

To: Planning & Regulatory Committee

Date: 27 July 2022

By: Planning Development Manager

District(s) Runnymede Borough Council

Electoral Division(s):
 Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water
 Mr Hulley

Case Officer:
 Janine Wright

Purpose: For Decision

Grid Ref: 502353 164004

Title: Surrey County Council Proposal RU.21/2018

Summary Report

Land at Junction 10, A320 Guildford Road, Ottershaw

Proposed development on land at the junction of A320 Guildford Road with A319 Chobham Road, Foxhills Road, Murray Road and Brox Road, Ottershaw. Planning application to carry out improvements to the existing highway including a new roundabout, junctions, access, pedestrian/cycle connections and crossings, public car park, landscaping and associated infrastructure and engineering works.

The application site forms part of an existing road network which provides a strategic link between Addlestone town and junction 11 of the M25. The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

The proposal is seeking planning permission for improvements to the existing highway which includes a:

- A new elongated roundabout with an inscribed circular diameter of 60 metres (m) located to the north east of the existing roundabout with four connecting distributor arms from the A320 Guildford Road south, A319 Chobham Road, A320 Guildford Road north and B3221 Murray Road.
- A new junction will be created between the southbound circulatory carriageway and the Murray Road westbound approach arm to gain access from Brox Road to the roundabout.
- A two-lane entry is to be provided on the A320 Guildford Road north bound, A320 Guildford Road southbound, Chobham Road and Murray Road.
- A segregated left turn lane from Chobham Road northbound to A320 Guildford Road north to bypass the roundabout.
- Northward realignment of the Murray Road connections to the new roundabout moved away from the properties on the south side of Murray Road but retaining the existing two-way road in the front of all these properties to which Brox Road would be connected near the village hall. The new road would include bus-stop laybys for east and westbound buses along Murray Road.
- A new T-junction of the retained Murray Road to the new alignment of the Murray Road connection to the new roundabout allowing all vehicle movements in and out.
- Sustainable Drainage features to provide surface water runoff attenuation including storage ponds in the centre of the roundabout and to the north east of the junction, as well as a ditch on the east side of Guildford Road north of the junction.
- Relocation of utilities where affected by the proposed junction layout.

- Relocation of existing Murray Road carpark further east to allow for additional car parking spaces and the installation of electric vehicle charging points.
- The proposal also includes the removal of trees along the north-west and north-east sides of the existing roundabout to accommodate the new roundabout.

The A320 scheme is a partnership between Runnymede Borough Council (RBC), Surrey County Council (SCC) and Homes England (HE). The project is funded through the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) and aims to increase the road capacity and improve sustainable transport infrastructure to support the delivery of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.

Junction 10 of the A320 provides a strategic link between Addlestone town and Junction 11 of the M25. The A320 serves Runnymede's most sustainable locations for growth, east of the borough, which will benefit from the greatest concentration of services and facilities including strategic employment sites and housing.

The application has been publicised by posting site notices and an advert has been placed in the local newspaper. A total of 330 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. A total of 55 letters of representation have been received. 54 letters of objection and one letter of no objection. Multiple letters of representation have been received from the Murray Road Residents Association.

Whilst the proposal forms part of a local transport infrastructure project, which category is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt provided it can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location, preserves its openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it (listed as an exception in paragraph 150 of the NPPF), in this case it is considered that the built form would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The applicant has submitted very special circumstance in support of the proposal. The very special circumstances, as set out within the report, emphasises that the proposed improvements to junction 10 would deliver the necessary road capacity to accommodate planned growth as set out within the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. This growth is estimated to deliver 3,500 new dwellings (including affordable housing) and other necessary infrastructure and services. The delivery of growth will in turn boost economic growth within the immediate and wider area.

The report summarises the assessments which have been made and put forward by the applicant. It also assesses the harm which has been identified as a result of the proposal, including residential amenity, impact on landscape character, ecology and historic buildings.

It is concluded that the proposal would comprise inappropriate development as it would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt. The very special circumstances (i.e. delivery of growth within the Borough) put forward by the applicant and the public benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt caused by reason of inappropriateness not preserving its openness and any other harm.

The proposal would result in a number of public benefits which include economic and housing growth within the Borough, improved pedestrian and cycle routes, improved traffic flows and a reduction in congestion. No significant adverse impacts on residential amenities are envisaged and the proposed landscaping and habitat creations, both on site and off site, are expected to result in an increase in biodiversity opportunities. On balance, the benefits of the proposal weigh in favour of the proposed development and therefore the application is recommended for permission.

The recommendation is subject to referral to the Secretary of State under paragraph 10 of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021, and in the absence of any direction by the Secretary of State, to PERMIT subject to the conditions and informatives

Application details

Applicant

SCC Property

Date application valid

18 November 2021

Period for Determination

17 February 2022 (extension of time 31 July 2022)

Amending Documents

Revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment (received on 17/12/21) ref: 100041683-ARC-HAC-PKC_JC10-RP-ZZ-00006

Revised Drainage Strategy (received on 14/1/2022) ref: 10041683-ARC-HAC-PKC_JC10-RP-ZZ-00009

Email received from Arcadis dated 5 May 2022 with attachments.

Fly-through video link received on 18 March 2022

Email received from Arcadis dated 10 May 2022 – additional queries and applicant’s response ref: NS/JAE7869/120-02-Rev0.

Email received from Arcadis dated 18 May 2022 – attaching SCC junction 10 planning checklist.

Email received from Arcadis dated 23.6.22 including comments on noise and vibrations

Email received from Arcadis dated 23.6.22 providing additional information on air quality

Email received from the Applicant dated 8.7.22 regarding the core working hours for enabling works, offline works and ancillary/close out phases. Details of the night-time working will be provided within the CEMP.

Email received from Arcadis dated 8.7.22 providing plans showing the location of the off-site habitat provisions.

Summary of Planning Issues

This section identifies and summarises the main planning issues in the report. The full text should be considered before the meeting

	Is this aspect in accordance with the Development Plan?	Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed
Principle of Development and Need	Yes	62-86
Environmental Impact Assessment	Yes	60-61

Green Belt	Yes	283-310
Landscape Character and Visual Impact	Yes	100-128
Heritage and archaeology	Yes	179-221
Surface water drainage and Flooding	Yes	163-178
Biodiversity, Ecology and Trees	Yes	129-161
Noise	Yes	229-241
Air Quality	Yes	242-261
Highway Capacity and Safety, Pedestrian and Cycle Access	Yes	265-282

Illustrative material

Site Plan

Plan 1 - Site Location Plan and Application Site Area

Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1 - Surrounding Area

Aerial 2 - Application Site

Site Photographs

Photo 1 – Looking northeast along Guildford Road (A320) ambulance station to the left

Photo 2 – Entrance to Murray House from Murray Road (B3121)

Photo 3 – Looking east along Murray Road (B3132)

Photo 4 – Looking north from Brox Road onto junction with Murray Road (B3121)

Photo 5 – Looking north along Guildford Road (A320) towards roundabout

Photo 6 – Looking northeast along Guildford Road (A320) towards roundabout

Photo 7 – Looking south from Foxhills Road, junction with Chobham Road (A319)

Photo 8 – Looking north west from Chobham Road (A319) junction with Foxhills Road

Photo 9 – Looking northeast over west side of roundabout towards Guildford Road (A320) from Chobham Road (A319)

Photo 10 – Looking west over Guildford Road spur

Photo 11 – looking south across Guildford Road roundabout spur (Guildford Road, from south, centre of picture Chobham Road right of picture)

Plans

Plan 1 Location Plan

Plan 2 Proposed Biodiversity off-site plans 1 & 2

Plan 3 Landscaping Plan (indicative)

Background

Description of existing use and background to the proposal

1. The application site forms part of an existing road network which has been in situ since the early 1900s.
2. The proposal forms part of a wider A320 corridor project which comprises improvements to the A320 between Ottershaw and Chertsey to increase the capacity of the local highway network and enhance the sustainable transport infrastructure. The wider project includes improvement works to junctions and link roads within the A320 corridor.
3. The A320 improvement package will deliver the necessary capacity on the road network to accommodate the planned growth in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. With the growth level estimated to deliver a minimum of 3,500 net dwellings (including affordable housing) as well as other necessary infrastructure and services. The delivery of this growth will in turn boost economic growth within the area but would also add pressure to the existing infrastructure.
4. In 2018, a corridor study of the A320 was undertaken following Runnymede Borough Council's Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) which accounted for the original study area and proposed growth in neighbouring authority areas, including the strategic sites being considered by Woking Borough Council and Surrey Heath Borough Council for allocation in their respective Local Plans.
5. The study identified the following key points:
 - Congestion of network, particularly during peak hours
 - Capacity constraints, with the exception of St Peters Way east
 - Large proportion of traffic movements are towards the M25 and therefore the A320 is acting as a collector road
 - The congestion along the corridor is exacerbated with the expected increase in traffic flows related to the Local Plan developments.
6. The study concluded that the corridor is expected to be saturated, with greater congestion during the peak periods. The proposed development seeks to reduce traffic congestion and the preparation for planned traffic growth through the delivery of new housing developments as set out within the Runnymede Local Plan 2030. The proposal would also enable improved air quality, improved pedestrian and cycle routes and enhanced connectivity across the wider area.
7. In February and June 2021, the applicant undertook a series of public engagement which included press releases, web platforms and social media. Engineering drawings of the scheme were published on their website in June 2021 so that residents and road users could see the plans in detail.
8. There are a number of improvements proposed along the A320 transport link including road widening and junction improvements. Most of the improvements works along the A320 corridor, aside from this planning application and planning application RU.21/1521, constitute Permitted Development and therefore do not require the benefit of planning permission. This scheme, due to the proposed works falling outside of the highway boundary, requires the benefit of planning permission and hence this application.

Site Description

9. The application site is approximately 3.46 hectares (ha) and relates to highway improvement works at junction 10 of the A320. For the purposes of this report, junction 10 includes the existing four arm roundabout and land immediately surrounding it. The four arm roundabout consists of the A320 Guildford Road feeding into and exiting from in a north/ south manner, Murray Road (B3121) joining from the east and Chobham Road (A319) joining to the south west. Foxhills Road (D3046) joins Chobham Road in a T junction approximately 15m south of the existing roundabout. Brox Road (C129) joins Murray Road from the south approximately 40m east of the roundabout. The speed limit of the junction is 40 miles per hour (mph) which changes to 30mph at the north end of A319, east end of Foxhills Road and north end of Brox Road. A signalised pedestrian crossing with tactile paving is located on the A320 south arm approximately 50m south of the roundabout. Uncontrolled crossings comprising dropped kerb, tactile paving and small refuge island are located on the other three arms of the roundabout.
10. The application site's northern boundary lies just to the north of Chertsey Ambulance Service which is situated on the A320 north of the existing roundabout. The application site extends southwards and eastwards to include the roundabout and junction 10 with Foxhills Road, Chobham Road, Brox Road and Murray Road. The application site also includes an area of land immediately to the north of Murray Road, which is currently within a horticultural use. The Murray Road carpark lies immediately to the north of Murray Road, approximately 30m from the existing roundabout and falls within the application site. The Murray Road carpark is a ground level car park which accommodates approximately 40 parking spaces.
11. The application site's southern boundary is formed with The Otter public house and The Trident Car Showroom. Residential properties then extend southwards and south westwards along the A320 and Chobham Road. 2 Chobham Road (a Grade II Listed property) is located between Chobham Road and Foxhills Road approximately 30m from the existing boundary. Beyond the Otter public house to the east is Ottershaw Village Hall (Brook Memorial Hall) and residential properties which front onto Murray Road. This includes Murray House (Grade II listed property), which is outside of the application site.
12. St Peters hospital and the M25 is located north of the application site and residential areas surround the application site to the south, south east and south west. Addlestone Town Centre is located approximately 2 miles to the east. The majority of the application site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The designated Green Belt boundary runs along Murray Road and cuts across the site, with the existing roundabout. A small section of Guildford Road south is included within the designation along with the existing roundabout and land north of the roundabout including the ambulance station and telephone exchange. However, Chobham Road and Foxhills Road are not included within the Green Belt boundary and nor is their junction with the roundabout. The nearest Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) is located approximately 2km east of the application site and includes the M25. A designated ancient and semi-natural woodland is located approximately 1.3 km north-east of the application site.
13. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation are both located approximately 2.7km to the west. The South West London Waterbodies SPA and Ramsar site is located approximately 3.8km to the north of the site. The Queenwood Golf Course Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) is located approximately 0.5km to the west of the application site, the Spinney Wood and Grassland SNCI is located approximately 1.3km to the west of the application site, the Hall's Farm Wood and Grassland SNCI is located 1.6km to the south and the Simplemarsh Farm SNCI is located 1.7km to the north east. Hardwick Court Farm Fields SNCI is 1.7km north of the site, Addlestone Bourne at Birch and Hoyt Wood SNCI is located approximately 1.7km to the south of the application site with

the Stanners Hill and Fern Hill (Chobham) SNCI located approximately 1.7km to the south west. The nearest area of ancient semi natural woodland is located approximately 700m west of the site.

Planning History

14. There are no relevant County planning permissions relating to this application site.

The proposal

15. A planning application has been submitted for highway improvement works at junction 10 on the A320 Guildford Road. The proposed works include a new roundabout, junctions, access, pedestrian/cycle connections and crossings, public carpark, landscaping and infrastructure and engineering works.

The Proposed Highway Works (operational phase)

16. The proposal includes the following highway works:
- A new elongated roundabout with an inscribed circular diameter of 60 metres (m) located to the north east of the existing roundabout with four connecting distributor arms from the A320 Guildford Road south, A319 Chobham Road, A320 Guildford Road north and B3221 Murray Road.
 - A new junction will be created between the southbound circulatory carriageway and the Murray Road westbound approach arm to gain access from Brox Road to the roundabout.
 - A two lane entry is to be provided on A320 Guildford Road northbound, A320 Guildford Road southbound, Chobham Road and Murray Road.
 - A segregated left turn lane from Chobham Road northbound to A320 Guildford Road north to bypass the roundabout.
 - Northward realignment of the Murray Road connections to the new roundabout moved away from the properties on the south side of Murray Road but retaining the existing two-way road in the front of all these properties to which Brox Road would be connected near the village hall. The new road would include bus-stop laybys for east and westbound buses along Murray Road.
 - A new T-junction of the retained Murray Road to the new alignment of the Murray Road connection to the new roundabout allowing all vehicle movements in and out.
 - Sustainable Drainage features to provide surface water runoff attenuation including storage ponds in the centre of the roundabout and to the north east of the junction, as well as a ditch on the east side of Guildford Road north of the junction.
 - Relocation of utilities where affected by the proposed junction layout.
 - Inclusion of lighting columns.

Improved Pedestrian Accessibility (operational phase)

17. The proposal includes the following improvements for pedestrian accessibility:
- Widening of the southern footway of the retained Murray Road to form part of an off-carriageway east-west cycle path including the pedestrian/cycle crossing of Guildford Road south and Chobham Road to improve the connectivity of the village.
 - Shared pedestrian/cyclist crossings of Guildford Road south of the roundabout junction and Chobham Road along with pedestrian crossings of Murray Road near the eastbound bus stop layby and Brox Road near the Ottershaw Village Hall (Brook Memorial Hall).
 - A 4m wide shared use footpath / cycleway around the west side of the new roundabout heading north along the west side of Guildford Road.

18. Murray Road Car Park

- Relocation of the existing Murray Road car park approximately 77m east of the existing location. The increase in car parking spaces to 50 of which 5 would be disabled spaces. Electric vehicle charging points are to be provided within the Murray Road car park.
- New street lighting for the proposed highway layout and lighting for the proposed Murray Road car park.

19. Tree Removal and Landscaping

- Landscape planting within the roundabout central island and elsewhere around the roundabout including screening planting between the roundabout and the Brox Road/retained Murray Road area.
- The proposal would involve the removal of 2 category A trees, 17 Category B trees, 1 group of Category B trees, 2 Category B woodland (partial), 9 Category C trees, 4 groups of Category C trees and 1 Category C hedgerow, and 2 Category U trees as part of the proposal. The trees within the woodland area, north-west of the existing junction are subject to an area Tree Preservation Order (ref: TPO38).

20. Off-Site Habitat Area

- An off-site grassland area has been proposed by the applicant to mitigate the loss of trees and woodland within the application site. The off-site land will be located within the Runnymede Borough and has been identified on the plans submitted by the applicant and titled, Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00006 Rev 01 and Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00007 Rev 01.
- The applicant has stated within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report that in order to achieve 20% biodiversity net gain the following habitats will be created at the offsite location. These include:

Scattered broadleaved trees
Semi-improved neutral grassland
Dense scrub
Species-rich hedges

21. Compulsory Purchase

- Surrey County Council has recently submitted the Compulsory Purchase Order, under the Highways Act 1980, and Side Roads Order for this scheme to the Department for Transport.
- The applicant has engaged with local residents and businesses affected by the compulsory purchase order (CPO).

22. Construction and Operational Phases

Construction Phase

- It is envisaged that the construction works for Junction 10 would take approximately 24 months to complete. The works will commence in late 2022 and will be completed in 2024.

- The core working hours proposed by the applicant would be between 07:00 – 19:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00-13:00 (Saturday).
- A period of up to one hour before and one hour after core working hours is envisaged for start up and close down activities. This would not include the use of plant or machinery likely to cause disturbances but may include movement to place of work, maintenance and general preparation works.
- Temporary road closures may be required during the construction phases and appropriate diversions routes will be identified with clear signage provided to minimise any impacts on road users.
- The location of the construction compound areas are to be finalised by the appointed contractor.

Operational Phases

- A long-term maintenance programme for the on-site and off-site planting and woodland areas will be entered into by SCC. The off-site planting and woodland will be secured via a Grampian style planning condition requiring a signed copy of the management agreement to be provided to the County Planning Authority and a management plan to be entered into.
- To mitigate the loss of trees and woodland within the application site, off-site habitat provision will be provided elsewhere within the Borough. The provisions include the planting of a native broadleaved woodland and native wildflower grassland. The location of the off-site land is shown on plans titled Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00006 Rev 01 and Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00007 Rev 01. The applicant has advised that the land, identified on the abovementioned plans, will be leased from the land owner for a period of 30 years. The applicant has confirmed that SCC will enter into a contractual agreement with the land owner and a copy of the signed document will be presented to the CPA prior to the commencement of development.

23. A previous application (ref: RU.21/1858) was submitted by the applicant in September 2021 and withdrawn. Prior to the submission of the current application alternative designs were considered and public consultations undertaken. As a consequence of those consultations, the applicant amended the scheme, submitting the pending application in November 2021, which has resulted in improved capacity benefits and the retention of existing trees.

Consultations and publicity

District Council

- 24. Runnymede Borough Council No Objection
- 25. Runnymede Borough Council Environmental Health Officer No comment received

Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)

- 26. County Arboriculturalist No objection, subject to conditions for the protection of trees

27. County Archaeological Officer	No archaeological concerns.
28. County Ecologist	No objection, subject to conditions for a CEMP and in accordance with Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA)
29. County Landscape Architect	No objection, subject to conditions
30. County Noise Consultant	No objection, subject to conditions For noise monitoring and hours of working
31. County Air Quality Consultant	No objection, subject to conditions
32. County Highway Authority	No objection, subject to construction transport management plan (CTMP).
33. Lead Local Flood Authority (SuDS)	No objection, subject to conditions
34. Environment Agency	No Objection
35. National Highways	No Objection, subject to conditions for a CTMP
36. County Historic/Listed Buildings Officer	No material impact on the special interest of the listed buildings
37. Natural England	No view received
38. Thames Water	No objection, advice provided
39. County Rights of Way	No view received
40. Forestry Commission	No comments received
41. SCC Emergency Planning	No comments received

Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups

42. Ottershaw Society	Objection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the size of the roundabout is excessive and overly complicated. - long term parking is a current major problem. A second carpark for long stay could be added allowing the current car park to be kept for shorter stay visitors to the Village Hall, local shops and businesses. We would like this option revisited to alleviate long term parking problems. - The proposal will speed up the flow of traffic exacerbating the speed through Ottershaw. There are concerns that the Guildford Road A320 either side of the proposed roundabout is not being widened this may cause more congestion. - Concerns regarding the pedestrian crossing points. The Guildford Road and to some extent Chobham and Murray Roads become very busy during peak times which makes pedestrian crossing difficult. Essentially some form of controlled crossing is necessary at these suggested points for users. - development of this size will require extensive landscaping to stop it becoming an eyesore. Large number of mature trees and shrubs that are on and surrounding the existing roundabout these 	

must be retained and enhanced with planting of mature trees and shrubs to further soften the impact of this proposal.

43. Ottershaw & West Addlestone Residents Association Objection

- the traffic scheme application published for consultation falls short of meeting the fundamental requirements of a HIF scheme and will considerably worsen the life in Ottershaw. No increase in capacity or free-flow of traffic is possible because of A320 north and south of the scheme remains as existing bottleneck.
- village has been cut in two parts by the A320. Traffic from ever-enlarging Woking uses this road to access M25. Traffic, north and south bound, has no interest in Ottershaw and most of our members were expecting a significant and imaginative scheme for traffic to 'by-pass' our village all together to reduce severance to the point our village would thrive again. The scheme does the exact opposite with a system 8.5 times larger than existing and dominates the village.
- the proposal makes no reference to the inevitable use of rat-runs through village residential roads (Brox Road/Slade Road in particular).
- no definition of measures to be taken to permit safe village life to continue and traffic to be diverted. For instance, traffic must not be diverted down the residential Slade and Brox Roads. The scheme should not commence until community agrees adequate protection is defined to deny residential side roads carrying the normal flow from the A320 and/or construction traffic. We need to see a full Traffic Management Plan and details of how noise and pollution will be limited.
- proposed access to rear of telephone exchange and electricity sub-station is not required. These units are seldom accessed and could continue to be so directly from A320. This will save wholesale distribution of swathes of mature trees. No defined landscaping and tree and hedge removal plans are included in the application. The scheme must not commence until details of landscaping is defined and emphasises preservation of as many mature trees and hedgerows as possible and use of mature trees to be planted in landscaping scheme.
- almost as soon as the scheme is finished a new RBC local plan will be adopted. The proposed scheme is not designated to cope with the increase in traffic load. Lets see a joined up plan to take traffic completely out of our village.
- proposed scheme does provide a car park close to our village hall but only marginally bigger than the existing carpark which is full most days with long-term parking. The scheme must not commence until SCC and RBC have published a plan to ensure the proposed carpark is available only to village hall and shop users. A second, long-term carpark should be included within the application. The scheme shall not commence until a scheme to manage the short-term parking is agreed between SCC and RBC and that scheme is published.

44. Ottershaw Village Hall Advice

- Great concern was expressed regarding the possible appropriation of the car park as spaces for contractors during the forthcoming A320 roadworks. The carpark is absolutely essential to both the life of our extremely busy community hall and to the livelihoods of the Ottershaw shopkeepers through their customers who park there. Any reduction in the size of the car park would be disastrous.

45. Brox Lane Residents' Association Objection

The Brox Lane residents have expressed their support for representations submitted by the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum and Ottershaw & West Addlestone Residents Association.

46. Murray Road Residents Association (MRRRA) Objection

Several letters of representation have been received from the Murray Road Residents Association (MRRRA). The main concerns raised by the residents relate to:

- Design - relocation of the T-Junction reducing queuing traffic on Ottershaw roundabout and into the village by elongating Murray Road moving the T-junction further west past Murray House and Mawbey Road.
- Tree retention – request the retention of the ancient tree combination with high native species hedgerows along Murray Road as it provides an important sensory, amenity and cultural value.
- Landscaping and planting – native species-rich hedgerow will be replaced by mere species-rich grassland is not good enough for us, or the wildlife. The outlook of the village will be altered by the landscape and will look like an airport terminal car park.
- Retention of hedgerows and trees – request retention of the hedgerows and trees as these will continue to provide a visual barrier to and enhances the natural environment. It would appear the native species rich hedgerow is to be removed. Existing tree lined road with existing hedges will prevent children from escaping and running out to very dangerous roundabout. Without the hedgerows the trees could be damaged through vandalism. Existing hedgerows provide a useful protection against anti-social behaviour that could occur in the car park.
- Impact on Heritage Assets – retention of ‘village feel’ and impact on setting of heritage buildings particularly the building of Ottershaw Village.
- Car parks – when there are 4 separate car parks offering 200 public car park spaces in Ottershaw why is another required?
- A vast area of Otter Nursery land north of Murray Road is subject to the threat of compulsory purchase to accommodate the project which is unnecessary.
- What is to be gained by destroying the frontage appearance of Murray House as the entrance to Ottershaw Village?
- As Murray Road is virtually straight it is unclear what is to be gained by acquiring any land to the south of the carriageway of Murray Road.
- Biodiversity – impact on wildlife and removal of species-rich hedgerows
- Realignment of Murray Road
- Pavement width – SCC want to provide a 3m wide pavement. By providing the 3m wide pavement it pushes the north lane of Murray Road closer to the existing trees and hedgerows thus making it dangerous for drivers and puts the hedgerows and trees at risk of earthworks. Either keep the existing pavement width the same or widen to 2m protecting the hedgerow and trees.
- Speed limits – reduce speed limits to 20mph to safeguard pedestrians and cyclists, creating a safer road environment for pedestrians and cyclists by forming a ‘safety net’.
- Relocation of carpark and northern bus stop – relocate closer to the village to improve mobility issues.
- ‘Motion’ scheme – reduced construction costs by using existing infrastructure

47. Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum Objection

- The proposal does not achieve the stated objectives for motorised traffic, it also falls short of many key provisions for cyclists and pedestrians which would easily be addressed at minimal cost. Given the focus on green transport and SCC net zero carbon council by 2030 and net zero

carbon county by 2050 these provisions in our opinion should be mandatory requirements for approval of any major infrastructure project.

- The HIF scheme has two key requirements, free flow of traffic and increase capacity on the A320 which must be met at an acceptable level of performance in order to declare success. It is considered that neither of these requirements are met through the solution offered. The scheme fails in the public duty to plan for the foreseeable and medium term future and does not demonstrate an efficient and appropriate use of public funds.
- Capacity increase: one of the two key requirements for the scheme is specifically to increase capacity of the A320. This requirement is not met primarily through the scheme retaining 3 lanes north of the Otter roundabout to the St Peter’s Way roundabout. The retention of 2 lanes incoming on St Peters Way also impacts this requirement being met.
- Free Flow key requirements: the second key requirement of the HIF scheme is to ensure the free flow of traffic along the A320. This is not met due to unchanged south exit from the Otter roundabout which remains 1 lane. This is in fact worsened compared to present due to the National Cycle Network improvement also ending at this point, thus placing additional cycle traffic on the road. Minimal extra queuing capacity on the A320 itself and traffic controls on the roundabout itself all impacting the free flow of traffic.
- Predicated capacity: the scheme only addresses planned growth through housing as shown in the current RBC 2030 local plan in our opinion it does not even fully address this. Whilst this is a significant factor, it also completely fails to address any planned developments in the surrounding areas and in particular Woking. The two key requirements of the A320 capacity increase and free flow are therefore further impacted by this failure.
- Size/Scale: the proposal will have a significant and irreversible negative impact on the village increasing the separation and severance between the north and south parts and fostering a ‘two village’ paradigm, completely the reverse of the wishes of our villagers. Other small-scale option which would significantly improve this have been proposed, considered possible but not adopted. The impact of this proposal on our village must be carefully weighed before a decision is made.
- Impacts on Ottershaw outside the scheme: the current roundabout will clearly remain a bottleneck and traffic from Woking and Addlestone will increasingly seek to cut through Brox and Slade Roads to access the A320 Woking or A319 to Addlestone/New Haw. Part mitigation would be some form of speed control/traffic calming along these road together with addressing on street parking in the village.

Surrey Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)

Objection

- The Murray Road Residents have expressed their dismay at the intention to take out a 110m of intact native species-rich hedgerow, leaving veteran trees and destroying all other vegetation. They have gone to an expense to hire a highways expert to give a suitable alternative layout for the road improvements; one which does not involve uprooting the bushes and harming the local amenity value that an attractive and important hedgerow provides. The hedge is over 30 years old and on public land it should be protected under the provisions of the hedgerow regulations 1997.
- The removal of the locally valued hedgerow will provoke reaction from residents who appreciate our leafy roadside. The destruction of any hedgerow providing wildlife habitat and carbon store goes against the grain of everything Surrey County Council is trying to achieve. The council should think about retaining not destroying an established hedgerow. Green boundaries add immensely to the beauty and character of our countryside and environment. They provide connectivity for wildlife, protect soil, absorb emissions and are natural air filters. At a time of plummeting biodiversity and climate emergency it is important to set the right example. It is

wrong to claim that you are acting in the public interest while ignoring the pleas of local residents and council tax payers to protect their precious local environment.

- We urge you to reconsider these highway improvement plans by considering the suitable alternative that has been laid before you by Experts Motion.

Officer comment

48. Officers have considered all the comments raised by the amenity groups and respond as follows:

- The principal of the HIF scheme is to improve the capacity of the highway network to cater for the anticipated increase in traffic from the 2030 Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan and enhancing highway users and improved provisions for active travel.
- The design of the car park is to have as little impact as possible. The applicant has commented that in previous designs a smaller car park was proposed with an overflow to the north of Murray Road, however, this was not acceptable to the residents and the design was amended. Consideration will be given to limit the stay of cars in the carpark.
- To fulfil the requirements of the HIF objectives in terms of the traffic capacity, the scheme is currently designed in accordance with manuals for streets and bridges (DMRB).
- The size of the roundabout and queuing capacity is based on modelling forecasts, traffic demand designed to alleviate peak time congestion. The existing roundabout is unable to manage this.
- The modelling shows Guildford Road (south) operates well without tailbacks from the roundabout.
- Regulation 6 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 states "*the removal of any hedgerow to which these Regulations apply is permitted if it is required [...] (e) for the carrying out of development for which planning permission has been granted or is deemed to have been granted*"¹ as such if planning permission is granted for this scheme, this would provide an exemption under these regulations.

Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public

49. The application was publicised by the posting 10 site notices and an advert was placed in the local newspaper.
50. A total of 330 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. A total of 53 letters of representation have been received. Fifty-two letters of objection and one letter of no objection. Multiple letters of representation have been received from the residents of Murray Road writing as a collective Residents Association.
51. The following concerns were raised within the letters of objection:-
- Inadequate Design of the road scheme
 - Impact on Ottershaw Village with large road dividing it into two halves – negative impact on the village
 - Increase in traffic/ congestion
 - An increase in noise levels
 - Light pollution
 - Health implication on residents – pollution
 - Impacts on the setting of listed buildings

¹ [The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 \(legislation.gov.uk\)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk)

- Pedestrian / cycle crossings and route are not suitable
- Highway safety
- Murray Road residents
- Air/Environmental Impact
- Inappropriate landscaping
- Cost implications of the proposal
- Unsuitable drainage provisions
- Tree removal
- Realignment of Murray Road
- Compulsory purchase of land
- Proposed overflow car park (removed from the current scheme)
- Suitability for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV)
- Impact on residents and businesses during construction works
- Narrow width of the road between Ottershaw and St Peter's roundabout
- Traffic calming measures are required along Brox Road and Slade Road
- Separation of the village between Foxhill Road, Chobham Road and Brox Road
- Inadequate crossing and signalling controls, additional crossing points required
- Bus link along Brox Road
- Bus stop along Murray Road needs to be relocated further east
- No reduced speed limits along Foxhills Road
- Negative impact on property prices
- Impact on wildlife and biodiversity
- Speed limits

52. In addition to the above, the MRRAs have appointed an independent highway consultancy (Motion) to review the proposed scheme. The representation prepared by their consultant has made reference to their letters of representation and the documentation submitted by the applicant, as part of the application. Motion, on behalf of the MRRAs has suggested an alternative design for the roundabout which includes the following alterations to the scheme:-

- Retained access to Ottershaw nursery
- Retention of existing trees and wider vegetation north of Murray Road
- Relocation of the bus stop along Murray Road further west
- Relocation of Murray Road and Brox Road junction further east
- Reduction in speed limit along Brox Road to 20mph
- Retained car park to be relocated further west closer to Ottershaw facilities

53. Motion has concluded that the design amendments proposed by them, are an alternative scheme to that which is proposed and includes highway, heritage and tree retention benefits.

54. The correspondence and design proposed by Motion has been reviewed by the County Highway Authority, County Landscape Architect, County Arboricultural officer and the County Historic Buildings Officer. However, it should be borne in mind that although the Motion scheme has been reviewed by officers and consultees, the Motion scheme proposed does not form part of this pending application and therefore cannot be considered as part of this application.

55. Officers have considered all the representations which have been submitted.

Planning considerations

Introduction

- 7
56. The guidance on the determination of planning applications contained in the Preamble/Agenda frontsheet is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraphs.
 57. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan (2030) (RBCLP). The Runnymede Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). A review of the Runnymede 2030 Plan commenced in January 2021 and at the current time, a number of evidence base documents are being updated.
 58. On 14 October 2020, members of the Runnymede Borough Council Planning Committee resolved to designate the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum and Ottershaw Neighbourhood Area as submitted. A neighbourhood plan is currently being prepared and has not yet been adopted.
 59. In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations. In assessing the application against development plan policy it will be necessary to determine whether the proposed measures for mitigating any environmental impact of the development are satisfactory. In this instance the main planning considerations are: Principle of Development and Need; Environmental Impact Assessment; Design, Landscape Character and Visual Impact; Heritage and Archaeology; Surface Water Drainage and Flooding; Biodiversity, Ecology and Trees; Residential Amenity, Noise and Air Quality; Highways Capacity and Safety, Public Rights of Way and Non-motorised user connectivity and Green Belt.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

60. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening request was submitted to the County Planning Authority on 1st April 2021 on behalf of the applicant.
61. The proposal has been screened under Regulation 6 of the EIA Regulations Schedule 2 (paragraph 10(f) (Construction of roads (unless included in Schedule 1)) and 13(b) (Changes or extensions to Schedule 2 development)). Based on the information provided, the EIA Officer has concluded there are unlikely to be significant effects on the environment of a type or scale that would warrant classification of the scheme as a whole or of any individual element of the scheme as an "EIA development". The proposal therefore does not require an Environmental Statement to accompany it.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT AND NEED

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy SD1 – Spatial Development Strategy

Policy SD2 – Site Allocations

Policy SD3 – Active & Sustainable Travel

Policy SD4 – Highway Design Considerations

Policy SD5 – Infrastructure Provision and Timing

Supplementary Planning Document – Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation (November 2020)

Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan (LTP4) – Major Transport Projects

National Planning Policy Framework 2021 – paragraphs 11, 20(b), 22 and 106 (b)

62. The A320 scheme is a partnership between Runnymede Borough Council (RBC), Surrey County Council (SCC) and Homes England (HE). The project is funded through the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) and aims to increase the road capacity and improve sustainable transport infrastructure to support the delivery of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.
63. Junction 10 of the A320 provides a strategic link between Addlestone town and junction 11 of the M25. The A320 serves Runnymede's most sustainable locations for growth, east of the borough, which will benefit from the greatest concentration of services and facilities including strategic employment sites and housing.
64. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development without delay. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan. The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan was adopted in July 2020 and is thus considered to be up-to-date. The housing needs identified within the Plan along with the proposed highway improvement works at junction 10 of the A320, and the wider A320 corridor, would deliver the development needs of the area.
65. Paragraphs 20(b) and 22 of the NPPF states that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for infrastructure for transport. Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure.
66. Paragraph 106(b) of the NPPF further states that planning policies should be prepared with the active involvement of local highway authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators so that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned.
67. The proposed highway improvement works to the junction and link roads are considered to be essential to the delivery of approximately 3,500 new homes across 10 sites in and around Ottershaw and Chertsey. New supporting infrastructure is therefore required in order to meet the housing needs in the borough and deliver the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.
68. The Runnymede Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out the Runnymede Borough Council's approach to infrastructure delivery and funding. The SPD categorises the infrastructure into different prioritisation levels including critical, essential, high priority and desirable infrastructure. Critical infrastructure is required in order to enable identified growth. Without critical infrastructure the development process cannot proceed, and the RBCLP cannot be delivered. The proposed highway improvement works to junction 10 of the A320 have been identified as being critical and necessary to enable growth within the borough without which a number of development sites allocated in the Local Plan, which are dependent upon the improvements proposed, would not be able to come forward (paragraph 2.4 and Table 2-2 in the SPD). 'Critical' has the highest prioritisation level in the SPD. The SPD states at paragraph 3.42 that Runnymede Borough Council have prepared evidence specific to the A320 corridor which shows that without mitigation the A320 will suffer 'severe' impacts as a result of growth set out in the Local Plan.
69. The RBCLP was formally adopted on 16th July 2020 and seeks to achieve a balance between protecting the borough's heritage, natural environment and built environment whilst allowing for new housing development and the creation of job opportunities.

70. Several rounds of public consultations were carried out during the development of the local plan and more than 6000 representations were received from local residents, businesses and other organisations. The plan was publicly examined and endorsed by an independent government-appointed inspector, subject to a number of modifications being made, all of which were accepted by local district councillors.
71. Policy SD1 of the RBCLP refers to identified housing and economic provisions over the Local Plan period and states that development will be largely directed towards the most sustainable, larger settlements in Runnymede and towards the garden village at Longcross. These locations have been identified as being the best locations for delivering supportive infrastructure as well as active and sustainable travel choices.
72. Policy SD2 of the RBCLP lists the allocated sites outlined for development within the Borough. Of the 24 allocated sites within the RBCLP, 11 are dependent on the delivery of necessary mitigation on the A320. Runnymede Borough Council consider that the allocated sites set out within policy SD2 are the most suitable when considered against the alternatives appraised through a robust site selection process and sustainability appraisal. The allocated sites are considered to offer the best opportunity to achieve sustainable development as well as the delivery of the spatial development strategy.
73. The proposed residential developments, set out within policy SD2, will result in an increase in travel demand in future years intensifying existing congestion problems and increasing travel demands along the A320 corridor. Paragraph 5.42 of the RBCLP recognises that there are a number of existing transport and infrastructure issues within the Borough including congestion on key transport routes including the A320, infrequent bus services and limited connectivity by walking/cycling routes in some areas. The RBCLP at paragraphs 5.49 and 5.50 recognises that growth will lead to impacts on the road network and that a number of locations along the A320 will require some form of intervention to ensure that congestion is managed and that sites allocated in the plan can be delivered sustainably.
74. Policy SD3 of the RBCLP states that working with stakeholders, the Council will support schemes and development proposals which enhance the accessibility and connectivity between people and places by active and sustainable forms of travel. This will be achieved by:
- supporting and implementing the objectives and strategies of the Surrey Local Transport Plan, strategies and projects prepared by Transport for the South East or agreed under the Duty to Cooperate, and schemes which help to alleviate existing transport and highway problems in Runnymede or the wider area as identified through further partnership working;
 - refusing planning permission for any development which would compromise the delivery of the mitigation works required to the A320 and/or M25 junction 11.
- Sub-paragraph 5.57 of the RBCLP, refers to a number of congestion ‘hot spots’ and highway issues within Runnymede, with reference made to the A320. The paragraph further states that “it is therefore considered necessary to include a policy which reiterates the Council’s intention to continue to work with its partners to achieve modal shift and to set out measures which support and achieve active and sustainable travel choices and require developers to explore these opportunities through Travel Plans.
75. The Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan (LTP4) seeks to improve and make routes safer for walking and cycling. The LTP4 includes a number of proposals to deliver wider ranging improvements for cleaner, healthier and safer transport in Surrey.

76. The proposal would allow for improved connectivity for current and future road users and would result in improved traffic flow, highway safety measures and pedestrian and cycle connectivity. Delivering the vision and objectives of the Local Transport Plan.
77. The highway improvement works at Junction 10 of the A320 have been identified as being critical to the delivery of housing and economic growth within Runnymede. The proposal would enable infrastructure improvements to alleviate existing transport and highway problems within the Borough. Policy SD3 recognises the need for mitigation works to be carried out along the A320 corridor and further states that planning permission should be refused for any development which compromises the delivery of these mitigation works.
78. Policy SD4 of the RBCLP states that development proposals which maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network and which take account of the needs of all highway users for safe access, egress and servicing arrangements will be supported.
79. The proposal has been designed to a high standard to ensure efficient and safe operation of the highway network. The proposal would increase capacity on the local highway network and enhance sustainable transport infrastructure, to enable the delivery of growth. The proposal would also promote improved pedestrian and cyclist connection for all road users.
80. Policy SD5 of the RBCLP states that working with infrastructure providers, developers and other key stakeholders, Runnymede Borough Council will support infrastructure projects which deliver the spatial development strategy and allocated development sites as identified within the plan.
81. The proposal would comply with policy SD5 of the RBCLP as it would deliver improvements to the local infrastructure network which are critical to the successful delivery of the spatial development strategy and allocated development sites as identified within the plan.

Conclusion of principle of development and need

82. The principle of the highway improvement works and the creation of a new roundabout and junctions for local residents and road users within the immediate and wider area of Runnymede is supported by policies SD1, SD2, SD3, SD4 and SD5 of the adopted RBCLP and the infrastructure delivery and prioritisation supplementary planning document (SPD). The RBCLP recognises that for the allocated sites and housing development proposals to be delivered, highway improvement measures to the A320 corridor (including the application site) are necessary.
83. The final design alignment is compliant with the DMRB for vehicle types and radi of curves and junctions.
84. The proposal is likely to bring benefits such as improved highway safety, a reduction in congestion, the delivery of sustainable transport infrastructure and residential and economic growth within the Borough. Given that the proposal is located within an urban area and the road network is existing, the principle of development has already been accepted and must be given the necessary weight in the assessment.
85. On balance, the proposal would accord with policies SD2, SD4 and SD5 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and paragraphs 20 (b), 22 and 106(b) of the NPPF.
86. Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that the proposal is within a sensitive location which is close to existing residential developments, heritage assets, ecological and landscape impacts as well as the designated Metropolitan Green Belt. All these impacts will be considered in more detail within the report.

DESIGN

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy SD4 – Highway Design Considerations
Policy EE1 – Townscape and Landscape Quality
National Planning Policy Framework 2021 – paragraph 132

87. The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement (PS) and Transport Assessment (TA) which provides details of the design associated with the project.
88. The PS states that in formulating the scheme the following key design principles were taken into account:-
- Providing a design that reflects the location and aims to improve traffic capacity and journey times.
 - Delivery of development growth to meet the current demand and future demands of the area (including residential and economic benefits for the Borough);
 - Keeping vehicle speeds at a reduced level, reducing the severity of road traffic collisions and providing more free-flowing arrangements to reduce queuing impacts;
 - Ensuring that the scheme design takes account of the needs of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists;
 - Minimising the impact on nearby residential properties and heritage assets.
89. The size and layout of the new junction and roundabout has been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)² as well as the functional and practical requirements of all road users.
90. The PS further states that the design process associated with the project sought to provide essential capacity upgrades in support of the wider A320 HIF Scheme (North of Woking packages of work, in support of National, Regional and Local Policies for the benefit of all road users). Consideration has also been given to:-
- Minimal impact on the Green Belt utilising as much of the existing highway as possible
 - Vehicle access along Murray Road and Brox Road
 - Vehicle movements
 - Providing appropriate facilities for pedestrians and cyclists
 - Noise and other environmental impacts
 - Landscaping
 - Adequate drainage
 - Appropriate street lighting
91. Policy EE1 of the RBCLP states that all development proposals will be expected to achieve high quality and inclusive design which responds to the local context including the built, natural and historic character of the area while making efficient use of the land.
92. Policy SD4 of the RBCLP states that development proposals which maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network and which take account of the needs of all highway users for safe access, egress and servicing arrangements will be supported.
93. The location of the new junction has sought to include existing carriageways and where possible incorporating new and existing landscaping within the roundabout and adjacent areas. It has been designed in a sensitive manner seeking to avoid impacts to heritage assets, residential properties, existing vegetation and the openness of the Green Belt.

² [Standards For Highways | Design Manual for Roads and Bridges \(DMRB\)](#)

94. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states design quality should be considered throughout the evolution and assessment of individual proposals. Early discussions between applicants, local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.
95. The applicant has engaged in early discussions and public consultations with local residents, businesses and the planning authority. The current proposal was submitted following a public consultation which commenced in September 2021. The applicant has given consideration to all the comments received and is continuing to engage in discussions with residents and public representatives.
96. The Murray Road Residents Association (MRRA) have expressed concern over the design of the proposal and have appointed an independent highway consultant to review the scheme. The highway consultant also submitted an alternative proposal in response to this proposal, on behalf of the MRRA, which includes moving the T-junction further along to Mawbey Road to minimise vegetation clearance and visual impact to the residents along Murray Road. The highway consultant also states their proposal seeks to improve operational capacity along Murray Road by providing additional stacking capacity at the roundabout for the westbound traffic, alongside assisting in preventing any eastbound vehicles waiting to turn into Brox Road.
97. The residents' design (submitted by Motion) has been reviewed by officers and shared with the applicant and consultees. However, the alternative design does not form part of the pending application and therefore no weight can be attributed to the proposed scheme.

Conclusion of design

98. The proposal has been designed to a high quality incorporating an inclusive design which responds to the local context including the built, natural and historic character of the area while making efficient use of the land.
99. The design of the roundabout and junction is considered to meet the requirements of all road users and is an inclusive design which responds positively to the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy EE1 of the RBCLP and paragraph 132 of the NPPF.

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AND VISUAL IMPACT

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy EE1 – Townscape and Landscape Quality

National Planning Policy Framework 2021, paragraph 174 and 180

100. Policy EE1 of the RBCLP states that development proposals will be expected to achieve high quality and inclusive design which responds positively to local context including built, and natural characters of the area while making good use of the land. Development proposals will be supported where they contribute to and enhance the quality of the public realm and/or landscape setting through high quality and inclusive hard and soft landscaping schemes. Implemented through an appropriate landscaping strategy which takes account of existing and proposed landscape character and features.

101. Much of the application site does not lie within the defined landscape character in the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment (LCA)³ as it forms the edge of the built-up area of Ottershaw. The application site is bounded to the north, west and south by Trumps Green to New Haw settled and Wooded Sandy Farmland landscape character area SS3. The southern part of the proposal is not located within the landscape character area as it forms the edge of the built-up area of Ottershaw. Mature trees, hedgerows and woodland are the key landscape features which surround the site and line the approach roads to the existing roundabout. The landscape features include valued mature oak trees and woodland which contribute positively to the visual amenity, biodiversity and overall landscape character.
102. The proposed development is seeking to increase the vehicular capacity around junction 10 of the A320, to support the wider A320 corridor project. The proposal involves the introduction of an elongated roundabout with a circular diameter of 60 metres and a length of 85 metres.
103. The proposed roundabout will be located north-east of the existing junction and would have a larger footprint, resulting in changes to the local landscape and townscape character. Existing vegetation, including mature trees, woodland (subject to a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO)) and hedgerows to the north and north-east of the existing junction will be lost.
104. A landscape assessment (LA) and arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) have been undertaken and the findings submitted as part of the application. The assessments have identified the significance of the changes, resulting from the proposed scheme, on the existing landscape features, including trees and visual amenity.

Landscape Character

105. The key direct effects of the proposal on the landscape character include the removal of a number of roadside trees, sections of hedgerows and woodlands (subject to a TPO).
106. The proposed expansion will occur to the north-east of the existing roundabout, with a loss of vegetation taking place to the north and north-east. The design of the junction has taken into account the need to incorporate the new road layout into the surrounding landscape, through sensitive design, and retention of as many trees as possible. However, it is noted that an area of woodland, subject to a TPO (ref: TPO38), and two category A trees will be removed as part of the proposed works.
107. The applicant has proposed a planting scheme which would ensure that the adverse impacts of the removal of a large number of trees would be mitigated in the medium to long term. The mitigation proposed would ensure that extensive new tree planting and woodland planting would compensate for the loss of the woodland, mature trees and existing vegetation. Over the medium to long term the planting would become established, and the wooded roadside character would be reinstated. It is acknowledged that full mitigation for the loss of mature oaks would only occur over the very long term.
108. To ensure that the wooded roadside character is re-established, a detailed landscaping scheme should be submitted to the County Planning Authority for consideration and this can be secured via a planning condition. The landscaping proposal would ensure that appropriate landscaping is put in place and suitably maintained to compensate for the loss of existing vegetation and habitats. All mitigatory planting and landscaping works would be protected for a period of 5 years after completion of the construction works.

³ [Landscape Character Assessment - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](http://surreycc.gov.uk)

109. The applicant has also submitted an outline landscape and ecological management plan (OLEMP) as part of the application. The OLEMP provides an overview of how the new planting scheme, including retention of existing vegetation, will be managed once the junction is operational.
110. The proposed mitigation measures put forward within the OLEMP have been designed in conjunction with project ecologists to encourage biodiversity opportunities which are appropriate for the area and landscape character. The mitigation measures proposed include the planting of wooded areas within the roundabout and additional/replacement planting within the application boundary. Ornamental planting will be incorporated, where possible within the scheme. Off-site planting will also be provided on a separate parcel of land, outside the application redline boundary, and will include the plantation of a native broadleaved woodland and native wildflower grassland.
111. The proposed planting within the application site includes:
- North of Murray Road - planting of a new woodland around the drainage basin.
 - South of Murray Road (including relocated car park) – retention of woodland, planting of several low level bed areas, areas of grass and a length of new native hedgerow.
 - Northern approach towards Chertsey - improvements to the woodland edge to maximise the retention of existing woodland trees.
 - New roundabout – replacement tree planting and a SuDS ponds with species rich grass verges.
 - Existing roundabout – this area will retain existing ornamental trees and new ornamental trees and shrubs will be planted.
 - West side of Guildford Road – the existing roadside trees will be retained and a new naturalistic edge to the woodland with new tree planting will be created.
 - North-west side of Guildford Road fronting the telephone exchange and ambulance station – the existing trees along this part of the road will be retained.
112. It is recognised that the development would cause an adverse impact on the landscape character of the area, in the short to medium term. The adverse impact on the landscape character would be as a result of the loss of trees and woodland, the construction of the proposal and the initial operational years whilst the planting matures. Whilst there would be a loss of trees and woodland and an increase in urban features, as a result of the built form, over the long-term these features would be softened by the planting and swale features which have been proposed.
113. It is considered that over the short to medium term the impact on the landscape character would be adverse, however, on balance the landscape character would be re-established once the planting has matured and the construction works have been completed. Where possible new tree planting will match the existing. Over the long-term the wooded roadside character will become re-established reducing the adverse impact on the landscape character of the area and encouraging biodiversity opportunities.
114. The County Landscape Architect (CLA) has been consulted on the proposal and is of the opinion that the existing trees and tall mature woodland, which surround part of the junction, contribute positively to the landscape character of the area and the loss of these features would have a substantial adverse effect on the existing landscape fabric of the application site. However, the CLA comments that it is accepted that the adverse impact, from the loss of the trees and woodland, would be substantially mitigated over the medium to long term by replacement planting with full mitigation for the loss of mature oaks occurring over the very long term. The CLA has reviewed the OLEMP and is satisfied with the content, however, he has requested that a full LEMP be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval. The LEMP will include a comprehensive landscape and ecological management scheme for all on site planting.

115. Whilst the proposal would result in a loss of vegetation, the applicant has actively sought to minimise the impact on existing vegetation, through the design and positioning of the junction, to allow for the retention of category A oak trees along Murray Road. The new and hard landscaping would be expected to be of a high standard and would bring improved benefits such as pedestrian accessibility, junction usability and aesthetics through a high quality and inclusive landscaping scheme. Therefore on balance, the proposal would provide enhancements over the medium to long term once the planting has matured. The proposal is considered to comply with policy EE1 of the RBCLP.
116. As such, a planning condition can be imposed requiring the applicant to provide a full LEMP, to safeguard the landscaping and protect the biodiversity in and around the application site.

Effects on views and visual amenity

117. The LA has identified a number of visual receptors that may experience changes in their views or visual amenity as a result of the construction and operational phases. These include:-
- Residential properties near to the junction (Murray Road, Brox Road)
 - Commercial properties (Ottershaw Nursery, Miller & Carter Steakhouse, Trident Garage, Ottershaw Village Hall, Chertsey Ambulance Station)
 - Pedestrians using the junction
118. The application site is surrounded by existing built form, including residential properties along the southern, eastern and western boundaries. The nearest residential properties, directly impacted by the proposal, are situated to the south of Murray Road, 2 – 16 Murray Road and 1 - 16 Murray House.
119. The LA further states that the new roundabout configuration will be heavily wooded in the long term including native trees and hedgerows, species rich grassland, understorey planting and retained trees. In the long-term, once the planting has matured, the visual impact from the roundabout will reduce for the receptors mentioned above. However, it is accepted that there would be an adverse impact on these receptors in the short to medium term.
120. In addition to the above, officers have identified vehicle users as a receptor. These receptors are likely to experience a low to medium sensitivity as their primary focus would be on the highway. However, the surrounding area would be within close proximity and the proposed changes would be noticeable. The overall visual effect on vehicle users is likely to be slight to moderate adverse effect, in the short to medium term whilst the replacement planting and woodland matures.
121. In terms of construction related impacts, as set out within paragraph 20 above, these would be short-term and temporary in nature with short-term adverse effects on road users, cyclists and local residents, particularly those along Murray Road and Brox Road. Effects are considered to be greater during the construction phase due to the additional noise and visual intrusion of working machinery and plant equipment, as well as the removal of the existing vegetation.
122. The LA has identified significant visual effects for receptors close to the junction during the construction phases and once the roundabout is operational. The significant adverse visual effect to the receptors during the construction and operational phases, would gradually reduce over time as the replacement planting matures.
123. Officers consider that the visual impact as a result of the machinery, plant equipment, construction vehicles etc, could be minimised through mitigation measures contained within a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a planning condition is recommended.

124. The CLA is in broad agreement with the assessment of the LA and considers that the substantial losses of vegetation would be particularly noticeable during the construction period and over the short to medium term once the new junction is operational. However, in the medium to long term the replacement planting and woodland would become integrated within the existing townscape and landscape and the predicted adverse effects on the visual receptors would be reduced.
125. The overall design of the scheme has taken into account the need to incorporate the new roundabout and junctions into the surrounding landscape, through sensitive design, retention of as many trees as possible and improved landscaping where required. High quality inclusive hard and soft landscaping proposals, including hard surfaces, ornamental trees, low level planting and hedgerows, would also seek to enhance the landscape setting and once mature the woodland and planting would integrate into the surrounding landscape area.

Conclusion of landscape character and visual impact

126. It is accepted that the intrinsic function and character of the application site, as a road junction will not alter. However, the enlarged footprint of the junction would have an adverse effect on the existing landscape fabric, character and street scene in the short to medium term, due to the loss of the existing vegetation.
127. The applicant has proposed a range of mitigation measures which will help soften the appearance of the roundabout in the landscape and screen views from the receptors identified. The mitigation measures include the introduction of planting, retention of existing trees and hedges and a new woodland area. The mitigation measures would also allow for biodiversity opportunities.
128. Officers recognise that the proposal would alter the landscape character in the immediate locality of the application site and would undoubtedly result in changes to the townscape and landscape and views of the area. However, this is an inevitable consequence of constructing a major new piece of infrastructure, which has been identified within the Runnymede Local Plan as being necessary. Officers recognise in the short term there would be adverse harm to both the landscape character and the visual amenity of residents and users of the road network however, it is noted that once the roundabout is operational and the landscaping has had an opportunity to mature, the adverse impacts on the visual and amenities of the area will lessen. Officers are satisfied that the hard and soft landscaping scheme proposed and through the imposition of conditions, this would assist in the delivery of a high quality landscape setting and would comply with Policy EE1 of the RBCLP.

BIODIVERSITY, ECOLOGY AND TREES

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy EE9 – Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation

National Planning Policy Framework 2021 – paragraph 174

129. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF requires that planning decisions enhance the natural environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.
130. Policy EE9 of the RBCLP states that development on important sites in the Borough will need to pay particular attention to the requirements of the policy. This policy sets out a number of criteria of which Point 4 is relevant to this proposal. Point 4) refers to ancient or veteran trees; and/or trees and hedgerows protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The policy seeks to achieve net gains in biodiversity through creation/expansion, restoration, enhancement and management of

habitats and features to improve the status of priority habitats and species. Development proposals should demonstrate how this will be achieved.

Ecology

131. There are several ecological designations in proximity to the application site but no ecological designations within the application site. Given the distance of the application site to these designations, officers are satisfied that the proposal would not have a physical impact upon statutory and non-statutory ecological designations.
132. The applicant has submitted an Ecological Impact Assessment incorporating a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (ECIA) and Ecological Mitigation Strategy (EMS) in support of the application. The ECIA was undertaken across the site to identify and describe all potentially significant ecological effects associated with the proposed development and to identify mitigation measures to make the proposed development acceptable.
133. The ECIA has identified several habitats which are present within the site and are considered to be important ecological features. These consist of woodland and parkland, scattered broadleaved trees, poor semi improved and amenity grassland, tall ruderal vegetation, scattered and dense/continuous scrub and hedges. The ECIA has also identified a number of protected species which could be affected by the proposal including reptiles, birds, bats and other mammals.
134. The ECIA states that approximately 0.34ha of semi natural broadleaved woodland and 0.18ha of broadleaved plantation would be permanently removed. These areas being immediately adjacent to the existing carriageway. The ECIA outlines mitigation measures for the loss of woodland including an area of 0.57ha of native broadleaved woodland habitat to be planted within the site alongside an area of native broadleaved woodland habitat created within SCC owned land beyond the site boundary. In terms of scattered trees, an area of approximately 0.03ha would be removed by the works however new tree planting is proposed to mitigate this in the form of 75 native broadleaved trees within the site alongside planting on land beyond the application site boundary.
135. Approximately an area of 0.3ha of scattered and dense/ continuous scrub would be removed by the proposed works. The applicant proposes that a total of 0.44ha of scrub would be planted within the site. With regards to hedgerow, approximately 0.11km of species rich hedge would be removed by the proposed works to the north of Murray Road and the ECIA recognises that this is a high proportion of the total hedge resource within the site boundary and therefore impacts are considered negative. The ECIA states that 0.01ha of hedgerow would be planted within the site and on the land beyond the site boundary to mitigate for the loss of the hedgerow.
136. The proposal would result in both short term impacts and medium and long term change to habitats. The short-term impacts would be from the construction phase of the proposal including use of plant and machinery, removal of trees and hedgerow, noise and lighting and general disturbance. This would include direct loss from clearance of vegetation and potential habitat and would be a negative impact until new proposed planting reaches maturity. The impacts on the important ecological features include habitat loss to woodland, scattered broadleaved trees, scattered and dense/continuous scrub and hedges. A loss of habitat was also considered relevant for reptiles, birds, bats and other mammals. Incidental mortality and disturbances were considered possible impacts during the construction phases for all fauna.
137. The ECIA identified that trees within the application site could provide habitat to bats. Of these, 22 of the 42 trees surveys were assessed as having negligible level of suitability for roosting bats. Of

the remaining trees, 15 were assessed as having a low level of suitability. Two large oak trees were assessed as moderate suitability and two trees were considered to be borderline between low and moderate. No trees were considered likely to offer sufficient level of shelter or protection for hibernating bats or breeding colonies. Two trees were also subjected to two separate dusk and dawn re-entry surveys and then two further trees were subjected to two single dusk surveys. No bat roosts were identified in these trees during any of the surveys. The ECIA concludes that whilst no roosts or evidence of roosts have been recorded in any of the trees scheduled for removal, the application site has been assessed as being of Local value to roosting bats and that tree removal does present some potential impacts to roosting bats. The ECIA states that the loss of bat foraging and commuting habitat such as woodland, hedge and tree lines, are considered negligible due to the small areas impacted and compared to the wide foraging and commuting areas used by bats. As such the ECIA states that all site clearance and construction works should adhere to a bat mitigation strategy.

138. With regards to reptiles whilst slow worm and grass snake records show them within 2km of the site, the closest slow worm was located approximately 0.9km south of the site. The ECIA found that areas of unmanaged grassland within the survey area were limited and mainly associated with road verges. The ECIA identified that the woodland could provide areas for reptiles. As such the ECIA concluded the site was considered of Site value for reptiles. The ECIA recommends that sensitive clearance of habitats suitable for supporting reptiles should be undertaken following a Method Statement and under ecological supervision and could include dismantling hibernation habitat by hand and clearance of vegetation using hand tools. The requirement for a Method Statement to ensure the protection of reptiles during the construction phase can be the subject of a condition.
139. In addition to the above, the ECIA recommends a pre-work check for evidence of badgers to be undertaken.
140. The applicant has proposed mitigation measures which include habitat creation both within the application site and elsewhere. The habitat creation will include both mitigation and enhancement by contributing to biodiversity net gain, aiming to achieve a 20% gain in biodiversity units as defined by the Defra metric. Further enhancement measures will include the provision of artificial bird and/or bat boxes and the creation of habitat features and shelters such as log piles and hibernacula to provide features suitable for amphibians, reptiles, hedgehogs and other small mammals. The ECIA recommends vegetation clearance works take place outside of the bird nesting season and if this is not possible checks for nesting birds shall only be carried out in accordance with the method statement.
141. The County Ecologist has reviewed the submitted ecology information and is satisfied with the reports submitted and has raised no objections to the proposal. The County Ecologist has recommended a planning condition be imposed requiring the submission of a Ecological Mitigation Plan, to ensure that the ecological mitigation strategy is implemented. The County Ecologist recognises that the LEMP is an outline version and therefore recommends that a final version is provided. The habitat creation measures will be subject to a LEMP which is to be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval. The LEMP will contain details of the locations and type of habitat creations both within and beyond the application site as well as information on how these habitats will be managed and monitored.
142. Officers recognise that the proposal would lead to a short term loss of woodland and trees alongside a hedgerow and grassland around the application site to facilitate the construction of a new roundabout and other necessary highway features that support protected species. Officers

also recognise that during the construction phase there would also be disturbance from noise and lighting. However, officers are of the view that potential adverse impacts during the construction phase can be managed through the submission of a CEMP and conditions requiring the checking of habitats before works commence as set out in the ECIA. Therefore, officers are satisfied that the requirements in respect of the identified species and protection of habitats have been met. Officers recognise that the proposal would lead to habitat loss during the construction phase however the applicant has provided mitigation measures which include checking for wildlife prior to site clearance, prioritisation of tree removal during the winter months to avoid the bird nesting season, ecological supervision when required, inclusion of bat boxes etc.

143. The proposal is considered to have been designed in a sensitive manner seeking to avoid impacts on ecology and biodiversity where possible and the proposal is considered to accord with policy EE9 of the RBCLP and paragraph 174 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain

144. The application is accompanied by a biodiversity net gain assessment report (BNG). In accordance with the Defra metric to show that the proposal provides BNG in accordance with paragraph 180(d) of the NPPF. Whilst paragraph 180(d) seeks biodiversity net gains, the requirement for at least 10% biodiversity net gain does not become a requirement for planning applications until November 2023. Therefore, there is currently no obligation for 10% BNG but applicants should start planning now for the requirements. The BNG process looks at the biodiversity distinctiveness of each habitat which is then assigned a value followed by assessing the condition of the habitat from good to poor. It should be noted that for this application some areas of habitat were too small to be included in the metric but this would have a minor effect on the overall score.
145. The BNG report outlines the different habitat types across the application site and the baseline situation for each habitat. The BNG report shows that following completion of the development there would be a net loss of habitat units (a loss of 7.55%) and hedgerow units (60.15%) in terms of biodiversity retention and creation which is as a result of loss of hedgerow and woodland. The BNG report goes on to state that in order to achieve 20% BNG additional habitat creation beyond the site will be required. The BNG report states this would take the form of 0.75km of scattered broad leaved trees, 0.25ha of heathland and shrub, 0.75km of hedgerow and 0.25ha semi improved neutral grassland on land owned by SCC on land beyond the application boundary. In doing so this would create a net gain for the application of 2.30 (22.57%) in habitat units and 0.90 (20.85%) gain in hedgerow units. This shows over a 10% BNG for the application proposal meeting Defra's current target of 10% BNG.
146. The BNG report outlines that amenity grassland within the site boundary would be removed and not replaced. Instead, this would be offset by the creation of areas of grassland – other neutral grassland within the site boundary.
147. The submitted indicative landscaping plans and accompanying information indicate the extent of the on-site areas which are to be planted and landscaped. In addition, the applicant has provided two drawings ref: Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00006 Rev 01 and Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00007 Rev 01 which refer to off-site habitat provisions. The submitted plans indicate that an area of land, outside the application site, will be planted with native wildflower and native broadleaved woodland to create off-site habitats which will mitigate the loss of trees and woodland within the application site.

148. Officers are therefore satisfied that biodiversity net gain will be achieved through the proposed on-site and off-site habitat provisions, subject to planning conditions.

Trees

149. An arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) and arboricultural surveys have been submitted in support of the application.
150. The AIA has identified and evaluated the direct and indirect impacts on existing trees as a result of the implementation of the proposed development. A total of 85 arboricultural items were recorded within the study area, these include:
- 73 individual trees
 - Eight groups of trees
 - Two hedges
 - Two woodlands
151. The AIA has identified that tree removal will be necessary in order to implement the proposal. The trees to be removed are as follows:
- two high quality trees (category A);
 - Seventeen individual trees, part of one group of trees and part of two woodlands graded moderate quality trees (category B); Part of the woodland is protected by a Group Tree Preservation Order
 - nine individual trees, four groups and one hedge of low quality (category C)
 - Two trees have been categorised as unsuitable for retention regardless of the site proposals (category U).
152. It is confirmed that a group of trees within the woodland area, located west of the proposed new roundabout, are protected under a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO ref: No. 38). This loss is required to provide a new access to the telephone exchange and electricity substation because their current access would be lost through the provision of the new dedicated slip road from Foxhills Road onto the A320 Guildford Road. This access would come from the A320 north of the ambulance station and loop around it to the west heading south to the Telephone Exchange. The new access road would be planted either side with species rich grassland.
153. Paragraph 059⁴ of the NPPG explains that anyone wanting to cut down, top, lop or uproot trees subject to a TPO must apply to the local planning authority for its consent unless the proposed work is except through an exemption. Exemptions are listed in Paragraph 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012 one being (vii) “*so far as such work is necessary to implement a planning permission*”. As such, should planning permission be granted for this application, this would constitute an exception under these regulations.
154. To mitigate the loss of the trees, hedgerow and woodland, the applicant has proposed replacement tree and hedgerow planting, both on and off site. The location of the off-site provisions are shown on Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00006 Rev 01 and Drawing 2 proposed habitat creation plan junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00007 Rev 01. Details of the proposed landscaping (soft and hard landscaping

⁴ Paragraph: 059 Reference ID: 36-059-20140306

as well as tree planting) will be prepared and submitted to the County Planning Authority for consideration. This will be imposed via a planning condition. The proposed mitigation scheme would seek to ensure that the correct species and plant sizes are introduced. In addition to the replacement planting, appropriate ornamental and roadside trees have been proposed. The planting consists of complementing the three retained mature trees with four extra heavy standards in front of the car park and two extra heavy standards in the triangle green outside Murray House.

155. The AIA has also identified that construction works will take place close to or within the root protection areas and canopies of retained trees. Suitable tree protection measures, such as protective fencing will be installed to ensure that the existing trees and hedges are adequately protected during the construction works. Details of the tree protection measures shall be secured by a planning condition.
156. The County Arboricultural Officer (CAO) has reviewed the submitted documentation and considers the impact on the trees to be medium, as the tree removal will be mitigated by significant planting. The CAO has concluded that the improvements to the junction would outweigh the tree loss, subject to suitable planning conditions.
157. In addition to the above, the CAO has commented that there is an over reliance on native tree species within the proposed planting scheme and therefore to provide some diversity and future proofing, the CAO recommends a mixture of non-native / ornamental species. The CAO recommends all stock is UK sources. The CAO has also commented that the information provided does not include a water programme.
158. The applicant will be required to submit a soft and hard landscaping scheme to be reviewed by the County Planning Authority in association with the CLA and CAO. This would include detail of the species and plant sizes are to be agreed with the applicant prior to planting alongside a planting maintenance regime and a commitment that all new planting and/or replacement trees will be safeguarded for a period of 3 years.
159. Following completion of the roundabout and junction, a landscape maintenance programme for both the on-site and off-site provisions will be entered into. The applicant has clarified that the appointed highway contractor would be responsible for the maintenance of the landscaping and planting for a 3 year period once the planting has been completed. Thereafter, SCC would be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the landscaping and planting.
160. The proposed development is considered to accord with policy EE9 of the RBCLP and paragraphs 174 of the NPPF, subject to the submission and approval of a suitable landscaping, tree planting and biodiversity proposals.

Conclusion of ecology, biodiversity and trees

161. The mitigation measures put forward by the applicant to mitigate the loss of habitat, on site, are considered to be acceptable. The proposed mitigation would allow for an increase in tree planting and landscaping, above what would be lost as a result of the construction works. In addition, the new landscaping proposals would allow for an increase in biodiversity net gain on and off site. The applicant has stated that tree protection measures will be put in place to ensure that the retained trees are suitably protected during the construction phases.

162. Overall officers consider that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the habitats and ecology within the application site. Therefore, subject to planning conditions the proposal is considered to accord with policy EE9 of the RBCLP and NPPF.

SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE AND FLOODING

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy EE13 – Managing Flood Risk (Page 148)

National Planning Policy Framework 2021 – paragraph 159, 167, 169

163. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increased flood risk elsewhere.
164. Paragraph 167 further states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Development should only be allowed in areas of flood where it can be demonstrated that the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, it incorporates sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), the development is appropriately flood resilient.
165. Paragraph 169 of the NPPF refers to major development and states that it should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA); have appropriate minimum operational standards; have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development and where possible provide multifunctional benefits.
166. Policy EE13 of the RBCLP states that new development will be guided to areas of low flood risk from all sources of flooding. Any development proposed in flood Zone 1 (over 1 hectare), must be accompanied by a site specific Flood Risk Assessment, proportionate to the scale of the development. It must demonstrate that all forms of flooding have been taken into account (as detailed in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment) over the lifetime of the development and must address impacts on climate change and constructed with adequate flood resilience and resistance measures.
167. The applicant has engaged in pre-application discussions with the LLFA and submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage / SuDS strategy in support of the application. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 where there is a very low risk of flooding. In accordance with Table 3: Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility⁵, any development is appropriate within Flood Zone 1 including the construction of road schemes.
168. The Drainage / SuDS strategy follows the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Surrey County Council SuDS Design Guidance, SuDS Manual and Manual for Contract Documents for Highways Works. An allowance for climate change and higher rainfall intensities will be incorporated into the design to mitigate the risk of surface water flooding in the future.
169. The main function of the highway drainage system is to remove surface water from the carriageway and provide effective sub-surface drainage. It is also important that the proposed drainage design consists of measures to minimise the impact on the environment. SuDS drainage

⁵ [Table 3 - Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone compatibility .pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#)

acts as a natural drainage system and manages surface water runoff, to attenuate flow and reduce the risk of flooding. Incorporating SuDS in the design improves water quality and provides biodiversity benefits.

170. The applicant has confirmed within the SuDS strategy that the proposed carriageway drainage would generally be in the form of kerbs and gullies connecting to carriage drains discharging by gravity. Where possible the carriage drainage will be routed into two attenuation ponds: one located within the roundabout central island and the other north-east of the proposed roundabout.
171. The outflow from the attenuation ponds would connect to a new ditch running northwards on the east side of Guildford Road north of the roundabout. The ditch would be approximately 1.2m in depth and 100m in length and could provide additional storage and treatment. The outflow of the ponds would connect to a new ditch on the east side of Guildford Road north of the roundabout connecting to a new carrier drain and existing discharge into the ordinary watercourse near the northern boundary of the ambulance station.
172. The catchment drainage to the central island pond would include highway drainage from Guildford Road to the south, the majority of the roundabout circulatory carriageway and the eastern catchment. Catchment drainage to the north-east pond would drain the realigned Murray Road and relocated Murray Road car park and would also drain the western section of Murray Road.
173. The western part of the junction would not be connected to the centre island pond. The drainage for this area, north of the Foxhills Road and Chobham Road junctions, would follow the proposed western footway/cycleway northwards to connect to the existing Thames Water surface water sewer at the ambulance station entrance.
174. Maintenance of the carriageway drainage would consist of gulleys discharging to a pipe system or ditches and the maintenance regime would be the same as the existing. Existing and new ditches should be maintained to ensure their capacity is not compromised from debris, sediments and vegetation which would impede its ability to hold and convey the flows. A maintenance layby is included at the roundabout to access the attenuation pond. A vehicle access track is proposed from the layby to the attenuation pond outfall.
175. The LLFA has reviewed the submitted FRA and Drainage / SuDS Strategy and raised no objections to the proposal. The LLFA is satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements set out in the NPPF. The LLFA has suggested the inclusion of planning conditions to ensure that the design complies with the national Non-Strategy Technical Standards for SuDS, that the proposal is properly implemented and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development and to ensure that the proposal does not increase flood risk on or off the site.
176. The Environment Agency and Thames Water were consulted on the application and raised no objections to the proposal.

Conclusion of Surface Water Drainage and Flooding

177. Officers consider that the drainage strategy and FRA submitted as part of this application would not have an adverse impact on the locality and would not increase the flood risk elsewhere. The applicant has demonstrated through the FRA that all forms of flooding have been taken into account and that the SuDS drainage proposal meets the requirement set out within the NPPF.

The drainage strategy will provide multifunction benefits which include biodiversity opportunities and adequate drainage provisions. A maintenance regime has been put in place to ensure that the SuDS drainage is suitably maintained through-out its lifetime.

178. The proposal is considered to meet the requirements set out within the NPPF and policy EE13 of the RBCLP, subject to planning conditions.

HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy EE3 – Strategic Heritage Policy

Policy EE4 – Listed buildings

Policy EE8 – Locally Listed and other Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Policy EE7 – Sites of Archaeological Importance (CSAI) and Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP)

National Planning Policy Framework – paragraph 195, 199, 202

179. 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 shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historical interest which it possesses’.
180. One of the core principles of the NPPF is that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraphs 189-199 sets 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. Paragraph 195 sets out that ‘local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking into account the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal’.
181. 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 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’. 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’.
182. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF outlines that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Paragraph 203 deals with non-designated heritage assets and states that their significance should be taken into account in determining the application. A balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
183. The NPPF defines the setting of a Heritage Asset within the glossary, as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

184. Guidance on the setting of Heritage Asset can be found in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic England, (December 2017). Paragraph 9 of this document makes clear that setting is not itself a heritage asset and its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to the ability to appreciate that significance.
185. Policy EE3 of the RBCLP states that development that affects Runnymede's heritage assets should be designed to protect, conserve and enhance the significance and value of these assets and their settings in accordance with national legislation, policy and guidance and any supplementary planning documents. The historic environment in Runnymede includes Listed Buildings and Locally Listed Buildings.
186. Policy EE4 of the RBCLP supports appropriate development which seeks to maintain, sustain and enhance the significance and special architectural and historic interest of listed buildings within the Borough. Proposals should not adversely affect the listed building or its setting by virtue of design, scale, materials or proximity or impact on views or other relevant aspects of the historic building fabric.
187. Policy EE8 of the RBCLP refers to locally listed and other non-designated heritage assets. The policy states that development will be required to preserve the character and significance of locally listed and other non-designated heritage assets, their setting and any features of architectural or historic interest.
188. In accordance with paragraph 194 of the NPPF, the application is supported by a Heritage Statement (HS) which identifies the heritage assets and describes the significance of the heritage asset affected, including the contributions made by their setting. The HS notes that Surrey Historic Environment Record has been consulted as part of the application.
189. The heritage assets identified as part of the HS are Grade II Listed Buildings at 2 Chobham Road and Murray House and the locally listed Trident Garages Ltd Showroom, 2 and 4 Murray Road and the Workhouse Chapel. The County Historic Buildings Officer agrees that this assessment is correct.
190. There are no known heritage assets recorded within the application site boundary and the proposal would not result in the alteration or demolition of a listed building. Therefore, it is appropriate to assess whether the proposal would harm the setting of the listed buildings and/or their significance.

2 Cobham Road

191. No.2 Chobham Road, Ottershaw is a Grade II listed building located on the junction of Chobham and Foxhills Road. The building is identified as a late 18th or early 19th century shop, cart shed and dairy, which retains distinctive characteristics. The building was almost certainly located close to the road for ease of access and may have belonged to Otter Farm which is to the east. The building has architectural significance owing to its good use of brickwork and symmetrical elevational form.
192. The position of the building close to the road makes a contribution to its setting as it reveals its historic significance as a dairy and cart shed. The exact layout of the road does not contribute to its setting.
193. An area of woodland located north of 2 Chobham Road also contributes to the setting of the listed building, as it previously formed part of a larger woodland and adds historic context to the appreciation of the building.

194. The building is situated outside the application boundary, although a small section of the road, which meets at the junction and forms part of the pavement, is included within the application boundary. The pavement is located along the front elevation of the building and the proposed development would be visible from this viewpoint.
195. The building is best viewed from directly in front of the entrance (east), where the design and form can be easily appreciated. The building can also be viewed from Chobham Road (south) and Foxhill Road (north). Longer views of the built form can be seen from Murray Road (east), however, these views are affected by the modern road and roundabout design which distracts from the appreciation of the building.
196. The setting of 2 Chobham Road has remained constant since the early 20th century with roads, junctions and roundabouts remaining, for the most part, within their historic position. However, it is acknowledged that the road and roundabout have been altered considerably since the early 20th century and the modern appearance, alongside the busyness of the road detracts from the appreciation of the listed building.
197. The proposed development will include a larger junction and roundabout north-east of the existing junction. Although the design of the highway will be altered to create a larger roundabout and junction, further away from the building, the historic position of the building close to the road will remain unchanged and therefore the proposal would not affect the setting of this building.
198. To create the widened footpath and cycleway on the western side of the A320, some trees from the woodland will be removed. The reduction in the number of woodland trees would not have an impact on the significance it contributes, as the woodland will remain and continue to be visible from the listed building. Furthermore, the woodland will continue to screen views of the telephone exchange and ambulance station as well as the proposed new track which leads to the telephone exchange.
199. The relocated Murray Road car park will be situated east of the listed building and would only be slightly visible from the first floor of the building. It is considered that the relocation of the car park will have a neutral effect on the significance of the building as it would neither enhance nor contribute to the appreciation of the building, as the key views would not be altered.
200. The HS states that other aspects of the setting which contribute to the listed building, such as the relationship with other historic buildings, will remain unchanged. The view of the listed building will also largely remain unaffected as the building's plot will remain as it is. Whilst long views from the west side of the junction will change, due to the size and design of the new roundabout, the changes will not result in a reduction in the appreciation of the significance of the listed building. The limited intervisibility between the junction and the listed building will remain the same as the woodland will continue to screen views of the roundabout.
201. The County Historic Buildings Officer (CHBO) has reviewed the submitted heritage statement and historic records. The CHBO has considered the impact of the proposal on 2 Chobham Road and concluded that it would not harm the character and setting of the building, as the building would continue to be located adjacent to a highway and would retain a strong prominence within this location. However, the CHBO has recommended that the existing bollards, along Foxhill Road, be retained in order to protect the building and prevent damage from speeding vehicles. A planning condition for the reinstatement of the bollards is recommended.

Murray House

202. Murray House is a Grade II Listed Building, located east of the proposal along Murray Road. Murray House is historically significant along with 2 and 4 Murray Road and the workhouse chapel as they form part of a group of buildings associated with the former Chertsey workhouse. These

buildings date back to 1836. The buildings have some architectural significance particularly, Murray House which was designed by Simon Kempthorne. The buildings also have some group value owing to their association with one another, although this has been greatly diminished owing to infilling between the buildings.

203. Murray House has been identified as being of a medium heritage significance largely due to its historic interest. The listing description states that the front elevation of Murray House is listed as it is the only surviving part of the original building. Architecturally the interest of Murray House has been greatly diminished due to the demolition of most of the building, however, aspects of the past life of the workhouse are connected to the present day and as such the building is of historical value.
204. The setting of Murray House, much like the building itself, has changed considerably and whilst some historic buildings remain, such as 2 & 4 Murray Road and the Workhouse Chapel, other buildings that were once associated with the listing have been lost and replaced with modern 20th century residential buildings. This loss of setting has caused harm to the significance of the building over time.
205. Murray House is best viewed from the residents' car park directly in front of the building and from Murray Road itself, where the front elevation can be appreciated. The building is set back from the existing highway, and this contributes to its grand appearance as a large house. The County Historic Building Officer considers that the relationship between Murray House and the remaining workhouse buildings makes a limited contribution to its setting. He does not consider the modern layout of the road reveals anything about the historical and architectural interest of the building as a 19th century workhouse.
206. The proposed roundabout will be located north-west of Murray House and would be positioned far enough away not to impact on the views and setting of the listed building. The road would be realigned to run northwards resulting in the road being located further away from the western end of Murray House. A new T-junction will join the realigned Murray Road connecting it with the roundabout. The HS states that while the alignment of Murray Road may offer some 'historical context' overall to Murray House, 2 & 4 Murray Road and the Workhouse Chapel, the setting of the listed building and locally listed buildings has changed too much for it to contribute to its significance.
207. An area of open space and cycleway/footpath will be located directly opposite the western part of Murray House with the realigned Murray Road beyond that. The new T-junction and realigned road are not considered to affect the significant views of the listed building as the important view from the north would be retained.
208. A small area of green space to the north of Murray House and Murray Road will be lost, due to the realignment of Murray Road, however, this area has no significant association with Murray House as it previously formed part of Otter Farm, which has now been demolished.
209. The CHBO has reviewed the accompanying documentations and concludes that the *"The proposed scheme will see the road layout immediately in front of Murray House changed. Despite this change, the grand appearance and setting of Murray House will not be altered and the proposal will not further dilute the association of this building with the other locally listed structures from the workhouse. As such, the proposal will have no impact on either the historic or architectural interest of either Murray House as a listed building or 2 & 4 Murray Road and the Workhouse Chapel as locally listed buildings"*.
210. Officers consider that the proposal would not harm the setting of the identified listed buildings. The proposal is considered to accord with policy EE4 of the RBCLP as the proposal seeks to

maintain the significance and special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and would not adversely affect the listed building or its setting.

Other locally listed buildings

211. The Trident Garage Showroom, 2 & 4 Murray Road and the Workhouse Chapel are recorded as locally listed buildings.
212. The showroom is located between the A320 and Chobham Road opposite the existing roundabout. The building is of historic interest as it dates to 1758 and was the local blacksmiths in the 19th and early 20th century. The building is located close to the road and is within a prominent location on the existing roundabout. It is therefore considered that the existing road contributes to the significance of the building.
213. The proposed elongated roundabout will be located north-east of Trident Garage Showrooms, with the eastern side of the road (Chobham Road) remaining. The area north of the building will be redesigned to include a green space and footway.
214. The HS states that the setting of the building will be enhanced by the proposal, as the realigning of the road will provide more opportunities to appreciate the building. The CHBO Officer disagrees with this argument as there is nothing being preserved or enhanced which contributes to the significance of the building. Whilst he disagrees with this statement, he is of the opinion that the proposal would cause no identifiable harm as the building would remain close to the road.
215. 2 & 4 Murray Road are located along Murray Road east of the main development site. The building dates to the mid-19th century. It is of low heritage significance due to the alterations which have been made to the building, however, it is associated with Murray House and was formally the Master's House for the workhouse. The building shares a setting with Murray House and the contributions to its significance are the three buildings (Murray House, the Chapel and 2 & 4 Murray Road) as a group.
216. The workhouse chapel is situated east of the proposed development along Murray Road. The chapel is of historical value due to its association with Murray House and the spiritual value of the building as a place of worship. However, the building is considered to be of low heritage significance due to the alternations which have been made during the conversion of the building into a residential use.
217. Officers have considered the impact of the proposal on the setting of the locally listed buildings and are of the opinion that the proposal will not have an impact on their historic or architectural interest.

On balance

218. In accordance with paragraph 194 of the NPPF, officers consider that the applicant has described the significance of the heritage assets affected by this proposal and included contributions made by their setting.
219. In accordance with paragraph 195, Officers have assessed the particular significance of the heritage assets which may be affected by the proposal (including by development affecting their setting) and taken into account the available evidence and necessary expertise. Having given due regard to paragraph 199 of the NPPF, Officers are of the opinion that the proposal would not cause harm to any of the designated or undesignated heritage assets.

Archaeology

220. Policy EE7 of the RBCLP refers to sites of archaeological importance and areas of high archaeological potential. Proposal within these areas should conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the significance, historic features and importance of the sites of archaeological importance and their settings.
221. The application site has not been identified as being within an area of a high archaeological potential. Furthermore, the proposal is largely confined to land which has been previously developed. The County Archaeologist has reviewed the proposal and accompanying documentation and considers that it is unlikely that archaeological remains will be affected by the proposed works. The County Archaeologist raises no concerns with the proposal on this matter. The proposal would accord with policy EE7 of the RBCLP

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY, NOISE & AIR QUALITY

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy EE2 – Environmental Protection

National Planning Policy Framework – paragraph 174, 185 & 186

Residential Amenity

222. Paragraph 185 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should:
- a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life
 - c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on amenity.
223. The main impacts on residential amenities arising from the proposal are considered to be noise, air quality and construction works. No buildings or other structure have been included within the proposal and as such there would be no overbearing or overshadowing of nearby residential properties.
224. The application site is surrounded by existing built form, including residential properties along the southern, eastern and western boundaries. The nearest residential properties, directly impacted by the proposal, are situated to the south of Murray Road, 2 – 16 Murray Road and 1 - 16 Murray House.
225. The proposal, particularly the realignment of Murray Road and relocated Murray Road car park would have an impact on the residential amenities of the occupants, if there is an increase in traffic movements and other associated effects such as air quality and noise.
226. The proposal is not in itself considered to have a material impact on the overall traffic levels, as improvements to junction 10 and the wider A320 corridor, are expected to result in less localised congestion and an increase in free flowing vehicle movements.
227. The existing road is situated within close proximity to the residential properties along Murray Road. The proposed realignment would only affect a small section of the road and residential properties along the eastern side of the existing junction. The residential properties further east of 1 Murray House and within the vicinity would not be directly impacted by the proposed realignment works.
228. It is anticipated that the properties along Murray Road, particularly 2 – 16 Murray Road and 1 - 16 Murray House, will experience an increase in noise levels during the construction phases.

229. The applicant has submitted a noise and vibration assessment in support of the application. The report has assessed the noise and vibration effects during construction works and the operational noise impacts. Noise predictions for the construction phase were made in accordance with BS5228:2009+A1:2014 Part 1 at distances of 25m, 50m, 100m, 200m and 300m from the proposed construction works associated with the junction. The operational impacts have been assessed in accordance with the Design for Manual for Roads and Bridges and the construction noise levels have been assessed in accordance with the British Standards (BS5228). Noise predictions followed the methodology contained in the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN).
230. Paragraph 001⁶ of the NPPG recognises that noise needs to be considered when development may create additional noise. Paragraph 005⁷ outlines that noise may slightly affect the acoustic character of an area but not to the extent there is a change in quality of life or behavioural changes. Paragraph 006⁸ goes on to say that there are various factors which combine in any particular situation that may lead to a noise impact such as the source and absolute level of the noise together with the time of day it occurs, how a new noise relates to the existing sound environment alongside the frequency and tonal characteristics of the noise.
231. It is noted that the existing properties along Murray Road already suffer from road noise due to their close proximity to the highway. As part of the proposal, the applicant carried out monitoring of noise levels in the vicinity of the site to understand the baseline noise levels. Monitoring was carried out in accordance with BS 7445:1-2003. This found an average noise level between 66.1 – 72.8 L_{Aeq, T} (dB) for daytime. For night time, the noise assessment outlines noise levels are between 50– 65dB.
232. The noise assessment includes an assessment of the construction effects of the project using methodology in BS 5228:2009+A1:2014 assessing when there is potential for significant effects. The noise assessment outlines that the assessment looked at a worst case scenario of all plant and machinery working at the same time in the same location and with no screening. The noise assessment outlines that during the construction phase enabling, off-line works, on-line works and close out these activities would take place during the day time and 38 properties would have the potential for significant effects from noise without mitigation. For the online works during the night time the number of properties could increase to 230 where there is no mitigation.
233. The noise assessment also includes an assessment of the operational effects of the proposal both in the opening year and in future assessment year (+15 years) to enable consideration of the change in road traffic noise. The noise assessment found with the proposed scheme 271 residential properties would experience no change, 8 residential properties would experience minor adverse effects and 233 residential properties would experience beneficial change ranging from minor to major.
234. The noise and vibration assessment has concluded that there is the possibility of significant effects during the construction phase of the proposed development should Best Practice Means (BPM) not be fully implemented. The implementation of the BPM would allow for a significant opportunity to reduce the potential impacts by adopting the methods and reducing noise to an acceptable level. The BPM would include: restricting working hours to core hours as far as appropriate, limiting activities to be undertaken outside core hours to a limited period, careful selection of plant and construction methods, noisy activities to be staggered, site hoarding with

⁶ Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 30-001-20190722

⁷ Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 30-005-20190722

⁸ Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 30-006-20190722

acoustic properties, use of acoustic screening measures where practicable such as hoardings or enclosures, all vehicles and mechanical plant to be fitted with exhaust silencers and maintained in good working order, compressors and generators to be 'sound reduced' models, use of designated routes; and reversing alarms to have minimum noise output. These mitigation measures can be formalised within a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) and would ensuring that the measures are put in place in order to reduce the noise impacts. Such measures include, access and delivery times, night working hours and a complaint procedures. Officers consider that it will be necessary to impose a planning condition, requesting that a CEMP be submitted to the County Planning Authority.

235. With regards to the operational phase, the noise assessment states that the use of specific mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers would not be possible and not in keeping with the Governments sustainable development principles to recommend acoustic barriers in such a situation. As a result no specific mitigation is recommended for operational noise.
236. The noise and vibration assessment has also concluded that ground-borne vibration impacts from road traffic movements on the proposed development would have a negligible magnitude of impact, resulting in effects that are not significant.
237. The County Noise Consultant has reviewed the submitted documentation and has concluded that planning conditions for noise monitoring and hours of working should be imposed to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring properties is not compromised.
238. The applicant has stated within paragraph 6.5.4 of the noise assessment states "*that monitoring would be undertaken by a suitable qualified / experienced Acoustic Consultant on behalf of the contractor to conclude compliance with appropriate limits. The monitoring would be undertaken at any residential or commercial receptor identified as having the potential to be adversely impacted as a result of noise from the proposed construction works; or on receipt of a justified complaint regarding noise*". In accordance with the County Noise Consultant, it is recommended that a planning condition be imposed to ensure that noise monitoring is undertaken.
239. The County Noise Consultant has recommended that an hours of working condition be imposed to ensure that the impact on the nearby residential properties is reduced during the construction phase of the development. The applicant has advised that the core hours of working proposed are:
- 07:00 – 19:00 (Monday – Friday)
07:00 – 13:00 (Saturday)

There shall be no working on Sundays or recognised Public, Bank and National Holidays.

The applicant has advised that some night time working will be required during the on-line construction phases and this information will be provided to the CPA once the contractor has been appointed. As such, it will be necessary to ensure that the night time working hours are set out within the CEMP, which will be subject to a planning condition.

240. It is acknowledged that there will be a noise impact, as a result of the construction works, on the residential amenities of the nearby occupants. However, the impacts will be mitigated through noise monitoring, restricted hours of working and the submission of a CEMP. It is also acknowledged that the construction works would be temporary and once completed the proposal would provide benefits such as free flowing traffic and improved road surfaces and pedestrian/cycle paths.

241. The mitigation measures proposed would reduce the impact on the residential amenities during the construction phases and subject to planning conditions, the proposal would accord with policy EE2 of the RBCLP.

Air quality

242. Paragraph 174(e) of the NPPF states that planning decision should prevent new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of air pollution. The development should, where possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air quality.
243. The EPUK and IAQM Guidance “Land-use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality” comments that there is a clear link between air quality and health in relation to PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and nitrogen dioxide. The guidance outlines that any air quality issue that relates to land use and its development is capable of being a material planning consideration. The weight given to air quality in making a planning application decision, in addition to the policies in the local plan, will be dependent on such factors as:
- The severity of the impacts on air quality
 - The air quality in the area surrounding the proposed development
 - The likely use of the development i.e. the length of time people are likely to be exposed at that location
 - The positive benefits provided through other material considerations
244. The control of air pollution is the responsibility of local authorities and other government regimes. The role of local authorities is covered by the Local Air Quality Monitoring (LAQM) regime which in this case, is the responsibility for monitoring and declaring Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) which falls to Runnymede Borough Council.
245. In terms of the air quality impacts associated with traffic, the Environmental Protection UK(EPUK)/Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) ‘*Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality*’ document provides indicative criteria for determining when an air quality assessment is likely to be required. For developments outside an Air Quality Management Area, such as this, an air quality assessment is likely to be required for developments generating a change in traffic of annual-average daily 100 HGVs or more. An air quality assessment is undertaken to inform the decision making process. It does not, of itself, provide a reason for granting or refusing planning permission. Almost all development will be associated with new emissions if the development is considered in isolation. Any impacts should be seen in the context of air quality objectives and existing air quality.
246. The application site does not fall within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and therefore an air quality assessment has not been submitted as part of the application. The applicant has advised that an air quality assessment was not submitted as it was agreed following the adopted screening opinion, undertaken in April 2021, that only a construction dust assessment would be required as part of the application. Taking account of background air quality concentrations of key pollutants for the current period and for the future year of 2030 and the conclusions of the air quality assessment for the adopted Runnymede Local Plan (2030) it is concluded that implementation of the proposed highway improvement works along the A320 corridor would not give rise to significant impacts on local air quality over the longer term. The implementation of the scheme would not be expected to adversely affect the implementation of the measures set out in the air quality action plan for the M25 Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

247. Implementation of the proposed scheme of works would be expected to deliver benefits (e.g., reduced incidence of congestion, improved journey times, improved accessibility by non-car modes, etc.) in terms of mitigating the likely impact of future development in the surrounding area on the capacity of the highways network. In operational terms the programme of highways improvement works is not expected to give rise to significant adverse impacts on traffic levels or highways capacity. Construction phase impacts will be mitigated through the deployment of the proposed Construction Traffic Management Plan.
248. The existing junction 10 of the A320 has been identified as a road network requiring capacity improvements. The proposed development is expected to reduce congestion and improve journey times along the A320 corridor. As well as providing improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Information provided within the Transport Assessment advises that the junction improvements are expected to substantially decrease vehicle queuing lengths during peak periods (morning and afternoon).
249. The County Air Quality Consultant (CAQC) has reviewed the accompanying documentation and Transport Assessment and requested clarification on whether the proposal would result in the redistribution of vehicles onto other roads within the vicinity.
250. The applicant has responded to this request stating that the level to which additional traffic may be attracted to the corridor has not been determined. However, the extent of the highway network outside of the scheme would limit peak hour demand to the extent of the proposed scheme. At those junctions within the scheme there are due to be improvements to air quality and noise impacts as there will be less localised congestion which is the greatest source of these impacts.
251. The applicant also provided further information on the air quality within the area stating when taking account of background air quality concentrations of key pollutants for the current period and for the future year of 2030 and the conclusions of the air quality assessment for the adopted Runnymede Local Plan (2030), it is concluded that implementation of the proposed highway improvement works along the A320 corridor would not give rise to significant impacts on local air quality over the longer term. The implementation of the scheme would not be expected to adversely affect the implementation of the measures set out in the air quality action plan for the M25 Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Implementation of the proposed scheme of works would be expected to deliver benefits (e.g. reduced incidence of congestion, improved journey times, improved accessibility by non-car modes, etc.) in terms of mitigating the likely impact of future development in the surrounding area on the capacity of the highways network. In operational terms the programme of highways improvement works is not expected to give rise to significant adverse impacts on traffic levels or highways capacity. Construction phase impacts will be mitigated through the deployment of the proposed CTMP.
252. The CAQC has reviewed the additional information submitted and concluded that based on the findings of the air quality assessment undertaken to inform the Runnymede Local Plan, which includes highways infrastructure changes, we agree that the air quality impacts associated with the junction are unlikely to be significant.
253. The proposed highway scheme has been developed to facilitate a reduction in traffic movements and to reduce traffic levels. Therefore, the proposal is unlikely to cause an adverse impact on the air quality, within the immediate area, as the capacity on the road network is unlikely to increase, as a result of the junction improvements.
254. However, it must be noted that future development as outlined in policy SD2 of the RBCLP may have an impact on the air quality within the area. As such, the air quality levels of the

forthcoming developments would need to be assessed independently by the Borough Council as part of the formal planning process for those schemes.

255. The proposed development is considered to accord with paragraph 174(e) of the NPPF as the development would not contribute to unacceptable levels of air pollution.

Dust

256. A construction dust assessment (CDA) has been undertaken and submitted in support of the application.
257. The CDA has identified that the construction activities at the site have the potential to result in fugitive dust emissions throughout the construction phases. Vehicle movements on site as well as the local road network have the potential to result in the re-suspension of dust from the highway surfaces. The impact on sensitive receptors depends significantly on local weather conditions during the undertaking of the dust generating activities, with the most significant effects likely to occur during dry and windy conditions. The CDA has assessed the magnitude of dust emissions that could be generated from the proposal using the IAQM 'Guidance on the assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction v1.1' guidance which provides a series of steps to undertake this assessment. The assessment process looks at the scale and nature of the works the activity involved (demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout) and categorises these activities according to magnitude (high/ medium/ small). This is then compared with the sensitivity of the receptors near to the site with receptors categorised as high/ medium and low. Then when combining the receptor sensitivity with the dust emission magnitude gives a dust risk category. From this, site specific mitigation measures can be identified.
258. The CDA identifies the dust generating activities that would occur with this proposal for each part of the construction phase. This includes:
- Demolition of the Murray Road carpark – dust emission magnitude considered to be small.
 - Earthworks with earth moving machinery active at one time – dust emission magnitude considered to be medium due to the volume of material to be moved
 - Construction material including asphalt, aggregate, timber and concrete – potential dust emission magnitude considered to be medium due to the volume of material to be moved
 - Trackout on unpaved road – potential dust emission magnitude considered to be medium.
259. A number of sensitive receptors have been identified within 350m of the site boundary. The CDA then assessed the potential impact on receptors for soiling, human health and ecological and indicated that the risk of dust effects is medium as a worst case scenario.
260. Following on from the above, the CDA has identified mitigation measures to ensure that the impact of dust on the sensitive receptors is minimised during the construction phase.

The mitigation measures proposed include:-

- Communication with stakeholders and community engagement
- Dust management plan (DMP)
- Site management recording all dust and air quality complaints, identifying causes, taking appropriate measures, recording exceptional incidences
- Monitoring undertaking daily on site and off site inspection and making the log available, visual monitoring, monitoring compliance with (DMP)
- Preparing and maintaining the site through plan site layout so that machinery and dust causing activities are located away from receptors, use of solid screens or barriers around dust activities,

- avoid run off of mud, removing material that have potential to produce dust from site as soon as possible; cover, seed or fence stockpiles
- Operating vehicle/machinery and sustainable transport ensuring vehicles switch off engines when stationary, avoid use of diesel or petrol powered generators, maximum speed limit on surface roads and work areas
- Operations including the use of dust suppression techniques such as water sprays for cutting, grinding or sawing equipment, ensuring an adequate water supply on site for dust suppression, using enclosed chutes, minimising drop heights
- Waste management including no bonfires
- Demolition ensuring effective water suppression, bagging debris
- Earthworks including revegetate earthworks and exposed areas
- Construction by ensuring sand and other aggregates are stored in bunded and ensuring fine powders are enclosed in tankers.
- Trackout (vehicle cleaning and inspection of road surfaces) using water assisted dust sweepers and inspection of haul routes.

261. It has been identified that the construction phase of the development has the potential to generate dust, which may have short-term adverse impact on residential amenities. However, with appropriate mitigation measures in place the construction works should not result in a significant residual effect. The applicant has proposed mitigation measures, as outlined in the CDA, which are considered to be acceptable. To ensure that the mitigation measures are imposed it is recommended that a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) be submitted to the County Planning Authority for consideration, and this would include the dust mitigation measures.
262. The County Air Quality Consultant has reviewed the CDA and is in agreement with the content and assessment undertaken; and that the mitigation measures proposed should be the subject of a CEMP and raises no objection.

Conclusion of Noise, Air Quality and Dust

263. It has been noted that the highway junction improvements, forming part of this application, are essential in order to meet the future growth within the immediate and wider area. The changes in the flow of traffic along the A320 are considered, on balance, to result in an improvement to the air quality within the area, as there would be a reduction in traffic congestion.
264. The inclusion of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) would ensure that any impact, as a result of construction works, on nearby residential properties would be minimised.
265. The proposed development, subject to planning conditions, is considered to accord with policy EE2 of the RBCLP and paragraphs 174, 185 and 186 of the NPPF.

HIGHWAY CAPACITY AND SAFETY, PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ACCESS

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy SD4 – Highway Design Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021, paragraph 111, 113

Surrey Transport Plan (2017)

Supplementary Planning Document – Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation (2020) Runnymede Borough Council

266. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Paragraph 113 further states that

developments that will generate significant amounts of movements should be supported by a transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

267. Paragraph 113 of the NPPF states that all development that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.
268. Policy SD4 of the RBCLP states that development proposals which maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network and take account of the needs of all highway users for safe access, egress and servicing arrangements will be supported.
269. The Surrey Transport Plan (STP) covers the period January 2022 to March 2032 and sets out the strategy to help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey, in order to protect and enhance the environment, improve the quality of life and reduce carbon emissions. The plan also highlights how transport networks should be integrated and provide benefits to people's health and the environment.
270. The A320 Guildford Road is a key link road between the M25 and surrounding communities such as Woking, Ottershaw and Chertsey. The road is also an access route to St Peters Hospital. The proposal is seeking to address existing and future congestion problems along the A320 corridor, including improvements to the existing roundabout as well as cycle and pedestrian access.
271. The proposed new roundabout will be approximately 60m in circular diameter and 85m in length located north-east of the existing roundabout. It will incorporate four connecting junctions from the A320 Guildford Road south, A319 Chobham Road, A320 Guildford Road north and B3221 Murray Road. The proposal will also include the realignment of Murray Road (northwards). The proposed works are due to commence late 2022 and would be completed in 2024.
272. The proposed roundabout design would be a significant improvement when compared to the existing roundabout. The proposal would meet the 2030 predicted traffic requirements to support the traffic demands arising from the development of new homes in the area and the need to increase capacity along the A320 corridor. The traffic capacity improvements throughout the junction would result in improved journey time and reliability when compared with the existing arrangements, thereby supporting the local economy and housing developments.
273. The proposed new roundabout and junctions would promote the free flow of traffic, reducing congestion within Ottershaw village and along the wider road network. The proposal would also allow for shared pedestrian/cycle controlled crossing provisions between Guildford Road (south) and Chobham Road along with pedestrian crossings of Murray Road near the eastbound bus stop layby and Brox Road, enabling improved connectivity between the east and west parts of the village.
274. The application has been accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA), as required by paragraph 113 of the NPPF. The TA includes analysis of the existing junction layout and traffic conditions at junction 10.
275. An assessment of the wider scheme for the A320 (north of Woking) has identified that traffic conditions will be within capacity in the 'Do Something future design year of 2030' with a reduced frequency and severity of queues. With the proposed scheme in place, the Paramics traffic modelling assessment has identified that there will be significant journey time savings for road users of junction 10 and the wider corridor during peak hours. The proposed improvements are considered to be essential to meet the future demands of growth in the area and without the junction improvement the area would suffer from adverse journey time impacts, created by congestion and delays.

276. The County Highway Authority (CHA) have reviewed the TA and have raised no objections to the proposal.

Murray Road Car Park

277. The Murray Road car park will be relocated further east of the existing car park and will provide fifty car parking spaces with five disabled spaces, increasing the parking provisions on site. Electric vehicle charging points will be provided within the car park.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access

278. The proposed highway improvements include improved access for pedestrian and cycle users as well as controlled crossing points. The proposals include:-

- A 4m wide shared pedestrian/cycle route around the west side of the new junction heading north along the west side of Guildford Road.
- Shared pedestrian/cycle crossings of Guildford Road, south of the roundabout junction and Chobham Road along with pedestrian crossings of Murray Road near the eastbound bus stop layby and Brox Road near the Brook Memorial Hall.
- The widening of the southern footway of the retained Murray Road to form part of an off-carriage east-west cycle including pedestrian/cycle crossing of Guildford Road south and Chobham Road to improve the connectivity of the village

279. The proposed provisions for improved pedestrian and cycle access and controlled crossing would improve operational safety for non-motorised users.

Highway Safety

280. With regard to road safety, the Highway Authority has assessed the information provided within the TA and additional information provided by the applicant in an email dated 18 May 2022. The CHA is satisfied that the visibility splays at the junctions and link roads and swept path analyses for the proposed road are acceptable. The junction geometry is based on a 30mph design speed for 85th percentile traffic. This is considered compatible with the busy, urban nature of the junction and approach roads and would reduce the severity of any road traffic collisions.

281. In order to ensure that the development is constructed safely and existing highway users and residents living and working close by are not adversely affected, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and programme of works would be required by condition. This condition would need to be satisfied and approved prior to the commencement of development.

282. Temporary road closures may be required during the construction phase of junction 10 and appropriate diversion routes will be identified and provided to the CHA to minimise any impact on road users.

Conclusion of Highways Capacity And Safety, Pedestrian And Cycle Access

283. Areas of future housing development have been identified within the Runnymede Borough Local plan and as outlined above, the junction is already at capacity. The proposal is for the construction of a new roundabout and other highway works to maintain and enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network in this locality as identified through traffic modelling. The proposal includes increase pedestrian and cycle connectivity around the junction taking account of the needs of all highway users for safe access and egress. The proposal also includes an access to the telephone exchange providing servicing arrangements. Consequently, officers are satisfied the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway capacity and road safety and is in accordance with Policy SD4 of the RBCLP. The CHA has reviewed the proposal from a

highway safety perspective and raise no objection. The proposal is to improve the efficiency of the junction and surrounding road network therefore it is not expected to create severe residual cumulative impacts and as such complies with the requirements of paragraphs 111 and 113 of the NPPF.

GREEN BELT

Runnymede Local Plan 2030

Policy EE18 – Engineering Operations in the Green Belt

National Planning Policy Framework 2021, paragraph 137, 148 and 150

284. Policy EE18 of the RBCLP states that proposals for engineering operations including the laying of roads and hardstanding are considered inappropriate development unless the applicant has demonstrated that the operation preserves the openness of the Green Belt at the site and its vicinity, and does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt. The extent and visual impact of the changes in land levels will be taken into account in assessing such proposals, as will the purpose and intent of future use of the hardstanding in order to ensure the visual effects are not harmful.
285. Paragraph 137 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy, as set out in paragraph 137 of the NPPF, is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 138 states that the Green Belt serves five purposes these being:
- a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - b) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - c) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
 - e) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
286. Of the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt, the purposes of checking unrestricted sprawl, the prevention of towns merging into one another, preserving the special character of a historic town and assisting in urban regeneration do not apply to this development. The land situated north-west and north-east of the existing roundabout would offend the purposes of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
287. Paragraph 147 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 further states when considering any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very Special Circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
288. The proposed development is an engineering operation and a local transport infrastructure project and not necessarily inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Paragraph 150 of the NPPF states that engineering operations and local transport infrastructure are not inappropriate provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposal would introduce a new roundabout across areas of undeveloped land, mainly north-east and north-west of the existing roundabout, together with associated infrastructure that includes lighting columns and signage. Activities on the road,

such as vehicle movements, would also constitute an intrusion in the Green Belt. As a consequence, it is recognised that the proposed development would cause some harm to the openness of the Green Belt and would therefore be inappropriate development.

289. Accordingly, for planning permission to be granted the demonstration of 'very special circumstances' is required. Paragraph 148 of the NPPF establishes that the decision-maker is required to ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and any other harm and that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposal is 'clearly outweighed' by other considerations. Therefore, where the other considerations clearly outweigh Green Belt harm, and any other harm, planning permission for inappropriate development may be granted.
290. The key consideration is the determination of the extent of the impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The application site forms part of an existing road network which contain areas of hardstanding. On the land to the north-west and north-east of the existing roundabout the proposal would be built over areas of woodland resulting in a greater impact. As such it is recognised that the proposal would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and would conflict with the purposes of avoiding encroachment into the countryside.

Harm to Openness

291. The proposed new roundabout would be situated north-east of the existing roundabout. Other alterations include the relocation of the existing Murray Road car park further east. The new roundabout has sought to include the existing highway into the design and where possible the proposal will be built on areas of previously developed land. However, the north-east and north-west elevations of the proposal would encroach into areas of land where there is no development, resulting in harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
292. As set out above, there is no dispute that the proposal would cause harm to the visual and spatial dimensions of openness. Whilst the road surface would be at ground level the vehicles themselves, although transitory, would also harm the visual dimension of openness as would the ancillary street lighting and new landscaping.
293. The proposal would traverse two areas of contrasting character such that the extent of harm on openness would vary depending on the area. It is considered that there would be greater harm to the north (including north-east and north-west) of the existing roundabout and lesser harm to the south. The areas to the south of the existing roundabout are visually contained within large areas of existing hardstanding from the carriageway as well as various buildings and man-made structures. Therefore, the harm to the openness south of the proposal would be limited. The land north of the existing roundabout is within a more open character which is defined by woodland, trees and hedgerows. Therefore, the impact on this land would be initially significant, reducing over time once the landscape mitigation has matured. There would also be some visual harm arising from the lighting columns and vehicles headlights, however, given that this is an existing carriageway, and several other roads are within the vicinity the harm would not be significant.

Purposes

294. The proposed new roundabout would not harm the Green Belt purposes of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another, of preserving the special character of an historic town or the purposes of assisting urban regeneration.

295. The proposal would be spatially and visually contained with defined boundaries and therefore it is not considered that the resulting pattern of development could reasonably be described as 'sprawl'. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in the merging of nearby settlements. However, there would be harm to purpose c) 'safeguarding the countryside from encroachment', as with openness, the harm primarily results from the areas of development north-east and north-west of the proposal existing roundabout.

Very Special Circumstances

296. Officers are of the opinion that if planning permission is to be granted, very special circumstances will have to exist in order to justify the development. Paragraph 148 of the NPPF provides that very special circumstance will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

297. The applicant has made a submission on the basis that other considerations clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm such that very special circumstances exist to enable planning permission to be granted. The following considerations have been put forward by the applicant:

- Contribution to the delivery of development growth in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and associated economic benefits
- Contribution to improving traffic capacity and journey times
- Safety considerations
- Other improvements – controlled crossing, improved car park and vehicle charging points.

Delivery of development growth

298. Policy SD2 of the RBCLP lists the allocated sites outlined for development within the Borough. A number of the allocated sites are dependent on the delivery of necessary mitigation on the A320. Runnymede Borough Council consider that the allocated sites set out within policy SD2 are the most suitable when considered against the alternatives appraised through a robust site selection process and sustainability appraisal. The allocated sites are considered to offer the best opportunity to achieve sustainable development as well as the delivery of the spatial development strategy.

299. The proposed highway improvement works to the junction and link roads are considered to be essential to the delivery of approximately 3,500 new homes across 10 sites in and around Ottershaw and Chertsey. New supporting infrastructure is therefore required in order to meet the housing needs in the borough and deliver the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.

Contribution to improving traffic capacity and journey times

300. The proposed development would replace the existing roundabout and would provide transport benefits, including improved pedestrian and cycle routes. The design of the roundabout would significantly improve congestion and achieve the predicted 2030 traffic requirements resulting in improved journey time, reliability and time savings when compared with the existing junction.

301. The proposal would also promote the free flow of traffic reducing congestion within Ottershaw village.

Safety Considerations

302. The proposal includes shared pedestrian/cycle routes around the west side of the junction as a 4m wide footway/ cycleway. Whilst there is currently such a footway/ cycleway in this location this would be wider providing for improved access. The proposal also includes footway/ cycleway along the southern part of the application site with Foxhills Road/ Chobham Road and the

southern arm of the A320 again improving accessibility and safety for these users in this locality. There are also proposed increased footways/ cycleways around Brox Road. The controlled crossings at the desire lines would improve operational safety for non-motorised users. The junction geometry is based on a 30mph design speed for 85th percentile traffic. This is considered compatible with a busy urban junction. Improved controlled crossing points are proposed at Murray Road, Brox Road, Guildford Road and Chobham Road.

Conclusion of Green Belt

303. In this case, the proposal is for improvements to the existing highway which include a new roundabout, junctions, access, pedestrian and cycle connections and crossings, a relocated carpark, landscaping and associated infrastructure and engineering works. The proposed development is considered to cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, the proposal would not benefit from the exemption under paragraph 150, points a) and b) of the NPPF and would, by definition, be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Green Belt harms must carry substantial weight in the overall Green Belt balance in accordance with paragraph 148 of the NPPF.
304. Inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the development, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
305. The outcome of the application will be depended upon a balance between the protection of the Green Belt and the need to deliver housing and economic development with the Runnymede Borough.
306. Officers have found that the development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would cause harm to the openness and purpose c) of paragraph 138 of the NPPF. Collectively, these harms must carry substantial weight in the overall Green Belt balance.
307. Officers have reviewed the considerations put forward by the applicant and consider that the highway improvement works are necessary in order to deliver improvements to the local infrastructure network. These improvements are critical to the successful delivery of the spatial development strategy and allocated development sites, as identified within the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan.
308. Officers consider that great weight should be attributed to the delivery of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan in order to accommodate the planned economic growth and housing delivery.
309. Officers have reviewed the information put forward by the applicant as well as other considerations and conclude that the very special circumstances, in favour of the development, clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm, identified above. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with paragraph 148 of the NPPF and policy EE18 of the RBCLP.
310. Very special circumstances for this proposal exist and therefore planning permission should be granted.

Other

311. Under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021 the County Planning Authority is required to consult the Secretary of State in respect of major development comprising of a site area of more than 1 hectare in size as well as development which may have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The Direction states that the Planning Authority shall not grant planning permission on the application until the expiry of 21 days beginning with the date which the Secretary of State tells the Authority in writing is the date he

received the material specified. Therefore, subject to a resolution by the committee to grant planning permission, the application will need to be referred to the Secretary of State to determine whether the application shall be called-in. If the application is not called-in the permission can be issued.

Human Rights Implications

312. The Human Rights Act Guidance for Interpretation, contained in the Preamble to the Agenda is expressly incorporated into this report and must be read in conjunction with the following paragraph.
313. The proposal involves highway improvement works to the existing highway and the creation of a new junctions and roundabout. It is recognised that the development has the potential to have an impact on the local environment and local amenity in terms of noise and dust. The proposal would have a short term impact during the construction phase however during the operational phase would improve capacity and traffic flows through the junction. The scale of the impacts is not considered sufficient to engage Article 8 or Article 1 of Protocol 1 and, if planning permission were to be granted any impact has capacity of being controlled or mitigated by measures incorporated in the planning application proposed and planning conditions and controls available through other regulatory regimes.
314. In considering this application and framing the recommendation officers have considered both individual interests of objectors and those in the wider community. Having taken account of the all the facts officers consider that the wider community needs and benefits would resulting from the highway improvement works outweigh any impact on individuals.

Conclusion

315. Officers have determined that the proposal for highway improvements to junction 10 of the A320 Guilford Road, represents an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt as the proposal does not preserve the openness and conflicts with the purposes of including land within it.
316. Officers have reviewed the application and supporting documentation and accept that Local Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
317. Whilst the proposal would result in a larger spatial footprint within the Green Belt, whilst the road surface would be at ground level the vehicles themselves would also harm the visual dimensions of openness as would the ancillary street lighting and new landscaping.
318. The inclusion of new and replacement planting (on site and off site woodland and trees) would compensate for the localised impacts on the landscape character and would minimise longer term visual impacts once the planting is mature. The proposal is therefore not considered to have a detrimental impact on the character of the wider landscape area and over time would enhance the roadside character and wildlife within and around the application site.
319. On balance, the public benefit as well as the landscape and ecological mitigation measures proposed all weigh in favour of the proposal and therefore it is accepted that the proposal would

accord with the relevant NPPF policies and the policies within the RBCLP. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation

The recommendation is subject to referral to the Secretary of State under paragraph 10 of the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021, and in the absence of any direction by the Secretary of State, to PERMIT subject to the conditions and informatives set out below:

Conditions:

IMPORTANT - CONDITION NO(S) 4, 6, 9, 13, 14, 18, 19 and 21 MUST BE DISCHARGED PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

Commencement

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the following plans/drawings:

10041683-ARC-LLO-ZZ-DR-CE-00044 Rev P04 Scheme Location Plan Junction 10 November 2021

10041683-ARC-GEN-PKC_JC10-DR-HE-00001 rev P03 Work Package C Junction 10 Planning Application General Arrangement dated November 2021

10041683-ARC-GEN-PKC_JC10-DR-HE-00004 Rev P03 Work Package C Junction 10 Longitudinal Sections November 2021

10041683-ARC-GEN-PKC_JC10-DR-HE-00005 Rev P03 Work Package C Junction 10 Cross Sections November 2021

10041683-ARC-GEN-PKC_JC10-DR-HE-00006 rev P03 Work Package C Junction 10 Planning Application Outline Plan November 2021

10041683-ARC-ELS-PKC_JC10-DR-CE-00001 Rev P03 Work Package C Junction 10 Planning Application Proposed Planting Arrangement November 2021

10041683-ARC-ELS-PKC_JC10-DR-CE-00002 Rev P03 Work Package C Junction 10 Planning Application Proposed Planting Schedule November 2021

10041683-ARC-HLG-PKC_JC10-DR-LE-00001 P01 rev P01 Junction 10 Lighting Arrangement and Light Level Intensity (Lux Contours) 17 December 2021

10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00006 rev 01 Drawing 2 Proposed Habitat Creation Plan Junction page number 1 date 8 July 2022

1004-1683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00007 rev 01 Drawing 2 Proposed Habitat Creation Plan Junction page number 2 dated 8 July 2022

Hours of Construction

- 3. No construction vehicles and heavy goods vehicles (HGVs), shall enter or leave the site nor any plant or machinery shall be operated except between the following hours:

07:00 – 19:00 (Monday – Friday)

07:00-13:00 (Saturday)

There shall be no working on Sundays or recognised Public, Bank and National Holidays. Night time working shall only take place during the hours set out within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which is to be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in accordance with Condition 8.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

- 4. No development hereby permitted shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The CTMP shall include, but not be limited to, details of:

- (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- (c) storage of plant and materials
- (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- (e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- (f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation
- (g) vehicle routing
- (h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway

Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Landscaping

- 5. Within 6 months of the date of this permission, details of a Hard and Soft Landscaping Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- 1) a scaled plan showing all existing vegetation and landscape features to be retained and trees and other plants to be planted;
- 2) location, type and materials to be used for hard landscaping including specifications, where applicable for:
 - a) permeable paving
 - b) tree pit design
 - c) underground modular systems
 - d) Sustainable urban drainage integration
 - e) use within tree Root Protection Areas (RPAs);
- 3) specifications for operations associated with plant establishment and maintenance that are compliant with best practice;
- 4) types, materials and dimensions of all boundary treatments;

- 5) a planting schedule and specification, including sizes and numbers/densities of all proposed trees/other plants and section drawing(s) of tree pits where relevant;
- 6) details of how the existing ground and soil conditions are to be made suitable for tree and other planting;
- 7) a 10 year aftercare regime including provision for replacements for failed plantings and details of regular maintenance visits, including annual mulching and watering through the summer months with industry standard watering bags being provided to all new trees. Where new trees are to be supplied with a distinct crown, the supply, planting and maintenance of such trees shall be in general accordance with British Standard BS 8545:2014.

There shall be no excavation or raising or lowering of levels within the prescribed root protection area of retained trees. The landscaping and planting shall be carried out in accordance with British Standards BS 4428:1989 and BS 8545:2014. The site shall be landscaped and planted out strictly in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season after completion of the development, whichever is the sooner.

In the event of the failure of any soft landscape planting in the first 5 years of planting, such planting shall be replaced with an equivalent number of live specimens of the same species and size by no later than the end of the first available planting season following the failure, damage or removal of the planting.

The development shall be implemented and managed strictly in accordance with the approved scheme.

Tree Protection

6. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, including demolition, and before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site, a Tree Protection Plan and method statement shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing. The Tree Protection measures shall be carried out in accordance with the details as approved. The Tree Protection measures shall remain in place until all the works have been completed.
7. No trees, hedgerows or shrubs within the curtilage of the site, except those identified in paragraph 5.2.1 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ref: 10041683-ARC-HAC-PKC_JC10-RP-ZZ-00006 Rev 4.0) and shown on drawing Tree Impact and protection plan junction 10 ref: 10041683-ARC-EBD-ZZ-DR-EC-00018 Rev P02 or otherwise clearly indicated in any supporting documents as being removed or subject to arboricultural works, shall be felled, lopped or pruned nor their roots removed or pruned during the carrying out of the development, or until the completion of the development hereby permitted.

Landscape Ecological Management Plan

8. Within 6 months of the date of this permission, a landscape and ecology management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details. The LEMP shall include the on site provisions and the off site provisions as shown on plans 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-00006 Rev 01 and 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00007 Rev 01 dated 6 July 2022 but not be limited to the following:-

- Description and evaluation of features to be managed including scattered Broadleaved Trees, Semi-improved Neutral Grassland, Dense Scrub and Species-rich Hedgerows.

- Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- Aims and objectives of management
- Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives
- Prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments
- Preparation of work schedule (including an annual work plan)
- Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan
- Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures
- Funding mechanism by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body responsible for its delivery
- 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 approved scheme.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

9. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (including demolition and ground works), an updated Construction and Environment Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.
- a) Introduction
 - b) Planning Context
 - c) Overview and Project Introduction
 - d) Ecology and Environment Aspects
 - i. Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
 - e) Project Contact List
 - i. Responsible persons and lines of communication.
 - ii. The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
 - f) Construction Site Rules
 - g) Complaints Procedure
 - h) Emergency Spillage Plan
 - i) Night time working hours
 - j) Access and Deliveries
 - k) Site Logistics
 - l) Mitigation and Control Measures
 - i. Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).

- ii. The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- iii. The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- iv. Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
- v. Management of existing trees during construction (including replacement procedure of trees damaged/removed during/for construction);
- m) Site Waste Management Plan and management procedure for construction waste.
- n) Structure removal
- i. details of any structural works to be carried out;
 - ii. details of any remediation or restoration works to be carried out including what material would be used as infill and to what depth the material would be spread to; and if further soil is to be added details of the volume, depth and how the soil would be placed between any air gaps in the infill material to avoid soil being washed away over time;
 - iii. details of how trees around the existing structure would be protected during any works;
 - iv. whether further surveys are required;
 - v. Details of what plant and machinery to be used; and
 - vi. Access for structure removal including with regards to the Tree Protective measures
- o) Material Storage Plan
- p) Construction lighting to be used, including its location, hours of use and measures to ensure the lighting is downwards and directional.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Noise

- 10. Noise levels from demolition and construction works during standard construction hours specified in Condition 3 shall be allowed up to 70 dB(A) LAeq,1h at 1 m from the façade of any residential building within the vicinity of the site. Noise generating works shall not take place outside of the hours permitted in Condition 3 without prior consent from the Country Planning Authority (CPA).
- 11. All vehicles and mobile plant operating at the site under the control of the operator, which shall include plant and equipment hired by the operator or used by the contractors, must be fitted with white noise broadband reversing alarms that shall be used at all times.
- 12. All plant and machinery shall be adequately maintained and silenced in accordance with the manufacturers recommendations at all times.

Noise Monitoring

- 13. Prior to the commencement of development, a Noise and Vibration Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority, taking into account the limits set in Conditions 10. At the request of the Country Planning Authority (CPA), noise and/or vibration monitoring shall be undertaken at representative noise and vibration sensitive receptors located adjacent to the application site or calculated from measurements taken at the site boundary. The results of the monitoring shall be reported to the CPA within 14 days of the

monitoring taking place. Measurements should only be undertaken by those competent to do so (i.e. Member or Associate grade of the Institute of Acoustics).

Drainage

14. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:-
- a) The results of infiltration testing completed in accordance with the BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels.
 - b) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+20% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of the development. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. If infiltration is deemed unfeasible, associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using the maximum discharge rate stated within the approved documents.
 - c) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).
 - d) A plan showing exceedance flow (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk.
 - e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
 - f) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.
15. Within 3 months of the completion of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provided the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.

Lighting

16. No external lighting shall be installed as part of the development hereby permitted unless and until details of a lighting scheme for the site have been submitted in writing to the County Planning Authority for written approval. The submitted scheme shall be prepared by a lighting engineer with input from a suitably experienced Ecologist. The scheme shall be in accordance with the recommendations as set out in the approved (Bat Preliminary Assessment dated or Preliminary Ecological Assessment dated) submitted with the application and include the following:
- a) the location, type, mounting, height, lighting controls and luminance of the proposed lighting by means of submission of Isolux plots and drawings of the proposed scheme

- b) any measures proposed to minimise and control the light spill;
- c) details as to how the impact of lighting on bats has been minimised
- d) Measures for reviewing any unforeseen impacts.

The lighting scheme shall thereafter be implemented as specified within the approved document.

Ecology

17. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the recommendations set out within section 4.1.1 – 4.6.1 "Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Measures" of the submitted Ecological Mitigation Strategy (ref: 100441683-ARC-EGN-PKC_JC10-RP-EC-00001 Rev 3.0 dated November 2021) including the mitigation to address vegetation clearance and bird, bat and reptile habitats during site clearance works, construction phases and completion of the development.
18. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of a pre-construction badger survey as detailed in section 4.3.9 "Badgers" of the submitted Ecological Mitigation Strategy (ref: 100441683-ARC-EGN-PKC_JC10-RP-EC-00001 Rev 3.0 dated November 2021) including details of suitable mitigation measures including a plan of the location of any badger protection fencing if necessary, shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for approval in writing.

Management Agreement

19. Prior to commencement of development, a Management Agreement, in relation to the land shown on plans reference: Drawing 2 Proposed Habitat Creation Plan Junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-00006 Rev 01 and Drawing 2 Proposed Habitat Creation Plan Junction 10 10041683-ARC-EGN-ZZ-DR-ZZ-00007 Rev 01 dated 6 July 2022 shall be entered into between Surrey County Council and the land owner and a copy of the signed Management Agreement shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority. Prior to 31 March 2024 the land shall be delivered and planted in accordance with the LEMP in condition 8 and the Management Agreement.

Contamination

20. In the event that unsuspected contamination is found at any time when constructing the development hereby permitted, work in that area shall cease and it must be reported in writing immediately to the County Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken to identify what remediation is necessary with a remediation scheme prepared and submitted to the County Planning Authority for their written approval. Once the remediation works have been completed, a verification report confirming this shall be provided to the County Planning Authority for written approval. Once approved, the scheme shall be implemented in full throughout the duration of the construction period.

Retention of Bollards 2 Chobham House

21. Prior to commencement of development, a plan showing the location of the bollards to be installed at 2 Chobham House, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Thereafter the bollards shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained.

Reasons:

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

2. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. To protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties during the construction period in accordance with Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
4. To ensure that construction works can be carried out safely in order that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020. This condition is required prior to commencement of development in order to ensure the construction phase of the proposal is carried out safely and does not prejudice highway safety.
5. To ensure a satisfactory development and in the interest of amenity and landscape character and in accordance with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020 and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.
6. To protect the trees to be retained and enhance the appearance of the surrounding area and to comply with policy EE9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020 and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework. This condition is required prior to commencement of development in order to ensure that the existing trees, to be retained on site, will be protected during the construction works.
7. To protect the trees to be retained and enhance the appearance of the surrounding area and to comply with Policy EE9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020 and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. To ensure that the landscape character and appearance of the site is enhanced and to comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
9. To prevent pollution to the environment, to protect species of conservation concern, to ensure proper waste management; and to protect residential amenity in accordance with Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020. This condition is required prior to commencement of development in order to ensure that the proposal does not have an impact on the residential amenities of the nearby occupants.
10. To protect the amenity of residential occupiers during the construction period and in accordance with Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
11. To protect the amenity of residential occupiers during the construction period and in accordance with Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
12. To protect the amenity of residential occupiers during the construction period and in accordance with policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
13. To protect the amenity of residential occupiers during the construction period and in accordance with policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
14. To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and in accordance with Policy EE13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020. The condition is required pre-commencement so as to ensure that drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site in accordance with Policy EE13 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020 prior to any works being undertaken which may impact existing surface water drainage arrangements.
15. To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and in accordance with policy EE13 of the RBCLP.

16. To protect the safety and amenities of road users, occupiers of the nearby properties and in accordance with Policy EE2 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
17. To protect Priority Species and their habitats in accordance with Policy EE9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
18. To protect Priority Species in accordance with Policy EE9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020. This condition is required prior to commencement of development in order to ensure that the proposal does not have an impact on any potential badger setts within the application site.
19. To ensure that off site mitigation measures are provided and in accordance with policy EE9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020. This condition is required prior to commencement of development in order to ensure that the proposal provides off site Biodiversity Net Gain provision in accordance with the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report 10041683-ARC-EBD-PKC_JC10-RP-EC-00001 dated June 2021.
20. To protect the health of construction workers and the general public and quality of the water environment from the effects of contamination in accordance with policy EE2 of Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020.
21. To ensure that the heritage asset is protected and to comply with policy EE4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2020. This condition is required prior to commencement of development as they are functionally necessary to protect the listed building 2 Chobham Road.

Informatives:

1. The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (Section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or is being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this Act.

Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1 March and 31 August inclusive. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and are assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity during this period and shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.
2. The applicants are advised that badgers may be present on site. Badgers and their setts are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. It is a criminal offence to kill, injure or take badgers or to interfere with a badger sett. Should a sett be found on site during construction, work should stop immediately and Natural England should be contacted. During site preparation works, all open trenches, pits and excavations shall be covered outside working hours so that any transiting fauna that falls into the earthworks can escape.
3. In determining this application the County Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively with the applicant by: entering into pre-application discussions; assessing the

proposals against relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework including its associated planning practice guidance and European Regulations, providing feedback to the applicant where appropriate. Further, the County Planning Authority has: identified all material considerations; forwarded consultation responses to the applicant; considered representations from interested parties; liaised with consultees and the applicant to resolve identified issues and determined the application within the timeframe agreed with the applicant. Issues of concern have been raised with the applicant including impacts of and on noise/traffic/air quality/dust/heritage/landscape/ecology/visual impact/Green Belt and addressed through negotiation and acceptable amendments to the proposals. The applicant has also been given advance sight of the draft planning conditions. This approach has been in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

4. Biosecurity is very important to minimise the risks of pests and diseases being imported into the UK and introduced into the environment. It is recommended that all trees grown abroad, but purchased for transplanting, shall spend at least one full growing season on a UK nursery and be subjected to a pest and disease control programme. Evidence of this control programme, together with an audit trail of when imported trees entered the UK, their origin and the length of time they have been in the nursery should be requested before the commencement of any tree planting. If this information is not available, alternative trees sources should be used. You are advised to consult the relevant UK Government agencies such as the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) and the Forestry Commission for current guidance, Plant Passport requirements and plant movement restrictions. Quality Assurance Schemes followed by nurseries should also be investigated when researching suppliers. For larger planting schemes, you may wish to consider engaging a suitably qualified professional to oversee tree / plant specification and planting.

5. If 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.

[National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidancewaste; traveller sites; planning for schools development; sustainable drainage systems; parking and Starter Homes.](#)

Contact Janine Wright

Tel. no. 020 8541 9897

Background papers

The deposited application documents and plans, including those amending or clarifying the proposal, and responses to consultations and representations received, as referred to in the report and included in the application file.

For this application, the deposited application documents and plans, and responses to consultations, are available to view on our [online register](#). The representations received are publicly available to view on the district/borough planning register.

The Runnymede Borough Council planning register for this application can be found under application reference RU.21/2018.

Other documents

The following were also referred to in the preparation of this report:

Government Guidance

[National Planning Policy Framework](#)

[Planning Practice Guidance](#)

The Development Plan

[Runnymede Local Plan 2030](#)

[Supplementary Planning Document – Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation \(2020\)](#)

Other Documents

The Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan (LTP4)

[institute of Air Quality Management 'Guidance on the assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction v1.1' 2018](#)

[Environmental Protection UK\(EPUK\)/Institute of Air Quality Management \(IAQM\) 'Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality' 2017](#)

[Design Manual for Roads and Bridge](#)

[Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic England, December 2017](#)

[Planning \(Listed Building and Conservation Areas\) Act 1990](#)

[Surrey County Council, Landscape Character Assessment, 2015](#)