in larger villages.

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.

The site is located in an isolated location. Whilst there are a small number of existing dwellings within close proximity of the proposal site, it is a rural site that is set away from key areas of development, with no clear relationship to any public services or any settlement. Although a small number of bridleways and footpaths are located in the surrounding area, these do not provide direct access to any settlement.

Furthermore, notwithstanding that there a couple of dwellings within the locality (Crooksbury Cottage and Yew Tree Cottage) these are positioned on a separate access track and are positioned circa 150 metres away. The application site is surrounded on 3 sides by undeveloped, open land and is only accessible via a 230m private track. The site is physically isolated and is remote from any settlement.

In reaching this judgement, officers have had regard to recent appeal decisions and case law regarding the interpretation of what might be isolated.

The word ‘isolated’ in the phrase ‘isolated new homes in the countryside’ indicates a dwelling that is physically separate or remote from a settlement. However, a Court of Appeal decision on the 28\(^{th}\) March found that a settlement would not necessarily exclude a hamlet or a cluster of dwellings, without, for example, a shop or post office of its own, or a school or community hall or a public house nearby, or public transport within easy reach.

One dwelling currently exists on the site; however, the proposal seeks to increase the level of occupation through the erection of two much larger dwellings.

As the proposal would be in an isolated location, it falls to be considered whether there are any Special Circumstances which would outweigh the isolated location such as:

• the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or
where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or

the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling. Such a design should:
  o be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
  o reflect the highest standards in architecture;
  o significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
  o be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

In dismissing the earlier scheme for 3 houses (WA/2016/0705), the Inspector commented that “there was little to show that any of the dwellings or the proposal would be for any of the special circumstances in Framework paragraph 55”. It is noted that the scale of development has been reduced, and the design of the proposal, nonetheless officers do not consider there are any Special Circumstances to justify an additional dwelling on the application site.

In respect of the more recent scheme, WA/2016/1864, the officer recommendation set out that there were special circumstances to justify the additional isolated home in the countryside by way of the re-use of previously development land, a reduction in built form and the removal of the sporadic lawful buildings on site, to outweigh the harm by reason of the isolated location. However, this view was not shared by the committee, and that application was refused on the basis of the isolated location of the additional dwelling without any special circumstances.

That previous decision WA/2016/1864 is a material consideration in the assessment of the current application. The changes to the design, and the reduction in bulk from the previously refused scheme, do not in officer’s view amount to Special Circumstances such to warrant a different decision taking into consideration the committee’s previous conclusions.

**Housing Land Supply**

In July 2017, the Council published an update to their five year housing supply position based on the Local Plan Examination Inspector’s provisional findings in July 2017. The statement sets out the housing requirement for the next five years based on West Surrey SHMA figures and various components of housing supply that the Council expects to come forward in that period. As it stands, the supply of housing is 6.28 years worth of the housing requirement. Therefore, the Council can demonstrate in excess of the requirements of paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

Notwithstanding this point, the provision of 1 additional dwelling as proposed does not make a significant contribution to housing supply, although this does not mean that what is otherwise sustainable development should be refused.
Landscape Considerations and Visual Amenity

The site is located within the AONB and AGLV. Policy RE3 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 sets out that new development must respect and where appropriate, enhance the character of the landscape in which it is located.

The Surrey Hills Management Plan 2014 – 2019 sets out the vision for the future management of the Surrey Hills AONB by identifying key landscape features that are the basis for the Surrey Hills being designated a nationally important AONB.

Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 requires development to be of high quality design and to be well related in size, scale and character to its surroundings. Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 are attributed substantial and full weight respectively due to their level of consistency with the NPPF 2012.

The site is visually enclosed and screened by woodland and is set into an undulating topography. The access track is 200m long and runs from the main road set between woodland on the western side and open grass paddock land to the east. The majority of the site opens out at the top of this track and slopes upward to the north. Enveloped by woodland, much of the site is covered by a TPO for woodland known as Waverley Common and an area of ancient woodland touches the north western corner of the site.

The application is supported by an Arboricultural Method Statement, prepared by David Archer Associates, dated September 2016.

The Council’s Tree and Landscape Officer indicates that the Arboricultural Method Statement provided gives good overall recommendations regarding likely impact to trees and notes that those specified as under threat in the statement are of minimal amenity value in contrast to the bulk of the surrounding woodland.

The existing dwelling on site is representative of traditional Surrey vernacular and is modest in size. It is set to a prominent high point to the western side of the site. The remaining buildings and structures are of mixed quality, bulk and materials; generally in a state of disrepair and forming a relatively sprawling level of development to the west and north of the dwelling.

The proposed units would be of a modern contemporary architectural style that seeks to integrate with the topography of the site by setting the units into the existing land levels. The proposed architecture does not replicate the design of the existing dwelling on site, nor does it seek to create residential units that respond directly to the traditional vernacular in the area.
However, the site has a unique characteristic in that it has an element of seclusion which means any reasonable development on the site does not need to respond to an existing street scene. As such, Officers consider there is some scope for alternative design principles to be employed.

Although the proposed units would be different in character to those in the surrounding locality, Officers consider that modern design of this nature should not be disregarded where its use would not be implicitly harmful. In this case, the overall scale and bulk of the proposed units are considered to be acceptable in context with the existing development on the site and in subsuming the proposed units within the landscape through the use of natural land levels and by the utilising of green roofs, they would integrate well with the surrounding landscape setting.

As the use of quality materials will be key to the success of this application, in the event permission is granted, a condition requiring samples of the proposed materials to be submitted in advance of the commencement of works is recommended.

Representations express concerns at the impact of lighting within dark skies. The location is rural where the level of light would be low. However, there is an existing residential dwelling and outbuildings which, when in use, would emit light. The proposal would not result in a likely significant increase in light over and above this. Furthermore, external lighting on the proposal could be controlled by condition if planning permission is approved.

Officers consider that the proposal would appropriately respond to this setting and integrate well with the rural and open relationship of the site and its countryside setting. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies RE3 and TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002.

- **Impact on Residential Amenity**

Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 seeks to ensure that new development is designed to create safe and attractive environments that meet the needs of users and incorporate the principles of sustainable development. Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002 are given substantial and full weight respectively due to their consistency with the NPPF 2012.

The site is set in a secluded area surrounded on three sides by woodland. The nearest neighbouring properties are Crooksberry Cottage and Yew Tree Cottage to the east of the site. These neighbouring properties would be over 150m from the location of the proposed units. Due to these significant separation distances, the proposed development would not be materially harmful to the occupiers of these neighbouring properties by way of loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing impacts.
Furthermore, owing to these separation distances and in considering the modest lighting levels associated with domestic properties, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not result in materially harmful light emissions that would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

It is acknowledged that the addition of a residential unit on the site would increase residential activity on the site. However, the levels of noise and disturbance associated with a typical residential dwelling would not be to a level that would otherwise cause material harm to the occupiers of surrounding neighbouring properties, particularly when such significant separation distances are involved.

Officers consider that the proposal would not result in material harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties and would therefore meet with the requirements of Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and Retained Policies D1 and D4 of the Local Plan 2002.

- **Amenity Space and Standard of Accommodation**

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

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

The proposed floor areas would exceed the guidelines set out in the Government Technical Housing standards. Furthermore, all habitable rooms would be served by sufficient light and outlook.

Both plots would be provided with suitable private amenity space.

Officers are satisfied both proposed dwellings would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupants.

- **Affordable Housing**

Policy AHN1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that the Council will require a minimum provision of 30% affordable housing on developments that have a
maximum combined floor space of more than 1000sqm. On developments in rural areas where the net number of dwellings is fewer than 11 units, the contribution may be made in the form of a payment equivalent to the cost of providing 30% on site provision.

The applicant is not proposing to provide on site affordable housing and no legal agreement has been agreed. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an off site contribution, the proposal would fail to provide affordable housing to meet the housing needs of the borough contrary to Policy AHN1 of the Local Plan Part 1.

Affordable housing was not secured as part of the previous schemes on site, neither was the lack of affordable housing the subject of a reason for refusal. This is because the Council now has an adopted policy in the Local Plan Part 1 to require the provision of affordable housing on this site.

- Impact on Highways and Parking Provision

Policy ST1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1) states that development schemes should be located where it is accessible by forms of travel other than by private car; should make necessary contributions to the improvement of existing and provision of new transport schemes and include measures to encourage non-car use. Development proposals should be consistent with the Surrey Local Transport Plan and objectives and actions within the Air Quality Action Plan. Provision for car parking should be incorporated into proposals and new and improved means of public access should be encouraged.

The County Highway Authority has undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and is satisfied that the application would not have a severe impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway subject to appropriate conditions.

The proposal would introduce a net gain of one residential unit to the site. Officers are satisfied that the additional traffic movements associated with one additional unit would not have a severe impact upon the safety and operation of the surrounding highway network, in accordance with Policy ST1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan: Part 1 2018.

The Council has a Parking Guidelines document (2013) which was prepared after the Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance in January 2012. Development proposals should comply with the appropriate guidance as set out within these documents.
The proposal would generate a requirement of 2.5 vehicle parking spaces for each of the proposed units. The plans submitted in support of this application clearly demonstrate that this requirement can be accommodated on the site.

Officers are therefore satisfied that the required parking provision can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site in accordance with Policy ST1 and the Council’s 2013 Parking Guidelines.

- **Archaeology**

  The NPPF 2012 sets out that, as a core principle, planning should take account of the different roles and character of different areas and heritage assets, in a manner appropriate to their significance should be conserved. In considering proposals for development involving ground disturbance on areas of land over 0.4 hectares, Policy HE15 requires that suitable consideration be given to the potential for a proposal to disturb as yet undiscovered archaeological remains. Appropriate desk based or field surveys should be submitted with an application and appropriate measures taken to ensure any important remains are preserved.

  An Archaeological Desk Based Study prepared by Thames Valley Archaeological Services, reference WCT16/53 and dated April 2016 has been submitted with the application that suggests there is some potential for the site to contain undisturbed archaeological remains.

  The Surrey County Council Archaeologist has been consulted on the application and notes that any permission should include a condition for the submission of a written scheme of investigation to ensure that archaeological remains are suitably monitored, and where necessary investigated further, as part of the proposed works.

  As such, subject to the inclusion of the recommended condition if permission is granted, Officers raise no concerns with regard to archaeology and consider the proposal would comply with Policy HE15 of the Waverley Borough Council Local Plan 2002.

- **Environmental Considerations**

  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 to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account. Policy D1 of the Local Plan sets out that development will not be permitted where it would have a materially detrimental impact to the environment by virtue of potential pollution of air, land or water and from the storage and use of hazardous substances.
The supporting text indicates that development will not be permitted unless practicable and effective measures are taken to treat, contain or control any contamination. Wherever practical, contamination should be dealt with on the site.

The site includes a potential area of contaminated land to the north eastern aspect. In addition, many of the outbuildings to the west of the site are in a neglected state that may compromise the environmental quality of the site.

The application is accompanied by a Ground Investigation Report, prepared by Ground & Water, reference GWPR1440/GIR and dated December 2015.

The Council’s Land Contamination Officer has fully considered the contents of the Investigation Report and is satisfied that these contamination issues can be dealt with by conditions, in the event permission is granted, to ensure suitable remediation schemes are put in place and carried out in advance of any further works associated with the proposal.

No significant additional concerns are raised with regard to environmental impact, however, conditions would be added to any permission to suitably control the removal of waste associated with both the demolition and construction processes. In addition an informative would be added to remind the applicant of their obligations to minimise noise disturbance associated with the demolition and construction processes.

- **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. 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.

The NPPG sets out that whether or not a local financial consideration is material to a decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It is not appropriate for a decision to be made on the basis that the development could have the potential to raise money for a local authority or other government body.

In the current case, the Council does not rely on local financial considerations to mitigate against the effects of the development to make it acceptable in planning terms. As such, it does not form a material planning consideration.
SuDS

Policy CC4 states that Sustainable Drainage Systems will be required on major developments. Proposed development on brownfield sites should aim to reduce run off rates to those on Greenfield sites where reasonable.

No detailed SuDS scheme has been provided. As such, it has not been demonstrated that surface water would be appropriately dealt with that could increase flood risk elsewhere.

Effect on the SPAs

The site lies within the Wealden Heaths I SPA 5km Buffer Zone and the Thames Basin Heath 7km Buffer Zone.

Whilst the proposal would result in an increase in people (permanently) on the site, due to the availability of alternative recreational opportunities within the area, which could divert residents from use of the SPA’s, the proposal would not have a likely significant effect on the integrity of the SPAs in accordance with Policy NE1 of the Local Plan 2018 (Part 1). An appropriate assessment is not therefore required.

Biodiversity and compliance with Habitat Regulations 2017

Policy NE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that the Council will seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Development will be permitted provided it retains, protects and enhances biodiversity and ensures any negative impacts are avoided or, if unavoidable, mitigated.

Further, 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 application is accompanied by the following ecological information: Arboricultural Method Statement’, author David Archer Associates, dated December 2017 ’Bat Assessment’, author ECOSA, dated December 2017 ‘Extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment’, author ECOSA, dated September 2016.

The ‘Bat Assessment’ appears appropriate in scope and methodology and has identified an active bat roost within one of the buildings subject to demolition in the current planning application. The assessment also identifies at least 5 species of bats foraging across the site. A number of mitigation measures are recommended by Surrey Wildlife Trust in the event that permission is granted. This includes the
submission of a Sensitive Lighting Management Plan which conforms to the recommendations of the Bat Conservation Trusts’ document entitled “Bats and Lighting in the UK – Bats and The Built Environment Series”.

The applicant has submitted the report titled ‘Extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment’ for which the study is dated May 2015, this is an outdated ecological assessment. This does not enable the Local Planning Authority to fully consider the possible adverse effect this development proposal may have on legally protected species and the biodiversity value of the site.

Government Planning Practice Guidance states that “Surveys should be up to date and ideally from the most recent survey season.”

The proposed development site is adjacent to optimal habitat for a range of protected species including breeding birds, amphibians and reptiles. There is therefore a reasonable likelihood for species protected by both national and European legislation being present and affected by the development.

Surrey Wildlife Trust has advised that without up to date ecological survey information it is difficult for the Trust to advise fully on the ecological consequences of the proposed development.

In the absence of up to date surveys, the Council cannot be satisfied that any possible adverse effects have been identified and mitigated.

Accessibility and Equalities Act 2010, Crime and Disorder and Human Rights Implications

There are no implications for this application.

Environmental Impact Regulations 2017

The proposal is considered not to be EIA development under either Schedule 1 or 2 of the EIA Impact Regulations 2017 or a variation/amendment of a previous EIA development nor taken in conjunction with other development that is likely to have a significant environmental effect.

Third Party Representations and Parish Council comments

Officers have carefully considered the third party representations as well as the Parish Council comments. The comments have all been addressed in the report above.
In relation to the comments of Tilford Parish Council, officers are satisfied that the proposal amounts to appropriate Green Belt Development for the reasons set out.

Other third party objections have been addressed elsewhere within this report. Some the concerns raised are reflected in the recommended reasons for refusal.

**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:

- 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;

- Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescales or recommendation.

**Conclusion**

The proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan. The re-use of previously development land and the removal of the sporadic lawful buildings on site would not outweigh the adverse impacts in relation to the isolated location, the failure to provide affordable housing and potential harm to protected species and surface water flooding. As such, planning permission is recommended for refusal.

**Recommendation**

That permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. **Reason**
   The proposal would amount to an unsustainable form of development as it would constitute one new isolated dwelling in the countryside where no special circumstances have been provided to justify the proposal. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy SP2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan, Part 1 (2018) and paragraphs 17 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. **Reason**
The application fails to demonstrate that the development would not lead to Surface Water run off that would increase flood risk. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policy CC4 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan, Part 1 (2018) and paragraphs 100 to 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

3. **Reason**
The applicant has failed to demonstrate that protected species under Schedules 1 and 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and their roosts/setts would not be significantly harmed as a result of the development proposed. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy NE1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan, Part 1 (2018) and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

4. **Reason**
In the absence of a completed legal agreement, the proposal would fail to provide affordable housing to meet the housing needs of the borough. The proposal would be contrary to Policy AHN1 of the Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites 2018 and Paragraphs 17 and 50 of the NPPF 2012.

**Informatives**

1. The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of paragraph 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.