

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**ADDENDUM**

**WEDNESDAY 6 JUNE 2018**

**ITEM 1**

**MO/2017/1620 - ELMER WORKS, GUILDFORD ROAD, FETCHAM, SURREY**

Clarification Points

SESW supplies water to approximately 95% of the Mole Valley District Council area.

Trees – Three individual trees and two groups of trees would be removed in the vicinity of the proposed access road. None of the trees are protected by TPO, or are worthy of protection. The proposals would add 6 trees to the site as replacement planting. These would be located in the vicinity of the access road.

RGF Building – The proposed parapet along the north-eastern elevation of the RGF Building would be 1m in height but would not exceed the maximum height of the roof of the building.

Page 1 – Amend description as follows:

Construction of a Chlorine Dosing Building (including an Emergency Air Scrubber Building) (450m<sup>2</sup>), a Lime Dosing Building (580m<sup>2</sup>), internal access road and the demolition of the Existing Chlorine Store, Backwash Tank and Overflow Tank.

**ITEM 2**

**MO/2018/0040 - ASH COPSE FARM, LYEFIELD LANE, FOREST GREEN, DORKING, SURREY, RH5 5SN**

Cllr Vivienne Michael has requested that the following summary of her representations to officers be included on the Addendum for Members attention in relation to items 2, 3 and 4.

Thank you for taking the time to discuss this yesterday and for agreeing to request that Reading Agricultural visit the site. As promised, a summary of the main points that should be addressed:

Firstly, amongst the representations, I think that the following are concise and pertinent:

1. Mr McGregor's letter (Lyefield Farm)
2. The Ecology Report, commissioned from Mr Bradley of Verdant Ecology (Home Farm, Abinger)
3. Strutt & Parker's (Newbury) Agricultural Report examines the farming case and issues of stocking levels and waste management. I understand that S&P did make a site visit.
4. Abinger Parish Council's letter.

Most of the representations mention the heavy vehicles that will be generated by the proposals and the unsuitability of access roads. Lyefield Lane from the B2127 is full of potholes, very narrow and with crumbling edges in many places. There is not enough

space for two vehicles to pass and no passing places. The section of the Lane leading from Lower Breach Road has deteriorated less and, as a consequence, traffic approaches from Lower Breach Road, Plough Lane and North Breach Lane parts of which are narrow and winding and used extensively by riders, cyclists and pedestrians.

A neighbour has also sent me the following notes from Mr Carnell of Strutt & Parker's planning department:

*Principle of development*

- *The previous applications were refused on the grounds that there was nothing tying the three applications together and the planners were therefore concerned that one application could come forward without the others (e.g. the mobile home could be sited without the associated agricultural buildings). The new applications have only addressed this point by the widening of the red line site boundary to encompass all the buildings and the offer of a unilateral undertaking to link the developments. However, we maintain that there are fundamental questions about the principle of the development that were not suitably addressed last summer, and remain unanswered in this submission. This is a proposal for built development in the open countryside where no buildings have previously stood, in a designated area of great landscape value. The Council must hold this application to the highest level of scrutiny to ensure the countryside is protected from inappropriate and potentially harmful development.*

*Business Case*

- *The number of livestock that the applicants are proposing to farm is far too great for the size of the holding. Strutt & Parker's farming specialists have provided clear evidence supporting this conclusion. Prevailing site conditions, including the clay soil type, make the type of farming contemplated unsuitable for this location. The ground is quickly made sodden by rainfall which result in a rapid deterioration of ground quality with potential adverse impacts with surface water run-off.*
- *Only a much smaller farming enterprise could sustainably exist at the site. Therefore the agricultural buildings in the application are not justified in planning terms.*
- *The Council commissioned a report from Reading Agricultural Consultants. However, this report was not based on any interaction with the applicants or a site visit and gives little or no scrutiny to the applicant's business case. Given the questions raised by S&P's farming team (and those local to the area who are familiar with ground conditions and farming in the local area) the Council cannot rely on the brief appraisal received from Reading Agricultural as a basis to approve an application.*

*Planning merit of new dwelling*

- *The applicant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that there is planning need for a temporary dwelling on site. Although Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 is no longer official guidance, it is common practice for Planning Inspectors to refer to the agricultural occupancy tests contained in the document to determine the need for the proposed dwelling. Strutt & Parker's letter addresses why these have not been met. For example, the applicant has not*

*demonstrated that the need could not be met by an existing dwelling within a short distance of the application site. Indeed, this was noted in the officer's report for application MO/2017/1114, but not addressed in the conclusions. As noted in our letter, there are several properties for sale or rent in the area that could conceivably be used by a worker at the site. It is surely preferable for one of these to be used rather than allow the siting of a new dwelling in the countryside where there is a strong presumption against such development.*

### *Ecology*

- *The applicant has not undertaken sufficient survey work to demonstrate that there will be no harm to protected species (see the report from Verdant Ecology as mentioned above). These surveys cannot be required at a later date via planning condition, but must be done up front and accompany the planning application so that the local planning authority has all available information available to it when it makes a decision.*
- *Great crested newts are generally present in ponds in the area. There are several of these within very close proximity to the site and there should be no progress with the application until those surveys have been done for these and other important species.*

### *Waste Management*

- *This is thoroughly addressed in Strutt & Parker's Agricultural Report and has been pretty well ignored by the applicant.*

From what was said yesterday I assume that this will come to DC in May at the earliest and that, with 20 plus letters of representation, speakers will be allowed. I'd be most grateful if you could keep me informed.

### Representations

One more letter has been received from the surveyors acting on behalf of two nearby residents, in response to all three applications. The following summarised points are raised:-

- It is reiterated that the enterprises proposed in the business plan are not economically viable and sustainable in the future. The estimated profits are not achievable if all costs are properly accounted for from a 10.5 hectare holding. The surpluses generated are insufficient to generate the interests of the investment and depreciation of the capital expenditure.
- As a consequence of the above, the buildings will become surplus to agriculture leading to future alternative use applications which are unlikely to be appropriate for the locality;
- Lack of sufficient information on how water and electricity will be supplied to the site, which would be critical to the enterprise;
- The farming enterprises proposed, given location and soil type, are grossly intensive and inappropriate and will lead to excessive manure production which will have to be exported and this would need to comply with the NVZ (Nitrate Vulnerable Zones) regulations. Details would need to be known of the importing farm and that their NVZ calculations are checked and verified.
- The stocking rates would breach the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations

and Statutory Management Requirement 1.

- The response to various questions posed to the applicant is misleading and inaccurate.
- Enterprise will not enhance the landscape;
- Unsustainability of farm enterprise due to the intensity of production on such a limited holding;
- The fact that the agent says silage 'may be brought in' shows the poor planning of the enterprise. Would the silage be bagged or clamped?;
- The feasibility of the applicant's business plan is fundamental to justifying the erection of new buildings in the open countryside, yet the business case is unviable;
- For a holding of this size, a much smaller farming enterprise would be required;
- The case for the mobile home is unproven. The applicant has failed to demonstrate:
  1. Clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise concerned;
  2. Functional need;
  3. That the proposed enterprise has been planned on a sound financial basis;
  4. That the functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling located close to the site, which is suitable and available for occupation by the workers concerned;
  5. Other normal planning requirements e.g. on siting and access, are satisfied.
- Lack of sufficient ecological information ‘
- Harm to AGLV visual character.

### **ITEM 3**

#### **MO/2018/0041 - ASH COPSE FARM, LYEFIELD LANE, FOREST GREEN, DORKING, SURREY, RH5 5SN**

##### Clarification Points

There is a distance of approximately 100m between the proposed mobile home and the proposed cattle shed.

Page 54 - Add condition 7 as follows:

No occupation of the mobile home shall take place unless and until the cattle shed and hay store, the subject of applications MO/18/0040 and MO/18/0042 respectively, have been erected and brought into use in accordance with the terms of the planning permissions.

Reason – To accord with the terms of the application and to control the use of the land in the interests of the open character of the countryside, in accordance with policy ENV3 of the Mole Valley Local Plan.

### Representations

One more letter has been received from the surveyors acting on behalf of two nearby residents, in response to all three applications. The following summarised points are raised:-

- It is reiterated that the enterprises proposed in the business plan are not economically viable and sustainable in the future. The estimated profits are not achievable if all costs are properly accounted for from a 10.5 hectare holding. The surpluses generated are insufficient to generate the interests of the investment and depreciation of the capital expenditure.
- As a consequence of the above, the buildings will become surplus to agriculture leading to future alternative use applications which are unlikely to be appropriate for the locality;
- Lack of sufficient information on how water and electricity will be supplied to the site, which would be critical to the enterprise;
- The farming enterprises proposed, given location and soil type, are grossly intensive and inappropriate and will lead to excessive manure production which will have to be exported and this would need to comply with the NVZ (Nitrate Vulnerable Zones) regulations. Details would need to be known of the importing farm and that their NVZ calculations are checked and verified.
- The stocking rates would breach the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations and Statutory Management Requirement 1.
- The response to various questions posed to the applicant is misleading and inaccurate.
- Enterprise will not enhance the landscape;
- Unsustainability of farm enterprise due to the intensity of production on such a limited holding;
- The fact that the agent says silage ‘may be brought in’ shows the poor planning of the enterprise. Would the silage be bagged or clamped?;
- The feasibility of the applicant’s business plan is fundamental to justifying the erection of new buildings in the open countryside, yet the business case is unviable;
- For a holding of this size, a much smaller farming enterprise would be required;
- The case for the mobile home is unproven. The applicant has failed to

demonstrate:

6. Clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise concerned;
  7. Functional need;
  8. That the proposed enterprise has been planned on a sound financial basis;
  9. That the functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling located close to the site, which is suitable and available for occupation by the workers concerned;
  10. Other normal planning requirements e.g. on siting and access, are satisfied.
- Lack of sufficient ecological information ‘
  - Harm to AGLV visual character.

#### **ITEM 4**

#### **MO/2018/0042 - ASH COPSE FARM, LYEFIELD LANE, FOREST GREEN, DORKING, SURREY, RH5 5SN**

##### Representations

One more letter has been received from the surveyors acting on behalf of two nearby residents, in response to all three applications. The following summarised points are raised:-

- It is reiterated that the enterprises proposed in the business plan are not economically viable and sustainable in the future. The estimated profits are not achievable if all costs are properly accounted for from a 10.5 hectare holding. The surpluses generated are insufficient to generate the interests of the investment and depreciation of the capital expenditure.
- As a consequence of the above, the buildings will become surplus to agriculture leading to future alternative use applications which are unlikely to be appropriate for the locality;
- Lack of sufficient information on how water and electricity will be supplied to the site, which would be critical to the enterprise;
- The farming enterprises proposed, given location and soil type, are grossly intensive and inappropriate and will lead to excessive manure production which will have to be exported and this would need to comply with the NVZ (Nitrate Vulnerable Zones) regulations. Details would need to be known of the importing farm and that their NVZ calculations are checked and verified.
- The stocking rates would breach the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations and Statutory Management Requirement 1.
- The response to various questions posed to the applicant is misleading and

inaccurate.

- Enterprise will not enhance the landscape;
- Unsustainability of farm enterprise due to the intensity of production on such a limited holding;
- The fact that the agent says silage 'may be brought in' shows the poor planning of the enterprise. Would the silage be bagged or clamped?;
- The feasibility of the applicant's business plan is fundamental to justifying the erection of new buildings in the open countryside, yet the business case is unviable;
- For a holding of this size, a much smaller farming enterprise would be required;
- The case for the mobile home is unproven. The applicant has failed to demonstrate:
  11. Clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise concerned;
  12. Functional need;
  13. That the proposed enterprise has been planned on a sound financial basis;
  14. That the functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling located close to the site, which is suitable and available for occupation by the workers concerned;
  15. Other normal planning requirements e.g. on siting and access, are satisfied.
- Lack of sufficient ecological information ‘
- Harm to AGLV visual character.

**ITEM 6**

**MO/2018/0471 - THE OLD COURT HOUSE, 267-273, HIGH STREET, DORKING, SURREY, RH4 1RY**

Clarification Points

Para 3.2 - The access to the car park at the rear of The Old Court House is taken from both Wathen Road and Jubilee Terrace.

**ITEM 7**

**MO/2018/0274 - LANGALLER FARM, LANGALLER LANE, FETCHAM, LEATHERHEAD, SURREY, KT22 9SN**

Page 138 – Amend condition 8 as follows:

No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors

- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) storage of plant and materials
- d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation
- g) vehicle routing
- h) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
- i) on-site turning for construction vehicles

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: The above condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Surrey Transport Plan, and saved polices MOV2 and MOV5 of the Mole Valley Local Plan.

**ITEM 8**

**MO/2018/0298 - 176-180, HIGH STREET, DORKING, SURREY, RH4 1QR**

Clarification Points

There is no access for neighbouring properties into the yard at the rear.

Refuse storage – It is suggested that the refuse and recycling storage be provided in two larger 1200litre eurobins which will be collected by the refuse collection staff from the compound and returned to the compound. A condition is recommended to require further details to be submitted.

The photos below show the views across the site to neighbouring properties.



View to the east



View to the south (windows in offices at 3/4, Dene Street)

Page 144, para. 4.1 – The views of Surrey CC Highways have been received as follows:

The proposed development has been considered by The County Highway Authority who having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds, recommends that a conditions requiring cycle parking to be provided and that a construction management plan be submitted and agreed by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development following conditions be imposed in any permission granted.

Page 147, para. 7.12 should read as follows:

The proposal would introduce five additional windows at first floor and five additional windows at second floor level. However, the orientation of these windows together with the relationship with neighbouring buildings would ensure that the above ground floor windows would not result in an unacceptable level of overlooking.

Page 148 – Amend condition 2 as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the submitted documents and plan numbers 0459-3D-O-100, 101, 102, 103, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204 and 300 contained within the application and no variations shall take place.

Page 148 – Amend condition 5 as follows:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme to demonstrate that the internal noise levels within the residential units will conform to the “indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings” guideline values and that noise levels within the ground floor shops complies with the guidance as specified within BS8233:2014, Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise reduction for Buildings, shall be submitted in writing to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The work specified in the approved scheme shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the premises and be retained thereafter.

Page 149 – Add conditions 9 and 10 as follows:

9. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

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

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: The above condition is required in order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Surrey Transport Plan, and saved polices MOV2 and MOV5 of the Mole Valley Local Plan.

10. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the facilities for the secure parking of bicycles within the development site have been provided in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The above condition is required in recognition of Section 4 "Promoting Sustainable Transport " in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, in accordance with the Surrey Transport Plan, and saved polices MOV2 and MOV5 of the Mole Valley Local Plan.

## **ITEM 9**

### **MO/2018/0389 - LITTLE ACRE, MILTON STREET, WESTCOTT, DORKING, SURREY, RH4 3PX**

#### **Clarification Points**

Page 151, para. 3.3 – First sentence to read as follows:

The application as originally submitted also sought permission to glaze in the rear lean-to timber canopy to form "a glass box".

Ecology Report - The measures set out in the Ecology Report have been implemented.

#### **Page 153, Section 4 - Representations**

Three further letters of representation received raising the following points:

- Concerned that the present application will threaten the character of the street which is of great historical significance, in addition to being in a conservation area and AONB.
- The building is clearly visible from the public footpath. Expansion of the building will make it look like a modern building which would be out of keeping.
- Concerned that there is no Conservation Area Management Plan for Milton

Street.

- Concerned about the piecemeal and incremental approach to modifications to the 2012 application for the conversion of the stable building.
- Concerned about noise from the store/plant room.

*Officer comment – Addressed in the Officer’s Report for Committee.*

- The additional window and the plant/store room would be visible from Milton Street, contrary to the applicant’s claim that they would not be visible due to the position of Little Acre to the rear of Carpenters.
- Concerned that the windows on the north elevation are larger than would appear on the plan.
- Concerned about appearance and impact on the conservation area of proposed/permitted decking area on the west side of 45 feet in depth.

*Officer comment – the decking area referred to is the raised patio area on the east elevation under the existing timber canopy at the rear of the building. This was approved under MO/2012/0657 and is detailed on plan number 4401/ST.01.*

- Concerned that there is no management plan for the Milton Street Conservation Area.

*Historic Environment Officer comment – The Council has management plans for four conservation areas in Mole Valley. They are for Dorking, Leatherhead, Little Bookham and Great Bookham.*

*We would like to be able to continue with the programme of conservation area character appraisals, but resources (financial and staffing) means that we have had to stop after the last ones. The creation of a character appraisal does not change the degree of protection afforded to the various heritage assets. The legislation and policies which we use when considering development proposals are still as strong as ever, i.e. the clear requirement to ‘preserve or enhance’ and so not cause harm. The character and setting of the many listed buildings in Milton Street is still at the forefront of our consideration when dealing with applications for development, as is the character and setting of the wider conservation area.*

*Although the publication of a conservation area character appraisal for Milton Street is unlikely in the near future, the conservation area character summary contained in the Mole Valley Local Plan in Appendix 6 is still relevant.*

## **ITEM 10**

### **MO/2018/0391 - DRAYCOTE, GUILDFORD ROAD, WESTCOTT, DORKING, SURREY, RH4 3NW**

#### **Clarification Points**

The existing property is a three bedroom house.

Dimensions for car parking bays - Manual for Streets suggests that parallel parking bays should be at least 6.0m in length. The two parking bays for the proposed 3 bedroom dwelling, which are arranged as parallel bays, are each 4.8m in length.

**ITEM11**

**MO/2017/2058 - SURREY HILLS HOTEL, HORSHAM ROAD, BEARE GREEN, SURREY**

Clarification Points

The previous refusal for 9 dwellings on the site (ref: MO/2015/1600) although for a lesser number of units, had a mix which included more larger units, and a greater amount of floorspace on the site. The mix included the following:

- 1 x 2 bed bungalow
- 3 x 2 bed houses
- 5 x 4 bed houses.

The current application is for 10 units in the following mix:

- 2 x 2 bed maisonettes
- 5 x 3 bed houses
- 3 x 4 bed houses

The mix proposes a greater number of smaller units, and complies with the recently adopted Capel Neighbourhood Plan.

Page 180 – Delete condition 12 (duplicate of 11).

Page 182 – Add condition as follows:

The garaging hereby permitted shall be used for the storage of private motor vehicles and incidental domestic storage only.

Reason: To ensure that adequate facilities are provided for the parking of vehicles clear of the highway, in the interests of the free flow of traffic and condition of safety on the highway in accordance with Mole Valley Local Plan policy MOV5.