

**22/P/01211 – Land at May and Juniper Cottages, Ash Green Road,
Ash, Guildford**

Location map



Not to scale



App No: 21/P/01211

8 Wk 25/08/2023

Deadline:

Appn Type: Full Application

Case Officer: Hannah Yates

Parish: Ash

Agent : Mr R. Steele
Savills

Ward:

Applicant: Mr C. Hebden
Bloor Homes Southern
River Reach
Unit 7 Newbury Business
Park
Lond Road
Newbury
RG14 2PS

Location: Land at May and Juniper Cottages, Ash Green Road, Ash, Guildford, GU12 6JH

Proposal: Reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.

Update to Report

This application was considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 19 July 2023 and was deferred in order for Members to undertake a site visit. The site visit is scheduled to take place week commencing 14 August 2023, prior to the committee meeting.

The original Committee Report is attached as Appendix 1. Members should also take into account the following when forming their decision on the application.

Summary of speakers comments at Planning Committee on 19 July 2023

The following is a summary made by the public speakers and the ward Councillor:

Norman Bristow, Ash Green Residents Association (AGRA) (to object):

- the applicant is the only major developer to have engaged with AGRA. However,

there were two things they could not agree on;

- when the outline was approved it was envisaged that all of the houses on the site, apart from five at the entrance, would be accessed from Foreman Road via the neighbouring site at Ash Manor;
- Ash Manor has now been refused and it leaves the proposed development with no access to Foreman Road. The other possible access to the north is unlikely to come forward in the foreseeable future;
- as a result, the only access for all 93 units is directly onto Ash Green Road which is only a country lane;
- while SCC have raised no objection, they have only assessed a limited amount of information, not the volume of traffic using the new junction, nor its impact;
- SCC at a recent meeting were unable to confirm if the traffic from the outline permission had been considered;
- reference to Streamside application and the fact that it was refused on highways grounds by the Committee. This despite SCC raising no objection to the proposal;
- SCC have said that traffic would decline once the Ash road bridge is in place, however, AGRA strongly question this assumption;
- outline approved based on five houses accessing onto Ash Green Road, not the 93 now proposed; and
- proposal should be refused until a more suitable access comes forward.

Louise Robertson (to object):

- original application had a significant buffer protecting the Ash Green Road streetscene;
- in the current application the buffer has all but disappeared, replaced by ten new houses which sit around the existing May and Juniper Cottages;
- required buffer zone is clearly described in Policy A31(6) and is not just an option or something to be considered but a requirement;
- the proposal completely detracts from the rural setting;
- proposed buffer zone is only 15 metres to the ancient woodland and the only other buffer is the existing hedgerows which a new footpath will destroy;
- no buffer around May and Juniper Cottage;
- without the buffer, this sizeable, modern estate will be visible from the road, changing the existing rural landscape;
- the proposed buffer does not respect the Inspector's comments in the recent Ash Manor appeal;
- non-compliance with policy D1. The proposal is not near the urban area, but is an isolated extension of Ash Green;
- proposal goes against the village character with no soft edges;
- proposal will take Ash Green Road from a rural setting to a merged development

- landscape; and
- the Committee are urged to refuse the application.

Rebecca Fenn-Tripp, Bloor Homes (in support):

- thank Officers for professional and collaborate approach;
- high quality development before the Committee;
- commend the Officer Report to Members;
- improved off-site footpath solution which results in less hedgerow removal;
- the site is allocated in the Local Plan and benefits from outline approval which already has an agreed s106 in place for infrastructure improvements, including a contribution towards Ash road bridge;
- proposal seeks to deliver 93 homes which is a reduction from the 100 sought at outline stage;
- policy compliant affordable housing provision at 40%;
- all of the development to be two storey to reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- 30% reduction in carbon emissions which is above the Council requirement;
- the access is as already secured through the outline application. Vehicular connections will be made to the boundaries of the site to ensure connectivity with the surrounding parcels;
- other benefits include job creation;
- applicant is committed to the delivery of the site and it will make a valuable contribution to the Council's supply of new homes; and
- hope Members approve the proposals.

CLlr David Shaw, speaking in his capacity as Ward Councillor:

- object based on lack of infrastructure and non-compliance with Policy ID1 of the Local Plan;
- not possible to add a Grampian condition to overcome the lack of infrastructure;
- only one access into the development from a country lane with no footpaths on western side, is very busy and has no lighting;
- footpaths to Ash Station are incomplete and pedestrians will have to divert on to other roads;
- water treatment works at capacity and no plans to update it;
- proposal should respect the historical context of the area by preventing coalescence of neighbouring villages;
- should not detract from rural landscape so should include the provision of a green buffer that provides separation;
- the proposed buffer has been reduced to a footpath and a wall and no longer provides an adequate separation. This is in conflict with Policy A31;

- conflict with parking polices and the SPD; and
- possible parking on the road.

Late Comments received before 19 July Committee as set out on the Late Sheets

As was reported on the Late Sheets, an additional email of objection was circulated to committee members from the Ash Green Residents Association on the evening of 18 July. Committee Services circulated this email to all committee members, and it has also been made available to view on the Councils website on the application page. A summary of the comments is provided below:

Key issues are:

- Volume - We believe that the volume of housing in this application is far too great for the current situation
- Lack of suitable access - For the foreseeable future ALL the traffic will have to go through Ash Green Road. The road is clearly unsuitable for the volume of traffic this site would generate. No access to the bridge.
- Non-Conformity with the SPD – No bus route proposed
- Non-Conformity with the Local Plan (specifically Policy A31 – buffer zone and coalescence)

We also considered these other factors:

- Housing mix has a deficit of 2-bed houses
- Refuse strategy is non-compliant (now conditioned)
- Northern boundary landscape insufficient (now conditioned)
- Flats and terraced housing out of keeping
- Affordable rented units along the railway
- Surrey Highways objections to the parking
- Lack of public transport (buses) in association with lack of connectivity and road widths

We also have other issues with the heritage, boundary treatment, road layout, appearance, lack of conformity with the housing mix, all which should be addressed in the planning balance but are mostly overlooked.

The following two paragraphs are quoted from Policy ID1 Infrastructure and Delivery:

(1) Infrastructure necessary to support new development will be provided and available when first needed to serve the developments occupants and users and/or

to mitigate its otherwise adverse material impacts. To achieve this the delivery of development may need to be phased to reflect the delivery of infrastructure.

(4) The imposition of Grampian conditions shall be considered as a means to secure the provision of infrastructure when it is needed if the timely provision of infrastructure necessary to support new development cannot be secured in line with this policy planning permission will be refused

When reviewing and applying these to this application:

- The only mitigation provided is a contribution to a bridge the site cannot connect to
- The delivery should be phased
- A Grampian condition cannot be imposed

Therefore, the application should be refused for Policy ID1 (1) and (4)

[Officer comments: The officer report to committee already addresses the comments raised in the latest objection. To reiterate a couple of points:

- The housing mix proposed is in accordance with the housing mix condition (condition 5) added to the outline planning consent and is acceptable. The mix is closely aligned with SHMA, and in any case policy H1(1) – Housing Mix - of the LPSS is not intended to be applied in a prescriptive manner.
- The Waste and Recycling team now raise no objection to the application, where previous issues have been addressed with the submission of amended plans. The movement of the presentation points and communal bin stores minimises reserving and allows bins to be collected from the main roadway.
- The County Highway Authority comments on parking provision relate to an old version, where informal visitor parking was proposed on street. The applicant is no longer proposing this strategy, where marked bays are proposed].

Additional late comments

On 12 July the applicant's team circulated a Committee Briefing Document to members of the planning committee. It has also been made available to view on the Councils website on the application page. A summary of the comments is provided below:

- Bloor Homes has worked collaboratively with Guildford Borough Council - as well as representatives of the local community resulting in the high quality, technically sound and attractive proposals now before Committee.
- The proposals will deliver 56 market and 37 affordable homes for local people on

an allocated site.

- These homes will make it easier for young people and families to stay in the area and help support and enhance local facilities.
- The development proposes a 30% reduction in CO2 through the use of photovoltaic panels. This represents an improvement of 10% above and beyond the 20% CO2 reduction required by the outline permission.
- The layout provides a sufficient balance of parking in accordance with the adopted standards.
- The layout allows for connectivity through the site into neighbouring schemes which form part of the wider masterplan, in accordance with the outline planning permission.
- Bloor has listened to the concerns of local residents and liaised constructively with AGRA to create a new, alternative accessible footpath along Ash Green Road, this will minimise hedge removal in comparison to what was originally approved.
- A reduction in the number of new homes from 100 to 93 creating a more spacious and open feel to the development.
- The use of sustainable urban drainage features to enhance biodiversity and the natural feel of the development.
- High quality elevational treatment, creating attractive street scenes that will enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- The integration of more public and private open space creating a more attractive and functional environment for residents.
- A maximum building height of two storeys across the development.
- The provision of landscaped and ecological buffers on the site boundaries creating more space and separation between the development and neighbouring heritage assets.

[Officer comments: The officer report in Appendix 1 covers all of the above topic areas. One specific point to respond on is the parking point. It is officer's view that there is an overprovision of allocated parking, and an under provision of unallocated visitor parking in relation to the current development plan policy on parking provision. However, it must be acknowledged that the LPDMP and the Parking Standards for New Development SPD were at a very early stage when this application was submitted. As such, at the point of submission the parking policies were emerging and of little weight in the assessment of planning applications. As such, it is understandable why the applicant has submitted the application in its current form. However, the applicant has also amended the plans to reduce the level of inconsistency with the policies, in particular the visitor parking requirements. The applicant also argues that garages should not be included in the parking provision numbers as these are likely to be used for storage, rather than vehicle parking. If this

approach was adopted, the proposal would just be one space over the maximum standard].

Corrections to the original Committee Report (Appendix 1) as set out on the Late Sheets

Relevant planning history – update

Reference	Description:	Decision Summary:	Appeal:
23/W/000 14	Prior Notification under Schedule 2, Part 11, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) for the demolition of existing Stable Block and Shed to the north of May and Juniper Cottages.	Prior Approval is not Required	N/A

The proposed development was found to comply with the criteria set out in Class B, Part 11, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

Three buildings are to be demolished consisting of stables and a field shelter. The supporting information submitted with the application advises:

- The buildings will be demolished by a professional licensed Demolition Contractor (yet to be appointed), who will be bound to associated health and safety legislation.
- The building will be taken down by hand and mechanical means, as appropriate. The concrete sub-base will be broken up and removed, with all waste, which cannot be recycled as part of the future redevelopment of the site being removed and disposed of at a licensed waste disposal/transfer facility.

The submitted information details the extent of the works proposed and how these will be undertaken and to what standard. Due to the small scale of the buildings to be demolished, and the fact they are of a timber construction, it was not considered necessary to seek to control the method of demolition or the restoration of the site. Other legislative controls ensure the protection of residential amenity. Accordingly prior approval is not required.

App No: 21/P/01211

8 Wk 25/08/2023

Deadline:

Appn Type: Full Application

Case Officer: Hannah Yates

Parish: Ash

Agent : Mr R. Steele
Savills

Ward:

Applicant: Mr C. Hebden
Bloor Homes Southern
River Reach
Unit 7 Newbury Business
Park
Lond Road
Newbury
RG14 2PS

Location: Land at May and Juniper Cottages, Ash Green Road, Ash, Guildford, GU12 6JH

Proposal: Reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.

Update to Report

This application was considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 19 July 2023 and was deferred in order for Members to undertake a site visit. The site visit is scheduled to take place week commencing 14 August 2023, prior to the committee meeting.

The original Committee Report is attached as Appendix 1. Members should also take into account the following when forming their decision on the application.

Summary of speakers comments at Planning Committee on 19 July 2023

The following is a summary made by the public speakers and the ward Councillor:

Norman Bristow, Ash Green Residents Association (AGRA) (to object):

- the applicant is the only major developer to have engaged with AGRA. However,

there were two things they could not agree on;

- when the outline was approved it was envisaged that all of the houses on the site, apart from five at the entrance, would be accessed from Foreman Road via the neighbouring site at Ash Manor;
- Ash Manor has now been refused and it leaves the proposed development with no access to Foreman Road. The other possible access to the north is unlikely to come forward in the foreseeable future;
- as a result, the only access for all 93 units is directly onto Ash Green Road which is only a country lane;
- while SCC have raised no objection, they have only assessed a limited amount of information, not the volume of traffic using the new junction, nor its impact;
- SCC at a recent meeting were unable to confirm if the traffic from the outline permission had been considered;
- reference to Streamside application and the fact that it was refused on highways grounds by the Committee. This despite SCC raising no objection to the proposal;
- SCC have said that traffic would decline once the Ash road bridge is in place, however, AGRA strongly question this assumption;
- outline approved based on five houses accessing onto Ash Green Road, not the 93 now proposed; and
- proposal should be refused until a more suitable access comes forward.

Louise Robertson (to object):

- original application had a significant buffer protecting the Ash Green Road streetscene;
- in the current application the buffer has all but disappeared, replaced by ten new houses which sit around the existing May and Juniper Cottages;
- required buffer zone is clearly described in Policy A31(6) and is not just an option or something to be considered but a requirement;
- the proposal completely detracts from the rural setting;
- proposed buffer zone is only 15 metres to the ancient woodland and the only other buffer is the existing hedgerows which a new footpath will destroy;
- no buffer around May and Juniper Cottage;
- without the buffer, this sizeable, modern estate will be visible from the road, changing the existing rural landscape;
- the proposed buffer does not respect the Inspector's comments in the recent Ash Manor appeal;
- non-compliance with policy D1. The proposal is not near the urban area, but is an isolated extension of Ash Green;
- proposal goes against the village character with no soft edges;
- proposal will take Ash Green Road from a rural setting to a merged development

- landscape; and
- the Committee are urged to refuse the application.

Rebecca Fenn-Tripp, Bloor Homes (in support):

- thank Officers for professional and collaborate approach;
- high quality development before the Committee;
- commend the Officer Report to Members;
- improved off-site footpath solution which results in less hedgerow removal;
- the site is allocated in the Local Plan and benefits from outline approval which already has an agreed s106 in place for infrastructure improvements, including a contribution towards Ash road bridge;
- proposal seeks to deliver 93 homes which is a reduction from the 100 sought at outline stage;
- policy compliant affordable housing provision at 40%;
- all of the development to be two storey to reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- 30% reduction in carbon emissions which is above the Council requirement;
- the access is as already secured through the outline application. Vehicular connections will be made to the boundaries of the site to ensure connectivity with the surrounding parcels;
- other benefits include job creation;
- applicant is committed to the delivery of the site and it will make a valuable contribution to the Council's supply of new homes; and
- hope Members approve the proposals.

CLlr David Shaw, speaking in his capacity as Ward Councillor:

- object based on lack of infrastructure and non-compliance with Policy ID1 of the Local Plan;
- not possible to add a Grampian condition to overcome the lack of infrastructure;
- only one access into the development from a country lane with no footpaths on western side, is very busy and has no lighting;
- footpaths to Ash Station are incomplete and pedestrians will have to divert on to other roads;
- water treatment works at capacity and no plans to update it;
- proposal should respect the historical context of the area by preventing coalescence of neighbouring villages;
- should not detract from rural landscape so should include the provision of a green buffer that provides separation;
- the proposed buffer has been reduced to a footpath and a wall and no longer provides an adequate separation. This is in conflict with Policy A31;

- conflict with parking polices and the SPD; and
- possible parking on the road.

Late Comments received before 19 July Committee as set out on the Late Sheets

As was reported on the Late Sheets, an additional email of objection was circulated to committee members from the Ash Green Residents Association on the evening of 18 July. Committee Services circulated this email to all committee members, and it has also been made available to view on the Councils website on the application page. A summary of the comments is provided below:

Key issues are:

- Volume - We believe that the volume of housing in this application is far too great for the current situation
- Lack of suitable access - For the foreseeable future ALL the traffic will have to go through Ash Green Road. The road is clearly unsuitable for the volume of traffic this site would generate. No access to the bridge.
- Non-Conformity with the SPD – No bus route proposed
- Non-Conformity with the Local Plan (specifically Policy A31 – buffer zone and coalescence)

We also considered these other factors:

- Housing mix has a deficit of 2-bed houses
- Refuse strategy is non-compliant (now conditioned)
- Northern boundary landscape insufficient (now conditioned)
- Flats and terraced housing out of keeping
- Affordable rented units along the railway
- Surrey Highways objections to the parking
- Lack of public transport (buses) in association with lack of connectivity and road widths

We also have other issues with the heritage, boundary treatment, road layout, appearance, lack of conformity with the housing mix, all which should be addressed in the planning balance but are mostly overlooked.

The following two paragraphs are quoted from Policy ID1 Infrastructure and Delivery:

(1) Infrastructure necessary to support new development will be provided and available when first needed to serve the developments occupants and users and/or

to mitigate its otherwise adverse material impacts. To achieve this the delivery of development may need to be phased to reflect the delivery of infrastructure.

(4) The imposition of Grampian conditions shall be considered as a means to secure the provision of infrastructure when it is needed if the timely provision of infrastructure necessary to support new development cannot be secured in line with this policy planning permission will be refused

When reviewing and applying these to this application:

- The only mitigation provided is a contribution to a bridge the site cannot connect to
- The delivery should be phased
- A Grampian condition cannot be imposed

Therefore, the application should be refused for Policy ID1 (1) and (4)

[Officer comments: The officer report to committee already addresses the comments raised in the latest objection. To reiterate a couple of points:

- The housing mix proposed is in accordance with the housing mix condition (condition 5) added to the outline planning consent and is acceptable. The mix is closely aligned with SHMA, and in any case policy H1(1) – Housing Mix - of the LPSS is not intended to be applied in a prescriptive manner.
- The Waste and Recycling team now raise no objection to the application, where previous issues have been addressed with the submission of amended plans. The movement of the presentation points and communal bin stores minimises reserving and allows bins to be collected from the main roadway.
- The County Highway Authority comments on parking provision relate to an old version, where informal visitor parking was proposed on street. The applicant is no longer proposing this strategy, where marked bays are proposed].

Additional late comments

On 12 July the applicant's team circulated a Committee Briefing Document to members of the planning committee. It has also been made available to view on the Councils website on the application page. A summary of the comments is provided below:

- Bloor Homes has worked collaboratively with Guildford Borough Council - as well as representatives of the local community resulting in the high quality, technically sound and attractive proposals now before Committee.
- The proposals will deliver 56 market and 37 affordable homes for local people on

an allocated site.

- These homes will make it easier for young people and families to stay in the area and help support and enhance local facilities.
- The development proposes a 30% reduction in CO2 through the use of photovoltaic panels. This represents an improvement of 10% above and beyond the 20% CO2 reduction required by the outline permission.
- The layout provides a sufficient balance of parking in accordance with the adopted standards.
- The layout allows for connectivity through the site into neighbouring schemes which form part of the wider masterplan, in accordance with the outline planning permission.
- Bloor has listened to the concerns of local residents and liaised constructively with AGRA to create a new, alternative accessible footpath along Ash Green Road, this will minimise hedge removal in comparison to what was originally approved.
- A reduction in the number of new homes from 100 to 93 creating a more spacious and open feel to the development.
- The use of sustainable urban drainage features to enhance biodiversity and the natural feel of the development.
- High quality elevational treatment, creating attractive street scenes that will enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- The integration of more public and private open space creating a more attractive and functional environment for residents.
- A maximum building height of two storeys across the development.
- The provision of landscaped and ecological buffers on the site boundaries creating more space and separation between the development and neighbouring heritage assets.

[Officer comments: The officer report in Appendix 1 covers all of the above topic areas. One specific point to respond on is the parking point. It is officer's view that there is an overprovision of allocated parking, and an under provision of unallocated visitor parking in relation to the current development plan policy on parking provision. However, it must be acknowledged that the LPDMP and the Parking Standards for New Development SPD were at a very early stage when this application was submitted. As such, at the point of submission the parking policies were emerging and of little weight in the assessment of planning applications. As such, it is understandable why the applicant has submitted the application in its current form. However, the applicant has also amended the plans to reduce the level of inconsistency with the policies, in particular the visitor parking requirements. The applicant also argues that garages should not be included in the parking provision numbers as these are likely to be used for storage, rather than vehicle parking. If this

approach was adopted, the proposal would just be one space over the maximum standard].

Corrections to the original Committee Report (Appendix 1) as set out on the Late Sheets

Relevant planning history – update

Reference	Description:	Decision Summary:	Appeal:
23/W/000 14	Prior Notification under Schedule 2, Part 11, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) for the demolition of existing Stable Block and Shed to the north of May and Juniper Cottages.	Prior Approval is not Required	N/A

The proposed development was found to comply with the criteria set out in Class B, Part 11, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

Three buildings are to be demolished consisting of stables and a field shelter. The supporting information submitted with the application advises:

- The buildings will be demolished by a professional licensed Demolition Contractor (yet to be appointed), who will be bound to associated health and safety legislation.
- The building will be taken down by hand and mechanical means, as appropriate. The concrete sub-base will be broken up and removed, with all waste, which cannot be recycled as part of the future redevelopment of the site being removed and disposed of at a licensed waste disposal/transfer facility.

The submitted information details the extent of the works proposed and how these will be undertaken and to what standard. Due to the small scale of the buildings to be demolished, and the fact they are of a timber construction, it was not considered necessary to seek to control the method of demolition or the restoration of the site. Other legislative controls ensure the protection of residential amenity. Accordingly prior approval is not required.

Reference	Description:	Decision	Appeal:
: 23/P/000 67	Reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.	Summary: Pending consideration	N/A

Appendix 1

Executive Summary

Reason for referral

This application has been referred to the Planning Committee because more than 20 letters of objection have been received, contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

It is noted that the application was included on the Planning Committee agenda for its meeting on 1 February 2023. Owing to the inability to find a chairperson for that meeting, the meeting was cancelled. In the intervening period the report has been updated to take into account submissions received before the committee meeting and the newly adopted policies in the Local Plan Development Management Policies.

Key information

Reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.

Details of the application

	Private	Affordable rented	Shared ownership	Total
One bed units	3	16	0	19
Two bed units	17	4	7	28
Three bed	24	5	4	33

Reference	Description:	Decision	Appeal:
23/P/000 67	Reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.	Summary: Pending consideration	N/A

Appendix 1

Executive Summary

Reason for referral

This application has been referred to the Planning Committee because more than 20 letters of objection have been received, contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

It is noted that the application was included on the Planning Committee agenda for its meeting on 1 February 2023. Owing to the inability to find a chairperson for that meeting, the meeting was cancelled. In the intervening period the report has been updated to take into account submissions received before the committee meeting and the newly adopted policies in the Local Plan Development Management Policies.

Key information

Reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.

Details of the application

	Private	Affordable rented	Shared ownership	Total
One bed units	3	16	0	19
Two bed units	17	4	7	28
Three bed	24	5	4	33

units				
Four bed units	11	1	0	12
Five bed units	1	0	0	1
Total	56	26	11	93

This equates to 40% affordable housing provision, with a 70/30 split of affordable rent to other forms of affordable units.

All homes meet the minimum size requirements as set out in the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard.

M4(3)(2)(a) ‘wheelchair adaptable’ standard homes: Plots 11-13, 17, 18, 21,22, 59 & 60

M4(2) ‘accessible and adaptable’ standard homes: Plots 40, 45, 46, 57 & 58 [Officer note: This layout complies with requirements of condition 5 on the outline permission]

Site area: 3.5 hectares

Density: 27 dwellings per hectare

Density excluding landscape buffers and open space: 33 dwellings per hectare

Allocated parking spaces: 160

Visitor parking spaces: 11

Garage parking spaces: 25 (not included in allocated parking spaces)

Separate secure cycle storage provided for the flats and within sheds/garages for dwellings on plot

The application proposes a number of 2 storey dwellings inclusive of detached, semi-detached and terraces; as well as 4 blocks of flats also 2 storeys in height. The application proposes a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) for children's play space, a central area of amenity green space and overlooked, green landscape buffers to the east and west.

Summary of considerations and constraints

The principle of the development has been established under the outline planning permission (18/P/02308) and the site is allocated under policy A31. The application seeks approval for the layout of the site as well the scale and appearance of the buildings and landscaping.

The application for reserved matters is consistent with current development plan policies, and it is concluded the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan

when read as a whole.

As identified in the body of the report, there are some conflicts with policy ID10 and the Strategic Development Framework SPD which form material considerations. These conflicts relate to parking provision for vehicles and cycles and the future potential of bus use through the site, however no material harm has been identified from these minor breaches. It is also noted that while the proposal does technically breach the Council's new parking policies, these were only emerging when the application was submitted and the applicant had designed a scheme which would have been compliant with the Council's previous parking standards.

In addition, it is acknowledged that the proposal fails to provide a full 'green buffer' between the development and Ash Green Road. However, while the proposal is therefore technically in conflict with policy A31 of the LPSS, Officers have not identified any material harm which would arise from this situation.

The benefits of the proposal include the provision of market and 40% affordable housing. In addition, there are economic benefits flowing from the proposal, as well as the provision of recreational open space including a LEAP for use by existing and future residents.

It is also noted that the proposed layout has responded to the constraints and opportunities on the site, including the adjacent Ash Manor complex. The proposed dwellings have been designed to reflect the local vernacular where materials will be conditioned and boundary treatment and landscaping plans refined ensuring the development is appropriate to the context. The scale and height of buildings is considered appropriate towards the edges of the A31 allocation. The scheme, through its urban design principles will create a place with a sense of identity/place and is considered to have an appropriate relationship with Ash Green. The arrangement of internal roads and pedestrian routes are safe and convenient, allowing for the potential of future permeability in accordance with the outline permission and the Strategic Development Framework SPD.

The design takes into account the amenity of future occupiers as well as providing appropriate separation distances from existing neighbours to avoid overlooking, loss of outlook, loss of daylight and sunlight and to minimise noise and disturbance.

The details secured as part of this application will minimise the harm to the designated heritage assets at the Ash Manor complex, and ensures that the development itself will cause less than substantial harm - at the lower end of the

scale. This level of heritage harm was considered to be acceptable at the outline stage given the public benefits of the scheme, and it is not open to the Council to revisit this judgement on this application for reserved matters.

The report will set out that the benefits of this proposal are considered to clearly and demonstrably outweigh the harm which has been identified, which includes the heritage harm which should be given great weight and considerable importance.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve - subject to the following condition(s) and reason(s) :-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing Reference	Drawing Title	Drawin g Revision	Dated (On GBC website)
SL.01	Amended site layout plan	P_2	10/05/2023
AHL.01	Affordable Housing Layout	M	10/05/2023
LP.01	Location plan	A	03/08/2022
CSL.01	Amended Coloured Site Layout	P_2	10/05/2023
CSE.01-2	Amended Coloured street scenes 2/2	M	10/05/2023
CSE.01-1	Amended coloured street scenes 1/2	K	10/05/2023
HT.BUT.E	Amended House Type Butler Elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.BUT.P	Amended House Type Butler Floor Plans	B	03/08/2022
HT.BUX-3.E	Amended house	A	03/08/2022

	type Buxton (2-block) elevations option 3		
HT.BUX-4.E	Amended house type Buxton (2-block) elevations option 4	A	03/08/2022
HT.BUX.P	Amended house type Buxton (2-block) floor plans	E	03/08/2022
HT.BUX-2-1.E	Amended house type Buxton 2 bedroom (2-block) elevations option 1	A	03/08/2022
HT.BUX-2-2.E	Amended house type Buxton 2 bedroom (2-block) elevations option 2	A	03/08/2022
HT.BUX-2.P	Amended house type Buxton 2 bedroom (2-block) floor plans	A	03/08/2022
HT.DOR-1.E	Amended house type dorneywood elevations option 1	B	03/08/2022
HT.DOR-2.E	Amended house type Dorneywood elevations option 2	B	03/08/2022
HT.DOR.P	Amended house type Dorneywood Floor Plans	B	03/08/2022
HT.DOR-A.E	Amended house type dorneywood - a elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.DOR-A.P	Amended house type dorneywood	A	03/08/2022

	- a floor plans		
HT.HAW.E	Amended house type Hawkins elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.HAW.P	Amended house type Hawkins floor plans	B	03/08/2022
HT.HUX.E	Amended house type huxley elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.HUX.P	Amended house type huxley floor plans	A	03/08/2022
HT.LIS.E	Amended house type lister elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.LIS.P	Amended house type lister floor plans	B	03/08/2022
HT.LYF.E1	Amended house type lyford elevations - option 1	A	03/08/2022
HT.LYF.E2	Amended house type lyford elevations - option 2	A	03/08/2022
HT.LYF.P	Amended house type lyford floor plans	A	03/08/2022
HT.PEE-1.E	Amended house type peelee elevations option 1	A	03/08/2022
HT.PEE-2.E	Amended house type peelee elevations option 2	A	03/08/2022
HT.PEE-3.E	Amended house type peelee	A	03/08/2022

	elevations option 3		
HT.PEE.P	Amended house type peelee floor plans	A	03/08/2022
HT.RAL.E	Amended house type raleigh elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.RAL.P	Amended house type raleigh floor plans	B	03/08/2022
HT.SANM4(2).E	Amended house type Sansom M4-2 (2-block) elevations	C	30/11/2022
HT.SANM4(2).P	Amended house type Sansom M4-2 (2-block) floor plans	B	30/11/2022
HT.TAN(2BLK).E	Amended house type tanner (2-block) elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.TAN(2BLK).P	Amended house type tanner (2-block) floor plans	A	03/08/2022
HT.TAN.E	Amended house type tanner elevations	A	03/08/2022
HT.TAN.P	Amended house type tanner floor plans	A	03/08/2022
P.1-4.E	Amended plots 1-4 (ht.lyf / ht.dek / ht.dek / ht.lyf) elevations	B	03/08/2022
P.1-4.P	Amended plots 1-4 (ht.lyf / ht.dek / ht.dek / ht.lyf) floor plans	B	03/08/2022
P.8-10.E	Amended plots 8-	B	03/08/2022

	10 (ht.sym) elevations		
P.8-10.P	Amended plots 8-10 (ht.sym) floor plans	B	03/08/2022
P.11-15.E	Amended plots 11-15 (ht.san/ht.tan / ht.lyf) elevations	A	03/08/2022
P.11-15.P	Amended plots 11-15 (ht.san / ht.tan) floor plans	A	03/08/2022
P.17-19.P	Amended proposed plots 17-19 floor plans	A	30/11/2022
P.17-19.E	Amended proposed plots 17-19 elevations	A	30/11/2022
P.20-22.E	Plots 20-22 Elevations	A	30/11/2022
		A	30/11/2022
P.28-29.E		A	03/08/2022
P.28-29.P	Amended plots 28-29 (ht.lyf/ht.bux) floor plans	A	03/08/2022
P.39-40.E	Amended plots 39-40 (ht.scu-ht.sun m4(3)) elevations	A	03/08/2022
P.39-40.P	Amended plots 39-40 (ht.scu-ht.sun m4(3)) floor plans	A	03/08/2022
P.62-64.E	Amended plots 62-64 (house type dekker) elevations	A	03/08/2022

P.62-64.P	Amended plots 62-64 (house type dekker) floor plans	A	03/08/2022
P.65-66.E	Amended plots 65-66 (house type sansom) elevations	A	30/11/2022
P.65-66.P	Amended plots 65-66 (house type sansom) floor plans	A	30/11/2022
P.87-89.E1	Amended plots 87-89 (house types tanner & lyford) elevations (sheet 1 of 2)	A	03/08/2022
P.87-89.E2	Amended plots 87-89 (house types tanner & lyford) elevations (sheet 2 of 2)	A	03/08/2022
P.87-89.P1	Amended plots 87-89 (house types tanner & lyford) floor plans (sheet 1 of 2)	A	03/08/2022
P.87-89.P2	Amended plots 87-89 (house types tanner & lyford) floor plans (sheet 2 of 2)	A	03/08/2022
P 35-38 P	Amended plots 35-38 (ht.acton) floor plans	B	10/05/2023
P 35-38 E	Amended plots 35-38 elevations	B	10/05/2023

P 35-38 E1	Amended front elevation of bin/cycle store and plots 35-38	A	10/05/2023
P.47-50.P	Amended plots 47-50 (ht.acton) floor plans	B	10/05/2023
P.47-50 E	Amended plots 47-50 (ht.acton) elevations	B	10/05/2023
P.67-74.P	Amended plots 67-74 (ht.acton) floor plans	B	10/05/2023
P.67-74.E	Amended plots 67-74 (ht.acton) elevations	B	10/05/2023
CP.01.PE	Amended car port floor plan and elevations	B	03/08/2022
GAR.01.PE	Amended single garage floor plans and elevations	B	03/08/2022
GAR.02.PE	Amended double garage floor plans and elevations	B	03/08/2022
SHD.01.PE	Amended timber shed floor plans and elevations	B	03/08/2022
BLOO200727 BBS.03 PE	Amended bin and bike store (plots 35-38) floor plans and elevations	B	10/05/2023
BBS.02.PE	Bins and bikes store (plots 67-74) floor plans and elevations	A	03/08/2022
BLOO200727 BBS.01 PE	Amended bin and bike store (plots 47-50) floor plans and elevations	C	10/05/2002 3

SO136-LS-003F	Amended plot landscaping plan 3/3		10/05/2023
SO136-LS-002F	Amended plot landscaping plan 2/3		10/05/2023
SO136-LS-001F	Amended plot landscaping plan 1/3		10/05/2023
BLOO200727 SE.01-2	Amended street scenes 2/2	M	10/05/2023
BLOO200727 SE.01-1	Amended street scenes 1/2	K	10/05/2023
BLOO200727 RSL.01	Amended refuse strategy layout	J	10/05/2023
BLOO200727 PSL.01	Amended parking strategy layout	N	10/05/2023
BLOO200727 NDAL.01	Amended net development area layout	H	10/05/2023
BLOO200727 DML.01	Amended dwelling material layout	N	10/05/2023
BLOO200727 BML.01	Amended boundary materials layout	N	10/05/2023
HT.SUNM4(3).E	Amended proposed elevations plots 45-46, 57-58	C	01/02/2023
HT.SUNM4(3).P	Amended proposed floor plans 45-46, 57-58	C	01/02/2023
HT.SAS(2BLK)-2.E	Amended proposed elevations plots 92-93	C	01/02/2023
HT.SAS(2BLK).P	Amended proposed floor	D	01/02/2023

	plans plots 92-93		
HT.DEK.E	Amended proposed elevations plots 5-6, 55-56	C	01/02/2023
HT.DEK.P	Amended proposed floor plans plots 5-6, 55-56	C	01/02/2023

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of proper planning.

2. No development above ground level shall take place (excluding ground works, demolition and construction up to damp proof course (dpc) and the construction of the access) until a written schedule with details of the source / manufacturer, colour and finish, OR samples on request, of all external facing and roof materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule must include the details of embodied carbon / energy (environmental credentials) of all external materials. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance of the development is achieved and to ensure materials that are lower in carbon are chosen.

3. No development above ground level shall take place (excluding ground works, demolition and construction up to damp proof course (dpc) and the construction of the access) until detailed drawing and/or samples of the:
 - a) porches
 - b) fenestration details; and
 - c) fascias, soffits and gutters

to be used externally have been submitted to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority. The details should include sections, plans and elevations on drawings at a scale of at least 1:20. The development shall only be carried out using the approved external materials.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory, taking into consideration its location within the setting of the Ash Manor complex.

4. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, a detailed landscaping scheme, in accordance with the overall principles of the submitted landscaping plans (SO136-LS-001 Rev F, SO136-LS-002 Rev F and SO136-LS-003 Rev F) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted landscaping scheme shall include full details of:

- a) hardstanding surfaces;
- b) soft landscaping – this must include a supplemented and robust boundary along the western side of the site adjacent to the Ash Manor complex;
- c) public seating

The scheme should incorporate measures to design out the opportunity for car owners to use verges for parking. For examples knee rails, mounding, dense evergreen shrubs rather than grass, and tree protection should be considered. It will also need to provide further details of how the railway buffer will be secured and maintained - boundaries will need to be clearly defined and maintenance responsibilities clearly explained.

The approved landscape scheme (with the exception of planting, seeding and turfing) shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

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

5. All planting, seeding or turfing approved 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.

6. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, an amended boundary treatment plan which details the design, external appearance and decorative finish of all railings, fences, gates, walls, bollards and other means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted plan needs to take the following into account:

- Replace long stretches of public facing fencing to the sides of plots 20, 19 and 1 with a more appropriate response (for example brick wall, climbers and trees). Rationalise low fencing to fronts of plots 5,6,19 and 20. (Street Scene Section B)
- Amend fencing to the side of 47-50 to a more appropriate response (for example cleft fencing) and provide access for maintenance
- The scheme should incorporate measures to design out the opportunity for car owners to use verges for parking

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the development first being occupied and shall be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory.

7. The development must accord with the Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by ACD Environmental (Ref. BLO22959ams) dated 27/07/2022 and the Tree Protection Plan (Ref. BLO22959-03).

Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality.

8. No development, or site preparation prior to operations which has any effect on compacting, disturbing or altering the levels of the site, shall take place until a person qualified in arboriculture, and approved by the Local Planning Authority, has been appointed to supervise construction activity occurring on the site. The Arboricultural Supervisor will be responsible for the implementation of protective measures, special surfacing and all works deemed necessary to ensure compliance with the approved ACD Environmental (Ref. BLO22959ams) dated 27/07/2022 and the Tree Protection Plan (Ref. BLO22959-03).

Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the tree protection measures need to be checked prior to the development commencing to ensure they are adequately installed.

9. Before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of development, a pre-commencement site meeting between the Tree Officer, Arboricultural Supervisor and Site Manager shall take place to confirm the protection of trees on and adjacent to the site in accordance with approved ACD Environmental (Ref. BLO22959ams) dated 27/07/2022 and the Tree Protection Plan (Ref. BLO22959-03). The tree protection shall be positioned as shown on the Tree Protection Plan, before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development.

The tree protection shall be retained until the development is completed and nothing shall be placed within the fencing, nor shall

any ground levels be altered or excavations made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. This tree condition may only be fully discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written evidence of appropriate monitoring and compliance by the pre-appointed Arboricultural Supervisor.

Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the tree protection measures need to be checked prior to the development commencing to ensure they are adequately installed.

10. All existing trees, hedges or hedgerows shall be retained, unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of 10 years from the first occupation of the development.

a) no retained tree, hedge or hedgerow shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be pruned other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. Any pruning shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998: 2010 (tree work) and in accordance with any approved supplied arboricultural information.

b) if any retained tree, hedge or hedgerow is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree, hedge or hedgerow of similar size and species shall be planted at the same place, in the next available planting season or sooner.

Reason: To protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality and reduce the risk to protected and retained landscape features.

11. Prior to the first occupation of any dwellings hereby approved, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP should be based on the proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the BEEP, its Addendum, and the Landscape Strategy Drawings (which should be

appended to the document); and should include, but not be limited to the following:

a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed, including but not limited to:

- i. Retained, enhanced, and newly created habitats
- ii. The Ancient Woodland and its buffer
- iii. Areas of the site being managed specifically for reptile species
- iv. Bird and bat boxes
- v. Boundary fencing

b) A reptile mitigation strategy

c) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management

d) Aims and objectives of management

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 applicant 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.

The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory landscaping and to prevent adverse impacts on protected species resulting from the proposed development works.

12. No development shall take place, until an amended Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved

Plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. In addition to what is contained in the submitted CEMP, the amended CEMP shall provide for:

- a) Map showing the location of all ecological features
- b) Practical measures to avoid and reduce impacts during construction, including, but not limited to, areas where reptiles are present, particularly reptile receptor areas
- c) The requirement for ground level bat roost assessment prior to tree works
- d) Responsible persons and lines of communication
- e) Use of protected fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs, including:
 - i. Erection, maintenance, repair, and removal of reptile exclusion fencing
 - ii. Erection, maintenance, and repair of boundary fencing installed to protect the Ancient Woodland buffer zone.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory measures are put in place to protect the environment during the construction period. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because the management of the construction needs to be considered before construction commences.

13. Prior to the start of development works, a survey of the site by an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the LPA. The survey should be undertaken within the proposed development boundary and a 30m buffer where possible, to search for any new badger setts and confirm that any setts present remain inactive. If any badger activity is detected a suitable course of action shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA to prevent harm to this species.

Reason: To prevent adverse impacts on protected species resulting from the proposed development works.

14. No external lighting shall be installed on the site or affixed to any buildings on the site unless the local planning authority has first approved in writing details of the position, height, design, measures

to control light spillage and intensity of illumination. Only the approved details shall be installed.

Reason: To prevent adverse impacts on protected species, in particular bats, resulting from the proposed development works and in the interest of minimising harm to nearby heritage assets.

15. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the local planning authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the local planning authority. Following completion of the remediation works, a verification report must be submitted to and approved in writing of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to neighbouring land and future users of the land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

16. Before any development is commenced (excluding demolition, ground works and construction up to damp proof course (dpc) and the construction of the access), a fully detailed scheme for protecting the proposed gardens/amenity areas from noise from the adjacent railway line shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The scheme shall comprise such works as are necessary to ensure compliance in general terms with the desirable noise levels detailed in the WHO 2000 Guidelines for Community Noise. Any works which form part of the scheme shall be fully completed before any part of the noise-sensitive development is occupied unless an alternative period is agreed in writing by the LPA and shall thereafter be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the proposed properties adjacent to the railway.

17. Works related to the construction of the development hereby permitted, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall not take place other than between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays and between 0800 and 1330 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To protect the neighbours from noise and disturbance outside the permitted hours during the construction period.

18. The window in the first floor side elevation of plot 80 of the development hereby approved shall be glazed with obscure glass and permanently fixed shut, unless the parts of the window which can be opened is more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and shall thereafter be permanently retained as such.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

19. No occupation of the dwellings hereby approved shall take place until details including plans, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing for the installation of a High Speed wholly Fibre broadband To The Premises (FTTP) connection to the development hereby approved. Thereafter, the infrastructure shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details at the same time as other services during the construction process and be available for use on the first occupation of each building where practicable or supported by evidence detailing reasonable endeavours to secure the provision of FTTP and alternative provisions that been made in the absence of FTTP.

Reason: To ensure that the new development in Guildford is provided with high quality broadband services and digital connectivity.

20. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning

(General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending those Orders with or without modification) any garage or car barn which has been approved with open sides, fronts or backs shall remain as such in perpetuity and they shall not be further enclosed in full or in part at any time and be useable for its designated purpose for car parking.

Reason: To prohibit the unsightly enclosure of the structures and in an ad-hoc manner, to protect the character and appearance of the development and ensure that parking provision is maintained to prevent obstruction of the highway.

21. Before the first occupation of the 90th dwelling of the development a certificate demonstrating that Secured by Design (physical security) has been successfully achieved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is acceptable in terms of crime and safety.

22. No development above ground level shall take place (excluding ground works, demolition and construction up to damp proof course (dpc) and the construction of the access) until amended details of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for user prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall thereafter be retained for such use at all times.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles.

Informatives:

1. This statement is provided in accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England)

Order 2015. Guildford Borough Council seek to take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals. We work with applicants in a positive and proactive manner by:

- Offering a pre application advice service
- Where pre-application advice has been sought and that advice has been followed we will advise applicants/agents of any further issues arising during the course of the application
- Where possible officers will seek minor amendments to overcome issues identified at an early stage in the application process

However, Guildford Borough Council will generally not engage in unnecessary negotiation for fundamentally unacceptable proposals or where significant changes to an application is required.

In this case pre-application advice was sought and provided which addressed initial issues, the application has been submitted in accordance with that advice, however, further issues were identified during the consultation stage of the application. Officers have worked with the applicant to overcome these issues.

2. If you need any advice regarding Building Regulations please do not hesitate to contact Guildford Borough Council Building Control on 01483 444545 or buildingcontrol@guildford.gov.uk
3. County Highway Authority Informatives:
 - The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development, subject to the above conditions but, if it is the applicant's intention to offer any of the roadworks included in the application for adoption as maintainable highways, permission under the Town and Country Planning Act should not be construed as approval to the highway engineering details necessary for inclusion in an Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. Further details about the post-planning adoption of roads may be obtained from the Transportation Development Planning Division of Surrey County Council.

- 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.
- The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme>. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/floodingadvice.
- 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. Please refer to: <http://www.beama.org.uk/resourceLibrary/beama-guide-to-electric-vehicle-infrastructure.html> for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types. Installation must be carried out in accordance with the IET Code of Practice for Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment: <https://www.theiet.org/resources/standards/cop-electric.cfm>

4. Lead Local Flood Authority Informatives:

- Proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County

Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written Consent. More details are available on our website.

- If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone
- If there are any further queries please contact the Flood Risk, Planning, and Consenting Team via SUDS@surreycc.gov.uk. Please use our reference number in any future correspondence.

5. Network Rail informatives:

The developer must ensure that their proposal, both during construction and after completion does not:

- encroach onto Network Rail land
- affect the safety, operation or integrity of the company's railway and its infrastructure
- undermine its support zone
- damage the company's infrastructure
- place additional load on cuttings
- adversely affect any railway land or structure
- over-sail or encroach upon the air-space of any Network Rail land
- cause to obstruct or interfere with any works or proposed works or Network Rail development both now and in the future

Network Rail strongly recommends the developer complies with the following comments and requirements to maintain the safe operation of the railway and protect Network Rail's infrastructure.

Future maintenance

The applicant must ensure that any construction and subsequent maintenance can be carried out to any proposed buildings or structures without adversely affecting the safety of/or encroaching upon Network Rail's adjacent land and air-space. Therefore, any buildings are required to be situated at least 2 metres (3m for overhead lines and third rail) from Network Rail's boundary. This requirement will allow for the construction and future maintenance of a building without the need to access the operational railway environment. Any less than 2m (3m for overhead

lines and third rail) and there is a strong possibility that the applicant (and any future resident) will need to utilise Network Rail land and air-space to facilitate works as well as adversely impact upon Network Rail's maintenance teams' ability to maintain our boundary fencing and boundary treatments. Access to Network Rail's land may not always be granted and if granted may be subject to railway site safety requirements and special provisions with all associated railway costs charged to the applicant. As mentioned above, any works within Network Rail's land would need approval from the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. This request should be submitted at least 20 weeks before any works are due to commence on site and the applicant is liable for all associated costs (e.g. a l l possession, site safety, asset protection presence costs). However, Network Rail is not required to grant permission for any thirdparty access to its land.

Plant & Materials

All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail's property, must at all times be carried out in a "fail safe" manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no plant or materials are capable of falling within 3.0m of the boundary with Network Rail.

Drainage

Storm/surface water must not be discharged onto Network Rail's property or into Network Rail's culverts or drains except by agreement with Network Rail. Suitable drainage or other works must be provided and maintained by the Developer to prevent surface water flows or run-off onto Network Rail's property. Proper provision must be made to accept and continue drainage discharging from Network Rail's property; full details to be submitted for approval to the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer. Suitable foul drainage must be provided separate from Network Rail's existing drainage. Soakaways, as a means of storm/surface water disposal must not be constructed within 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail's property. After the completion and occupation of the development, any new or exacerbated problems attributable to the new development shall be investigated and remedied at the applicants' expense.

Scaffolding

Any scaffold which is to be constructed within 10 metres of the railway boundary fence must be erected in such a manner that at no time will any poles over-sail the railway and protective netting around such scaffold must be installed. The applicant/applicant's contractor must consider if they can undertake the works and associated scaffold/access for working at height within the footprint of their property boundary.

Piling

Where vibro-compaction/displacement piling plant is to be used in development, details of the use of such machinery and a method statement should be submitted for the approval of the Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer prior to the commencement of works and the works shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

Fencing

In view of the nature of the development, it is essential that the developer provide (at their own expense) and thereafter maintain a substantial, trespass proof fence along the development side of the existing boundary fence, to a minimum height of 1.8 metres. The 1.8m fencing should be adjacent to the railway boundary and the developer/applicant should make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point during or post construction should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein, be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation within Network Rail's land boundary must not be disturbed. Any fencing installed by the applicant must not prevent Network Rail from maintaining its own fencing/boundary treatment.

Lighting

Any lighting associated with the development (including vehicle lights) must not interfere with the sighting of signalling apparatus and/or train drivers' vision on approaching trains. The location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. The developers should obtain Network Rail's Asset Protection Engineer's approval of their detailed proposals regarding lighting.

Noise and Vibration

The potential for any noise/vibration impacts caused by the proximity between the proposed development and any existing railway should be made aware to the future occupiers of the site. It must also be assessed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework which holds relevant national guidance information. The current level of usage may be subject to change at any time without notification including increased frequency of trains, night-time train running and heavy freight trains. The appropriate building materials should be used to reduce any potential noise disturbance from the railway.

Vehicle Incursion

Where a proposal calls for hard standing area/parking of vehicles area near the boundary with the operational railway, Network Rail would recommend the installation of a highways approved vehicle incursion barrier or high kerbs to prevent vehicles accidentally driving or rolling onto the railway or damaging lineside fencing.

Landscaping

Any trees/shrubs to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary as the species will contribute to leaf fall which will have a detrimental effect on the safety and operation of the railway. Network Rail wish to be involved in the approval of any landscaping scheme adjacent to the railway. Any hedge planted adjacent to Network Rail's boundary fencing for screening purposes should be so placed that when fully grown it does not damage the fencing or provide a means of scaling it. No hedge should prevent Network Rail from maintaining its boundary fencing. If required, Network Rail's Asset Protection team are able to provide more details on which trees/shrubs are permitted within close proximity to the railway.

Existing Rights

Whilst not a planning matter, we would like to remind the applicant of the need to identify and comply with all existing rights on the land. Network Rail request all existing rights, covenants and easements are retained unless agreed otherwise with Network Rail.

Property Rights

Notwithstanding the above, if any property rights are required from Network Rail in order to deliver the development, Network Rail's Property team will need to be contacted.

If you would like to discuss any of the above, please contact your local Network Rail's Asset Protection team:

Anglia: AssetProtectionAnglia@Networkrail.co.uk

Kent and Sussex: AssetProtectionLondonSouthEast@NetworkRail.co.uk

Wessex: AssetProtectionWessex@NetworkRail.co.uk

To identify your route, please use the link:

<https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/our-routes>

6. Thames Water Informatives:

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-yourdevelopment/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

7. Environmental Health Informatives:

As this is a large development involving the addition of 100 houses to the area, the applicant should be following the guidance contained in the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) document 'Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality':

https://www.environmental-protection.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/air-quality-planningguidance_

Jan17.pdf In particular, the staged approach outlined in Section 6 of this document should be reviewed and followed.

Officer's Report

Site description

The site is within the urban area of Ash and Tongham and forms part of a large site allocated for housing under policy A31 of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites. The site is also within the 400m to 5km zone of influence of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The application site comprises an irregularly shaped section of land located north of Ash Green Road. The site was most recently used for the keeping of horses and includes a stable building close to the access to Ash Green Road. The site is generally open and laid to grass, containing little development other than the stable building and includes few notable landscape features. The site is generally flat but the site levels fall gradually from south to north in the direction of the railway.

The site boundaries are generally marked with mature trees and hedgerow's with an area of ancient woodland marking the eastern boundary and a railway line marking the northern boundary. A number of trees along the western and southern boundary are covered by TPO (No. 7 of 2017). To the south of the site are a number of detached and semi-detached properties along Ash Green Road. To the west of the site is a small complex of buildings known as Ash Manor that contains a number of dwellings and farm structures. The largest building within the complex is Grade II* listed and is converted into two residential dwellings, known as Ash Manor and Old Manor Cottage. To the south of these is The Oast House, which is also in residential use and which includes a stable block off one wing. The Oast House and stables are Grade II listed (one listing). To the south of this is a further residential dwelling known as Oak Barn, which too is Grade II listed.

Proposal

Reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission 18/P/02308, approved on 18/02/2020, to consider appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of the erection of 93 dwellings.

Amended plans and additional information

Through the process of the application determination, three sets of amended plans and a number of amended and additional supporting documents were received in response to concerns raised. The key changes to the application are:

- Reduction from 100 dwellings to 93
- Change in layout to address concerns around the landscape buffers to west and

east of the site

- Reduction in height of flats from 3 storey to 2 storey and the introduction of corner turning apartment
- Change in layout around May and Juniper Cottages to provide better enclosure of private space and a better response to the public realm
- A larger and more centralised area of public open space
- Addition of a swale in the SuDs strategy
- Introduction of street trees
- Amended house designs on two plots, so that the development complies with Condition 5 of the Outline Planning Permission which requires 10% of the homes to meet M4(2) standards and 5% to meet M4(3) standards
- The layout has been adjusted in certain locations to ensure adequate turning and servicing for refuse vehicles.

In addition, immediately after Planning Committee in February the applicant submitted a number of other alterations. These included:

- The provision of additional visitor parking bays within the development (increase of ten spaces)
- Bin collection points moved adjacent to plot 23 and opposite plot 30
- Apartment blocks amended to show the entrance lobby widened
- Windows to apartments that face plot 66 have been removed.

A number of re-consultations were undertaken on the amended information, and a summary of the combined responses are found in the consultation section below.

Details of the application

	Private	Affordable rented	Shared ownership	Total
One bed units	3	16	0	19
Two bed units	17	4	7	28
Three bed units	24	5	4	33
Four bed units	11	1	0	12
Five bed units	1	0	0	1
Total	56	26	11	93

This equates to 40% affordable housing provision, with a 70/30 split of affordable rent to other forms of affordable units.

All homes meet the minimum size requirements as set out in the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard.

M4(3)(2)(a) 'wheelchair adaptable' standard homes: Plots 11-13, 17, 18, 21,22, 59 & 60

M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable' standard homes: Plots 40, 45, 46, 57 & 58 [Officer note: This layout complies with requirements of condition 5 on the outline permission]

Site area: 3.5 hectares

Density: 27 dwellings per hectare

Density excluding landscape buffers and open space: 33 dwellings per hectare

Allocated parking spaces: 160

Visitor parking spaces: 11

Garage parking spaces: 25 (not included in allocated parking spaces)

Separate secure cycle storage provided for the flats and within sheds/garages for dwellings on plot

The application proposes a number of 2 storey dwellings inclusive of detached, semi-detached and terraces; as well as 4 blocks of flats also 2 storeys in height. The application proposes a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) for children's play space, a central area of amenity green space and overlooked, green landscape buffers to the east and west.

Relevant planning history

On site:

Reference	Description:	Decision Summary:	Appeal:
22/N/001 17	Non material amendment to planning application 18/P/02308 approved 18/02/2020 to change the description of the approved outline planning proposal.	Approved 19/01/2023	N/A

The description of the development approved under planning application ref: 18/P/02308 is:

Outline application for development of 100 dwellings (including 40 affordable

homes) with access to be determined, with associated garages, parking, open space, landscaping and play areas (layout, scale, appearance and landscape to form the reserved matters).

This NMA changed the description of development of the planning permission to the following:

Outline application for development of **up to** 100 dwellings (including **up to** 40 affordable homes) with access to be determined, with associated garages, parking, open space, landscaping and play areas (layout, scale, appearance and landscape to form the reserved matters).

Reference	Description:	Decision Summary:	Appeal:
22/N/000 33	Non-material amendment to planning application 18/P/02308 approved 18/02/2020 to vary condition 14 on the approved planning permission.	Approved 28/07/2022	N/A

Condition 14 on 18/P/02308 now reads:

14. Prior to first occupation, the following package of measures shall be implemented at the applicant's expense through a S278 Agreement, and in accordance with the agreed plans specified:

- i) A 2m footway shall be provided on the southern side of Foreman Road from the site access towards The Croft in accordance with Drawing Ref: SO136-PLN-003 Rev A as approved under 20/D/00099/4.
- ii) High Friction Surfacing shall be implemented on Foreman Road on the approach to the site access in accordance with Drawing Ref: SO136-PLN-003 Rev A as approved under 20/D/00099/4.
- iii) The speed limit shall be reduced from 40mph to 30mph with associated speed reduction measures, subject to TRO approval, in accordance with Drawing Ref: SO136-PLN-003 Rev A as approved under 20/D/00099/4.
- iv) A 1.5m footway shall be provided from the site access to Foreman Road in accordance with works as approved under 21/P/01166, drawing Refs: SO136-PLN-001, SO136-PLN-002 and A294-AGR-111 P3 and in accordance with Drawing Ref: SO136-PLN-003 Rev A as approved under 20/D/00099/4, unless alternative pedestrian access is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

This non material amendment application has amended the approved footpath which is required between the application site and Forman Road, from a footpath solely on the north side of Ash Green Road, to one that is on both the north and south side of Ash Green Road, considerably lessening the impact on existing hedgerow and trees along this boundary. The route was very carefully considered by the County Highway Authority, the Local Planning Authority and a local resident group to be the best route achievable within the constraints. The amended footpath is subject to the grant of planning permission 21/P/01166 (see below history on adjacent sites).

Reference	Description:	Decision Summary:	Appeal:
18/P/0230 8 /S106/2	Deed of variation is proposed to Clause 1 and the second schedule of the Section 106 agreement. Within Clause 1 the Principal Agreement is to be amended to reflect the change in the Affordable Indicative Mix, the Affordable Housing Units, the Affordable Rented Units and the Shared Ownership Units. The amounts will be changed from set numbers to percentages of the total number of dwellings. Amendments to the Second Schedule are also proposed to reflect this.	Pending	N/A
18/P/0230 8/S106/1	Deed of Variation to the Section 106 dated 18/02/2020 to vary the arrangements for delivery of	Approve 12/11/2020	N/A

the SANG to mitigate the impact of the development permitted by the planning permission 18/P/02308.

18/P/02308	Outline application for development of 100 dwellings (including 40 affordable homes) with access to be determined, with associated garages, parking, open space, landscaping and play areas (layout, scale, appearance and landscape to form the reserved matters).	Approve 18/02/2020	N/A
------------	---	-----------------------	-----

Adjacent sites:

Reference	Description:	Decision Summary:	Appeal:	
:	Ash Green Road (footpath application)	Alterations to and creation of a new footpath along Ash Green Road, Ash, GU12 6JH	Approve 15/10/2021	N/A
21/P/01166	Ash Manor:	Erection of 69 dwellings with associated vehicular and pedestrian access from Ash Green Road, parking and secure cycle storage, on site open space, landscape and ecology management and, servicing.	Non-determination	Appeal Dismissed 10/05/2022

Consultations.

A summary of all the responses on the amended scheme is contained below. This is not a verbatim report and full copies of all representations received are available on the electronic planning file, which is available to view online.

Statutory consultees

County Highway Authority: The proposed development has been considered by the County Highway Authority who having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds, recommends conditions relating to space for parking and turning and electric vehicle charging as well as a number of informatives. [Officer note: Conditions covering these points are on the outline permission, and have therefore already been secured].

Surrey County Council are satisfied with the width of the road for the proposed number of dwellings. The access onto Ash Green Road is acceptable for the number of dwellings proposed. Our design guidance suggests an access width of 4.8m up to 100 dwellings, with a radius of 4.5m. The access is 5.5m where it meets Ash Green Road and has a radius of 6m. Although the width reduces to 4.7m for a section, this is acceptable as there is sufficient forward visibility if two larger vehicles were to meet. Manual for Streets does say that carriageway widths can be reduced to act as traffic calming feature. A width of 4.8m allows for one large vehicle (refuse/delivery van) and a car to pass.

The developer has already approached Surrey County Council (SCC) regarding the internal layout and adoption of the spine road, discussions will continue through the S38 agreement process. SCC are satisfied with the alignment of the spine road, the speed controlling bend near dwelling 28 will reduce speeds at this point, there is sufficient visibility within proposed highway based on perceived speeds of vehicles. The shared surface near the community space will require a raised table and kerbs with some upstand to delineate where pedestrians can safely walk through the site. This detail will come out during the S38 technical approval process. The off-street parking provision for the dwellings is satisfactory and in accordance with standards. However, the indicative visitor parking spaces should be removed from the plan, we have therefore conditioned this plan to be submitted prior to occupation. All other conditions and S106 contributions shall be carried forward from 18/P/02308.

Natural England: No objection, subject to SANG being secured. [Officer note: This was secured through the outline permission]

Historic England: Historic England considers that the scheme will cause some harm to designated heritage assets, and advises that paragraphs 190, 194 and 196 of the NPPF should inform your decision as to whether all harm has been avoided or minimised; that there is a clear and convincing justification for the harm that remains; and the public benefits of the proposal outweigh what we assess to be less-than-substantial harm.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Thames Water: Thames Water would advise that with regard to foul water sewerage network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided. Informatives recommended regarding existing public sewers crossing the site.

Lead Local Flood Authority (SCC): No objection. Informatives recommended regarding the Ordinary Water Course.

We are satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements of the NPPF, its accompanying PPG and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for sustainable drainage systems.

The Applicant has addressed the comments from our letter dated 23/03/2022 reference LLFA-GU-21-0608 RevA. A buffer has been included along the western boundary to the existing Ordinary Watercourse and a swale has been included. Currently no surface water is indicated entering the swale, full details must be submitted at the detailed design stage.

The surface water drainage for this site will be dealt with under a separate discharge of planning conditions application.

Network Rail: No objections. Due to the proximity of the development to the rail, we request the applicant or developer engage with our Asset Protection and Optimisation (ASPRO) team prior to commencing works. Where applicable, the applicant must also follow the attached Asset Protection informatives. The informatives are issued to all development within close proximity to the railway.

Non-statutory consultees

Designing Out Crime Officer Surrey Police: The change in landscape design has addressed concerns around the unobserved landscaping corridors around the edge of the development.

Surrey Wildlife Trust: The applicant has submitted a Biodiversity and Ecology Enhancement Plan (BEEP), prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist, which outlines the general biodiversity enhancements proposed for the site. Section 4.4 of the BEEP states that “the proposed development aims to retain and enhance existing habitats and maintain the connective features of the Site to the wider landscape”.

The NPPF (2021) states that "Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures”.

We cannot advise the LPA on whether the project will provide measurable net gains for biodiversity due to the absence of a biodiversity net gain metric calculation and biodiversity net gain plan. However, having reviewed the BEEP, we would advise the LPA that “the proposals for retaining and enhancing existing habitats” would likely have benefits for ecology if habitats are created, maintained, and managed appropriately, in line with a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP). This document should include a reptile mitigation strategy. Additional condition recommendations in relation to protection of badger and bats.

Internal consultees

Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager: A broadly policy-compliant affordable housing contribution at 40% has been offered, with the appropriate split between affordable rented (26 units) and other affordable intermediate homes (11 units).

Whilst broadly compliant, there is a deficit in 2-bedroom units for affordable rent, with a higher proportion of 1-bedroom units for affordable rent and other less significant variations from the overall SHMA requirements. However, the affordable housing offered as broadly compliant with the policy requirement should be secured within the terms of a legally binding Section 106 agreement, which makes adequate provision for homes at or close to Social Rent as described within the NPPF definitions (Affordable housing for rent – as above), with suitable safeguards in place to ensure the affordable housing units are provided in perpetuity at the development, appropriately managed by a suitable Registered Provider. [Officer

note: Affordable housing was secured through the outline permission]

Environmental Health: No objection. Conditions recommended in relation to unsuspected contaminated land, noise from the railway and working hours. Informatives recommended in relation to air quality and good working practices.

Waste and Recycling: Having reviewed the Amended Refuse Strategy Layout, uploaded to the planning portal on 10 May 2023, I no longer hold any objections to this application. The movement of the presentation points and communal bin stores minimises our reserving and allows us to service these properties from the main roadway.

I would suggest that –

- Plots 81 and 82 present waste towards the frontage of their properties
- Plots 52 and 53 present waste towards the road side of plot 53
- Plots 90 and 91 present waste towards the road side of plot 90

The above 3 points are not of major cause of concern due to the low number of containers. We will issue all properties with an Section 46 Notice (EPA 1990) on occupation informing them of how our service works and how they interact with it, including where they must present their bin.

Arboricultural Officer: No objection. I have now had the opportunity to review the revised scheme and in principle support the new layout subject. Conditions recommended relating to conformity with the Arboricultural Method Statement.

- All trees are located on the four boundaries and can be adequately protected during development of the site
- The strip of woodland on the eastern side (outside red line) is identified as ‘ancient woodland’ and is protected in accordance with the Forestry Commission and Natural England standing advice – a minimum 15 metre ecological buffer zone is proposed.

Conservation Officer: Less-than-substantial harm has been identified to the heritage assets of the Ash Manor complex, both individually and collectively. In terms of the harm arising solely from the proposed development, this is judged to be at the lower end of the spectrum, whilst cumulative harm is slightly higher, rising to the lower end of mid-range.

With less-than-substantial harm being identified I therefore advise that paragraph 202 of the NPPF will need to be engaged.

Urban Designer: In summary the amended scheme responds positively to the urban design comments and discussions. Further work is required to understand how the railway buffer would be secured and maintained. Further amendments are also requested to benefit the overall appearance and character of the scheme in relation to materials, on street parking, fencing design details and landscaping. [Officer comment: Where possible, these requested amendments are addressed by a number of conditions]

Parish Councils

Ash Parish Council: Objection.

- Properties potentially overlooking Juniper Cottage
- Garages/Parking located to rear of properties possible source of anti-social behaviour
- Concern about the lack of sufficient parking on local adjoining roads for any potential overflow parking from development
- Two entrances required for development of this size but only one included in plans leading onto a dangerous curve. Access via the proposed adjacent development at Ash Manor not certain.
- Potential for flooding Is the drainage proposed appropriate for the design layout of the site
- 1 five bedroom property is proposed. There is a requirement for smaller dwellings in the area
- Urban design officer to be consulted on the new plans. [Officer comment: Comments have now been received from the Urban Designer on the latest amendments]

Normandy Parish Council: The Council objects in relation to highway safety and traffic generation.

Amenity groups/Residents associations

Ash Green Residents Association: AGRA wish to record their objections to the above planning application on the following grounds:

- The infrastructure required to support development is not available and will not be available at the time of first need. This is due to unspent S106 contributions on infrastructure projects, and infrastructure outlined in the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites not being delivered. [Officer note: This is a reserved matters application,

where planning permission for up to 100 units exists. Contributions towards infrastructure provision were secured by way of planning obligation prior to the grant of outline planning permission. All issues relating to infrastructure detailed in the AGRA objection are matters of principle, and do not concern matters which are the subject of this application (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale).]

- Given that the primary route from the adjoining site to the south of Ash Manor does not and may not ever exist, and that the Ash Green Road junction is insufficient for anything more than 5 houses, this application for 97 houses is too great a volume for the junction and should therefore be refused.
- Insufficient assessment of the access at outline stage.
- For the foreseeable future all the traffic will have to go through Ash Green Road. The road is clearly unsuitable for the volume of traffic this site would generate.
- The access road from Ash Green Road is insufficient in size to be the sole access into the site in relation to the number of units served, especially with the narrow 5.5 metre entrance at Ash Green Road. Neither this application nor the outline application have demonstrated that the junction with Ash Green Road can support the additional volume of traffic produced by 97 houses. The application should be refused on the grounds of highway safety until such time as the primary access (through an anticipated link from Ash Road Bridge and through to the adjacent Ash Manor site) is provided. There is no access to the bridge. The bridge has planning permission, but...the land between the bridge and the development site is not owned by either the developer or the council and there is no information on how this might be achieved. Historic England have also objected to this part of the access road. So, today there is no prospect of this link being completed. [Officer note: The Transport Assessment submitted with the Outline application did assess transport impacts with the access located on Ash Green Road. Matters of access were considered and approved at the time that outline permission was granted, and cannot be revisited as part of this application for reserved matters. The outline application was assessed by SCC in relation to access to the site, inclusive of the option that the Ash Green Road site access remained the only site access. The S106 on the outline permission only requires the closure of the access from Ash Green Road (except in relation to access 7 dwellings) if, and when, the Ash Road Bridge and related link roads have been constructed, and rights of access over them have been conveyed. Neither the bridge or the link roads have been constructed, although the scheme does provide future connections to both (in accordance with the conditions on the outline permission). Therefore the layout now applied for is in accordance with the restrictions placed on the outline permission in this regard. Furthermore, the County Highways Authority do not object to the application and, have stated

for the avoidance of doubt that the road widths proposed are acceptable for the number of units proposed].

- The officer report mentions the s.106 contains information on the closure of Ash Green Road. It completely fails to mention that this should have been submitted prior to the submission of the first reserved matters.
- The site does not offer any realistic options of travel other than the car, therefore the site is unsustainable. Access to both GP surgeries and schools would also require a car. The width of the internal roads will not accommodate buses. It is also noted that this aspect of the proposal would not be compliant with the SDF SPD. [Officer note: The matters raised concern the accessibility of the site in principle, which was a matter assessed through the outline permission and cannot be revisited as part of this application. The issue of the widths of the internal roads is addressed in on the section of the officer report on site highway/parking consideration below].
- The applicant has stated that their submitted drainage scheme will not work. Thames Water have provided a no objection response, which is different to the response for the adjacent scheme at land south of Ash Manor. [Officer comment: Drainage is not for consideration as part of this Reserved Matters application. Separate conditions covering the drainage are imposed on the outline permission. Thames Water have been approached regarding an anomaly in the site address on a previous response. This has been rectified within the latest response received from them on 28/10/2022].
- The heritage constraints around this area are well known to AGRA and to the council. The application is within the setting of Ash Manor and earlier amendments have resulted from consideration of the heritage assets. The buffer zone between the development and the historic buildings should be increased. The removal of the access to the Ash Manor site is strongly supported by AGRA as a road would cause harm to the setting of all the listed buildings in the complex. Without an access road the site becomes unsustainable, and should also be refused on heritage grounds. [Officer comment: The existing outline permission requires an access to be provided between the site to the south and the site to the north west. The reserved matters application must proceed in accordance with the outline. This matter was assessed through the outline permission and cannot be revisited under this application. The issue of impact on the heritage assets as a result of the matters relevant to this application (application appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) are considered below].
- Policy A31 (6) requires a buffer zone to prevent the coalescence of Ash Green with Ash. It also requires sensitive design at site boundaries so as to respect the transition between rural and urban landscapes. May and Juniper Cottages are sited in Ash Green Road, which is defined in the Local Plan as being within Ash

Green. Therefore, there must be a suitable buffer zone between those houses and any development. This application, as for the failed Ash Manor one, has an insufficient buffer zone. [Officer note: This comment is addressed in the layout section of the officer report below].

- Believe that the volume of housing in this application is far too great for the current situation. It is very clear that the only thing approved at outline was the access (see below) so therefore the volume is still a debatable issue. There have been many cases where applications have been refused at appeal because the volume at reserved matters stage was deemed unacceptable by the planning committee. We believe the volume is unacceptable given the issues with access, layout, landscaping and infrastructure.
- The housing mix is only broadly compliant but has a deficit of the much needed 2-bed houses [Officer Note: This will be discussed below].
- There are no flats or terraced houses in Ash Green, therefore the proposal would be out of keeping.

Third party comments

34 objections have been received and a summary of all these responses is contained below. This is not a verbatim report and full copies of all representations received are available on the electronic planning file, which is available to view online.

- Access onto Ash Green Road for up to 100 vehicles is unsafe and inappropriate, where Ash Green Road and the adjacent Harpers Road could not accommodate more traffic [Officer note: The site already has planning permission for 100 units under the outline permission, and this matter cannot be revisited]
- Ash Green Road is too narrow
- Insufficient sight line from the now only site entrance
- The application does not support active travel
- Problems with construction traffic [Officer note: The site already has planning permission for 100 units under the outline permission, and this matter cannot be revisited. Condition 16 on the outline permission requires the submission of a Construction Transport Management Plan and Condition 20 on the outline approved the Travel Plan submitted at outline stage]
- Permission should only now be granted for the 5 homes which will access the site from Ash Green Road and not the full 93 as proposed
- No pedestrian footpaths linking the site to anything else [Officer note: The outline permission secured a new pedestrian footpath from the site connecting with the existing footpath on Foreman Road]
- The application should not be approved unless the proposed path down the

North side of Ash Green Road is replaced by the agreed path down the South side of the road [Officer note: 22/N/00033 has replaced the previously approved footpath proposal with the agreed alternative on both the north and south side of Ash Green Road]

- Insufficient buffer to Ash Green Road, contrary to A31 policy requirement
- Number of houses proposed is excessive, out of keeping with Ash Green
- Design of houses not in keeping with others on Ash Green Road negatively impacting the street scene of this country road
- Detrimental to the rural character of the area
- Density too great
- No design statement has been made with the proposal being a normal housing estate
- Harm to the setting of Ash Manor, a Grade II* asset, and the Grade II assets Ash Manor Oast, The Oast House and Oak Barn
- Impact on neighbouring amenity - loss of natural light, no green buffer in between May and Juniper Cottages and the new houses, loss of privacy, overlooking and noise and disruption
- Materially alters the village community
- Negative impact on ecology
- Hedgerow and established trees will be removed causing a loss of wildlife habitat
- Negative impact on the Ancient Woodland next door
- The SuDS scheme required for the site by the LPA has been found by Bloor Homes to not be viable
- The drainage strategy is paramount given the relationship of this site and its other direct neighbours to the heritage assets nearby [Officer note: This is a reserved matters application, where drainage of the site was agreed at outline stage and is secured by condition]
- There has been significant building of new homes in the area and the existing infrastructure - schools, healthcare and policing already too stretched, no additional bus services
- Potential for increased crime, in an area where antisocial behaviour has been a problem [Officer note: This is a reserved matters application, where planning permission for up to 100 units exists. Infrastructure was dealt with through the outline, and cannot be revisited now]
- GBC is delivering more houses than needed each year
- "Future Homes Standard" due in 2025 which has a much tougher target for carbon reduction than is proposed
- Scheme is too significant and would be out of keeping with the area.
- The proposal would be harmful to local wildlife. It is noted that the stable building has already been demolished.

- Increased traffic on local roads which are already congested.
- Ash Green Road has no footpath where the entrance to the site will be, making it extremely dangerous for people walking down to the disused railway line as all site traffic will have to turn right out of the site. The existing railway bridge is too narrow and weight limited, with little visibility for site traffic.
- The Ash Green Road/Harper Lane junction, over Harper's Bridge, has substandard visibility. There are no lights along local roads.
- Ash Green Road can only support the extra traffic with improved infrastructure. Ash Green Road will be subject to at least an additional 150 cars using the one single entrance and exit to the new development.
- The local roads of Ash Green Road, Harpers Road, and Wyke Lane can not take the additional traffic that this development would bring. Surrey Highways have already said that improvements would need to be made to the Harpers Bridge junction.
- The SuDS scheme is not viable.
- No buffer to May and Juniper Cottages.
- Loss of amenity to surrounding properties.

Planning policies.

Guildford Borough Local Plan 2015-2034:

The Guildford borough Local Plan: strategy and sites was adopted by Council on 25 April 2019. The Plan carries full weight as part of the Council's Development Plan.

Policy S1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy P4: Flooding, flood risk and groundwater protection zones

Policy D1: Place shaping

Policy D2: Climate change, sustainable design, construction and energy

Policy D3: Historic environment

Policy ID4: Green and blue infrastructure

Policy A31: Land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) (2023):

Policy H7 First Homes

Policy P6 Protecting important habitats and species

Policy P7 Biodiversity in new developments

Policy P9 Air quality and air quality management areas

Policy P10 Water quality, waterbodies, and riparian corridors
Policy P11 Sustainable surface water management
Policy D4 Achieving high quality design and respecting local distinctiveness
Policy D5 Protection of amenity and provision of amenity space
Policy P6 External servicing features and stores
Policy D7 Public realm
Policy D11 Noise impacts
Policy D12 Light impacts and Dark Skies
Policy D14 Sustainable and low impact development
Policy D15 Climate change adaptation
Policy D16 Carbon emissions from buildings
Policy D18 Designated heritage assets
Policy D19 Listed buildings
Policy ID6 Open space in new developments
Policy ID9 Achieving a comprehensive Guildford Borough cycle network
Policy ID10 Parking standards for new development

Planning Practice Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development
Chapter 4: Decision making
Chapter 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities
Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport
Chapter 11: Making effective use of land
Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places
Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

National Design Guide

Supplementary planning documents:

Parking Standards for New Development SPD
Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance 2021
Strategic Development Framework SPD 2020
Residential Design Guide SPG 2004
Guidance on the storage and collection of household waste for new developments
2017

[Officer Note: The Strategic Development Framework SPD was published in July 2020 by the Council as a guide for future masterplanning, planning and development of the strategic sites. Members are reminded that, whilst SPDs have been subject to consultation and their content is a material consideration, it does not form part of the development plan, and does not attract the same weight to be given to Local Plan policies].

Planning considerations.

The main planning considerations in this case are:

- the principle of development
- the layout of the development
- the scale and appearance of the buildings
- open space and landscaping
- on site highway/parking considerations
- housing mix
- living environment for future occupiers
- the impact on trees
- biodiversity and ecological enhancement plan
- the impact on nearby heritage assets
- the impact on character of the area
- the impact on residential amenity
- other matters for clarification

The principle of development

This is a reserved matters application seeking approval for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following the grant of outline planning permission (inclusive of access) in 2020. Therefore the principle of the development has been fully established. Matters of access, site sustainability and required infrastructure were approved at outline stage and are not to be considered again as part of this application. The principle of the development of the site for up to 100 homes is also not to be revisited as part of this application.

It is not open to a local authority to deny the approval of reserved matters submitted within the validity period of an outline permission, so as to, in effect, revoke the permission. The grant of outline permission constitutes commitment by the planning authority to the principle of the development, and disentitles them from refusing

approval of a reserved matters on grounds going to the principle of the development. PPG advice on the award of costs, explains at paragraph 049 that a planning authority may be at risk of an award where it refuses to approve reserved matters when the objections relate to issues that should already have been considered at the outline stage.

In addition to a number of conditions relating to access to the site, there are also a number of other conditions on the outline permission which have dealt with other matters of principle which require:

- full details of the children's play space (LEAP)
- foul water drainage strategy
- surface water drainage strategy
- sustainability measures of individual homes
- water efficiency
- site levels and finished floor levels
- a Construction Transport Management Plan
- a scheme for parking and turning of vehicles
- a scheme for electric vehicle charging points
- a Travel Plan
- a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation

These matters are not for consideration as part of this application. The assessment of details submitted under planning conditions are dealt with under delegated authority.

The outline application was also subject to a planning obligation which secured:

- affordable housing
- appropriate SANG mitigation and contributions towards SAMM
- a recreational open space contribution
- a healthcare contribution
- an education contribution
- highways improvements
- a footbridge contribution
- a public art contribution
- a road bridge scheme contribution
- restriction on the access onto Ash Green Road following

There is no requirement for a legal agreement for this reserved matters application.

The relevant considerations in respect of this application are whether the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development is acceptable in planning terms. These aspects of the proposal will be assessed below.

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

Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that 'the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities'. The NPPF notes that decisions should ensure that developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

The National Design Guide also provides useful information on how to design scheme which take into account context, identity, the built form and public spaces etc.

Policy D1 of the LPSS makes clear that new development will be required to achieve a high quality design that responds to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is set. The design criterion set out in policy G5 of the saved Local Plan are also relevant.

Policy D4 of the LPDMP is also relevant and it provides further detailed design

guidance. Amongst other things, it notes that development proposals are required to incorporate high quality design which should contribute to local distinctiveness by demonstrating a clear understanding of the place. Development proposals should respond positively to:

- a. the history of a place;
- b. significant views (to and from);
- c. surrounding context;
- d. built and natural features of interest;
- e. prevailing character;
- f. landscape; and
- g. topography.

Policy D4 goes on to note that development proposals are expected to demonstrate high quality design at the earliest stages of the design process, and then through the evolution of the scheme, including in relation to:

- a) layout - settlement pattern of roads, paths, spaces and buildings, urban grain, plot sizes, building patterns, rhythms and lines
- b) form and scale of buildings and spaces - height, bulk, massing, proportions, profile and roofscapes
- c) appearance
- d) landscape - landform and drainage, hard landscape and soft landscape
- e) materials
- f) detailing

Development proposals are also required to reflect appropriate residential densities that are demonstrated to result from a design-led approach taking into account factors including: a) the site size, characteristics and location; b) the urban grain of the area and appropriate building forms, heights and sizes for the site; and c) the context and local character of the area. Development proposals are expected to make efficient use of land and increased densities may be appropriate if it would not have a detrimental impact on an area's prevailing character and setting.

Policy A31 covers the site allocation, and within this policy there are a number of points which cover issues relating to layout, scale and appearance. These are:

(6) Development proposals in the vicinity of Ash Green to have recognition of the historic location of Ash Green village. The properties along Ash Green Road form part of Ash Green village. Proposals for the land west of this road must respect the

historical context of this area by preventing the coalescence of Ash, Tongham and Ash Green. Any development as a whole will not be of a size and scale that would detract from the character of the rural landscape. This must include the provision of a green buffer that maintains separation between any proposed new development and the properties fronting onto Ash Green Road. This will also help soften the edges of the strategic development location and provide a transition between the built up area and the countryside beyond

(7) Sensitive design at site boundaries that has regard to the transition from urban to rural

(8) Sensitive design at site boundaries with the adjacent complex of listed buildings at Ash Manor. Views to and from this heritage asset, including their approach from White Lane, must be protected

A further material consideration of relevance is the Strategic Development Framework SPD which sets out a vision and a number of design objectives for this part of the A31 allocation (between Ash train station and Harpers Lane, either side of the railway line). Pages 136 - 153 of this document are relevant to this application, setting out a number of considerations around design, accessibility and movement, green infrastructure and character including a number of illustrative plans providing an example of how development could come forward.

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement - May 2021, a Design Response Document - December 2021 and a Design Response Document addendum - August 2022. These detail the design evolution of the scheme and review the immediate and local context in detail, provide site and contextual analysis, and describe how the amendments have been designed to take into consideration the Ash Manor complex and urban design comments as well as the Strategic Development Framework for Ash and Tongham.

It is acknowledged that a detailed study has been undertaken to understand the local built and natural environment to inform the revised scheme. The key constraints and opportunities of the site identified in the submission are the identifiable determinants of the layout, alongside the requirements coming from relevant Local Plan policies.

Layout

- *Western boundary*

The layout has been designed to provide breathing space to the nearby heritage assets in the Ash Manor complex, by locating an area of open space in the south west corner of the site, and providing a landscaped buffer along the western boundary of the development ensuring built form does not come too close to the boundary. In the submission documents, the architect has suggested the layout has been formed in this way, around an area of open space to suggest a rural edge. The western buffer has a width of between 12 - 19 metres from the boundary to the dwellings. It is a multi functional space, as in addition to providing an offset to the boundary nearest to Ash Manor in accordance with point 8 of policy A31, it also provides pedestrian connectivity around the site in the form of a paved footpath, space for additional landscaping serving an ecological function and the opportunity for a swale for surface water drainage.

The layout of the dwellings along this boundary has allowed for defensible frontages and passive surveillance. The frontages to plots 1, 5, 6, 19, 20, 31, 32, 33 overlook the space. This will provide a good level of passive visual surveillance.

This design response is considered to be positive, relating to the context and will allow the buffer to function as public open space and a useable and attractive pedestrian link.

The site layout provides for a connection onto the adjoining site to the north west, as required by condition and the Strategic Development Framework SPD. The position of this access has been agreed under condition 6 of the outline, and is not for consideration under this reserved matters application. The submitted layout ensures the development is in accordance with the Strategic Development Framework SPD which requires connectivity between sites.

- Eastern boundary

The application proposes a 15-metre buffer from the ancient woodland to the east of the site. Development fronts onto this boundary ensuring it is overlooked. It is beneficial that an access road borders the buffer zone rather than gardens of the properties, which reduces the possibility of fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour. The boundary treatment plan indicates the erection of a 1.2m timber cleft fence, separating the buffer zone from the rest of the proposed development which is considered an appropriate response. Within the buffer zone, meadow wildflower and tussock grassland seeding is proposed, along with shrub and tree planting.

The response to the Ancient Woodland boundary is considered to work well, and will provide an attractive soft edge to the development responding well to the context, towards the edge of the urban area in compliance with point 7 of policy A31.

- Northern boundary

Along the boundary with the railway line to the north of the site, the applicant is proposing housing backing onto this boundary with a landscape buffer to the rear of the gardens of the properties. In principle, the approach of backing housing onto the railway is considered an acceptable and appropriate design response. However this landscape buffer is not considered to be resolved from a design perspective, where the submitted boundary treatment plan is confusing along the boundary with the railway line. To ensure resolution of this matter and adequate definition of public/private space a condition will be added requiring an amended boundary treatment plan is submitted and agreed, prior to first occupation.

The constraint of noise from the railway line has been considered by the applicant in relation to layout, where acoustic fencing will be utilised. Environmental Health have recommended a condition to ensure the proposal meets the relevant guidelines on noise for residential development.

- Southern boundary

The proposed layout is now responding positively to the context along the southern boundary, ensuring the development integrates well with the existing adjacent properties of May and Juniper Cottages. Plots 92 and 93 would form a 'perimeter block' and a defensible rear boundary with these two adjacent properties, and plots 80 - 85 would continue the building line of May and Juniper Cottages, which is an appropriate and logical response. In addition to May and Juniper Cottages, there is also Greenlands and Little Orchard on the other side of Ash Green Road around the location of the access. Both these dwellings are set away from Ash Green Road, with an element of landscaping in front. Therefore the addition of an additional 7 dwellings facing Ash Green Road behind a landscape buffer on the application site is not particularly out of character in this location and would not have a detrimental impact on the character of Ash Green Road.

Point 6 of policy A31, referenced above, is of particular relevance to the development in relation to its boundary with Ash Green Road. The Inspector's decision relating to the Ash Manor application discusses the buffer zone. Specifically, in para 36 of the decision she states "It therefore seems to me that the purpose is

for a green buffer to be provided that would be sufficient as a landscape feature to provide a visual break between the proposed development area and the houses along the southern side of Ash Green Road.”

Plots 51 and 80-85 stand between 15 and 25 metres from Ash Green Road. Plots 80-85 front onto a minor access road, parallel to Ash Green Road, therefore have a separation from Ash Green Road itself. The area of land to the front of plots 80-85 contains a green landscaped area between 6 - 12 metres, giving space for existing high quality mature trees and space for additional landscaping. It is considered that the layout proposed does provide a green buffer between the development and the existing properties along the southern side of Ash Green Road in accordance with this policy requirement.

There is a clear difference between the application in this regard and the dismissed appeal scheme at the land surrounding the adjacent Ash Manor (ref. 20/P/01461). The fact that the proposed dwellings are fronting an area of overlooked, green space of significant depth which is supplemented by landscaping is a different scenario to dwellings backing onto a buffer as was the case in the failed appeal. Another relevant difference between the two applications is how the existing dwellings on Ash Green Road differ as you move up the road. There are two dwellings opposite the site access - Little Orchard and Greenlands. These two properties are set back from the road, with intersecting hedgerow and trees. This situation effectively adds to the green buffer, with a more rural existing response to Ash Green Road than further south opposite the failed appeal scheme where properties are closer to the road. There is also a gap between Little Orchard and Greenlands and the next development you come to as you move south along Ash Green Road of approximately 60 metres, which provides a further break to the almost continuous built form further south, which is also in close proximity to the road. In addition, another difference between the failed appeal and this application is what is shown in the illustrative plans of the Strategic Development Framework SPD. These plans are only illustrative, however they show an area of open space adjacent to Ash Green Road along the boundary with the neighbouring site (the Ash Manor site), this area of open space does not stretch to the area that abuts Ash Green Road in this application site. The SPD therefore made a distinction between the application site and its neighbour.

The site layout provides for a connection onto the adjoining site to the south west, as required by condition. The position of this access has been agreed under condition 6 of the outline, and is not for consideration under this reserved matters application. The submitted layout ensures the development is in accordance with the Strategic Development Framework SPD which requires connectivity between sites.

- Community Green and surrounds

The application now proposes a central area of open space designed for a leisure use and a meeting place. This area of open space is well located for the use of residents, and is of a size and design that will facilitate this aim. The central open space provides a green focal point for the development, having a positive impact on the visual amenity of the site.

- General layout considerations

The scheme comprises residential development parcels to either side of a primary vehicle route. The overall urban form broadly follows the principles of perimeter blocks, which ensures dwellings front onto streets and open space. The vehicle route would connect adjacent allocated land areas to the south and to the north-east of the site. A pedestrian/ cycle link and vehicle access is also proposed from Ash Green Road in accordance with the intentions of the Strategic Development Framework SPD. The intention is that the Ash Green Road vehicle access would be stopped up when alternative access is available from the allocated site to the south and on completion of the road bridge.

The dwellings would have adequate spacing between them ensuring the proposal does not appear cramped or overdevelopment. The application proposes a number of different dwelling types inclusive of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing as well as a number of flats providing variety and interest. The density achieved is considered to be acceptable, making an efficient use of land whilst taking into consideration all of the identified constraints of the site. It is noted that a number of comments have been received raising concerns about the proposed apartments and terraced housing which are said to be out of keeping with Ash Green. It is noted that the apartments would be within two storey buildings and as such, Officers do not believe that they would represent incongruous features in the area. The area does not have one set architectural or design characteristic and as such, there is no in principle objection to terraced housing in the area.

Open space and Green Infrastructure includes a 'buffer' to the Ancient Woodland; a 'buffer' to the adjacent railway; a narrow 'buffer' to the western boundary hedgerow; open space with a play area in the site's south-western corner; and a central community space within the scheme. The proposal provides good cycle and pedestrian connectivity in accordance with the Strategic Development Framework SPD, where direct routes to the train station and other facilities have been provided

which would safeguard this potential as and when adjacent sites in the allocation come forward.

The Surrey Police Designing Out Crime Officer has raised no objection to the amended scheme, the applicant having addressed previous issues associated with the initial design which was inward facing and caused issues in relation to corridors of unsurveyed open space.

Scale and appearance

The application proposes a number of design responses across different areas of the site. The following is set out in the design submissions of the applicant:

- Southern open space

The buildings are designed as cottages and utilitarian buildings to evoke a farmstead character and materials will reflect Ash Manor buildings. New trees, hedges and timber cleft fencing will further evoke the character of Ash Manor barn and associated buildings.

- Cottage and utilitarian character
- Small pane casement windows with splayed brick headers
- Dark window frames and fascias
- Lean-to and flat top entrance canopy
- Red/orange brick
- Terracotta tile hanging and black weatherboarding to first floor
- Chimneys to key plots and plot series

- Community green and internal streets and edges

The houses will reflect the cottage character of houses within Ash Green and nearby farms together with an Arts and Craft influence. Formal hedge planting and timber picket fencing to plot boundaries.

- Cottage character and Arts and Craft design influence
- Small pane casement windows horizontal headers
- Bay windows to larger houses
- Gabled and flat top entrance canopy
- Red/orange and blended brick
- Terracotta tile hanging first floor and projecting gables

- Chimneys to key plots and plot series

- Ash Green Road

The houses facing Ash Green Road are influenced by both the form of May and Juniper cottages and the taller existing villas on Ash Green Road south-east of the site. Plots 80-83 are designed to reflect the existing cottages, whereas plots 84-51 are designed with roof forms and window fenestration to reflect the established character and roofscape of the existing villas.

- Cottage character and detached villas
- Small pane casement windows to cottages
- Taller vertical sash style to villas
- Bay windows to larger houses
- Flat/rounded top entrance canopy
- Lean-to canopy and roof and bay window combination
- Red/orange and blended brick
- Painted brick to one villa
- Chimneys to key plots

In terms of the architectural strategy, the proposed dwellings are of simple design with a subtle diversity among the different house types in the different areas of the site bringing interest whilst remaining harmonious. All properties are two storeys in height to reflect the sites location near the outer edges of the A31 allocation and urban area and the existing surrounding development. The dwellings would range in height, with the tallest standing at approximately 9.2m, which is not deemed to be excessive.

A wide variety of materials are proposed including brick, tile hanging, render, painted brick and weatherboarding. A number of boundary treatments are also proposed inclusive of brick walls, close boarded fencing, cleft fencing and hedges. To ensure a high quality finish to the development, notwithstanding the submitted materials and boundary treatment plan (where there remain a few minor concerns with finishes currently proposed), conditions are recommended to secure both materials and boundary treatments.

The street scenes created are considered to be acceptable, and will be further improved upon with updates to materials and boundary treatment plans secured via condition. The Principal Urban Design Officer raises no objection to the scheme proposed, and considers the amendments have addressed the concerns raised.

Therefore, the proposals are in accordance with policies A31 and D1 of the Local Plan 2019, policy D4 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies, the principles contained in the Strategic Development Framework SPD and the NPPF.

Open space and landscaping

It is noted that policy ID6 of the LPDMP splits the open space required into categories. In accordance with policy ID6 the application site would have an estimated population of 205 based on Ordinance Survey data of occupancy rates. Due to the size of the scheme (93 units), the following therefore needs to be provided on site:

0.2 hectares of Amenity/ Natural Green Space

0.01 hectares of Play Space (Children)

The layout shows the development will deliver two formal areas of open space measuring approximately 0.3 hectares, including an area of children's play space measuring 0.04 hectares. This would exceed the guidance on provision set out in policy ID6.

The application provides a LEAP in the south west corner of the site. This LEAP meets the Fields in Trust Guidance, having an activity zone over 400sqm, and being over 20 metres to the nearest residential dwelling. It is also within the walking distance guidelines of 400m to all the properties on the site. Exact details of this play space have been secured by a condition on the outline consent.

The applicants have submitted a detailed planting specifications within a number of landscaping plans and planting schedule. The principles contained within this document are considered to be appropriate where the structural landscaping is native and appropriate. In the built-up part of the site, a mix of native species and ornamental or 'introduced' species are proposed in order to add variety in terms of colour, texture, fragrance and season interest and also to provide habitat and food sources for birds, insects and other small animals. This is considered to be acceptable in the locations proposed. The applicant is also proposing street trees along the main road, which is a considerable benefit, complying with para 131 of the NPPF.

There are however, a number of elements of the landscaping which have not been submitted, such as areas of hard landscaping and a suitable management and maintenance scheme. In addition there are a few areas of the scheme which need

further modification to ensure a high quality finish such as measures to design out the opportunity for car owners to use verges for parking, more inclusive seating (with arm rests) in areas of public open space, resolution of the railway land buffer zone, and changes to some of the boundary treatments proposed (as discussed in the above section). These matters are secured by condition.

The open space provided has merit in providing opportunities for recreation and physical activity. The spaces provided would have a clear function and have been designed with permeability and connectivity within and beyond the site boundaries in mind. There are effective linkages across the site for residents accessing these facilities, which would comply with policies D1(6) and D1(7) of the LPSS, policy ID6 of the LPDMP and the NPPF.

On site highway/parking considerations

As noted above, outline permission gave approval for the means of access into the site and dealt with the principle of developing the site with up to 100 houses. This included a package of measures secured through a S278 agreement, and approved through conditions 14 and 17 of the outline, together with transport infrastructure measures secured through the S106 Agreement.

Vehicle and Cycle Parking

Policy ID10 of the LPDMP relates to parking standards for development.

3) For non-strategic sites:

- a) the provision of car parking in new residential development in Guildford town centre or suburban areas, for use by residents themselves, will have regard to the maximum standards set out in the Parking Standards for New Development SPD;
- c) the provision of additional unallocated parking, to allow for visitors, deliveries and servicing, at the ratio of 0.2 spaces per dwelling will only be required where 50% or more of the total number of spaces, provided for use by residents themselves, are allocated;
- e) the provision of electric vehicle charging will provide at least the minimum requirements set out in Building Regulations (Part S); and
- f) the provision of cycle parking will have regard to the minimum requirements set out in the Parking Standards for New Development SPD.

4) For residential and non-residential development on strategic sites and also non-strategic sites in urban areas:

a) the provision of car and motorised vehicle parking at lower than the defined maximum standards must be justified by a coherent package of sustainable transport measures which will be proportionate to the level of reduction sought. Evidence will be expected to address:

i) generous provision of unallocated car parking as a proportion of all car parking spaces provided by the development proposal, where this enables more efficient use of land;

ii) excellent quality of walking and cycling access to a local centre, district centre or Guildford town centre;

iii) high public transport accessibility; and

iv) planning obligations and/or on-street parking controls such that the level of any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely impact road safety or the movement of other road users.

5) For all sites:

a) car parking spaces external to a dwelling will be required to meet the minimum size requirements of 5 by 2.5 metres;

b) a garage will only count as providing a car parking space if it meets the minimum internal dimensions of 6 by 3 metres. A garage with the minimum internal dimensions of 7 by 3.3 metres will be considered to also have the capacity to park up to 2 cycles, allowing independent access. A garage with the minimum internal dimensions of 7 by 4 metres will be considered to have the capacity to park up to 5 cycles, allowing independent access. Alternate layouts for garages which can be demonstrated to provide equivalent or better space provision and access for a vehicle and cycles may be acceptable;

c) car parking spaces for disabled drivers will be designed and provided in accordance with national guidance;

d) development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the level of any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely impact road safety or the movement of other road users.

The Parking Standards for New Development SPD notes that the site is in the suburban area and is a non-strategic site. As such, the maximum standards for car parking for dwellings, for use by residents themselves are:

1 bed flats	1 space
2 bed flats	1 space
1 bed houses	1 space
2 bed houses	1.5 spaces
3 bed houses	2 spaces

4+ bed houses 2.5 spaces

This equates to a maximum requirement of 159 spaces for this application.

Within their submission, the applicant has put forward the following breakdown of car parking on the application site:

- 160 allocated spaces (including a mix of allocated parking on driveways, allocated parking in carports and car barns and allocated parking in parking courtyards)
- 25 garages - all with internal dimensions of 6 x 3 metres

Within the submitted Reserved Matters Transport Statement the applicant has not counted the garage spaces, as garages are often not used to park cars in. However, the proposed garages meet the internal dimensions of 6 x 3 metres and in Officer's opinion should be counted in the parking numbers. This results in 185 allocated parking spaces for residents on the site. This exceeds the maximum standards in the Parking Standards for New Development SPD and is therefore contrary to policy in this regard.

It is noted that the applicant has confirmed that all of the parking spaces and garages meet the size requirements set out in policy ID10.

In terms of visitor spaces the Parking Standards for New Development SPD in this instance requires 19 spaces which are unallocated for use by visitors, deliveries etc. The proposal has been amended to increase the number of unallocated spaces within the development to 11. These spaces are spread across the development. It is noted the County Highway Authority originally raised concerns about the provision of visitor parking on the site as they were to be provided mostly on the road side. As noted above, amended plans have now been submitted and the 11 visitor spaces are now provided in marked bays around the site. The County Highway Authority now confirm they have no objections with regard to parking. However, although the County Highway Authority are satisfied with the parking provision, the SPD requires 19 unallocated spaces as part of this proposal. Only 11 unallocated spaces are provided and therefore this provision for visitors, deliveries, and servicing does not accord with the requirement of policy ID10 and the SPD.

Both of the conflicts with policy ID10 and the SPD will be factored into the overall balance at the end of this report.

Notwithstanding the above, it must be acknowledged that the LPDMP and the Parking Standards for New Development SPD were at a very early stage when this

application was submitted. As such, at the point of submission the parking policies were emerging and of little weight in the assessment of planning applications. As such, it is understandable why the applicant has submitted the application in its current form. However, having said this, the applicant has also amended the plans to reduce the level of inconsistency with the policies, in particular the visitor parking requirements. The applicant also argues that garages should not be included in the parking provision numbers as these are likely to be used for storage, rather than vehicle parking. If this approach was adopted, the proposal would just be one space over the maximum standard. However, as noted above, this is not the approach which has been adopted by Officers.

In terms of cycle parking the SPD requires a minimum of one parking space per bedroom. It is stated in the applicant's submission that for some plots, garages will be used for cycle parking (albeit alongside sheds for some dwellings, and communal cycle parking for the flats). However, for garages to count as providing cycling parking, they would have to be of a larger size to meet the requirements of Policy ID10 (5)(b). The applicant has confirmed their intention to provide 226 cycle parking spaces within the development. This level of provision meets the Council's standards and there is no reason to believe that this number of cycle stands cannot be accommodated on the site. As such, the proposal is compliant with policy ID10 and the SPD in this regard. It is noted that cycle provision is secured by condition 18 on the Outline permission and an additional condition is recommended on this reserved matters application, for an amended cycle parking strategy to be submitted to and agreed by the Council. This will further emphasise the importance of cycling generally, and the level of cycle parking provision.

Electric vehicle charging is secured under condition 19 imposed upon the outline planning permission. All dwellings with dedicated off-street parking spaces will have 1 charging socket per dwelling. Where allocated parking is in courtyards, an appropriate ducting strategy will be prepared to ensure at minimum 1 EV charging point is provided per dwelling, which will be metered to the associated dwelling's electricity supply.

Internal Road Layout

The submitted Reserved Matters Transport Statement states that the internal road layout has been designed in accordance with Surrey County Council's, Surrey Design – Technical Appendix (January 2002), as well as up to date and commonly applied design principles set out in Manual for Streets (MfS) - 2007. To that end the following key design principles have been followed:

- Carriageway widths have been kept to a practicable minimum to encourage low vehicle speeds and create an environment that is safe and useable by pedestrians and cyclists
- Priority has been given to the movement of pedestrians and cyclists, with a fully permeable and safe layout along with landscaping and open green areas to soften the design
- Where shared surfaces are provided, these are open and further enhance connectivity for non motorised road users
- The need to accommodate vehicular movement with the exception of the main spine road which has been designed to allow two buses to pass, and parking, has not been allowed to dominate the layout. Parking is generally within the property curtilage, or in short sections of off-street parking bays. Parking for flats is contained within off-street parking courts.

SCC raised no objection to the internal road layout proposed, stating they are satisfied with the alignment of the spine road where the speed controlling bend near dwelling 28 will reduce speeds at this point and there is sufficient visibility within proposed highway based on perceived speeds of vehicles.

Compliance with the Strategic Development Framework SPD

The Strategic Development Framework SPD indicates the location of primary routes, and states the intention that buses should be able to use the primary routes. The internal access road linking the north west corner of the site to the southern boundary is secured by condition 6 of the Outline permission, and forms part of this identified primary route.

The application has been designed with a road width of 5.5m, which accords with Manual for Streets (DfT; 2007) Fig. 3.12 Street Specification – residential street: 20mph speed limit; 5.5m minimum carriageway width; and, with no bus access. Further, Para 6.5.7 states ‘Using a residential street as a bus route need not require restrictions on direct vehicular access to housing. Detailed requirements for streets designated as bus routes can be determined in consultation with local public transport operators. Streets on bus routes should not generally be less than 6.0 m wide (although this could be reduced on short sections with good inter-visibility between opposing flows). The presence and arrangement of on-street parking, and the manner of its provision, will affect width requirements’. It is noted that the application proposes no on-street parking keeping the roadway open for vehicular traffic. It is recommended by Highways England that the minimum width should be increased to 6.0 metres for lengths with occasional use by buses or heavy goods

vehicles. Currently, the road is narrower than the recommended minimum width for a standard bus route. As bus movement could be viewed as 'occasional use', the width proposed could enable bus movement, with possible lay-bys for bus passing, if this were so required to enable policy. However, the overly winding nature of the road, which restricts long forward visibility, has raised safety concerns of bus movement through a solely residential neighbourhood.

The applicant has been asked to fully explore the possibility of the primary route being designed to allow for a potential future bus route in order to comply with the aspirations of the SPD, and they have provided a response in the cover letter dated 30/11/2022.

The key points made by the applicant in relation to the potential bus route are:

- Site residents will be served by existing bus routes - it is unlikely to be necessary or desirable for such services to deviate from a direct route and traverse through the application site.
- The proposed width of 5.5m is sufficient to permit a smaller, 'hopper' style bus to navigate through the application site. Bus access is therefore not precluded, should a localised service ever be provided along this route in the future.
- Any changes to existing bus routes is only speculation, as no details are available to confirm the deliverability of amending these services in this respect at the time of writing.
- Condition 6 of the outline permission has already been discharged with a 5.5m road width, therefore the LPA, in consultation with SCC Highways, has already accepted this width.

In addressing the points made by the applicant, which are considered to have merit as an argument for not providing the standard 6.0m wider road which could accommodate regular bus movement, it is also considered that a 6.0m road, with related longer forward visibility splays and potential higher speeds, would not be appropriate in the context of a solely residential neighbourhood, where it could form an overly engineered response in an application that has responded to the adjacent Ash Manor (Grade II) heritage setting and landscape structure, and a site that is located towards the edge of the urban area. It is therefore considered that the applicant has addressed the 5.5m width road width as being the most appropriate response on this site. SCC are satisfied with the internal layout, inclusive of the 5.5m width and have stated details will be agreed through a separate S38 technical approval process.

Access for pedestrians and cyclists, including within the built development and

around the perimeter of the site within the open space is considered a positive response, being permeable and pedestrian friendly. The application proposes a cycle and pedestrian route from the access at Ash Green Road, up to the north west corner of the site, ensuring the potential for future connectivity is not lost in accordance with the Strategic Development Framework SPD.

Other road layout matters

The applicant has provided plans which show a GBC refuse vehicle is able to enter and exit the site in a forward gear. The applicant has submitted tracking plans for manoeuvres, where it has been demonstrated that the refuse truck can safely move around the site.

The GBC Waste and Recycling team raise no objection to the amended scheme, where the presentation points and communal bin stores minimises the requirement for reversing and allows collection from the main roadways.

The applicant has also provided tracking plans showing a fire truck can manoeuvre around the site, ensuring compliance with building regulations.

Overall, internal layout and parking proposed is considered to be acceptable, forming a well considered and designed residential development, which would comply with policies D1(6) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: strategy and sites 2019 and saved Local Plan policy G5(9). A conflict with one element of the Strategic Development Framework SPD has been identified, relating to the potential bus route, however in all other regards, the application is considered to comply with the SDF SPD. The above assessment has identified some conflict with emerging policy ID11, where higher than the maximum allocated parking is provided, and a lower number of unallocated visitor parking is provided. This breach does not however result in any harmful impact, as the total number of spaces, when including the garages is very close to the total parking requirement for the site (both for residents and visitors) when looking at the requirements of the LPDMP and SPD.

Housing mix

This section is for information only, demonstrating how the layout complies with the condition on the outline. Housing mix was agreed at the outline, and cannot be revisited at this stage.

Policy H1 of the LPSS states that 'new residential development is required to deliver

a wide choice of homes to meet a range of accommodation needs as set out in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). New development should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size, characteristics and location'.

The outline permission dealt with this matter, where condition 5 required the development to come forward within the following range of mixes to ensure a close match with the requirements of the SHMA:

Market Housing:	Affordable Homes:
1-bed: 5-10%	1-bed: 35-45%
2-bed: 25-30%	2-bed: 30-35%
3-bed: 35-45%	3-bed: 20-25%
4+bed: 20-25%	4+bed: 0-5%

The current application is in compliance with these ranges, as shown in the two tables below, ensuring that the type of homes delivered match the boroughs housing need.

Table 1			
Market Mix	No.	SHMA % Req	Provided %
1 bed	3	10	5
2 bed	17	30	30
3 bed	24	40	43
4 bed+	12	20	21
Total	56		

Table 2			
Affordable Mix	No.	SHMA % Req	Provided %
1 bed	16	40	43
2 bed	11	30	30
3 bed	9	25	24
4 bed	1	5	3
Total	37		

GBC's Housing team raise no objection to the affordable housing mix. In relation to the location of the affordable units, these are integrated throughout the development.

Living environment for future occupiers

Policy D5 of the LPDMP relates to the provision of amenity space. It states:

2) All new build residential development proposals, including flatted development, are expected to have direct access to an area of private outdoor amenity space. In providing appropriate outdoor amenity space, both private and shared, development proposals are required to:

- a) take into account the orientation of the amenity space in relation to the sun at different times of the year;
- b) address issues of overlooking and enclosure, which may otherwise impact unacceptably on the proposed property and any neighbouring properties; and
- c) design the amenity space to be of a shape, size and location to allow effective and practical use of the space by residents.

3) All balconies or terraces provided on new flatted development proposals are required to be:

- a) designed as an integrated part of the overall design; and
- b) a minimum of 4sqm.

4) Development proposals are required to have regard to relevant national and local design guidance or codes, including in relation to garden sizes and residential building separation distances.

All of the proposed houses would have access to both private and communal outdoor space. Garden sizes across the development are occasionally on the small side, however all gardens do provide a level of amenity for future occupiers, where smaller gardens are not uncommon in new build housing, and not always undesirable dependant on the needs of the purchaser.

The largest block of flats in the centre of the scheme only has access to the shared areas of open space. It is not considered balconies would be appropriate in this location, as they would cause issues of overlooking to neighbouring dwellings. The supporting text of policy D5 states there may be instances whereby communal gardens are considered to be the most appropriate form of provision, however this will need to be justified on the basis of site-specific circumstances. The central block of flats is located particularly close to the central area of open space, and it is considered the approach in this instance is justified.

All flats are dual aspect, where landscaping has been incorporated into rear parking

courtyards to improve outlook for rear facing rooms.

The layout provides for adequate separation distances between buildings /properties to ensure appropriate privacy, outlook and daylight/sunlight. All units will meet the required Nationally Described Space Standards in terms of internal layout/space.

As such, the external and internal amenity of the proposed units would be acceptable and the application complies with policy D5.

The impact on trees

Policy P6 of the LPDMP seeks to protect Ancient woodland and significant trees. It states:

4) Where ancient woodland falls within or adjacent to a development site, the following measures are required.

a) The submission of information setting out the location of all significant ancient or veteran trees (a BS5837 Survey).

b) An appropriate buffer around the ancient woodland of a minimum of 15 metres or a greater distance if specified by national policy.

c) A clear separation between the woodland and the rest of the development, delineated by a physical feature such as a wildlife permeable barrier, a cycle lane, path or lightly trafficked road.

d) Site design that discourages harmful activities such as the use of the woodland as a cut-through where well-used paths do not currently exist.

5) Development proposals for sites that contain significant trees, including ancient and veteran trees and ancient woodland, are expected to incorporate them and their root structures and understorey in undeveloped land within the public realm, and to provide green linkages between them.

The application site contains a number of trees around the edges of the site, and has been submitted with a Tree Protection Plan and a Method Statement prepared by ACD Consultants. There is a TPO along the boundary with the site to the west affecting a number of individual trees (TPO no. No. 7 of 2017) and also an area of Ancient Woodland along the eastern boundary of the site.

The application does not propose the removal of any trees, where all retained trees will be protected through the course of the development. Some minor development

is required with the root protection areas of two of the TPO trees, however it has been shown that in these locations, a special no-dig construction will be utilised.

The woodland block to the east of the site is designated as Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory. The Forestry Commission and Natural England's guidance, known as 'standing advice' refers to Ancient Woodland, and trees classed as ancient, or veteran or aged as irreplaceable. Ancient woodland takes hundreds of years to establish and is important for its:

- Wildlife (which include rare and threatened species)
- Soils
- Recreational value
- Cultural, historical and landscape value.

The Standing Advice provides guidance regarding potential mitigation regarding development in close proximity to Ancient Woodland. The advice is that an appropriate buffer zone should be provided of semi-natural habitat between the development and the Ancient Woodland (depending on the size of the development, a minimum buffer should be at least 15 metres). The application proposes a 15-metre buffer from the ancient woodland, which provides an adequate buffer between the woodland and development. It is beneficial that the access road borders the buffer zone rather than gardens of the properties, which reduces the possibility of fly-tipping. Landscape plans indicate the erection of a fence, separating the buffer zone from the rest of the proposed development. Within the buffer zone, tussock grassland and wildflower seeding is proposed, along with native shrub planting.

The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objections, stating all trees are located on the four boundaries and can be adequately protected during development of the site. Conditions requiring development in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan and an on-site meeting with the Council's Arboricultural Officer prior to works commencing are recommended.

The development is therefore in accordance with policy P6 of the LPDMP and the NPPF in this regard.

The biodiversity and ecological enhancement plan

Policy P7 of the LPDMP relates to biodiversity in proposed developments, and includes the requirement for a 20% net gain. This is a reserved matters application, where biodiversity impacts were assessed and concluded under the outline

permission. This requirement does not therefore apply to a reserved matters application where permission has already been granted.

Notwithstanding the above, it is noted that condition 23 of the outline consent required the Reserved Matters application to be submitted with a Biodiversity and Ecology Enhancement Plan (BEEP). The applicant has submitted the a BEEP, which has been prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist. The document outlines the general biodiversity enhancements proposed for the site. Section 4.4 of the BEEP states that “the proposed development aims to retain and enhance existing habitats and maintain the connective features of the site to the wider landscape”.

Surrey Wildlife Trust have assessed the submitted BEEP and have advised that if implemented properly, the proposals contained in the BEEP for retaining and enhancing existing habitats would likely have benefits for ecology. To ensure the proper implementation of the intentions of the BEEP, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) has been added as a condition. Other conditions recommended by SWT relating to an amended Construction Environment Management Plan, a badger survey, a retile mitigation strategy and a ground level tree bat roost assessment have also been incorporated as conditions to the application.

Based on the above, and considering biodiversity impacts have already been considered as part of the outline consent, the proposal remains acceptable in this regard.

The impact of nearby heritage assets

Whilst the application site itself is void of heritage assets within its boundary, there are a number of heritage assets within the immediate context of the site that have the potential of being affected by the proposed development. The assets in question have been identified as:

- Ash Manor and Old Manor Cottage – Grade II* (approximately 125m to the west of the site boundary)
- Ash Manor Oast and The Oast House – Grade II (approximately 85m to the west of the site boundary)
- Oak Barn – Grade II (approximately 85m to the west of the site boundary)

Collectively, these assets are referred to as the Ash Manor complex. The applicant has submitted a Heritage Assessment which has taken into account the assets

identified above.

Statutory provisions:

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

This statutory duty requires decision makers to give considerable weight and importance where there is harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset.

NPPF provisions:

Chapter 16 of the NPPF at paragraph 195 sets out that the Local Planning Authority 'should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset). They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal'.

Paragraphs 197 - 203 set out the framework for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets and this application takes account of the relevant considerations in these paragraphs.

Policies D18 and D19 of the LPDMP reiterate the NPPF stating development proposals which result in harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered in line with national policy and guidance.

Outline permission and approach to reserved matters

When assessing the acceptability of the scheme at the outline stage, the Council recognised that the scheme would result in "less than substantial" harm to the setting of Ash Manor. Applying "considerable weight" to this harm – as it was required to do by section 66(1) – the Council considered that the public benefits of the scheme outweighed that harm.

On this application for reserved matters it is not open to the Council to revisit or

remake that judgement. However, it is entitled to consider whether the layout, appearance, scale and landscaping now put forward is such that the harm caused has been minimised, consistent with national and local policy, and that, therefore, the public benefits of the scheme continue to outweigh the harm.

Significance and setting of the Ash Manor complex

In terms of significance, Historic England (HE) have stated in their consultation response that the grade II* listed Ash Manor and Old Manor Cottage is one of three listed buildings forming a discrete group within the rural landscape to the north of Ash Green. The building's significance is derived from its historic and architectural interest as a moated manor house thought to have 13th century origins with successive phases of development dating to the 16th, 17th and the mid-20th centuries. Ash Manor and Old Manor Cottage have a strong group value in combination with the nearby grade II listed Oak Barn, Ash Manor Oast and The Oast house, together having integrity and coherence in a rural setting.

The GBC Conservation Officer states the special interest of the Ash Manor complex derives from the architecture and history of its buildings and their setting. The current agricultural and open character of the setting of this group of listed buildings is one that has remained constant throughout the sites history. It contributes to the significance of the group of buildings by illustrating the functional relationship between agricultural buildings and farmland, and the current openness of the surroundings helps us to read the historic importance of this group of buildings. The immediate setting now comprises domestic curtilages and so has changed considerably from that of the original farmstead, facilitated by the conversion of some of the farm buildings, as well as the removal of others. Nevertheless, the interrelationship between the farmstead and the moated site of Ash Manor is still evident.

Assessment of impact on setting and significance

The Conservation Officer considers that the introduction of houses, gardens and road infrastructure would result in a concerning change to the wider setting of this group of heritage assets. This would manifest, not only by virtue of physical change to the character of this land, including by being perceptible and disruptive in outward views from the heritage asset, as well as inward views, but also, it would facilitate in the erosion of a part of the legible understanding of the site's history, role and use as a manorial farmstead. Equally, the activity and noise generated from the placement of 90+ homes and their occupants would certainly have an impact on

assets current tranquil character and sense of privacy.

However, the Conservation Officer acknowledges that the site has outline planning permission for 100 dwellings, where less than substantial harm was identified. Moreover, the Conservation Officer accepts that various revisions have been made to the scheme, with the aim of minimising harm and improving the layout and design of the scheme. These include:

- Increase set back from the western boundary
- Re-design of area around May and Juniper Cottages
- Reduction in height of the apartments buildings and introduction of corner turning apartment
- Introduction of street trees
- Reduction in prominent frontage parking
- Increased open spaces around trees on the Ash Green Road boundary

These revisions are generally welcomed by the conservation officer, who recognises that the sensitivities of the heritage assets has been factored into the layout. In particular she recognises that harm will be minimised by leaving the most sensitive section of the western boundary free from development; having a looser/organic arrangement of development where it is proposed on the western edge; constraining the mass and bulk through the avoidance of having gable ends orientated towards the western boundary; and, in particular, by the provision of a robust ecological buffer along the screened boundary.

On this basis the Conservation Officer concludes that the degree of harm caused from the scheme can be described as being at the lower end of the 'less than substantial harm' spectrum.

Historic England considers the proposal will cause some harm to the significance of the Ash Manor complex and that this harm is within the less than substantial range under the terms of the NPPF. In their initial response to this application they stated, "to reduce this harm, it is essential that this site delivers a high quality, locally distinctive design, along with landscape enhancements and sensitive lighting. We highlight the importance of an impermeable site boundary to the west of the proposed site except, if necessary, where to facilitate an opening to the north corner for the proposed future access. The current boundary formed of hedging and Common Oaks should be augmented by additional high and under-storey planting to provide a visual and noise barrier between the historic buildings and new development. The landscaping should encourage native species and have suitable

on-going management (including via a management plan) to ensure that the proposed buffer planting remains effective. Conditions should be applied to prevent removal in the future. Additionally, the lighting to the rear of the houses to the western boundary of the site should be designed to have as a minimal an impact as possible. If these amendments are undertaken, we consider this would go some way to reducing the urbanising effect on the setting of the manorial complex".

Since this response, amendments to the application have been received, improving the application (in the ways stated above by the Conservation Officer). In addition, the landscaping has also been enhanced along the western boundary. The maintenance of this landscaping is secured by the S106 on the outline permission, where a scheme has to be submitted and agreed by the Council. A sensitive lighting scheme has been added as a condition to this permission.

In relation to the proposed future access arrangements (connection into the Ash road bridge scheme) HE note that 'we recognise that the principle of a future access point at the north west corner of the site has been approved in principle as part of the Outline consent and the future route of this is illustrated in the Strategic Development Framework SPD. The routing of main spine road in this location across the north west adjacent field would be directly in the setting of the Manor and within key views from the north of the property. The proposal would insert a significant new piece of infrastructure into the landscape, which would have an urbanising and negative impact on the rural setting of Ash Manor and Old Manor Cottage. In addition it could create a precedent for additional new development in this field. We recommend in our advice further below that this field should remain undeveloped to help preserve the rural setting of Ash Manor and help protect its significance'.

It is noted that the application maintains an ability for this site to connect to the bridge by taking the estate roads to the north-west corner of the site. From here it may be possible in the future to link into the bridge, but only when other applications were approved and constructed. The infrastructure which is needed outside of the application site is not yet known and would be considered when / if the relevant planning applications are made. The impact on the heritage assets would then be carefully considered. However, it is emphasised that HE have commented on the proposal, including the estate road being taken to the north-western corner of the site and their conclusions on the level of harm have been duly taken into account.

In relation to cumulative effects, PPG guidance on the Historic Environment clearly states in paragraph 18a-013-20190723 that "when assessing any application which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to

consider the implications of cumulative change.” The relevant scheme in this instance is application 19/P/01460 – Land East of Ash Railway Station and Foreman Road & South of Guildford Road, Ash. The harm of this scheme upon the significance of the Ash Manor complex was recently assessed by the Planning Inspector in relation to the recent appeal at Land at Ash Manor, Ash Green Road, Ash, (APP/Y3615/W/21/3273305) who concluded that “the harm to the significance of the heritage assets would be in the middle of the scale in the less than substantial category”.

When taking the above into consideration, the Conservation Officer goes on to state when considered together the combined effect of the proposed scheme and the approved road bridge scheme would result in increased erosion of the historic setting to the north and east of the heritage assets, and thereby diminishing one’s appreciation or experience of the heritage assets as a collective group. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that the two developments would be read and/or be experienced in one view, either from the Ash Manor complex or in views towards it. With this in mind she concludes that the cumulative harm to the significance of the heritage assets would fall in the lower end of mid-range of harm in the less-than-substantial category.

From the above it is noted that the applicant, HE and the Council’s Conservation Officer agree that the harm to the setting of the Ash Manor complex from the application would be less than substantial. The site has outline permission for 100 dwellings which forms a material consideration and the applicant has minimised the harm by submitting a layout which pulls development away from the boundary with the heritage assets, protects and supplements the existing considerable landscaping along this boundary, and has considered the orientation, design and scale of the units nearest to the heritage assets. When taking into account the mitigating measures, the level of harm is considered to be at the lower end of the ‘less than substantial harm’ spectrum.

Conclusion on impact on heritage assets

From the above it is noted that the applicant, HE and the Council’s Conservation Officer agree that the harm to the setting of the Ash Manor complex from the application would be less than substantial. The site has outline permission for 100 dwellings which forms a material consideration and the applicant has minimised the harm by submitting a layout which pulls development away from the boundary with the heritage assets, protects and supplements the existing considerable landscaping along this boundary, and has considered the orientation, design and scale of the

units nearest to the heritage assets in accordance with policy A31(8).

It has been concluded above that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm at the lower end of the scale to the Ash Manor complex (Grade II* and II). Looking at the cumulative impact with the Ash Road Bridge scheme, this would rise to less than substantial (at the low end of the mid-range of the scale). As less than substantial harm has been identified, paragraph 202 of the NPPF is engaged. Para 202 states 'this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.

Having reached the view that the proposal results in harm to surrounding heritage assets, one must look at paragraph 199 of the NPPF which states that 'when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This accords with the duty under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and "is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. Paragraph 200 goes on to note that 'any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification'. It is noted that any future additional infrastructure which is needed outside of the application site boundary would be considered on its own merits when / if an application is submitted.

The "less than substantial harm" identified shall be weighed against the public benefits in the final section of this report.

The impact on character of the area

The initial point which needs to be raised is that this application relates to the approval of details pursuant to an outline permission. The change in character of the site from open fields to a built residential development has been approved in principle and is not for consideration at this stage. The site is also a part of a wider allocation (A31), where it can be assumed there will be a level of change to the character of the surrounding area from additional residential development.

The application site is located towards the edge of the urban area adjacent to Ash Green. The proposal responds appropriately to all edges of the development, as described in detail in the above layout section of the report, to ensure the impact on

the character and appearance of the area is acceptable. It is considered the application is in accordance with policy A31(7) which requires sensitive design at site boundaries that has regard to the transition from urban to rural.

It is acknowledged that one of the requirements of the allocation is that development proposals in the vicinity of Ash Green should recognise the historic location of Ash Green village. The properties along Ash Green Road form part of Ash Green village. Proposals for the land west of this road must respect the historical context of this area by preventing the coalescence of Ash, Tongham and Ash Green. Any development as a whole will not be of a size and scale that would detract from the character of the rural landscape. This must include the provision of a green buffer that maintains separation between any proposed new development and the properties fronting onto Ash Green Road. This will also help soften the edges of the strategic development location and provide a transition between the built up area and the countryside beyond.

It is noted that the proposal has a relatively narrow frontage directly onto Ash Green Road. This section has been designed to include a landscaped strip which includes existing trees that are being retained, as well as new tree planting. This landscaped strip would vary in width of between 6 and 12 metres (approx.). In addition, while not necessarily a 'green buffer', the proposed dwellings (plots 80-85) which address Ash Green Road are also set well back into the site. As such, any built form would be between 15 and 25 metres from Ash Green Road and Officers consider that this would also help to soften the edges of the strategic development location and provide a transition between the built up area and the countryside beyond.

It is acknowledged that both May and Juniper Cottages are being retained as part of this proposal. These dwellings are on the eastern side of Ash Green Road. It is noted that the proposed scheme shows plots 92 and 93 to the rear of May and Juniper Cottages as well as plots 80 and 81 to the side. It is noted that the rear gardens of plots 92 and 93 would provide a buffer, however, these would be private areas of land, controlled by the occupier of the dwellings and the Council would have no control over whether the gardens would fulfil the role of a 'green buffer' into the future. It is acknowledged that plots 80 and 81 would be located close to the side of May and Juniper Cottages and a 'green buffer' would also not be provided here. Therefore, the conclusion reached by Officers is that where May and Juniper Cottages are concerned, a 'green buffer' has not been provided to these properties and on this basis, the detailed proposal now before the Council technically does not comply with this requirement of policy A31.

Having said the above, it is not considered that policy A31 requires or envisages a 'cordon sanitaire' around May and Juniper Cottages and the Council's SDF SPD shows the land immediately up to Ash Green Road in this location as the 'development area' (whereas a green buffer or open space is shown in the SDF SPD for the Ash Manor site). As plots 80 to 85 exhibit a similar set back to Ash Green Road as May and Juniper Cottages, Officers consider that the location of plots 80 and 81 close to the side of Juniper Cottage does not negatively impact on the perception that the scheme would still provide a buffer to Ash Green Road, as has been set out above. As regards plots 80 and 81, these would be set well behind the rear elevations of May and Juniper Cottages and although a 'green buffer' is not proposed, the distance of separation between the built form would result in some distinction between the development associated with the allocation and the existing properties. As concluded already above, there would be no harm caused to the streetscene or the character of the wider area.

In conclusion on this point, while the proposal would provide an adequate transition from urban to rural, this has not been fully achieved in the manner as set out in the allocation. As a 'green buffer' has not been provided in full, there is some conflict with policy A31 of the LPSS. However, the level of harm to the area resulting from this is relatively low and as such, only modest weight should be afforded to this matter. This will be considered further in the final balancing section of the report.

The impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy D5 of the LPDMP relates to the protection of amenity. It states:

- 1) Development proposals are required to avoid having an unacceptable impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or resulting in unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties, in terms of:
 - a) Privacy and overlooking
 - b) Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development
 - c) Access to sunlight and daylight
 - d) Artificial lighting
 - e) Noise and vibration
 - f) Odour, fumes and dust

May and Juniper Cottages

The proposed development wraps around the side and rear of these two existing properties, to provide enclosure of the rear gardens and a positive outward design response. The back to back distance between these neighbours and plots 92 and 93

will measure between approximately 30m - 32m. This is a sufficient minimum distance to ensure no direct, window to window overlooking or loss of privacy from plots 92 and 93 to the existing cottages.

Plot 91 is located behind Juniper Cottage on a diagonal line, standing approximately 20 metres from the dwelling and 7 metres from the rear garden at its closest point. Between the two properties is a pedestrian access route. The front elevation of plot 91 is angled away from Juniper Cottage and its garden, ensuring no materially harmful overlooking impact. In addition, additional landscaping (native shrub mix) is proposed between the two properties, helping to enhance the separation.

Plot 80 follows the same building line as May and Juniper Cottages, with approximately 10 metres from side elevation to side elevation. Plot 80 contains one side facing window, which serves a first floor bathroom. This will be conditioned to be obscurely glazed to ensure no materially harmful overlooking impact.

Greenlands and Little Orchard

Both these dwellings are sited over 40 metres from the nearest dwellings on the application site, with Ash Green Road between them. At this distance, and with the road as an intervening feature, there will be no material impact on these neighbouring dwellings in relation to overlooking, overbearing impact and loss of privacy.

Other dwellings in the vicinity of the development

Due to distances involved between the site and any other neighbouring properties, there is no harmful impact to the amenities of any other neighbours in the vicinity of the development. It must be borne in mind that this is an allocated housing site and therefore existing residents will inevitably have new "neighbours" replacing the existing green field aspect.

The proposal has been found to accord with policy D5 of the LPDMP and the NPPF, in respect of impact on amenity.

Other matters for clarification

Flood Risk and drainage strategy

This issue is not for consideration as part of this reserved matters application as it

was dealt with by the outline permission and conditions. However, for information/completeness, through design negotiations on the site, officers encouraged the applicant to look at the use of SuDs in accordance with principles in design guidance. On this basis, the applicant submitted plans showing a swale.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have advised that due to the fall of the site it should be possible for some of the plots and parking areas to drain into this swale, however the details of this need to be agreed under condition 10.

Energy reduction and sustainability measures

Energy reduction measures are covered in the outline planning condition 19 and are not for consideration as part of this reserved matters. However, for information, the applicant is now seeking to achieve a 30% CO2 reduction through the use of an increased number of photovoltaic panels spread throughout the development representing an improvement of 10% above and beyond the 20% required by the outline permission.

Planning balance

Heritage harm vs. public benefits balance

Where less than substantial harm has been identified to a heritage asset, paragraph 202 of the NPPF is engaged. Paragraph 202 states 'this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. It is also important to note that paragraphs 199 and 200 of the NPPF state that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance...Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification'.

There are two key benefits arising from the proposal.

Firstly the provision of market housing, which is afforded significant weight. The Council has a deliverable supply of housing land for in excess of five years. The Council's published Position Statement is that the Council has 6.46 years supply. However, the application site is included in the 5 year supply, within the 1-5 years

delivery, and is therefore an important element of the Council's supply.

Secondly the provision of affordable housing, which is also afforded significant weight. The application proposes a policy compliant 40% affordable housing, which equates to 37 units. This is not an insignificant number of units helping to address an acute need which exists across the borough. In addition, the mix of units is very closely aligned with the SHMA mix, addressing the identified housing need in a way that provides a true mix of units in accordance with need identified.

There are two additional benefits arising from the scheme. Firstly the economic benefits in the short term arising from construction jobs and in the longer term stemming from continuing occupation. This is given modest weight. Secondly the provision of recreational open space including a LEAP for use by existing and future residents, which stems directly from the proposed development. This is also given modest weight.

As noted above, paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that 'when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. It should also be remembered that section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that 'in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

It has been concluded above that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm (at the lower end of the scale) to the Ash Manor complex (Grade II* and II). Taking into account the cumulative impact with the Ash road bridge scheme, this would rise to less than substantial (at the low end of the mid-range of the scale).

A key consideration is that the Council have already accepted, at outline stage, that the public benefits of the scheme outweigh the "less than substantial harm" that would be caused to the Ash Manor complex. It is not open to the council to revisit this judgement on this application for reserved matters.

As part of this application, it has been concluded that the harm – taking account the additional detail from the reserved matters – would be at the lower end of the "less

than substantial” scale. Moreover, in accordance with national policy - and as was required by Historic England – it is accepted that, through this reserved matters application, the applicant has minimised the harm that would be caused.

Although the harm increases to the low end of the mid-range when considered cumulatively with the Ash Road Bridge, this is still within the “less than substantial” scale as originally assessed. Moreover, it is to be noted that the Ash Road Bridge scheme in isolation has been judged by a planning inspector to cause harm to the Ash Manor complex “in the middle of the scale in the less than substantial category.”

Therefore, although great weight and considerable importance has been afforded to the heritage harm, it is considered – as was the case at the outline stage - that the public benefits of housing, both market and affordable, along with the other identified benefits continue to be sufficient to outweigh the identified heritage harm.

Conclusion and final balance

The principle of the development has been established under the outline planning permission (18/P/02308) and the site is allocated under policy A31. The application seeks approval for the layout of the site as well the scale and appearance of the buildings and the landscaping of the site.

The application for reserved matters is consistent with current development plan policies, and it is concluded the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan when read as a whole.

As identified in the body of the report, there are some conflicts with policy ID10 and the Strategic Development Framework SPD which form material considerations. These conflicts relate to parking provision for vehicles and cycles and the future potential of bus use through the site, however no material harm has been identified from these minor breaches. It is also noted that while the proposal does technically breach the Council's new parking policies, these were only emerging when the application was submitted and the applicant had designed a scheme which would have been compliant with the Council's previous parking standards. Taking into account the position set out earlier in the report, **modest weight** is afforded to this breach of policy ID10, the Parking Standards for New Development SPD and the SDF SPD.

In addition, it is acknowledged that the proposal fails to provide a full 'green buffer'

between the development and Ash Green Road. While the proposal is therefore technically in conflict with policy A31 of the LPSS, Officers have not identified any material harm which would arise from this situation. As such, **modest weight** is also afforded to this matter.

The benefits of the proposal have already been set out above. Firstly the provision of market housing is afforded **significant weight**. Secondly, the provision of affordable housing is also afforded **significant weight**. In addition, the economic benefits in the short term arising from construction jobs and in the longer term stemming from continuing occupation is given **modest weight**. The provision of recreational open space including a LEAP for use by existing and future residents, which stems directly from the proposed development is also given **modest weight**.

It is also noted that the proposed layout has responded to the constraints and opportunities on the site, including the adjacent Ash Manor complex. The proposed dwellings have been designed to reflect the local vernacular where materials will be conditioned and boundary treatment and landscaping plans refined ensuring the development is appropriate to the context. The scale and height of buildings is considered appropriate towards the edges of the A31 allocation. The scheme, through its urban design principles will create a place with a sense of identity/place and is considered to have an appropriate relationship with Ash Green. The arrangement of internal roads and pedestrian routes are safe and convenient, allowing for the potential of future permeability in accordance with the outline permission and the Strategic Development Framework SPD.

The design takes into account the amenity of future occupiers as well as providing appropriate separation distances from existing neighbours to avoid overlooking, loss of outlook, loss of daylight and sunlight and to minimise noise and disturbance.

The details approved by this application will minimise the harm to the designated heritage assets at the Ash Manor complex, and ensures that the development itself will cause less than substantial harm - at the lower end of the scale. This level of heritage harm was considered to be acceptable at the outline stage given the public benefits of the scheme, and it is not open to the Council to revisit this judgement on this application for reserved matters.

In conclusion the benefits of this proposal are considered to clearly and demonstrably outweigh the harm which has been identified, which includes the heritage harm which should be given great weight and considerable importance. Subject to the conditions, the application is therefore recommended for approval.