



Contact: Michael Parker  
Phone: 01483 444041  
Fax: 01483 444646  
Email: [michael.parker@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:michael.parker@guildford.gov.uk)

Date: 15/12/2016

Dear

Location: Land occupied by Forest Garage and Philip Stonely Body Workshop,  
Forest Road, Effingham Junction, Leatherhead, KT24 5HE  
Regarding: Erection of three terraced houses.  
Reference: 16/A/00886

Thank you for your pre-application enquiry received on 30 November 2016. In response to your enquiry I hope that you will find the following information helpful.

Site description / constraints:

- Green Belt, inside the identified settlement area of East Horsley
- Risk of flooding from surface water – 1 in 1,000 years
- 400m-5km buffer of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area
- contaminated land

Planning considerations:

Loss of the existing use:

- Existing and allocated business, industrial and warehousing are safeguarded under saved local plan policy E3 which sets out that the loss of these premises will not be permitted unless:
  1. The retention of the land or premises has been explored fully without success; or
  2. The land or premises are unsuitably located in terms of its impact on the environment, levels of traffic movement, its accessibility to public transport and its link with the infrastructure, and its impact on the amenity of the area or adjoining occupiers.

And there is suitably located land or premises either on the market or with outstanding planning permission, for any displaced firm.

- Paragraph 51 of the NPPF supports the change of use of commercial buildings currently in the B2 use classes to residential where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate. The loss of the B2 use is therefore acceptable in principle subject to complying with the relevant criteria discussed above. Paragraph 51 of the NPPF post dates the saved Local Plan and is therefore considered to carry greater weight when assessing the loss of the

commercial use.

- The Council acknowledges that the borough is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and therefore there is an identified need for additional housing in the borough.
- However in order for the change of use of the existing B2 use class to be acceptable there must not be strong economic reasons why such a development would be inappropriate.
- In this case the existing building appears to be currently occupied. The fact that the business premises is still in use is considered to be a strong indicator that the site is a viable business location. No information regarding this has been submitted with this pre-application enquiry. Therefore there is considered to be a strong economic reason to refuse the loss of the B use from the site.

#### Green Belt considerations:

- The application site is located within the defined Settlement Boundary of East Horsley and is surrounded by built development. Policy RE3 of the saved Local Plan 2003 allows for small scale housing development appropriate to the scale of the locality and paragraph 89 of the NPPF allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites, whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development'.
- In this case the proposal would result in the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of three terrace properties however it is difficult to assess the overall impact of the development as no details/drawings have been provided of the existing garage and no elevations of the proposed houses.
- I would however raise concerns with the overall footprint of the development at this stage. The site plan shows that the terrace properties would cover a much larger area than the existing garage building. This would indicate that the overall harm to the openness of the Green Belt would be greater than the existing development.

#### Design and layout

- The proposed terraced building would be significantly larger in depth when compared to the existing garage building, extending significantly beyond the front and rear elevations of the dwelling to the north of the site.
- Whilst no elevational drawings have been provided at this stage it is clear that the dwellings would be at least two storeys in height and when combined with the significant footprint of the development it is considered the overall scale of the development would be out of keeping with the more modest properties to the north and south of the site.
- A row of terrace properties would also be at odds with the general pattern of development in the area with the majority of the buildings in the area being either detached or semi-detached.
- The proposed parking area to the front would dominate the front of the site to the detriment of the character of the site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing garage has hardstanding



across the whole of the front of the site, this is considered to be the nature of garage developments. Any residential development should seek to provide private driveways to each dwelling and reduce the level of hardstanding to allow more soft landscaping. Closer attention should be paid to the general arrangement of the residential properties to the north of the site.

- Due to the lack of any elevational drawings it is not possible to provide any comments on the proposed design of the dwellings.

#### Living environment

- Due to the level of information provided it is not possible to fully comment on this aspect of the proposal.
- We would expect all habitable rooms to be of a good size and provide adequate outlook.
- In terms of the size of the rear gardens I am concerned regarding the depth of the rear gardens of two of the units. The depth of only 9.6 metres is well below the depth of the properties and is not considered to be adequate for properties of this size.

#### Neighbour amenity

- Due to the significant depth of the proposed building I am concerned the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring dwelling to the north in terms of overbearing impact and loss of light.
- The property to the south has a mixed use of shop and residential flat. Without the benefit of a site visit to ascertain where exactly the flat property is at this premises it is not possible to fully assess the impact on this property.
- Due to the separation distances to the dwelling to the east, The Orchard, it is considered that there would not be a material impact to their residential amenity.

#### Car parking and highways

- Without details of the number of bedrooms proposed for each dwelling it is not possible to fully comment. However the provision of four parking spaces for terrace properties of the size proposed would appear to constitute an under provision of parking on the site.
- I would expect to see two car parking spaces per dwelling for a development of this scale.
- There is a requirement to provide covered and secure cycle parking, this need to be located close to entrances for accessibility and security.
- It is noted that a new central access is proposed. We would seek comments from Surrey County Council regarding highway safety and capacity. They provide their own pre-application service if you want further advice on this issue.

#### Surface Water Flooding

- The site is shown on our mapping system and being within an area of surface water flooding



risk - 1 in 1000. We would advise that you seek independent advice from a drainage consultant in order to ensure that any future proposal does not make the current situation worse.

- The Council has produced Surface Water Management Plans, please refer to these documents

#### Contaminated land

- Our records show that this site is designated as contaminated land.
- Any subsequent application should include a phase one contaminated land survey and any recommended additional surveys.
- If you require further information regarding this please contact our Environmental Health Team directly.

#### Sustainability

- As set out in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2011, there is a requirement to achieve a 10 percent reduction in carbon emissions through the use of on site low or zero carbon technologies and include water efficiency measures in line with building regulations.
- This information can be submitted with the application or can be secured by condition.

#### Trees and ecology

- Without the benefit of a site visit or further information regarding these elements it is not possible to provide full comments on these matters.
- It does not appear from our own records that there are any trees within the site. We would expect to see a landscaping scheme to be submitted with any subsequent application.
- Given the semi-rural location of the site and the fact that the existing building is to be removed a bat survey should be undertaken to assess the impact of the loss of the building. any further recommended surveys should be undertaken prior to submission of any future application.

#### Suggested amendments:

- Detailed justification needs to be put forward in terms of the loss of the existing business use at the site.
- Overall scale of development should be reduced. I would advise that a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings would be more appropriate in this location. The depth of the dwellings should be commensurate with the depth of the buildings to the north and south of the site.
- The reduction in the scale and depth of the development would overcome the concerns regarding Green Belt, impact on character of the area, neighbouring amenity and size of the rear gardens. It would also reduce the requirement for hardstanding to the front of the site and allow for the retention of the two existing access points as one could be used for each of the dwellings.
- Surveys would need to be carried out regarding land contamination and bats.



- I would be happy to consider an amended scheme with more detailed information through a fresh pre-application enquiry.

Additional consultees:

If you require further advice on highway matters contact Surrey County Council who are the relevant Highway Authority and offer their own pre-application advice service.

S.106 requirements:

Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area

- The site lies within the 400m to 5km buffer zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. All net new dwellings will be required to contribute to the provision of avoidance measures (SANG and SAMM) through a financial contribution in line with the Council's adopted tariff. More details can be found on the Council's website.
- Note: The SANG tariff excludes the minimum legal costs (approx. £670) and monitoring fee (£500 per point in time monitored) per obligation, but includes the SPA access management contribution. Please refer to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy (2009-2016) for further information.

Validation requirements:

Please review the Council's local validation list and local validation checklist, available on the Council's website at [www.guildford.gov.uk](http://www.guildford.gov.uk)

Some of the above requirements are not necessary and could be discharged by condition, however, there is an opportunity to resolve many through the application. So that there is less information required following the grant of planning permission and fewer delays in being able to implement planning permission.

Relevant planning documents:

Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction 24/09/07)  
Supplementary Planning Guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents

You may also find it useful to refer to the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

Estimated timescale for application:

This would be a full application and therefore has a target determination period of 8 weeks. However, if ten representation letters were received contrary to the officer recommendation the application would be referred to the planning committee for a decision.

Relevant planning history:

No relevant planning history

Please note that this advice represents officers' informal opinion based upon the information you

have provided. It is given without prejudice to any decision the Council may make on any subsequent formal planning application. A planning application will be the subject of publicity and consultation in accordance with the Council's procedures. These and other matters which may subsequently come to light, may result in additional issues being raised that are pertinent to the determination of the application.

Yours sincerely

Mr Michael Parker  
Planning Officer  
Planning Services



**Guildford Borough Council**  
Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB