



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 21-24 January 2020

Site visit made on 24 January 2020

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/19/3237359 **Land East of Loxwood Road, Alfold, Surrey**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Catesby Strategic Land Ltd against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref WA/2019/0745, dated 7 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is up to 80 dwellings (including 24 affordable) with associated landscaping, open space and SUDS.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for up to 80 dwellings (including 24 affordable) with associated landscaping, open space and SUDS at Land East of Loxwood Road, Alfold, Surrey in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WA/2019/0745, dated 7 May 2019, subject to the conditions contained in the attached Schedule.

Application for costs

2. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by Catesby Strategic Land Ltd against Waverley Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application for planning permission was made in outline and sought detailed permission for the site access only. Matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for subsequent consideration.
4. The appellant's evidence contained a revised indicative masterplan¹ for the proposal. It was confirmed at the Inquiry that this replaced previous versions. The Council accepted that it had had the opportunity to consider the drawing in preparing for the Inquiry. Given the relatively minor changes from previous versions (showing additional landscaping), and having regard to its indicative nature, no party is prejudiced by its introduction during the appeal and I have had regard to it.
5. Discussion between the parties took place during the course of the appeal leading to the submission of further information and agreement on a number of

¹ See Proof of Joanna Ede, Appendix 2

matters, subject to appropriate conditions and planning obligations. As a result, the Council confirmed that it would not be defending reasons for refusal 3 (housing mix), 4 (recreation/play space), 5 (ecology), 7 (affordable housing provision) or 8 (environmental matters). Therefore, detailed evidence was not presented by the main parties on these topics.

6. During the course of the Inquiry and after some time discussing the topic, it was agreed between the parties that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply. For the purposes of the appeal, it was agreed that four years' worth of supply exists.
7. On 13 February 2020, after the Inquiry had concluded, the Government published the 2019 Housing Delivery Test Results. This led to the requirement for a 5% buffer, in lieu of the 20% buffer applicable at the time of the Inquiry. Applying this buffer to the calculation previously agreed between the parties², the supply would be around 4.5 years. As such, it remains the case that the Council cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply.

Main Issues

8. Having regard to the above, the main issues are whether the site is a suitable location for the development having regard to the development plan; whether future occupants would have access to adequate services and facilities without undue reliance on private vehicles; and the effect on trees the subject of a tree preservation order.

Reasons

Policy considerations

9. The appeal site is located on the edge of Alfold, beyond the currently defined settlement boundary for the village and therefore, in open countryside. Policy SP2 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan, Part 1 (February 2018) (LP) sets out the spatial strategy for the area. It seeks to avoid major development on land with the highest amenity and landscape value, focusing development at the four main settlements in the Borough, with moderate levels of development at larger villages and limited development in/around other villages, including Alfold. The policy also recognises, in line with the objective above, that those villages not within Surrey Hills AONB or Green Belt offer more scope for growth. Alfold is a village unaffected by these designations, unlike much of the Borough.
10. Policy ALH1 of the LP allocates a minimum of 125 homes to Alfold. In addition, 188 dwellings are anticipated to be delivered on windfall sites in the large and smaller villages. The proposed development would result in the minimum requirement for 125 dwellings being exceeded in Alfold, but that is not necessarily problematic or undesirable. Rather, it would allow for the provision of additional housing that would assist in meeting the Borough's needs in an area recognised to be relatively unconstrained by landscape designations. This is pertinent in the absence of a demonstrable five-year housing land supply.
11. The parties agree that there might be an implicit cap to the amount of development supported in Alfold by Policy ALH1, but neither party identified where such a cap might be placed. In my view, 80 dwellings would fall

² See Inquiry Document 13

comfortably within the policy expectation for limited development having regard to the size of Alfold, the minimum number of homes allocated and the outstanding need for/unmet supply of housing land in the Borough.

12. The LP expects delivery to be achieved in accordance with Policy ALH1 through decisions on planning applications, the detailed application of the Local Plan (Parts 1 and 2) and Neighbourhood Plans. There is currently no Neighbourhood Plan in place for the area and Part 2 of the Local Plan is at an early stage of preparation. Neither document has progressed sufficiently to be attributed any more than limited weight. Therefore, planning applications such as the appeal scheme are currently the primary route for delivering housing in the area. I find no conflict with Policies SP2 and ALH1 of the LP.
13. The Council also makes reference to policies RE1 and TD1 of the LP, which identify that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and seek to protect the character and amenity of the borough. The appeal scheme is at outline stage and it is not currently possible to draw firm conclusions on design matters. That said, the indicative masterplan indicates that the number of dwellings proposed can be satisfactorily accommodated within the site, along with good amounts of open space and tree planting.
14. The Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (April 2019) (LVIA) demonstrates that the effects of the development would be limited and localised. I do not disagree, given the relationship with existing residential development, the potential for landscaping and the intervening trees and hedgerows that would screen views from public vantage points. The introduction of 80 houses would have inevitable visual consequences, but these would be limited and I find no material conflict with these policies.

Access to services and facilities

15. Alfold has a limited range of services and facilities, including a petrol filling station and associated convenience store, a part-time Post Office, a business centre providing some employment uses, churches, public houses and a veterinary surgery. It does not have many of the fundamental requirements for day to day living such as schools, doctor's surgery or a supermarket.
16. The bus services serving the village are also limited but do provide opportunities for accessing larger settlements such as Guildford, Billingshurst and Cranleigh for those willing and able to travel at the times supported by the infrequent schedules. In addition, a community transport service known as The Hoppa Shopper runs during the week. A bus serving the local secondary school picks up and drops off in the village.
17. Some opportunity exists for accessing the services and facilities of other settlements by cycle along recognised routes such as the Surrey Cycleway and Downlink but is only likely to be desirable to enthusiastic cyclists given the distances involved and the nature of many of the on-road routes. There are some 5 railway stations at various distances from the site but all within 17km which provide links further afield, including to London, but would require some time and/or planning to reach by means other than the private car.
18. The level of services, facilities and public transport options available would not allow future residents of the development to meet their needs within the village

or to rely solely on public transport for travel in the majority of cases. It is neither parties' case that it would.

19. The services and facilities available are commensurate with the scale of Alfold and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. Nevertheless, the appellant has proposed a range of measures to improve the current situation and promote the use of sustainable modes of travel.
20. The development would incorporate a pedestrian and cycle link into Chilton Close, reducing the distance to facilities such as the bus stops to the north. In addition, footway improvements would be carried out along Horsham Road (A281) to improve the safety and attractiveness of the route, which could be used to access the convenience store at the petrol filling station. A financial contribution would be made to fund a Demand Responsive Bus Service (DRBS) for a period of five years, which the County Council have agreed to utilise for improving local bus provision. This would improve the frequency/availability of the services available and could be used to access larger settlements or the surrounding railway stations.
21. Also of relevance is the extant planning permission at Dunsfold Aerodrome. The site currently accommodates a range of employment uses that might be available to future residents within a cycle or short drive. Those willing to walk the 2.7km distance would also be able to access employment without the need for a private car.
22. After development, however, a new settlement (described as a main settlement in the LP) comprising 1,800 homes, employment, a school, health care, community facilities, retail and leisure would become available. This development is also required to provide a sustainable transport package, including regular bus services that would serve the surrounding area, including Alfold. This would dramatically improve the level of services and facilities close-by to future residents of the appeal scheme. The County Council has committed to delivering a footpath between Dunsfold Aerodrome and Alfold which would be likely to improve the safety and attractiveness of a walk to these facilities³. It is expected that this will be completed during 2020/21, in advance of any occupation at the appeal site.
23. It will take some time for the Dunsfold Aerodrome scheme to be built and it cannot be guaranteed that its facilities will be available to new residents of the appeal scheme immediately. However, the DRBS funding would be available for a period of 5 years and it is likely that development will have progressed within this time to a stage where its improved public transport requirements are provided. It is expected that these services will begin to receive funding after the first 100 dwellings are built, which the Council itself anticipates will be well within 5 years.
24. The appellant has committed to implementing a Travel Plan that would encourage the use of public transport and other sustainable modes of travel. Information packs and vouchers towards bicycles would be provided to new residents for example.

³ See CD9.8, para.1.4

25. Taking all of these factors together, I am satisfied that the development would maximise the sustainable transport options available in this rural area and that there is a realistic prospect that residents could utilise sustainable modes of travel if they are inclined to do so. The measures proposed would encourage and facilitate such use and there need not be reliance entirely on private vehicles for travel. It is clear that this site is not the most accessible compared with urban sites and that opportunities for sustainable travel patterns will remain limited after the development, but they are in my view sufficient for the scale of development proposed in this case.
26. Far from putting undue strain on the existing facilities in the village, it seems to me that the increased population arising from the development would support the local services, providing increased custom at the local shops and patronage at the local pubs for example. There is no evidence before me to indicate that local services such as doctor's surgeries or school buses, have any deficiency in capacity and no objections have been raised by relevant consultees or service providers. The Council has adopted a CIL Charging Schedule which funds necessary infrastructure related to education, leisure and recreation facilities. The development would be relatively modest and I see no reason why it could not be accommodated.
27. Having regard to the above, I find no material conflict with Policies SP1 and SP2 of the LP, which reiterate the presumption in favour of sustainable development and seek to meet development needs in a sustainable manner; or saved Policy D1 of the Local Plan (2002) which seeks to avoid environmental harms.

Trees

28. As part of the development, a road would pass through a line of oak trees forming an existing field boundary, the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. In order to avoid harmful digging or the compaction of roots close to the trees in question, an engineered structure is proposed that would bridge the root protection areas and the change in ground levels. Nevertheless, it would be necessary to remove one of the trees within the group.
29. The tree to be removed is one of the smallest in the group, apparently having been suppressed by the larger trees either side. It is for this reason that the access is proposed to take this route, minimising the effect on the overall group and leaving the more dominant specimens in situ. The tree to be removed is described in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as moderate in quality and it seems to me that, whilst the visual amenity of the group would undoubtedly be impacted by the development, there is more than sufficient scope within the scheme to replace the tree lost. Indeed, a great many trees are shown on the indicative masterplan. Landscaping is a reserved matter and the required species and size of tree planting would remain within the Council's control.
30. Asides from the loss of one tree, the appellant's arboriculture expert expects that only very minor pruning of the lower limbs of an adjacent tree would be necessary to allow clearance for vehicles. The Council disagree with this but provided no expert evidence to support its case. The trees have already developed their relatively upright structure given the proximity to trees either side and so growth of lower limbs is and is likely to remain limited. Even if some minor pruning did become necessary in the future, this could be done

sensitively and would require the Council's consent, the trees being subject to a preservation order.

31. The Council accepts the findings of the LVIA that the overall development would result in only localised impacts and the same is true of the proposed tree works. Although the development would introduce a gap into the existing group, the linear landscape feature would remain. Any gap created would also be likely to close over time, as upper limbs of the trees either side grow towards one another. There would be some visual harm arising to the group of trees but there would also be scope for significant tree replacement.
32. Policy D7 of the Local Plan (2002) restricts development that would result in the loss of a protected tree and the development would be in conflict. However, the harm arising would be very limited and largely compensated by the replacement tree planting proposed. As such, I attach this harm only limited weight. I find no conflict with policy NE2 of the LP, which seeks to maintain and enhance existing trees, where appropriate; or saved policy D6 of the Local Plan (2002), which set out the circumstances where works to protected trees will be considered.

Other Matters

33. The appeal is accompanied by a Transport Assessment (May 2019) which concludes that the development would not materially harm highway safety or capacity in the area. Both the Council and the Local Highway Authority accept these conclusions and I have no reason to take a different view. Similarly, a Flood Risk Assessment (April 2019) demonstrates that the site will not be at risk of flooding or cause flooding elsewhere and that it can be suitably drained.
34. A range of ecological surveys demonstrate that the development can occur without material harm to ecological interests, subject to mitigation and enhancement measures being secured by condition. Overall, the parties agree that there would be a net gain to biodiversity which should be considered a benefit of the scheme. The appeal site includes an area of land previously set aside for reptile mitigation associated with the adjacent residential development. This has only recently been provided and the submitted Planning Obligation provides for suitable re-provision so as to maintain favourable habitat for reptiles.
35. The amount of traffic utilising the existing access from Loxwood Road would inevitably increase as a result on the development, passing by residential properties. However, these would be residents accessing their own residential properties and the nature and amount of traffic would not be so significant as to harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties. Any inconvenience such as noise and dust would be for a short period during construction. Such impacts could be minimised through the use of conditions and would not harm living conditions in the long-term. The detailed design and layout of the eventual scheme, along with any lighting and landscaping are matters for the reserved matters stage. The site does not fall within an Air Quality Management Area and the effects of the scheme are expected to be negligible.

Conditions

36. The parties have broadly agreed a set of conditions in the event that planning permission is granted. I have had regard to these in imposing the conditions

- contained in the attached Schedule. I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions as necessary in order to improve precision and otherwise ensure compliance with the tests for conditions contained in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
37. I have imposed the standard conditions and timescales defining the reserved matters, the time period for relevant applications to be made and for commencement on site. In addition, I have clarified the plans approved in the interests of certainty.
 38. Having had regard to local water pressure concerns, a condition is necessary to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided for the development. Given the potential for archaeological remains to be present on the site, a programme of archaeological work is secured. Refuse and recycling facilities are secured to ensure that the needs of the future occupants are met. Details of boundary treatments are needed to ensure an acceptable appearance. The LP seeks to minimise water usage and a condition is appropriate to support this objective.
 39. In order to protect ecological interests, a Construction Environmental Management Plan is needed, along with a reptile impact mitigation, enhancement and translocation plan and details of lighting, so as to avoid impacts on bats. Given the presence of protected trees, supervision and protection measures are secured.
 40. To ensure the safety and convenience of highway users, a Construction Transport Management Plan will secure details of operations during the construction period. Furthermore, appropriate parking and turning spaces are to be provided and confirmation that the existing vehicular access, that will be used to reach the appeal site, meets adoptable standards is necessary.
 41. The proposed pedestrian/cycle route through Chilton Close and footway improvement works along Horsham Road are part of the proposed package of measures to encourage sustainable movements. As such, it is necessary that these be secured by condition. For similar reasons, details of secure cycle storage and routes within the site are also secured. Electric charging points are also needed to encourage the use of more sustainable vehicles in accordance with the LP. This objective is also supported by the Sustainable Travel Information Pack.
 42. A further requirement of the LP is the provision of the highest available speed broadband infrastructure to future homes. I have had regard to concerns surrounding the ability of the developer to make early provision within the scheme but the wording proposed by the Council provides sufficient flexibility whilst ensuring that this objective is met. Such a measure is likely to facilitate home working, studying and shopping, further reducing the need to travel and contributing to the sustainable transport measures proposed.
 43. Details of a surface water drainage scheme are necessary, along with verification that an appropriate scheme has been implemented to minimise the risks of flooding. In order to minimise the impact of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants the hours for operating plant and machinery and for deliveries to the site are restricted. The burning of waste or other materials during construction is also prohibited. In addition, a Dust Management Plan is required.

44. I have imposed a condition requiring details of the proposed Local Area of Play to ensure that it meets the needs of future residents. There was disagreement between the parties at the Inquiry as to when the scheme should be implemented. To ensure enforceability, it is necessary to define a trigger point for delivery. However, I have amended the Council's suggested requirement for delivery after 30 dwellings have been completed bearing in mind the practicalities for delivery during other construction works on the site and uncertainty surrounding the timing for delivery of the open space. I have replaced this with a requirement for the scheme to include a timetable for implementation which will be part of the detail requiring the Council's approval.
45. I have not imposed a condition requiring the proposed dwellings to accord with the nationally described space standards because the LP does not contain any enabling policy provisions. Policy D4 of the Local Plan (2002) deals generally with design and layout matters but is silent on internal space requirements. There is no evidence before me to justify imposition of the standard in this area.
46. The Council suggest that a vast range of permitted development rights should be removed from the dwellings subject of the appeal. PPG is clear that such conditions should only be imposed in exceptional circumstances. No detailed justification has been provided in this case and I can see no reason why a condition should be necessary in this instance.
47. It is also unnecessary to require the submission of landscaping details at this stage. Landscaping is a reserved matter and detailed consideration of this issue will be for the Council at the reserved matters stage.

Planning Obligations

48. The submitted Unilateral Undertaking would provide for a policy compliant, 30% provision of affordable housing; the provision of open space (including reptile mitigation land) and play equipment; Sustainable Drainage Systems; and provisions for the ongoing maintenance of the land and equipment.
49. In addition, a bilateral Planning Obligation has been signed with the County Council to provide for the package of sustainable travel measures, including cycle vouchers, Travel Plan, Travel Plan auditing fee and financial contributions to fund the Demand Responsive Bus Service.
50. I am satisfied that these obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and that they are otherwise in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. As such, I have had regard to them in reaching my decision.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

51. The proposed development would deliver housing in accordance with the spatial strategy for the area, on a site unconstrained by landscape designations and where there is a significant identified need for both market and affordable housing. Although not the most accessible location in the Borough, planning conditions and obligations would maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and would provide a realistic option for future residents such that it would not be necessary to rely solely on the use of private vehicles.

52. The development would involve the loss of an oak tree the subject of a tree preservation order and this would result in some harm to the amenity it offers in the immediate locality, as well as a conflict with saved Policy D7 of the Local Plan (2002). That said, the linear landscape feature would largely remain intact and significant replacement planting could be secured as part of landscaping proposals at the reserved matters stage. There would also be some limited and localised landscape and visual effects, but these could be minimised through the detailed design of the scheme.
53. The development would make a meaningful contribution towards the needs for housing in the Borough, both market and affordable. This attracts significant weight given the Council's lack of housing land and the significant and ongoing need for affordable housing. Benefits would also arise from financial investment in the construction process and from increased local expenditure and funding once the development is occupied; from the delivery of publicly accessible open space and play equipment; and through a net gain to biodiversity.
54. The development would be in conflict with saved Policy D7 of the Local Plan (2002) but the opportunity for replacement tree planting would assist in mitigating such harm so that I attach the conflict only limited weight. Notwithstanding that the policies most important for determining this application are to be considered out-of-date by virtue of a lack of sufficient housing land in the area, I have found broad support for the proposal within the development plan, such that I consider the scheme to accord with it, taken as a whole. I attach significant weight to the benefits that would arise from the appeal proposal and these indicate a favourable decision, despite the conflict with Policy D7.
55. In light of the above, the appeal is allowed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Stephen Whale, Counsel

He called:

Jessica Robinson BA Principal Planning Officer

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Sasha White QC and
Matthew Fraser

He called:

Jeff Richards BA (Hons) Director, Turleys
MTP MRTPI

Joanne Ede MA DipLD Director, Turleys
CMLI

Patrick Stileman Dip.Arb Operations Director, Forbes-Laird Arboricultural
(RFS) CUEW MICFoR Consultancy
MRICS RC.Arbor.A

Ian Fielding BSc (Hons) Technical Director, WSP
MCIHT CMILT

Mat Jones BSc (Hons) Senior Director, Turleys
Dip TP MRTPI

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Kevin Deanus Councillor
Chris Britton Councillor and Member of NP Steering Group

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY

- 1 Appellant's Opening Statement
- 2 Council's Opening Statement
- 3 Copy of oral submissions from Cllr Britton
- 4 Copy of Alfold Parish Council comments dated 20 December 2019
- 5 2019 Indices of Deprivation
- 6 NP Housing Policy Recommendations
- 7 Council's Housing Land Supply Statement (December 2019)
- 8 Latest position on progress for Local Plan, Part 2
- 9 Copy of oral submissions from Cllr Deanus
- 10 Agreement on Housing Land Supply and Costs
- 11 Completed S106 agreement
- 12 Completed Unilateral Undertaking
- 13 Updated Calculation of Five Year Supply Following Agreed SoCG
- 14 Site Location Plan for Springbok Estate
- 15 Appellant's Costs Application
- 16 Chronology of discussions with Surrey County Council
- 17 Draft conditions agreed between the parties
- 18 Updated draft of conditions agreed between the parties
- 19 CIL Compliance Statement Addendum
- 20 Authorisation for handwritten amendment to S106 agreement
- 21 Updated draft of conditions agreed between the parties
- 22 E-mail from Mr Cooper regarding UU and access road condition
- 23 Council's Closing Statement
- 24 Appellant's Closing Statement
- 25 Appellant's amended Costs Application

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: CATQ3020_1001 Rev.C, CATQ3020_3402 Rev.B-1, CATQ3020_3403 Rev.B-2 and No.70064838-SK-001 Rev A.
- 5) There shall be no occupation beyond the 50th dwelling until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow additional development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation of those additional dwellings shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.
- 6) No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 7) No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which is in accordance with the approach outlined in the Ecological Assessment, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall deal with the treatment of any environmentally sensitive areas, their aftercare and maintenance as well as a plan detailing the works to be carried out showing how the environment will be protected during the works. Such a scheme shall include details of the following:
 - a) A detailed reptile mitigation strategy including a trapping and translocation method (as opposed to displacement);
 - b) a map or plan showing habitat areas to be specifically protected during the works;
 - c) the measures to be used during the development in order to minimise the environmental impact of the works;
 - d) the ecological enhancements as mitigation for the loss of habitat resulting from the development;
 - e) any other necessary mitigation for protected species;
 - f) information on the persons/bodies responsible for particular activities associated with the CEMP that demonstrate they are qualified for the

activity they are undertaking, for example the Ecological Clerk of Works.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.

- 8) The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with a reptile impact mitigation, compensation, enhancement and translocation plan and measures contained therein which will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include detail of:
 - a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
 - b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - c) storage of plant and materials;
 - d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management);
 - e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones;
 - f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation;
 - g) vehicle routing;
 - h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway;
 - i) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused;
 - j) no HGV movements to or from the site shall take place between the hours of 8.30 and 9.15 am and 3.15 and 4.00 pm nor shall the contractor permit any HGVs associated with the development at the site to be laid up, waiting, on the public highway during these times;
 - k) on-site turning for construction vehicles;has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.
- 10) No dwelling hereby approved shall be first occupied unless and until space for the parking of vehicles and space for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in a forward gear has been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved scheme shall be retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
- 11) No dwelling constructed pursuant to this permission shall be occupied until the pedestrian and cycle access to be provided between the site and Chilton Close has been constructed in accordance with the details to be approved as reserved matters. The pedestrian access as constructed shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.
- 12) Prior to commencement of development the access road (as demonstrated on plan ref CATQ3020_1004) is to have been completed to an adoptable standard. Written confirmation of the completion of the access road to an adoptable standard shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority no later than 7 days prior to the commencement of the development.

- 13) Prior to first occupation of the development the footway improvement scheme on Horsham Road between the Alfold Crossways junction and the M&S/BP garage shall be constructed in accordance with drawing No. 70064838-SK-001 Rev A.
- 14) The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the following facilities have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) Secure cycle storage for each dwelling.
 - b) Safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists to travel within the development site.
- 15) 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 local 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 & 1 in 100 (+40% allowance for climate change) storm events and 10% allowance for urban creep, during all stages of the development (Pre, Post and during), associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 7.3 l/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 of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.);
 - c) Evidence through hydraulic modelling that the proposed site flood alleviation scheme and compensatory area is sufficiently sized;
 - d) 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;
 - e) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system;
 - f) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 16) Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme, 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).

- 17) No machinery or plant shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site associated with the construction process except between the hours 08:00 - 18:00 Monday to Friday, 08:00 - 13:00 Saturday and not at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.
- 18) Prior to the first occupation of the units hereby approved, a lighting scheme setting out the location, type, and illumination levels of lighting to be provided on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. External lighting shall be installed on the site in strict accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the units and shall thereafter be retained.
- 19) There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site during the demolition and construction phases of the development.
- 20) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until each of the proposed dwellings are provided with a fast charge socket (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 to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
- 21) No development, groundworks or demolition processes shall be undertaken until an agreed scheme of supervision for the arboricultural protection measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The supervision and monitoring shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved details. The scheme shall include details of a) a pre-commencement meeting between the Local Planning Authority Tree Officer and personnel responsible for the implementation of the approved development and b) timings, frequency & methods of site visiting and an agreed reporting process to the Local Planning Authority.
- 22) Before work begins, cross sections/details indicating the proposed finished ground levels, surface materials including sub-base and depth of construction, within protected zones around retained trees shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 23) Prior to the occupation of the dwellings, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to confirm that the dwellings have been completed to meet the requirement of a maximum usage of 110 litres of water per person per day.
- 24) Prior to the first occupation, a strategy for the provision of the highest available headline speed of broadband provision to future occupants of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall take into account the timetable for the delivery of 'superfast broadband' (defined as having a headline access speed of 24Mb or more) in the vicinity of the site (to the extent that such information is available). The strategy shall seek to ensure that upon occupation of any dwelling, the provision of the highest available headline speed of broadband service to that dwelling from a site-wide network is in place. Unless evidence is put forward and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority that technological advances for the provision of a broadband service for the majority of potential customers will no longer

- necessitate below ground infrastructure, the development of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.
- 25) Prior to the first occupation of the units hereby permitted, full details of the proposed refuse and recycling stores to serve each unit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The stores and appropriate bins shall be provided on site prior to the first occupation of the units in strict accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be retained.
 - 26) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved a detailed scheme for the proposed Local Area for Play and open spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a proposed timetable for implementation, details of the equipment to be provided, its maintenance and a regime of inspections to be carried out by a qualified Inspector to demonstrate that the equipment is of an appropriate quality/standard. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 27) Prior to the occupation of the development details of any proposed boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.
 - 28) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Dust Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan can be part of a broader site Construction Management Plan but should detail all potential sources of particulate emissions and include appropriate mitigation measures.
 - 29) Prior to the first occupation of the development a Sustainable Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Pack shall be in accordance with the sustainable development aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Surrey County Council's Travel Plans Good Practice Guide for Developers. The approved Sustainable Travel Information Pack shall be issued to the first-time occupier of each dwelling, prior to first occupation.
 - 30) Prior to commencement of any works on site, details of any services to be provided or repaired, including drains and soakaways, on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.