

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**ADDENDUM**

**9 June 2021**

**ITEM 1 MO/2020/2019 Unit 2, 285-293 High Street, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 1RL**

The alteration of the rear balcony and glass balustrade has been removed from the description and proposal at the applicant request new drawing numbers 6208 P 12 Rev C and 6208 P 14 Rev C

<b>ITEM 1</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<b>Q1 – Cllr Harper</b>	Why are the hours of opening so restricted?	The hours of opening are similar to those of other drinking establishments in the town. This condition has been put forward after consideration of the business need and the neighbouring properties.
<b>Q2 – Cllr Harper</b>	Has the wider impact of the greater economic viability of the Dorking centre been considered?	The wider economic viability and neighbouring concerns have been considered.
<b>Q3 – Cllr Harper</b>	Is it considered that everyone currently outside after midnight is unsupervised and not monitored by security staff at all and could be far worse than inside?	The application can only be considered within the area of the location plan. We cannot restrict outside of this area, within the High Street itself but clearly take account of movements to and from the application site after hours.
<b>Q4 – Cllr Harper</b>	Can we sensibly impose this restriction on this business, please could we think about waiving this restriction?	The officers have used the restriction on the amount of visitors to the 24 hour security boxes under consideration for neighboring properties.

<b>Q5 – Cllr Harper</b>	Are licencing conditions a subset or do they work within planning conditions	Licencing conditions and planning conditions are both different types of legislation.
-------------------------	--	---

There have been some minor changes to the front elevation under new drawings 6208 P 09 Rev C and 6208 P 11 Rev C.

A change to appendix (Previously published addendum) there are approximately 2000 safety deposit boxes.

Further representation has been received by the Lonsdale Place Dorking Ltd, after a meeting with the applicant Mr Jones. There are still concerns over:

- Anti-social behaviour
- Opening times
- The yard was only ever to be used as a fire escape route. Further restriction of the yard area would be welcomed.
- Kitchen odour's

Officer comment – The kitchen will be removed from Unit 1 to Unit 2 which will use the existing extraction system used by the former ASK restaurant, which would help to alleviate the odour problem.

Condition 2 to be changed to 'The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the submitted documents and plan numbers 6208 P 14 Rev C, 6208 P 13 Rev A, 6208 P 09 Rev C, 6208 P 11 Rev C and 6208 P 12 Rev C contained within the application and no variations shall take place.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the submitted application and to ensure minimal impact on local amenity and the environment in accordance with Mole Valley Core Strategy policy CS14 and Mole Valley Local Plan policy ENV22.

Condition 6, 7 and 11 to be removed, as the balcony has been removed from the application.

Condition 10 to be changed to 'Except in an emergency, such as an evacuation of the building, the rear yard shall at no time be open to clients. Staff shall only be permitted to access the area between 8am to 8pm Monday to Saturday and 9am to 8pm on Sundays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the local area and ensure a satisfactory environment for occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with Mole Valley Local Plan policy ENV22 and policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy.

Condition 13 to be changed to 'No more than 4 bins shall be within the rear yard at any one time'.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the local area and ensure a satisfactory environment for occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with Mole

Valley Local Plan policy ENV22 and policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy.

Additional Condition to be added 'A silent alarm shall be connected to the rear doors to alert management that the doors have been opened outside of the times within Condition 10.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the local area and ensure a satisfactory environment for occupiers of adjoining properties in accordance with Mole Valley Local Plan policy ENV22 and policy CS14 of the Mole Valley Core Strategy.

**ITEM 2** **MO/2020/2352 Chenies, Meadowside, Bookham, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT23 3LF**

Please refer to Appendix

**ITEM 4** **MO/2020/2027 Spicers Farm, Lowfield Heath Road, Charlwood, Surrey, RH6 0BT**

Add plan number condition to read 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 2006SP\_000, 2006SP\_201 & 2006SP\_200 contained within the application and no variations shall take place.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the submitted application and to ensure minimal impact on local amenity and the environment in accordance with Mole Valley Core Strategy policy CS14 and Mole Valley Local Plan policy ENV22.

**ITEM 5** **MO/2020/2254 Westlees Farm, Logmore Lane, Westcott, Dorking, Surrey, RH4 3JN**

<b>ITEM 5</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
Q1 – Cllr Harper	Understand that horses are not agricultural and whether the decision on the lawful development certificate was wrong? Would a different view on the certificate change the course of substantial harm to heritage or Green Belt or would these still outweigh the benefits?	There is a distinction in law between grazing horses (only kept on land for grazing with no additional feed and not ridden) and equestrian use which is the keeping of horses to ride them. This has a bearing on the issue of PDL.  The site has not got a lawful use for equestrian use and therefore is agricultural. Agricultural land is not classed as PDL.

		In this case the harm to the heritage of the site would still outweigh the benefits of new dwellings.
Cllr Friend	Officer report for MO/2020/0336 was it correct to say 'The site consists of a farmhouse and a range of farm buildings complete with 55 acres of adjoining open fields. Over the last decade or so, the farm buildings and the site have generally been used for equestrian use and grazing'.	<p>The statement relating to the site subject of MO/2020/0336 was that Case officer's opinion of the site as a whole.</p> <p>There has been no formal change of use of the land from a farm to an equestrian business or no Certificate of Lawful use that has been approved to demonstrate that the land has been used for Equestrian use for a continuous period of 10 years.</p>
Cllr Friend	Would these buildings including equestrian purposes be defined as a mixed use rather than purely agricultural use?	It would be necessary to make a Lawful Development Certificate to demonstrate the use of the land. The officer assessment of the land use at this time is that it is agricultural.
Cllr Friend	For consistency, can it be explained why the exclusion of the buildings from the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' was not a material factor in the determining of the two approved applications MO/2020/0336 and MO/2020/0337.	These two applications were for the conversions of buildings rather than demolition and rebuild. The conversion works complied with para 145 criterion (d) of the NPPF, which allows for the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction. Under sub paragraph d) there is no requirement to assess whether the land is PDL. ,
Cllr Friend	Paragraph 10.5 refers to the loss of the non-designated heritage assets as resulting in substantial harm with no public benefits that outweigh the loss. In the NPPF, it can be seen that the Public Benefit test seems to apply to Designated Heritage Assets (Para 196) but that for Non-designated heritage assets (para 197 as quoted	The Historic Environment Officer advises that the words 'substantial harm' should be replaced with 'total loss of the non-designated heritage assets'. Heritage assets (designated or otherwise) carry a public benefit. Their loss through demolition is therefore a public benefit loss which should be weighed against

	<p>in the officers report at 9.11.1). As such paragraph 9.11.5 which seeks (but does not find) mitigating factors would seem not to be relevant in this application. Why is a rating of “Substantial Harm” given to this aspect?</p>	<p>other benefits of the scheme (including public benefits) according to paragraph 197 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Amend para 9.11.5 to read- ‘There are no mitigating factors to outweigh the harm to the character of the area arising from the loss of these Non-Designated heritage assets and therefore a balanced judgement will be required to be given to this loss as detailed in the NPPF.’</p> <p>Amend para 10.5 to read ‘The total loss of the non-designated heritage assets of the Surrey Barn and the Roadside Barn would result in heritage harm and it is considered that there are no heritage benefits that would outweigh the loss of these buildings.’</p>
Cllr Friend	<p>The overall mass of the buildings will reduce by more than a quarter. Leaving aside the design aspects referenced in paragraph 10.6, does this reduction not represent an enhancement due to the reduced scale?</p>	<p>There would be an overall reduction in massing through this scheme. However, that is not the only issue to consider and that alone is not sufficient to make the proposal acceptable. The main issues relating to the land not being PDL and the fact that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt weigh heavily against the application.</p>

Comments raised by agent	Officer Comments	Amendments
<p>PDL – the report incorrectly describes the site as agricultural. However in MO/2018/0663 the land, including the current site, was used for the storage of various materials, storage of a derelict mobile home and the keeping of pigs. This is mixed use.</p>	<p>A site may be used for a variety of uses, however, its main use in this case is for agricultural purposes. The keeping of pigs is an agricultural use. Any storage of other items would be ancillary to the main agricultural use of the land.</p>	

<p>Equestrian grazing is mis-described in para 9.3.3. as an agricultural activity. That statement is only correct if the horses have no supplemental feed, are never ridden and are only used to pull agricultural implements or used for fur / meat purposes. None of these apply to the current use of the land. Therefore the land is clearly previously-developed.</p>	<p>Agree with statement that horses are only agricultural if they are grazing on the land with no supplementary feed, etc. However, there is no evidence provided to show that the site has been used for equestrian use in the form of a certificate of lawful development for existing use. A certificate of lawful development would only be granted if it could be demonstrated that the site had been used for equestrian purposes for a continuous period of at least 10 years.</p>	
<p>Economic Benefits – downplayed. Site needs to employ staff to live on site for animal husbandry. Economic benefits arise from the provision of staff accommodation to the business and the locality.</p>	<p>Whilst the provision of staff accommodation may benefit the private business, it would not result in any additional benefits to the wider economy over and above those arising from any future occupiers of new dwellings. In other words, the benefits to the economy would be equivalent regardless of the type of occupant, be that staff or residents with no link to the business. As such, the extant schemes would also benefit the economy in the same way.</p>	
<p>Lighting impacts – lighting impacts not recorded correctly. The 35% reduction on the amended scheme is compared to the permitted scheme of MO/2019/1795. This would have a significant benefit to the AONB.</p>	<p>During the course of the planning application the drawings were amended to reduce the extent of glazing on the Surrey Barn building. However, lighting impact is not the only concern with this application. Other concerns remain around the scale and design of the Surrey Barn and the increase in size of the Gatehouse Barn.</p>	<p>Pg. 56/57 Amend Officer comment under Surrey Hills AONB Officer section to say ‘the amended scheme would reduce light spill by 35% over the permitted scheme of MO/2019/1795 for the conversion of the Surrey Barn to a 4 bed dwelling.’</p>
<p>Scale - The report to committee downplays the reduction in floor area, volume and height of the proposals compared to the</p>	<p>The drawings do show a reduction in floor area and massing across the site. However, the proposal gives rise to conflict with</p>	

<p>existing barns. The overall amount of buildings will significantly reduce compared to the existing buildings that are to be demolished, by 109 m2 (a reduction of 19%). The volume of the buildings will also significantly reduce, by 649.8 m3 (a reduction of over 26%). Finally, the proposed main house will be lower than the existing barns – a reduction from 121.91m AOD to 120.84m AOD. These are significant benefits in terms of the effect on the AONB and AGLV.</p>	<p>Development Plan policies associated with development within the Green Belt, the impact on the AONB, and the loss of Non-Designated heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Bio-diversity - The proposed refusal reason relating to biodiversity ignores the fact that no evidence of bats using the gatehouse building (B12) was recorded in the 2020 survey. It would be reasonable to include mitigation for this building as part of the overall mitigation strategy based on an assumption that it may be suitable for singleton bats roosting. This matter could be conditioned if appropriate, avoiding the need for further surveys at the pre-determination stage.</p>	<p>Surrey Wildlife Trust have responded and give the following feedback: the applicant should be required to undertake the further surveys specified in paragraphs 4.2.5 and 4.2.6 of the above referenced Corylus report dated December 2020. The results of these surveys and appropriate provision for impact avoidance and mitigation measures should be provided to the Council for approval in writing prior to the commencement of any works relating to B12. If active roosts are found to be present at building B12, a protected species mitigation licence would be required from Natural England prior to the commencement of any works relating to B12.</p> <p>Supplementary reports cannot be conditioned and it is considered that the existing reports including for badgers, which the survey was carried out on the Farmhouse and is out of date, the reason for refusal is still valid.</p>	

Staff accommodation gardens could be enlarged and this matter could be conditioned.	The application will be determined on the basis of the submitted plans which show the gardens to be small in size.	
Lack of objection has been given insufficient weight in the planning balance.	<p>The comments submitted from third parties in support of the application has been reported in section 6 of the officer report on pg 58.</p> <p>The application must be assessed against adopted planning and in this case the proposal fails to comply as set out in the reasons for refusal.</p>	

## Amendments

Pg 56/57 Section 5 Consultations

Officer comments section in response to AONB Officer

Amend comments to:

'the amended scheme would reduce light spill by 35% over the permitted scheme of MO/2019/1795 for the conversion of the Surrey Barn to a 4 bed dwelling.'

Pg 57 Surrey Wildlife Trusts comments received 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021

## Bats

The Corylus report states that B4 (Roadside Barn) supports a non-breeding day roost of Pipistrelle species bats, with B5 (Surrey Barn) supporting non-breeding day roosts of common pipistrelle and brown long-eared bats, and a transitional barbastelle roost. B6 supports a non-breeding day roost of common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bats, and a transitional barbastelle roost.

Regarding Surrey Barn and Roadside Barn, should it be minded to grant this planning application for this site, the Local Planning Authority should advise the applicant that they will be required to:

- Obtain a mitigation licence from Natural England following the receipt of planning permission and prior to any works which may affect bats commencing.
- Undertake all the actions which will be detailed in the Method Statement which must support a mitigation licence which is expected to be based on the mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions presented within Section 5 of the above referenced Corylus report.

The above referenced December 2020 Corylus report identifies that building B12 (Gatehouse Barn) has a low suitability to host active bat roosts. Building B12 is scheduled for demolition, therefore any active roosts present would be lost to development. Paragraph 4.2.5 and 4.2.6 of this report is clear that further surveys are required in order to confirm presence / likely absence and determine appropriate impact avoidance and mitigation



measures. The report's authors state that they have sufficient information regarding the potential roosting features of B12 to determine that the building provides potential for low status roosts of commoner species during both active and hibernation phases. A proposed impact avoidance and mitigation working methodology is presented based on this assumption.

Should the Council be minded to grant permission of the proposed development, the applicant should be required to undertake the further surveys specified in paragraphs 4.2.5 and 4.2.6 of the report. The results of these surveys and appropriate provision for impact avoidance and mitigation measures should be provided to the Council for approval in writing prior to the commencement of any works relating to B12.

If active roosts are found to be present at building B12, a protected species mitigation licence would be required from Natural England prior to the commencement of any works relating to B12.

We would recommend that all construction activities take place outside the Bat active hours and would advise that if during construction lighting is required, the illumination of the boundary habitats would be avoided in order to minimise any disturbance to wildlife.

#### Protected Species Reptiles and Amphibians

Immediately adjacent to the application site, but within the wider site, it is known that there are a small population of Slow Worms, as set out in the Reptile Presence/Likely-absence Surveys submitted with the application. Therefore, we would recommend a precautionary approach to works.

Should any Reptiles be discovered during construction, which are likely to be affected by the development, works will cease immediately. The developer will then seek the advice of a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist and works will only proceed in accordance with the advice they provide.

#### Protected species – Badgers

The File Note – Ecology Update June 2019 and Badger Survey August 2019 submitted with the application sets out that 'Badger activity has been regularly noted' and that 'the sett holes surrounding the farmhouse (B1) have been assessed to be unused outliers, and therefore do not require a licence to disturb or destroy'. Therefore, on the basis of the above, should the Council be minded to grant planning permission, works should be undertaken in a precautionary manner, in accordance with the Main Recommendations of the Badger Survey.

If the event that Badgers are found on site during works, all work must cease and the applicant must contact Natural England with regards to obtaining a licence to undertake the works.

#### Protected Species - Breeding Birds

The developer should take action to ensure that development activities such as vegetation or site clearance are timed to avoid the bird nest season of early March to August inclusive.

Pg 70 Para 9.11.5 – ‘There are no mitigating factors to outweigh the harm to the character of the area arising from the loss of these Non-Designated heritage assets and therefore a balanced judgement will be required to be given to this loss as detailed in the NPPF.’

Pg 71 Para 10.5 - ‘The total loss of the non-designated heritage assets of the Surrey Barn and the Roadside Barn would result in heritage harm and it is considered that there are no heritage benefits that would outweigh the loss of these buildings.’

**ITEM 6**            **Opus 1, Ryebrook Business Park, Bay Tree Avenue, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT22 7LA**

<b>ITEM 6</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
Q1 – Cllr Preedy	The description refers to ‘change of use of ground, first and second floor’ can you confirm this is for the entire building	Yes, the change of use relates to the whole building
Q2 – Cllr Preedy	Can we make it clear that the prior approval for 30 dwellings over-rides our ability to require affordable housing	Yes, it is officer’s opinion that the extant prior approval has reasonable probability of being carried out without affordable housing and as such represents a valid fall-back position which attracts significant weight in favour of permitting the scheme without affordable housing.
Q3 – Cllr Preedy	Why do we need Conditions 6 and 7? Also is there any reason to suppose that surface water issues will be changed by the application	Conditions 6 and 7 were recommended by the Council’s Drainage consultant and Surrey County Council lead flood authority
Q4 – Cllr Preedy	Can we ask for bike charging facilities within the bike store?	It is not considered reasonable to add a condition for bike charging facilities as this would not be supported by policy
Q1 – Cllr Bushnell	There are a number of extra car parking spaces over the required 30 as mentioned in the report, will these be used for businesses and/or will residents and their visitors be able to use them out of business hours	The applicant has confirmed that the extra car parking spaces would be used by residents and their visitors

**ITEM 7 The Dukes Head, Horsham Road, Beare Green, Dorking, Surrey, RH5 4QP**

<b>ITEM7</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
Q1 – Cllr Preedy	In similar cases we have looked for evidence that the property has been unsuccessfully marketed as a going concern. Is there any evidence that the Dukes Head has been offered for sale as business. Does the absence of any such effort change the assessment of viability of the business	The applicant has not provided a marketing assessment and the viability assessment report was carried out in absence of this. Officer's opinion has been informed by the applicant's viability assessment and the consultation comments by Economic Development who have raised no objection to the loss of the public house. Officers are of the opinion that the provision of 8 new dwellings would outweigh the loss of the community facility.
Q2 – Cllr Preedy	Re. Condition 11 (bats) is this intended to say these are works which may affect bats and so one of the proposed actions is needed. I feel we need to be stronger about the requirement to carry out more surveys	The preliminary survey found that the building may be suitable for bat roosts, as such the condition was recommended to ensure that the works would be carried out in an appropriate manner which would not harm bats.
Q3 – Cllr Preedy	Condition 13 – I can't see a surface water drainage scheme on the website	It should now be visible on the website

**ITEM 8 Site at Riverdale Farm, Rusper Road, Capel, Surrey**

<b>ITEM 8</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
Q1 – Cllr Preedy	The current hardstanding appears to go to the edge of the woodland at Rome Wood. Can we ensure that if permission is granted the 6 metre grassed area will be re-instated?	Yes, condition 5 requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans which shows the 6 metre grassed area
Q2 – Cllr Preedy	As the appeal decision on the neighbouring site did not restrict occupation to a particular family, can conditions 2 and 3 be reasonably imposed?	Given the Riverdale Paddocks site does not have a personal condition, condition 2 has been removed from the recommendation.

**Remove Condition 2 referring to a personal condition**

**Amend Condition 3 to read as the following:**

When the use hereby permitted ceases, the land shall be restored to its former condition, with any structures and hard standings removed within 3 months in accordance with a scheme of work to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure minimal impact on local amenity and the environment in accordance with Mole Valley Core Strategy policy CS5 and Mole Valley Local Plan policies ENV3 and ENV22.

**ITEM 9 Rosemar Farm House, Shellwood Road, Leigh, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8NT**

<b>ITEM 9</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
Q1 – Cllr Preedy	Did the Certificate of Lawfulness as a Kennels/Cattery change the status of the land as Previously Developed? If so, is this a change we should draw Members attention to compared with previous refusals?	The issuing of the Certificate of Lawfulness has no bearing on the status on the status of the definition of previously developed land.
Q2 – Cllr Preedy	In 10.7.2 economic sustainability, should we also take note that the removal of the kennel/cattery business will reduce local employment?	In terms of economic sustainability the kennels/cattery business has been vacant for a number of years and notwithstanding this, there is an extant prior notification consent (commenced but not completed) which if fully implemented would have the same consequence resulting in the loss of local employment and as such does not form part of the material considerations in the assessment of this application.

**ITEM 10 105 Lower Road, Fetcham, Surrey**

Two additional letters of representation received. Does not change officer recommendation.

**ITEM 11 The Steading, Wheelers Lane, Brockham, Betchworth, Surrey, RH3 7HJ**

<b>ITEM 11</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
<b><u>Q1. Cllr Budd</u></b>	I read in your report the builder intends to raise the ground 30mm to prevent flooding, please can you tell us the maximum high to the top of the ridge.	The Officer report does not refer to a ground level increase. The Flood Risk Assessment report submitted with the application does refer to the internal finished floor levels of both dwellings being raised above the adjacent ground level. It does not refer to the external ground levels being raised by this amount. The applicants are required to build the dwellings in accordance with the approved elevation plans. However, if it adds comfort to Members, a pointed ground levels survey can be requested by planning condition.
<b><u>Q2. Cllr Budd</u></b>	Where is the datum is being taken from?	There are standard datum points which are taken from Ordnance Survey data. A ground levels condition can be added
<b><u>Q3. Cllr Budd</u></b>	Is rainwater going to be captured and at what rate will it be released	This is a technical question that will be dealt with once the applicant submits the surface water drainage details required by Condition 5.
Q1. Cllr Preedy	Following MO/2019/1084 (the Certificate of Lawfulness for 10 years as incidental residential use, is it relevant for the Highways Statement to assess historic traffic levels along the access road including “many visitors including owners visiting their horses as well as stable hands”? This is surely the traffic level associated with an operating equestrian business. If it was an equestrian business rather than residential use then is the application site PDL & does it meet the	The highway assessment is relevant in so far as, the access road remains unchanged from its previous uses which generated higher vehicle movements than the proposed two dwellings.  Whether the stables were used by the applicant (which is what the Certificate of Lawfulness established), or as an equestrian business, which has not been proven, this does not affect whether the site constitutes Previous Developed Land, and the

	NPPF exceptions allowing replacement of buildings in the Green Belt (rather than their conversion)?	proposal would still meet the exception listed in the NPPF.
Q2. Cllr Preedy	Re Informative 6. Since the Ecological survey is now 3 years old, can we make the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence of this Informative (carrying out an investigation) into a Condition?	An ecology update was carried out in December 2020 and Surrey Wildlife Trust consider it up to date. It would not be possible to make it a Condition requirement to carry out another survey as this would not meet the 'Reasonable' test for a Planning Condition.

**\* Please note this application's main difference to Westlees Farm (Item 5) is the Certificate of Lawfulness which established the use of the land as residential land in association with The Steading (neighbouring dwelling). This site is therefore Previously Developed Land with existing buildings on it.**

**ITEM 12 Recreation Ground, Barnett Wood Lane, Ashtead, Surrey**

<b>ITEM 12</b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
Q1. Cllr Preedy	Cross-references in 10.4.6 & 10.6.1 seem to be incorrect.	You are quite right. Thank you for pointing these out. Corrections are made below.
Q2. Cllr Preedy	The current layout shows the MUGA plus 3 grass football pitches – one South of the footpath crossing the Rec. Is the intention to retain the new facility plus 3 grass pitches or will one of the grass pitches have to be sacrificed?	The applicant has confirmed that the three grass pitches would remain - the closest to the site labelled Senior Pitch would be moved along slightly.
Q3. Cllr Preedy	The open space of the Rec is used to accommodate other events – notably the Annual Village Day which attracts lots of people. What consideration has been given as to how such events could be run with the new facility in place?	The applicant has confirmed that at the Ashtead Village Day event the whole southern area of the recreation ground is not used and so more use could be made of this area for the event. In any case, the Club would be open to considering offering the pitch for use by the organisers for the event.
Q4. Cllr Preedy	Are there restrictions on the operating hours of the football clubhouse and are these consistent with the	The clubhouse building was permitted in 2003 under MO/2002/1983. There is no planning condition attached to this regarding hours of

	proposed hours of operation?	use. The football clubhouse is outside of the red-edged application site area. However, the applicant informs me that the changing facilities will be open on parallel timings with the facility and clubhouse.
Q5. Cllr Preedy	Cannot conditions 4 & 5 be combined into a single Condition? If not then some of the wording of Condition 5 needs to be amended to say "use of floodlights" rather than "pitch use"	They need to remain as separate conditions for clarity and precision even though they overlap. I take your point about the wording in condition 5 though. A correction to condition 5 is made below to add "use of floodlights".
Q6. Cllr Preedy	Condition 8 requires a plan for secure parking of bicycles; however will these necessarily be within the red-line area and, if not, is this a problem?	Yes the bicycle parking will need to be within the red line area, otherwise we would not be able to use a planning condition requiring this, as it would not be strictly relevant if it is outside the red-edged plan. There is plenty of space within the red line around the pitch for bicycle parking to be located suitably. The applicant is accepting of this condition though a location for this has not been discussed.
Q7. Cllr Harper	Regarding the proximity of the skate park to this practice area - is there any screening to avoid the different activities distracting each other? It is understood that the netball club that used the MUGA until about six years ago felt intimidated by comments made by skate park users.	No, no solid screening is proposed between the two activities, only the proposed mesh fencing. The control of people's behaviour is outside of the role of the planning system. This is not a material planning consideration.
Q8. Cllr Harper	I presume it's open for booking by all residents, but what hours are open each evening, or is every evening going to be football from 5 to 10pm (hard work for the coaches!)?	The submitted Indicative Use Schedule is available on the MV website. This is indicative only but shows that the pitch is likely to be in use by the football club on all evenings during the week (from 6pm until either until 9 or 10pm depending on the time of year, etc). At the

		weekends the use would need to cease at 4pm (condition 4). The pitch would be available for external hire during the day (weekdays) and in the school holidays. Also, football is seasonal and the Club stops playing soon after Easter to resume with pre-season training in July. The applicant has indicated, for example, that the netball club that used to hire the existing MUGA (which is marked out for netball also) could hire the proposed pitch for netball.
Q9. Cllr Harper	Who controls the price for other users, does it include changing facilities and are they connected to our local leisure centre prices or market pricing or prohibitive pricing?	Ashtead Football Club would control the pricing, but as a not-for-profit organisation they would be competitive to ensure the facility is maintained, staffed and all costs covered whilst also future-proofing the longevity of the facility. It can be with or without changing facilities. They aim to offer discounted rates to the 6 local primary schools, charities, disability and mental health organisations for use during the day.
Q10. Cllr Harper	Is 10pm the time floodlights go off? If I've booked for 9-10pm, am I able to use these lights up to 10pm or does changing facilities close at 10pm too, so have to be off by 9:45 effectively?	The recommended conditions 4 and 5 allow 30 mins after 9 or 10pm to allow for clearing the pitches, and so the floodlights can still be on for up to 30 mins to allow this. The ability to turn off some of the floodlights (or not use all of them in that session) will be designed in. See condition 6 (e) which states that in the event of the pitch being subdivided and not fully used, that areas furthest from residential properties should be used first. In this case, only the part of the pitch in use would be floodlit. The clubhouse/changing



		facilities are outside of the red line in this application. However, there are no existing planning conditions regarding the hours of use of the clubhouse/changing facilities. The existing planning condition allows use of the existing MUGA, pitches and floodlights until 10pm every day. The changing facilities would need to be used for a short while beyond 9 or 10pm after training.
Q11. Cllr Harper	Regarding equal opportunities and equality legislation, what is the time allocated to disabled use (disabled basketball or football?) and for female sport (ie are the football teams in male only leagues from u9 upwards or something)? How is it being ensured that the amenity is at least partly accessible to all at convenient times? Will there be any outreach or is this solely to accommodate existing demand?	The Club will outreach to the likes of Seeability, Savi and the FA about organising a schedule which suits them and the Club. The Club wants to make this the blind football hub of Surrey as this is currently not catered for. Regarding female sport youth football is mixed boys and girls up to the age of 15.
Q12. Cllr Harper	Are the changing facilities disabled and gender neutral/friendly?	The applicant confirms that the changing rooms are already disabled and gender-neutral/friendly including a separate disabled toilet, with sloped access.
Q13. Cllr Harper	Is the skate board park lit until 10pm?	The skate park does not have separate lighting.
Q14. Cllr Harper	Is the car park lit until after 10pm, or does it go dark (thinking of safety)?	The car park is lit till the council street lights go off at 1am. The club lights are on a timer and certainly keep it lit to past 10pm and will remain on till way past the closure of the facility and clubhouse.
Q15. Cllr Adams	Would it be possible to maintain the Right of Way by putting a gate in the fence and re-routing the footpath along the side of the field?	The Right of Way would need to be permanently diverted before the development could commence, it could not safely stay inside the

		football pitch area, even with a gate. The precise details would be subject to a formal application and consultation process, separate to this planning application.
Q16. Cllr Adams	How much land would be lost to public use?	Approximately 2,835 sqm - the new pitch less the existing MUGA.
Q17. Cllr Adams	Is there an estimate of the number of people that would be deprived of an open recreation area compared to the number that would benefit from this application?	None has been provided.

### **Amendments:**

Paragraph 10.4.6: Reference to paragraph 9.4.7 on the fifth line should read “paragraph 10.4.8” instead.

Paragraph 10.6.1 should reference paragraphs 10.7.4 and 10.7.5, not paragraph 9.7.

Condition 5 should read: The floodlights hereby permitted shall not be used outside the hours of 09:00 to 22:00 on three days between Monday to Thursday and not outside the hours of 09:00 to 21:00 on the other day and on Fridays and not outside the hours of 09:00 to 16:00 on Saturdays and Sundays. Additional restrictions shall apply during the summer period from 1st April to 1st October when use of the floodlights on Mondays to Thursdays shall not be outside the hours of 09:00 to 21:00 and 09:00 to 18:00 on Fridays and not outside the hours of 09:00 to 16:00 on Saturdays and Sundays. A period of 30 minutes is allowed to clear the pitches at the end of the permitted hours.

### **ITEM 13 Headley Lodge, 53-55 Leatherhead Road, Ashted, Surrey**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b> <b><u>13</u></b>		
<b>Cllr</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
Roger Adams	What is the purpose of the signs and why are they of that size?	The signs comprise advertisements for the units for sale on site at the Headley Lodge retirement home run by Churchill Retirement Living. The applicant had designed the signs to be what they consider a suitable size for maximum visual impact to be seen/read by people passing by on the road (in cars/buses) but has reduced the quantum and size of the signage in response to Officer concerns over the impact on the visual amenity.
	If the applicant has offered to reduce the time the signs are displayed to 12 months, why is it viewed that the time	The applicant had originally requested the full 5 year advertisement consent period, however, they agreed to reduce this to 2 years in response to Officer concerns over the impact on

	<p>should be reduced from the standard 5 years to only 2 years, i.e. why not just 1 year?</p>	<p>the visual amenity. The Officer considers that a 2 year period would be a reasonable time for the advertisements to fulfil their purpose of facilitating sales of the remaining units on site on the basis of information provided during the course of the application. The applicant would accept a shorter period of time if necessary to achieve the Council's approval of the scheme although this would be a compromise as they believe that a longer duration would be required to achieve the sales.</p>
--	---	---