



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held between 15-17 and 21-22 April 2026

Site visit made on 21 April 2026

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002295

Land at Snows Ride, Windlesham, Surrey GU20 6LA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Retirement Villages Developments Limited against the decision of Surrey Heath Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 24/0428/OOU.
 - The development proposed is a mixed residential led development comprising up to 154 integrated retirement community units (Use Class C2) and 33 dwellings (Use Class C3) together with a general practice surgery, the creation of suitable alternative natural greenspace, landscaping, car parking, access, maintenance workshop, refuse storage and communal facilities.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a mixed residential led development comprising up to 154 integrated retirement community units (Use Class C2) and 33 dwellings (Use Class C3) together with a general practice surgery, the creation of suitable alternative natural greenspace, landscaping, car parking, access, maintenance workshop, refuse storage and communal facilities on land at Snows Ride, Windlesham, Surrey G20 6LA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/0428/OOU and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is made in outline with all detailed matters reserved for later consideration other than for access. For the purposes of the appeal, the access details are confined to the points of access into the site shown on parameter plan 01 (BA10517-2500). They do not extend to the internal roadways shown on the illustrative drawings.
3. In addition to the access details listed above, the proposal includes changes to the public highway along Snows Ride including remodelling the junction with the A30 London Road and reducing the speed limit. Also proposed is the formation of a public footpath along Snows Ride with crossing points, partly within the highway and partly within the site, and dedicating a public footpath through the site between Snows Ride and the public footpath alongside the A30 London Road. I consider these changes along with other obligations later in my decision.
4. An alteration to the site boundary has been proposed after the submission of the appeal. This effectively excludes the northern drive to Windlesham Court from the application site. The Council has no objection to the change. I consider the alteration to the site boundary does not materially alter the scheme considered at

the application stage and would not prejudice the views of any interested parties. I have therefore taken the amendment into account in my decision.

5. The draft Surrey Heath Local Plan 2019-2038 is currently at examination. The examining Inspector issued a post-hearing letter in January 2026 indicating that the plan is likely to be capable of being found sound and legally compliant subject to main modifications. At the date of the inquiry those modifications had yet to be published and will require consultation and further consideration. It remains possible that the policies contained in the draft plan may be modified. For that reason, I place only limited weight on them.

Main Issues

6. It is agreed between the main parties that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, because it does not meet all of the 'golden rules' set out in paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
7. Having regard to the agreed position, I consider the main issues in this appeal to be:
 - 1) The effect on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt
 - 2) The effect on the character and appearance of the area
 - 3) Whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any harm arising from the two issues above would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify development in the Green Belt.

Reasons

Purposes and openness of the Green Belt

8. Both parties accept that the site is grey belt, because it is land that does not strongly contribute to purposes (a), (b) or (d) of the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 143 of the Framework, and there are no policies relating to areas or assets in footnote 7 of the Framework (other than Green Belt) which provide a strong reason for refusal.
9. Purpose (c) of the Green Belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. My impression is that because the site is undeveloped and agricultural in nature it does form part of the countryside. However, the countryside in this part of the borough is somewhat fragmented with plots of grazing land and woodland being interspersed with sizeable areas of residential, commercial or recreational uses. While the proposed development would therefore encroach into the countryside, that impact would be moderated by the presence of existing development in the area. Activity generated by the proposal would also be moderated by surrounding uses and the busy A30 London Road to the north. Having regard to its acknowledged status as grey belt and the moderating factors noted above, I consider the degree of harm that would be caused to the purposes of the Green Belt to be limited.
10. It is also necessary to consider the effect of the development on openness. At present the site is open and undeveloped other than for a barn. In spatial terms, the

development would introduce substantial built form over approximately half of the site. The parameter plan indicates that some of the buildings would be up to 2½ storeys in height and the development would include a club house, apartment blocks and medical surgery of institutional scale. In visual terms, while the site is well screened in views from the A30 London Road by a wooded tree belt, from Snows Ride the site is more visible with views between the trees along the boundary. The same applies to the boundaries with the drives to Windlesham Court. Development on the site would therefore be visible from a range of public and private vantage points. Having regard to its size and visibility I consider it would cause significant harm to the openness of this part of the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

11. The site is pastureland currently used for grazing horses. It is largely open in appearance being divided into one large field to the west and two smaller fields to the east, with a modern agricultural barn in the north-east corner accessed from the drive to Windlesham Court. Its boundaries along Snows Ride and the drives to Windlesham Court are lined with trees through which the site can be seen. The northern boundary along the A30 London Road consists of a thicker tree belt and understorey which screens views of the site. The southern and south-western boundaries are also tree lined but of a more domestic appearance.
12. As noted above, while the site itself is agricultural in nature the wider area consists of a patchwork of grazing land, blocks of woodland, large residential dwellings set in extensive grounds, some commercial uses and recreational uses including golf courses in between larger settlement areas. The character of the area is therefore a mixed one, with aspects of countryside interspersed with other uses. While Snows Ride provides a clear edge between the site and the suburban development to the west, in the wider context there is less distinction between developed and undeveloped land.
13. Development in the manner proposed would extend buildings at a suburban density onto a significant part of the site visible from Snows Ride. It would also be seen from the private drives to Windlesham Court and to a limited degree through the new access from the A30 London Road. Such development would erode the open and undeveloped character and appearance of the site. However, given the proximity of other development in the area, it would have a more limited impact on the wider character, where dispersed development between settlements is a feature of the area.
14. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would cause only limited harm to the character and appearance of the area. Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Plan 2011-2028 (the Local Plan) is primarily aimed at design principles but includes a criterion requiring development to respect and enhance the local, natural or historic character of the environment. To that extent there would be limited conflict with Policy DM9. Policy WNP2.1 of the Windlesham Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2028 relates to new housing development within Windlesham Village and therefore has limited relevance to development outside the settlement boundaries. Emerging Policy DH1 of the draft Surrey Heath Local Plan 2019-2038 carries limited weight for the reason set out in my preliminary matters.

Other considerations

15. The inquiry examined a range of benefits that would be generated by the proposed development. I examine these in turn.

Housing land supply

16. The Council acknowledges that it is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, although there is a difference of view as to the extent of that shortfall. The Council says that it is 3.1 years while the appellant says that it is 2.24 years, the difference between them resulting from disputed delivery rates on a number of sites. The evidence provided on the delivery rates of those sites was not tested by either main party at the inquiry. However, even if I were to take the Council's preferred figure, it is clear that there is a significant gap in housing land supply. The appellant has provided evidence to demonstrate that, if granted, there is a reasonable prospect that the proposal would start delivering residential units within the 5-year timeframe. The development would therefore help address the current shortfall in housing land and contribute towards the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. I give this benefit significant weight.

Specialist housing for older people

17. The proposal would deliver an integrated retirement community consisting of up to 154 units with communal facilities and varying levels of care depending on the needs of individual residents. Although some representations from interested parties express the view that there is already a sufficient supply of housing for the elderly in the area, I have been provided with evidence that shows a marked shortfall in specialist housing for the elderly in the borough. The shortfall is of further concern in the context of the population of Surrey Heath having a greater proportion of elderly than the national average, and that proportion being forecast to grow relative to the borough's total population. The emerging plan does contain a policy and site allocations aimed at increasing the delivery of specialist elderly accommodation, but for the reasons already stated I give this only limited weight. The integrated retirement community would provide greater choice in the market for those who could afford it and would help meet the growing need for specialist elderly accommodation. I give this benefit significant weight.

Affordable housing.

18. The development proposes 23 affordable dwellings out of a total of 33 dwellings, a proportion of 70%. All would be offered for discounted market sales with 11 dwellings at a 70% discount and 12 dwellings at a 40% discount. Eligible purchasers would be subject to an income cap and local connection criteria.
19. For a scheme of the size proposed, Policies CP5 and CP6 of the Local Plan seek 40% of Use Class C3¹ (dwellinghouses) to be affordable, with tenures split evenly between social rented and intermediate. There is no local policy requirement for affordable accommodation in Use Class C2 (residential institutions). Affordable discounted market sales housing is defined as that sold at a discount of at least 20%.
20. The proposed development would therefore significantly exceed both the number of affordable dwellings required by Policies CP5 and CP6 and the discounted rate required to meet the definition of affordable housing. However, it would not provide

¹ Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended

the tenures required by the policies. The definition of what constitutes intermediate affordable housing has changed since the Local Plan was adopted and does not now include discounted market sales.

21. The appellant argues that the discounts offered are approximately equivalent in financial terms to social rent and shared ownership tenures but is offering discounted market sales as an alternative affordable housing tenure because of difficulties with attracting registered providers as partners in the development. That is because of the current lack of grant funding and the difficulty in managing a relatively small number of affordable units. While that may be the case, the tenures are not equivalent, particularly in the context of Surrey Heath, where it is social rent and intermediate affordable tenures that are in greatest need. The proposal therefore conflicts in part with Policies CP5 and CP6.
22. I acknowledge the significant benefit of providing 70% of dwellinghouses on the site as affordable units and at enhanced discounted rates. However, I share the Council's concern that the affordable dwellings offered lack the affordable tenures that are in greatest need in the area. For that reason, I give the provision of affordable housing on the site only moderate beneficial weight.

Self-build and custom build housing

23. Ten self-build plots are proposed as part of the development. Based on the Council's self-build register there is an unmet need for self-build and custom build plots in the borough, although the majority of this need dates from early base periods, more recent base periods showing much lower demand. I note the appellant's criticism of these figures, and that secondary sources of information suggest a greater level of demand which is also recognised in the most recent local housing needs assessment. While there is therefore a degree of uncertainty over the level of demand for self-build and custom build housing in the borough, I am satisfied that there is an unmet need for this type of specialist housing and the provision of 10 plots would help address that need. I give that benefit moderate weight.

Suitable alternative natural greenspace

24. Approximately half the site would be laid out to provide suitable alternative natural greenspace whose principal purpose is to divert recreational pressure away from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. Although it would not provide a circular walk of the length normally sought, Natural England are satisfied that in this case the space would perform effectively in mitigating pressure on the special protection area, in part because it is of a significantly larger size than is normally required. Mitigating pressure arising from the development is a necessary requirement and does not amount to a benefit by itself. However, the space would also be made publicly available for informal recreation. That would be of benefit to local people within walking distance who would have access to a large new area of informal open space. I give that benefit moderate weight.

General practice surgery

25. The scheme would provide serviced land for a general practice surgery. The surgery would be available to residents of the scheme and also to members of the public. I was presented with evidence that shows a need for additional primary care

capacity in the local area, which if developed the serviced land would in large part be able to meet.

26. Offering a serviced plot does not necessarily guarantee provision of a general practice surgery as that would still be reliant on the availability of public funding for the building and its subsequent operation. The Council was able to point to a similar circumstance locally where land had been offered for a surgery but in the event no such facility had been built². However, in this case the scheme has the support of the NHS Frimley Integrated Care Board (now superseded by the NHS Thames Valley Integrated Care Board) who have been involved in negotiating an extended period of 10 years to develop the land as a surgery, to reflect the timescales required in obtaining public funding for new healthcare infrastructure.
27. Having regard to the support of the Integrated Care Board, I consider that there is a reasonable prospect of a new general practice surgery being provided which would help meet primary healthcare needs in the area. The offer of serviced land at no cost that would enable the surgery to be provided on this site is therefore of benefit to both future residents and the public more widely. I give that benefit significant weight.

Biodiversity net gain

28. The development is required to provide at least 10% biodiversity net gain by statute. That provision is nevertheless a benefit in that it would result in more or better quality natural habitat than there was before the development took place. I give the biodiversity net gain limited beneficial weight.

Transport improvements

29. The proposal includes new marked bus stops, and improved junction to Snows Riad, improved crossing points, footway and reduced speed limit on Snows Ride, and a public route through the site. While primarily required to improve access to and from the site for residents of the development, these improvements would also benefit members of the public, in particular the footway along Snows Ride which at present does not have one. I give these improvements limited beneficial weight.

Release of underoccupied general market housing

30. It is possible that future residents would be trading down from larger houses, which would then be occupied by those who require family-sized accommodation. As a consequence the development may result in a more efficient use of general housing stock, although that may not necessarily be the case in all instances and may not benefit the local area since future occupants could be drawn from a wide area. I give this assumed benefit only limited weight.

Mixed intergenerational community

31. The development would include a mix of dwellings but would be heavily skewed towards accommodation for the elderly with 154 of the 187 units on the site being part of the integrated retirement community. I give this benefit very limited weight.

Economic benefits

² 21/0936/FFU Orchard Cottage, Shepherds Lane, Windlesham

32. The development would bring economic benefits, both during the construction phase for the building industry and in the longer term through employment and the spending power of future occupants. Paragraph 85 of the Framework gives significant weight to supporting economic growth and productivity, although I consider that is more relevant to the production of goods or services than it is to the primary purpose of the proposal, which is to provide residential accommodation. There would nevertheless be a modest amount of employment on the site, and the general practice surgery if built would provide health services. I therefore give the economic benefits of the proposal moderate weight.

Legal undertaking

33. The proposal is accompanied by a legal undertaking which secures the planning benefits offered by the appellant as part of the scheme. The obligations provide restrictions on occupation of the integrated retirement units to ensure that they meet the definition of Use Class C2 (residential institutions) for which permission is sought. Further obligations secure financial contributions towards a strategic access, management and monitoring plan to mitigate pressure on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, and for biodiversity net gain monitoring. Both these are required to meet legislative requirements.
34. A contribution to primary health care is also offered, as is a plot of land for a general practice surgery. The latter obligation has been drafted to ensure that the land remains available for a surgery for a period of 10 years, as requested by the Integrated Care Board. In a change to officer advice given at the application stage, the Council now considers neither of these contributions to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
35. With a large proportion of the proposed development being an integrated retirement community, it is likely that its residents would have greater health care needs than the general population. Although individual care packages funded by residents would be integral to the operation of the community, it is inevitable that more acute or severe health problems would need to be met by the national health service. In anticipation of the additional demands on local health services, the Integrated Care Board has requested the financial contribution to help meet short-term demand and supports the provision of a general practice surgery to help meet longer term demand.
36. While the surgery would also serve a wider public function, for which there is an acknowledged need, it would only be partly supported by the development, there still being a need for public funding for the building and its operation. Having regard to those factors, I consider that these obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable, are related to the development, and are reasonably related in scale and kind to what is being proposed. I therefore give them weight in my decision.
37. An obligation secures the self-build and custom build plots, sets out a mechanism for an approved marketing strategy and the use of the land in the event that there is no interest in the plots for self-build and custom build. That obligation is necessary to ensure the delivery of the self-build and custom build housing so far as practically possible.

38. An obligation is offered to fund a monitoring fee and coordinator as part of the travel plan, which would be secured separately by condition. This funding is needed to ensure that the travel plan would be implemented and effective.
39. An obligation secures the provision of affordable housing at the proposed discounted rates, together with an income cap and local connection criteria. This is necessary to meet the requirements for affordable housing as part of the Use Class C3 (dwellinghouses) element of the scheme. The partial conflict with Policies CP5 and CP6 of the Local Plan does not obviate the need for the obligation because the affordable housing is still of public benefit.
40. An obligation secures the provision of suitable alternative natural greenspace. During the course of the inquiry, the parties reached agreement on future ownership and maintenance, which is now to be through a third party. That agreement addresses concerns experienced locally on other greenspace provision, where maintenance has proved a problem. The greenspace is necessary to mitigate potential harm to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.
41. An obligation provides a mechanism whereby if a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved on site, off-site provision will be secured instead. As the scheme is made in outline without details of biodiversity net gain available now, the obligation is necessary to provide certainty that biodiversity requirements are met.
42. Lastly, and in relation to the proposed reduction in the speed limit on Snows Ride, an obligation is necessary to secure funding for the associated traffic regulation order that would be required to implement such a proposal.

Conditions

The conditions accord with the outcome of the roundtable discussion held at the inquiry. To ensure that they meet the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the Framework, I have made minor changes to the wording of some of those conditions in the interests of clarity and consistency but their intent remains as discussed. I have listed as separate conditions the time limits from the requirement to approve reserved matters. Reasons for the conditions are set out in core document CD10.19 'conditions schedule v7 (final agreed)'.

Planning Balance

43. In terms of the inappropriateness of the development, there is a large measure of agreement between the main parties on the criteria set out in paragraph 155 of the Framework, relating to the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt. It is agreed that the development would utilise grey belt. It is also agreed that there are demonstrable unmet needs for specialist elderly accommodation, self-build and affordable housing, and primary health care in the area. Furthermore, no objection is raised to the sustainability of the location in terms of accessibility to local services and facilities. The only requirement which is not met is that relating to the golden rules, and then only to the criterion relating to the provision of affordable housing, as no issue is taken by the Council on improvements to local infrastructure, or the provision of green space that would be accessible to the public.
44. So far as affordable housing is concerned, the scheme exceeds the 50% requirement in the golden rules for dwellinghouses but does not provide 15% of

integrated retirement community units or the equivalent. That position has been accepted by both main parties and consequently my starting point for consideration of the scheme in relation to the Green Belt is that the development is inappropriate. Nevertheless, it is clear from the degree of conformity with the criteria in paragraph 155 of the Framework that the extent of inappropriateness is limited in this case.

45. National policy in paragraph 153 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Those circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
46. In this case I have concluded that limited harm would be caused to the purposes of the Green Belt, and that significant harm would be caused to its openness. I give that harm substantial weight in accordance with paragraph 153 of the Framework. In addition to the harm to the Green Belt, there would also be limited harm caused to the character and appearance of the area.
47. Balanced against those harms are the other considerations put forward by the appellant. A number of these are necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms and carry only limited or very limited beneficial weight. They do not justify building in the Green Belt. There are other considerations which are of moderate beneficial weight, including the provision of affordable housing, self-build plots, publicly accessible greenspace and economic benefits. While these carry more weight, they do not by themselves justify inappropriate development.
48. There are however, 3 other considerations that I do consider carry significant beneficial weight. Firstly, the proposal would deliver a significant number of new homes. The shortfall in housing land supply indicates that the spatial strategy in the adopted Local Plan is insufficient to meet housing need and consequently carries limited weight. A new plan is being progressed but that carries limited weight because it has yet to complete its examination. Against the background of unmet need, the proposal would make a significant contribution to providing housing in an accessible location on the edge of an existing settlement.
49. Secondly, the proposal includes the provision of specialist housing for the elderly. There is a particular need for such housing in the area, to which the proposal would make a significant contribution. There may also be indirect advantages to the health and wellbeing of its residents, where the communal nature of the scheme would help create a supportive community.
50. Thirdly, the proposal offers serviced land for a general practice surgery. This would help meet an acknowledged need for additional primary health care provision in the area. It therefore represents a significant public benefit and an opportunity to provide a site for a new surgery that might arise only rarely.
51. Taken together, I consider that the other considerations noted above do clearly outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt and to the character and appearance of the area. Notwithstanding the substantial weight that harm to the Green Belt attracts, in this case I conclude that the other considerations amount to the very special circumstances needed to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Conclusion

52. The proposal would conflict with Policy DM9 of the Local Plan. It would also conflict with Policies CP5 and CP6 relating to affordable housing, although notwithstanding that conflict I consider that the provision of affordable housing for discounted market sales should be given moderate beneficial weight. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan as a whole. It would also conflict with national planning policy because it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, in this case other considerations clearly outweigh the conflict with the development plan, the harm to the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area.
53. Because the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 of the Framework applies. This says that planning permission should be granted unless certain criteria apply. I conclude that the policies in the Framework, including Green Belt policy, do not provide strong reasons for refusal and the adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The presumption, sometimes referred to as the tilted balance, adds further weight to my conclusion that the development is acceptable.
54. For those reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR

Appearances:

For the appellant:

Christopher Young KC and Daniel Henderson	Counsel, No 5 Chambers
Richard Hammond BA Dip LA CMLI	Associate Landscape Architect, EDLA
James Donagh BA (Hons) MIED	Director, Stantec
Andrew Moger BA (Hons) MA MRTPI	Director, Tetlow King Planning
Richard Garside BSc (Hons) MRICS	Director, Newsteer
Ben Pycroft BA (Hons) MRTPI	Senior Director, Emery Planning
Alex Williams BSc MRICS	Senior Development Manager, Retirement Villages Developments Limited
Rob Henderson MA (Hons) MRTPI	Planning Director, Pegasus Group

For the Council:

Giles Atkinson	Counsel, 6 Pump Court
Gemma Fitzpatrick BA MA MRTPI	Surrey Heath Borough Council

Jane Burgess (for the appellant) and Steven Bell and Karen Luxton-Walsh (for the Council) took part in the round table session on the legal undertaking and draft conditions.

Interested parties:

George Gilbert	Windlesham Society
Councillor Richard Wilson	Bagshot and North Windlesham Ward
Councillor Valerie White	Bagshot and North Windlesham Ward
Harry Goatcher	Resident

Appeal documents:

Documents relevant to the appeal, including documents received during the inquiry, are available to view at: [Appeal inquiry Shows Ride, Windlesham | Surrey Heath Borough Council](https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate)

Schedule of conditions

1. Approval of details of the layout, scale, design and external appearance of the development (hereafter referred to as 'the reserved matters') shall be obtained in writing from the local planning authority before such development, subject to the outline permission, is commenced.
2. Application for approval of the reserved matters other than those relating to the general practice surgery land and the custom build and self-build plots shall be made to the local planning authority within 3 years of this permission.
3. Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to the general practice surgery land shall be made to the local planning authority within 7 years of this permission.
4. Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to the custom build and self-build housebuilding plots shall be made to the local planning authority within 5 years of this permission.
5. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of 2 years from the final approval of the relevant reserved matters.
6. The application(s) for the approval of the reserved matters pursuant to this outline permission shall be in accordance with approved drawing existing site location plan BA10517-2000 Rev A and parameter plan 01 BA10517-2500 with the development not exceeding the maximum ground floor level to ridge heights set out in the latter plan.
7. Prior to the first occupation of any residential unit within the permitted development, the on-site suitable alternative natural greenspace shall be delivered in accordance with a landscape and ecological mitigation strategy that shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
8. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the bellmouths of the proposed vehicular accesses to the site shall be constructed in accordance with details that have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
9. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a scheme of highway improvement works has been implemented in accordance with details that shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and which shall comprise:
 - A publicly accessible footpath linking Hawkes Leap to the A30 London Road
 - Installation of crossing points and associated tactile paving and dropped kerbs
 - Enhancements to the Snows Ride/A30 London Road junction narrowed and improved by reducing the kerb radii and upgrading the existing pedestrian refuge island

as illustrated in plan drawings 'SK10-01', 'SK10-2' and 'SK10-03' in the submitted document titled 'Transport Assessment' Rev B dated April 2024. The agreed

works thereafter shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

10. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the improvement and upgrading of the existing bus stops located on the A30 London Road has been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for:

- Bus shelters (in both directions of travel)
- Seating
- Lighting
- Real Time Passenger Information
- Raised height kerbing to provide accessible and level access
- Bus cage and clearway (subject to Road Safety Audit requirements)
- Crossing facility for pedestrians (on A30 between the two bus stops)

Thereafter the said approved facilities shall be retained and maintained.

11. Prior to the occupation of the development a Residential Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local 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 Guide", and in general accordance with the 'Framework Travel Plan' document (dated April 2024). The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented upon occupation of the development.

12. 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) 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 school start and finish times, nor shall the contractor permit any HGVs associated with the development at the site to be laid up, waiting, in Snows Ride during these times
- (k) on-site turning for construction vehicles

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development

13. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a pedestrian inter-visibility splay measuring 2m by 2m has been provided on each side of all vehicle and pedestrian accesses, the depth measured from the back of the footway (or

verge) and the widths outwards from the edges of the access. No obstruction to visibility between 0.6m and 2m in height above ground level shall be erected within the area of such splays.

14. No development shall commence until a scheme to deal with potential contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include

- (a) a contaminated land desk study and appropriate site investigation methodology
- (b) a site investigation report based on conclusions of (a)
- (c) a remediation action plan based upon (a) and (b)
- (d) a discovery strategy to deal with unforeseen contamination discovered during construction
- (e) a validation strategy identifying measures to validate the works undertaken as a result of (c) and (d).

Prior to occupation, a verification report with substantiating evidence to demonstrate any agreed remediation has been carried out.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include:

- a) Map showing the location of all ecological features
- b) Risk assessment of the potentially damaging construction activities
- c) Practical measures to avoid and reduce impacts during construction
- d) Location and timing of works to avoid harm to biodiversity features
- e) Responsible persons and lines of communication
- f) Use of protected fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
- g) Site working hours (incl. delivery, loading and unloading)
- h) Details of proposed means of dust suppression and emission control
- i) Details of proposed means of noise mitigation and control
- j) Lighting impact mitigation if artificial lighting will be used during the development
- k) Material and waste management
- l) Procedure for implementing the CEMP
- m) Procedure for handling complaints
- n) Reptile strategy.

Once approved the management plan shall thereafter be implemented as part of the construction process.

16. No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, to be conducted in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

17. Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, an updated badger survey to include a mitigation strategy to be implemented if evidence of badger sett(s) is found, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

18. Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted, a bat report and assessment including an updated bat survey of the trees shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The report shall include an updated preliminary ground level tree roost assessment for all trees that will be affected. The bat report and assessment shall include a mitigation and enhancement strategy for bats. The mitigation and enhancement strategy shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted.
19. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a habitat management and monitoring plan prepared in accordance with the approved biodiversity gain plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall include:
- A non-technical summary
 - The roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the plan
 - The habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved biodiversity gain plan
 - The management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved biodiversity gain plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development
 - The monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority
 - Thereafter the habitat management and monitoring plan shall be implemented as agreed within the approved details and for a minimum period of 30 years from the date of completion of development.
20. Notice in writing shall be given to the local planning authority when the:
- Habitat management and monitoring plan has been implemented
 - Habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the habitat management and monitoring plan have been completed.
21. Monitoring reports in accordance with the methodology and frequency specified in the approved habitat management and monitoring plan, submitted pursuant to condition 19 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
22. 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 sustainable drainage strategy hierarchy and be compliant with the national non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. 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) and 1 in 100 (+45% allowance for climate change) storm events and 10% allowance for urban creep during all stages of

the development. Associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate equivalent to 8.2l/s including multifunctional sustainable drainage systems.

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.

23. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The verification report shall demonstrate that the surface water 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), and confirm any defects have been rectified.

24. The 10 self-build and custom-build housebuilding plots hereby permitted shall be developed as self-build dwellings within the definition of self-build and custom build housing in the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015. The first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be by a person or persons who had a primary input into the design and layout of the dwelling and who will live in the dwelling for at least 3 years. Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings the local planning authority shall be notified of the person(s) who will take up first occupation of each dwelling.

25. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the 40mph speed limit along Snows Ride has been reduced to 30mph in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

***** end of schedule of conditions *****