



GUILDFORD
BOROUGH

www.guildford.gov.uk

Tom Horwood
Joint Chief Executive of Guildford and
Waverley Borough Councils

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY 30 MARCH 2022

Please find attached the following:

Agenda No Item

8. **Late Sheets - Updates, amendments, corrections and Late Representations**
(Pages 1 - 18)

Yours sincerely

Sophie Butcher, Democratic Services Officer

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

30 March 2022

Update/Amendment/Correction/List

21/P/01057 – (Page 17) – White Horse Yard, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6BB

Please find attached the Schedule of Accommodation for Amended Scheme Space Standards in relation to the above application.

In addition, an amendment to condition 10 has been made and read as follows:

No residential development, excluding demolition, shall take place until written confirmation has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority that Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) to mitigate the impact of the development has been secured and no dwelling shall be occupied before written confirmation has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority that the works required to bring the land up to acceptable SANG standard have been completed.

Reason: This is required as a pre-commencement condition as the development is only acceptable if the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area can be mitigated. This is reliant on the provision of SANG. Avoidance works associated with development need to be carried out prior to the occupation of the development so that measures can cater for increased number of residents to avoid adverse impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

Policy Clarification

Policy H2 (3) is applicable 'in Designated Rural Areas, the threshold for providing affordable housing is on sites providing more than 5 dwellings'.

Ripley is a Designated Rural Area.

Market Housing Mix

The Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan policy LNPH2: Housing for All sets out a housing mix for affordable housing only.

Surrey Police

Request a condition for development to achieve a Secure By Design accreditation to reduce the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime.

Case officer note, this is the subject of a condition.

Historic England

Please note that Historic England do not wish to offer advice on the applications 21/P/01057 and 21/P/01058. Please see attached correspondence.

Recommendation

- (i) That a S.106 agreement be entered into to secure:
- 7 Shared Ownership affordable housing units on site (plots 1, 16-21)

This replaces:

- A contribution of £437,491 towards affordable housing;
- A late stage, upwards only, review mechanism at 75% of disposal of dwellings to capture and secure additional contribution towards affordable housing

Please attach Kempton Carr Croft viability appraisal dated 24 March 2022 to support this. (attached)

The Housing and Strategy Manager has advised that the KCC Viability Appraisal work shows this as a viable offer and the offer of 7 Shared Ownership units on site is acceptable.

Amend condition 31 (obscure glazing) to include plot 3

In response to questions raised from members:

- Highlight the location plan and block plans show the property to the South of South Cottage known as the Stables
- The width of the proposed access road is 4.8m
- 1 visitor parking space is provided. Surrey County Council as Highway Authority do not object to the application
- Lovelace Neighbourhood plan requires visitor parking spaces on sites of more than 10 dwellings. The Lovelace NP requires 60 parking spaces based on policy LNP14. Surrey County Council raises no objection to the parking provision of 41 spaces plus 1 visitor space. The Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan was made on 6 May 2021. This planning application was submitted on 30 June 2020, predating the Lovelace NP by just over 10 months.
- The proposed access road materials have not been specified. Condition 28 requires the submission of hard and soft landscaping details.
- Water Run-off. The Lead Local Flood Authority is satisfied that the proposed drainage strategy meets the requirements of the NPPF and requests conditions, see Conditions 12 and 13 of the report.
- Impact on The Stables – Plot 7 one first floor side window serving a bathroom, condition 31 requires it to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m. The building is located 2.5 metres from the boundary, observing a separation of 8.5m between The Stables and Plot 7
- Impact on York Cottage distance to boundary. Plot 3 is located 1.8m from the shared boundary and would not extend the depth of York Cottage.
- Impact on residential amenity is considered on page 48 of the committee report
- Impact on foundations is a Building control matter
- Loss of trees along access – no objection from the Tree officer these are low grade specimens and are not worthy of a Tree Preservation Order.
- Site allocation boundary follows the Green Belt boundary. As set out in the committee report the application site includes areas to the east and south which fall within the green belt. These areas are devoid of development and curtilages do not extend into this area. Typo page 37 last paragraph second sentence should refer to south not west.
- Confirm the proposal does not include any retail provision, see page 48/49 of the Committee report.

21/P/01306 – (Page 97)- Land at Effingham Lodge Farm, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JP

Corrections / Amendments:

It is noted that some residents have raised concerns about the costs of the new school and whether or not it was, or is currently, the most cost-effective solution, particularly when compared to the possible refurbishment of the existing buildings. Members have received similar comments from Effingham Residents Association.

While the Inspector's appeal report and the Secretary of State (SoS) decision letter is a material planning consideration, other matters can be considered if there is sound new evidence produced which provides a reason to depart from it. This could in theory include changes to the costs associated with the delivery of the new school versus, for example, the refurbishment of the existing buildings. However, when deciding the level of weight to be attributed to the matter (if evidence existed to confirm it), Members would need to balance this against the benefits which are directly attributed to the provision of a new replacement school. Such considerations may include:

1. the SoS Decision Letter adopted the Inspector's finding that funding for the refurbishment of the school is not available. Even if the delivery of the school was not considered to be the least expensive option, as far as Officers are aware, there is no reason to disagree with SoS conclusion that funding for refurbishment does not exist. As such, based on the evidence before us, it remains the case that the only or best way to meet the need for the school is still the delivery of the development consented on appeal together with the proposed development;
2. it is Officer's understanding that refurbishing the existing school would not deliver the same benefits that would flow from a modern purpose-built education facility. While a refurbishment may improve the 'condition' of the existing school estate, it would, most probably, still fail to improve its 'sufficiency and suitability' to the same level as a new, replacement facility. For example, a refurbishment of the existing buildings may not resolve issues with inadequate classroom sizes, cramped nature of the site etc. In addition, concerns regarding the inadequacy of the existing school site regarding its security and the lack of enough outdoor playing field space would remain;
3. the refurbishment of the existing school would not provide the additional pupil places which the replacement school delivers, and which the Planning inspector agreed were required. Surrey County Council have not indicated that the additional places are no longer required;
4. the refurbishment of the existing school buildings would pose many logistical issues including the need for temporary accommodation, where this would be located and its impact on the already limited sports facilities on site. The replacement of the school would avoid this situation completely and would allow for an effective transition from the existing building to the replacement, with a much reduced impact on the education provision.

On this basis, even if the Committee consider that the replacement school is not the least expensive option (which has not been evidenced), Members could still give substantial weight to the provision of the replacement school and the unique benefits and opportunities that it presents. It is also noted that the replacement of the school is the only option under consideration. It is not demonstrated that the refurbishment of the existing buildings is a realistic alternative proposal.

The parking table on page 156 of the agenda has been incorrectly formatted. A corrected version is provided below:

	GBC parking standard	Surrey guidance	CC	Effingham NP	Proposed provision
1 bed flat (20)	1 x 20 = 20	1 x 20 = 20		1 x 20 = 20	60 56 allocated spaces + 4 disabled
2 bed flat (20)	1.5 x 20 = 30	1 x 20 = 20		2 x 20 = 40	
2 bed (22)	1.5 x 22 = 33	1.5 x 22 = 33		2 x 22 = 44	160 151 spaces allocated or in garages + 2 disabled
3 bed (28)	1.5 x 28 = 42	2 x 28 = 56		2 x 28 = 56	
4 bed (15)	1.5 x 15 = 22.5	2 x 15 = 30		3 x 15 = 45	
5 bed (5)	1.5 x 5 = 7.5	2 x 5 = 10		3 x 5 = 15	
Visitor spaces					9
Car club spaces					1
Total	155	169		220	223

21/P/01283 – (Page 67) – Howard of Effingham School, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JR

Corrections / Amendments:

Recommended condition 47 on page 83 of the agenda is no longer required. The treatment of the two areas of land being removed from the application are already secured through condition 7 of application 20/P/02048 (reserved matters for the replacement school), which reads:

Before the development hereby approved is first occupied, a planting and landscaping scheme (which shall include any fencing, gates and/or boundary treatments) for the two areas of the site which have been removed from the curtilage of the school (i.e. the land fronting Lower Road to the south-west of the site and the land to the north-west of the large car park) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved schemes shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the development or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or diseased in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, shall be replaced in the next available planting sooner with others of similar size, species and number, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of an appropriate landscape scheme in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

Corrections / Amendments:

21/P/01283 – (Page 67) – Howard of Effingham School, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JR and 21/P/01306 (Page 97) – Land at Effingham Lodge Farm, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JP

The Local Planning Authority has been made aware of concerns raised by residents that some letters of representation for both applications are missing from the Council's website and that the number of objections referenced in the Officer Reports are incorrect.

Members should be aware that in total we have 31 representations relating to application 21/P/01306 and 57 representations relating to application 21/P/01283 which have been received but not uploaded to our website. These objections are also not included in the tally of received objections which are set out on pages 89 and 128 of the agenda. The reason for this is that the representations do not have the postal address of the writer, which is a GBC policy. It should be noted that the Council did contact all 88 responders individually to request a postal address, however, no responses were received.

Notwithstanding the above, it is confirmed that Officers have reviewed all 88 objections referred to above and all of the points which are raised are already included in the representation summaries on pages 89 and 128 of the agenda.

It is also confirmed that apart from the 88 representations noted above, the Local Planning Authority has no record of any further responses which have been received but not logged against these applications.

21/P/02059 – (Page 171) – Clandon Downs, High Clandon, East Clandon, Guildford, GU4 7RP

Please note, item 21/P/02059, was placed on the agenda in error. The committee report is not yet finalised and is awaiting further discussions about its referral.

Should the item be placed before planning committee it is likely to be at the next meeting on the 27 April.

21/P/02296 – (Page 181 - 215) – 1 & 2 Ash Grove, Guildford, GU2 8UT

Conditions and reasons:

Condition 6 amended as follows (page 186)

The development must accord with the Arboricultural Report prepared by Dryad (amended version dated 24.02.2022, reference D2549.REV4.0.AIA.AM) *and addendum showing removal of tree G2 (reference D2549 - Additional tree removal twodio V1.2)*. No development shall commence on site until the protective fencing and any other protection measures shown on the Tree Protection Plan (amended version dated 24.01.2022, reference D2549.REV4.0.A1.TCPWR Rev 4.0) in the Arboricultural Report have been installed. At all times, until the completion of the development, such fencing and protection measures shall be retained as approved. Within all fenced areas, soil levels shall remain unaltered and the land kept free of vehicles, plant, materials and debris. No development shall commence until a site meeting has taken place with the site manager, the retained consulting arboriculturalist and the Local Planning Authority Tree Officer.

Reason: To protect the trees on site which are to be retained in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

Third party comments: (page 37-38) updated

42 individuals have objected. The concerns raised are summarised below:

- impact of traffic on existing highway network
[officer comment: highway improvement works were agreed under the outline planning permission]
- loss of parking on The Street

- lack of new infrastructure proposed – healthcare, education, shops
- lack of homes suitable for first-time buyers
- EIA development
[officer comment: this did not constitute EIA development when the outline application was screened and the reserved matters does not either]
- out of character
- loss of Poplar trees
[officer comment: addressed in report page]
- foul and sewerage capacity
- surface water flooding risk
- pedestrian access to SANG
- poor public transport
- construction traffic
- overdevelopment
- proximity of homes to A31 Hog's Back
[officer comment: several of the objections raised above relate to matters that were addressed on the outline application and were deemed acceptable subject to conditions and a planning obligation]
- location of apartments
- harm to the Green Belt
[officer comment: the site is not in the Green Belt and was inset from the Green Belt]
- noise and disturbance during construction
- loss of wildlife habitat

At the time the agenda was published there were 6 responses, an additional 36 were received after 30.06.2020

Members have been made aware in advance by the Council's Solicitor that this item does not qualify for public speaking, as at 30.06.2020 when the agenda was published the Council had received only 6 letters in respect of this application (and so, fewer than 20 letters).

Planning policies

Draft Local Plan: development management policies - Issues and Preferred Options' document (LPDMP)

Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states:

“Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).”

The LPDMP is at a very early stage of preparation (consultation on the first Regulation 18 Preferred Options is still underway and there is currently no 'policy' in existence). There has been no analysis of the consultation comments – as there are likely to be unresolved objections to the preferred policy approaches which will require a response and potential amendments. Adoption of the LPDMP is currently anticipated to be Sept 2022 and it would be some time yet before this would carry significant weight in decision making.

Planning considerations.

Amendments and corrections.

Page 16 & 39-40

The PPG (Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 21b-006-20190315) 'How must decisions on applications for planning permission be made?'

"Development plan policies are material to an application for planning permission the decision must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (see section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 – these provisions also apply to appeals)"

When the outline planning permission was granted on 28.01.2018 the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites (LPSS) had not been adopted. Therefore, the policy requirements were not a relevant material consideration and could not be applied as matter of law.

Following adoption of the LPSS on 25.04.2019, the policies relevant to the reserved matters can be applied to the proposed:

- appearance
- landscaping
- layout
- scale

Planning matters that were addressed under outline planning permission cannot now be re-evaluated under the LPSS. These principles have been established and there are conditions and S106 planning obligations in place.

Highway matters from the outline permission (page 17-18)

Bus services

The Travel Plan submitted and approved for condition 20 of the outline permission (16/P/00222) provided details of the how local facilities and amenities could be accessed by public transport.

Any bus strategy for Ash would be implemented by Surrey County Council and they have confirmed that they would be using S106 contributions from other developments towards this. The Council have been given no details of this.

Notwithstanding this, the Inspector considered the proximity of bus stops and frequency of bus services in their decision and was satisfied that that the bus would provide an alternative mode of travel. The site also has an approved Travel Plan which takes into account the change in bus routes and was found acceptable to the County.

The layout of the development and the scale and appearance of the buildings

Street design (page 45)

Width of roads – awaiting details from applicant

Landscaping and trees (page 56-57)

In the professional opinion of officers including Council's Tree Officer, and the applicants Landscape Architect, it is recommended that all of the remaining 27 Poplars along The Street are removed in favour semi-mature, native replacement trees. These are likely to be ...

All trees south of the Hogs Back Brewery entrance (48 trees) and 7 trees in north eastern corner of the site are approved to be lost for the permitted pedestrian access onto The Street and highway improvement works. So of the 83 Poplars along The Street two-thirds are already approved to be removed.

Sustainable design and construction (page 19, 58-59)

The Energy Strategy submitted and approved for condition 10 of the outline permission (16/P/00222) has an indicative solar photovoltaic layout to achieve the 20% reduction in carbon emissions. The summary box states that 74 dwellings/buildings would solar panels.

As this is an indicative layout, condition 23 has been suggested for a final plan of the location of the solar panels.

The impact on residential amenity *Occupier amenity (page 18, 53-54)*

The Inspector considered the principal of development adjoining a slip road and A31, Hog's Back. Both air quality and noise impacts were considered with reports produced by the appellant and Council. In paragraph 66-64, they were satisfied the residential site would not experience undue levels of pollution and that appropriate noise mitigation would manage noise impacts. These are matters of principle and are not to be re-evaluated as part of this reserved matters application.

Noise mitigation

The Noise Assessment submitted and approved for condition 10 of the outline permission (16/P/00222) include the following measures:

- positioned further into the site to increase the separation distance from the A31 and northern boundary near the A331
- arranged in clusters around central garden areas to provide shelter;
- enclosed, high ridge garages and car barns to provide almost continuous screening around garden;
- short sections of fence would supplement the garden fences;
- 3m high fence along the western and the majority of the southern boundary to the A31;
- enhanced glazing and ventilation

There would be no groundworks to change land levels or create a bund. The mitigation above would meet the requirements for 55 decibels required by the Inspector in their decision.

21/P/02643 – (Page 217) – Tretower House, Merrow Street, Guildford, GU4 7AT

Planning Considerations:

Sustainability:

For clarification, the submitted Climate Change and Sustainability Questionnaire states that the development will be providing PV panels contributing to at least 25% renewable energy (in addition to the other measures as set out in the officers report). These measures will be secured by way of Conditions 5 and 20 as set out in the officer's report.

Conditions:

Condition 6 is amended to ensure the Landscape Ecological Management Plan is submitted to the LPA for approval ***prior to the commencement*** of development.

Condition 6 wording amended as follows:

Prior to the ***commencement of development***, a detailed landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) for the site to include detailed landscaping proposals and the enhancement and mitigation measures set out in the 'Addendum to Planning Supporting Letter - Ecology (from Tetra Tech Planning) dated 8 March 2021, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP should include adequate details of proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement and include details of the following:

- a) description and evaluation of features to be managed
- b) ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management
- c) aims and objectives of management
- d) appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives
- e) prescriptions for management actions together with a plan of management compartments
- f) preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period)
- g) details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan
- h) ongoing monitoring and remedial measures
- i) legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the application with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery
- j) monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and / or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme
- k) final biodiversity net gain assessment

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed LEMP.

Reason: To increase the biodiversity of the site and mitigate any impact from the development.

Condition 20 is updated to include reference to the proposed sustainability measures as set out in the Planning Supporting Letter (Page 11) from Tetra Tech (dated 17 December 2021) . Condition updated as follows:

Condition 20 wording amended as follows:

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the sustainability measures set out in the submitted Climate Change and Sustainability Questionnaire (received 20 December

2021) and the sustainability measures set out on Page 11 of the Planning Supporting Letter from Tetra Tech (dated 17 December 2021).

Reason: To ensure that measures to make the development sustainable and efficient in the use of energy, water and materials are included in the development.



Historic England

Ms Jo Trask
Guildford Borough Council

Direct Dial: 0207 973 3749

Our ref: **W**: L01473775
25 March 2022

Dear Ms Trask

Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2021

WHITE HORSE YARD, HIGH STREET, RIPLEY, GU23 6BB
Application No. 20/P/01058

Thank you for your letter of 21 March 2022 regarding the above application for listed building consent.

Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.

We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers. You may also find it helpful to refer to our published advice at <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/>

It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Scott

Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas
E-mail: Andrew.Scott@HistoricEngland.org.uk



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Historic England

Ms Jo Trask
Guildford Borough Council

Direct Dial: 0207 973 3749

Our ref: **W:** P01473713
25 March 2022

Dear Ms Trask

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**WHITE HORSE YARD, HIGH STREET, RIPLEY, GU23 6BB
Application No. 20/P/01057**

Thank you for your letter of 21 March 2022 regarding the above application for planning permission.

Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.

We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers. You may also find it helpful to refer to our published advice at <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/>

It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Scott

Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas
E-mail: Andrew.Scott@HistoricEngland.org.uk



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Schedule of Accommodation for Amended Scheme _03.03.22

JOB NO.:

1366_PLN_200

SITE ADDRESS:

White Horse Yard, High Street, Ripley

PLOT NO.	TYPE (H/F)	NO. OF BEDROOMS	NO. OF PERSONS	REQUIRED AREA (M2)	ACTUAL AREA (M2)	AREA (SQFT)	REQUIRED BUILT IN STORAGE (M2)	ACTUAL BUILT IN STORAGE (M2)
plot 1	End Terrace	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 2	Mid Terrace	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 3	End Terrace	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 4	Detached	3	6	102	119.0	1281	2.5	3.0
plot 5	Semi Detached	3	6	102	106.0	1141	2.5	2.6
plot 6	Semi Detached	3	5	93	108.0	1163	2.5	2.7
plot 7	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 8	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 9	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 10	Semi Detached	2	4	79	81.0	872	2.0	2.9
plot 11	Detached	3	6	102	114.0	1227	2.5	2.6
plot 12	Detached	3	6	102	114.0	1227	2.5	2.6
plot 13	Detached	3	5	93	100.0	1076	2.5	2.8
plot 14	Detached	4	7	115	146.0	1572	3.0	3.8
plot 15	Detached	3	6	102	119.0	1281	2.5	2.9
plot 16	GF Flat	2	4	70	72.3	778	2.0	2.2
plot 17	GF Flat	2	4	70	74.0	797	2.0	2.2
plot 18	FF Flat	2	4	70	72.3	778	2.0	2.2
plot 19	FF Flat	2	4	70	74.0	797	2.0	2.2
plot 20	SF Flat	1	2	50	56.0	603	1.5	1.5
plot 21	SF Flat	1	2	50	56.0	603	1.5	1.5
plot 22	Detached	4	7	115	132.0	1421	3.0	3.0
plot 23	Detached	4	7	115	132.0	1421	3.0	3.0
plot 24	Semi Detached	4	7	121	143.0	1539	3.0	3.1
plot 25	Semi Detached	4	7	121	143.0	1539	3.0	3.1
plot 26	Detached	4	7	115	159.0	1711	3.0	3.6
TOTAL		69	130		2606.6	28057		

COMMUNALS	AREA (M2)	AREA (SQFT)
Plots 16-21 - GF	20.9	225
Plots 16-21 - FF	20.9	225
Plots 16-21 - SF	13.5	145
Bin Store	17.5	188
Cycle Store	9.9	107
TOTAL	82.7	890

Viability Appraisal -
26 unit scheme - with 7 shared ownership units
Up-dated GDV, Build Costs

White Horse Yard
High Street
Ripley
Surrey

Development Appraisal
Kempton Carr Croft
24 March 2022

APPRAISAL SUMMARY**KEMPTON CARR CROFT**

**Viability Appraisal -
26 unit scheme - with 7 shared ownership units
Up-dated GDV, Build Costs**

Appraisal Summary for Phase 1

Currency in £

REVENUE

Sales Valuation	Units	ft²	Sales Rate ft²	Unit Price	Gross Sales
Private Sale units	19	22,831	534.65	642,454	12,206,624
Shared Ownership	7	5,228	345.49	258,032	1,806,221
Totals	26	28,059			14,012,845

NET REALISATION**14,012,845****OUTLAY****ACQUISITION COSTS**

Residualised Price		1,758,203		1,758,203
Stamp Duty		77,410		
Effective Stamp Duty Rate	4.40%			
Agent Fee	1.00%	17,582		
Legal Fee	0.80%	14,066		
				109,058

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Construction	ft²	Build Rate ft²	Cost
Private Sale units	28,949	205.75	5,956,257
Contingency		5.00%	351,408
Abnormals			1,071,911
Acquisition White Horse Lane			125,000
Section 106 Contribution			320,737
SANG payment			312,000
			8,137,313

PROFESSIONAL FEES

Professional Fees	10.00%	702,817	702,817
-------------------	--------	---------	---------

DISPOSAL FEES

Effective Purchaser's Costs Rate	0.00%		
Private Sales Marketing & Legal Fee	2.50%	305,166	
Affordable Transfer	1.00%	18,062	
			323,228

FINANCE

Timescale	Duration	Commences
Pre-Construction	6	Jul 2020
Construction	18	Jan 2021
Income Flow	6	Jul 2022
Sale	9	Apr 2022
Total Duration	30	

Debit Rate 6.500%, Credit Rate 0.000% (Effective)

Land	239,548
Construction	434,402
Other	63,418
Total Finance Cost	737,368

TOTAL COSTS**11,767,987****PROFIT**

**Viability Appraisal -
26 unit scheme - with 7 shared ownership units
Up-dated GDV, Build Costs**

2,244,858

Performance Measures

Profit on Cost%	19.08%
Profit on GDV%	16.02%
Profit on NDV%	16.02%
IRR% (without Interest)	22.27%
Profit Erosion (finance rate 6.500)	2 yrs 8 mths

Planning Committee

30 March 2022

Late Representations

Since the last date for the submission of views on applications/matters before the Committee this evening, representations in respect of the under mentioned applications/ matters have been received. The letters, copies of which will be available for inspection by councillors at the meeting, are summarised below.

Item 5 – Planning Applications

21/P/01306 – (Page 97) – Land at Effingham Lodge Farm, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JP

Since the publication of the Committee Report, ten additional letters of objection have been received. The additional points raised include the following:

- disappointed about proposal for further housing;
- arguments about increased construction costs are surprising given house prices in the south-east;
- house prices will have increased since the appeal proposal was considered; and
- increased emissions and pollution from the development.

An additional letter has also been received from the Effingham Residents Association (dated 22 March 2022). The residents association sent this letter directly to Members on 28 March.

21/P/01283 – (Page 67) – Howard of Effingham School, Lower Road, Effingham, Leatherhead, KT24 5JP

Since the publication of the Committee Report, five additional letters of objection have been received. The additional points raised include the following:

- number of houses proposed is disproportionate and will completely adversely affect the
- village [Officer Note: This application does not include additional housing];
- there already are enough houses about to be built as well as a very large school;
- excessive development and just not fair for Effingham [Officer Note: This proposal seeks only to remove land from the originally approved masterplan];
- financial viability concerns;
- increased traffic, impact on highways and lack of infrastructure [Officer Note: This proposal seeks only to remove land from the originally approved masterplan];
- impact on the Green Belt; and
- requires a new fresh application.

21/P/02643 – (Page 217) - Tretower House, Merrow Street, Guildford, GU4 7AT

Third party representations:

A further letter has been received raising concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on ecology, specifically with regard to bats and toads and biodiversity net gain.

Officer note:

With regard to Bats: There are conditions recommended in order to mitigate any impacts on Bats.

With regard to the Common Toad: In accordance with the recommendations and advice from Surrey Wildlife Trust, conditions 6, 7 and 8 are recommended in order to mitigate any impact on the common toad species. Including Condition 7 which requires the submission of the following information to the LPA prior to the commencement of development:

a Common Toad Mitigation Strategy to include adequate details of all measures of impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement to reduce the impact on the species and include details of the following:

- *ACO Climate Tunnel*
- *ACO Wildlife Kerb*
- *Amphibian Garden.*
- *construction detail*
- *monitoring and maintenance programme*

Surrey Wildlife Trust would be consulted on the details submitted in relation to the ecological conditions. SWT are satisfied with the assessments carried out and that conditions can be used to mitigate any impact.

With regard to 'biodiversity net gain': As set out in the Officer's Report, the Government announced it would mandate net gains for biodiversity (BNG) in the Environment Bill in the 2019 Spring Statement. The Environment Bill received Royal Assent on 9 November 2021. Mandatory biodiversity net gain as set out in the Environment Act applies in England only by amending the Town & Country Planning Act (TCPA) and is likely to become law in 2023. The absence of this change to TCPA and no Development Plan policy regarding biodiversity net gain, means that it would be unreasonable to require BNG, in this instance. However, as para 175 of the NPPF sets out the principles that should be applied to habitats and biodiversity and policy ID4 of the LPSS seeks to contribute to biodiversity of green and blue infrastructure, it would be appropriate to require biodiversity enhancements by condition. (Condition 6)