

**To:** Planning & Regulatory Committee

**Date:** 26 June 2024

**By:** Planning Development Manager

**District:** Runnymede Borough Council

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

**Case Officer:**  
Charlotte Parker

**Purpose:** For Decision

**Grid Ref:** 502613 163703

**Title:** Surrey County Council Proposal RU.23/0474

## Summary Report

**Former Brockhurst Care Home, Brox Road, Ottershaw, Surrey KT16 0HQ**

**Outline application for the erection of 3-4 storey building for extra care accommodation, comprising self-contained apartments, staff and communal facilities, and associated parking. Appearance and Landscaping reserved.**

The application site is located close to the Ottershaw village centre, on land owned by Surrey County Council. The site, with frontages to Brox Road and Slade Road, was previously occupied by the former Brockhurst care home. This building was demolished in 2021 and hoarding now encloses the site.

The site is in a predominantly residential part of Ottershaw, with a mix of houses and flats to the north, south and west and commercial uses (day nursery and yard) to the east.

This is an outline application seeking self-contained extra care accommodation with associated facilities (indicatively 51 units). The application has been submitted by Surrey County Council under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations (1992). At this outline stage the planning considerations relate only to the principle of the development, including the layout, scale and means of access. The detailed design (appearance) and site landscaping are reserved matters which would be submitted at a later stage.

As originally submitted in 2023, the application sought a U shaped building of between one and three storeys in height. Amendments were sought to address issues in relation to the bulk and massing of the building, and its relationship with neighbouring properties. An amended scheme was subsequently submitted in March 2024, and re-consultation carried out. Negotiations have also been taking place regarding mitigation measures for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and these would be secured as part of any permission.

A total of 28 representations were received in relation to the application as originally submitted; a further 8 sets of supplementary comments were then received (from those who originally commented) in relation to the amended plans received in March 2024. A further 32 representations (from those who had not originally commented) were then received in response to the re-consultation carried out in March 2024. Comments made in these representations are

summarised in the report, but relate primarily to the scale, massing and design of the building, and its impact on neighbour amenity.

Runnymede Borough Council raised no objection, but requested that full consideration is given to representations made on the application, and the scale and massing of the building.

Other statutory and technical consultees have provided advice on a range of issues, and this has either been reflected in additional information submitted during the course of the application or in proposed conditions.

Officers are satisfied that development of this scale and nature could be satisfactorily accommodated on the site, subject to details which would be submitted at the reserved matters stage or required by condition.

**It is recommended that pursuant to Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the Committee resolves to grant outline planning permission for application ref: RU.23/0474, subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure payment (SANG and SMM) to mitigate the impact of the development of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and subject to the recommended planning conditions.**

---

## **Application details**

### **Applicant**

SCC Property

### **Date application valid**

22 March 2023

### **Period for Determination**

21 June 2023

### **Amending Documents**

Statement of Need Rev 1.3 dated February 2024

BNG Metric Rev 1.5 dated 1 February 2024

Design and Access Addendum report (amended design proposal) Rev P2 dated 19 February 2024

Sustainable Drainage Systems Rev 2.0 dated 2 February 2024

Transport Statement Addendum Rev 1.1 dated 19 February 2024

Arboricultural Appraisal and Impact Assessment dated 25 January 2024

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Metric 4.0 – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology

BNG Assessment Letter dated 31 January 2024

Addendum Planning Statement dated February 2024

Supplementary Air Quality Report Rev 1.0 dated 1 February 2024

Sustainable Design and Construction Statement Rev 3.0 dated 2 February 2024

Energy Statement Rev 1.0 dated January 2024

Daylight Sunlight Report (Neighbouring Properties) dated 1 February 2024

Landscape Statement Rev P02 dated 16 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90200 – Rev P04 - General Arrangements – Indicative Elevations (1 of 2) dated 19 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-DR-A-90201 – Rev P04 - General Arrangements – Indicative Elevations (2 of 2) dated 19 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-B1-DR-A-90111 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans – Basement Floor dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-A-90112 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Ground Floor dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-01-DR-A-90113 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - First Floor dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-02-DR-A-90114 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Second Floor dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-03-DR-A-90116 Rev P02 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Third Floor dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-RF-DR-A-90115 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans – Roof dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-RF-DR-A-90103 Rev P03 – Proposed Indicative Roof Site Plan dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-LL-DR-A-90302 Rev P03 – Proposed Indicative Site Sections dated 19 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90301 Rev P03 – Existing Site Sections dated 19 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX- 00-DR-L-40101 Rev P02 – Landscape Illustrative Masterplan dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-C-70001 Rev P02 – Proposed Drainage Strategy dated 2 February 2024

Plan number PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-L-40102 Rev P03 – Landscape Proving Plan dated 28 May 2024

---

## 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 of the proposal in accordance with the development plan?**

**Paragraphs in the report where this has been discussed**

Principle and Need	Yes	42-55
Layout, Design and Character	Yes	56-78
Residential Amenity	Yes	79-91
Highways, Access and Parking	Yes	92-104
Trees and Landscaping	Yes	104-117
Sustainable Design	Yes	118-132
Flood Risk and Drainage	Yes	133-139
Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain	Yes	140-154
Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	Yes	155-167
Air Quality	Yes	168-176
Heritage Assets	Yes	177-184

## Illustrative material

### Site Plan

Plan 1 – Site Location and Application Site

### Aerial Photographs

Aerial 1 – Surrounding Area

Aerial 2 – Application Site

## Background

### Site Description

1. The application site is located in the settlement and urban area of Ottershaw, approximately 200m south of the village centre and A320. It falls within Character Area 2a (Formal Suburban – Town) as defined in the Runnymede Design Guide (2021), and adjoining land falling within Area 2b (Formal Suburban – Landscape).
2. The 0.56ha site was formerly occupied by a 46 bed elderly persons care home (Brockhurst) which was demolished in 2021. The existing site access is to the north-west corner of the site, on Brox Road. The vacant site is currently secured, with hoardings to the two main road frontages, and to the residential areas to the north and west.
3. To its south-east side the site fronts Slade Road, with housing fronting the site on the south side of the road set back slightly behind hedging (Nos. 2-10 evens). Adjoining the site to the north-east is a group of recently constructed houses, Nos. 11-23 (odds) Slade Road, which are set back from the road behind a planted verge and parking area. Behind this group is a terrace of housing (Nos 1-9 Slade Court) and its parking/garaging.

4. To the north-west the site adjoins the rear of properties in Crawshaw Road (Nos 1-6 incl. Summerfield Place and Nos. 7-14 incl Crawshaw Road), and a parking court which is located to the north-west corner of the site. To the south-west the site fronts Brox Road, with a mix of housing (Nos. 56- 62) and commercial premises (No 64/builders yard and Nos. 68-72 Toad Hall day nursery) fronting it on the opposite side of the road. The site retains a number of trees (a mix of deciduous and evergreen), with some low hedging to the road frontages.
5. The former building on the site has been demolished, leaving a cleared site with some retained areas of grass, and areas of loose earth, fine rubble and gravel. The site retains a number of trees.

### Planning History

6. The original residential care home (46 place care home for the elderly) was constructed in the late 1960s (planning ref: CHE.18974/1).
  7. Prior approval for the demolition of the building was granted in October 2021 under reference RU.21/0041; the building has since been demolished.
- 

### The Proposal

8. Outline planning permission is sought for the erection of a three and four storey building, to provide specialist housing designed for older people (Class C2). The building would contain up to 51 one bed roomed self-contained apartments, with communal and staff areas.
9. The housing would be for the affordable rental sector. Tenancies would be awarded in accordance with a nominations agreement between Runnymede Borough Council (as the local housing authority), Surrey County Council (as the local care authority) and a regulated social housing provider as the operator.
10. The proposed building would be L shaped, with frontages to Brox Road and Slade Road (set back behind landscaped areas). As this is an outline application the precise design is not for consideration at this stage, however the illustrative plans indicate that the four storey sections would be positioned at the Brox Road/Slade Road junction (forming a corner feature), and on the inside of the building facing into the garden area. The remainder of the building would be three storeys in height, stepping down to either end of the 'L' (partly accommodating plant and equipment, and a possible green roof). Solar photovoltaic (PV) panels are indicatively shown on the roof (ie. above the four storey section). In addition, a partial basement section would be provided to the centre of the building. The main entrance to the building would be to the west facing elevation (on Brox Road).
11. As originally submitted, the proposed building was U shaped and of predominantly two and three storeys in height (with one section at single storey). The northernmost wing has since been omitted from the proposals due to concerns raised by Officers in relation to proximity to neighbouring occupiers and the amenity of future occupiers. The removal of this wing and associated reduction of the building's footprint, and reconfiguration of the layout, has necessitated the increased height.
12. The maximum height of the building would be 13.4m (four storey section), and it would have a footprint of 1450 sq. m and floor area of 5750 sq.m. The building would be flat roofed. Ground floor apartments would have small private gardens, with balconies indicated to serve each of the upper floor units.

13. The proposed south-west facing wing (Brox Road elevation) would measure 55m by 16m. The proposed south-east wing would project a further 28m along Slade Road, also to a maximum depth of 16m. The four storey sections would be to a maximum height of 13.4m.
  14. In addition to the self-contained apartments, the building shown illustratively would contain an entrance/reception area, kitchen, dining room, communal lounge, activity/therapy room, staff facilities, refuse and mobility scooter/cycle stores (all at ground floor level). Further space for plant would be provided at basement level.
  15. The new building would be central to the site, broadly in the location of the previous building, with the majority of trees and the existing boundary treatment retained. Hard and soft landscaping would be provided including paved seating areas. Illustrative drawings show a network of paths and grassed areas to the wider site.
  16. Access would be from Brox Road (utilising the existing access point), with 25 parking spaces provided to the north side of the site (to include two disabled spaces and a drop off bay).
  17. This application is an **Outline Application**, seeking permission for means of access, layout, and scale. Appearance and landscaping are Reserved Matters which would be submitted for approval at a later date, should outline planning permission be granted.
- 

## Consultations and publicity

### District Council

18. Runnymede Borough Council - Does not consider there are grounds to object to the principle of this development, subject to full and proper assessment against National Planning Policy (The NPPF), The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and the Council's Design Guide. Full consideration and weight also needs to be given to the issues and concerns raised by local residents and the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum. Comments as follows:
  - Concerns raised that the increased scale of the building (extending to 4 storeys) would fail to respond positively to the character of the local area which is characterised by predominantly two storey development. The application should be supported with scaled street scene elevations which provides details of the proposed scale of the building and how this would relate to the scale and design of existing surrounding development.
  - Following an assessment of the supporting documents and plans the council is of the opinion that the development would not be sympathetic to existing local character and would fail to protect and enhance the existing local context.
  - The proposed increase in scale of the building to 4 storeys coupled with its positioning also has the potential to result in adverse impacts upon the amenities of existing two storey residential properties located to the north along Crawshaw Road and their garden areas. This has the potential to result in overlooking, loss of privacy and overbearing impact.
  - Further consideration should therefore be given by SCC to the scale and layout of the development having regard to policies in the development plan and the councils Design SPD, to the scale and character of neighbouring development and to the impact on residential amenity.

### **Consultees (Statutory and Non-Statutory)**

19. Affinity Water Ltd – No views received.
20. Arboriculturalist – No objection subject to conditions in relation to planting and service details.
21. Archaeological Officer – No objection. No further archaeological investigation required.
22. Historic/Listed Buildings – No objection. No material impact on the locally listed building.
23. RPS Planning & Dev Ltd - Air Quality – No objection subject to mitigation measures being secured by condition (Dust Management Plan or Construction Environmental Management Plan)
24. RPS Planning & Dev Ltd – Noise – No objection subject to the imposition of conditions.
25. SuDS & Consenting Team – No objection subject to the imposition of conditions.
26. County Ecologist – No objection subject to the imposition of condition.
27. Thames Water – No objection raised in relation to waste water network or sewage treatment network. Suggests imposition of condition in relation to piling (due to proximity of strategic sewer).
28. Transport Development Planning Reg 3 – No objection subject to the imposition of conditions.
29. Borough Environmental Health officer – No objection on the basis that it appears the site is suitable for the proposed development provided suitable mitigation methods are employed. Requests submission of noise impact assessment at reserved matters stage.

### **Parish/Town Council and Amenity Groups**

30. Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum – Support expressed for the principle of extra care housing on the site, but considers the building to be unacceptably tall and have excessive massing, which will be harmful to the character of the area and street scene. Does not support the suggestion that the massing at the Brox Road/Slade Road junction will constitute a landmark feature. Cites the absence of other four storey accommodation in Ottershaw, and decisions taken by Runnymede BC in refusing other three storey development. Considers the development will have an unacceptable impact on the Old School locally listed building. Overall the development is contrary to Runnymede’s design guidance. Insufficient parking – will result in overspill onto neighbouring roads. Will impact on highway safety (conflict with nearby commercial uses). Highlights inconsistencies with BNG calculations (NB. These have been addressed – see ecology section below).
31. Ottershaw and West Addlestone Residents – (comments made in relation to original scheme in 2023). Supports the submission from Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum. Whilst the principle of providing this form of care is beyond doubt, the design put forward in this planning application fails in every aspect – it would be a disaster for Ottershaw and is without any consideration whatsoever for the surrounding street scene.

### **Summary of publicity undertaken and key issues raised by public**

32. The application as submitted in March 2023 was publicised by the posting of 3 site notices and an advert was placed in the local newspaper. A total of 231 owner/occupiers of neighbouring properties were directly notified by letter. The revised application (March 2024) was publicised by the posting of 3 site notices and an advert was placed in the local newspaper. Letters were sent to all those previously notified, plus those who had made comments on the application in 2023.

33. A total of 28 representations were received in relation to the application as originally submitted; a further 8 supplementary sets of comments were then received (from those who originally commented) in relation to the amended plans received in March 2024. A further 32 representations (from those who had not originally commented) were then received in response to the re-consultation carried out in March 2024.
34. Representations made on the plans as originally submitted in 2023 raised objections on the following matters including:
- Scale of building too great for site – overdevelopment
  - The proposed design fails to comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede Local Plan (and design guidance) due to massing, use of materials and failure to incorporate a landmark feature
  - The proposed building is generic and out of character with Ottershaw village and its local vernacular
  - Height and footprint of building too great – should be the same as previous building on site
  - Insufficient parking provision – will result in displacement of parking to neighbouring roads
  - Ottershaw is not well served with public transport (not reflected in proposed parking provision)
  - Loss of residential amenity to surrounding properties due to overlooking from windows and balconies (over greater number of storeys than previously), loss of light, noise and air pollution (cars)
  - Design and layout not suitable for elderly people with additional needs; courtyard area would be in shade
  - Queries raised over definition of extra care housing and proposed occupancy
  - Concern over further loss of hedgerow and trees, including ‘landmark’ conifers on corner of Slade Road and Brox Road
  - Concern raised over cumulative impact of this and other major development in the area on infrastructure, including drainage
  - Will increase flood risk/surface water flooding

Further objections were raised in relation to the amended plans (March 2024) as follows:

- Design and massing remains out of character with the area, increase in height to four storeys unacceptable, no other four storey buildings in Ottershaw
- Proposed design remains at odds with Policy EE1, design guidance and emerging neighbourhood plan design code (need for ‘feathering’, incorporation of landmark feature) and will be overdominant in street scene
- Refusals by Runnymede BC on grounds of height/character cited as examples (including 20m telecoms mast)
- Building too close to road (at corner of Brox Road/Slade Road junction)
- Design ‘looks more like a prison than a care home’ – more sympathetic design required
- Increase in unit numbers (from 44 to 51) when compared to originally submitted scheme unacceptable
- Insufficient space around building to provide suitable landscaping (and amenity space)
- Proposed amendments do not overcome previous concerns over impact on light levels to neighbouring properties, and overlooking from windows and balconies
- Unsuitable environment for future occupiers (‘throwback’ design for care homes)
- Previous comments in relation to insufficient parking provision re-iterated (suggestion that increased parking could be provided in place of some of proposed landscaping)
- Needs space for other vehicles such as ambulances (as care home)



- Will result in increase in traffic on already congested roads and potential conflict with HGV movements (nearby operator)
- Impact on local GP provision (site should be redeveloped for surgery)
- Additional comments raised in relation to impact on local infrastructure (roads, utilities, drainage, public services, schools, parks)
- Impact on locally listed building (Old School) should be taken into account
- Query over BNG calculations (due to removal of section of hedge)
- Loss of trees

35. Support was expressed through both rounds of consultation for the principle of providing extra care housing on the site.

## Planning considerations

### Introduction

36. 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.
37. In this case the statutory development plan for consideration of the application consists of the Surrey Waste Local Plan Part 1 – Policies and Part 2 – Sites, which together form the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2019-2033 (**SWLP**), the South East Plan 2009 (retained Policy NRM6 only) (**SEP**) and Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (**RBLP**).
38. In addition, Runnymede Borough Council has adopted relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance as follows; Runnymede Design SPD July 2021 (**RD**); Runnymede Parking Guidance SPD 2022 (**RPG**) and Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area SPD 2021 (**TBHSPA**).
39. On 14 October 2020, members of Runnymede Borough Council Planning Committee resolved to designate the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum and Ottershaw Neighbourhood Area as submitted. The preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for Ottershaw is underway, however due to the stage of plan preparation no weight can be given in this regard.
40. In considering this application the acceptability of the proposed development will be assessed against relevant development plan policies and material considerations.
41. 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 case the main planning considerations are considered to be; the principle of the development and its impact on character of the area with particular reference to height, massing and design; impact on residential amenity, highways considerations; and the impact on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA).

### PRINCIPLE AND NEED

#### Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP)

#### Policy SD1: Spatial Development Strategy

#### Policy SD5: Infrastructure Provision and Timing

#### Policy SL20: Affordable Housing

#### Policy SL23: Accommodating Older Persons and Students

42. Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states:

*‘To support the government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay’.*

43. Paragraphs 61 and 62 set out how housing need should be determined, and the NPPF goes on to state in Paragraph 63:

*‘Within this context of establishing need, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. These groups should include (but are not limited to) those who require affordable housing; families with children; older people (including those who require retirement housing, housing-with-care and care homes); students; people with disabilities; service families; travellers; people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes.’*

44. RBCLP Policy SL20 seeks the delivery of affordable housing as a proportion (30%) of all housing delivered over the Plan period, of which around 70% will be delivered as Affordable/Social Rent. Policy SL23 states that the Council will support proposals for specialist accommodation for older people, including sheltered housing, care homes and other appropriate forms of accommodation on suitable sites, to meet needs that have been identified in the Council’s most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). It will be expected that proposed development is readily accessible to public transport, shops, local services, community facilities and social networks for residents, carers and their visitors.

45. These policies sit within the wider framework set out in the RBCLP, which seeks in Policy SD1 (Spatial Development Strategy) to deliver a minimum of 7507 net additional dwellings over the plan period, and in Policy SD5 (Infrastructure Provision and Timing) to deliver social and community infrastructure which includes affordable housing.

46. The County Council has produced “planning guidance for accommodation with care for older people” (April 2024). The guidance refers to housing (C2) within care settings and states that the following elements should be provide:-

- support for older people with care and other needs;
- support for independent living ensuring residents remain active;
- support for residents to avoid admission into care homes as their needs increase;
- provision of facilities for residents such as craft rooms, communal lounge and dining room;
- provision of office space for secure record keeping;
- alarm system to call for support in cases of emergencies;
- best practice design standards, layout and accessibility in the overall design;
- 24/7 on-site support to residents and emergency care response;

47. Surrey County Council’s (SCC) Cabinet approved an Accommodation with Care and Support (AwCS) Strategy on 16 July 2019. Underlying this Strategy is the significant strain being experienced by the care and support system, and the challenges being faced due to Surrey’s ageing population and the lack of specialist accommodation which enables older people to remain and be cared for in their communities as their needs increase.

48. ‘Extra Care’ is a term applied to housing for older people, often (but not exclusively) in the social rented sector, provided in self-contained units with access to care, support, domestic, social, community and other services. SCC has identified that of the various types of specialist housing, extra care accommodation has the greatest shortfall between demand and provision, particularly in terms of affordable rented provision.

49. As part of its AwCS Strategy, SCC seeks to achieve a minimum of 25 extra care units per 1000 of Surrey’s population of over 75s by 2030. This site has been identified along with

a number of others in Surrey as being suitable for extra care housing. If approved, the delivery of around 51 extra care units as proposed would meet an identified need in Runnymede and deliver against the target set in the Strategy.

50. There is no objection in land use terms to this site being developed to provide extra care accommodation. The site was previously occupied by a residential home for the elderly, constructed in the 1960s and demolished in 2021. As such there would be no change of use of the land, and the site would continue to provide accommodation for older people.
51. The proposal would meet an identified need for accommodation which supports older people with care needs, enabling residents to live independently within their local community. Additional and/or more complex care needs would be available to residents should it be required. Communal facilities such as craft and therapy rooms, dining, lounge and kitchen areas would be provided, encouraging residents to participate in shared activities to promote health and wellbeing. A bespoke care package, suitable to meet the residents' needs, would be delivered by care workers. Staff would be on-site 24/7 to ensure that care needs are met and emergencies responded to.
52. As outlined in the Statement of Need accompanying this application (paragraph 3.10), extra care provision has been made across a number of sites in Runnymede in recent years. However, the tenure of these units is primarily leasehold and there are currently no market-led schemes in the pipeline.
53. Another affordable extra care housing scheme (up to 48 units) in Runnymede is under consideration, this being for the former Birchlands Care Home site in Englefield Green (planning reference RU.24/0071). However, one of the facilities listed in the Statement as providing affordable 56 units of extra care accommodation for social rent, Aldwyn Place in Egham, is in the process of being converted away from a housing with care model, which will result in a loss of provision in the Borough. The Runnymede planning profile for accommodation with care for older people (April 2024) identifies a growing need over time for affordable extra care housing, and across Surrey there remains a significant demand gap to be filled by SCC and partner organisations in the delivery of affordable extra care units.
54. Representations have been received which raise concern over the potential impact of the development on local infrastructure and services. In this regard it is noted that the site previously provided accommodation for older people, albeit within a different 'model' of delivery. No specific shortfall or deficiency has been identified as part of the consultation process on this application (aside from the need to mitigate impact on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA – see paragraphs 155-167 below). Specific reference has been made in representations to the impact on local healthcare provision, in particular the capacity of the local GP surgery. On this point, this housing would be prioritised for people already within the local community and therefore already within the local healthcare system. Furthermore, one of expected outcomes of providing extra care accommodation such as this is that people are less reliant on or in need of GP and emergency care due to the on-site support provided. It is not considered therefore that this development would impact significantly on local healthcare provision or capacity.
55. The development of this site for up to 51 units would be in accordance with national and development plan policy which seeks to boost the supply of housing generally, and specialist housing for different groups in the community in particular – in this case older people. The proposal would also align with the aims of the AwCS Strategy and make a contribution to closing the identified gap in the supply of affordable extra care housing across the County.

56. Paragraphs 131-141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) seek to promote the creation of well-designed places. Paragraph 135 states that:

*'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:*

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

57. Further detailed guidance is set out in the National Design Guide (2019). This sets out the Government's priorities for design in the form of ten characteristics, stating that the underlying purpose for design quality and the quality of new development at all scales is to create well-designed and well-built places that benefit people at all stages of life (including the elderly) and communities.

58. RBCLP Policy EE1 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 land. New development should seek to create attractive and resilient places which contribute positively to the Borough's townscape, with particular reference to enhancing the public realm, providing safe environments and ensuring accessibility in all its forms. Particular regard should be had to the layout, scale, materials and detailing of development, as well as the Runnymede Design SPD and (where applicable) adopted Neighbourhood Plans. It should be ensured that there would be no adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of the proposed development, or to neighbouring properties, and provide all development should provide an appropriate standard of private amenity space.

59. The Runnymede Design SPD (RD) (2021) defines twelve 'aspirations' for the Borough, describing the place the Council wants Runnymede to be in the future. These include the creation of healthier and safer communities, with greater emphasis on walking and cycling, the provision of 'inclusive' people friendly places delivering a range of high quality new homes and new development, the need to address sustainability and climate change and the future proofing of development. A series of 25 'design standards' are then provided, based on these aspirations, with four overarching standards; (1) Strengthening Runnymede's Character, (2) Making People-Friendly Places (3), Place-Making and Creating Character and (4) Achieving Sustainable Design. The guidance is set against the wider policy context that Runnymede is expected to deliver around 500 dwellings per year over the plan period (to 2030) and the need to make good use of land whilst respecting the environmental characteristics of individual sites.

60. The RD SPD categorises areas of the borough by character, the Brockhurst site being in Character Area 2a (Formal Suburban – Town), but on the edge of Area 2b (Formal Suburban – Landscape). Areas identified as ‘2a’ – amongst other characteristics – have a domestic/residential scale, buildings are of traditional materials (brick, stone, render, pebble dash), with high levels of homogeneity in type of dwelling (age, form, height, mass); and often at two storeys. Characteristics of area 2b to the south (on the other side of Brox Road) are; residential dwellings facing the street in semi-detached or detached formations, but loosely grouped on larger than average plots; streets less well defined by buildings; more open; buildings set back but visible with greater evidence of trees and greenery influenced by a more distinctive setting (e.g, rising land, settlement edge); sense of space and width.
61. Within this broad context, specific standards seek to guide development such that it (amongst other considerations) responds positively to the site, local character and history; uses building heights positively paying attention to roofscape; results in good buildings and well-designed spaces between them; uses focal points and corners to create variety and; ensures residential amenity.
62. This proposal is in outline, with layout, scale and access for consideration at this stage, and appearance and landscaping as ‘reserved matters’ for future consideration.
63. ‘Layout’ is defined in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) as ‘the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development’. ‘Scale’ is defined as the ‘height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings’.
64. As such, whilst the layout and overall scale of the development can be considered, the building’s external appearance including - for example, the position of window openings and balconies, materials and other detailing - is not for consideration at this stage. Similarly, details of hard and soft landscaping would be reserved for future consideration, though the spaces they would occupy form part of the ‘layout’ and can be assessed accordingly.
65. ‘Access’, defined as ‘the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network’, is also for consideration at this stage and would include the access routes (vehicular and pedestrian) and car parking area.
66. In terms of layout, the proposed building would have an L shaped footprint, and although different in form from the previous building, it would overlap with its former footprint. The south-east facing wing would be positioned relatively close to the road frontage (Slade Road), behind a landscaped area, with the south-west facing wing (to Brox Road) positioned such that the separation from the road would increase towards the site entrance and northern site boundary. The parking and turning area would be located to the north side of the building, with the remainder of the site landscaped with a mix of planted, grassed and hard surfaced areas, trees, and provision of ancillary structures including seating.
67. In terms of scale, the building would be a mix of three and four storeys in height, the four storey element focused around the ‘corner’ fronting the Brox Road/Slade Road junction. Further four storey sections would be located on the inner side of the ‘L’, facing into the site. As such, the massing of the building would be dispersed and broken up, with the most prominent section when viewed from the public realm being that at the apex/corner of the building.

68. It should be noted that whilst illustrative details have been submitted with the application, to show how the development might look on completion, they are not for consideration at this stage and are subject to change. The assessment below will be carried on this basis.
69. The previous building on site was two storeys in height, cruciform in footprint, and flat roofed. Its utilitarian and institutional appearance was such that it made no contribution to the public realm or street scene, and by virtue of its set back position from both road frontages was partially glimpsed behind trees and hedging rather than prominent in the street scene. By contrast, the proposed building has been designed to be 'outward facing', with principal elevations fronting and in part closer to both Brox Road and Slade Road. It would also be taller than the previous building, with accommodation over three and four storeys. The proposal would also result in the removal of trees on the Brox Road/Slade Road junction (see paragraphs 104-117 below), resulting in the building being visible and prominent in the street scene.
70. As set out above, the RD SPD sets out 25 'design standards' for new development, with four overarching standards; strengthening Runnymede's character, making people-friendly places, place-making and creating character and achieving sustainable design. Other design standards relate to site context (responding positively to the site, local character and local history); site layout and masterplanning (making good connections, creating a permeable and legible structure, using building heights positively, reinforcing landscape character and biodiversity and using landmarks, gateways, focal points and corners are used to create variety); and detailed design (designing the space between buildings, protecting and enhancing ecology and biodiversity, providing for vehicle and cycle parking, ensuring residential amenity and remembering 'forgotten' elements).
71. As set out in the planning history section above, the previous building on the site was built in the 1960s as a residential care home for the elderly. Previous to this, the land had been used in association with Ottershaw Hospital, built as an isolation hospital in 1881. Historic maps indicate that hospital buildings and associated land occupied much of the land bounded by Murray Road, Brox Road and Slade Road in the early part of the twentieth century. The area has since been redeveloped for housing on an incremental basis, resulting on a patchwork of residential cul de sacs of late C20th and early C21st housing, both flatted development and housing, and predominantly of two and three storeys in height. Within this wider area there is other purpose-built retirement accommodation (Alan Hilton Court), this being a substantial two and three storey building arranged around a central courtyard.
72. Based on the previous use of the site, and history and development of the wider area, the proposed use is considered appropriate for the site. In locational terms, it is close to the services and facilities in the centre of Ottershaw which would be easily accessible for future residents. The proposed building would be larger (and taller) than the existing, however it is considered that it responds positively to the corner position of the site (with two long road frontages) and has been designed appropriately given other site constraints, including the relationship with neighbouring properties. Whilst detailed design is a reserved matter, the massing as proposed would allow for the creation of a focal point to the building at its apex on the Brox Road/Slade Road junction, which is prominent in the street scene when approaching from the west (Brox Road) (design standard).
73. The RD SPD makes specific reference to the height, bulk and massing of new buildings, and requires that it relates well to its local context. On this point a number of representations made on the application express the view that the proposal is unacceptably tall and bulky, and out of character with Ottershaw.
74. It is acknowledged that development of more than three storeys in height does not form part of the character of the area, and that the majority of buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site are of domestic scale (two storeys, some with roofspace accommodation). The majority are also of traditional form with brick elevations and pitched roofs. The provision of a building with four storey elements, with a flat roof, would

therefore be a departure from the established pattern of development in the area. However, it is considered that subject to detailed design, a building of this height and massing could be successfully accommodated on the site. This is due to the size and configuration of the site, and its long established use as a care home with a non-domestic layout, scale and appearance. There would also be sufficient space to provide appropriate landscaping both to the front and rear of the building, including the provision of new tree planting and hedgerows.

- 75. Furthermore, as set out in national planning guidance and National Design Guide, in addition to appearance and detailing, design encapsulates the function and connectivity of development, encouraging the provision of well-designed and well-built places that benefit people at all stages of life, including the elderly. The potential of sites should be optimised to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development, and should be safe, inclusive and accessible places which promote health and well-being.
- 76. As set out previously, this development seeks to meet an urgent need for modern, purpose-built affordable housing for the elderly. Extra care housing facilities need to include both self-contained living accommodation, and ancillary and communal facilities for residents and staff. This requires a critical mass of development, and a layout which functions for this use. Such development should also be well located in relation to local facilities and services, with good connectivity to them including on foot, and by bicycle and mobility scooter.
- 77. As set out above, this site is very well located in relation to the centre of Ottershaw. There is a continuous, level footway from the site to the village centre to the north, where there are a number of shops and community facilities (village hall, social club). A doctors' surgery is located approximately 200m to the south of the site (Bousley Rise). Buses serving Ottershaw connect with a number of destinations including Woking, Staines, Chertsey, St Peters Hospital and Kingston, as well as local services to Addlestone and West Byfleet. Services 593 and 446 run from the bus stop on Brox Road outside the application site, and serve Woking, Staines and Chertsey. This connectivity and accessibility accords with RD design standard 10 which requires development to make good connections, including with nearby services, facilities and transport nodes.
- 78. The residential amenity of future residents, including through the provision of shared and private amenity space, will be addressed in more detail below. However, inasmuch as this relates to design, it is considered that this would be a well-designed and well-built development which would be fit for purpose, providing also an appropriate balance between making efficient use of land and safeguarding the character of the area.

**RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

**Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP)**  
**Policy EE1 – Townscape and Landscape Quality**  
**Policy EE2 – Environmental Protection**  
**Runnymede Design SPD – July 2021**

79. Paragraph 191 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states that:

*‘Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to 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 ;*
- (b) *identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and*
- (c) *limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.'*

80. RBCLP Policy EE1 states that development proposals will be supported where they ensure that there is no adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of the development proposed or to neighbouring property or uses and provide an appropriate standard of private amenity space.
81. RD 2021 Design Standard 24 states that all dwellings must be designed with high quality internal and external space to accommodate different lifestyles and a range of private and communal activities. Accommodation must be designed to provide suitable levels of natural daylight and sunlight to new and existing properties, and designs should make sure that habitable rooms enjoy reasonable levels of privacy and provide private amenity spaces where possible and appropriate. To safeguard privacy, a distance of 22m between facing habitable rooms is considered acceptable as a rule of thumb for flatted development. However it also states that as buildings get higher, greater spacing may be required between elevations to avoid overlooking and compromised privacy. It also states that distance may also need to be increased to avoid overshadowing.
82. The application site has residential properties immediately adjoining it on all sides. On its north-west side the site adjoins the rear of properties fronting Crawshaw Road, comprising three pairs of semi-detached houses (Summerfield Place) with rear gardens abutting the site boundary, a terrace of six houses (Nos 1-6), also with gardens abutting the site boundary, and a linked building comprising four flats (Nos 7-10) which is separated from the site by a car parking/turning area. In all cases accommodation is over two storeys, with living areas to the ground floor and bedrooms over (for the houses). The flatted element has its principal windows facing away from the site. A further terrace of housing is located further to the east (Nos 11-14), also behind a parking/turning area). These houses have their principal/front elevation to the south, facing towards the application site.
83. As now proposed, the closest part of the proposed building would be the end wall of the northern wing of the 'L'. This would be positioned 14 m from the site boundary and approximately 24m from the rear elevations of Nos 7-10 Crawshaw Road, which would be in direct alignment (No. 4 has a rear conservatory and as such a shorter rear garden/closer proximity to the proposed building). As such, there would be a minimum separation distance of 22 m between the proposed building and the houses to the north. Notwithstanding the proposed height of the proposed building at this point (3 storeys), this distance is considered sufficient to prevent significant harm through any overbearing or overshadowing effect (taking into account the form and massing of this part of the building).
84. The part of the building closest to the properties in Crawshaw Road is shown as accommodating residential units over all three storeys. Although the scheme is in outline and illustrative internal layouts/window positions have not been submitted, the position of balconies (to the south-west and north-east elevations) indicates that these would be the principal elevations, and the north-west facing elevation (towards Crawshaw Road) would be a secondary elevation.
85. Taking into account the guideline privacy distances set out in the RD 2021 (22m) it is considered that privacy would be adequately safeguarded. Furthermore, the exact relationships would be considered further at the reserved matters stage and if necessary,



obscure glazing of these windows could be required. In addition, the detailed design of balconies would be assessed at that stage, and for measures to be taken to prevent harmful overlooking to properties in Crawshaw Road.

86. To the north-east side of the site the closest neighbouring properties are Nos 11-23 (odds) Slade Road, and Nos 1-9 Slade Court, which are set back from Slade Road (behind Nos 11-23). Both groups of housing run in linear form with their principal and rear elevations facing south-east and north-west respectively. Immediately abutting the site to this side are the side elevations of No 1 Slade Court and No 11 Slade Road; the former has no windows on this side, and the latter has one upper floor window apparently serving a bathroom. Both properties have rear gardens to this side, however it is considered that there would be sufficient distance from the main north/south wing of the proposed building (35m) to ensure that privacy would be maintained (including in relation to balconies). Where there would be a closer relationship with the proposed building (ie. the end of the wing fronting Slade Road), the relationship would be such that there would not be any harmful loss of amenity through any overbearing or overshadowing effect, and mutual privacy could be ensured at the detailed design stage.
87. Properties to the south east and south west have their frontages to Slade Road and Brox Road respectively, and relationships in this respect are considered to be such that amenities would be adequately safeguarded, taking into account also the proposed height of the building and the provision of balconies.
88. The current access to the site would be retained as part of the development, and parking would be similarly located to that previously on the site, albeit that additional parking spaces would be provided along the northern and eastern site boundaries (and to the rear of gardens to properties in Crawshaw Road and Slade Road). As such the impact of the movement and parking of vehicles would be similar to that of the previous care home on site. Plans indicate that additional planting would be provided to these boundaries, and the need for fencing (including acoustic fencing) would be considered at detailed stage. As set out in the Transport Statement (assessed below) traffic levels are anticipated to be relatively low due to the nature of the use and the profile of future occupiers.
89. On the basis it is considered that there would be no unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring properties due to noise or other disturbance resulting from vehicle movements.
90. To conclude in relation to neighbour amenity, whilst the development would result in some impact on neighbouring properties (as set out above), it is considered that an acceptable degree of privacy between habitable rooms and on outdoor private amenity spaces would be maintained. No other significant harm to residential amenity has been identified, though as this scheme is currently in outline it would be necessary at the reserved matters stage to give careful consideration to the exact positioning of windows and balconies including through the use (as necessary) of obscure glazing or other design features. Landscaping details would also need to ensure that neighbour amenity is safeguarded. Conditions are also recommended to control/mitigate disturbance during construction (dust, Construction Transport Management Plan and lighting).
91. In terms of the amenity of future occupiers, it is considered that each unit has been designed such that living conditions would be acceptable, taking into account the guidance in RD 2021. Each unit would have outside living amenity space in the form of a private garden (ground floor) or balcony (upper floor), oriented to provide sufficient levels of daylight/sunlight. There would also be communal accommodation and amenity space. Amenity has also been considered in relation to the retention of trees (and new planting).

## **HIGHWAYS, ACCESS AND PARKING**

### **Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP)**

92. Paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states:

*'In assessing.....specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:(a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*

*(b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*

*(c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code ; and*

*(d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.'*

93. It goes on the state in Paragraph 115 that:

*'Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.'*

94. And in Paragraph 116 that:

*'Within this context, applications for development should:*

*(a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;*

*(b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;*

*(c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;*

*(d) allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and*

*(e) be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.'*

95. RBCLP Policy SD3 states that 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.

96. RBCLP Policy SD4 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, subject to appropriate mitigation measures being secured. Relevant design and parking standards for vehicle and cycle parking within development proposals will be assessed against the Council's current adopted guidance.
97. The current access to the site is from Brox Road to the north-west corner of the site, and has dropped kerbs with tactile paving on either side. Both Brox Road and Slade Road have a speed limit of 30 mph.
98. No change is proposed to the existing access as part of this application. A condition is recommended which would ensure sufficient visibility splays are provided. The access road would run for the length of the site along its northern end to a turning head, and serve 25 parking spaces (to include two disabled spaces and a drop off zone). All spaces would be provided with electric charging points, in accordance with SCC guidance.
99. A separate pedestrian access to the site would be formed to the centre of the Brox Road frontage, leading from the main entrance to the building. Mobility scooter and bike storage would be provided (adjacent to the car park).
100. As set out in the application details, five of the parking spaces would be allocated to staff, with two bookable spaces for visitors and a drop off bay; the remaining 18 spaces would be for residents. It is stated that demand would depend on occupancy, which would vary depending on the number of residents and their respective carers. It is also stated that as a comparison, similar residential (retirement flats) sites have been reviewed using the TRICS database to understand typical parking accumulation, and that to consider maximum parking accumulation (the maximum number of vehicles parked at any one time within the hour), a worse-case scenario has been considered which assumes that vehicles arriving and leaving within the hour would be parked at the same time. The Transport Statement also refers to the potential provision of a car club facility, which would provide additional flexibility in terms of providing residents with access to a car.
101. In terms of vehicle movements, as set out in the Transport Statement (Technical Addendum Rev 1.1 dated 19 February 2024), the proposed development would result in six two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak and five vehicle trips in the PM peak, which it is considered would have a negligible impact on the local highway network.  
Representations relating to the commercial use of a site close to the Brox Road access are noted, however no highway safety or capacity issues have been identified by the Council's Transport Development Planning (TDP) officer in this regard.
102. For parking, the overall conclusion of the Transport Statement is that given the small scale of the proposed development, the anticipated low scale of vehicle trip generation, the sustainable location, close proximity of the public car parks, and the onsite parking, any increase in parking demand due to the development is considered likely to be minimal. As set out above, the site is well located in relation to local services and public transport links.
103. Representations made in relation to parking provision are noted. However the Council's TDP officer raises no objection in this regard, it being acknowledged that robust evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that expected parking demand would be accommodated within the site.
104. It has been confirmed by the Council's TDP Officer that subject to the imposition of conditions, including the submission of a Travel Plan, the application is acceptable on

safety, capacity and policy grounds, and accords with relevant guidance (Surrey's Local Transport Plan 4, Healthy Streets guidance and Surrey Parking Standards). Regard has also been had to the Runnymede Parking Guidance SPD (2022).

## TREES AND LANDSCAPING

### Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP) Policy EE1 – Townscape and Landscape Quality Runnymede Design SPD – July 2021

105. Paragraphs 131-141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) seek to promote the creation of well-designed places and highlight the importance of appropriate and effective landscaping as part of this wider objective.
106. With specific reference to trees, it states in Paragraph 136:
- 'Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. Applicants and local planning authorities should work with highways officers and tree officers to ensure that the right trees are planted in the right places, and solutions are found that are compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users.'*
107. RBCLP Policy EE1 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 land. New development should contribute to and enhance the quality of the public realm and/or landscape setting through high quality and inclusive hard and soft landscaping schemes. This will be demonstrated and implemented through an appropriate landscaping strategy which takes account of existing and proposed townscape/landscape character and features.
108. RBCLP Policy EE11 – Seeks to avoid further habitat fragmentation of Green Infrastructure.
109. The Runnymede Design SPD (RD) (2021) Design Standard 18 states that new development and associated landscape should retain, incorporate and enhance features that contribute towards landscape character and the biodiversity of the area.
110. None of the trees on the application site are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and none are identified as Veteran Trees (Preliminary Ecological Assessment and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (PEA) 2024). However, the site contains a number of trees, some of which contribute to the character of the site and area. Trees currently on site are a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees, with 29 individual trees and two groups assessed in the arboricultural appraisal and impact assessment (AAIA). Deciduous species include Broad-leaved and Common Lime, Sycamore, Norway Maple and Silver Birch. One tree group (G11) comprises Himalayan Birch and the other (G15) Lawson and Leyland Cypress. The trees are a mix of mature and early mature trees, all graded at 'B' or 'C' except for one Lime which is graded A.
111. Eight individual trees (three Broad-leaved Lime T6, T22, T24; two Silver Birch T9, T14; one Goat Willow T11; one Lawson Cypress T12; one Norway Maple T21) and the two groups (G10 and G15) are proposed to be removed. One further tree (T23 – Flowering

Cherry) is included in the assessment, but is dying and categorised as a 'U' tree. The majority are Category B trees (apart from T11 and T12 which are Category C trees). All these trees would be removed to facilitate the erection of the building, or formation of hard surfacing. The remainder of the trees assessed in the AAIA would be retained.

112. RBCLP Policy EE1 and its supporting design guidance (RD) seek as part of any new development the inclusion of high quality and inclusive hard and soft landscaping schemes. Whilst the retention of existing trees as part of redevelopment proposals can form an important component part of new landscaping proposals, the loss of existing trees needs to be considered in the context of the site and development as a whole, and opportunities for the planting of new trees.
113. In this case it is recognised that a number of trees of medium quality would be removed, including some which are prominent in the street scene (most notably the group of Lawson and Leyland Cypress at the Brox Road/Slade Road junction). Objection has been raised to the loss of this group of trees in representations made on the application. It is acknowledged that the loss of these trees, and others within the site, would result in some change to its character and appearance within the public realm. This has already been considered in paragraphs 56-78 above in relation to wider character considerations.
114. However, whilst of prominence in the street scene, the group at the Brox Road/Slade Road are not graded highly in the AIAA. It is not considered that their removal would have a significantly harmful impact on the appearance of the site or character of the area. As set out in the application details, a total of 30 new trees would be planted as part of the landscaping for the new development, including species to form a new 'orchard'.
115. As set out in the Arboricultural Appraisal and Impact Assessment (AAIA) submitted with the application, there would be some incursion into the root protection area of two of the retained trees (T8 Birch and T13 Oak), both close to the eastern corner of the site. A number of mitigation methodologies are proposed in the AAIA including ground protection, arboricultural supervision and 'hand digging' within impacted root protection areas (RPA's), as well as tree friendly construction methods including above ground pathway installation or porous materials. It is noted further that as the paths would form part of the landscaping proposals (a reserved matter), the precise position of paths, materials and details of any land level changes would be considered at that time to ensure maximum avoidance of disturbance to tree roots. A condition would be added requiring submission of a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement to provide details of how paths and walls would be constructed, and the routes of services (in relation to trees and their roots).
116. Although indicative only at this stage, the illustrative landscape masterplan submitted with the application shows the overall strategy which would be applied to the landscaping of the site. Boundary hedging would be formed/supplemented to boundaries, with a number of trees planted and an orchard area. Further into the site planting would be in the form of grassed and shrub areas, intersected by a network of paths. Each ground floor garden area would be laid partially to grass (with a patio area), and enclosed with hedges. Hard surfaced areas would be a mix of tarmac (access road and parking areas), and paving.
117. This landscape strategy is considered acceptable for the site, and that it strikes the appropriate balance between retaining trees and maximising biodiversity, and providing an appropriate environment for future occupiers of the site, including those with limited mobility.

## SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

### Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020

### Policy 4 – Sustainable Construction and Waste Management in New Development

### Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP)

### Policy SD7 – Sustainable Design Development

### Policy SD8 - Renewable & Low Carbon Energy

### Runnymede Design SPD – July 2021

8

118. Paragraphs 158-164 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) sets out the role the planning system is expected to play in supporting the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate. As part of this, it states in Paragraph 162 that:

*‘In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to:*

*(a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable; and*

*(b) take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption.*

119. SWLP Policy 4 seeks to minimise waste generated during the construction, demolition and excavation phase of development, maximise opportunities for re-use and for the recycling of such waste, encourage the provision of on-site facilities to manage the waste arising during the operation of the development and storage facilities to facilitate the reuse and recycling of waste.
120. RBCLP Policy SD7 states that development proposals will be supported where their design incorporates measures which facilitate materials recycling, encourage sustainable modes of travel, maximise energy efficiency, incorporate renewable technologies, protect biodiversity, maximise accessibility and incorporate sustainable construction and demolition techniques.
121. RBCLP Policy SD8 supports the provision of renewable technologies, and requires that development proposals of 1,000sqm or more of net additional floorspace will be expected to incorporate measures to supply a minimum of 10% of the development’s energy needs from renewable and/or low carbon technologies unless it can be demonstrated with evidence that this is not feasible or viable.
122. The Runnymede Design SPD (RD) (2021) includes as one of its underpinning ‘aspirations’ the need to future proof new development and encourage more flexible design and use of buildings, and the need to address sustainability and climate change in all thinking on new development. Design Standard 4 ‘achieving sustainable design’ requires that all proposals should deliver sustainable development in terms of their structure, landscape, movement and buildings.
123. A Sustainable Design and Construction Statement has been submitted with the application. This states how the various strands of national and local policy encompassing sustainability in all its forms are reflected in the proposals. These include; operational energy (including the provision of renewable technologies to meet the RBLP Policy SD8 requirement of 10%); embodied carbon; biodiversity and ecology; adaption and resilience; health and wellbeing; connectivity; social value; resource efficiency; and construction waste.

124. A number of key Surrey County Council documents forming part of its Organisation Strategy are cited, including its Community Vision for Surrey in 2030, which includes the desire for Surrey to be a great place to live, work and learn, and a place where communities feel supported and people are able to support each other. It also cites the Council's four key priorities - growing a sustainable economy so everyone can benefit; tackling health inequality; enabling a greener future; empowering communities, as well as the Council's Environmental Policy and Action Plan, its Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan, Local Transport Plan and Sustainable Construction Standing Advice Note.
125. Measures proposed in the Statement include those relating to the design of the building, to ensure that it is energy efficient, minimising heat loss and utilising low carbon energy systems (with an ambition to achieve net zero carbon in operation). Other efficiencies would be sought through the use of measures such as the installation of efficient fittings to reduce water consumption.
126. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) would be developed, which would set out key objectives for achieving efficient use of material resources and to reduce the amount of waste produced through construction activities on site, in line with the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020. In accordance with the principles set out in Policy S4 of the SWLP, and in response to the relevant regulatory, policy and guidance context, it is stated that the RMP should set out several strategies to reuse, recycle or recover at least 90% of construction and demolition waste. The submission of these details would be required by condition.
127. For the detailed design stage (reserved matters) embodied carbon reduction strategies and circular economy principles would be explored and implemented to reduce overall waste generation, and that compliance with the waste hierarchy is also embedded (ie. through the provision of accessible waste storage with containers for different waste streams).
128. Improved health and wellbeing would be achieved through the project as a whole, as residents with extra needs would be able to better access support to enhance their quality of life, including through communal living and the social cohesion that would bring. The building has been designed such that it focuses on indoor air quality, and the provision of sufficient daylight, together with the provision of shared and private outdoor amenity space.
129. Enhancing biodiversity would be achieved through landscaping design, the planting for which would include a range of species with ecological value and measures to create a range of natural habitats.
130. The incorporation of Sustainable Drainage System techniques (SuDS), which would build in climate change resilience.
131. Various measures would be incorporated to encourage active travel, and reduce car use (the site is close to local bus routes). 100% provision would also be made for electric charging points.
132. It is considered that subject to the implementation of the range of measures set out above, the proposal meets national and local policy objectives in relation to sustainable construction.

## **FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE**

### **Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP) Policy EE13 – Managing Flood Risk**

133. Paragraphs 165-175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) set out the role the planning system is expected to play in minimising the risk of flooding and mitigating its effects. Development should be directed away from areas at highest risk, and in determining applications LPAs should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
134. In order to minimise flood risk, including surface water flooding, Paragraph 175 states that:
- ‘Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The systems used should:*
- (a) take account of advice from the lead local flood authority;*
- (b) have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards;*
- (c) have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and*
- (d) where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.’*
135. RBCLP Policy EE13 seeks to minimise flood risk, including surface water flooding for which sustainable drainage provision should be made as part of development.
136. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted with the application. This concludes that as the proposed development is located in EA Flood Zone 1, there is a very low risk of fluvial flooding (a 0.1% or 1 in 1,000 risk). It also concludes that the site is located within an area of predominantly low risk of surface water flooding, however there is a flowpath that crosses the site at the north-eastern corner and another that runs along the fencing down the western boundary. It states that levels will be maintained in these locations to avoid displacing floodwater and these areas will feature low vulnerability uses (road turning head and site boundary features). It further states that there is a low risk of groundwater flooding during construction as indicated by groundwater level monitoring on the site, and mitigation for this risk is outlined.
137. It also states that there will be an increase in load on the foul drainage system. However, it advises that a Thames Water Pre-Development application has been submitted and confirmation has been received that there is sufficient capacity for the proposed flow rates.
138. The FRA cross refers to the Drainage Strategy which sets out how on-site risk would be mitigated and run-off managed, to include management strategies including a range of sustainable features (SuDS) - porous pavements, tree pit drainage and attenuation storage tanks. These measures collectively would restrict run-off to greenfield rates.
139. These details have been reviewed by the LLFA who are satisfied that subject to the imposition of conditions the requirements of the NPPF, its accompanying PPG and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for sustainable drainage systems are met. Thames Water have raised no objection, but have advised of the proximity of the site to a strategic sewer (15m) in relation to any potential piling operations (an informative will be added accordingly). Subject to the imposition of conditions, the proposal is considered to meet the requirements of RBCLP Policy EE13.

## **ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN**

**Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP)  
Policy EE9 – Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation  
Runnymede Design SPD – July 2021**



140. Paragraphs 180-188 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) seek to ensure that planning policies and decision making contribute to and enhance the local and natural environment. In particular, they should seek to minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity, ensuring that any harm to biodiversity is adequately mitigated. If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused (Paragraph 186 (a)).
141. RBCLP Policy EE9 states that net gains in biodiversity, through creation/expansion, restoration, enhancement and management of habitats and features to improve the status of priority habitats and species will be sought. Development proposals should demonstrate how this will be achieved and should be in accordance with any Supplementary Planning Document the Council.
142. Although this is an outline application and landscaping is a reserved matter, to accord with policy an assessment needs to be made of the impact of the development on biodiversity including any protected species.
143. A Preliminary Ecological and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (PEA and BNG) has been submitted. This sets out the ecological constraints of the site, whether any mitigation measures are likely to be required, any additional surveys which may be required, and opportunities for ecological enhancement. It also sets out the baseline BNG unit score for the area surveyed.
144. No statutory designated sites were recorded within 2 km of the site. Seven non-statutory designated sites, comprising Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) were recorded within 2 km of the survey area, the closest being Queenwood Golf Course SNCI (approximately 900 m to the north. The site is not within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA), however three BOAs are located within 1km of the survey area (Chobhom South Heaths, Woking Heaths and River Wey (plus tributaries)).
145. Eight UK habitat classification types were recorded on site during the field survey (modified grassland; bramble scrub; Suburban/ Mosaic of Developed/ Natural Surface Introduced Scrub; built linear features, fence; other developed land; artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface; scattered trees; other hedgerows). These habitats could support the following protected species or species of conservation concern: invertebrates, reptiles, badgers, amphibians nesting birds, other mammals and foraging bats.
146. The report concludes that there is a low likelihood of any impact on any protected sites (subject to any required mitigation for the SPA). In terms of protected species and species of conservation concern, the survey area does not support aquatic habitat suitable for great crested newt, and due to physical barriers there is unlikely that they would be present within the survey area. Similarly otters or water voles are unlikely to be supported. The site does not contain suitable habitat for hazel dormouse.
147. The site does have suitability for amphibians, reptiles, birds, invertebrates and mammals (including badger and bats) and without mitigation the proposed development could result in generalised impacts if mitigation is not considered (these are set out in paragraph 6.1.2 of the PEA).
148. The survey area supports minimal suitable badger habitat, namely foraging opportunities within the modified grassland. No signs of badger including push-throughs underneath boundary fences, setts, latrines, foraging signs or hairs were recorded during the survey. Two bat species were identified as part of the desk study (common pipistrelle

and brown long-eared) and four roosts have been identified within 2km of the survey area. Five habitats suitable for use by bats were identified (hedgerows, modified grassland, introduced scrub, bramble scrub and mature trees).

149. The desk study returned records of a number of non-native and invasive plant species, but none were observed on site during the survey so are considered unlikely to be present. No rare/notable plant species were recorded on site.
150. As set out above, RBC Policy EE9 states that net gains in biodiversity, through creation/expansion, restoration, enhancement and management of habitats and features to improve the status of priority habitats and species will be sought as part of development proposals.
151. As set out in the application details (BNG Assessment Letter January 2024), an assessment has been carried out which evaluates the baseline biodiversity units and identifies possible scenarios for habitat enhancement and creation, and the potential net gain in biodiversity units that this would achieve (based on the submitted landscape plan). Biodiversity net gain, including assessment and habitat classification, is calculated and interpreted following eight accepted principles and rules and supported by good practice principles and code of practice that detail, among other things, how to implement biodiversity net gain good practice principles within each stage of a development project's life cycle.
152. The broad habitat types in the survey area have been set out above. Habitat retention, enhancement, and creation opportunities (as detailed in the landscape plan) comprise:
- Retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows
  - Creation of native hedgerow (mixed species native hedge)
  - Creation of neutral grassland (woodland glade)
  - Creation of mixed scrub
  - Creation of new tree planting (native and orchard trees)
153. Applying the BNG metric (a habitat based approach used to assess an area's value to wildlife), it is calculated that the development would result in a 0.12% increase in habitat units and 219.39% increase in hedgerow units. On this basis it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted to conclude that the proposal would meet policy requirements in relation to ecology and BNG.
154. The County Ecologist has confirmed that the application is acceptable, including in relation to BNG, subject to the imposition of conditions.

## **THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA (SPA)**

### **South East Plan Policy NRM6 – Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP) Policy EE9 – Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation Policy EE10 - Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area**

155. Paragraph 188 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states that 'the presumption in favour of sustainable development' does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site. The application site is located within 5km of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA).

156. The South East Plan was formally abolished in 2013, except for Natural Resource Management Policy 6 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. This policy requires that new residential development which is likely to have a significant effect on the ecological integrity of Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects.
157. RBCLP Policy EE9 states that development proposals not directly related to the management of Ramsar, SPA, SAC as well as SSSI units forming part of these designations will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the impact of proposals, either alone or in combination, will not result in likely significant adverse effects. If significant adverse effects remain even with the implementation of suitable avoidance and/or mitigation, development proposals will need to demonstrate that alternatives to the proposal have been fully explored and that Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI) exist. In these exceptional circumstances the Council will only permit development where suitable compensatory measures can be implemented.
158. RBCLP Policy EE10 requires that additional residential development (including strategic allocations) beyond the 400m Special Protection Area exclusion zone, but within 5km of the Special Protection Area boundary, will need to put in place adequate measures to avoid and mitigate potential effects on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). To meet these requirements developments will need to provide or contribute to Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and make a financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) at the Special Protection Area.
159. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area SPD (April 2021) (TBHSPA SPD) provides guidance on the implementation of the policy. Based on the principles established in the Delivery Framework adopted by the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership in 2009 (Runnymede BC being one of the local authority partners), the SPD provides guidance to demonstrate how the adverse effects of development within Runnymede on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA should be avoided and mitigated.
160. The Thames Basin Heaths account for around two-thirds (approximately 2,000 ha) of Surrey's remaining heathland and were designated on 9th March 2005 as a Special Protection Area (SPA) for internationally important birds; providing habitat for woodlark (*Lullula arborea*), nightjar (*Caprimulgus europaeus*) and Dartford warbler (*Sylvia undata*). These birds nest on or near the ground and as a result they are very susceptible to predation of adults, chicks and eggs (particularly by cats, rats and crows) and to disturbance from informal recreational use, especially walking, cycling and dog walking.
161. The policy and guidance (and mitigation measures they seek) are based on the vulnerability of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (TBHSPA) and the impact of visitors, in particular those with dogs. It is for this reason that alternative recreational provision (including for dog walkers) is sought in the form of SANG (SAMM provision supporting monitoring and management within the SPA itself).
162. The SPD requires that where net new residential development is proposed within the 400m-5km zone of influence, avoidance measures must be delivered prior to occupation of new dwellings and provided in perpetuity. Measures must be based on a combination of Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) and the provision and/or improvement and/or maintenance of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).
163. The SPD states that when assessing any planning application for a C2 or C3 care or extra care facility, account will be taken of whether there is any risk of the residents of the facility causing a likely significant effect upon the integrity of the SPA. It states that

the occupancy of C2 or C3 care or extra care facilities will be considered on an individual basis under advice from Natural England.

164. As set out in the application details, the provider for this development is yet to be determined, and precise details of residents' likely age and mobility profile are not available. However, by its very nature extra care accommodation is designed to provide for a range of ages, providing greater support to meet health and mobility needs as they develop over time. Residents could be eligible for accommodation from the age of 55 (though it is more likely to be accessed from the age of 75), and car parking spaces will be available to them. A proportion of them are therefore likely to access the SPA by car. In addition, as the TBHSPA is a local open space to the site, there is a high probability that residents will be taken there by visitors. Some visitors may have dogs (one of the main risks to nesting birds).
165. The applicant has agreed to make a payment in accordance with policy and guidance, to both SANG and SAMM, to meet legal requirements under the Habitat Regulations, and this would be secured through a legal agreement with Runnymede Borough Council.
166. Runnymede Borough Council operates a tariff mechanism (based on occupancy rate) and calculates contributions accordingly. Following discussions with Natural England, it has been agreed that contributions can be made on a 'net' basis, on the basis that until the closure of the previous Brockhurst residential facility there were residents on site and pressure on the SPA accordingly. This equates to an occupancy rate of 4.2 (3 units x 1.4 occupancy rate), and a SANG contribution of £3794.70 and SAMM contribution of £1798.15. This would be secured by a legal agreement (Unilateral Undertaking) between the applicant and Runnymede Borough Council.
167. The recommendation for this application is to resolve to grant outline consent, subject to this legal agreement being completed.

## **AIR QUALITY**

### **Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP) Policy EE2 – Environmental Protection**

168. Paragraph 191 of the NPPF (2023) requires that planning policies and decisions ensure new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.
169. Paragraph 192 states that planning policies and decisions should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.
170. RBCLP Policy EE2 requires that development proposals are assessed in relation to air quality, including where appropriate through the submission of assessments or reports, stating that planning permission will only be granted where abatement or mitigation measures to reduce impacts to acceptable levels can be secured and implemented.
171. An Air Quality Appraisal has been submitted with the application. This identifies the pollutants of concern as nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and dust. The key issues are identified as the impact of the development on the surrounding area and the suitability of the site for its proposed use as a care home. The Council's air quality advisers agree that the correct pollutants and key issues have been identified.

172. The application site is not in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), the nearest AQMA being approximately 1.6 km to the east of the site (close to the M3 motorway). The Air Quality Appraisal submitted with the application refers to data collected at a NO<sub>2</sub> monitoring site operated by RBC, located approximately 360m to the northwest of the site (at the A320 roundabout in Ottershaw).
173. The Air Quality Appraisal concludes that although congestion and traffic levels at this junction currently result in NO<sub>2</sub> levels which exceed Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objectives, the site is sufficiently distant from this location to ensure that emissions are unlikely to adversely influence pollutant concentrations at the proposed development site. Defra mapping for the area is also referenced, this indicating that background pollutant concentrations for the 1 km grid square covering the site (PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub>) are well below the current AQS annual mean objective of 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> for both pollutants. Local air quality is good with background concentrations comfortably below currently legislated air quality criteria. It ultimately concludes that the location is considered suitable for a development introducing new sensitive receptor exposure, ie. a care home use.
174. The report also concludes that subject to mitigation measures being introduced, the impact of dust at construction stage can be adequately managed.
175. In line with best practice, a number of mitigation measures and opportunities have been outlined for consideration at the detailed design stage to minimise exposure for occupants of the new building and existing residents to local ambient sources of air pollution. The report also recommends submission of a simple air quality statement to determine the scale of any potential impacts on existing or future new receptors due to the proposed development, and a risk assessment of dust impacts during construction work with recommendations for mitigation and controls consistent with the level of risk.
176. The Council's air quality advisers recommend that, subject to the submission of details by condition (Dust Management Plan), the application is acceptable in relation to air quality and dust. No objection has been raised in this regard by RBC's EHO. As this application is in outline, a condition is recommended to require submission of control measures for dust.

## HERITAGE ASSETS

**Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 (RBCLP)**  
**Policy EE1 – Townscape and Landscape Quality**  
**Policy EE3 – Strategic Heritage Policy**  
**Policy EE7 - Scheduled Monuments, County Sites of Archaeological Importance (CSAIs) and Areas of High Archaeological Potential (AHAPs)**  
**Policy EE8 – Locally Listed and other Non-Designated Heritage Assets**  
**Runnymede Design SPD – July 2021**

177. Paragraph 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states that:

*'In determining applications, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.'*

178. It goes on to advise that in determining applications, LPAs should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by the development, taking account of any available evidence and any necessary expertise. Paragraph 209 states:

*'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. RBCLP Policy EE1 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 land.'*

179. RBCLP Policy EE3 sets out the Borough's strategic policy in relation to heritage assets, stating 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 which the council may produce.
180. RBCLP Policy EE7 requires that an archaeological assessment, and where appropriate the results of a site evaluation, will be required to accompany a planning application for proposals for development on sites which exceed 0.4ha in size and further archaeological work as required.
181. RBCLP Policy EE8 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.
182. There are no designated heritage assets (including their settings) close to the application site. Toad Hall Nursery, which is located opposite the site at the Brox Road/Slade Road junction, is identified on Runnymede Borough Council's Local List (2019), and as such is considered a non-designated heritage asset to which NPPF paragraph 209 and RBCLP Policy EE8 apply. This asset dates from 1906, and was built as a school funded by the Countess of Meath (who founded the Ministering Children's League). It closed as a school in 1967, operated as a restaurant and is now a children's day nursery.
183. The Council's historic buildings officer advises that the building's significance derives from its role in the history of Ottershaw and its good quality Arts and Crafts architecture. He further advises that the setting of the nursery is largely self-contained within its own curtilage, and that while there are views out from the site, the wider setting consists of a highly urbanised context comprising of a builder's merchants, commercial premises, a small number of early 20th century dwellings (and the application site). There are no known historic links between these sites and the locally listed building, nor are there any clear architectural influence from its surroundings. As such, the wider setting reveals nothing about the architectural or historic interest of the building and there would be no harm to the setting of the locally listed building from the development.
184. In line with the policy requirement set out in RBCLP Policy EE7, an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment has been carried out. Further field evaluation was then undertaken, with three trial trenches excavated. Two of the trenches revealed undisturbed ground but contained no archaeological features and the other trench revealed evidence of modern disturbance. As the results of the evaluation, coupled with the disturbance caused by the previous development of the site clearly demonstrate that significant archaeological remains are not present, the County Council's Archaeological Officer confirms that there are no further archaeological concerns regarding this application and no further archaeological mitigation works are required.

---

## Human Rights Implications

185. 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.
186. In this case, it is the Officer's view that the scale of such impact is not considered sufficient to engage Article 6 or Article A of Protocol 1 and any impacts can be mitigated by conditions. The proposal is not considered to interfere with any Convention rights.
- 

## Conclusion

187. This is an outline application, seeking approval for layout, scale and means of access (with appearance and means of access reserved for future consideration).
188. The proposal accords with national and local planning policy regarding the provision of housing for boosting the supply of housing generally, and specialist housing for different groups in the community in particular. The site is well located in relation to Ottershaw village centre, and the services and facilities located there, with good inter-connectivity between the site and its surroundings.
189. It is recognised that the proposed building, as shown indicatively as part of this outline application, would be of different and greater massing than that previously on the site, resulting in a change to site and how it would be viewed in the public realm. It would also result in the loss of trees, some of which are prominent in the street scene.
190. Comments raised in representations, including those raised by the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum and Runnymede Borough Council, are acknowledged and have been afforded due weight.
191. Weighing in its favour, and attributed significant weight, the proposal would deliver up to 51 modern, extra care units on an existing, unused brownfield site in a sustainable location. It would also accord with the Borough's aspirations as set out in the Runnymede Design SPD (RD) (2021), namely the creation of healthier and safer communities, with emphasis on walking and cycling, the provision of 'inclusive' people friendly places delivering a range of high quality new homes and new development, and the need to address sustainability and climate change and the future proofing of development. It would also result in a positive benefit in terms of biodiversity, delivering a net gain in this regard.
192. Taking all factors into account, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development which underpins the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (NPPF), it is considered that the benefits of the scheme outweigh the harms. It is therefore recommended that outline consent should be granted for this development.

## Recommendation

Pursuant to Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the Committee resolves to grant outline planning permission for application ref: RU.23/0474, subject to the completion of legal agreement to secure payments (SANG and SAMM) to mitigate the impact of the development of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and subject to the recommended planning conditions.

## Conditions and Reasons:

IMPORTANT - CONDITION NOS. 4, 6, 13, 16, 19, 21, MUST BE DISCHARGED PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

## Commencement

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

### Reason:

To comply with Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

## Approved Plans

2. The means of access, siting, layout and scale of the development hereby approved is as shown on the following approved plans/drawings:
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90100 Rev P01 – Existing Location Plan dated 3 February 2023
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90102 Rev P01 – Existing Site Plan dated 3 February 2023
  - 2111027-01 – Post Demolition Survey dated March 2022
  - TCP1\_BH – Tree Constraints Plan dated June 2021
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90200 – Rev P04 - General Arrangements – Indicative Elevations (1 of 2) dated 19 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-DR-A-90201 – Rev P04 - General Arrangements – Indicative Elevations (2 of 2) dated 19 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-B1-DR-A-90111 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans – Basement Floor dated 2 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-A-90112 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Ground Floor dated 2 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-01-DR-A-90113 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - First Floor dated 2 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-02-DR-A-90114 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Second Floor dated 2 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XPR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90100 Rev P01 – Existing Location Plan dated 3 February 2023
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90102 Rev P01 – Existing Site Plan dated 3 February 2023
  - 2111027-01 – Post Demolition Survey dated March 2022
  - TCP1\_BH – Tree Constraints Plan dated June 2021
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90200 – Rev P04 - General Arrangements – Indicative Elevations (1 of 2) dated 19 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-DR-A-90201 – Rev P04 - General Arrangements – Indicative Elevations (2 of 2) dated 19 February 2024
  - PR-290-ATK-XX-B1-DR-A-90111 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans – Basement Floor dated 2 February 2024



- PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-A-90112 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Ground Floor dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-01-DR-A-90113 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - First Floor dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-02-DR-A-90114 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Second Floor dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-03-DR-A-90116 Rev P02 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Third Floor dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-RF-DR-A-90115 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans – Roof dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-RF-DR-A-90103 Rev P03 – Proposed Indicative Roof Site Plan dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-LL-DR-A-90302 Rev P03 – Proposed Indicative Site Sections dated 19 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90301 Rev P03 – Existing Site Sections dated 19 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-L-40101 Rev P02 – Landscape Illustrative Masterplan dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-C-70001 Rev P02 – Proposed Drainage Strategy dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-L-40102 Rev P03 – Landscape Proving Plan dated 28 May 2024
- X-02-DR-A-90116 Rev P02 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans - Third Floor dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-02-DR-A-90115 Rev P03 – General Arrangements - Proposed Indicative Plans – Roof dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-RF-DR-A-90103 Rev P03 – Proposed Indicative Roof Site Plan dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-LL-DR-A-90302 Rev P03 – Proposed Indicative Site Sections dated 19 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90301 Rev P03 – Existing Site Sections dated 19 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-XX-RP-L-40101 Rev P02 – Landscape Illustrative Masterplan dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-C-70001 Rev 1.0 – Proposed Drainage Strategy dated 2 February 2024
- PR-290-ATK-XX-00-DR-L-40102 Rev P03 – Landscape Proving Plan dated 28 May 2024

**Reason:**

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

**Reserved Matters**

3. Approval of the details of the design and external appearance of the building, and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the County Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced and carried out as approved. Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to above, shall be submitted in writing to the County Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

**Reason:**

To comply with Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order)

and Section 92(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

## Drainage

- 8
4. 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 County 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. Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 (+35% allowance for climate change) & 1 in 100 (+45% allowance for climate change) storm during all stages of the development. Associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 2l/s.
    - b. 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.).
    - c. A plan showing exceedance flows (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.
    - d. Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
    - e. 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.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

### Reason:

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 in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 173, 175 and 180; and Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policy EE13.

5. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer has been submitted to and approved in writing 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), provide 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.

### Reason:

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 in

accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 173, 175 and 180; and Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policy EE13.

### Highways, Traffic and Access

6. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Transport Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority, to include:
- a) Details of parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors.
  - b) Details of loading and unloading of plant and materials.
  - c) Details of storage of plant and materials.
  - d) A programme of works (including measures for traffic management).
  - e) Details of boundary hoarding to be provided behind any visibility zones
  - f) Details of HGV deliveries and hours of operation.
  - g) Details of vehicle routing.
  - h) Measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway.
  - i) Details of how 'before and after' condition surveys of the highway are to be submitted, and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
  - i) Details of turning for construction vehicles.

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

**Reason:**

To ensure the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 108, 114, 115, 116 and 194; and Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan 2030 Policies SD3 and SD4.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until at least 50% of all available parking spaces are provided with a fast-charge Electric Vehicle charging point (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply) in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

**Reason:**

To comply with the terms of the application, the Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan 4, Healthy Streets for Surrey design guidance, and Surrey County Council Parking Standards by ensuring that electric vehicle charging points are available to all users at the earliest opportunity in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 108, 112, 114, 116 and 135; and Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan 2030 Policies SD3 and SD4.

8. The development hereby permitted shall be provided with visibility splays at the access junction of 2.4 metres by 43 metres, in accordance with the posted speed limit, and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 0.6m high, with the exception of parked cars.

**Reason:**

To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users, in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 108, 112, 114, 116 and 135; and Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan 2030 Policies SD3 and SD4.

9. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until facilities for the secure, covered parking of bicycles including charging facilities for electric cycles and charging facilities for mobility scooters has been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority, and thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

**Reason:**

To comply with the terms of the Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan 4, Healthy Streets for Surrey design guidance, and Surrey County Council Parking Standards by ensuring that safe and secure parking for sustainable transport modes, with appropriate charging facilities, is made available to all users at the earliest opportunity in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 108, 112, 114, 116 and 135; and Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan 2030 Policies SD3 and SD4.

10. The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

**Reason:**

To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety or cause inconvenience to other highway users, in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 108, 112, 114, 116 and 135; and Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan 2030 Policies SD3 and SD4.

11. Prior to occupation of the development, a Travel Plan shall be submitted for the written approval of the County Planning Authority in accordance with the sustainable development aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Surrey County Council's 'Travel Plans Good Practice Guidance' and in general accordance with the 'Heads of Travel Plan' document. The Travel Plan shall include details of the proposed Car Club scheme or other shared transport service. The approved Travel Plan shall then be implemented prior to first occupation and thereafter maintained and developed to the satisfaction of the County Planning Authority.

**Reason:**

To comply with the terms of the Surrey County Council Local Transport Plan 4, Healthy Streets for Surrey design guidance, and Surrey County Council Parking Standards by ensuring access to sustainable transport modes and reduce reliance on the private car in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework 2023 paragraphs 108, 112, 114, 116 and 135; and Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan 2030 Policies SD3 and SD4.

**Limitations**

12. The height and scale of the proposed building shall not exceed that shown on Plan Numbers PR-290-ATK-XX-LL-DR-A-90302 Rev P03, PR-290-ATK-XX-ZZ-DR-A-90200 – Rev P04 and PR-290-ATK-XX-DR-A-90201 dated 19 February 2024 hereby approved.

**Reason:**

To ensure that the scale of the development respects the character and appearance of the area within which it is located, in accordance with Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policy EE1.

**Dust Management**

13. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Dust Management Plan for the construction phase of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:**

In the interests of the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings, in accordance with Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policies EE1 and EE2.

**Hours of Operation**

14. No construction activities shall take place on the site except between the hours of 8am and 6pm Mondays to Fridays and 8am to 1pm Saturdays.

**Reason:**

In the interests of the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings, in accordance with Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policies EE1 and EE2.

**Lighting**

15. There shall be no external lighting installed on the site, including any temporary lighting required during construction, in connection with the development hereby permitted unless and until details of the proposed lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. Details to be submitted shall include:
- confirming the type of fittings to be mounted on the building façade
  - providing details of lighting controls
  - providing a complete lighting scheme with associated lux plots
  - submitting lighting design and calculations demonstrating that the scheme is in compliance with the International Commission on Illumination's Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations Second Edition (CIE 150:2017).
  - Consideration of the lighting impacts on the ecological interests on the site such as Bats

Only the external lighting which has been approved in accordance with this condition shall be installed on the site.

**Reason:**

In the interests of the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings and the ecological interest of the site, in accordance with Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policies EE2 and EE9.

## Trees

16. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The AMS shall include details of:

- a) the construction of paths and retaining walls;
- b) the location of services (in relation to trees)

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved AMS.

**Reason:**

To safeguard existing trees and landscape features and to ensure their contribution to the character of development and the character of the local area in accordance with Runnymede Local Plan 2030 Policy EE1.

17. No trees shall be removed except for those identified within the Tree Protection Plan TPP1\_BH Rev A dated January 2024 (forming part of the Arboricultural Appraisal and Impact Assessment dated 25 January 2024).

**Reason:**

To safeguard existing trees and landscape features and to ensure their contribution to the character of development and the character of the local area in accordance with Runnymede Local Plan 2030 Policy EE1.

18. The development shall proceed in accordance with the details, including tree protection fencing and construction exclusion zone, contained within the Arboricultural Appraisal and Impact Assessment dated 25 January 2024 and appendices attached thereto and retained during the construction phase of the development.

**Reason:**

To safeguard existing trees and landscape features and to ensure their contribution to the character of development and the character of the local area in accordance with Runnymede Local Plan 2030 Policy EE1.

## Biodiversity and Habitat Management

19. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. This Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the recommendations set out in Table 12 and 13 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Rev. 1.1 and include the following:

- Details of how retained habitats will be protected
- Details of mitigation measures for protected species during active works
- Details of a wildlife-sensitive lighting strategy for the proposals

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

**Reason:**

To enhance and protect habitats and biodiversity and in accordance with the National Planning Framework and Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policy EE9.

20. Within 6 months from the date of the approval of the landscaping ‘Reserved Matter’ application, a landscape and ecological 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:-

- (a) detailed planting schedules for the habitats to be created within the site
- (b) updated biodiversity net gain score based on the final landscaping and planting scheme
- (c) management recommendations for the retention, enhanced and created hedgerows
- (d) details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the monitoring plan
- (e) specification and locations of bird, bat and invertebrate boxes (and other biodiversity features of relevance)
- (f) detailed 30 year habitat creation and monitoring plan to ensure the delivery of biodiversity net gain on site
- (g) annual maintenance scheme for trees and hedgerows

The approved details shall be incorporated into the development prior to the first occupation of any part of the development and permanently maintained thereafter.

**Reason:**

To enhance and protect habitats and biodiversity and in accordance with the National Planning Framework and Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030 Policy EE9.

21. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Resource Management Plan (RMP)/details of measures to demonstrate the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority :

- a. That waste generated during the construction of development is limited to the minimum quantity necessary.
- b. Opportunities for re-use and for the recycling of construction residues and waste on site are maximised.
- c. On-site facilities to manage the waste arising during the operation of the development of an appropriate type and scale have been considered as part of the development.
- d. Integrated storage to facilitate reuse and recycling of waste is incorporated in the development.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:**

To ensure the minimisation of waste and maximisation of recycling in accordance with Policy S4 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020.

22. The extra care accommodation hereby permitted shall remain within Use Class C2 Residential Institutions in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or any subsequent Order amending or replacing this Order, and shall remain as affordable housing for rent in accordance with the definition within the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 Annex 2: Glossary, or any subsequent Government guidance.

**Reason:**

To ensure that the proposed development remains solely for the use intended and meets the definition of affordable housing in order to contribute to the Runnymede Borough and wider Surrey affordable housing need in accordance with National

**Informatives:**

1. 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 elements of the design (as originally submitted) and impacts of the development on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and addressed through negotiation and acceptable amendments to the proposals. The applicant has also been given advance sight of the draft planning conditions and the County Planning Authority has also engaged positively in the preparation of draft legal agreements. This approach has been in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.
2. Attention is drawn to the requirements of Sections 7 and 8A of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and to the Code of Practice for Access of the Disabled to Buildings (British Standards Institution Code of Practice BS 8300:2009) or any prescribed document replacing that code.
3. This approval relates only to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and must not be taken to imply or be construed as an approval under the Building Regulations 2000 or for the purposes of any other statutory provision whatsoever.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. The applicant's attention is drawn to the advice as set out in comments received from Thames Water dated 29 March 2023 including those regarding the proximity of the site to a strategic sewer. Should any piling be undertaken, a piling method statement should be produced.



7. If proposed 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 the Council's website.
8. It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be provided in accordance with the Surrey County Council Vehicular, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development 2023.
9. The applicant is expected to ensure the safe operation of all construction traffic to prevent unnecessary disturbance, obstruction and inconvenience to other highway users. Care should be taken to ensure that the waiting, parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles does not hinder the free flow of any carriageway, footway, bridleway, footpath, cycle route, right of way or private driveway or entrance. The developer is also expected to require their contractors to sign up to the 'Considerate Constructors Scheme' Code of Practice ([www.ccscheme.org.uk](http://www.ccscheme.org.uk)) and to follow this throughout the period of construction within the site, and within adjacent areas such as on the adjoining public highway and other areas of public realm.
10. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide e-bike charging points with socket timers to prevent them constantly drawing a current over night or for longer than required. Signage should be considered regarding damaged or shock impacted batteries, indicating that these should not be used/charged. The design of communal bike areas should consider fire spread and there should be detection in areas where charging takes place. With regard to an e-bike socket in a domestic dwelling, the residence should have detection, and an official e-bike charger should be used. Guidance on detection can be found in BS 5839-6 for fire detection and fire alarm systems in both new and existing domestic premises and BS 5839-1 the code of practice for designing, installing, commissioning and maintaining fire detection and alarm systems in non-domestic buildings.
11. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders (Highways Act Sections 131, 148, 149).
12. Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage.
13. The applicant is advised that careful consideration should be given to the location of ancillary storage structures to be considered as part of the reserved matters for landscaping. This is to ensure that these structures are positioned such that the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers is safeguarded.

---

**Contact Charlotte Parker**

**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, 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 entry for this application can be found under application reference RU.23/0474.

## **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**

[Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020](#)  
[Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document \(DPD\) 2011](#)  
[Surrey Minerals Plan Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document \(DPD\) 2011](#)  
[Surrey Minerals Plan Site Restoration Supplementary Planning Document \(SPD\) 2011](#)  
<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/land-planning-and-development/minerals-and-waste/minerals-core-strategy-development-plan/aggregates-recycling-joint-development-plan>  
South East Plan 2009 (retained Policy NRM6 only)  
Runnymede Borough Local Plan 2030

### **Other Documents**

Runnymede Design SPD July 2021  
Runnymede Parking Guidance SPD 2022  
Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area SPD 2021

---



This page is intentionally left blank