

WA/2023/02240 – Erection of a detached dwelling and a garage to provide ancillary accommodation above; erection of an extension and alterations to existing dwelling. at LITTLE HEATH LINKSIDE WEST HINDHEAD GU26 6PA

Applicant: Simon Foster - KAT Investments (Surrey) Limited
Parish: Haslemere CP
Ward: Hindhead & Beacon Hill
Case Officer: Dana Nickson
Neighbour Notification Expiry Date: 10/11/2023
Extended Expiry Date: 15/04/2024
Committee Meeting Date: Planning Committee 08/05/2024

RECOMMENDATION That, subject to conditions, permission be GRANTED

1. Site Description

The application site is located on the south-eastern side of Linkside West in Hindhead. The property is a two storey dwelling with a detached garage to the side and a large amenity area to the rear. The character of the area is residential. The site levels are relatively flat.

2. Proposal

Planning permission is being sought for:

- The subdivision of the plot and the erection of a detached dwelling located towards the rear of the site and perpendicular to the existing dwelling.
 - The dwelling would be two storey and would incorporate 4 bedrooms, measuring a maximum of approximately 15.8m in width and between 7m and 10m in depth, with a maximum height of approximately 8.6m and eaves height of 5.4m. The dwelling would be grey facing brick with a slate roof tiles, aluminium windows and doors and would incorporate extensive glazing and a stone cladding feature to the front.
 - A linked outbuilding is proposed to the front of the dwelling, incorporating a double garage with a 5th bedroom and ensuite above, this part of the dwelling would measure 7.5m in width and between 6.5m and 8m in depth with a maximum height of 6.3m and eaves height of 3m. The materials would be charred timber cladding with aluminium windows and the garage doors would be charred timber cladding to match the rest of the outbuilding.
 - A flat green roofed glazed structure to a height of 2.8m would link the outbuilding to the dwelling.

This dwelling is referred to as Plot 2 on the submitted plans.

- The application also proposes extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling comprising of:
 - A single storey extension that would infill an area to the side/rear measuring approximately 4.1m in width and 6m in depth, with a maximum height of 5m. The extension would incorporate a glazed gable ended feature to the rear.

- Removal of the front bay window.
- Alterations to fenestration.

This existing dwelling is referred to as Plot 1 on the submitted plans.

- A new vehicular access is proposed from Linkside West, that would serve both Plots, as well as an access driveway parallel with the northern boundary, to serve Plot 2.

3. Relevant Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision
WA/2023/02534	Erection of a detached dwelling with access and associated works following demolition of existing detached garage; creation of new vehicular access to existing dwelling.	Withdrawn 21/03/2024
WA/2021/01774	Erection of 2 dwellings and associated works following demolition of existing outbuilding; alterations and extensions to existing dwelling.	Refused 19/01/2022 Appeal Dismissed 04/01/2023
WA/1986/2073	Erection of a first-floor extension to provide bedroom and bathroom. Extension to garage/store to provide additional garage,	Granted 12/02/1987
WA/1979/1140	Extension to sun lounge and utility room and alterations to WC and shower room	Granted 17/08/1979

4. Relevant Planning Constraints

Built-Up Area

Haslemere Design Statement

Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan

East Hants Special Protection Area 5 Km zone

Wealden Heaths I Special Protection Area 5 Km zone

Wealden Heaths II Special Protection Area 5 Km zone

Tree Preservation Order

CIL Charging Schedule Zone A

5. Relevant Development Plan Policies and Guidance

- Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1): Strategic policies and sites (adopted February 2018): SP1, SP2, ST1 , AHN3, TD1, NE1, NE2, CC1, CC2
- Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 2) 2023: Site Allocations and Development (adopted March 2023): DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM5, DM7, DM9, DM11
- Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021): H1, H2, H5, H6, H7, H8, H9, H12

Other guidance:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (updated December 2023 (NPPF))

- The National Planning Practice Guidance (updated November 2023) (NPPG)
- Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)
- BRE Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice (updated 2022)
- Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD)
- Council's Parking Guidelines (2013)
- Surrey Vehicle, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance (2023)
- Haslemere Design Statement (2012)
- National Design Guide (2019)
- Climate Change and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (October 2022)

6. Consultations and Town/Parish Council Comments

Consultee	Comments
SCC Highways	No objection subject to conditions
WBC(Tree & Landscape Officer)	No objection subject to conditions
Haslemere Town Council	<p>Objection</p> <p>The proposed works to the existing dwelling do not integrate with, respect the character or appearance of the street scene, contrary to policy H6.1 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan, TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1 and DM4 of the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>The scale and mass of the proposed works to the existing dwelling will result in overdevelopment of the site contrary to policy H6.1 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan, TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1 and DM4 of the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>The new dwelling similarly would result in overdevelopment of the site contrary to policy H6.1 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan, TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1 and DM4 of the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>The new windfall dwelling would result in a densification of the site which is not consistent with, or responding positively to, the character & appearance of the immediate area contrary to policies H2 and H3 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The proposals will result in overlooking which will harm the residential amenity of neighbours contrary to policy H6 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan, TD1 of the Local Plan Part 1 and DM4 of the Local Plan Part 2.</p>

7. Representations

101 letters have been received, from 55 different households raising objections on the following grounds:

- The proposal does not meet the requirements of the Waverley and Haslemere policies, as well as the Haslemere Design Statement and the NPPF.
- This is not a built-up area as referred to in the Planning Statement – the Linkside are characterised by large houses on spacious plots with garages and there is no on street parking which makes it a pleasant place to walk.
- Overdevelopment of the plot; cramped form of development; the density is not consistent with the character of the area.
- The subdivision of plots on Linkside is not supported; Linkside has restricted covenants which need to be considered in assessing this proposal.
- The density of Linkside should not be compared to Grove Road. The covenant for the Linkside clearly states the density of housing permitted on the plots.
- The surrounding area is characterised by individually designed properties occupying large plots with no shared drives – this proposal is out of character.
- The developer is trying to distance Little Heath from the Linkside development and connect it to Grove Road.
- The Linkside residents have applied to WBC months ago for special status relating housing density.
- There are clear precedents of applications refused for subdivision of plots within the Linkside: Acorn Hill, Avening and the recent refusal of Little Heath itself. This application must be refused on the same grounds as planning policy has not changed.
- The proposed house would be clearly recognised as a separate house in strong contrast to the others; incongruous design, too high.
- The proposal would block natural light; impact on the Right of Light.
- Large houses in small gardens; not in keeping with the rest of the area. The Plot division would result in very small gardens for both plots. There should only be one dwelling per plot.
- Developer focused on planning policies and housing supply issues and ignored the main reason for refusal – undesirable back land development.

- The Appeal Decisions referred to by the developer are not relevant, they do not involve subdivisions of the plots.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy.
- Light pollution from the excessive glazing; sound pollution.
- Loss of views.
- The proposal will destroy the peacefulness and tranquillity of the Linksides.
- There would be a further application on this plot, the development would match the previously refused application WA/2021/01774 that was also dismissed at appeal; this application is a tactic to get the previously rejected application approved; this is an incomplete application; both applications should be considered together.
- The second application was submitted after the comment deadline for the first application; WA/2023/02440 and WA/2023/02534 are not independent of each other and rely on each other.
- Inconsistencies in the Design & Access Statement and Planning Statement, still referring to the third house. They fail to consider Policy BE6 that protects from this kind of development.
- The numbering of Plots 2 and 3 over two applications appears deliberately confusing. They contain many inconsistencies and too few dimensions.
- The Street Scene is poor quality and misleading.
- The appeal report was poorly considered and full of conflicting information.
- Even if limited to one additional house it will remain an infilling against relevant planning policies.
- The site is close to AONB and very close to the woodlands and National Trust Land.
- Loss of trees and heavily glazed buildings will negatively interfere with the bats and wildlife and result in excessive light pollution.
- 7 healthy trees have already been removed and more are to be removed.
- Impact on Flood Risk from the increased development within the plot.

- Insufficient parking provided; will result in parking on the road and outside neighbouring properties; driver and pedestrians safety risks.
- Concerns regarding the increased traffic during building works and beyond.
- This application is an abuse of the planning process; underhand tactics to achieve the same goal.
- The developer has not tried to contact and liaise with the neighbours; brags on their website that they get planning permission where other have failed.
- Applicants make no attempt to address the reasons for refusal of the previous application.
- The application should have not been accepted for submission as it is not materially different from the previously refused application. It would be inconsistent of WBC if they were not to refuse this application again.
- If this application is allowed, it will create a precedent for other plots being subdivided which will destroy the character of the Linkside.

Officers Response: The issues raised in the objections are all noted. The material planning considerations will be addressed within the paragraphs below and the remaining matters will be addressed at the end of the report.

8. Planning Considerations:

9. 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.

Policy SP2 of the Local Plan Part 1 (2018) states that development will be focused on the four main settlements (Farnham, Godalming, Haslemere and Cranleigh).

The application site is not located within one of the four main settlements and the associated amenities. However, it is located in a residential area in Hindhead, close to other dwellings and in close proximity to the shops and amenities of Beacon Hill. As such, the principle of extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling and the erection of additional dwellings is considered acceptable subject to residential and visual amenity impact as well as other material considerations.

10. Planning history and differences with previous proposal

The planning history is a material consideration.

Planning permission has been previously refused under planning application WA/2021/01774 for the erection of 2 dwellings and associated works following demolition of existing outbuilding and alterations and extensions to existing dwelling. The proposal was subsequently dismissed at appeal (Ref. APP/R3650/W/22/3296043). The application was refused for three reasons which are summarised below:

1. That the development of the site constituted undesirable backland development and would conflict with the pattern of development, detrimental to the street scene and overall prevailing character of the area.
2. That the development would cause harm to the residential amenity of Duno and Tarraleah
3. That the bat survey recommended further emergence surveys and in the absence of these surveys it was not possible to establish species presence, population size and mitigation or avoidance requirements.

In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector concluded the following:

Character and Appearance

The Inspector concluded that the erection of a dwelling on Plot 2 (which is not proposed in this application) would cause harm as the width of the proposed dwelling and its close positioning to the existing dwelling would be out of keeping with the plot widths and the spacing to the sides of the buildings of other properties in the area.

In considering Plot 3 the Inspector concluded that its backland location would be unusual though not unique, and that whilst the dwelling would intensify the built form, that the plot is deeper than other surrounding properties. This positioning as well as the deep plot would ensure that the spacious character of the area would not be unduly reduced.

Living Conditions

The Inspector assessed the relationship between both of the proposed dwellings and concluded that neither would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regards to privacy and overlooking.

Bat Survey

The third reason for refusal related to the absence of emergence surveys, the appellant provided a Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey (June 2022) which identified a number of roosts and set out the need for mitigation which satisfied the Inspector that this matter could be satisfactorily addressed.

A copy of the Inspector decision letter is appended to this report (Appendix 1).

- The difference between the current proposal and the appealed application is that the third plot has been omitted from the current proposal. This proposal

consists from the extensions and alterations to the host dwelling and the erection of an additional dwelling to the rear of the site, rather than 2 dwellings.

The planning consideration is whether the current proposal addresses the planning harm from the previous reasons for refusal and appeal decision and whether the scheme and is acceptable in its own right.

For clarification purposes, a further application for the erection of a new dwelling to the side of the existing dwelling (WA/2023/02534) was submitted on 09/11/2023, which proposed a third dwelling as proposed in the previously refused scheme, on its own. That application was since withdrawn on 21/03/2024.

In considering the current application, Officers have been mindful of any material changes in planning circumstances since the granting of that original permission, including the publication of the updated National Planning Policy Framework in 2023 and the adoption of Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

The Climate Change and Sustainability checklist is also now a requirement.

The Inspector's Decision on planning application WA/2021/01744 is also a material planning consideration that has been given significant weight in the considerations below.

11. The size, scale and design and size of the proposal and its impact in the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area

Paragraph 128(d) of the NPPF 2023 states (inter alia) that planning decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account the desirability of maintaining the area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens).

Further, at paragraph 135(c), the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to the local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 requires new development to be of a high quality design that responds to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is located.

Policy DM4 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 states that all new development would be expected to respond effectively to its surroundings taking into account (inter alia) the scale, height, mass and form of adjacent surrounding structures as well as established street patterns, building setbacks, rooflines and streetscape rhythm including the spaces between buildings.

Policy H6 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021) requires new development to be of high quality design and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and be in keeping with the existing streetscape.

Policy 6 of the Haslemere Design Statement states (inter alia) that proposals for new buildings should relate to their surroundings, and should be sympathetic to their environment; variety in scale and texture is encouraged to add interest to the street scenes and contemporary designs should be of a high standard and complement their context. Extensions to existing dwellings should be carefully considered, to reflect the style of the original dwelling and avoid having an adverse effect on the street-scene.

With regards to garden land and infilling, the Haslemere Design Statement further states, that should only be permitted when:

- there is garden area appropriate to new and existing dwellings.
- there is adequate off -street parking.
- they do not have a detrimental impact on the existing character of the area or local biodiversity.

The area known as the Linkside, is characterised by individually designed dwellings, displaying a varied palette of materials, set within generous plots with tree lined streets and of a general verdant appearance.

The application site is located on the south-eastern side of, and facing Linkside West, in between the rear of the properties on Linkside South and Grove Road. Most plots have an average width slightly wider than the dwellings, and benefit from deep rear gardens; however, some of them have smaller gardens, in particular in the area surrounding the application site. Little Heaths benefits from a wider plot (37m) and a rear amenity area deeper than the ones of the adjoining properties (60m), resulting in a significantly larger rear garden.

The host dwelling and the detached garage are located centrally within the plot in terms of width and set back from the road.

In order to address the first reason for refusal of planning application WA/2021/01774 and the subsequent appeal decision, the second additional dwelling located to the side of the host dwelling does not form part of the current proposal.

The proposal seeks to subdivide the plot in two and introduce a two storey detached dwelling with a linked garage with room above to the rear of the side, accessed from a access driveway parallel with the northern boundary. The submitted plans refer to the host dwelling as Plot 1 and the proposed dwelling as Plot 2. It is acknowledged this led to some confusion, as the 2021 application referred to the current Plot 2 as Plot 3, and Plot 2 was the second additional dwelling that does not form part of this proposal.

Plot Sizes and Density

The application site measures 2,230sqm (0.223ha) and the subdivision of the plots would result in Plot 1 measuring 1,117sqm (0.1117ha) and Plot 2 measuring 1,113sqm (0.1113ha).

The surrounding properties measure as follows, clockwise starting from the north of the site:

Reydon 1,171sqm (0.117ha)
Birkdale Cottage – 990sqm (0.099ha)
Laurel Cottage – 1,100sqm (0.11ha)
Terrigal – 830sqm (0.083ha)
Tarraleah – 760sqm (0.076ha)
Rosemoor – 870sqm (0.087ha)

The proposed plots sizes and density are therefore considered to be appropriate and in keeping with the surrounding area.

The comments received from objectors stating that the site should not be compared to Grove Road are noted. It is however a fact that the site adjoins the rear of Grove Road. Nevertheless, the plot sizes would be comparable to the ones on Linkside South directly adjoining the site, and other sites in the wider Linkside area.

Layout

The proposed layout comprises the existing dwelling to the front of the application site and the proposed dwelling to the rear. Plot 1, the existing dwelling and garage would remain unchanged, facing Linkside West. The orientation of the dwelling to the rear (Plot 2) has been rotated to face the northern boundary with the side elevation backing into the rear amenity area of the existing dwelling.

The proposed dwelling would maintain a 2m separation distance to the eastern side boundary and a minimum separation distance of 1.4m to the western side boundary. Given that the western boundary would adjoin the rear amenity area of the existing dwelling, there would be a separation distance of approximately 16.5m between the two buildings and therefore there would be sufficient space between the buildings to prevent the dwellings appearing cramped within the site.

The dwelling on Plot 2 would be sited relatively in the middle of the plot, width wise, maintaining a separation distance of approximately 14.5m to the front (northern) boundary and between 10.7m and 14.7m to the rear (southern) boundary.

The linked outbuilding would be located to the north of the dwelling and would maintain a separation distance of between 2m and 3.3m to the northern boundary.

A new vehicular access is proposed from Linkside West that would lead to the proposed dwelling to the rear via an approximately 3.8m wide access driveway parallel with the northern boundary.

Additional hardstanding is proposed to the front of Plot 1 and there would be ample space on the hardstanding proposed at the front of Plot 2 to adequately accommodate turning and parking of vehicles.

The comments received from the objectors regarding the proposed dwelling being located to the rear of the site are noted; whilst most of the dwellings in the surrounding area are located towards the front of the plot, some are located towards the middle and

others are being located towards the rear of the plot, (Magpies, Grove Road), Hawk House (Linkside South).

Whilst there is no other example of backland development in the immediately surrounding area, the Inspector stated in the Appeal Decision of planning application WA/2021/01774 that, whilst:

“The addition of this dwelling would intensify the build form, the appeal site has a deeper plot than other surrounding properties. The main section of the proposed dwelling on (Plot 2 under the current application) would be situated to the rear of the existing dwelling. This positioning, although not directly fronting and being perpendicular on the road, as well as the deep plot, would ensure that the spacious character of the area would not be unduly reduced. I appreciate this dwelling would be served by a long driveway access along the northern boundary of the appeal site, but as part of this proposed access would be shared with the existing dwelling and the area of land to the north of the existing building would remain largely open, I do not find this element of the proposal would detract from the area’s character.”

The Inspector’s assessment of the proposed dwelling to the rear of the site, labelled Plot 2 under this application, is a material consideration in the assessment of this application. In light of this, Officers consider the proposed layout to be acceptable.

Scale, Height and Mass

There would be no increase in the height of the existing dwelling and the additional mass as a result of the proposed side/rear infill extension would afford limited views from within the streetscene.

The proposed dwelling to the rear would have a maximum height of approximately 8.6m, which would be some 1m higher than the existing dwelling; however, this is not considered excessive for a detached two storey house and it is noted that the properties in the surrounding area vary considerably in height, scale and mass.

This view is supported by the Inspector in the Appeal Decision of planning application WA/2021/01774: “giving the range of properties in the area, the size and scale of the proposed dwellings would not be harmful.”

Design, Materials and Appearance

The proposed extension to the host dwelling (Plot 1) would have a contemporary design and would be finished in zinc cladding with a gabled ended glazed inset wall to the rear. The existing property would be modernised following the removal of the front bay window, by replacing the existing traditional dormers with taller zinc cladded dormers and contemporary glazing, as well as replacing the existing fenestration with floor to ceiling contemporary fenestration.

The proposal is not different from the extensions and alterations proposed under the previous scheme, and Officers considered they would not be detrimental in the wider street scene, which was also echoed in the Inspector’s Appeal Decision.

The proposed dwelling to the rear (Plot 2) would have a contemporary design with an asymmetric roof and central gabled ended projections on both the front and rear elevation as well as a two storey bay window with a central stone cladding feature to the front. The dwelling would be built out of contemporary materials, featuring grey facing brick, slate roof tiles and polyester powder coated aluminium fenestration. In contrast, the proposed outbuilding incorporating a garage with a bedroom above would have a simple shape and would be constructed out of charred timber cladding. The glass link with a green roof would provide easy access between the main dwelling and the outbuilding.

It is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling is more contemporary in design than the surrounding properties; however, contemporary design and use of different materials is not discouraged, and in fact supported in the Haslemere Design Statement. It is also acknowledged that the property would incorporate a significant amount of glazing and it is noted that Officers previously found the design of the proposed dwelling to be out of keeping and the amount of glazing to be excessive. However, as stated previously, the Inspector's Appeal Decision is a material consideration in the assessment of this proposal which must be given considerably weight, and the Inspector found the design of the proposed dwelling, including the window configuration to cause no harm to the character of the area.

The proposed site plans indicate a pair of entrance gates within the site, on the access driveway towards the proposed rear dwelling which are also shown on the CGI images, however, no elevations and details of the design have been provided. As such, it is considered reasonable to impose a condition ensuring details are provided prior to construction of the gates.

Size

Policy AHN3 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 relates to housing types and sizes with there being a need for market housing in Waverley, mainly for three bedroom dwellings (38.2%), followed by two beds (32.1%) then by four + beds (20.4%) and one beds (9.3%).

There is similar need in Haslemere, as stated under Policy H5 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021), mainly for three bedroom dwellings (34.1%), followed by two beds (32.6%), then four beds (19.7%) and one beds (13.7%). A four beds property with a fifth bedroom in the ancillary building is proposed and therefore the dwelling size is supported.

Conclusion

The Inspector's decision on the previous application identified harm as a result of the additional dwelling to the side of the existing dwelling (referred to as Plot 2 in the Appeal Decision) eroding the spacious, verdant character of the area. No harm to the character of the area or impact on residential amenity was identified as a result of the proposed dwelling to the rear of the site (referred to as Plot 3 in the Appeal Decision).

As such, it is considered that this reason for refusal has been sufficiently addressed and that no identified harm is caused by the current application.

The proposal would therefore accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policies DM1 and DM4 of the Waverley Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, Policy HS6 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021), the Haslemere Design Statement (2012), the Residential Extensions SPD (2010) and the NPPF 2023.

The comments received from the objectors regarding the intentions of the developer to build the third plot that should be considered as part of the overall proposal are all noted. A planning application has indeed been submitted to the Council (WA/2023/02534) which was subsequently withdrawn. Therefore the only proposal under consideration is the current one, which has been assessed on its own merits.

12. 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. Policy DM5 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 states that new development should not harm the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties by way of overlooking, loss of daylight or sunlight or overbearing appearance.

It is acknowledged that the second reason for refusal of planning application WA/2021/01774 referred to the impact of the proposal on the amenities of the neighbouring properties, namely Duno (Terrigal) and Tarraleah. However, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would not have an unacceptable harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties which is a material consideration in the assessment of the current application.

Whilst the application site shares a common boundary with nine different properties, the neighbours potentially impacted by the proposal are the immediately six adjoining dwellings as the properties across the road on Linkside West would enjoy the same relationship with the application site as they currently do.

In order to ensure the amenity of the neighbouring properties is protected, a variety of tests are applied. One of the tests is the BRE 45-degree and 25-degree rules of thumb to test the impact on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring windows. The 45-degree test is used to check development that is perpendicular to a window and the 25-degree test is used where the development is opposite a window.

With regards to potential overlooking and loss of privacy, the general rule of thumb is that there should be a distance of at least 21m between proposed windows and those of neighbouring properties and 18m between proposed windows and neighbouring private amenity area.

Reydon and Birkdale Cottage

These neighbouring properties are located to the north of the application site at a distance of approximately 11.5m and 15m from the shared boundary..

No additional built form is proposed to the northern side of Little Heath and the proposed access driveway that would run parallel with the northern boundary would

allow vehicles to access Plot 2 and therefore the use would be limited and unlikely to cause significant harm to residential amenity in terms of noise and disturbance.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in undue harm to the amenities of the occupiers of these dwellings.

Laurel Cottage

This property is located to the north of the application site at a distance of approximately 16m from the shared boundary. The proposed built form closest to the shared boundary with Laurel Cottage would be confined to the corner of the application site located between 2m and 3.3m from the shared boundary.

The proposed garage with accommodation above would slope away from the common boundary, from 2.6m to 6.3m (at a distance of approximately 8.6m from the boundary) at which is unlikely to appear overbearing as viewed from the rear of this dwelling. In addition, whilst the garage would be located to the south of the rear amenity area at this property, given its height and distance to the common boundary, it is not considered to result in undue loss of light or overshadowing.

Terrigal (Duno)

This property is located to the south-east of the application site and benefits from a long rear garden of approximately 42m directly to the east of the proposed additional dwelling. Whilst it is noted that the site plan does not accurately show the extent of this dwelling which benefits from a single storey rear extension and a conservatory not shown on the plan, the first-floor rear facing windows of the proposed dwelling would be some 21m away from the first-floor rear facing windows at Terrigal and some 11m from the rear amenity area directly in front of the rear elevation.

Whilst this distance would be under the recommended distance of 18m and the Inspector acknowledged there would be some views towards the amenity area, given that the proposal would not be sited directly behind this property, the views would be at an angle and therefore not considered to result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy. Such views would be comparable from the ones currently afforded from the first floor windows at the adjoining properties towards the rear amenity area this dwelling, which are oblique views that are common in residential areas such as this.

In terms of loss of light, the proposed development conforms with the 45 and the 25-degree rules and therefore no material loss of light would occur.

However, the proposed additional dwelling would be located 2m from the common boundary and given its scale, would be visible over the boundary hedging from the rear of this neighbouring garden. The Inspector considered the outbuilding close to the boundary with the application site to afford sufficient separation distance between the proposal and the rear of the garden at Terrigal.

It is noted from the comments received from the occupiers of this dwelling that the outbuilding was since dismantled; however the outbuilding was not the only mitigating factor and the proposed dwelling would only adjoin a small section of the overall garden, which given the length of the amenity area, on balance, is not considered to result in such a degree of harm as to warrant a refusal on these grounds.

Tarraleah

This neighbouring property is located directly to the rear of the proposed dwelling and would therefore have the most direct relationship with the proposal. However, there would be a separation distance of approximately 23m between the rear elevations and their respective first-floor windows and of between 10.7m and 14.7m to the common boundary.

The Inspector acknowledged that the rear amenity area at this property is shorter than the one of the surrounding properties, at around 11m at the nearest point; however, considered that the established boundary treatment would provide an effective screen to the sections of the garden that are closest with the application site. The Inspector also considered that although the vegetation might be pruned, this is typically undertaken as part of ongoing maintenance and the submitted plans also show landscaping along this boundary.

In addition the proposal would be sited to the north of this neighbouring property and would comply with the 45 and the 25-degree rules, therefore no material loss of light would occur.

Rosemoor

This neighbouring property is located to the south of the existing dwelling where no built form is proposed. The closest point of the proposed additional dwelling would be some 33m to the north-east, as such, it is not considered to result in harm to the amenities of the occupiers of this dwelling.

The relationship between Little Heath and the additional dwelling to the rear

The proposed dwelling would be orientated perpendicular to the existing dwelling, as such, there would be no direct views between main elevations. It is noted however that the proposed dwelling benefits from a small side window on the elevation facing the rear amenity area at Little Heath. Given that this window would serve a bedroom that benefits from three additional windows to the rear, it is considered reasonable to impose a condition to ensure this window would be obscurely glazed and unopenable unless 1.7m above the finished floor levels of the room it serves.

In addition, there would be a separation distance of approximately 16m between the two dwellings and the proposal would comply with the 45 and 25-degree rules, therefore not resulting in material loss of light.

The comments received from the objectors with regards to light pollution as a result of the extensive glazing are all noted. The amount of glazing is not considered excessive for a contemporary dwelling and domestic scale light bulbs would be installed in all the rooms. In addition, it is likely that the future occupiers of the dwelling would install blinds which would significantly reduce the amount of light from those windows late evenings in the summer and late afternoons in the winter.

The comments regarding potential sound pollution are also noted, however, it is not anticipated that noise generated from one additional family dwelling within a residential

area would be to such a degree so as to cause nuisance to the occupiers of the surrounding properties.

In light of the above, and in light of the Inspector's assessment of the proposal on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties, it is considered that the proposal would not result in such a degree of harm so as to warrant a refusal on these grounds.

The proposal would therefore sufficiently accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy DM5 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, Policy H6 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021) and the Residential Extensions SPD (2010).

13. Provision of suitable living 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 play space provision, appropriate facilities for the storage of waste and private clothes drying facilities.

Policy DM5 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 sets out that all development should demonstrate that they provide adequate internal and external space in order to ensure an appropriate living environment for future occupiers and meeting the Nationally Described Space Standard is a minimum requirement. In addition, external space should be provided; where an area of private garden is proposed for the exclusive use of a dwelling house, this should be at least 10m in depth and the width of the dwelling.

Internal Space

The plans indicate that the proposal comprises a 5-bed dwelling over two levels (Plot 2) and alterations to the existing dwelling (Plot 1). Whilst existing dwellings are not usually included in the internal space assessments, Plot 1 has also been included on this occasion.

The Government Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards (2015) requires dwellings to meet certain internal space standards as detailed below:

Plot No.	Unit size (bed/person) 2 storey dwelling	Minimum GIA (sqm) as required by THS	Proposed GIA (sqm)	Does it comply?
1	4b/8p	124sqm	219sqm	Yes
2	5b/8p	128sqm	293sqm	Yes

In addition, the Government Technical standards require in order to provide a double (or twin bedroom) a room should be at least 2.5m wide and have a floor area of at least 11.5sqm. The proposed bedrooms would comply with these requirements.

Outdoor Amenity Space

Paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF 2023 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are (inter alia) safe, inclusive and accessible which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Part 5 of Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 sets to maximise opportunities to improve the quality of life and health and well-being of current and future residents, by the provision of:

- private amenity space.
- on site playspace provision (for all ages).
- private clothes drying facilities.

Policy DM5 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 states that where an area of private garden is proposed for the exclusive use of a dwelling house, as a guideline, this should be at least 10m in depth and extend the whole width of the dwelling.

The plans indicate that the remaining rear garden at the existing dwelling (Plot 1) would have a depth of approximately 15m with a width far greater than the width of the dwelling. In addition, there would be additional amenity area to the side of the house/the rear of the garage.

With regards to the additional dwelling (Plot 2), the plans indicate that the rear amenity area would be wider than the width of the dwelling with a depth between 10.7m and 14.7m.

The comments received from objectors regarding insufficient amenity space for the size of the dwellings are noted; however, the proposed amenity areas comply and exceed the minimum standards. This view is also supported in the Officer Report for planning application WA/2021/01774 and the Inspector's Appeal Decision.

Outlook and Ventilation

All habitable rooms would benefit from appropriate outlook and ventilation and some of the rooms would be dual aspect.

It is noted that there would be one first floor window to the side elevation of the proposed dwelling that would be in close proximity to the boundary with Little Heath; however, given that the window is a secondary window to a bedroom that benefits from three additional windows to the rear, it is considered reasonable to impose a condition to ensure this window would be obscurely glazed and unopenable unless 1.7m above the finished floor levels of the room it serves.

The proposed linked outbuilding would also benefit from a first floor side window in close proximity with the boundary with Laurel Cottage and Terrigal; given that this window would serve a staircase and there is an additional window on the opposite elevation, it is considered reasonable to impose the same condition for this window as well.

Cycle Storage

The Surrey Vehicle, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance has been updated in 2023 and states that cycle parking should be designed and provided in accordance with government guidance and the NPPF. For residential provision, the location of the cycle parking should be convenient, accessible and fit for purpose. For a three-bed or more house, a minimum of 2 cycle space should be provided.

There would be sufficient space inside the existing/proposed garages to accommodate at least two cycles.

Refuse and Recycling Provision

Part 5 of Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 requires that appropriate facilities for the storage of waste (including general refuse, garden, food and recycling) are provided for all new dwellings.

The Waverley Bin Provision Guidance for Developers requires each new household to be provided before occupation with a 180ltr black refuse bin, 240ltr blue recycling bin, 23ltr green food waste caddy and a 7ltr grey/silver food waste caddy. In addition, all new individual properties need to accommodate a minimum of 3 wheeled bins.

The guidance states that residents need to be made fully aware before they purchase their property that they are expected to present their bins at the kerbside of the nearest public adopted highway for collection. The distance that waste collection crews can walk to collect bins for emptying must not exceed 15m for two-wheeled bins and 10m for four-wheeled bins.

Whilst it is noted that the proposed bins location with the temporary bins location have been mixed up on the plans, it is clear this is a drafting error. The location of the bins for the proposed dwelling would be to the side of the garage, and the temporary location of bins on collections days would be further down the access driveway and some 15m away from the kerbside, which would be on the limit, but within the accepted tolerance for collection crews to walk and collect the bins for emptying.

Whilst the drag distance to the collection point would be approximately 32m, given that this is not an unusual situation within the Borough, on balance, this is considered to be acceptable.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would provide a suitable residential environment for future occupiers. The proposal would therefore sufficiently accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy DM5 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, the relevant SPDs and planning guidance and the NPPF 2023.

14. Five Year Housing Land Supply or Housing Land Supply

The Council published its latest Five-Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement, with a base date of 1 April 2023 in October 2023. Since the Position Statement was published the annual housing requirement for the Borough has changed following the publication of the updated affordability ratios by the Office for National Statistics. The new annual housing requirement figure is 710 dpa. In addition, the number of homes in the five-year supply has also changed since the publication of the Five-Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement 2023. Having regard to the findings of the Planning Inspector for the Land East of Knowle Lane, Cranleigh (Appeal reference APP/R3650/

W/23/3326412) the Council considers it has a deliverable supply of 2,493 dwellings. This equates to a 3.5-year housing land supply.

As the Council cannot presently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF 2023 is engaged via footnote 8. Therefore, unless the site is located in an area, or involves an asset, of particular importance, that provides a clear reason for refusal, then permission must be granted unless it can be demonstrated that any adverse impacts demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

The application proposes the erection of one additional dwelling. It would therefore represent a very minor contribution to housing supply. In considering this matter in the previous appeal the Inspector concluded that the erection of 2 dwellings would make a contextually small contribution to the Council's housing supply and therefore attached limited weight to this. The Inspector attached substantial weight to the harm to the character and appearance of the area. Given the lack of harm identified above to the character and appearance of the area the contribution to housing supply resulting from this development is given significant weight in the planning balance.

15. Effect on East Hants and Wealden Heaths SPAs

The application site is located within the East Hants Special Protection Area 5 Km zone and the Wealden Heaths I Special Protection Area 5 Km zone.

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

16. 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.'

It is noted that planning application WA/2021/01774 was also refused for the lack of Ecological Information (the third reason for refusal). However, this was provided in the Appeal submission and the Inspector found it to be adequate as whilst the reports have identified a number of roosts, given that mitigation measures could be utilised to avoid unacceptable impact, the matter could be satisfactorily addressed.

The same report, titled Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey, prepared by Surrey Wildlife Trust Ecology Services, and dated 10/06/2022 was submitted in support of this application. Whilst it is acknowledged that Ecology Reports are valid for 18 months, the report was only 13 and a half months old at the time of the submission of the application (28/07/2023). In addition, given that a bat roost was recorded at this site,

a bat mitigation licence from Natural England would be required and the licence would require updated surveys regardless. As such, no ecological concerns are being raised subject to the applicant adhering to the advice contained within the report, which can be secured by way of condition.

In addition, and in order to comply with Policy H10 (Dark skies) of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021) it is considered reasonable to impose a condition ensuring any external lighting installed would meet the Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance for the reduction of obtrusive light.

In light of the above and having regards to the completed Biodiversity Checklist and the environmental constraints, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy NE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, Policy H10 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021) and Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the NPPF 2023.

17. Parking and Highway Safety

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF (2023) states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impact on the road network would be severe. Policy ST1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states, inter alia, that provision for car parking should be incorporated into proposals and new and improved means of public access should be encouraged.

The County Highways Authority was consulted on this application and has undertaken an assessment in terms of safety, capacity and policy grounds. The CHA confirms that this application has been considered individually and the conditions and informatives apply to this application only.

The proposed dwelling would be accessed via a new access road from Linkside West which is considered acceptable subject to specific conditions being imposed and informatives added to the decision notice. The proposed access would require the removal and replacement of a highways tree and, as such, the relevant informative has also been included. The CHA does not consider that the proposed development would result in a significant increase in vehicular trips on the surrounding highway network, nor does the CHA consider that the proposal would have a material impact on highway safety.

The CHA also suggests conditions referring to cycle parking and electrical vehicle charging; however, given that Officers assessed there is sufficient space to provide cycle parking in the existing/proposed garages and that electric vehicle charging is covered by the building control regs, it is not necessary to impose those conditions.

The CHA also noted that the proposed on-site parking would be in line with parking guidelines and the surrounding road network is subject to unrestricted parking; however, the LPA further assessed the parking provision below.

With regards to on-site parking provision, Appendix 2 of the Council's Parking Guidelines (2013) sets out the minimum number of parking spaces that would normally be expected for residential developments as follows:

Locational Characteristics	Town Centre	Rest of Waverley
1 bed	1 space per unit	1 space per unit
2 bed	1 space per unit	2 spaces per unit
3+ bed	1.5 spaces per unit	2.5 spaces per unit

The application site is not located within a town centre location and should therefore comply with the 'rest of Waverley' guidance.

Both properties would benefit from a double garage and there would be ample parking on the front driveways to accommodate at least two other vehicles, which would result in 4 on-site parking spaces per dwelling which exceeds the minimum requirements.

The comments received from objectors regarding highway safety and on-site parking provision have been fully assessed above and no concern is raised.

The proposed development is considered to comply with Policy ST1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy DM9 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, Policy H7 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021) the Council's Parking Guidelines (2013) and the NPPF 2023.

18. Trees and Landscape

Policy NE2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 states that the Council will seek, where appropriate, to maintain and enhance existing trees, woodland and hedgerows within the Borough.

Policy DM11 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 sets out that development should retain trees, woodland and important features such as hedges. In the event that removal cannot be avoided, appropriate mitigation should be provided.

Policy H9 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021) states that development proposals will be supported where they conserve and enhance trees, hedgerows and woodlands of value. Development proposals that affect trees, hedgerows or woodland of value should demonstrate they have been informed by a qualified arboriculturist or ecologist and include a management plan. The site survey should also include an Arboricultural Method Statement and associated Tree Protection Plan.

A Tree Survey and Impact Assessment prepared by Keen Consultants and dated July 2023 was submitted in support of the application. The report identifies the protected trees and includes Tree Constraints and Tree Protection Plans.

The Council's Tree Officer was consulted on this application and reviewed the submitted information.

The proposed access will require the loss of T2 whitebeam which is subject of TPO control (TPO 5/03 T43). The character of Linkside West is of a mature tree lined residential highway, a gap to the front of Little Heath is not in keeping with this character. With regard to a relatively young age class and small size the loss of T2 whitebeam can be adequately mitigated by replacement planting in a prominent position with 1x extra heavy standard replacement tree of comparable species.

The root protection area (RPA) of T1 Scots pine (also subject of the Order) has been plotted in a regular circular fashion which does not account for a constrained rooting environment affected by the highway and a foreseeable asymmetric root distribution.

To retain and improve growing conditions for T1 and a forthcoming replacement tree the construction of the access and nearby driveway areas should follow 'no - dig' principles and incorporate a fit for purpose cellular confinement system or other suitable system.

The proposal will result in foreseeable pressure to prune Trees T8 & T7 on occupation and some facilitative pruning is noted. With regard to the submitted tree quality assessment this would not be considered an overriding constraint to the proposal.

Retained trees provide screening and will preserve a mature character to the locale, there is opportunity to improve the site's relationship with its setting with appropriate tree planting on the boundaries.

The Council's Tree Officer concludes that the proposal would be acceptable from a Trees and Landscape perspective subject to specific conditions being imposed, including pre-commencement conditions.

The comments received from the objectors with regards to the impact on trees are all noted; as the Council's Tree Officer, in his professional capacity found the proposal to be acceptable subject to conditions, no concerns are raised on arboricultural grounds.

In light of the above, the proposal would accord with Policy NE2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy DM11 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, Policy H9 of the Haslemere Neighbourhood Plan (2021) and the NPPF 2023.

19. Climate Change & Sustainability

Policy CC1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 seeks to support development which contributes to mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change, including measures that use renewable and low carbon energy supply systems.

Policy CC2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 seeks to promote sustainable patterns of development and reduce the level of greenhouse gas emissions.

Policy DM2 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 states that all development should seek to maximise energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions through its design, structure, orientation and positioning, landscaping and relevant technology.

The Council's Climate Change and Sustainability SPD (October 2022) is relevant.

A Climate Change and Sustainability Checklist as well as a separate Energy Statement have been submitted in support of the application. The proposals include double glazing, draught proofing, low energy lighting and wherever possible will use local sustainable materials. In addition, permeable surfaces will be incorporated as well as food waste and garden waste composting facilities. The Energy Statement lists renewable energy feasibility options as well as draft dwelling emissions and daily water consumption. These measures are considered proportionate to the scale of

development proposed and would comply with the relevant policies and guidance. No concern is therefore raised subject to the proposed measures being secured by way of condition.

20. Community Infrastructure Levy

The proposal would be CIL liable, and according to the CIL charging schedule zone it falls within zone A.

21. Matters raised in representations

The material planning issues have been fully assessed in the planning considerations above.

With regards to the comments regarding the covenants stipulated in the deeds for the properties on the Linksides, it must be noted that the presence of a restrictive covenant is not a material planning consideration and therefore it cannot be taken into account.

Several comments mention Policy BE6 of the Local Plan 2002 as not being taken into consideration and that residents applied to WBC for the Linksides to be included under this policy for special status regarding housing density. The Local Plan 2002 has been replaced by the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 and the policy has not been carried over. In any event, the policy referred to specific areas of the Borough and did not include the Linksides and therefore has no bearing on the assessment of this proposal.

With regards to the inconsistencies in the initially submitted Design & Access Statement and Planning Statement, still referring to the third house, this was in part given that the applicant intended to submit a separate application for the third house. The application was indeed submitted and subsequently withdrawn and the documents have been updated accordingly. If any errors still remain, this would be due to an administrative error, the proposal under consideration is clearly for only one additional dwelling and the wording in the statements is not binding in the decision notice.

References have been made to several appeal decisions in the vicinity that do not support the subdivision of the plots. These appeal decisions have also been put forward for consideration in the letters of representations sent for the Appeal of planning application WA/2021/01774. The Inspector concluded in the Appeal Decision that whilst the comments on the relevance of the appeal decisions put forward by different parties on other sites are noted, it was evident from the details presented that they turned on their own particular merits, as did the appeal on planning application WA/2021/01774.

The only Appeal Decision relevant to this proposal is the one on the previously refused scheme - APP/R3650/W/22/3296043.

The Proposed Street Scene is considered sufficiently adequate to assess the proposal.

It must also be noted that whilst they are helpful, there is no requirement for annotated dimensions on the plans as long as they are to scale and therefore can be measured.

Several comments refer to the application site being located close to the AONB; however the application site is not within the AONB and, as such, the AONB policies do not apply to this proposal.

The comments regarding the impact on flooding are also noted. The site is not located within a Flood Zone and the proposed hardstanding is not considered to be excessive so as to have an impact on the flood risk in the area, which is also echoed in the Inspector's Appeal Decision on the previous application.

Whilst developers are encouraged to engage with the neighbourhood before submitting a planning application, this is only advised and not a requirement.

The only situation when a Local Planning Authority can refuse to accept a planning application for consideration is when it is absolutely identical with a previous application. In this case there is a significant difference, in the fact that the current application only proposes one additional dwelling instead of two.

With regards to the concerns referring to increased traffic during the construction phase, this would only be temporary and not a reason to preclude planning permission.

With regards to the concerns that if approved, this application would create an unwanted precedent in the area, it must be noted that every application is assessed on its own merits.

Whilst loss of views is often cited in planning objection letters by neighbours understandably concerned on how a proposal would affect their property, unfortunately, there is no right to a view under the planning system.

22. Planning Balance and Conclusion

The planning balance assessment concludes that the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan, and there would be no adverse effects as a result of the proposal, as such, planning permission is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That permission GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

1. Condition:

The plan numbers to which this permission relates are:

- Location Plan (1:2500, drawing no. 212-100)
- Proposed Site Plan (1:200, drawing no. 411-001)
- Proposed Site Separation Distances (1:200, drawing no. 411-101)
- Plot 1 – Proposed Floor Plans (1:100, drawing no. 412-100)
- Plot 1 – Proposed Elevations (1:100, drawing no. 413-100)
- Plot 2 – Proposed Floor Plans (1:100, drawing no. 412-200)
- Plot 2 – Proposed Elevations (1:100, drawing no. 413-200)
- Proposed Street Elevation (1:50, drawing no. 413-001)
- Proposed Movement and Access Strategy (1:200, drawing no. 411-002)
- Proposed Site Landscape Plan (1:200, drawing no. 415-100)

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. No material variation from these plans shall take place unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

In order that the development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in complete accordance with the approved plans and to accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and Policies DM1 and DM4 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

2. Condition:

No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

In the interest of the character and amenity of the area in accordance with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and Policies DM1 and DM4 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

3. Condition:

Prior to the installation of that part of the development, scaled elevations for the proposed gates on the access road to Plot 2, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be then carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason:

In order that the development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in complete accordance with the approved plans and to accord with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and Policies DM1 and DM4 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

4. Condition:

Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the proposed first floor window on the western side elevation of the additional dwelling (shown on the plans as serving a bedroom); and the proposed window on the eastern side elevation of the linked outbuilding (showed on the plans as serving a staircase) shall be glazed to Pilkington Textured Glass Privacy Level 5 or standard equivalent and be non-opening unless the parts of the windows which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the finished floor levels of the rooms in which the windows are installed. This shall be retained at such a privacy level for the lifetime of the development and shall not at any time be replaced with clear glazing.

Reason:

In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM5 of the Waverley Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

5. Condition:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows or other openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the side elevations of the additional dwelling hereby permitted without the written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of residential amenity in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM5 of the Waverley Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

6. Condition:

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed vehicular access to Linkside West hereby approved has been constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 0.6m high.

Reason:

In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in accordance with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part1) 2018, Policy DM9 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, and the Council's Parking Guidelines (2013).

7. Condition:

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

Reason:

In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in accordance with Policy TD1 of the Local Plan (Part1) 2018, Policy DM9 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023, and the Council's Parking Guidelines (2013).

8. Condition:

The development hereby approved shall be completed at all times in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Bat Presence/Likely Absence Survey

prepared by Surrey Wildlife Trust Ecology Services, dated 10/06/2022, submitted with this application.

Reason:

To ensure ecological protection of the site in accordance with Policy NE1 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and the guidance contained in the NPPF.

9. Condition:

In this condition 'retained tree' means an existing tree, which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the first occupation of the development.

a) no retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be pruned other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any pruning shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (tree work) and in accordance with any supplied arboricultural method statement.

b) if any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

c) tree protection shall be maintained in-situ and not moved or removed until all construction has finished and equipment, materials, or machinery are removed from site.

d) any arboricultural protection information and plans submitted as part of the application, and listed in the approved plans condition, or submitted to meet a condition of consent shall be implemented and adhered to at all times during the construction process unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. This shall include any requirement for arboricultural supervision and site monitoring.

This condition may only fully be discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written evidence of contemporaneous supervision and monitoring of tree protection throughout construction by the appointed arboriculturist.

Reason:

In the interests of the protection of trees and their rooting areas of which contribute visual amenity and character to the area in accordance with Policy NE2 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, and Policy DM11 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

10. Condition:

No development shall take place until an Arboricultural Method Statement & an amended tree protection plan in line with BS 5837:2012 is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to include appropriate 'no-dig' construction and cellular confinement system near the tree identified as T1 (Scots

pine), and the position of a replacement tree at the site frontage, arrangements for arboricultural supervision and site monitoring and any other activities with the potential to adversely impact retained trees including instillation of services.

Reason:

In the interests of the protection of trees and their rooting areas of which contribute visual amenity and character to the area in accordance with Policy NE2 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, and Policy DM11 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

11. Condition:

No development shall take place until the approved tree protection measures are installed, and any further information provided in accordance with the submitted arboricultural information. The applicant shall arrange a pre-commencement meeting after the installation of the tree protection between the Local Planning Authority and the applicant's project arboriculturist to allow inspection and verification of the protection measures and agree arboricultural supervision arrangements and tree protection monitoring frequency.

Reason:

In the interests of the protection of trees and their rooting areas of which contribute visual amenity and character to the area in accordance with Policy NE2 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, and Policy DM11 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

12. Condition:

No development shall take place until full details of all proposed tree planting, including appropriate replacement planting of the tree identified as T2 (whitebeam), arrangements to ensure the provision of adequate rooting volume to sustain planted trees into maturity, the proposed times of planting, and arrangements for aftercare over a period of 5 years have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and all tree planting and aftercare shall be carried out in accordance with those details and at those times. If within a period of five years from the date of the planting of any tree, that tree, or any planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason:

In the interests of the protection of trees and their rooting areas of which contribute visual amenity and character to the area in accordance with Policy NE2 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, and Policy DM11 of Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 2) 2023.

13. Condition:

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

Reason:

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

14. Condition:

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the appropriate proposed measures identified within the submitted Climate Change and Sustainability Checklist and accompanying Energy Statement, unless first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

In the interests of achieving a high standard of sustainability in accordance with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan (Part 1) 2018, Policy DM2 of the Local Plan (Part 2) 2023 and the Council's Climate change and Sustainability SPD (2022).

Informatives:

1. The development hereby permitted is CIL liable. 'CIL Form 6: Commencement Notice' must be received by the Council prior to the commencement of development. Commencement of development is defined in Regulation 7 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). Failure to adhere to the CIL Regulations and commencing work without notifying the Council could forfeit any rights you have to exemptions, payment by instalments and you may also incur surcharges. For further information see our webpages (www.waverley.gov.uk/CIL) or contact CIL@waverley.gov.uk
2. The applicant is reminded that all bat species, their breeding sites and resting places are fully protected by law, as such, a European Protected Species License (EPS) needs to be obtained from Natural England before any works can commence on site.
3. The following British Standards should be referred to: a) BS 3882:2015 Specification for topsoil; b) BS 3998:2010 Tree work – Recommendations; c) BS 3936-1:1992 Nursery Stock - Part 1: Specification for trees and shrubs; d) BS 4428:1989 Code of practice for general landscaping operations (excluding hard surfaces); e) BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to demolition, design and construction – Recommendations; f) BS 7370-4:1993 Grounds maintenance part 4. Recommendations for maintenance of soft landscape (other than amenity turf); g) BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape –

Recommendations; h) BS 8601:2013 Specification for subsoil and requirements for use.

4. The applicant is expected to ensure the safe operation of all construction traffic to prevent unnecessary disturbance obstruction and inconvenience to other highway users. Care should be taken to ensure that the waiting, parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles does not hinder the free flow of any carriageway, footway, bridleway, footpath, cycle route, right of way or private driveway or entrance. The developer is also expected to require their contractors to sign up to the "Considerate Constructors Scheme" Code of Practice, (www.ccscheme.org.uk) and to follow this throughout the period of construction within the site, and within adjacent areas such as on the adjoining public highway and other areas of public realm. Where repeated problems occur the Highway Authority may use available powers under the terms of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the safe operation of the highway.
5. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover or to install dropped kerbs. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs.
6. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works (including Statutory connections/diversions required by the development itself or the associated highway 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 (including Statutory connections/diversions required by the development itself or the associated highway 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.
7. In the event that the access works require the felling of a highway tree not being subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and its removal has been permitted through planning permission, or as permitted development, the developer will pay to the Council as part of its licence application fee compensation for its loss based upon

20% of the tree's CAVAT valuation to compensate for the loss of highway amenity.

8. It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be provided in accordance with the Surrey County Council Vehicular, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development 2022. Where undercover parking areas (multi-storey car parks, basement or undercroft parking) are proposed, the developer and LPA should liaise with Building Control Teams and the Local Fire Service to understand any additional requirements. If an active connection costs on average more than £3600 to install, the developer must provide cabling (defined as a 'cabled route' within the 2022 Building Regulations) and two formal quotes from the distribution network operator showing this.
9. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide e-bike charging points with socket timers to prevent them constantly drawing a current over night or for longer than required. Signage should be considered regarding damaged or shock impacted batteries, indicating that these should not be used/charged. The design of communal bike areas should consider fire spread and there should be detection in areas where charging takes place. With regard to an e-bike socket in a domestic dwelling, the residence should have detection, and an official e-bike charger should be used. Guidance on detection can be found in BS 5839-6 for fire detection and fire alarm systems in both new and existing domestic premises and BS 5839-1 the code of practice for designing, installing, commissioning, and maintaining fire detection and alarm systems in non-domestic buildings.