App No: 25/P/01664 **8 Wk Deadline:** 29/05/2026
Appn Type: Full Application
Case Officer: Nicola Powis
Parish: West Clandon **Ward:** Clandon & Horsley
Agent : Mr Graham
OSP Architecture Ltd
Broadmede House
Farnham Business
Weydon Lane
Farnham
GU9 8QT

Applicant: Mr Adam Lodge
Broadmede House
Farnham Business
Weydon Lane
Farnham, Surrey
GU9 8QT

Location: Robins View, The Street, West Clandon, Guildford, GU4 7TE
Proposal: Erection of a two-storey detached dwelling with associated access, parking, and landscaping following removal of the existing outbuilding (amended drawings received 28/05/26, Flood Risk Assessment received 21/07/26).

RECOMMENDATION:

1. **That delegated authority be granted to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement being entered into to secure the provision of SANG and SAMM Contributions in accordance with the adopted tariff of the SPA Avoidance Strategy to mitigate against the impact on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area.**

2. **That the application be approved, subject to the following conditions and reasons.**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

   Received 9 December 2025

   25153 / S102 EXISTING SITE PLAN
   25153 / S103 EXISTING FLOOR PLANS, ROOF PLANS & ELEVATIONS (EXISTING OUTBUILDING)
   25153 / S101 LOCATION PLAN

   Received 14 April 2026

   260302-1.0-RV-TPP TREE PROTECTION PLAN

Received 28 May 2026

P101B PROPOSED SITE PLAN
P110B PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
P111B PROPOSED STREET SCENE

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

3. Prior to the commencement of any development above slab level works, a written schedule with details of the source/ manufacturer, colour and finish, OR samples on request of all external facing and roof materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must include details of reasonable efforts for all external materials to be locally sourced. The development shall be carried out using only those external materials approved.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance of the development is achieved and to ensure the development reduces embodied carbon in line with Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the Climate Change Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2024 paragraphs 5.53-5.63.

4. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed vehicular access to The Street has been constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 0.6m high.

Reason\; In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to promote sustainable forms of transport in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026).

5. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plan Drawing No. 25153/P101B for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning area shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to promote sustainable forms of transport in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026).

6. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the following cycle facilities have been provided within the development site:

(i) Secure, lit and covered cycle parking for a minimum of 2 bicycles;
(ii) Charging point with timer for e-bikes within said facilities; and
(iii) Clear hardstanding routes between the cycle stores and the site access.

The above shall be provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to promote sustainable forms of transport in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026).

7. No development related works shall take place on site until a finalized Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP), prepared in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA).

The approved AMS and TPP shall be adhered to in full. No development shall commence until all tree protection measures identified within the AMS and TPP have been installed, and a site meeting has taken place involving the site manager, the retained consulting arboriculturist, and the LPA Tree Officer.

Reason: To protect trees on and adjacent to the site that are to be retained, in the interests of the visual amenity of the locality. Pre-commencement so that protection is provided from the outset of development.

8. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the drainage system shall be installed in accordance with the document ref Ref: J-16175-AG-02 (Nijhuis Industries Ltd) dated 9 September 2026. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development does not increase flood risk on or off site and is maintained for the lifetime of the development.

9. No development shall take place until a scheme to enhance the nature conservation interest of the site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To increase the biodiversity of the site and mitigate any impact from the development. Pre-commencement so that protection is provided from the outset of development.

10. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until bird nesting and roosting boxes have been installed on the building or in any trees on the site in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to preserve and enhance the natural environment including protected species.

11. Prior to the commencement of development above slab level a scheme to incorporate features for breeding birds, including swifts, and hedgehogs, as integral design features within the built development shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented during the development process.

Reason: To ensure the provision of biodiversity enhancement measures as required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2026.

12. Prior to commencement of development an amphibian and reptile precautionary working method statement (PWMS) is submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This should be prepared by a suitably experienced ecologist and appropriate to the local context.

Reason: To protect biodiversity on the site. Pre-commencement so that protection is provided from the outset of development.

13. Prior to the commencement of any development above slab level works, an energy modelling document (either a SAP output document or BREL Compliance Report) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate the Dwelling Fabric Energy Efficiency (DFEE) value is at least 10% lower than the Target Fabric Energy Efficiency value set by Building Regulations. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To reduce carbon emissions and incorporate energy efficiency in accordance with Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) policy D2: Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy and Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP), policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the Council's 'Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy' SPD 2024.

14. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved a copy of the "water efficiency calculator for new dwellings" worksheet that accords with Part G of the building regulations' Approved Documents, and the water consumption notice specified at regulation 37 of the Building Regulations, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each of the dwellings, hereby permitted, must achieve a water efficiency of 110 litres per occupant per day. The details set out in the worksheet and notice shall be implemented in the finished building.

Reason: To secure development that meets the water consumption standard set out in regulation 36 (2) of the Building Regulations and delivers a water efficient development in accordance with Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) policy D2: Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy and Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP), policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the borough's designation as an area of

'serious' water stress.

15. Prior to installation, details of the solar panels for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall set out for each unit:

a) the total solar PV capacity (kilowatts peak);
b) number of panels;
c) orientation of panels;
d) demonstrate that the capacity has been reasonably maximised;
e) and provide a roof plan and elevations showing the panels.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and maintained as operational thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the scheme reduces carbon emissions in accordance with Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) Policy D2(2), and that the scheme delivers the commitments set out in the submitted documents.

16. Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling, details of all boundary treatments have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development or phased as agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of neighbouring residents and the locality.

17. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted all windows in the southern side elevation shall be glazed with obscure glass that accords with level three obscurity as shown on the Pilkington textured glass privacy levels (or equivalent) and only openable above a height of 1.7m above the internal floor level of the room to which it serves. The opening(s) shall be permanently maintained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

Informatives:

1. **Biodiversity Statutory Gain Plan Condition (The 'BNG Condition')**

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition") that development may not begin unless:

(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority, and
(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun

because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

2. 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 in certain circumstances
- 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.

Pre-application advice was not sought by the applicant prior to submission and alterations and additional information were required to overcome concerns, these were sought and the applicant agreed to the changes.

3. 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

4. The applicant is expected to ensure the safe operation of all construction traffic to prevent unnecessary disturbance obstruction and inconvenience to other highway users. Care should be taken to ensure that the waiting, parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles does not hinder the free flow of any carriageway, footway, bridleway, footpath, cycle route, right of way or private driveway or entrance. The developer is also expected to require their contractors to sign up to the "Considerate Constructors Scheme" Code of Practice, (www.ccscheme.org.uk) and to follow this throughout the period of construction within the site, and within adjacent areas such as on the adjoining public highway and other areas of public realm. Where repeated problems occur the Highway Authority may use available powers under the terms of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the safe operation of the highway.

5. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover or to install dropped kerbs. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers- or-dropped-kerbs.

6. The applicant is advised that any alterations to existing highway infrastructure should be designed so there is no adverse effect on surface water flow routes and should not increase flood risk on or off site. It is possible to check the long-term flood risk on the following Government website: Check the long term flood risk for an area

in England - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) For further information please contact the Flood Risk, Planning and Consenting Team: suds@surreycc.gov.uk.

7. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide e-bike charging points with socket timers to prevent them constantly drawing a current over night or for longer than required. Signage should be considered regarding damaged or shock impacted batteries, indicating that these should not be used/charged. The design of communal bike areas should consider fire spread and there should be detection in areas where charging takes place. With regard to an e-bike socket in a domestic dwelling, the residence should have detection, and an official e-bike charger should be used. Guidance on detection can be found in BS 5839-6 for fire detection and fire alarm systems in both new and existing domestic premises.

8. If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards.

9. Sub ground structures should be designed so they do not have an adverse effect on groundwater.

10. You are advised to ensure that the proposed development will result in no net increase in external artificial lighting at the development site, across suitable habitat for nocturnal species, to comply with legislation, planning policy and best practice guidance (BCT and Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2023).

11. You are advised to take action to ensure that development activities such as demolition and vegetation clearance are timed to avoid the breeding bird season of early March to August inclusive.

12. Habitat for great crested newt does exist within the site, and should the species be recorded during works, all work should cease immediately, and advice sought from Natural England or a suitability experienced ecologist to agree on the appropriate actions.

13. You are advised to ensure that you not cause any invasive non-native species to spread as a result of the works associated with the proposed development through the implementation of best practice methods of construction and a biosecurity protocol.

14. This permission shall be read in conjunction with an agreement made under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 with regards to mitigation against impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

Officer's Report

The application has been referred to Planning Committee as 20 or more letters of representation have been received which are contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

Site description

The application site is an area of land that is currently the southern part of the garden of the dwelling

known as 'Robin's View' (formerly known as 'Bruce Cottage'), which is located to the east of The Street in the settlement of West Clandon. It is a gap within the built-up frontage of development fronting onto The Street. The site is about 280m to the south-west of Clandon railway station, is within the Green Belt and is within the 400m to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. Planning permission was granted in 2020 for a dwelling to the north of what was then known as Bruce Cottage (the new dwelling is known as Owl Cottage).

Access to the piece of land is currently taken through the access and garden of 'Robin's View'. The land is fairly level and backs onto open countryside, with the frontage being screened by a hedgerow. It is understood that Australind, to the south, was previously screened from Robin's View by trees but these have been largely removed. There is some screening on the southern boundary further to the east.

There is currently a small, single storey outbuilding located on the site of the proposed dwelling, which would be demolished.

Proposal

Erection of a two-storey detached dwelling with associated access, parking, and landscaping following removal of the existing outbuilding. (amended drawings received 28/05/26). This was originally submitted as a self-build dwelling but it has been clarified that it would be a market dwelling.

The application proposes a two storey, four bedroomed dwelling. It would be 8.5m high to its ridge and would measure a maximum of 15.4m deep and 14.8m in width. The dwelling has been reduced in height, depth and width during the consideration of the application.

The dwelling would be located at a slight angle to the boundary with Australind and would taper from 2m away from the side boundary at the rear to 3m at the front. On the north side with Robin's View the dwelling would be 1.6m from the boundary at the rear and 3.2m from the boundary at the front. The dwelling would be of a traditional pitched roofed design with two front gables and a cat slide roof to the integral garage on the northern side.

Relevant planning history

21/P/01624 - permission granted for new access drive and car port for Bruce Cottage, 2022

20/P/01173 - permission granted for a two storey dwelling to the north of Bruce Cottage, 2020.

Consultations

Statutory consultees

County Highway Authority: No objection subject to conditions and informative notes.

Thames Water: No comments received.

Surrey Wildlife Trust: A query raised over the suitability for roosting bats of the group of trees proposed to be removed has now been addressed. Sensitive lighting should be used on the site to protect bats in the area and to limit light pollution. Site clearance should avoid bird nesting season. Features for breeding birds should be incorporated into the development. Recommend an amphibian and reptile precautionary working method statement (PWMS) to be required pre-commencement. Works to cease

if greater crested newts found during works and appropriate actions be agreed. Measures for hedgehogs to be incorporated. Invasive non-native species to be controlled. SPA mitigation would be required. Biodiversity enhancement should be sought. Statutory Biodiversity Net Gain would be secured off-site.

Internal consultees

Head of Environmental Health and Licensing: No objection but if the proposed ASHP does not comply with the criteria of the Microgeneration Certification Scheme, but if it is not compliant then a BS 4142:2014 +A1:2019 assessment must be undertaken in order to assess the impact of any noise on nearby premises. It is requested that the applicant submit additional information regarding the ASHP make and model so that this can be checked.

Arboricultural Officer: No objection subject to a condition.

Advisory Consultee

Surrey County Council Lead Local Flood Authority: No objection subject to a condition and two advisory notes.

West Clandon Parish Council

Initial comments, 17 January 2026

The host dwelling has already had its plot split once to provide a new dwelling to the north. Further development on this site would be overdevelopment. The proposed dwelling would extend almost to the site's boundaries giving a terraced approach.

The proposed dwelling is too large, too close to boundaries and too tall and out of character for this semi-rural area.

The dwelling would be too close to the dwelling to the south, which has an annex with windows in its side elevation immediately adjacent to the boundary. Overshadowing and overlooking of the dwelling to the south.

Concern about surface water run-off to other properties - there is believed to be a spring on the site.

No improvements to biodiversity proposed.

Visibility splays not shown for proposed new access.

Further Comments, 18 June 2026

The amendments made do not address the objections raised by the Parish Council.

Previous objections are reiterated. It is stated further that the proposal does not respect the rooflines of neighbouring dwellings. The Neighbourhood Plan favours two and three bedroomed dwellings rather than large houses such as this. The front boundary treatment is not in line with the Neighbourhood Plan, which calls for attractive and open frontages avoiding solid gates and fencing.

The lack of information on biodiversity improvements is not in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan

Policy 6.

Additional concerns raised about surface water drainage issues due to the spring on the site.

Third party comments:

22 representations have been received raising the following objections and concerns:

- inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which would harm its openness, there are no very special circumstances, which would outweigh this harm;
- the plot has already been subdivided once - this proposal would not fulfil the requirement of limited infilling as set out in local plan policy;
- dwelling would be disproportionately large for the site, not in accordance with LPSS Policy D1 in terms of maintaining the character of the area;
- overbearing and incongruous in the street-scene;
- overbearing impact on neighbouring property, loss of outlook and loss of light and privacy (impact on windows in the residential annex of Australind) contrary to NPPF and local plan policy;
- boundary treatment on the site is misrepresented as much of the vegetation on the southern boundary has been removed;
- concern about surface water drainage issues due to a pond on the site which was fed by a natural spring being filled in by the current owners of the site, neighbours' gardens have been affected by this, the application should include information about how the spring would be managed;
- query about the status of the existing building on the site, which would be replaced as it has been constructed in the past three years and no planning history has been seen;
- height would be excessive for the area at 9.5m [**Officer note**: the height has now been reduced to 8.5m], the footprint would be over-large;
- the proposal does not address the local need for smaller dwellings;
- additional dangerous access point onto The Street in an area where there have been several recent accidents, existing access for Robin's View has not been constructed in its approved location, the new access would be on a blind corner;
- additional pressure on local services;
- impact on wildlife, removal of a wildlife corridor and impact on bird activity;
- noise and disturbance, disruption to traffic from deliveries and construction traffic [**Officer Note**: construction noise etc would be for a limited period and would not be a valid reason to refuse planning permission];
- the speed limit on The Street is not enforced;
- the site is within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area so appropriate measures need to be taken;
- no biodiversity net gain is demonstrated in the proposal, no ecological assessment of the site [**Officer Note**: this has since been provided];
- no affordable housing or CIL contributions [**Officer Note:** Affordable housing or other contribution requirements are not triggered by this proposal];
- no evidence that this would be a self-build dwelling has been submitted, if this is not proven, BNG must be provided;
- no information has been submitted with regards to the sustainability credentials of the proposed dwelling;
- all side windows should be obscure glazed to avoid overlooking;
- if permission is granted, permitted development rights should be taken away in the Green Belt location.

Four letters of support have been received outlining the following positive comments:

- supports infill development rather than massive estates;
- the proposed dwelling would be well-proportioned and sensitive to the character of the area;
- proposed dwelling would sit comfortably in the street-scene;
- details relating to drainage, highways safety, sustainability and so on would be expected to be covered by conditions;
- the proposal would not adversely affect neighbours' amenities;
- the site is underutilised at present, and does not contribute to the street-scene;
- a new, well-designed home would be beneficial to the village;
- new boundary planting would be provided to replace diseased or unsafe trees that have been removed;
- the dwelling that was permitted to the north of Robin's View (then Bruce Cottage) is larger than this proposal;
- disagrees that there are surface water drainage and flooding issues on the site;
- the proposal meets the policy requirements for limited infilling within a village.

Following the receipt of amended plans 12 additional representations have been received from people who had originally commented, and a further four representations have been received from people who had not previously commented.

Issues raised are:

- amendments that have been made do not alter the fact that this would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- concerned that the LPA has not fulfilled its statutory duty to notify neighbours with regards to the amended drawings [**Officer Note:** re-notification of neighbours/interested parties has been carried out with regards to amended drawings];
- amendments made to the drawings fail to address the original objections to the height, mass and scale of the proposed dwelling;
- no account has been taken of the flood plain, too much hard surfacing;
- NPPF and local plan policies have not been addressed;
- the dwelling would still be over-large and over-bearing;
- concerns about highways safety reiterated;
- concerns with regards to noise and disturbance during construction are reiterated;
- continue to object to the design of the proposed development;
- unacceptable overlooking of dwellings opposite the site.

Following receipt of amended plans, one further representation has been made by one of the supporters of the application:

- it is disputed that the former pond on the site was a natural spring;
- considers that some of the objections raised relate to personal issues and not to genuine planning reasons;
- disputes the locations of previous accidents on the public highway (A247);
- considers that there are precedents for other three and four bedroomed dwellings, some on smaller plots, in the locality

Planning policies.

National Planning Policy Framework (2026)

Chapter 1 - Introduction
Chapter 3 - Decision-making policies
Chapter 4 - Achieving sustainable development
Chapter 5 - Meeting the challenge of climate change
Chapter 6 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Chapter 10 - Securing clean energy and water
Chapter 12 - Making effective use of land
Chapter 13 - Protecting Green Belt land
Chapter 14 - Achieving well-designed places
Chapter 15 - Promoting sustainable transport
Chapter 17 - Pollution, public protection and security
Chapter 18 - Managing flood risk and coastal change
Chapter 19 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS)

Policy S1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Policy S2: Planning for the borough -our spatial development strategy
Policy H1: Homes for all
Policy P2: Green Belt
Policy P4: Flooding, flood risk and groundwater protection zones
Policy P5: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area
Policy D1: Place shaping
Policy D2: Climate change, sustainable design, construction and energy
Policy ID4: Green and blue infrastructure

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP)

Policy P6: Protecting Important Habitats and Species
Policy P7: Biodiversity in New Developments
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 D6: External Servicing Features and Stores
Policy D8: Residential Infill Development
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 D17: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation and Storage
Policy ID10: Parking Standards for New Development

Supplementary Planning Documents

Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD
Parking Standards for New Development SPD
Thames Basin Heaths Special Protected Area Avoidance Strategy 2017
Residential Design Guide (Adopted 2004)

Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document
Green and Blue Infrastructure SPD

West Clandon Neighbourhood Plan:

Policy 1 Design within West Clandon Village
Policy 6 Biodiversity and Environment
Policy 8 Car Parking

Five-Year Housing Land Supply

The Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. This supply is assessed as being 2.98 years, based on most recent evidence as reflected in the GBC LAA (2025). Therefore, the Plan and its policies are regarded as out-of-date in terms of Policies S3 and S4 of the NPPF, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies when making decisions on planning applications.

This means that the principle of new residential development may be considered acceptable, subject to a full assessment of all planning issues.

Planning considerations

The main planning considerations in this case are:

- The principle of development and Green Belt impacts
- The impact on the character of the site and the surrounding area
- The impact on neighbouring amenity
- Living conditions for proposed occupants
- Highway/parking considerations
- Impact on trees and vegetation
- Surface water flooding
- Sustainable construction and design
- Biodiversity
- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area
- Equality, Diversity and Human Rights
- Planning Balance and Conclusion

The principle of development and Green Belt Impacts

The Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. This supply is assessed as being 2.98 years, based on most recent evidence as reflected in the GBC LAA (2025). Therefore, the Plan and its policies are regarded as out-of-date in terms of Policy S3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026), and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies when making decisions on planning applications. Within settlements Policy S4 applies, and this states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the policies in the NPPF.

As the site is also located within the Green Belt, Policy GB6 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2026 applies and this states that development would be inappropriate unless it falls within one of the categories in policy GB7. Policy GB7 sets out a list of categories which are not inappropriate in the Green Belt, including criterion 1 (c), which allows limited infilling within villages lying within the Green

Belt. Further, Policy GB7 lists 1 (g), permits development that would utilise Grey Belt land and would not undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan where there is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed and the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to policy TR3 of the NPPF. The area is identified as Grey Belt in Guildford's Green Belt Assessment (August 2026), which has assessed the area against the purposes of the Green Belt set out in policy GB2 (1) (a) (b) and (d) and found that it does not strongly contribute to any of these purposes. There is an evidenced need for housing development and the location is sustainable in transport terms, being located about 250m from Clandon Railway Station.

Further, Policy HO7 of the NPPF states that substantial weight should be given to the benefits of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community.

Guildford Local Plan Strategy and Sites (LPSS) policies S1, S2 and P2 see limited residential infill being acceptable in settlements within the Green Belt. Whilst larger new housing sites are specifically planned for, infill development in villages within the Green Belt within settlement boundaries may also be acceptable under policy P2 provided it meets relevant policy criteria including policy D1 of the LPSS in terms of responding to local character, policy D4 of the LPDMP in terms of providing high quality design, policy D5 (protecting amenity for existing and future development), policy D8 (residential infill development must integrate well with the surrounding environment).

Policy P1 of the West Clandon Neighbourhood Plan supports development within the village provided it meets the design requirements set out in policy P1.

Limited infilling in the Green Belt is defined in the LPSS paragraph 4.3.23 as the development of a small gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage, or the small-scale redevelopment of existing properties within such a frontage. It also includes infilling of small gaps within built development. It should be appropriate to the scale of the locality and not have an adverse impact on the character of the countryside or the local environment.

In this case, the proposal is for infilling with one dwelling in the side garden of an existing property, on land that forms a gap in a continuous built-up frontage. In this part of West Clandon, residential development is one dwelling deep along the A247 frontage along both sides. Permission has already been granted for one additional dwelling on the site of what was previously known as Bruce Cottage - that was also frontage infill, located to the north of the donor dwelling, with this proposal being located to the south.

Some of the objections received refer to the fact that the site has already been subdivided once, but the NPPF Policy GB7 (1) (c) permits 'limited infilling' in villages and it would not restrict a proposal such as this where the site has already been subdivided. Policy P2 of the Local Plan Strategy and Sites provides more explanation of 'limited infilling' in the Green Belt and states that this shall mean limited infilling within identified settlement boundaries, including in West Clandon and also outside settlement boundaries if it can be demonstrated that the site should be considered to be in the village. Para 4.3.23 of the LPSS states that for the purposes of policy P2, limited infilling is considered to be the development of a small gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage, or the small-scale redevelopment of existing properties within such a frontage. It is considered that this proposal would be in accordance with this policy definition.

Policy D8 provides more general advice on assessing residential infill development, with this being required to integrate well with surrounding development and the environment, respond positively to

the character of the area, avoid unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring residents and incorporate sufficient amenity space, parking, bin storage etc. These issues will be assessed further below, but in terms of the principle of the proposal it is considered that there would be no adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt from permitting an infill dwelling in this location and this would not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Reference has also been made to the fact that there is an existing building on the site, which would be demolished and replaced, and to the fact that this building has been erected recently without planning permission. The outbuilding may benefit from permitted development rights - this has not been ascertained - but the LPA has not taken enforcement action over it, and its removal would facilitate the new infill development.

The NPPF 2026 gives substantial weight to the benefits of providing new homes, both market homes and those to meet the needs of different groups. Policy L2 gives substantial weight to development proposals that make effective use of a variety of different types of land. L2 (1) (d) gives substantial weight to creating additional homes within settlements ... including additional units within residential curtilages. This is subject to a number of criteria including being consistent with the street-scene, maintaining safe access and egress for occupiers and users and acceptable amenity standards and where development is within residential curtilages, not occupying more than twice the footprint of all the existing buildings on the site, and following development, would retain at least 50% of the non-developed area within the curtilage of the existing buildings, unless additional development can be accommodated without harm to the overall character of the area, and taking into account the availability of infrastructure and the importance of locating development in sustainable locations (in accordance with Policy TR3). Further, Policy L3 of the NPPF requires that development proposals should make efficient use of land. Within settlements development proposals for residential use should contribute to an increase in density of the area in which they are situated. In considering the potential to increase densities, the existing character of the area should be taken into account.

Subject to an assessment of the proposal in terms of its impact in planning terms, it is considered that the principle of the development of this site which is in an existing residential frontage within an identified settlement boundary in the Green Belt is acceptable. Further, the site would meet the criteria to be considered grey belt land as it does not strongly contribute to purposes (a), (b) or (d) of policy GB2 of the NPPF.

<u>The impact on the character of the site and surrounding area</u>

Whilst seeking to make efficient use of land and increase densities in appropriate locations, the NPPF also seeks to protect the existing character of areas. Policy DP3 sets out key principles for well-designed places. Development proposals should respond to their context and integrate with and enhance their surroundings. This should not preclude innovation and change where appropriate, especially where an increase in densities is justified in accordance with policies L2 and L3 referred to above. Development proposals should also be in accordance with design standards set out in the development plan (LPSS and LPDM Policies).

Policy D1 of the LPSS requires a high standard of design for new development, responding to local character. Policy D4 of the LPDMP sets out criteria for assessing whether a proposal achieves a high quality of design and respects local distinctiveness. It should enhance the surroundings, be attractive and coherent. The layout, materials and form should be of a high quality. Residential densities should make efficient use of land whilst respecting the context and character of the area. Policy P1 of the West Clandon Neighbourhood Plan requires new development to promote and reinforce local character and distinctiveness. The retention of open front boundaries is favoured.

Whilst making efficient use of land, cramped forms of development should be avoided. The development of new one, two and three bedroom market homes is favoured (this proposal would provide one new four bedroomed house).

Policy D8 of the DM Policies is particularly relevant as it sets out criteria for assessing residential infill proposals. These should:
a) integrate well with surrounding development and the environment;
b) respond positively to the existing character and identity of the local area;
c) avoid unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbouring residents; and
d) incorporate landscaping measures and ensure that sufficient amenity space, parking, bin storage and cycle parking is available and that they relate well to the buildings within the site.

The Policy specifies that piecemeal proposals will be resisted (i.e. artificial subdivision of land should be avoided, particularly where infrastructure contributions could thereby be avoided). It is not considered that this is the case with this application.

In villages, infill development proposals must reflect development forms that respect the character and context of the village and avoid overly formalised layouts (recognising the organic growth of the village), retain the transitional nature between the edge of the village and rural areas and seek to maximise the provision of safe walking and cycling routes to village facilities.

The application site is part of a ribbon of frontage development facing the A247 and the remaining site of Robin's View (following its subdivision to allow the building of Owl Cottage) is about 48 m wide on its street frontage. As a comparison, the frontage of Owl Cottage is about 17.3 m in width, that of Australind to the south is about 32.7m wide. To the west, the frontage of Beech is about 26m wide and Jaynes is about 24m wide. The plot frontage for the proposed new dwelling would be about 24 m in width, which would not be out of character with other plots in the area, and would be wider than that of Owl Cottage, which has been permitted to the north. Whilst the width of the site tapers to the rear (east) down to 11.5m in width, this occurs over the full depth of the plot, which is 68m. The narrowing of the site to the rear is not evident in the street-scene and there would be ample garden space for the proposed four bedroomed dwelling.

Many of the objections to this application refer to the size and bulk of the proposed dwelling and its height, depth and width have been reduced during the consideration of the application. The height has been reduced by about 1 metre, and the dimensions have been reduced by one metre all round the dwelling. The public view of the dwelling, from the street, would be in the context of set-backs from the side boundary of 3m from the boundary with Australind to the south and 3.2m from the boundary with Robin's View to the north. In comparison, Jaynes on the opposite side of the A247 is set back from its northern boundary by just over 2m and extends almost up to its southern boundary. Beech, next door to Jaynes is set back about 1.5m from its northern boundary and about 5.5m from its southern boundary (with outbuildings within this area). Owl Cottage to the north of Robin's View is over 16m deep on its plot, with a garage located forward of the dwelling. The proposed new dwelling would be a maximum of 15.4m in depth and it would include an integral garage to its side.

The character of dwellings in the area is mixed, with some historic buildings and a number of more modern developments and new infill buildings. The dwellings in the area are characteristically substantial two storey buildings located in spacious surroundings, and the current proposal is considered to be appropriate in its context.

Materials are stated as being red bricks, hanging tiles and clay roof tiles. No further details are given and it is recommended that if permission is granted, materials should be required to be agreed by

condition.

It is considered that Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plan and NPPF Policies would be complied with in terms of the proposed pattern of development and integrating with the character of the surrounding area.

The impact on neighbouring amenity

The NPPF 2026 requires that in Policy L2 (1) (d) (ii) that acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours should be retained in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space.

Policy D5 of the Local Plan DM Policies requires that amenity is protected from unacceptable impact on privacy, access to sunlight and daylight, artificial lighting, noise and vibration, odour, fumes and dust.

Impact on amenity has been raised in a number of the objections referred to in the representations from neighbours and others. Issues of concern raised are noise and disturbance during construction works, loss of privacy, overbearing impact and loss of light to the neighbouring dwelling.

The impact on the amenities of neighbours is examined in relation to each neighbouring dwelling that would be affected:

Robin's View

Robin's View is the donor dwelling to the site and would lose part of its side garden to accommodate the new development. The integral garage would be located on the side facing Robin's View, with a lean-to roof and an eaves height of 2.85 m adjacent to the boundary. The dwelling would be between 1.6m and 3.2m from the side boundary with Robin's View and that dwelling is 2.7m from its side boundary to its main southerly wall. Robin's View has both ground and first floor side windows in its south elevation facing the proposed new dwelling. From the drawings of the dwelling available from previous applications to alter this dwelling, these windows appear to serve living and bedroom accommodation, with the rooms also having windows in other elevations. The proposed new dwelling would not have any windows in its north side elevation so overlooking between dwellings is not considered to be a concern. Any overlooking of back gardens would be normally expected in a situation of ribbon frontage development such as this. There would be some loss of light to the windows in the south side elevation of Robins's View but with about 5m between the two dwellings, the eaves height being single storey level and the affected rooms having windows in other elevations, it is considered that the impact on daylight would not be unacceptable. Robin's View has a rear garden depth of some 42m and the donor dwelling would retain ample amenity space.

Australind

Australind, to the south is a detached two storey dwelling with a detached annex building located immediately adjacent to the south of the proposed new dwelling. Both the main dwelling and the annex have ground and first floor side windows that face towards the application site.

It is understood that until recently the application site was well screened from Australind by substantial trees, most of which have now been removed. The side boundary at its point between the existing annex and the proposed dwelling is currently very open allowing views between the side windows of Australind and its annex and Robin's View. However, the side wall of the annex is some 23m from

the relevant part of the side wall in Robin's View so this is not considered to represent an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

The proposed new dwelling would block the views between the existing buildings, but it would have both ground and first floor windows in its southern elevation facing Australind. At ground floor level the windows would serve a WC and the living room (a secondary window) and at first floor level the windows would serve bathrooms. All these windows could be required to be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m in order to protect privacy. The western side of the southerly boundary is better screened by planting, but any overlooking from the rear of the proposed new dwelling over the rear garden of the rear garden of Australind would be at an oblique angle and is not considered to be unacceptable in the context of a built-up frontage.

There are concerns with regards to loss of light to the annex at Australind, which is used for ancillary domestic purposes. The ground floor has high level windows in its northerly side and is used as a home office. The annex also has a first floor window and a ground floor door and window in its south elevation. The proposed new dwelling would be 5.4m in height to its eaves on its south side adjacent to the boundary with Australind and there would be about 3.7m between the two buildings at the point where the outbuilding's windows are located. There is some concern with regards to loss of light to the annex, although it is noted that reference has been made to there previously being substantial trees screening this boundary, which would also have blocked light to these windows. The annex provides ancillary accommodation and has other side windows in its southerly side elevation. The main dwelling is about 15m away from the side boundary and whilst it also has side windows in its north elevation, at this distance it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would lead to loss of light to these.

Concern has also been raised with regard to an overbearing impact over Australind's amenity space. However, Australind has a substantial garden area to the side, front and rear. A certificate of lawfulness was granted in 2026 for a new outbuilding to the rear of the annex, adjacent to the boundary with Robin's View (to provide a garage, office and gym) and work had begun on this at the time of the officer's site visit to view the site from Australind. This would substantially block off the application site from Australind's amenity space. Further, new boundary planting would be sought if permission were to be recommended. With the proposed dwelling being over 2m from its side boundary with Australind (at the point where their new outbuilding is being located), it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable overbearing impact on this site.

Beech

Beech is a two storey dwelling located on the western side of the A247. It is set back from its front boundary by about 18m and from the front boundary of the application site by 28m. This front to front relationship would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupants of this dwelling.

Jaynes

Jaynes is a two storey detached dwelling located on the western side of the A247. This dwelling is set back from its front boundary by some 18m and from the front boundary of the application site by some 28m. This front to front relationship would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupants of this dwelling.

Demolition of the existing outbuilding and constructing the proposed dwelling would undoubtedly lead to some road congestion and inconvenience and noise to neighbours, but that would be for the

duration of the build only and once completed it would not be expected that the dwellings would create noticeable additional noise in this residential area.

With appropriate conditions it is considered that the impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupants would not be adversely affected.

Living conditions of occupants of the proposed dwellings

The NPPF 2026 requires that in Policy L2 (1) (d) (ii) that acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours should be retained in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space. Policy P3 requires that healthy living conditions should be provided for occupiers and users in terms of access to light and avoiding exposure to air noise and light pollution that could have an unacceptable impact on health and quality of life. Where necessary mitigation should be incorporated to secure acceptable living conditions.

Policy D1(4) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategies and Sites 2015 - 2034 states that all new development is expected to have regard to and perform positively against the recommendations set out in the latest Building for Life guidance and conform to the nationally described space standards (NDSS).

The proposed development would be for a detached two storey dwellinghouse with four double bedrooms.

All bedrooms would comply with the minimum area and width standards, and there would be room for storage within the dwelling. All habitable rooms would include adequate windows to provide natural light and sunlight. The dwelling would have its own garden and parking area with ample amenity space for the occupants.

Overall, it is considered that the dwelling would have acceptable living conditions through provision of private outdoor amenity space, NDSS compliance and access to natural light. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policy D1 of the LPSS and Policy D5 of the LPDMP.

Highway/parking considerations

Advice on safety at the access to the highway is provided by the Highway Authority, Surrey County Council. Parking standards are set out in Policy ID10 of the Local Plan DM Policies and in the Parking SPD.

Highways safety issues have been raised in some of the objection representations. However, the Surrey County Highways Officer has no objection to the proposal subject to conditions requiring the agreement and provision of visibility splays at the access, parking and turning space being provided and cycle storage being provided. These conditions are included in the recommendation.

Five informative notes are also recommended, relating to following the considerate constructor's scheme code of practice during construction works, advising of the need to obtain separate approval from SCC for works to the highway, advising that surface water run-off to the highway should be controlled and regarding e-bike charging points.

Electrical car charging points would be required by Building Regulations.

The site is within the built up village area of West Clandon, within very easy walking distance of the

railway station and with local facilities including a primary school, a public house, a village hall and a golf course.

It is considered that with the recommended conditions and informative notes highways safety would not be compromised by this proposal.

Impact on trees and vegetation

There are no trees on the site that are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. An Arboricultural Assessment was submitted with the application, identifying all Category A, B and C trees. Tree removal would be limited to one low quality Category C tree group (G003) and whilst some neighbours have raised concerns that significant tree(s) have been removed from the site prior to the Arboricultural Assessment being carried out, the Council's Arboricultural Officer has stated no objection to the proposal, subject to a condition to ensure that the trees that are scheduled for retention are protected during the works, if permission is granted.

Surface water flooding

Policy CC3 (1) (a) of the NPPF requires that development should be located where the risk of flooding is minimised or can be managed and the development made safe without increasing the risk elsewhere. Policy F4 of the NPPF states that site-specific flood risk assessments should be appropriate to the scale, nature and location of development. Policy F7 states that development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users or visitors, and should not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. Development should not be permitted in a location known to be at risk of any form of flooding unless listed criteria are met, including ensuring that the development will be safe throughout its lifetime, the development being appropriately flood resistant and resilient and it can be demonstrated that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere. Policy F8 requires that development proposals which could affect drainage on or around the development site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of run-off, in ways which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal.

Policy P11 of the LPDMP refers Sustainable Surface Water Management. This requires drainage schemes for all development proposals to intercept as much rainwater and run off as possible including run off from outside of the site.

Some of the representations raising objections refer to there being a spring on the site, which formerly fed into a pond. Another interested party has disputed this and claimed that the former pond was merely a garden pond that has now been filled in.

The area of the garden to the south of Bruce Cottage where the proposed dwelling would be located is identified as an area of high risk of surface water flooding by the Environment Agency. It is therefore necessary that a site specific flood risk assessment be provided to meet the requirements of Policy F4 of the NPPF.

A flood risk assessment and drainage strategy has been provided and assessed by Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. The LLFA has no objection on surface water drainage grounds and states that appropriate mitigation has been set out with regards to the surface water risk to and from the site. A condition and two informative notes have been recommended by the LLFA, which are included in the recommendation and subject to these, surface water drainage would be acceptable. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with the Local Plan and NPPF in this regard.

Sustainable construction and design

Policy CC2 of the NPPF seeks to mitigate climate change by locating development in sustainable locations. Policy DP3 (2) (b) of the NPPF requires that development proposals should contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation and the transition to net zero by using building layouts, building orientation, massing, landscaping and materials which conserve energy and other resources, and which minimise risks from the impacts of climate change including overheating.

Policy D2 of the LPSS and Policies D15 and D16 of the LPDMP and the Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD. Policy D2 of the LPSS states that applications for development, including refurbishment, conversion and extensions to existing buildings should include information setting out how sustainable design and construction practice will be incorporated including… measures that enable sustainable lifestyles for the occupants of the buildings, including electric car charging points. All developments should be fit for purpose and remain so into the future. Planning applications must include adequate information to demonstrate and quantify how proposals comply with the energy requirements at paragraphs 5-10 of this policy.

Policy D15 of the LPDMP states that development proposals are required to demonstrate how new buildings will be designed and constructed for the comfort, health, and wellbeing of current and future occupiers over the lifetime of the development, covering the full range of expected climate impacts and with particular regard to overheating. They must also incorporate passive heat control measures, and the exclusion of conventional air conditioning in line with the cooling hierarchy. Development proposals are required to demonstrate adaptation for more frequent and severe rainfall events

A Climate Change, Energy and Sustainable Development Questionnaire has been submitted with the application. This states that any materials from the demolition of the existing outbuilding on the site would be re-used where possible; locally sourced building materials would be used where possible; all structural timber would be FSC or PEFC certified; the dwelling has been designed with a fabric first approach to reduce heat loss; high performance insulation and glazing would be used to minimise energy demand, the internal layout would make effective use of natural daylight; full use would be made of the dwelling's southern aspect; passive ventilation would be used; water efficient fixtures and appliances would be fitted; renewable technologies such as photovoltaic panels and an air source heat pump are proposed; electric vehicle charging would be provided, space for home working would be incorporated into the design; external surfacing would be permeable. The percentage reduction from target emission rates has not yet been determined, but would be confirmed by the SAP assessment.

It is recommended that conditions are imposed to ensure that the fabric of the building would be energy efficient and that water efficiency measures and renewable energy would be incorporated into the development.

With these, the requirements of the Local Plan and the NPPF in this regard would be met.

Biodiversity

Biodiversity net gain (BNG)

The application was initially submitted as a self-build project but this has been amended so that it would be a market dwelling. Therefore the statutory provisions for biodiversity net gain would apply as this application was submitted prior to 6 August 2026.

Policy P7 requires that developments should seek maximum biodiversity gain on site. The Local Plan policy requirement is stated as 20% for statutory BNG, but in accordance with Policy N2 (3) of the NPPF 2026 the LPA can now only seek 10% BNG unless a higher requirement is set out in an up-to-date development plan policy for site specific allocations.

A Biodiversity Net Gain Metric and BNG Statement have been submitted with the application and these have been reviewed by Surrey Wildlife Trust. SWT notes that this information is in line with the Surrey Local Nature Recovery Strategy, which was published on 31 March 2026. Statutory biodiversity net gain would be provided through an off-site strategy and this would be secured through the statutory deemed planning condition, which would apply to a decision for permission.

Biodiversity enhancements

Policy ID4 of the LPSS and Policy P7 of the LPDMP require a net gain in biodiversity to be achieved in connection with any new development.

The West Clandon Neighbourhood Plan policy 6 seeks to enhance biodiversity through providing bird/bee/bat boxes, and to retain a leafy rural character where possible. Boundary treatments should not obstruct the movement of wildlife.

A Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Bat Scoping Survey (both produced by United Environmental Services Ltd, April 2026), have been submitted with the application. These documents have been reviewed by Surrey Wildlife Trust who have made a number of recommendations. SWT has requested that it be confirmed by the applicant's ecologist through a ground level assessment that no trees with potential for roosting bats would be removed. This has been confirmed through an additional survey.

Other ecological issues are recommended to be addressed by conditions, should permission be granted. This would require an amphibian and reptile precautionary working method statement and an on-site biodiversity ecological enhancement plan to be required pre-commencement and the provision of advice with regards to external lighting, and control of non-native invasive species of plants.

Subject to this it is considered that the requirements of the NPPF, the Guildford Local Plan Strategic and DMP Policies and the West Clandon Neighbourhood Plan would be met.

<u>Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area</u>

The application site is located within the 400m - 5km buffer zone of the TBHSPA. Natural England advise that new residential development in this proximity of the protected site has the potential to significantly adversely impact on the integrity of the site through increased dog walking and an increase in general recreational use. The proposed development results the creation of one by four bedroomed dwelling. As such it has the potential, in combination with other development, to have a significant adverse impact on the protected sites. The Council adopted the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy SPD in July 2017 which provides a framework by which applicants can provide or contribute to the delivery, maintenance and management of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) within the borough and to Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) which can mitigate the impact of development.

The development requires a total SANG contribution of £10,596.50 and a total SAMM contribution of

£1,243.28 which should be secured by a Legal Agreement. This is for one new four bedroomed dwelling.

.

An appropriate assessment has been undertaken by the Council as the competent authority. It is therefore concluded that subject to the completion of a legal agreement the development would not impact on the TBHSPA and would meet the objectives of the TBHSPA Avoidance Strategy and Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009. For the same reasons the development meets the requirements of Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

Legal agreement requirements

The three tests as set out in Regulation 122(2) require S106 agreements to be:

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
(b) directly related to the development; and
(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

As the application would result in the net gain of a new residential unit, in order for the development to be acceptable in planning terms, a S.106 agreement is required as part of any subsequent planning approval to secure a financial contribution towards a SANG and SAMM, in line with the Guildford Borough Council TBHSPA Avoidance Strategy 2017. This strategy has been formally adopted by the Council. In line with this strategy and the requirements of Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations 2017, a s.106 agreement is required to ensure that the additional residential unit proposed by this development would not have any likely significant effect on the TBHSPA. In this instance the applicant has agreed to complete a Unilateral Undertaking to secure the financial contributions.

Equality, diversity, and human rights

In reaching its decision on a planning application the Council is required to have regard to the duties contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, known collectively as the public sector equality duty.

Section 149 provides that the Council must have due regard to the need to -

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimization
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected
- characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and
- persons who do not share it.

Officers have had due regard to these matters when assessing this application and have concluded that neither the granting nor the refusal of this application would be likely to have an impact on protected groups and, therefore, that these considerations would not weigh in favour of or against this application.

Consideration has also been given to Articles 1 and 8 of the of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights. It is not considered that the decision would result in a violation of any persons rights under the Convention.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

The Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. This supply is assessed as

being 2.98 years, based on most recent evidence as reflected in the GBC LAA (2025). Therefore, the Plan and its policies are regarded as out-of-date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies when making decisions on planning applications.

In this situation Policy S3 of the NPPF 2026 states that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that within settlements development proposals should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision- making policies in the NPPF.

The assessment above has concluded that this would be development in a sustainable location, making effective use of land.

Policy P2 of the LPSS allows for residential infill development within villages within the Green Belt. This can include the small-scale redevelopment of a site, as in the case of this application and it has been demonstrated that this proposal would not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The proposed development would result in the net gain of one residential unit in a reasonably sustainable village location. The proposed design of the dwellings would be of high quality, positively responding to the character and context of the locality, and would not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

The proposed development would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on highway safety and would provide for acceptable living conditions to occupants.

Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal would not result in harm to the priority and protected species and habitats. Biodiversity net gain would be required through the deemed BNG condition.

Subject to a s106 agreement to secure the necessary SANG and SAMM contributions, the development would not impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.

Therefore, subject to the conditions and the completion of a s106 Agreement to secure the necessary SANG and SAMM contributions, the application is deemed to be acceptable and the application is recommended for approval.