

App No: 25/P/01474
Appn Type: Full Application
Case Officer: John Busher

8 Wk Deadline: 26/06/2026

Parish: Shackleford
Agent: Mr Paul Galgey
Planning Potential Ltd.
Magdalen House
148 Tooley Street
London
SE1 2TU

Ward: Pilgrims
Applicant: Tracy Puttock
Ashill Land Ltd.
Swan Court
11 Worple Road
Wimbledon
SW19 4JS

Location: Land to the east of, Eashing Lane, Godalming, GU7
Proposal: Residential development comprising of 234 dwellings, including 50% affordable dwellings, together with means of access, internal road network, parking, public open space (including play space), landscaping and associated works (application for full planning permission).

Reason for Referral:

This application has been referred to the planning committee as more than 20 letters have been received which are contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION:

That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Planning to grant Planning permission subject to:

(i) Waverley Borough Council resolving to approve planning application WA/2026/00451 (for the creation of a vehicular access to Ock Way (i.e. the eastern access into the site) and pedestrian access routes; and

(ii) The conditions set out below, subject to minor modifications which may be made by the Assistant Director of Planning; and

(iii) The completion of a s.106 agreement which will secure:

- **healthcare contribution;**
- **police contribution;**
- **early years education contribution;**
- **securing and ensuring the delivery of the affordable housing (117 units – 70 affordable rent; 24 shared ownership and 23 DMS);**
- **securing the custom-build units, including marketing etc and details of how and when they can be disposed of if there is no interest;**
- **securing the provision of the on-site car club;**
- **securing contribution towards a Travel Plan audit;**
- **securing contribution towards a TRO for the Eashing Lane 20mph zone and 7.5t weight restriction;**
- **securing contribution towards improvements to the digital demand responsive bus service;**
- **restricting occupation of the development until the Ock Way vehicular access**

and pedestrian and cycle accesses have been delivered in accordance with an agreed programme for opening;

- securing the delivery, management and maintenance of BNG;
- securing a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan;
- securing the delivery, management and maintenance of on-site open space and play space;
- securing the establishment / formation of a management company for the development; and
- s106 monitoring payments (including BNG monitoring).

If the terms of the s.106 or wording of the planning conditions are materially amended as part of ongoing s.106 or planning condition(s) negotiations, any changes are delegated to the Joint Assistant Director of Planning; and

(iv) That upon completion of the above, the application be determined by the Joint Assistant Director of Planning in line with the resolution of the Planning Committee.

(v) That if, after 12 months has elapsed since the resolution of the Planning Committee to grant planning permission and the s.106 agreement is not completed then the Joint Assistant Director of Planning may refuse the application on the basis that the necessary mitigations to offset the impact of the development cannot be secured.

Approve - subject to the following condition(s) and reason(s): -

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

| Drawing Number | Drawing Title | Revision | Issue Date |
|---|------------------------|----------|----------------|
| Planning Layers Drawing Register | | | |
| CB_09_396_00 0 | Site Location Plan | B | 12 March 2026 |
| CB_09_396_00 1 | Planning Layout | B | 12 March 2026 |
| CB_09_396_10 1 | Planning Layout 1-1000 | B | 12 March 2026 |
| CB_09_396_00 2 | Land Use Plan | | May 2025 |
| CB_09_396_00 3 | Housing Mix Plan | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_00 4 | Affordable Housing and | | September 2025 |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------|
| | Custom Build Plan | | |
| CB_09_396_005 | Building Heights Plan | | May 2025 |
| CB_09_396_006 | Parking Strategy Plan | | May 2025 |
| CB_09_396_007 | Bin & Cycle Storage Plan | | April 2025 |
| CB_09_396_012 | Character Areas Plan | | August 2025 |
| CB_09_396_017 | M4(2) & M4(3) Plan | | September 2025 |
| House Types Drawing Register | | | |
| CB_09_396_CA_2B.1_01 | 2B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2B.1_02 | 2B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2B.1_3B.1_01 | 2B.1 & 3B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2B.3_01 | 2B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2B.3_02 | 2B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_01 | 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_02 | 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_2BA.2 | 2BA.1 & 2BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_2BA.2_01 | 2BA.1 & 2BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_03 | 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_3BA.1_01 | 2BA.1 & 3BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_04 | 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.1_05 | 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_2BA.2_01 | 2BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA_3B.1_01 | 3B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA | 3B.2 Floor Plans | | September |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| 3B.2_01 | & Elevations | | 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA 3B.3_01 | 3B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA 3B.4_01 | 3B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA 3B.4_02 | 3B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA 3BA.1_01 | 3BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA 3BA.1_02 | 3BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA _3BA.1_2BA.1_ 01 | 3BA.1 & 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA 3BA.2_01 | 3BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA _3BA.2_3BA.1_ 01 | 3BA.2 & 3BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA 4BA.1_01 | 4BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_CA _4BA.1_2BA.1_ 01 | 4BA.1 & 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE 3B.1_01 | 3B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE 3B.1_02 | 3B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE 3B.3_01 | 3B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE 4B.2_01 | 4B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE 4B.3_01 | 4B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE 4B.4_01 | 4B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE _A_2BC.1_01 | Flat Block A & 2BC.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE _A_2BCA.1_01 | Flat Block A & 2BCA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | A | 6 February 2026 |
| CB_09_396_EE _B_2BCA.1 | Flat Block B & 2BCA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_EE | Flat Block B & | | September |

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------|
| _B_2BCA.1_01 | 2BCA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GAR_01 | Garages Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_2B.3_01 | 2B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_2BA.1_01 | 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_2BA.2_01 | 2BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_2BC.1_01 | 2BC.1 Elevations & Floor Plans | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_2BCA.1_01 | 2BCA.1 Elevations & Floor Plans | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_3B.1_01 | 3B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_3B.1_02 | 3B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_3B.2_01 | 3B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_3B.2_02 | 3B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_3B.3_01 | 3B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_3B.4_01 | 3B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_3BA.2_01 | 3BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_4B.2_01 | 4B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_4B.2_02 | 4B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_4B.3_01 | 4B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_4B.4_01 | 4B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_4B1_01 | 4B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_4B1_02 | 4B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_GE_4B1_03 | 4B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS_2B.3_01 | 2B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS_2B.3_02 | 2B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| CB_09_396_MS _2BA.1_01 | 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _2BA.2_01 | 2BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _2BCA.1_01 | 2BCA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3B.1_01 | 3B.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3B.2_01 | 3B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3B.2_02 | 3B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3B.3_01 | 3B.3 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3B.4_01 | 3B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3B.4_02 | 3B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3BA.2_01 | 3BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3BA.2_02 | 3BA.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3BA.2_2BA.1_ _01 | 3BA.2 & 2BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _3BA.2_3BA.1_ _01 | 3BA.2 & 3BA.1 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _4B.2_01 | 4B.2 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _4B.4_01 | 4B.4 Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _A_01 | Flat Block A Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _C_01 | Flat Block C Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_MS _D_01 | Flat Block D Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| CB_09_396_SU _B_CYC_01 | Sub Station & Cycle Store Floor Plans & Elevations | | September 2025 |
| Landscape Drawing Register | | | |
| GLS_200_176_ | Illustrative | | 14.05.25 |

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|--|----------|
| 1210 | Landscape Masterplan | | |
| GLS_200_176_2001 | Play Area Details Sheet 1 | | 15.10.25 |
| GLS_200_176_2002 | Play Area Details Sheet 2 | | 15.10.25 |
| GLS_200_176_2003 | Play Area Details Sheet 3 | | 15.10.25 |
| GLS_200_176_2004 | Play Area Details Sheet 4 | | 15.10.25 |

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No development shall take place until written confirmation has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority that Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) to mitigate the impact of the development has been fully secured. To demonstrate this, the applicant will be required to provide evidence that SANG capacity has been secured at a SANG which has a catchment which includes the application site.

Reason: This is required as a pre-commencement condition as the development is only acceptable if the impact on the Wealden Heaths Special Protection Area can be mitigated. This is reliant on the provision of SANG.

4. Prior to the commencement of any development above slab level works, a written schedule with details of the source/ manufacturer, colour and finish, OR samples on request of all external facing and roof materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must include details of reasonable efforts for all external materials to be locally sourced. The development shall be carried out using only those external materials approved.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory external appearance of the development is achieved and to ensure the development is in line with Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the Climate Change Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2024 paragraphs 5.53-5.63.

5. No above ground works shall take place (excluding ground works and construction up to damp proof course (dpc) and the construction of the access) until written details and/or samples of:

- a) fenestration details; and
- b) fascias, soffits and gutters
- c) balustrading

to be used externally have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out using the approved external materials.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory.

6. No above ground works shall take place (excluding ground works and construction up to damp proof course (dpc) and the construction of the accesses) until details of all boundary treatments within and around the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance the agreed timetable. The approved scheme shall be maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality and to ensure a high-quality design.

7. The development hereby approved shall be based upon the principles of Secured by Design (physical security) and the scheme shall be implemented in accordance with those principles.

Reason: To ensure that the development is acceptable in terms of crime and safety.

8. Before the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals for the development, including a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of ten years, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The proposals shall include exact details and drawings of all tree planting pits showing how trees will be planted to ensure that they have adequate room to grow and thrive within the development. The approved landscape scheme (with the exception of planting, seeding and turfing) shall be implemented and made available for use prior to the occupation of the development or phased in accordance with a phasing plan to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of an appropriate landscape scheme in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

9. All planting, seeding and turfing approved shall either be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the development or in accordance with a phasing plan which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or diseased in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, shall be replaced in the next available planting season with others of similar size, species and number.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of an appropriate landscape scheme in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

10. The development hereby approved shall not commence until a finalised Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP), in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and

Construction, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in full accordance with the approved AMS and TPP and no development shall commence until tree protection measures, as set out in the AMS and TPP, have been fully installed and a site meeting has taken place with the site manager, the retained consultant arboriculturist and the Council's Arboricultural Officer.

Reason: To protect the trees on site and adjacent, which are to be retained in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

11. The development hereby approved shall only take place in accordance with the Project Specification for an archaeological evaluation dated 23rd October 2025 and produced by Thames Valley Archaeological Services which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To allow adequate archaeological investigation before any archaeological remains are disturbed by the approved development.

12. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the final design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. The design must be compliant with the National standards for sustainable drainage systems and the NPPF. The required drainage details shall include:

- a) hydraulic calculations to demonstrate 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.
- b) detailed design drawings for all sustainable drainage elements including cross sections and detailed drainage layout plan, including details of rainwater harvesting.
- c) an exceedance flow routing plan demonstrating no increase in surface water flood risk on or off site. The plan must include proposed levels and flow directions.
- d) evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the water quality requirements of the National standards.
- e) evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the amenity requirements of the National standards.
- f) evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the biodiversity requirements of the National standards.
- g) details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for all drainage elements.
- h) details of how surface water will be managed during construction including measures to protect on site and downstream systems prior to the final drainage system being operational. Including details of how existing watercourse on and adjacent to the site will be protected.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the National standards for sustainable drainage systems and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk

on or off site.

13. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), confirming any defects have been rectified. Provide the details of any management company. Provide an 'As-Built' drainage layout and state the national grid reference of key drainage elements.

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National standards for Sustainable drainage systems.

14. No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:-

1. foul water capacity exists off site to serve the development and that this has been agreed in writing by Local Planning Authority, or
2. a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan, or
3. all foul water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed.

Reason: Network reinforcement works may be required to accommodate the proposed development.

15. No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:-

1. all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional demand to serve the development have been completed and that this has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority; or
2. a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.

Reason: The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development.

16. Works related to the construction of the development hereby permitted, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall not take place other than between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays and between 0800 and 1330 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays.

Reason: To protect the neighbours from noise and disturbance outside the permitted hours during the construction period.

17. Before any works above slab level commence:

- (a) written details and calculations showing the likely impact of noise from the air source heat pumps associated with the dwellings; and
- (b) if needed, a scheme of works or such other steps as may be necessary to minimise the effects of noise from the air source heat pumps.

shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

All works forming part of the agreed details for (a) and / or (b) above shall be completed before the individual air source heat pumps are operational.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the local residents from unreasonable noise levels which would be detrimental to the residential character of the area.

18. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (for air quality) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall incorporate air quality mitigation measures in accordance with the section 7: Mitigation measures and Appendix A: Construction Dust Risk Assessment, prepared by Air Quality Experts dated March 2026, (reference 1069-AL.EashingLane.1, Rev 2), and any other mitigation measures deemed appropriate to address the risks identified in the report. The approved CEMP shall be implemented in full during the construction phase to ensure that dust emissions and air quality impacts arising from construction activities and associated vehicle movements are appropriately mitigated.

Reason: To ensure that dust emissions and air quality impacts arising from construction activities and associated vehicle movements are appropriately mitigated.

19. No development (including demolition, groundworks and construction of the vehicular access(es)) shall commence until a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The SWMP shall make all reasonable attempts to accord with the DEFRA non-statutory guidance for site waste management plans (2008). The details shall include:

- a) any waste generated by construction, demolition and excavation activities is limited to the minimum quantity necessary;
- b) opportunities for first, re-use and secondly, recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste on the application site are maximised; and
- c) sufficient on-site facilities to manage waste (storage, reuse and recycling) arising during the operation of the development of an appropriate type and scale will be provided and maintained for the duration of the development.

The Site Waste Management Plan will subsequently be kept up to date throughout the development process in accordance with established methodology. The SWMP measures shall be implemented and maintained for the course of the development works.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes the waste hierarchy into account from the outset to manage waste, in accordance with Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the Climate Change Sustainable Design. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition because waste will begin to be generated as soon as any development commences on the site.

20. Prior to the first occupation of each of the individual house types hereby approved, a copy of the “water efficiency calculator for new dwellings” worksheet for each house type that accords with Part G of the building regulations’ Approved Documents, and the water consumption notice specified at regulation 37 of the Building Regulations, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each of the dwellings, hereby permitted, must achieve a water efficiency of 110 litres per occupant per day. The details set out in the worksheet and notice shall be implemented in the finished buildings.

Reason: To secure development that meets the water consumption standard set out in regulation 36 (2) of the Building Regulations and delivers a water efficient development in accordance with Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) policy D2: Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy and Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP), policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the borough’s designation as an area of ‘serious’ water stress.

21. Prior to the commencement of any development above slab level works, an energy modelling document (either a SAP output document or BREL Compliance Report) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate that the Dwelling Fabric Energy Efficiency (DFEE) value for each approved house type is at least 10% lower than the Target Fabric Energy Efficiency value set by Building Regulations. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To reduce carbon emissions and incorporate energy efficiency in accordance with Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) policy D2: Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy and Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP), policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the Council’s ‘Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy’ SPD 2024.

22. Prior to the commencement of any development above slab level works, an energy statement, including ‘Design-stage’ SAP reports, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The SAP reports shall demonstrate that each new dwelling has been designed in accordance with a

'fabric first' approach and that heating and hot water for each dwelling shall be provided by an air source heat pump. The approved details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of each dwelling and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To reduce carbon emissions and incorporate energy efficiency in accordance Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) policy D2: Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy and Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP), policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development and the Council's 'Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy' SPD 2024, and to ensure commitments set out in the application documents are delivered.

23. Prior to first occupation of each dwelling, all energy and efficiency measures set out in the approved Energy and Sustainability Statement (dated October 2025, prepared by AES Sustainability Consultants) shall be installed and made fully operational. Thereafter, these measures shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development takes sustainable design and construction principles into account, including climate change adaption and reducing carbon emissions, in accordance with Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) and policy D2: Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy and Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development.

24. No dwelling/apartment block hereby approved shall be occupied until its associated refuse and recycling storage facilities, as set out on drawing number CB_09_396_007, have been provided in full and made available for use. The refuse and recycling storage facilities shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenity, and to encourage waste minimisation and recycling of domestic refuse, in the interests of sustainable development.

25. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the proposed vehicular access to Eashing Lane shall be constructed and provided with visibility splays in accordance with drawing number ITB12206-GA-038 Rev J (Proposed Site/Eashing Lane Access), and thereafter the visibility splays shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction between 0.6m and 2.0m above ground level.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

26. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of an electric vehicle charging scheme for visitor parking spaces (50% active and 50% passive provision) and a programme for their delivery shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and delivery

programme and thereafter retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: To encourage the use of electric cars in order to reduce carbon emissions.

27. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of a scheme to provide publicly accessible visitor cycle parking and a programme for its installation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and delivery programme and thereafter retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles.

28. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, a written schedule and drawing showing all street materials, including details of source/manufacturer, colour and finish, and samples of materials, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and thereafter shall be retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to ensure that the proposed materials are in keeping with the character of the area, in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

29. Prior to the commencement of above ground works a written schedule and drawing showing the proposed street trees and planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in the first available planting season following commencement of above-ground works and maintained for a minimum period of ten years, including the replacement of any failed specimens in accordance with a maintenance schedule to be agreed as part of the submission.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to ensure that the proposed materials are in keeping with the character of the area, in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

30. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a scheme detailing 2.0m x 2.0m pedestrian inter-visibility splays at all driveway and parking court accesses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once implemented the visibility splays shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 600mm high to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

31. Prior to first occupation of the development the applicant shall enter into a S278 agreement with the County Highway Authority to construct the following package of highway works in general accordance with drawing numbers ITB12206-GA-038 Rev J; ITB12206-GA-039 Rev H; ITB12206-GA-044 Rev D; ITB12206-GA-047 Rev B; and ITB12206-GA-049 Rev A:

- a new footway / cycleway extending eastwards along the northern side of Eashing Lane.
- replacement parking lay-by for pick-ups/drop-offs associated with Hedgehogs Nursery.
- a new raised table uncontrolled crossing from the new footway / cycleway to Hedgehogs Nursery and a short section of new footway on the southern side of Eashing Lane.
- a new parallel (pedestrian and cyclist) crossing between the Aarons Hill and Franklyn Road junctions with Eashing Lane.
- conversion of the western Franklyn Road footway to become a footway/cycleway.
- a raised table at the Eashing Lane / Aarons Hill junction to provide greater priority for pedestrians and cyclists and to slow vehicle speeds.
- 20mph zone on Eashing Lane between its junctions with Franklyn Road and The Hollow comprising speed limit roundels, speed cushions, raised table, carriageway narrowings and Vehicle Activated Speed Limit sign.
- uncontrolled crossing with tactile paving at the Halfway Lane junction with Eashing Lane.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

32. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes linking the site with Eashing Lane and Halfway Lane (Public Bridleway No. 292) have been constructed in accordance with the drawing number CB_09_396_001 Rev B (planning layout) and thereafter the pedestrian and cycle routes shall be permanently retained and maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: To secure a high-quality Active Travel Network in accordance with policy ID3 of the Guildford Local Plan (2019) and to ensure compliance with the Sustainable Transport requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

33. No dwelling hereby approved shall be first occupied unless and until space for the parking of vehicles and space for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in a forward gear has been provided for that dwelling, in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

34. Each dwelling shall be provided with dedicated high quality, secure, lit, and covered cycle parking in accordance with the approved plans, and to also include:

- a) standard three-point outdoor plug socket for the charging of e-bikes (20% of all bikes within communal storage areas should be able to be charged at any one time).
- b) hard paved surface provided from the respective cycle store or cycle parking location for each property, to the nearest publicly accessible road or cycle route.

in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the occupation of any dwelling. Once agreed, the approved facilities shall be provided to each dwelling prior to their first occupation and thereafter, shall be permanently retained and maintained to for their designated purpose to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles.

35. The proposed access roads, footways and cycle routes within the site shall remain open and available for public use at all times, free of any obstruction to their intended uses, all to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To retain a high-quality Active Travel Network in accordance with policy ID3 of the Guildford Local Plan (2019) and to ensure compliance with the Sustainable Transport requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

36. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Sensitive Lighting Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Sensitive Lighting Management Plan should comply with the Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night (Guidance Note 08/23), and include a horizontal illuminance contour plan, which demonstrates dark corridors for nocturnal species. The Plan shall also include a timetable for the installation of the proposed lighting. The Sensitive Lighting Management Plan should also demonstrate the protection measures afforded to the adjacent ancient and semi-natural woodland and on-site wildlife corridors. In addition, the submitted details shall demonstrate that the proposed street lighting ensures consistent and uninterrupted illumination to allow year-round use on foot and by cycle. The development shall only be built in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not harm bats or their habitats and that the development does not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users and to secure a high-quality Active Travel Network in accordance with policy ID3 of the Guildford Local Plan (2019) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

37. No part of the development shall be first occupied unless and until the internal estate road layout has been provided with vehicular junction and forward visibility splays in accordance with drawing number ITB2206-GA-042 Rev D (Site Layout Internal Visibility Splays). Once implemented the visibility splays shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 600mm high to the

satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

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

- parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials
- programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- HGV deliveries and hours of operation
- vehicle routing
- measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
- before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
- measures to prevent deliveries at the beginning and end of the school day and to measures to prevent HGVs waiting on the public highway during these times.
- on-site turning for construction vehicles

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

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

39. Parking bays (private and visitor) located directly adjacent to grassed areas shall be provided with an additional hardstanding strip, or as otherwise agreed, to a minimum width of 900mm so that drivers/passengers may step onto a paved surface. Once constructed, such paved areas shall be permanently retained for their designated use to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory parking to serve the development.

40. Prior to first occupation of the development to submit a full Travel Plan, in accordance with the approved Framework Travel Plan (dated October 2025) for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority. The approved full Travel Plan shall then be implemented and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles.

41. The garages hereby approved shall only be used for incidental residential parking and storage as such and not for any trade, business or as ancillary

accommodation.

Reason: In order to maintain sufficient parking of the development and to protect the character and residential amenity of the area.

42. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP should include, but not be limited to:

- 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 protective fencing, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
- g) Reptile Strategy.
- h) Updated Badger Survey.
- i) Identification and protection of wildlife corridor(s).

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To protect and improve the biodiversity and ecological value of the site.

43. Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, an Ecological Enhancement Plan detailing how the development will deliver ecological enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Ecological Enhancement Plan should be based on impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the final ecological report and should include, but not be limited to the following:

- a) Description and evaluation of features to be provided
- b) Location plan of all ecological enhancement features being provided
- c) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management
- d) Prescriptions for management actions
- e) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures
- f) Identification, protection and enhancement of wildlife corridor(s).

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that the development delivers ecological enhancements on the site.

44. The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP), prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The HMMP shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- a non-technical summary.
- the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the HMMP.
- the planned 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; and
- the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: To ensure that habitat on the site is adequately managed.

Informatives:

1. If you need any advice regarding Building Regulations, please do not hesitate to contact Guildford Borough Council Building Control on 01483 444545 or buildingcontrol@guildford.gov.uk.
2. This statement is provided in accordance with Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Guildford Borough Council seek to take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals. We work with applicants in a positive and proactive manner by:
 - Offering a pre-application advice service in certain circumstances
 - Where pre-application advice has been sought and that advice has been followed we will advise applicants/agents of any further issues arising during the course of the application
 - Where possible officers will seek minor amendments to overcome issues identified at an early stage in the application process

However, Guildford Borough Council will generally not engage in unnecessary negotiation for fundamentally unacceptable proposals or where significant changes to an application is required.

In this case pre-application advice was sought and provided which addressed initial issues, the application has been submitted in accordance with that advice, however, further issues were identified during the consultation stage of the application. Officers have worked with the applicant to overcome these issues.

3. Lead Local Flood Authority Informatives:

If proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written Consent.

If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source

Protection Zone the Environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards.

Sub ground structures should be designed so they do not have an adverse effect on groundwater.

4. Thames Water Informative:

A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 3577 9483 or by emailing trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed online via www.thameswater.co.uk. Please refer to the Wholesale; Business customers; Groundwater discharges section.

5. County Highway Authority Informatives:

It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be provided in accordance with the Surrey County Council Vehicular, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development 2023. Where undercover parking areas (multi-storey car parks, basement or undercroft parking) are proposed, the developer and LPA should liaise with Building Control Teams and the Local Fire Service to understand any additional requirements. If an active connection costs on average more than £3600 to install, the developer must provide cabling (defined as a 'cabled route' within the 2022 Building Regulations) and two formal quotes from the distribution network operator showing this.

The electric vehicle charging condition has been recommended because Surrey County Council's Electric Vehicle charging requirements for the development proposed, exceeds those as defined within Building Regulations. The County Highway consider it is necessary for the condition to be imposed on any consent granted, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (2024) at paragraph 117 (e) and Surrey County Council's LTP4 policy on improving emissions intensity and energy efficiency of vehicles and operational efficiency of roads through technology improvements.

It is the responsibility of the developer to provide e-bike charging points with socket timers to prevent them constantly drawing a current over night or for longer than required. Signage should be considered regarding damaged or shock impacted batteries, indicating that these should not be used/charged. The design of communal bike areas should consider fire spread and there should be detection in areas where charging takes place. With regard to an e-bike socket in a non-domestic building, the premises should have detection, and an official e-bike charger should be used. Guidance on detection can be found in BS 5839-1 of the code of practice for designing, installing, commissioning, and maintaining fire detection and alarm systems in non-domestic buildings.

Where cycle parking (and bin stores) are located beyond any integral garaging or building, or in rear gardens, the route from any cycle or bin store to the nearest available paved route should be properly surfaced to allow for ease of access at all times of the year.

Design standards for the layout and construction of access roads and junctions, including the provision of visibility zones, shall be in accordance with the requirements of the County Highway Authority and the County Council's 'Healthy Streets' Design Code.

The applicant is expected to ensure the safe operation of all construction traffic to prevent unnecessary disturbance obstruction and inconvenience to other highway users. Care should be taken to ensure that the waiting, parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles does not hinder the free flow of any carriageway, footway, bridleway, footpath, cycle route, right of way or private driveway or entrance. The developer is also expected to require their contractors to sign up to the "Considerate Constructors Scheme" Code of Practice, (www.ccscheme.org.uk) and to follow this throughout the period of construction within the site, and within adjacent areas such as on the adjoining public highway and other areas of public realm.

The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development, subject to the above planning conditions but, if it is the applicant's intention to offer any of the roadworks included in the application for adoption as maintainable highways (which is encouraged), permission under the Town and Country Planning Act should not be construed as approval to the highway engineering details necessary for inclusion in an Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. In the event that the applicant wishes to pursue highway adoption, matters such as service margins, drainage, lighting, materials, landscaping and street furniture will require separate approval. Further details about the post-planning adoption of roads may be obtained from the Transport Development Planning Team of Surrey County Council.

Notwithstanding any permission granted under the Planning Acts, no signs, devices or other apparatus may be erected within the limits of the highway without the express approval of the Highway Authority. It is not the policy of the Highway Authority to approve the erection of signs or other devices of a non-statutory nature within the limits of the highway.

The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to obstruct the public highway by the erection of scaffolding, hoarding or any other device or apparatus for which a licence must be sought from the Highway Authority Local Highways Service.

Where cycle parking is proposed to be accommodated within private garages, it is recommended that side or rear pedestrian entrance doors are provided to allow ease of access to any stored cycle.

Officer's Report

Site description

The application site is a 9.7ha parcel of arable farmland that is located on the southern boundary of Guildford borough. The site is bound to the south and west by Eashing Lane and to the north by Halfway Lane which is a public bridleway. To the south-east of the site are a number of two-storey dwellings and bungalows which are addressed to Aarons Hill. To the east is the recently completed housing development known as Ockford Park which includes a mix of 262 dwellings and apartments, open space as well as a community building which sits within Waverley Borough Council's administrative area.

At present, the site includes the remnants of a construction haul road which was constructed and used as part of the development of Ockford Park. This runs roughly through the middle of the field. Otherwise, the site is currently used as arable farmland and was planted with crops at the time of the case officer's site visit. The land is classified as 'low-value' agricultural land and this will be discussed in greater detail below.

The site is generally flat and apart from a hedgerow and a number of trees around its perimeter (and the former haul road noted above) is relatively featureless.

While the site is situated within Guildford Borough it would clearly have a closer association with Godalming which is located within Waverley Borough Council. The site directly abuts the settlement boundary of Godalming to the south and east and as the crow flies is approximately one kilometre from Godalming railway station. To the north-west, approximately one kilometre from the site is the small village of Eashing which contains a small business park, a public house and a petrol station.

In terms of the surroundings as noted above, there are residential dwellings to the east and south-east of the site which are within the settlement area of Godalming. This includes St Marks and All Saints CoE primary school on the opposite side of Eashing Lane, approximately 50 metres from the south-eastern corner of the site. On Halfway Lane (to the north of the site) is a small complex of commercial buildings which include a veterinary practice and a catering company. These businesses are both located within Guildford borough. Beyond the immediate surroundings of the site to the west, north and south-west is arable farmland as well as a number of scattered large, detached dwellings.

As regards formal designations the site is located within the Green Belt, an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and an Area of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP). There are very small areas of the site which are of medium to low risk of surface water flooding, mainly in the south-east corner. There is also a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in place which protects existing trees located along the western and south-western boundary (TPO 4 of 2025). There is a further TPOs in place outside of the site, but close to its north-eastern boundary, which affords protection to an Oak and a False Acacia (TPO 2 of 2016).

In terms of heritage assets it is noted that there are a number of Grade II listed buildings that are located around and within Eashing village. Eashing Bridge is also a Grade I listed Scheduled Ancient Monument. Within Waverley Borough Council is Westbrook House (Grade II* Listed) and its associated listed park and garden (Grade II Listed) which are located to the north-east of the site.

Proposal

The formal description of development reads as follows: 'Residential development comprising of 234 dwellings, including 50% affordable dwellings, together with means of access, internal road network, parking, public open space (including play space), landscaping and associated works (application for full planning permission)'.

The application proposes the construction of 234 dwellings, in a mix as set out in the table below:

| Proposed Mix | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 1-bed | 2-bed | 3-bed | 4-bed | Total |
| Total dwellings | 12 | 102 | 93 | 27 | 234 |
| | | | | | |
| Of which... | | | | | |
| Houses | 0 | 67 | 93 | 27 | 187 |
| Apartments | 12 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Affordable | 12 | 70 | 32 | 3 | 117 |

The proposal contains two main areas of development which are separated by the new access road. The access is taken from Eashing Lane in the east which is on the same alignment as the existing haul road which was used in the construction of Ockford Park. This access road runs roughly through the middle of the site and leads to a second access to the east which would link into Ock Way on Ockford Park. It is important to note that the eastern access is located within Waverley Borough Council's administrative area and is being considered by that authority through a separate planning application. The access would be tree lined on both sides and at the centre of the site is a linear area of open space which runs almost the entire depth of the plot from north to south. This opens out into a more formal area of landscaping where it intersects with the access road. This provides a central focal point for the development. There are also a number of sizeable areas of open space around the perimeter of the site, notably in the north-east corner where the site abuts the existing open space area at Ockford Park. One equipped formal play space is provided in the south-west quadrant of the site and this is supplemented with a new naturalistic play area which will connect into the existing play area provided as part of the Ockford Park development. As well as this, various play trail locations are provided throughout the scheme.

The housing development consists largely of a number of perimeter blocks. Generally speaking, the density is highest in the centre and eastern edge of the site and lowers towards the Green Belt and open countryside. Five apartment buildings are proposed, two on the eastern boundary overlooking the open space between the site and Ockford Park and three at the eastern end of the central access road. Two of the apartment blocks overlook and 'frame' the proposed central open space area. The apartment buildings would be set over three storeys. The dwellings would all be two storeys in height.

As noted above, the layout includes a large, landscaped buffer to the west and northern boundaries, which will help the scheme to integrate into the landscape which surrounds it. There are numerous pedestrian and cycle connections through the site that link into the surrounding area. All of the trees protected by TPO 4 of 2025 retained.

It is noted that before submitting this application the application sought a Screening Opinion from the Local Planning Authority (application 25/S/00007 refers). This concluded that the

environmental impacts resulting from the development were not of a nature which would trigger an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Relevant planning history

| Reference: | Description: | Decision Summary: | Appeal: |
|------------|---|-----------------------|---------|
| 25/S/00007 | Request for an EIA Screening Opinion under the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended). | Not EIA development | N/A |
| 19/P/01535 | Creation of a temporary construction access, haul road and compound. | Approve 04/12/2019 | N/A |

As noted above, the eastern access to the site falls outside of Guildford borough and a planning application for this element of the proposal is being considered by Waverley Borough Council. Details of the access application are provided below:

| Reference: | Description: | Decision Summary: | Appeal: |
|---------------|--|-------------------|---------|
| WA/2026/00451 | Creation of a vehicular access to Ock Way and pedestrian access routes (application associated with planning application 25/P/01474 under determination by Guildford Borough Council). | Pending | N/A |

As also noted above, a residential scheme of 262 dwellings was approved by Waverley Borough Council in 2019. The development is known as Ockford Park and it is now completed and occupied. For completeness, details of the application are provided below.

| Reference: | Description: | Decision Summary: | Appeal: |
|--------------|---|-------------------|---------|
| WA/2018/1239 | Erection of 262 dwellings (Use Class C3) including 78 affordable dwellings together with a 131sqm building for community use (Use Class D1) and associated works including informal and formal open space, internal road network, landscape enhancement and access; following demolition of existing buildings (as amended by plans received 02/11/2018). | Approve | N/A |

Consultations

A summary of the consultation responses received for the application is contained below. This is not a verbatim report and full copies of all representations received are on the electronic planning file, which is available to view online.

Statutory consultees

Environment Agency: No comment, the agency does not need to be consulted on this application.

County Highway Authority, Surrey County Council: No objections raised, subject to conditions and securing a number of highway safety interventions through a legal agreement.

Natural England: No objections raised.

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), Surrey County Council: No objections raised, subject to standard conditions.

County Archaeologist, Surrey County Council: No objections raised subject to condition. It is noted that the proposed scheme is acceptable from the archaeological point of view, and no concerns are raised towards investigative work now taking place on the site. To secure the archaeological investigation work and any detailed mitigation works that may be required a condition should be attached should consent be granted.

Historic England: Historic England (HE) note that the Council should seek the views of its specialist conservation and archaeological advisers.

The Gardens Trust: The Trust's comments focus on Westbrook which is a Grade II registered park and garden. The following comments are noted:

- the proposed development of 234 residential units may harm the setting of Westbrook, which is significant due to its historical and architectural value, including contributions from notable figures like Thackeray Turner and Gertrude Jekyll;
- the site's proximity to Westbrook means it is part of the park's wider setting, which is essential for understanding its significance;
- the Heritage Statement submitted with the application inadequately assesses the relationship between the registered park and garden and its setting, particularly overlooking long-range views and the experiential aspects of the landscape;
- previous developments, such as Phase 1 of Ockford Park, have already altered the registered park and garden's setting, and further development could exacerbate this harm;
- the cumulative impact of the existing Phase 1 development as well as this proposal has not been sufficiently addressed, particularly regarding visibility from key vantage points like the 'thunderbox';
- while some mitigation measures, such as green buffers and play areas, are proposed, they are insufficient to fully address the negative impacts on the registered park and garden's significance;
- recommendations from the Trust to improve this aspect of the development include reducing housing density and height, relocating play spaces, and enhancing the buffer zone with a diverse mix of trees to better protect the registered park and garden's setting;

- the response emphasises adherence to NPPF policies regarding the conservation of heritage assets, highlighting that the application fails to demonstrate no unacceptable harm to the registered park and garden's significance;
- it calls for careful consideration of the statutory duty to preserve the setting of listed buildings and registered parks, urging a thorough reassessment of the proposed development's impacts; and
- The Gardens Trust expresses concern over the potential erosion of Westbrook's original setting and advocates for a more sensitive approach to development in the area.

Internal consultees

Head of Environmental Health and Licensing: No objections subject to conditions. It is noted that the Council's Environmental Health Officer did originally raise queries regarding the relationship between the commercial properties to the north of the site and the closest residential dwellings that are proposed, as well as the impact on air quality. All of these issues have now been addressed through the submission of additional information and clarification.

Operational Services, Recycling and Waste: No comments received.

Arboricultural Officer: No objections raised. The following comments are noted:

- the development will have minimal impact on existing trees, with only one small tree, two groups of trees, and one hedge being partially removed. This will not significantly alter the site's arboricultural character or the local landscape;
- minor incursions into the root protection areas (RPAs) of retained trees are expected, but no long-term damage is anticipated if recommended measures are implemented;
- a nearby ancient woodland will not be directly affected, and the minor incursion into its buffer zone is deemed negligible, complying with UK planning guidance; and
- no arboricultural objections are raised provided a finalised Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) are submitted and approved before development begins. These measures must adhere to BS 5837:2012 standards.

Non-statutory consultees

Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey: It is noted that the large numbers of housing being developed across Surrey and more specifically within Guildford Borough will place a significant additional demand upon the police service. The necessity of investment in additional policing services is a key planning consideration in determination of this planning application. The response states that all the infrastructure outlined in this funding request has been found compliant with Regulation 122 of the CIL and are considered directly related to the development in scale and kind and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The police request that a contribution of £46,266.30 be secured as part of this application.

Designing Out Crime Officer, Surrey Police: Concerns that due to the development being adjacent to the Ockford Park development, the developer may highlight the use of Bridleway 6 as a safe and established route to the Railway Station in Godalming. It is noted in the response that this bridleway has known safety and security concerns, particularly during the hours of darkness. Consideration should also be given to a requirement for the development to achieve a Secure by Design Gold award. [Officer Note: These matters will

be addressed later in the report].

NHS Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Board (ICB) (now part of the new NHS Surrey and Sussex ICB): The ICB note that it is necessary for measures to be put in place so the impacts to local healthcare as a direct result of this development are addressed. They note that the level of contribution (£182,975) is reasonable in scale and kind because it is based on the size and nature of the development.

Thames Water: No objections raised, subject to conditions dealing with water supply and foul / wastewater disposal.

Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT): As Natural England have confirmed their agreement to the Council's Appropriate Assessment, Surrey Wildlife Trust raise no objections to the development. This is subject to a number of prior to commencement matters (some of which will be secured by conditions and others through the legal agreement).

Waverley Borough Council: The application documents show that this development immediately abuts the boundary of Waverley and that the proposed vehicular crossover access 3no. footpath links are located within the boundary of Waverley. This will be separately considered under WA/2026/00451 for the creation of a vehicular access to Ock Way and pedestrian access routes (application associated with planning application 25/P/01474 under determination by Guildford Borough Council). A request for a Screening Opinion has also been received under SC/2026/00482 which Waverley will assess in due course. Without prejudice to the applications listed above, insofar as they relate to the development within Waverley Borough, the entirety of residential development proposed is outside the Waverley boundary and therefore subject to compliance with Guildford Borough Council planning policy, Waverley has no objection.

The Surrey Gardens Trust: The Surrey Gardens Trust (SGT) has raised concerns about the potential negative impact of the development on the setting and significance of Westbrook's gardens, particularly its rural character, key views, and sense of isolation. They highlight the importance of preserving the integrity of the landscape and suggest that the proposed green boundary may not sufficiently mitigate harm. They recommend a denser woodland buffer and adjustments to the development, such as reducing the number, density, and height of the houses, as well as stepping them further back from the site boundary. The SGT also notes the cumulative impact of previous developments, such as Ockford Park. They emphasise the importance of considering noise, light pollution, and the overall experience of the heritage asset in the planning decision.

National Highways (NH): No objection. Due to the low number of trips from the development that are estimated to travel via the strategic road network, NH are satisfied that the development will not materially affect the safety, reliability and/or operation of the strategic road network in this location and its vicinity.

Countryside Access Officer, Surrey County Council: No objections.

Surrey Hills National Landscape Advisor: The Surrey Hills National Landscape (SHNL) issue is whether the proposed development would spoil the setting of the SHNL by harming views from or into the SHNL. Due to the intervening distance and landform, it is not considered that it could be reasonably be substantiated that the proposal would spoil the setting of the SHNL. The main landscape value of the site is one of forming part of an open

and publicly prominent undeveloped area. It is not surprising though that Natural England excluded this site and its immediate setting in its proposals to extend the SHNL as it does not really meet the "natural beauty" test and is influenced by the adjacent built-up area.

Parish / Town Councils

Shackleford Parish Council (SPC): The Parish Council objects to the application. The following concerns are noted:

- the Parish Council state that the site is classified as Grey Belt land, which SPC disputes, asserting it remains arable and should be protected as Green Belt [Officer Note: Whether or not the site is considered to be 'grey belt' will be assessed below];
- the openness of the countryside will be harmed by the scale, density and height of Phase II;
- the temporary construction access granted for Ockford Park Phase I does not justify reclassification; the site should not be considered developed;
- the proposed development's density and height (up to 13m) are inappropriate for the semi-rural area, threatening the openness of the countryside and contributing to urban sprawl;
- the cumulative impact of nearby developments (e.g., Ockford Park Phase I, Hurst Farm) will eliminate open spaces between Godalming and Milford;
- SPC highlights ongoing congestion and safety concerns on Eashing Lane, exacerbated by the proposed development;
- the narrow road poses dangers for pedestrians and vehicles, particularly during peak hours, and new accesses will further complicate traffic flow. It is noted that previous traffic mitigation measures from Phase I remain unimplemented, leaving residents frustrated;
- the application lacks details on how it will address the increased demand on local services, including healthcare, education, and water supply;
- existing facilities are already under pressure, with reports of low water pressure and overcrowded schools;
- SPC expresses concerns about potential harm to local wildlife and ecosystems, questioning the feasibility of achieving a biodiversity net gain of at least 10%;
- more information is needed on ecological protections and management plans; and
- SPC requests that planning permission for the application be refused due to its failure to meet planning policies and the adverse effects it would have on the community and environment.

Godalming Town Council: Object to the application. The following points are noted:

- welcome the intention to provide 50% affordable housing;
- proposal would have unmitigated and unacknowledged impact on infrastructure and services within the Godalming area, in particular on schools, the local highway network and on local health services;
- concern over perceived lack of engagement between the developer and the Town Council;
- no planning gain allocated to educational or recreational infrastructure in Godalming where residents of the scheme will most likely access services;
- application fails to acknowledge the cumulative impact of large-scale developments in the area, including those in Milford;
- the Green Belt harm has not been adequately addressed. The development represents a permanent loss of openness and the proposal amounts to the outward expansion of

- a large built-up area;
- the application should be deferred until cross-boundary planning gain arrangements can be established; ensure that a financial contribution is secured for enhancements to St Mark and All Saints primary school, provision of a multi-use games area for use of the school and improvements to the local highway network. It is also suggested that a travel and access strategy is required; and
- without the above, the proposal does not represent sustainable development.

Amenity groups / residents associations

The Godalming Trust: The Trust have strong reservations about the proposed development and object to the application. The following points are noted:

- neither Historic England nor The Gardens Trust have been consulted on the application [Officer Note: Both bodies have been consulted and their responses have been summarised above];
- large amount of traffic from the site will use The Hollow/Lower Eashing Lane, crossing Eashing Bridge which is a Grade I listed Scheduled Ancient Monument which was not designed for modern, heavy traffic. The Trust advise that an Impact Assessment of the bridge should be required;
- concerns raised that the submitted heritage report is inaccurate, misleading and contains errors;
- the impact on Westbrook has not been taken seriously;
- the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and AGLV. The site is not Grey Belt and there are no 'special circumstances';
- concerns over increase in traffic and that the proposal will greatly increase accident risk and create gridlock; and
- the proposal conflicts with the local plan and should be refused.

Third party comments

A summary of the third-party responses received for the application is contained below. This is not a verbatim report and full copies of all representations received are on the electronic planning file, which is available to view online.

73 letters of representation have been received raising a number of objections and concerns. The principal issues are summarised below:

- development will increase traffic on Eashing Lane and due to on-street parking, frequent use by large vehicles and the general increase in traffic the proposal could cause congestion and highway safety issues;
- congestion on Eashing Lane at its junction with Portsmouth Road;
- pedestrian and cycle infrastructure should be provided and public transport improved;
- the site was a draft allocation in the Guildford Local Plan and was not taken forward due to Green Belt and other concerns. These issues remain valid;
- the Planning Statement at paragraph 1.8 states 'it has been agreed that GBC will be the determining authority for these works, under a single planning application, with WBC commenting as a consultee and deferring authority to GBC to determine the application'. Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) cannot grant permission for land outside their area. No single authority can approve land outside its jurisdiction. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that where development crosses boundaries, each LPA must issue its

own decision notice. If a separate application was made to WBC within the administrative control of those who live near to the site, it would be refused, preventing the development as a whole [Officer Note: This issue has now been addressed as the works proposed in the Waverley boundary are being considered through a separate application by Waverley Borough Council. The eastern access no longer forms part of the Guildford proposal];

- it is alleged that residents who live at Ockford Park, immediately adjacent to the site, are subject to a contractual clause which states buyers will not make any objection to any planning application whatsoever in connection with the development. Whilst this contractual clause is not in place with Ashill directly, residents at Ockford Park are scared to comment on the development, as adjoining owners. This is an attack on democracy and free speech;
- the site should not be referred to as Phase 2, as it is not a second phase under an already approved application, but an entirely new development;
- as the site includes an Area of High Archaeological Potential, footnote seven of the NPPF is engaged and that precludes the site from being considered under the grey belt definition;
- the site is not previously developed and is farmland;
- the site provides a visual and spatial buffer between Godalming and surrounding settlements and its openness contributes to the rural character of the area. It is also stated that the proposal would merge Godalming and Eashing into one another. The site therefore fulfills the purposes of the Green Belt and is therefore not grey belt;
- treating the site as grey belt would set a dangerous precedent;
- although Guildford does not have a five-year housing land supply, this does not mean the harm to the Green Belt is outweighed;
- concerns regarding the use of the bridleway which connects Ockford Park to the railway station. The alternative routes put forward by the applicant will not be used. Sending another 262 households to the station via an unlit bridleway is not a safe or sound decision. Lighting must be provided;
- there are not sufficient public services in the area to cope with increased demand - such as schools and GP surgeries. Contributions to these should be secured by way of a s106 agreement;
- the public open space will need to be adopted by the local parish or borough Council, otherwise it will not be public;
- proposed areas of green space do not compensate for loss of farmland;
- possible impact on local views and the AGLV;
- proposal would result in significant landscape harm;
- concerns regarding flooding;
- proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and development should be restricted to the south of the access road only;
- impact on Halfway House which is a non-statutory designated heritage asset;
- proposal will add further traffic to Ock Way which is already difficult for pedestrians to negotiate. The access would breach the continuous pavement and the additional vehicles would be a danger to pedestrians, especially the many children who live in this area;
- public transport options are limited, leaving residents reliant on cars;
- increased air pollution and traffic noise will impact on residents and schools;
- cumulative impact of this development and others in the area has not been properly assessed;
- proposal would add to suburban sprawl;

- how can a development which will result in a further 500 plus vehicle movements a day be sustainable;
- Eashing Lane will be dangerous for pedestrians and walkers, especially children who use the road;
- impact on Eashing Bridge;
- impact on ecology;
- the site lies in a water-stressed area where demand already strains supply and drought risk is high. The proposal would increase pressure on the system still further;
- harm to the rural character of the surrounding area;
- condition four of application 19/P/01535 required the haul road to be removed and the land restored. The proposal contradicts this;
- loss of rural tranquillity and character;
- destruction of nature habitats;
- light pollution;
- overlooking and loss of privacy from the apartment buildings which will be in close proximity to existing bungalows on Aarons Hill;
- overlooking from apartments (with balconies) over properties Ock Way;
- overshadowing of properties on Ock Way and Aarons Hill from the proposed apartment buildings;
- Ock Way is not adopted by the County Council and the proposal would therefore need to be agreed by existing residents;
- the clear impact will be on WBC and not GBC. Those affected are not given a direct voice in the planning determination as they are not resident in the planning authority area;
- taking a major planning decision under the current circumstances of minimal representation for the affected, with a democratic process so near around the corner (local government reorganisation), would completely fail to recognise the rights of local people to be represented on matters that affect them so greatly;
- end of consultation process was during the Christmas holidays which may result in many responses being rushed and some may not be able to respond at all;
- inappropriate presentation of the site as a fifteen-minute community;
- loss of hedgerows;
- noise, vibration and disturbance caused during construction works;
- there is plenty of land in and around Guildford to build houses on;
- severe loss of biodiversity;
- Godalming should not have to bear the brunt of Guildford's housing need;
- to protect food security, this site should be retained for agricultural use;
- concerns regarding the impact on Westbrook and the associated registered park and garden;
- the heritage report submitted with the application is misleading and inaccurate;
- failure to consult statutory consultees such as Historic England and the Gardens Trust;
- visual impact assessment fails to meet the standards of an objective assessment and omits material information;
- impact on the setting of Fox Way;
- proposed architecture of poor quality - scheme is mundane and unimaginative;
- the scheme will appear contrived due to the materials, size of windows and design choices;
- impact on the ancient woodland; and
- adverse impact on Eashing village.

Planning policies

The list below covers the main policies which are relevant to this proposal.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Chapter 2. Achieving sustainable development

Chapter 4. Decision-making

Chapter 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Chapter 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities

Chapter 9. Promoting sustainable transport

Chapter 11. Making effective use of land

Chapter 12. Achieving well designed places

Chapter 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Chapter 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Chapter 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034

Policy S1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Policy S2 Planning for the borough - our spatial strategy

Policy H1 Homes for all

Policy H2 Affordable homes

Policy P1: Surrey Hills National Landscape and Area of Great Landscape Value

Policy P4 Flooding, flood risk and groundwater protection zones

Policy P5 Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

Policy D1 Place shaping

Policy D2 Sustainable design, construction and energy

Policy D3 Historic Environment

Policy E5: Rural economy

Policy ID1: Infrastructure and delivery

Policy ID3 Sustainable transport for new developments

Policy ID4 Green and blue infrastructure

Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies March 2023

Policy H7: First Homes

Policy P6: Protecting Important Habitats and Species

Policy P7: Biodiversity in New Developments

Policy P9: Air Quality and Air Quality Management Areas

Policy P11: Sustainable Surface Water Management

Policy D4: Achieving High Quality Design and Respecting Local Distinctiveness

Policy D5: Protection of Amenity and Provision of Amenity Space

Policy D6: External Servicing Features and Stores

Policy D7: Public Realm

Policy D11: Noise Impacts

Policy D12: Light Impacts and Dark Skies

Policy D14: Sustainable and Low Impact Development

Policy D15: Climate Change Adaptation

Policy D16: Carbon Emissions from Buildings

Policy D17: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation and Storage

Policy D18: Designated Heritage Assets

Policy D19: Listed Buildings

Policy D20: Conservation Areas

Policy D21: Scheduled Ancient Monuments
Policy D22: Registered Parks and Gardens
Policy D23: Non-Designated Heritage Assets
Policy ID6: Open Space in New Developments
Policy ID9: Achieving a Comprehensive Guildford Borough Cycle Network
Policy ID10: Parking Standards for New Development

Supplementary planning documents

Parking Standards SPD (2023)
Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD (2020)
Planning Contributions SPD 2017 (updated in April 2022)
Thames Basin Heaths Special Protected Area Avoidance Strategy SPD (2017 and update)
Planning Contributions for Open Space in New Developments (2024)
Residential Design Guide SPG (2004)
Surrey Hills Management Plan

It is acknowledged that the proposal may have an impact on heritage assets which are located within Waverley Borough Council (WBC). The relevant WBC policies will be referenced in the report where necessary.

Planning considerations

The main planning considerations in this case are:

- equality, diversity and human rights
- the principle of development
- Green Belt
- loss of best and most versatile agricultural land
- housing details
- layout and design of the proposal
- impact on the wider landscape including the National Landscape and Area of Great Landscape Value
- impact on heritage assets
- impact on archaeology
- impact on neighbouring amenity
- amenity of the proposed dwellings
- highway/parking considerations
- flooding and drainage considerations
- sustainable design and construction
- open space provision
- impact on ecology and biodiversity
- impact on trees and ancient woodland
- impact on air quality
- Wealden Heaths SPA
- Waverley Borough Council element
- planning contributions and legal tests
- balancing exercise and public benefit
- conclusion

Equality, diversity and human rights

In reaching its decision on a planning application the Council is required to have regard to the duties contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, known collectively as the public sector equality duty.

Section 149 provides that the Council must have due regard to the need to -

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers have had due regard to these matters when assessing this application and have concluded that neither the granting nor the refusal of this application would be likely to have an impact on protected groups and, therefore, that these considerations would not weigh in favour of or against this application.

Consideration has also been given to Articles 1 and 8 of the of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights. It is not considered that the decision would result in a violation of any person's rights under the Convention.

The principle of development

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. This supply is assessed as being 2.98 years, based on most recent evidence as reflected in the GBC LAA (2025). Therefore, the Plan and its policies are regarded as out-of-date in terms of paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

Policy S2 of the LPSS, the spatial strategy, is not in compliance with the NPPF, and is therefore out of date. All other policies comply with the NPPF and therefore are afforded full weight unless otherwise specified in the topic specific sections below.

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that 'plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development...For decision-taking this means: c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless: i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination'. Footnote 8 clarifies that paragraph 11d is engaged for applications involving the provision of housing where the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply. As noted above, the Council accepts it cannot currently demonstrate a five-year

housing land supply.

As such, it is noted that the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development (or so called 'tilted balance') could apply to this proposal. This weighs a development's adverse impacts against its benefits, not on a level playing field, but tilted towards granting permission as a starting point, prior to application of the tests at paragraph 11d)i or 11d)ii. Whether the tilted balance is engaged will depend on whether the proposal meets the tests in paragraph 11d)i or 11d)ii noted above. This will be considered in greater detail at the end of the report.

Green Belt

As noted above, the site is located within the Green Belt. Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states that 'the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'. Paragraph 153 goes on to note that 'when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 154 sets out a number of exceptions where development may not be inappropriate in the Green Belt. It is an agreed position between the Local Planning Authority and the applicant that none of these paragraph 154 exceptions apply to the development.

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF introduces the relatively new concept of 'grey belt'. It states that:

The development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply:

- a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;*
- b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;*
- c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and*
- d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157....*

Potentially, if a development complies with the applicable parts of paragraph 155, it could be classed as not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and it would therefore be acceptable, without the need to demonstrate very special circumstances. The proposal will be assessed against points a-d below.

a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan

The definition of grey belt is set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF. It states that 'for the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not

strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development'. These matters will be considered in turn below.

For clarity, it is the view of the Local Planning Authority that the site does not constitute previously developed land. It is noted that some of the objections raised by residents make reference to the fact that the haul road that currently exists on the site does not mean that the site should be regarded as previously developed. Officers agree with this point of view and it is noted that the applicant does not seek to argue this point. The removal of the haul road is secured by a planning condition and once it is removed the site would revert back to its previous condition as an undeveloped field.

Purposes (a), (b) and (d) of paragraph 143 are as follows:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

As regards (a) it is noted that the PPG provides some additional guidance on how this assessment should be carried out. The PPG state that 'this purpose relates to the sprawl of large built-up areas. Villages should not be considered large built-up areas'. Although there is no definition for what the Government considers to be a 'large built-up area' Officers conclude that although Godalming is a relatively large town, it is not the case that all towns are necessarily also 'large built-up areas'. Godalming is considered a Town because of its position in the hierarchy for this LPA and its population of around 23,000. The overall scale of Godalming is therefore not considered to be large enough for it to constitute a large built-up area and therefore, on this basis, the site makes 'no contribution' to purpose A.

Even if Members disagree with the above conclusion, it is noted the PPG states that sites which make a strong contribution to purpose (a) 'are likely to be free of existing development and lack physical feature(s) in reasonable proximity that could restrict and contain development. They are also likely to include all of the following features: be adjacent or near to a large built-up area or if developed, result in an incongruous pattern of development (such as an extended "finger" of development into the Green Belt).

The application site is bound by existing residential development to the east and south-east. While it is acknowledged that there are undeveloped fields to the south-west of the site, taking into account the wider context, it is noted that the built-up area of Godalming to the south of Eashing Cemetery extends a similar extent to the west than the application site would. So, in overall terms, the proposal would not extend the western most point of the town further into the countryside than is presently the case. It is acknowledged that to the north and west of the site there are largely open, undeveloped fields which extend into the wider open countryside. However, the site does exhibit a strong tree and hedgerow line along its northern and western boundaries, as well as Eashing Lane itself which could themselves successfully restrict and contain development. In addition, it is noted that there are other more sporadic urbanising influences in the immediate vicinity of the site including the large expanse of built form associated with the commercial premises off Halfway Lane.

Even if it could be argued that Godalming is a 'large built-up area', from the assessment above, it would still be concluded that the site would only make a weak (and not a strong)

contribution to purpose (a).

As regards purpose (b) this seeks to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. On this the PPG notes that 'this purpose relates to the merging of towns, not villages'. It also sets out that sites which contribute strongly to this purpose are likely to be free of existing development and include all of the following features: forming a substantial part of a gap between towns and/or the development of which would be likely to result in the loss of visual separation of towns. For these purposes, Godalming is considered to be a town.

Although the PPG confirms that a village is not considered to be a 'town' it does not define what exactly the Government deem to be a 'town' for these purposes. However, notwithstanding this, the closest towns to the south, north and west of the site are all a significant distance away from Godalming. As such, the site does not make a contribution to the visual separation between Godalming and any other neighbouring town. The PPG states that a site which contributes weakly to purpose (b) are likely to include those that do not form part of a gap between towns, or form part of a gap between towns, but only a very small part of this gap, without making a contribution to visual separation. For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the site contributes weakly to purpose (b) of paragraph 143.

Purpose (d) of paragraph 143 concerns the preservation of the setting and special character of historic towns. The PPG states that 'this purpose relates to historic towns, not villages. Where there are no historic towns in the plan area, it may not be necessary to provide detailed assessments against this purpose'. Again, neither the NPPF or PPG define what is meant by the term 'historic town', however, as noted above, it is not deemed to include a 'village'. However, based on the fact that Godalming has a long history dating to Anglo-Saxon times and includes a large number of listed buildings and a conservation area, for the purposes of this assessment against purpose (d) it is considered to be a 'historic town'.

While the town itself has a range of listed buildings and conservation areas, the proposed site is located in an area which mainly exhibits more modern development which was built after the Second World War. Although there are listed buildings and a registered park and garden to the north-east of the site (which individually the proposal may result in some harm to), overall given the immediate context, the proposal is considered to preserve the setting and special character of Godalming as a whole. The PPG notes that sites which perform moderately against purpose (d) are likely to form part of the setting and/or contribute to the special character of a historic town but include one or more features that weaken their contribution to this purpose, such as (but not limited to): being separated to some extent from historic aspects of the town by existing development or topography; containing existing development; and/or not having an important visual, physical, or experiential relationship to historic aspects of the town. As explained above, as it is considered that the site is separated to some extent from historic aspects of the town by existing development and that it does not have an important visual, physical, or experiential relationship to historic aspects of Godalming, it makes only a weak to moderate contribution to purpose (d).

The second element of criterion (a) of paragraph 155 of the NPPF is that the development should not 'fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan'. On this point it is noted that in the context of the plan area

(i.e. Guildford borough), the site represents a very small proportion of the overall Green Belt. An assessment of purposes (a), (b) and (d) has already been carried out above. The remaining Green Belt purposes are (c) 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment' and (e) 'to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land'. On its own the site does safeguard the countryside from encroachment and leaving it undeveloped may help to assist in urban regeneration. However, as purposes (c) and (e) are to be considered against the remaining Green Belt, across the plan area, it is highly unlikely that a proposal, of this scale, could be said to fundamentally undermine the Council's ability to safeguard the countryside from encroachment or that it would dissuade the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Therefore, considered on the of the remaining Green Belt in the borough, and taking into account the assessment of purposes (a), (b) and (d) above, the proposal would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the plan area.

In conclusion on criterion (a) of paragraph 155 of the NPPF it is considered that the proposal would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the plan area.

b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed

As already briefly mentioned above, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. This supply is assessed as being 2.98 years, based on most recent evidence as reflected in the GBC LAA (2025). As such, it is agreed that there is a demonstrable unmet need for housing in the borough, for both market sale and to be secured as affordable and therefore the proposal meets with point (a) of paragraph 155.

c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework

Paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF state the following (respectively):

The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location; b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.

Whether or not the application site is considered to be in a 'sustainable location' will be

assessed below. It is noted that concerns have been raised by members of the public and Surrey Police about the safety of the New Way/Bridleway 6. As such, this route from the site to Godalming town centre will not be relied upon as part of this assessment. However, for those who do utilise the route, it is a 15-minute walk (approximately) from the site to Godalming station.

The application site is located approximately a 20/25-minute walk from Godalming Station via Eashing Lane and Ockford Road. While it is acknowledged that part of the route is on an incline, it is a pleasant walk, with pavements for the entire length. In the town centre there is a wide range of shops and facilities, including the railway station, which is a slightly longer walk. While it is acknowledged that a 25-minute walk is slightly longer than would ideally be desired, it is not unreasonable to say that at least a proportion of the new population would be able and willing to walk to the town centre from the site.

In terms of schools, there is a primary school (St Marks and All Saints) that would be a short and easily accessible walk from the site. Godalming College (sixth form) would be a 26-minute walk from the site. There is a scout hut and community centre located off Franklyn Road, which are both less than a 10-minute walk from the southern side boundary. On Quarry Hill, approximately a 12-minute walk from the site, is a local convenience store, which while a weekly shop would not be possible, basic essentials can be purchased for day-to-day needs. The closest public house is just a 17-minute walk away on Ockford Road (Inn on the Lake).

In terms of cycling it is acknowledged that the site is not easily accessible from the town centre due to the lack of dedicated cycling infrastructure, which would be difficult to install on the surrounding narrow roads. It is also noted that rights of way route number six runs from the eastern edge of Ockford Park and leads to the railway station. This would be a faster route to the town centre and would be suitable for cycle traffic. However, it is fully acknowledged and as evidenced in some of the consultation responses to this application that this route is considered by many to be un-safe, particularly during hours of dusk or darkness, due to the lack of lighting and its heavy tree planting on both sides. As such, this route is not relied on as part of this assessment.

As regards public transport there are a number of local bus services which run close to the site. The closest route is between the Eashing Lane Estates to Guildford (number 72), however, this only runs once per hour, with the first service departing just before 10am during the weekdays. There are more frequent services approximately a 15-minute walk away (at the bottom of Eashing Lane) (numbers 70 and 71) which link the area to Guildford, Haslemere and Midhurst. A walk of 15-minutes to reach a well-served bus stop is not considered to be unreasonable.

In addition, it is noted that measures are being implemented which will make the site more sustainable as part of the planning process. An element of this is a s106 contribution towards the expansion of the existing demand responsive bus service to provide early morning and evening services to Ockford Park and its surrounds. Along with the traffic calming measures on Eashing Lane and new crossing points, the measures being secured as part of the application would also increase the sustainability of the site.

With all of this information in mind, it is considered that the site is well connected on foot and by cycle to a range of everyday necessities such as schools, shops and facilities. While it is noted that the use of the private car will still be required, overall, it is concluded that

the site is located in a sustainable location.

It is therefore concluded that criterion (c) of paragraph 155 is satisfied.

d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157

Paragraphs 156-157 of the NPPF state the following:

'Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions ('Golden Rules') should be made:

- a. affordable housing which reflects either: (i) development plan policies produced in accordance with paragraphs 67-68 of this Framework; or (ii) until such policies are in place, the policy set out in paragraph 157 below;
- b. necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and
- c. the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces.

Before development plan policies for affordable housing are updated in line with paragraphs 67-68 of this Framework, the affordable housing contribution required to satisfy the Golden Rules is 15 percentage points above the highest existing affordable housing requirement which would otherwise apply to the development, subject to a cap of 50%. In the absence of a pre-existing requirement for affordable housing, a 50% affordable housing contribution should apply by default. The use of site-specific viability assessment for land within or released from the Green Belt should be subject to the approach set out in national planning practice guidance on viability'.

In relation to criterion (a), as the Council's normal requirement for affordable units is 40%, the 50% cap set out in paragraph 157 of the NPPF is engaged. The proposal includes 117 affordable housing units which equates to 50% of the total dwellings. Therefore, the development complies with Golden Rule (a).

In terms of criterion (b), and as will be discussed in greater detail later in this report, the proposal is contributing to necessary improvements to local infrastructure as part of the application. These would be secured by way of a s106 agreement. In summary, the applicant has agreed to all of the infrastructure improvements which have been requested by various consultees. These include contributions towards primary healthcare in the area, policing and highways. On this basis, it is considered that Golden Rule (b) has been met.

Finally, Golden Rule (c) states that proposals should provide new, or improvements to existing green spaces that are accessible to the public. It also goes on to require that new residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces. While the on-site open space provision will be set out in detail later in the report it is noted that the development includes a large area of public open space which equates to an area of 2.48 hectares (not including the SuDS feature). This provision is well beyond what is required through the local plan. In addition, an equipped formal play space is to be provided

relatively centrally within the development and this is supplemented with other areas of play trails located in various points throughout the scheme. This means that all future residents will have convenient access to quality open space. Furthermore, all of these spaces will be open and available to the general public to use. It is considered that the proposal meets the requirements of criterion (c) and therefore, all of the Golden Rules.

Based on the above assessment it has been concluded that:

- a. the development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
- b. there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- c. the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework; and
- d. the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 of the Framework.

As all four criterion of paragraph 155 of the NPPF have been met, the proposal should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

Application of footnote 7

It is noted that the definition of Grey Belt states that it excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.

Footnote 7 of the NPPF states the following: 'The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 194) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 75); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change'.

The site does not constitute any of the following designations:

- Habitat sites or Sites of Special Scientific Interest,
- Local Green Space or National Landscape,
- National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or Heritage Coast,
- Irreplaceable habitats.

It will be set out below that the proposal does not result in harm to designated heritage assets. It will also be explained that there are no strong reasons for refusing the development on flood risk grounds.

As regards archaeology, NPPF footnote 75 states that 'non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets'. Therefore, for footnote 7 to apply to archaeology (and preclude the site from being considered under the grey belt definition), archaeological remains would have to be found; and further, those remains would need to be of demonstrably equivalent significance to

scheduled monuments.

As will be discussed in greater detail below, the applicant has engaged Thames Valley Archaeological Services (TVAS), who supported the delivery of the adjacent development through the provision of archaeological services. Following the grant of planning permission WA/2018/1239 (by Waverley Borough Council), TVAS supported the discharge of planning condition 26 which required a programme of archaeological investigation prior to development commencing. The approved details of archaeological investigation confirm that the Phase 1 land has low archaeological potential except for a small area of deposits; however, this did not preclude development of the site. Notably, the TVAS investigation included 19 trenches across the application site (Eashing Lane) which cover a central west-east strip along the location of the haul road (considered under the planning consent for the haul road – reference 19/P/01535). TVAS concludes that the site has low archaeological potential.

A Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted as part of this planning application and it has been reviewed by the County Archaeologist. The County Archaeologist notes that an evaluation of the Land at Ockford Wood Farm which bordered to the site to the east revealed some significant pits dating from the Neolithic period and post medieval linear features, whilst trenching within the central part of the current development site, which served as access to the Ockford Park site, revealed evidence of post medieval agricultural activity. The application site was also subject to a geophysical survey and selective test pitting in 2018 that revealed undated linear features and a further Neolithic pit. The County Archaeologist notes that the site can therefore be seen to have a low to moderate archaeological potential.

The County Archaeologist raises no objection to the proposal subject to a condition which secures the archaeological investigation work put forward by the applicant. From the evidence before the Local Planning Authority, it is concluded that the site is unlikely to contain non-designated assets of archaeological interest, or archaeological assets which are of an equivalent significance to scheduled monuments. Furthermore, there are no reasons to suggest that there would be strong reasons for refusing the development on designated heritage asset grounds, noting that the County Archaeologist has not raised any objections to the proposal.

In terms of the Surrey Hills National Landscape, it is noted that it is located to the west of the site. The Surrey Hills National Landscape Planning Advisor notes that 'due to the intervening distance and landform it is not considered that it could be reasonably be substantiated that the proposal would spoil the setting of the SHNL. The main landscape value of the site is one of forming part of an open and publicly prominent undeveloped area. It is not surprising though that Natural England excluded this site and its immediate setting in its proposals to extend the SHNL as it does not really meet the "natural beauty" test and is influenced by the adjacent built-up area'. As such, there would not be a 'strong' reason for refusing the application on these grounds.

For these reasons it is considered that footnote 7 does not apply to this development.

Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land

Paragraph 187(b), of the Framework, states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (inter alia) 'recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland'. The Framework's glossary defines Best and Most versatile (BMV) agricultural land as being land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification. The NPPF also notes that LPAs should seek to:

- protect and enhance landscapes, biodiversity, geology and soils
- recognise soils as a natural capital asset that provide important ecosystem services
- consider the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land, and try to use areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land
- prevent soil, air, water, or noise pollution, or land instability from new and existing development

The PPG notes that decisions 'should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land' and policy E5(3) (rural economy) of the LPSS states that 'agricultural land will be protected as set out in national policy and the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land will be taken into account'.

The applicant has submitted a letter with the application which notes that the parcels of land to the north and south of the existing haul road are predominantly grade 3 greensand loam. It is noted that the soil is very free draining and regularly suffers from drought. The letter goes on to note that 'the field parcel has been a constant struggle to produce profitable crops'.

While it is noted that the haul road has made the centre of the site unsuitable for farming due to the destruction of soil structure and organic matter, nevertheless, the letter also confirms that this area of the site would too have been low-grade and also suffering from the poor conditions outlined above.

In addition to this letter, the applicant has more recently submitted a further assessment of BMV entitled 'Agricultural Land Classification'. While all of the above points are noted, the Natural England Provisional Agricultural Land Classification Map identifies the land as good to moderate quality Grade 3 land. The applicant goes on to note that 'given the documented agricultural constraints, the land could be classified as subgrade 3b. However, the land has recently been used for sugar beet production, and therefore it would be reasonable to classify the land as subgrade 3a. On this basis the land is BMV, and its loss should be considered within the overall planning balance'. The Local Planning Authority has no evidence to suggest that this categorisation is incorrect.

On this basis and as acknowledged by the applicant, the proposal would result in the loss of grade 3a agricultural land and the proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, PPG and policy E5 of the LPSS. This is a harm resulting from the proposal and this will be considered as part of the planning balance in the final section of this report.

Housing details

The need for both market and affordable housing has already been set out above. In addition, it has been confirmed that the Council does not have a five-year housing land supply. Further details of the housing offered proposed through this application are set out

below.

Affordable housing

Policy H2 of the LPSS seeks at least 40 per cent of the homes on application sites to be affordable, with the mix in tenures being the same as set out above. Policy H2 also states that 'the tenure and number of bedrooms of the affordable homes provided on each qualifying site must contribute, to the Council's satisfaction, towards meeting the mix of affordable housing needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015, or subsequent affordable housing needs evidence'. However, as noted above, because of the 'Golden Rules' set out in paragraphs 156 and 157 of the NPPF, the affordable housing offer in this instance is 50%, which amounts to a total of 117 units.

The Council's Housing Strategy 2025-2034 states that as of October 2024, 2,365 people were on the housing register, waiting for affordable housing. In 2023/24, 121 new affordable homes were built which consisted of 73 for rent and 48 for affordable home ownership. The Strategy also notes that in 2023/24, 324 homeless applicants were helped into secure accommodation in the borough and that 134 households needed emergency bed and breakfast (B&B) placements.

More up-to-date information from the Housing Officer notes that the Council currently has 2,536 households on the housing register, with 2,231 having a legally recognised priority housing need within Bands A–C. Band A represents households in urgent / emergency housing need (31 applicants), Band B are high priority need (88 applicants), and Band C with a legally recognised priority housing need (2,112 applicants). While the majority of households on the register are waiting for smaller sized homes, applicants in high priority need (Band B) need larger three-four bedroom homes. An applicant waiting for a family home will wait significantly longer than someone waiting for a one or two bedroom home, with latest data showing that the average wait for applicants in band C being four years and six months for a one-bedroom home, to eight years and three months for a three bedroom home, reflecting the scarcity of family sized stock.

Of the proposed 117 affordable units, 70 will be for affordable rent and 47 units will be for intermediate tenures (broken down as 24 shared ownership units and 23 discount market sale (DMS)). It is noted that the tenure split between affordable rent and intermediate would in this instance be 60% and 40% respectively. It is noted that this is not compliant with the Council's aim of a 70% (affordable rent)/30% (intermediate) split, however, given the volume of affordable rental units being secured as part of this scheme due to the 'Golden Rules', there is a need to ensure that the development creates a mixed and balanced community. In this regard, the Council's Housing Officer has confirmed that the proposed provision is acceptable and no objections have been raised.

Dispersing the affordable units throughout the scheme is acknowledged to be a difficult task given that half of the units would be affordable. In this instance it is inevitable that there will be some concentration of affordable properties. Even, so officers believe that the applicant has designed the layout in a manner which intersperses the affordable and market units as much as possible and no objections are raised in this regard. It is also noted that the Council's Housing Officer notes that the location of the affordable units is acceptable.

The affordable homes are tenure blind and this approach promotes social cohesion, equal

access to amenities and a consistent quality of townscape across all character areas. The inclusion of affordable rent, shared ownership and discount market sale tenures supports a broad spectrum of household types and income levels, contributing to a genuinely inclusive and balanced community. Particularly notable is the spatial logic of the distribution: affordable homes occupy prominent and well-connected locations, ensuring visibility, integration and parity of experience. Their placement close to open spaces, pedestrian routes and connections to local bus services supports sustainable living patterns and reinforces the principle of tenure neutrality, ensuring that affordable housing is seamlessly embedded within the wider neighbourhood structure.

While the proposal may not be technically compliant with policy H2 of the Local Plan, this is in part due to the additional requirements imposed by the 'Golden Rules'. However, as submitted, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable.

Dwelling mix

Policy H1 of the LPSS states that 'new residential development is required to deliver a wide choice of homes to meet a range of accommodation needs as set out in the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). New development should provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes appropriate to the site size, characteristics and location'. The proposed dwelling mix for the development, as well as the SHMA requirement, is provided below.

| Table 1 | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Overall Housing Mix | No. | SHMA % Req | Provided % |
| 1 bed | 12 | 20 | 5.1 |
| 2 bed | 102 | 30 | 43.6 |
| 3 bed | 93 | 35 | 39.7 |
| 4 bed | 27 | 15 | 11.5 |
| Total | 234 | | |

| Table 2 | | | |
|-------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Market Mix | No. | SHMA % Req | Provided % |
| 1 bed | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 2 bed | 32 | 30 | 27.4 |
| 3 bed | 61 | 40 | 52.1 |
| 4 bed | 24 | 20 | 20.5 |
| Total | 117 | | |

| Table 3 | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Affordable Mix | No. | SHMA % Req | Provided % |
| 1 bed | 12 | 40 | 10.3 |
| 2 bed | 70 | 30 | 59.8 |
| 3 bed | 32 | 25 | 27.4 |
| 4 bed | 3 | 5 | 2.6 |
| Total | 117 | | |

It is noted that in the Inspector's Final Report (paragraph 48) on the LPSS examination he stated 'as regards housing mix, the policy is not prescriptive but seeks a mix of tenure, types and sizes of dwelling, which the text indicates will be guided by the strategic housing market assessment. The policy also seeks an appropriate amount of accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair user dwellings'. From the tables above it can be seen

that in overall terms the main non-compliance with the SHMA is the under provision of one-bedroom units and the over provision of two-bedroom units. The supply of three and four bedroom properties are broadly in line with what is normally expected.

In this instance, the provision of more two-bedroom units at the expense of one-bedroom units is deemed to be justified. It is noted that due to the location of the site in a suburban location, it is more suited to larger units. As has been evidenced in other applications, smaller one-bedroom units will generally be more commonplace and more suited to larger town centre locations (such as Guildford). For example, large numbers of one-bedroom units have been consented and delivered or in the process of being delivered at Guildford Plaza, Guildford Station and North Street.

In addition, while it is acknowledged that the proposed mix is slightly different to the SHMA guidance, it is noted that the SHMA mix is to be achieved over the whole of the housing market area and over the lifetime of the plan. It is not feasible or practical to require every site to rigidly meet the identified mix in the SHMA and this is reflected in the Inspector's comments noted above. The flexibility set out in the policy must be used to achieve an acceptable mix across the borough. Furthermore, it is noted that the Council's Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager has raised no objections to the mix for the affordable dwellings. The proposal is not likely to cause any material harm to the Council's ability to deliver a compliant SHMA mix on a wider basis and overall, the proposed mix is deemed to be acceptable.

Accessible units

Policy H1 of the LPSS requires that 'on residential development sites of 25 homes or more 10% of new homes will be required to meet Building Regulations M4(2) category 2 standard 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and 5% of new homes will be required to meet Building Regulations M4(3)(b) category 3 wheelchair user accessible dwellings standard'.

The applicant has confirmed compliance with the above requirements and are providing 67 accessible and adaptable dwellings (which actually equates to a provision of 28.5%) and 12 wheelchair user accessible dwellings. These will be secured by condition.

Custom / self-build units

Policy H1 of the LPSS states that 'self-build and custom housebuilding will be supported if the proposed development has no adverse effect on the local character. On development sites of 100 homes or more 5% of the total homes shall be available for sale as self-build and custom housebuilding plots whilst there is an identified need. For phased development, self-build plots must be delivered and serviced at the earliest stage possible. Self-build and custom housebuilding plots are encouraged on smaller residential development sites. Self-build plots made available must respond to the sizes identified on the register. Plots must be made available and priced and marketed appropriately as self-build or custom build plots for at least 18 months'.

The proposal includes the provision of 12 custom build units. This equates to 5.12% of the total number of homes proposed which therefore meets the policy requirement.

It is expected that the custom-build dwellings will be built in full by the applicant and the customisable element will be for the internal layout, fit out and decoration only. The custom-

build units will be secured through the legal agreement, as will their marketing and the disposal of the plots if they are not purchased as a custom-build unit.

Overall, the proposal is considered to meet with the NPPF's objective of boosting the supply of homes, which meet the needs of groups with specific housing needs. In this regard the proposal is consistent with policy H1 of the LPSS, as well as the guidance set out in the NPPF.

Layout and design of the proposal

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that 'the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities...'. The NPPF notes that decisions should ensure that developments:

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

Policy D1 of the LPSS makes clear that new development will be required to achieve a high-quality design that responds to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is set.

It is noted that the applicant has engaged in a thorough pre-application process with the Local Planning Authority which has resulted in a positive evolution of the layout and design. This process has been set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement (DAS). In addition, it is also noted that the applicant has engaged with the Council's Design Review process which is run independently by Design South East (DSE).

Although the submitted scheme has materially changed since the review was undertaken by DSE, the key recommendations flowing from the process are noted below:

1. establish aspirational sustainability principles, in response to the current climate context, that could initiate a transformational shift towards sustainable development for Guildford;
2. optimise the use of the site through testing the density of homes and flexible

- commercial and community uses;
3. integrate the development with phase 1, the surrounding settlements and local amenities and infrastructure, creating improved connections with these, informed by analysis of resident movement;
 4. develop the street design to prioritise active travel, incorporating varying widths, natural traffic calming, pedestrian crossings, shared surface streets, cycling provision and landscaping;
 5. reconfigure the green public open spaces to create a focal, civic hub at the centre of the development (between phase 1 and 2), with community amenity and a sense of identity;
 6. introduce large, native planting and explore the use of water on site;
 7. maximise the play provision, including integrated, incidental play across the site and along key routes, as well as formal provision; and
 8. create character areas that are defined by street types and the specific conditions of the site boundaries, including development pattern, scale, massing, street features and landscape.

It is considered that the submitted scheme has sought to address these points and compliance with local and national policies will be discussed below.

The proposed masterplan establishes a coherent and well-structured layout supported by a clear and legible street hierarchy. The block structure is rational and well-proportioned, with building frontages consistently addressing streets and open spaces, thereby reinforcing a strong public realm and supporting natural surveillance. The use of private drives along landscape edges is effective in creating a softer, more rural transition at the site boundary, complementing the site's edge-of-settlement character. The distribution of plot types indicates a varied housing mix, and the alignment of built form contributes to a well-defined and outward-facing neighbourhood structure.

Importantly, the layout aligns comfortably with the surrounding context. It responds positively to the existing Ockford Park development to the west and reflects the prevailing residential pattern along Eashing Lane and Aarons Hill. The block structure, street orientation and density transitions are sympathetic to the established settlement grain, enabling the scheme to integrate as a natural continuation of the existing neighbourhood rather than appearing as an isolated or disconnected extension. The placement of focal buildings and focal spaces further strengthens legibility and provides visual anchors that reinforce the site's relationship with its surroundings.

The street hierarchy demonstrates a structured and intentional approach to vehicular movement. The secondary street forms a clear organising spine through the development, providing direct connections to both Eashing Lane and Ock Way. This establishes a sound basis for distributing traffic and supporting future sustainable transport options. The network of local streets contributes to a fine-grain pattern that enhances walkability and reduces pressure on the primary route. However, the movement network includes several cul-de-sac arrangements that limit route choice and may concentrate vehicular movements, reducing overall resilience and permeability.

The site is well positioned to connect with a range of important local destinations, and the masterplan provides a strong foundation for supporting sustainable movement patterns. The permeability strategy enables direct and convenient routes to key facilities within both the immediate and wider area. The layout facilitates a clear and legible connection to St

Mark and All Saints Primary School, located to the south, supporting safe and direct active travel for school-age children. The scheme also benefits from close proximity to the community building within the existing Ockford Park, with internal pedestrian routes aligning well with this destination and offering opportunities for social cohesion between phases.

The layout plan also highlights the important role of SuDS features, public open spaces, existing hedgerows and proposed tree planting in shaping movement and reinforcing character. These elements contribute to a coherent green infrastructure network that supports biodiversity, enhances visual amenity and provides a series of well-connected recreational routes. The alignment of internal views towards key landscape features and focal buildings further strengthens legibility and contributes to a high-quality townscape structure.

When read alongside the building-heights and density plans, the housing mix demonstrates a well-calibrated and contextually sensitive approach to massing, form and character. Higher-intensity typologies, such as flats and coach houses, are focused around focal spaces, the secondary street and key access points, where additional height and density can be comfortably absorbed without undermining the surrounding townscape. Family housing, predominantly 3–4 bedroom homes, forms the core of the suburban blocks and reinforces the established character of both the surrounding area and Phase 1. Along the landscape edges, lower-rise and lower-density homes are positioned to create a gentle and appropriate transition to open countryside. This deliberate alignment between mix, height and density strengthens the overall townscape structure and supports a clear, coherent hierarchy of character areas.

The proposed development establishes a clear and well-structured character framework supported by a coherent and contextually grounded architectural strategy. Four distinct character areas, Green Edge, Core Area, Main Street, and Eastern Edge, provide a legible and responsive identity for the neighbourhood. Each area is shaped by a calibrated combination of built form, material palette, landscape structure and architectural detailing, ensuring that the development is both visually cohesive and rich in local distinctiveness.

The architectural language across the site draws on a contemporary interpretation of local vernacular forms, characterised by pitched roofs, warm brick tones and a restrained palette of cladding and detailing. This consistency creates a unified identity, while the controlled variation in materials, textures and massing across character areas introduces subtle differentiation and supports a strong sense of place. Importantly, the scheme responds directly to the established character of nearby areas, Ock Way, Aarons Hill, and Quarry Hill/Ockford Ridge, adopting familiar forms, materials and detailing while evolving them into a coherent, contemporary architectural expression. This approach reinforces settlement character, supports visual continuity and ensures that the development integrates comfortably into its setting.

The green edge forms the most landscape-led part of the development, mediating between built form and countryside. A deliberately understated palette of red and dark red brick with tile hanging creates a warm, semi-rural character and helps reduce perceived massing. Slate grey cladding is used sparingly to introduce subtle variation without disrupting the calm identity of this edge.

Traditional elements such as cat-slide porches, boarding features and balconies reinforce

a cottage-influenced aesthetic and encourage engagement with the landscape. Soft boundary treatments - predominantly hedges and shrubs, enhance permeability and ensure the built form sits comfortably within its rural setting.

The core area provides the everyday residential character that binds the neighbourhood together. A coherent palette of red and dark red brick, complemented by grey and red roof tiles, creates a grounded and consistent identity. Slate grey composite cladding adds texture and interest while maintaining a brick-led character. Consistent grey eaves, soffits, fascias and window frames reinforce cohesion and support a tenure-blind approach. Gable roof forms introduce rhythm and mark key corners, creating a visually engaging but calm suburban townscape. Soft landscaping and low-level planting strengthen the welcoming, green character of this central area.

The 'main street' is the most expressive and civic-oriented character area, forming the primary organising spine of the development. A richer palette of red and dark red brick with dark grey cladding creates a confident and visually prominent frontage. The use of both grey and red roof tiles produces an articulated roofscape appropriate for a key visual corridor. Architectural detailing, such as projecting brick surrounds and composite cladding features, adds depth, breaks down massing and emphasises key junctions. The resulting street edge is structured, legible and distinctive, reinforcing the Main Street's role as the central spine of the neighbourhood.

The eastern edge adopts a transitional character that mediates between the new development and existing homes along Eashing Lane and Aarons Hill. A refined palette of dark red brick, buff brick, grey roof tiles and dark grey cladding respects the surrounding context while establishing a clear identity. The use of buff brick on upper storeys paired with red brick at ground level provides subtle articulation and reduces perceived massing. Projecting Flemish bond and stretcher bond detailing adds texture and elevates architectural quality. Soft boundary treatments ensure a gentle interface with neighbouring development.

Across all character areas, the architectural strategy is unified by consistent materials, detailing and massing, while calibrated variation provides richness and distinction. The result is a robust, contextually sensitive and well-executed approach that creates a coherent, legible and high-quality residential environment. The development responds positively to its surroundings while establishing a distinctive and confident sense of place.

The landscape and open space strategy forms a strong foundation for the development's placemaking approach. It establishes a coherent green infrastructure network that supports biodiversity, provides high-quality amenity space and reinforces the character of the four defined character areas. The arrangement of open spaces, green corridors and play areas is well considered, ensuring that landscape is integral to the structure and identity of the neighbourhood rather than an add-on.

A series of interconnected green corridors run through the site, creating attractive pedestrian and cycle routes while supporting ecological connectivity. These corridors link directly to landscape-led edges, particularly along the green edge and eastern edge, where planting, hedgerows and open frontages soften the transition to countryside and existing residential areas. Within the core area and along the main street, street trees and coordinated planting contribute to a verdant, human-scaled environment and reinforce the hierarchy of streets.

The development provides a well-distributed network of public open spaces, including central greens, pocket parks and landscape buffers. These spaces are positioned to maximise accessibility and natural surveillance, offering opportunities for informal recreation, social interaction and visual relief within the built form. Their variety ensures that residents have access to both active and passive amenity spaces within a short walk of their homes.

Play provision is inclusive and appropriately scaled, with a hierarchy of LAPs, LEAPs and informal play features embedded within the green infrastructure. This ensures that all homes are within easy reach of play opportunities, supporting active lifestyles and fostering social interaction among families. The integration of play into green corridors and open spaces encourages nature-based play and contributes to a child-friendly environment.

The landscape strategy also incorporates a strong ecological component, retaining and enhancing existing hedgerows and mature trees, introducing native planting and wildflower meadows, and integrating SuDS features as landscape assets. These measures support biodiversity net gain and ensure that water management contributes positively to character and amenity.

Overall, the landscape, open space and play strategy is robust, inclusive and well-integrated with the development's urban design framework. It enhances the identity and legibility of the neighbourhood, supports sustainable movement, and provides a high-quality living environment that responds positively to its landscape setting.

With conditions to control the landscaping, boundary treatments and materials, the proposal is deemed to be consistent with local and national design policies.

Impact on the wider landscape including the National Landscape and Area of Great Landscape Value

Section 15 of the NPPF seeks to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Paragraph 189 of the NPPF confirms that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within National Landscapes, which are afforded the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The duty to seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Landscape is also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications affecting its setting.

The application site lies within the wider setting (but outside of) the Surrey Hills National Landscape and within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). As such, the proposal has been assessed having regard to the potential effects upon landscape character, visual amenity, and the special qualities and setting of the designated landscape.

At the local level, policy P5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2015–2034) seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment and requires development proposals to protect and enhance landscape character and biodiversity. Policy D1 requires development to respond appropriately to the character of the area and to integrate effectively with its surroundings, whilst policy D4 seeks high-quality design that respects local distinctiveness and landscape setting. Policy P1 of the LPSS echoes the NPPFs

requirements in relation to the National Landscape and AGLV. The Surrey Hills Management Plan is also a relevant consideration.

The site is encompassed by the Guildford Landscape Character Assessment and Guidance (Guildford Borough Council, 2007). The site falls within Landscape Type L: Open Greensand Hills and Landscape Character Area L1: Shackleford Open Greensand Hills, the relevant key characteristics for which are similar to those of the County Landscape Character Assessment and are summarised as follows:

- undulating landscape underlain by a solid geology of Folkestone Formation sandstone and Bargate Sandstone as well as a drift geology of Head - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel.
- a diverse landscape, predominantly pastoral but with areas of arable farmland, woodland, heathland, golf courses, parkland, nurseries and paddocks.
- field pattern of mainly medium to large regular fields with straight boundaries typical of parliamentary enclosure bounded by hedgerows with hedgerow trees or by fences.
- presence of ponds and streams including a tributary of the River Wey which runs south through the area ... through a small-scale valley bounded by narrow woodland belts.
- small areas of Open Access Land on heathland commons plus footpaths including the North Downs Way provide a recreational access.
- a network of rural roads and lanes spreads across the area and the major route of the A3 creates a physical barrier and traffic noise where it runs north south through the centre of the area.
- sparsely settled with historic villages ... traditional farmsteads plus some more modern settlement spreading along roads...
- presence of historic houses...plus parks and gardens.
- a rural, peaceful area with views across the valley pastures to wooded hills to the south.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. It notes that 'when the screening effects of the layers of vegetation in the contextual landscape and the built form within Godalming and the surrounding settlements are taken into account, the views towards the site are limited to the following:

- a combination of open and partial views from Eashing Lane, running to the south west of the site, and further north, towards Eashing, affecting transient receptors in vehicles using the road, and pedestrians on the footway lining the road;
- open and partial views from Halfway Lane, as it runs from east to west, to the north of the site, affecting people using the private access, people employed in the commercial buildings to the north east corner of the site, and the bridleway along Halfway Lane; and
- open views from the western edge of the Ockford Park development, immediately adjacent to the site, affecting residential receptors'.

The National Landscape is located to the west of the site. Immediately to the west the site would not be visible from the National Landscape or its setting due to topography and landscaping. While in theory the site may be visible from the National Landscape to the north-west, given the distance and the intervening topography and landscaping, together with the modest height of the buildings and the proposed landscaping, the development would not result in any harm to its setting. Indeed, it is noted that the Surrey Hill National Landscape (SHNL) Planning Advisor states that the issue is whether the proposed development would spoil the setting of the SHNL by harming views from or into the SHNL. The Planning Advisor notes that 'due to the intervening distance and landform it is not considered that it could be reasonably be substantiated that the proposal would spoil the

setting of the SHNL. The main landscape value of the site is one of forming part of an open and publicly prominent undeveloped area. It is not surprising though that Natural England excluded this site and its immediate setting in its proposals to extend the SHNL as it does not really meet the "natural beauty" test and is influenced by the adjacent built-up area'.

The site is located with the AGLV at the edge of a section which wraps around Godalming urban area. Policy P1 of the LPSS states that 'development proposals within the AGLV will be required to demonstrate that they would not harm the setting of the AONB [National Landscape] or the distinctive character of the AGLV. The impact on the setting of the National Landscape has been discussed above. It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in some adverse impacts on views from Eashing Lane, Halfway Lane and Ock Way. The LVIA notes that upon completion the edge of the settlement of Godalming will be brought forward in some of the local views. Views of the dwellings on the fringe of Ockford Park will be replaced by the new homes. Views from Ock Way will change from an arable field to dwellings set beyond an area of public space, comprising a village green with new planting. In views from the south-west of the site, the vegetation on Eashing Lane will continue to be seen in the foreground, with growth of the reinforcement planting from day one of operation, reaching maturity at year 15. The dwellings will be seen beyond the area of public open space along the western edge of the site which will also truncate distant views towards the Surrey Hills. While it is noted that some of these impacts would be reduced by mitigation, in some views there would still be some residual harm.

Whilst the proposal may not result in any harm to the setting of the National Landscape and although the design and layout of the scheme in itself is deemed to be acceptable, inevitably the placement of 234 new buildings on an agricultural field would result in some local harm to the character and appearance of the immediate landscape and area. This will be factored into the planning balance below.

Impact on heritage assets

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that *'in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'*

Case-law has confirmed that, when concerned with developments that would cause adverse impacts to the significance of designated heritage assets (including through impacts on their setting) then this is a factor which must be given considerable importance and weight in any balancing exercise.

Turning to policy, Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the framework for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets and this application takes account of the relevant considerations in these paragraphs. Paragraph 208 sets out that 'local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal'.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF applies to designated heritage assets. It states that 'when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance'. This policy reflects the statutory duty in section 66(1). Paragraph 213 goes on to note that 'any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification'.

Policy D3 of the LPSS is generally reflective of the NPPF and it states:

- the historic environment will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to its significance. Development of the highest design quality that will sustain and, where appropriate, enhance the special interest, character and significance of the borough's heritage assets and their settings and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness will be supported; and
- the impact of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets and their settings will be considered in accordance with case law, legislation and the NPPF.

Policies D18, D19, D21 and D22 of the LPDMP are also relevant as these related to listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens.

It is noted that the majority of the heritage assets in the area are within the jurisdiction of Waverley Borough Council. Policy HA1 which relates to the protection of designated heritage assets is also generally reflective of the guidance contained within the NPPF. Policy HA1 states that Waverley Borough Council will 'ensure that the significance of the heritage assets within the Borough are conserved or enhanced to ensure the continued protection and enjoyment of the historic environment by (inter alia):

1. Safeguarding and managing Waverley's rich and diverse heritage. This includes all heritage assets, archaeological sites and historic landscapes, designated and non-designated assets, and their setting in accordance with legislation and national policy.
2. Understanding and respecting the significance of the assets.

Policies DM20 and DM24 of Part Two of the Waverley Local Plan provides further policy on listed buildings and their settings, as well as the impact on historic landscapes and gardens.

In this case, it has been identified that the following heritage assets have the potential to be affected by the proposed development and should therefore be included within the heritage assessment:

- Westbrook House – Grade II* Listed Building
- Westbrook Gardens – Grade II Registered Park and Garden
- Eashing Bridge – Grade I Listed and Scheduled Monument
- Eashing Farmhouse – Grade II Listed Building
- Barn approximately 15 yards to the rear of Eashing Farmhouse – Grade II Listed Building
- Eashing Farm Cottages – Grade II Listed Building
- Barn approximately 15 yards to the rear of Eashing Farm Cottages – Grade II Listed

Building

The following heritage assets have also been reviewed; however, they are not included within the detailed assessment. Their distance from the site, together with the extent of intervening vegetation and built form, is considered sufficient to prevent any meaningful visual or physical impact arising from the proposed development:

- Jordans – Grade II Listed Building
- Walled Garden to the rear and left of Jordans – Grade II Listed Building
- Outhouse 30 yards north of Jordans – Grade II Listed Building
- Dean Cottage
- Anglo-Saxon Fortified Centre at Eashing – Scheduled Monument

It should also be noted that the site sits in close proximity to the existing Ockford Park development which gained planning permission in 2019. The cumulative impact of the current proposal and the earlier permission on surrounding assets will also need to be considered in the report. While the NPPF does not contain specific guidance on this matter, the Historic England document entitled 'Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment' states that: *'The cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes may have as great an effect on the significance of a heritage asset as a larger scale change. Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development to the asset itself or its setting, consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset in order to accord with NPPF policies. Negative change could include severing the last link to part of the history of an asset or between the asset and its original setting. Conversely, positive change could include the restoration of a building's plan form or an original designed landscape'*. Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note 3 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' also re-iterates this advice and the PPG makes clear that cumulative harm can be an important factor in assessing setting cases.

Westbrook House – Grade II* Listed Building

Westbrook House is a substantial Grade II* listed Arts and Crafts property, built between 1899 and 1900 and set on the north side of Westbrook Road. The house and its designed landscape occupy a pronounced south-facing hillside above the River Wey valley, a topographic relationship that was used to create both drama and intimacy within the composition. The site is approached from a gently curving drive leading north from Westbrook Road, which rises steeply to the house.

The property was designed by the architect Hugh Thackeray Turner (1853-1973), an important architectural theorist and Arts and Craft architect in the Arts and Crafts style as his private residence. The property is considered a masterpiece of the architect's work, an embodiment of the principles of the Arts and Craft movement. The surrounding gardens were slowly developed in the early twentieth century, designed by Thackeray Turner in collaboration with the distinguished garden designer Gertrude Jekyll (1843 – 1932).

The building is a two-storey dwelling with additional attic accommodation, presenting a substantial domestic scale and articulated through a series of forward-projecting gabled elements. It is constructed principally of Bargate rubble stone, notable for the unusually large blocks employed, which give the elevations a pronounced textural richness and a sense of permanence. In contrast to the prevailing local palette, the dwelling also

incorporates ashlar Douling stone dressings which introduces a refined, almost ecclesiastical quality that distinguishes it within the area.

The main range is aligned on an east–west axis, with the principal (north-facing) elevation defined by a confidently expressed stone gabled porch. This porch is a dominant architectural feature, supported by a massive oak beam resting on paired, twined stone Doric columns, creating a striking and somewhat formal entrance composition. The overall massing is broken down into discrete, well-proportioned accretive volumes, with the projecting gables and varied roof forms reducing the perceived bulk and generating a visually engaging frontage. The rear elevation is playfully asymmetric addressing a deep rear lawn with a composition that unfolds across several distinct planes. At the western end, a forward-projecting gable provides a strong anchor point, while the central portion of the elevation is dominated by a steeply pitched red-tiled roof that sweeps down to the top of the ground floor windows and which is animated by double-stacked dormer windows and a tall prominent chimney stack that collectively introduce vertical emphasis and visual complexity. To the east a recessive south-facing gable that appears to run almost incidentally into the central block creates further modulation lending the composition an informal, accretive quality.

Internally, the domestic plan has been deliberately arranged so that the principal ground-floor reception rooms, the dining room, morning room, drawing room and study, together with the main bedrooms on the floors above, are all positioned to take full advantage of the southerly aspect and the expansive, engaging views across the gardens. This orientation reflects a conscious design strategy to maximise natural light and visual connection with the landscape, reinforcing the building's relationship with its setting. Much of the contemporary interior survives with wood panelling, decorative plaster friezes and decorative cornices to the principal rooms.

The setting of Westbrook is shaped by its elevated position and this topographical relationship is fundamental to how the place is experienced with the rising ground providing a sense of drama and outward connection, whilst the surrounding tree coverage enabling moments of enclosure and privacy. The house's immediate setting comprises of formal terraces, garden compartments, steps, walls and planting that wrap around the house and which form the core of the grade II registered landscape. These elements are deliberately composed to exploit the fall of the land, creating a sequence of framed views and controlled transitions between the house, its terraces, and the wider grounds.

Beyond the formal garden, the setting extends into the sloping lawns, wooded belts, and boundary planting that define the outer envelope of the registered park and garden. These areas contribute to the sense of seclusion and reinforce the semi-rural character that has long distinguished this part of Godalming.

The wider setting includes the wooded hillsides, dispersed historic villas, and the broader Wey valley landscape, all of which provide the visual and spatial context that Turner consciously engaged with. Longer-ranging views to the west, appreciable from the first and second floor bedrooms offer a broad panorama across the valley, while views to the south, also available from these upper rooms, are more moderated by mature tree cover, creating a layered and filtered relationship with the surrounding landscape.

The significance of Westbrook House can be summarised as following:

- its status as a distinguished exemplar of Arts and Crafts domestic architecture, demonstrating the movements commitment to craftsmanship and vernacular inspiration
- the use of locally resonant materials and exceptionally high-quality handcrafted detailing, expressing the Arts and Crafts ethos of honesty in construction and artisanal skill.
- its strong associative value with Hugh Thackeray Turner, both architect and original owner, whose authorship and influence place the house among the most accomplished works from the Arts and Crafts movement.
- the high degree of Arts and Crafts plan-form integrity, with the original arrangement, southerly outlook, proportions and interrelationship of principal rooms surviving largely intact, preserving the architect's intended spatial hierarchy and domestic functioning.
- surviving high-quality Arts and Craft interior detailing, including crafted joinery and decorative finishes that reinforce the building's unified architectural and material character.
- its deliberate visual and functional connectivity between interiors and the formal landscape gardens, designed collaboratively by Hugh Thackeray Turner and Gertrude Jekyll, which together form a rare, coherent Arts and Craft house and garden composition.

- Impact of the proposal on the significance of Westbrook House

Having reviewed the submitted information, it is considered that the proposed development of 234 dwellings would not result in a detrimental impact on the setting or significance of Westbrook House, a highly accomplished example of Arts and Crafts domestic architecture. The heritage asset is already physically and visually separated from the application site by the built form associated with the existing Ockford Park. This intervening development establishes a clear break in character, scale, and spatial relationship, such that the proposed scheme would not intrude upon the aspects of setting that contribute to the asset's significance.

It is acknowledged that there may be limited opportunities to view the uppermost elements, principally the roofscape, of parts of the proposed development from first and second-floor rear elevation windows of Westbrook House. However, these potential views would be heavily filtered and softened by established vegetation between the house and Westbrook Road and Halfway Lane, together with the built form of the existing Ockford Park. These elements collectively interrupt, filter, and obscure sightlines, ensuring that any visibility of the proposed development would be peripheral, glimpsed, and visually recessive.

As noted above the significance of Westbrook House is rooted in a series of tightly defined architectural, artistic, and associative qualities. These significance components demonstrate that the heritage value of Westbrook House is fundamentally inward-looking and compositionally contained. The building was conceived as part of a unified architectural and horticultural ensemble, where the formal gardens provide the principal designed setting. The experiential, aesthetic, and functional relationship between the house and its immediate garden compartments is the dominant context through which the asset is understood and appreciated.

Expansive or long-distance outward views from the rear elevation do not form part of the asset's significance. They were neither designed nor intended to contribute to the

appreciation of the building's architectural or historic interest. The key contributors to significance lie in the intimate, enclosed, and intentional relationship between the house, its crafted interiors, and its formal gardens, not in wider panoramic views beyond the garden boundary.

It is acknowledged that the introduction of a substantial quantum of new housing will inevitably generate a degree of noise and activity, both during and after construction. Such change has the potential to influence the perceived tranquillity associated with Westbrook House's edge-of-settlement position. However, the proposed development would be located on the far side of the Ockford Park scheme, which already lies significantly closer to Westbrook House and currently forms the dominant source of contemporary residential activity within the wider area.

Given this existing context, any additional noise or general residential activity arising from the proposed development is unlikely to be discernible from the heritage asset once operational. The intervening-built form of Ockford Park, combined with established vegetation and the spatial separation between the asset and the application site, would effectively absorb and diffuse such activity. As a result, aside from temporary and time-limited effects during the construction phase, the proposal would not materially alter the ambient conditions experienced at Westbrook House nor diminish the tranquillity that contributes to its edge-of-settlement character.

Consideration has also been given to the potential for returned views in which Westbrook House and the proposed development might be read together. Based on site analysis, the only potentially feasible location from which both the listed building and elements of the proposed development could theoretically be perceived within the same visual envelope is along Eashing Lane.

From this position, however, the ability to discern Westbrook House is already extremely limited. Dense and well-established vegetation along Westbrook House's boundary, combined with further planting close to the application site, substantially obscures the listed building from public vantage points. As a result, the building is largely recessive in the wider landscape and does not present as a visually prominent feature in views from Eashing Lane.

Furthermore, the relative orientation of the listed building in relation to the proposed development site means that the two would not naturally be read together. Their positions sit on opposing alignments, and any theoretical co-visibility would only arise in the context of a very wide, panoramic view. Even in such a scenario, the ability to identify Westbrook House would remain constrained by vegetation, distance, and its inward-looking architectural character. Consequently, the proposed development would not form part of the experiential or aesthetic setting through which the listed building is typically appreciated.

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not harm the setting or significance of Westbrook House. The asset's key heritage values - its architectural distinction, craftsmanship, associative interest, plan-form integrity, high-quality interiors, and its rare, coherent relationship with the formal gardens - are all inward-focused and remain entirely unaffected. The intervening-built form of Ockford Park, combined with established vegetation and spatial separation, ensures that the proposed development would not intrude upon the designed setting or alter the way in which the asset is

experienced or understood. Any glimpsed views of roofscape or minor changes in background activity would be limited, filtered, and visually recessive, and would not diminish the appreciation of the heritage asset. The proposal therefore results in no harm to the significance of Westbrook House

Westbrook Gardens – Grade II Registered Park and Garden

The garden is an early twentieth century formal garden designed by Hugh Thackeray Turner in collaboration with Gertrude Jekyll that sits enclosing the main house. The site comprises about 5.5ha and is bounded to the south by Westbrook Road and the gardens of Shepherd's Cottage and Far Cottage, to the east by the entrance drive, and to the west by agricultural land. The northern part of the site is occupied by a belt of mixed woodland on the steep slope down to the River Wey.

The gardens lie predominantly to the south and west of the house, structured around a series of strong north-south and east-west axes. They are experienced as a sequence of distinct, carefully composed spaces: the intricately planned formal gardens occupy the western side; the former kitchen garden to the east now accommodates the tennis court and pool; and the central area is largely open lawn, providing a generous foreground to the southern elevation, with privacy forming a central focus of its layout.

The formal gardens to the west are reached through the door in the garden wall at the house's north-west corner. They comprise a series of enclosed and sunken garden rooms arranged on strong axial paths. The principal feature is the large circular sunk garden, enclosed by a 2–2.5 m high yew hedge with arched openings on all four compass points. Inside, concentric, gently sloping stone-edged terraces focus on a raised octagonal lily tank at the centre.

To the north-west of this lies the octagonal Winter Garden, accessed from the circular garden's west side. This irregular, stone-walled enclosure (c.10 m by 10 m) sits about one metre below ground level and is paved in hoggin (originally brick), with perimeter beds and four internal beds restored to the layout shown on the 1912 plan.

North of these three sunk gardens is a more tightly composed sequence of garden rooms arranged along a broad north-south grassed path. This area is shown on the 1912 plan as a rose garden, though it had disappeared by the early 21st century. In 2009 it was re-imagined by landscape designer Simon Dorrell, who introduced a series of distinctive rectilinear forms that reinterpret and echo the strong cruciform geometry of the original layout.

A wide grass path with associated planting beds runs along the west side of the formal gardens, opening into a lawned area to the south that was originally planted as an orchard. East of this lawn lies a large shrubbery enclosing a circular lawn. South of both areas stands a substantial east-west stone wall that defines the southern edge of this western part of the garden. Historically, this wall formed the northern boundary of the southern walled kitchen garden. That former kitchen-garden area was historically severed from Westbrook and now forms the garden of Far Cottage, located immediately to the south on Westbrook Road, and therefore no longer falls within the designation.

The south front of the house overlooks a long stone terrace that spans the full width of the elevation, forming a strong architectural platform from which the principal garden spaces

are viewed. The terrace is arranged on two levels, linked by broad stone steps and enclosed by low stone walls and planted stone-edged beds that soften the structure and create a transitional zone between house and garden. From this elevated position, the ground falls gently away to a broad lawn extending to the garden's southern boundary, providing an open, uninterrupted foreground that enhances the formality and symmetry of the south elevation.

The lawn is framed to the west by a pleached lime walk set above a flagstone path, introducing a linear, rhythmic element that reinforces the garden's axial structure and offers filtered views back towards the house. To the east, the space is enclosed by a substantial stone wall centred on a stone-built summerhouse, which acts as a focal point. The interplay between these two edges, the disciplined geometry of the lime walk and the solidity of the stone wall, gives the lawn a strong sense of enclosure while maintaining its openness and visual breadth.

At the southern end of the eastern wall, a wide arched opening leads into a further former walled kitchen garden. Although historically a productive space, this area has been extensively remodelled in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st centuries. The original kitchen-garden layout has been replaced by a tennis court and an outdoor swimming pool, introducing a markedly different character and function. These changes have altered the historic legibility of the garden's productive hierarchy, but the enclosing walls and the axial connection from the main lawn still preserve a sense of the area's former role within the wider designed landscape.

The setting of Westbrook Garden is defined by its intimate, inward-looking character and the carefully choreographed relationship between the house, its terraces, and the sequence of garden compartments designed by Hugh Thackeray Turner and Gertrude Jekyll. The garden sits on a gently sloping site immediately south and west of the house, enclosed by mature boundary planting that creates a sense of seclusion and containment. This enclosure is a deliberate design device, allowing the garden to function as a series of "rooms" in which planting, structure and crafted detail are experienced at close quarters. The setting is therefore dominated by the interplay of architecture, horticulture and craftsmanship rather than by long-distance or expansive outward views.

The wider landscape contributes to the setting only in a limited and carefully controlled way. The garden's boundaries, comprising mature trees, hedging and woodland blocks, filter or exclude external views, reinforcing the sense of a self-contained designed landscape. The only intentional outward-facing element is the Thunderbox platform on the western boundary, which historically provided a functional vantage point for observing incoming storms rather than framing or celebrating the wider countryside.

Beyond this, the surrounding landform, vegetation and intervening development ensure that the garden is visually and experientially separate from the broader landscape, including the land to the south where the proposed development is located. As a result, the significance of Westbrook Garden is derived almost entirely from its internal composition, its relationship with the house, and the survival of its designed structure, rather than from any wider setting or external visual connections.

In terms of the significance of the gardens, these can be summarised as:

- a rare and well-preserved example of early 20th-century Arts and Crafts garden

design, retaining the characteristic integration of architectural structure, craftsmanship, and horticultural composition.

- an accomplished and uncommon surviving collaboration between Hugh Thackeray Turner and Gertrude Jekyll, two nationally significant figures whose joint work is increasingly scarce in an intact form.
- high architectural interest embodied in the formal garden structures, including the circular sunk garden, Winter Garden, stone terraces, and pleached lime walk, all demonstrating notable craftsmanship and design quality.
- clear evidence of the original functional zoning, with the spatial hierarchy of formal, productive, and transitional areas still legible. Although the eastern and southern kitchen gardens have been altered, the surviving walls, axial connections, and overall structure continue to convey their historic purpose.
- a strong and enduring relationship with the house and wider setting, with the garden forming an integral part of the architectural composition and providing a carefully designed foreground and approach to the principal elevations.
- a choreographed sequence of distinct spaces, reflecting Jekyll's hallmark approach to spatial progression and contributing significantly to the garden's aesthetic and experiential value.
- a sophisticated interplay between architecture, planting, and topography, creating a rich, varied, and characteristically Arts and Crafts garden experience that remains highly legible despite later changes.

- Impact of the proposal on the significance of the registered park and garden

The historic park and garden associated with Westbrook House represents a rare and well-preserved example of early 20th-century Arts and Crafts garden design. Its significance derives from the characteristic integration of architectural structure, craftsmanship, and horticultural composition, and from its status as an uncommon surviving collaboration between Hugh Thackeray Turner and Gertrude Jekyll. The garden retains high architectural interest through its formal structures, including the circular sunk garden, Winter Garden, stone terraces, and pleached lime walk, all of which demonstrate notable craftsmanship and design quality.

The spatial hierarchy of formal, productive, and transitional areas remains legible, with surviving walls, axial connections, and the overall structure continuing to convey the garden's historic purpose despite later alterations to the eastern and southern kitchen gardens. The garden also maintains a strong and enduring relationship with the house and wider setting, forming an integral part of the architectural composition and providing a carefully designed foreground and approach to the principal elevations. Its choreographed sequence of distinct spaces, reflecting Jekyll's hallmark approach to spatial progression, contributes significantly to its aesthetic and experiential value. The sophisticated interplay between architecture, planting, and topography continues to create a rich and characteristically Arts and Crafts garden experience that remains highly legible.

A further notable feature of significance is the presence of a rare surviving "Thunderbox" lookout platform, positioned slightly elevated along the western boundary and intentionally oriented towards the west. This uncovered structure was designed to observe approaching weather fronts and storms, an experiential device entirely consistent with Arts and Crafts principles of engaging directly with nature and the surrounding landscape. Only two such features are known to survive: this example at Westbrook House and another at Gertrude Jekyll's own property at Munstead Wood. Its rarity, intactness, and clear functional purpose

contribute materially to the historic and evidential value of the garden and reinforce the authenticity of the Turner-Jekyll collaboration.

While the historic garden is fundamentally inward-looking, it is acknowledged that the Thunderbox provides one designed opportunity for outward views. These views are principally directed across the open landscape to the west. From this platform, it is possible, at an oblique angle, to perceive the general location of the proposed development site. However, any such visibility would be limited, filtered, and incidental. Crucially, the Thunderbox was not conceived as a picturesque viewing point or as a device for appreciating the wider landscape; its purpose was functional and meteorological, enabling observation of incoming storms. The fact that a portion of the proposed development may be appreciated in a constrained way from this single, peripheral point within the garden does not diminish the significance of the feature. Its evidential, functional, and associative value remains wholly intact, and the proposal does not intrude upon its intended experience or meaning.

Taken together, these significance components demonstrate that the historic park and garden is fundamentally inward-looking and compositionally self-contained. Its value lies in the intimate, carefully structured relationship between the house, the formal garden compartments, and the designed progression of spaces. The garden's significance is not dependent on wider landscape views or on visual relationships with land beyond its defined boundaries.

The proposed development would be located beyond the Ockford Park scheme, which already forms a substantial and visually dominant layer of intervening development between the historic garden and the application site. As a result, the proposed dwellings would not intrude into the designed garden setting, nor would they affect the spatial hierarchy, architectural structures, or experiential qualities that underpin the garden's significance. Any potential glimpsed views of roofscape from upper floors of the house would not alter the enclosed, choreographed character of the garden spaces or the way in which they are experienced.

Similarly, the introduction of additional residential activity would not materially affect the tranquillity or experiential qualities of the historic garden. Ockford Park already represents the primary source of contemporary activity in the wider area, and the proposed development, being further removed, would not introduce perceptible change to the ambient conditions within the garden. The intervening-built form and established vegetation would effectively absorb and diffuse any additional noise or movement.

Overall, the proposed development would not erode the architectural, artistic, associative, or landscape values that define the significance of Westbrook House and its historic park and garden. The proposal therefore results in no harm to the significance of the heritage asset.

Eashing Bridge – Grade I Listed and Scheduled Monument

Although located at a reasonable distance from the application site, this heritage asset has been included as it forms part of the principal approach from the A3. Its inclusion enables consideration of whether any potential additional traffic generated by the proposed development could affect the asset's significance or the way it is experienced along this route.

Eashing Bridge is a 13th-century multi-span medieval stone bridge of exceptional historic and architectural importance, protected both as a Scheduled Monument and a Grade I listed structure. It is one of a chain of medieval bridges across the River Wey between Guildford and Farnham comprises two separate medieval bridges, linked by a short, raised causeway, which together carry the historic route across the two channels of the River Wey at Lower Eashing. The bridges are low in profile and built predominantly of Bargate stone and local sandstone rubble, materials characteristic of Surrey's medieval vernacular and valued for their durability and warm, mottled texture. The use of thin Bargate slabs to form the voussoirs over the arches is a notable local detail, and the bridge retains a high proportion of original medieval fabric.

The structure's origins are traditionally associated with the Cistercian monastic community of Waverley Abbey, who are thought to have constructed or commissioned the crossing to support regional movement, trade, and access to their estates. Although later repairs and alterations are evident, the bridge retains a remarkable proportion of its medieval fabric, including its low segmental arches, robust piers, and distinctive rural setting. Its survival as a largely intact early river crossing makes it one of Surrey's most important medieval transport structures and a key component of the historic landscape of the Wey valley.

The setting of Eashing Bridge is defined by its intimate relationship with the River Wey and the historic routeway it carries across the valley. The bridge sits within a narrow, enclosed river corridor characterised by mature riparian vegetation, the sound and movement of the watercourse, and the gently curving alignment of the historic lane. This creates a strongly atmospheric, small-scale environment in which the medieval fabric, form and craftsmanship of the bridge can be appreciated at close quarters. The immediate setting is therefore experiential and sensory, shaped by the interplay of stonework, water, vegetation and the historic function of the crossing.

Beyond this immediate envelope, the wider setting contributes in a more limited and filtered way. The surrounding landform rises away from the river, with woodland blocks, hedgerows and the historic settlement pattern of Eashing enclosing views and reinforcing the sense of a self-contained crossing point. Modern development, including the A3 corridor, is visually and acoustically separated from the bridge by distance, topography and vegetation, ensuring that the bridge continues to be experienced as part of a rural, historic landscape. Long-distance or panoramic views do not form part of its significance; instead, its value is rooted in its medieval construction, its survival as a rare multi-span stone bridge, and its enduring functional relationship with the river and the historic route it serves.

Surrey County Council, as the Local Highway Authority, has not requested any physical modifications to the bridge or its traffic-management arrangements to support the additional vehicle movements associated with the proposal. As such, the Council's Conservation Officer notes that there is no basis to conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the significance of Eashing Bridge.

Therefore, the proposal results in no harm in terms of:

- NPPF paragraphs 199–202, which require great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets
- Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving listed

- buildings and their settings
- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, which affords statutory protection to Scheduled Monuments and requires their preservation to be given paramount consideration

Accordingly, the proposed development is compliant with national heritage policy and statutory duties in respect of Eashing Bridge.

Eashing Farm House and Barn – Grade II Listed Building

Farm House

Eashing Farm House is a two-storey Grade II listed farmhouse, dating to the late 16th century with identifiable 18th and 20th-century additions, that is located to the west of the application site.

It forms the principal historic dwelling within a coherent farmstead group comprising cottages, barns and associated agricultural outbuildings, and provides a clear illustration of the agricultural origins and rural development of this part of Eashing. Its traditional domestic scale, plain-tiled hipped roof, and use of locally distinctive vernacular materials, including timber framing with whitewashed brick infill, colour washed sandstone rubble, and red and brown brick dressings, are characteristic of the Surrey countryside and make a significant contribution to its architectural and historic interest

The principal elevation presents a simple, largely symmetrical frontage facing Eashing Lane, articulated by regularly spaced casement windows set beneath gauged brick heads, and a central half-glazed entrance sheltered by a stone and timber panelled porch with a hipped roof. This composition clearly expresses its role as the main farmhouse within the historic group. The brick dentilled eaves, traditional timber casement windows and the recessed roundel window at first-floor level further reinforce its vernacular identity and evidential value.

The building's complex plan form, comprising two parallel front ranges, a rear wing set at right angles, and a further parallel range to the rear right, reflects its incremental evolution over several centuries. This is further emphasised by the presence of multiple chimney stacks, including a large ridge stack to the older rear range, a valley stack to the left, and an end stack to the rear extension. These features collectively indicate an evolved internal plan typical of farmhouses that have adapted over time to changing agricultural needs and patterns of occupation.

The right-hand return elevation, with its exposed timber framing, pentice-roofed "cross" window and later extensions, provides additional evidence of the building's layered development and long-term functional use. The interplay of historic fabric and later accretions contributes to the building's architectural richness and enhances its ability to illustrate the evolution of a working rural dwelling.

Taken together, these architectural qualities, its form, materials, detailing, phasing and relationship to the lane, ensure that Eashing Farm House retains a high degree of legibility as the principal dwelling within a historic agricultural ensemble. Its survival, alongside associated listed barns and cottages, provides valuable evidence for the historic pattern of rural settlement, farmstead organisation and agricultural development in Eashing.

Barn

The barn situated approximately 15 yards to the rear of Eashing Farm House is a Grade II listed agricultural building and forms an essential component of the historic farmstead group at Eashing. Dating to the mid- to late-18th century, with a 20th-century rear extension, it provides clear evidence of the evolution of the working farm and contributes materially to the legibility of the wider agricultural ensemble.

The building is a traditional Surrey timber-framed barn, its structural frame expressed through weatherboarded elevations set on a brick and sandstone plinth, a characteristic combination within the region. The barn is covered by a plain-tiled, half-hipped roof, which reinforces its vernacular identity and reflects long-established local construction practices.

Its simple rectangular plan and large opposing central threshing doors are typical of barns designed for agricultural processes and storage, enabling cross-ventilation and efficient movement of agricultural produce. Despite later alterations, including the 20th-century rear extension, the barn retains a high degree of architectural and historic integrity, with its form, materials and construction techniques clearly communicating its agricultural origins.

Eashing Farmhouse and its associated listed barn occupy a distinctly rural and agrarian setting along Eashing Lane, forming part of a small but coherent historic farmstead on the western edge of the dispersed settlement of Eashing. Their setting is shaped by the interplay of historic farm buildings, open fields and the wooded valley landscape characteristic of this stretch of the Wey corridor, all of which reinforce the site's rural identity and contribute to the clear legibility of its historic development.

The farmhouse sits within a multi-asset heritage cluster that includes Platt Cottages, associated barns and outbuilding (some more modern than others), and the wider historic settlement of Eashing, notably the nationally significant Eashing Bridges. Together, these assets form a coherent historic grouping that illustrates the area's agricultural origins, its evolution as a dispersed rural settlement, and the long continuity of farming activity in this part of Surrey. Within this context, the farmhouse and barn serve as key components in understanding the hierarchy, organisation and operation of the historic farmstead.

In its immediate setting, the farmhouse is positioned close to the lane within a modest, traditionally scaled curtilage that retains the character of a working farmstead rather than a suburbanised residential plot. Mature boundary vegetation, hedgerows, trees and informal planting create a sense of enclosure and verdant rurality, reinforcing the lane's historic character. The spatial and functional relationship with the listed barns to the rear and the adjacent farm cottages is particularly important, as these buildings collectively express the historic structure and evolution of the farm group.

Beyond the immediate cluster, the farmhouse and barn are surrounded by pastoral fields, paddocks and pockets of woodland, contributing to a strong sense of rural tranquillity. The gently undulating topography and the pattern of hedgerows and tree belts create a layered, visually contained landscape that frames views to and from the farmstead while limiting long-distance visibility. This reinforces the site's rural seclusion and enhances the appreciation of its historic character.

Overall, the setting is characterised by quietness, limited modern intrusion and a strong

sense of historic continuity. Approaching along Eashing Lane, the experience is defined by the interplay of vegetation, glimpsed views of traditional buildings and the gradual reveal of the farmstead cluster. These qualities collectively support a rich understanding of the site's historic function, its architectural evolution and its contribution to the rural landscape of the Wey valley.

In terms of significance, this can be summarised as follows:

Farmhouse

- a well-preserved example of Surrey vernacular farmhouse architecture, expressed through its two-storey form, pitched clay-tiled roof and use of locally distinctive materials.
- simple, balanced proportions and restrained detailing, characteristic of modest rural farmhouses within the Wey valley landscape.
- surviving historic fabric, including traditional timber casement windows and chimney stacks, which reinforces the building's architectural integrity and evidential value.
- clear evidence of incremental development, reflecting the organic evolution typical of working agricultural dwellings.
- strong architectural legibility as the principal farmhouse, with its form, orientation and relationship to the lane reinforcing its historic domestic and functional role.
- a key component of a coherent architectural ensemble, contributing to the character and completeness of the associated listed barns and cottages.
- illustrative of the long-established agricultural history of Eashing and the wider Shackleford parish, representing a traditional rural farmstead with deep historic roots.
- enhances understanding of the functional hierarchy and evolution of the historic farm group, including domestic, agricultural and ancillary components.

Barn

- a well-preserved example of an 18th-century Surrey agricultural building, retaining the defining characteristics of traditional vernacular construction in the Wey valley.
- a key surviving element of a long-established historic farmstead, illustrating the agricultural origins and subsequent development of Eashing.
- provides direct evidential insight into 18th-century farming practices, particularly threshing, storage and the movement of agricultural produce.
- large opposing central threshing doors give strong legibility to its original working function and internal arrangement.
- weatherboarded timber frame on a brick and sandstone plinth, demonstrating regionally distinctive and long-standing vernacular building techniques.
- plain-tiled, half-hipped roof and simple rectangular plan, characteristic of threshing barns of the period and reinforcing its agricultural identity.
- strong group value with Eashing Farm House and associated listed buildings, collectively illustrating the hierarchy, organisation and evolution of a traditional Surrey farmstead.

- The impact of the proposal on significance of Eashing Farm House and Barn

Eashing Farmhouse, Eashing Cottages and the associated Barn form a small, coherent historic cluster within the rural settlement of Eashing, with significance derived from their

vernacular character, group value and long-established relationship with the surrounding landscape. Although relatively close in absolute distance, the assets are visually and physically separated from the proposed development by mature, intact trees and woodland blocks along the western side of Eashing Lane, combined with the lane's winding alignment. While it is possible that very limited elements of the development may be distantly perceived when looking south-east along Eashing Lane, such glimpses would be filtered, recessive and incidental. They do not contribute to, nor do they define, the way in which the historical or architectural significance of the Eashing assets is experienced or understood.

The submitted layout demonstrates that the western corner of the development has been deliberately designed to taper away from Eashing Lane, giving way to a substantial landscape buffer rather than built form. This green edge - comprising structural planting, retained mature trees and open space - creates a soft, transitional boundary that reinforces the rural character of the lane and maintains the sense of separation that is characteristic of the approach to the Eashing heritage cluster. This landscape-led approach materially reduces the potential for visual intrusion and ensures that the development does not encroach upon the intimate, small-scale setting that underpins the significance of Eashing Farmhouse, Eashing Cottages and the Barn. As such, the proposal results in no harm.

Eashing Farm Cottages and Barn – Grade II Listed Building

Cottage

Eashing Farm Cottages comprise a former early-16th-century hall house, subsequently extended, adapted and historically divided into three cottages, although it has now been converted back to a single residential dwelling. The earliest fabric is a timber-framed structure set on a rendered plinth, with a mixture of brick and whitewashed render infill and areas of sandstone rubble, reflecting the building's incremental development. The original hall house form remains legible in the steeply pitched plain-tiled roof, hipped with gablets to the left, and in the surviving medieval carpentry internally.

A 17th-century cross wing projects to the right of centre, identifiable by its hipped roof with gablet and its two-storey height, contrasting with the single-storey-and-attic arrangement of the flanking ranges. Later 18th- and 20th-century extensions continue the linear form, including a tile-hung upper storey on the right-hand addition, illustrating the building's long domestic evolution.

The roofscape is a prominent feature, punctuated by a fine tall triple chimney stack with a corbelled top to the left, and further corbelled stacks to the right end. These inserted stacks reflect the transition from an open-hall plan to a fully floored and heated dwelling, consistent with the wider regional shift in domestic arrangements during the post-medieval period.

Fenestration is irregular, characteristic of a multi-phase building. It includes gabled leaded casement dormers to the left and left of centre, an eaves dormer to the right-hand extension, and a scattering of first-floor casements across the principal elevation. The ground floor contains four windows of varying size and alignment, reinforcing the piecemeal nature of adaptation over several centuries.

Entrances are similarly varied: a 19th-century door sits left of centre beneath a braced, open gabled hood, with an identical door to the left of the cross wing (serving No. 3). A

further entrance is located on the right-hand return, sheltered by a pentice-roofed brick porch. These elements contribute to the cottages' vernacular character and illustrate the subdivision of the original house into multiple units.

Despite later accretions, the building retains a substantial proportion of early fabric and a clear architectural narrative. The combination of medieval structure, 17th-century cross wing, and later extensions creates a richly layered historic form, while the prominent chimneys, varied roof profiles, and irregular openings contribute to its aesthetic and evidential value. Together, these features underpin the building's special interest as a well-preserved example of a Surrey hall house adapted over time to meet changing domestic needs.

Barn

The barn is a late-18th-century agricultural building constructed in the traditional Surrey vernacular. It is timber framed, raised on brick plinths, with areas of brick and cement-block underbuilding that reflect both original construction and later functional repairs. The exterior is clad in tarred weatherboarding, giving the building its characteristic dark, utilitarian appearance and emphasising its historic working character.

The barn is covered by a half-hipped plain-tiled roof, steeply pitched and typical of threshing barns of the period. The plan is rectangular, with central opposing wain entrances designed to create the through-draught required for threshing. The entrance on the side nearest the cottages has since been blocked, but its form remains clearly legible, preserving the understanding of the barn's original operation.

Internally, the barn is arranged in five bays, supported by a well-preserved queen-strut roof structure with clasped and trenched purlins. Surviving diagonal wind-bracing reinforces the structural stability and provides valuable evidence of late-18th-century agricultural carpentry. The retention of this roof structure is a key component of the barn's architectural and evidential significance, demonstrating both craftsmanship and the functional logic of its original use.

Eashing Farm Cottages and the listed barn occupy a prominent position along Eashing Lane, where the historic farmstead meets the roadside in a compact and visually coherent group. The cottages sit slightly elevated on the right-hand side of the lane, presenting a domestic frontage softened by gardens, planting, and informal boundaries. Their scale, materials, and alignment contribute to the traditional rural character of the lane.

Directly opposite, to the rear, the listed barn sits hard against the roadside, its weatherboarded elevations and low roofline forming a strong and immediate presence within the streetscape. This close relationship with the lane is characteristic of historic working buildings in rural Surrey, where barns were often positioned for ease of access and movement of goods. The barn's simple form and traditional materials continue to signal its agricultural origins.

The listed barn forms part of a small cluster of buildings (some converted, some new) that accommodate a mixture of commercial and workshop uses. Although these uses introduce a degree of activity, the scale and form of the buildings remain consistent with the historic agricultural character of the site. Traditional materials, low rooflines, and the retention of boundary walls help preserve the barn's visual identity as a historic working structure.

Eashing Lane itself contributes strongly to the setting of both assets. Its narrow, curving alignment, mature vegetation, and intermittent built form create a semi-enclosed rural approach, while the presence of small businesses reflects the gradual adaptation of former agricultural buildings to modern uses. This combination of rural qualities and light commercial activity forms the immediate context in which both the cottages and the barn are experienced today.

Beyond the lane, the wider landscape of fields, paddocks, and woodland continues to provide an open rural backdrop. This broader setting supports an understanding of the historic farmstead and reinforces the agricultural origins of both listed buildings.

Together, the domestic frontage, the adapted working buildings, and the surrounding rural landscape form the key components of the setting that contribute to the significance of Eashing Farm Cottages and the listed barn

In terms of significance this can be summarised as:

Cottage

- retains substantial fabric of an early-16th-century hall house, including key elements of the medieval timber frame.
- clear physical evidence of open-hall construction, such as sooted rafters and high-quality carpentry, demonstrating early domestic planning.
- distinct 17th-century cross wing and 18th-century refronting that together form a well-defined sequence of architectural development.
- strong vernacular character expressed through steeply pitched tiled roofs with gablets, irregular casement fenestration, and prominent corbelled chimney stacks.
- exceptional legibility of the building's evolution from medieval hall house to a multi-unit cottage range, preserving its phased development in built form.
- high evidential value for changing domestic arrangements, charting the transition from open hall living to floored, heated post-medieval accommodation.
- demonstrates long-term adaptation to shifting social and economic conditions, including subdivision into smaller dwellings.
- represents historic rural settlement patterns and the incremental development of small farmsteads in Surrey.
- contributes to understanding of vernacular building traditions, construction techniques, and local craftsmanship spanning several centuries.

Barn

- a late-18th-century timber-framed threshing barn that retains its characteristic five-bay plan and agricultural form.
- constructed in traditional materials-timber frame on brick plinths, tarred weatherboarding, and a half-hipped plain-tiled roof, typical of Surrey vernacular farm buildings.
- well-preserved internal structure, including queen-strut trusses, clasped and trenched purlins, and diagonal wind-bracing, offering strong evidential value for historic carpentry.
- surviving opposing wain entrances (one now blocked) maintain the clarity of the barn's original threshing function.

- a representative and largely intact example of regional agricultural architecture, retaining its simplicity, proportions, and utilitarian character.
- provides direct evidence of late-18th-century farming practices, particularly threshing, storage, and the movement of agricultural produce.
- demonstrates the functional hierarchy of a historic farmstead, with the barn forming the working counterpart to the former farmhouse.
- retains its identity as a historic agricultural building despite later adaptation, preserving its core form and purpose.
- listed in part for its group value with Eashing Farm Cottages, reflecting their shared development and long-standing functional relationship.

- Impact on the significance of Eashing Farm Cottages and Barn

Eashing Farmhouse, Eashing Cottages and the associated Barn form a small, coherent historic cluster within the rural settlement of Eashing, with significance derived from their vernacular character, group value and long-established relationship with the surrounding landscape. Although relatively close in absolute distance, the assets are visually and physically separated from the proposed development by mature, intact trees and woodland blocks along the western side of Eashing Lane, combined with the lane's winding alignment. While it is possible that very limited elements of the development may be distantly perceived when looking south-east along Eashing Lane, such glimpses would be filtered, recessive and incidental. They do not contribute to, nor do they define, the way in which the historical or architectural significance of the Eashing assets is experienced or understood.

The submitted layout further demonstrates that the western corner of the development has been deliberately designed to taper away from Eashing Lane, giving way to a substantial landscape buffer rather than built form. This green edge, comprising structural planting, retained mature trees and open space, creates a soft, transitional boundary that reinforces the rural character of the lane and maintains the sense of separation that is characteristic of the approach to the Eashing heritage cluster. This landscape-led approach materially reduces the potential for visual intrusion and ensures that the development does not encroach upon the intimate, small-scale setting that underpins the significance of Eashing Farmhouse, Eashing Cottages and the Barn. As such, the proposal results in no harm.

In conclusion, it is noted that no harm to any designated or non-designated heritage asset has been identified. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be compliant with the various local and national heritage and conservation policies which have been noted above.

Cumulative impact on heritage assets

While the proposed development would extend the modern built form further west, introducing an additional phase of housing beyond that already delivered, the heritage comments for each heritage asset assessed makes clear that the dominant source of change within the wider setting has been the existing Ockford Park. That earlier phase already constitutes 'the dominant source of contemporary residential activity within the wider area' and forms 'a substantial and visually dominant layer of intervening development' between the heritage assets and the application site. In this context, the proposed scheme would add to an established pattern of expansion, but it would do so beyond the existing development, in a position that is visually and physically more distant, and therefore less sensitive in heritage terms, to the identified designated assets.

As acknowledged in the assessment, the combination of intervening-built form, mature vegetation, and the site's relative separation ensures that any additional change introduced by the proposal would be absorbed within the existing envelope of development created by the existing Ockford Park. Consequently, although the scheme contributes to cumulative change at the settlement edge, its incremental effect would be so limited and so heavily filtered that it would not be perceptible as harm to the significance or experience of Westbrook House, Westbrook Garden, or the Eashing farmstead group. The cumulative influence of the proposal is therefore materially overshadowed by the transformative role already played by Ockford Park, and the additional proposed development would not introduce any additional adverse effect on the significance of the heritage assets.

Impact on archaeology

The application site is within a designated Area of High Archaeological Potential.

No desk based archaeological assessment has been provided but the application is supported by a Written Scheme of Investigation for a trial trench evaluation of the site that contains an outline of previous archaeological investigations that have been carried out to the east and within the central part of the site itself. The County Archaeologist notes that an evaluation of the Land at Ockford Wood Farm which bordered to the site to the east revealed some significant pits dating from the Neolithic period and post medieval linear features, whilst trenching within the central part of the current development site, which served as access to the Ockford Park site, revealed evidence of post medieval agricultural activity. The application site was also subject to a geophysical survey and selective test pitting in 2018 that revealed undated linear features and a further Neolithic pit. The County Archaeologist notes that the site can therefore be seen to have a low to moderate archaeological potential.

In recognition of this, the application is accompanied by a Written Scheme of Investigation for a programme of archaeological work prepared by Thames Valley Archaeological Services that proposes the excavation of eighty-six trial trenches located across the site to examine the possibility that some archaeological deposits may be present on the site. The County Archaeologist confirms that the proposed scheme is acceptable from the archaeological point of view, and that no concerns are raised towards the investigative work now taking place on the site. To secure the archaeological investigation work and any detailed mitigation works that may be required it is advised that a condition should be attached should consent be granted.

Taking into account the above, the development is deemed to be compliant with policy D3 of the LPSS and the advice set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

LPDMP policy H4 states that permission will be granted provided that development does not have an unacceptable effect on amenity. LPDMP policy D5 states that development proposals are required to avoid having an unacceptable impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or resulting in unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties, in terms of privacy and overlooking, visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development, access to sunlight and daylight, artificial lighting, noise and vibration and odour, fumes and dust.

The proposal has the potential to impact on the amenity of a number of existing properties around the site. These will be assessed below.

62-67 Eashing Lane

These are two storey semi-detached properties which are located to the south of the site. The rear gardens of these dwellings are buffered from the site by the Aarons Hill allotments, and as such, the distance of separation between the proposed and existing rear elevations is significant and sufficient to prevent any adverse amenity impacts. It is noted that 67 Eashing Lane has a slightly different relationship to the site than the other properties on this section of the road as it would also have a proposed dwelling to its side. Proposed plot 28 would be a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It would be set off the common side boundary with number 67 by approximately 5.5 metres and is set at an angle which orientates the dwelling slightly away from its neighbour. While the rear elevation of plot 28 would extend beyond the rear elevation of number 67 Eashing Lane, due to the distance of separation, it would not breach the angle of 45 degrees. As such, the two dwellings would have an acceptable relationship with each other thereby avoiding any adverse overshadowing, loss of light or overbearing impacts. In terms of overlooking, there would be no first-floor side windows in the flank elevation of plot 28 and this could be secured by condition. There would be two first floor windows in the rear elevation of plot 28, however, the closest window to 67 Eashing Lane would be small in size and serving a dressing area. This window would also be set a significant distance off the side boundary. As such, the relationship between the two properties would be similar to that experienced in all suburban areas and is not objectionable. It is also noted that plots 37-39 would be situated to the north-west of number 67's rear garden. However, the interface distance between the rear elevations would be approximately 36 metres which is sufficient to prevent any harmful amenity impacts.

1-7 Aarons Hill

These bungalows would share a common rear boundary with the application site. The interface distance between the rear elevations at approximately 28 metres would be similar to a normal relationship in a suburban environment. Even though 1-7 Aarons Hill are bungalows, this distance of separation is sufficient to prevent any harmful amenity impacts between these dwellings.

9-17 Aarons Hill

These properties would share a rear boundary with the south-eastern corner of the site. Here it is proposed to have a small parking courtyard for plots 53 to 56, as well as Block A which is a three-storey apartment building.

The parking courtyard would abut the rear boundaries of 9-13 Aarons Hill and according to the plans, they would be separated by a three metre (approximately) wide landscaped buffer. While it is acknowledged that compared to the existing situation there may be some additional noise and disturbance created by this aspect of the proposal, it is not considered that it would be to such a degree that the amenity of numbers 9-13 would be materially harmed in this instance.

Block A and its amenity space would be situated to the rear of 15-17 Aarons Hill. Number

15 is orientated away from the Block A and there would be a large area of open space proposed adjacent to its rear garden. The main three storey element of Block A would be situated approximately 25 metres from 15 Aarons Hill's rear boundary and the smaller two storey element would be approximately 14 metres away. This together with the relative orientation between the two would ensure that there would be no harm caused to this property in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overshadowing. The side elevation of Block A would face 17 Aarons Hill. However, at its closest point Block A drops to two storeys in height and it would be approximately ten metres from the common boundary, with the main three storey element of Block A being 21.5 metres away. This would prevent any harmful level of overbearing. It is noted that there is a window in the side elevation of the two-storey element of Block A which would serve the kitchen of a proposed two bedroom coach house. As noted above, this window would be approximately ten metres from number 17's rear boundary and while there may be some resulting loss of privacy, due to the position of the buildings relative to one another it would be minor and not to a level which would result in any material level of harm to the occupiers. The other first and second floor windows which face number 17 (and 15) Aarons Hill are over 30 metres away.

It is fully acknowledged that the outlook from all of the above properties would dramatically change as a result of this proposal. However, this in and of itself would not be a reason to withhold planning permission, particularly as not materially harmful amenity impacts have been found.

Ock Way

It is noted that the eastern boundary of the site consists of two apartment buildings (with attached coach houses) and six dwellings. These would face the western edge of the recently completed Ockford Park development where there are multiple properties that overlook the application site. While it is acknowledged that a number of objections have been received from the residents of these buildings, it is noted that the proposed and existing buildings fronting onto Ock Way would be separated from each other by a distance of between 23 and 45 metres. This would also be across a busy road. This interface of front-to-front elevations is more than sufficient to prevent any harm to the amenity of the existing Ock Way properties.

It is also noted that the eastern vehicular entrance into the site would be onto Ock Way, directly opposite numbers 8-12 Ock Way. While it is acknowledged again that this will change the outlook from these dwellings significantly and may result in additional noise and increased vehicular movements (with associated headlights being noticeable), in a suburban environment this is not an impact which would materially reduce or harm the amenity of these dwellings to an extent that an objection could be raised. However, in any event the access onto Ock Way is to be assessed by Waverley Borough Council through the application already referenced above.

Other premises

As has been noted above there are a number of commercial properties located to the north-east of the site, notably a veterinary practice and a catering company. The distance of separation between these and the closest proposed dwellings is between 29 and 31 metres and the boundary between them is formed of a dense hedgerow with tree planting. This will be supplemented with additional planting proposed through the application. This is sufficient to ensure that both uses can co-exist without resulting in harm to one another.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has also not raised any concerns in this regard.

It is also noted that the Aarons Hill allotments would share a boundary with the application site. While the outlook from the allotments would change dramatically as a result of the scheme and some overlooking from plots 40-48 would occur this is not that much different to the existing situation where the allotments are also overlooked by the existing dwellings on Eashing Lane. In addition, the amenity of the allotments is obviously not protected in the same way as a residential dwelling would be.

While there are other residential dwellings in the area, none of these would experience any adverse amenity impacts in terms of overlooking, overbearing or loss of light.

With a condition imposed to prevent the creation of any first-floor windows in the eastern (side) elevation of plot 28, the proposal is deemed to be compliant with policies H4 and D5 of the LPDMP in this regard.

Amenity of the proposed dwellings

Policy H1 of the LPSS states that 'all new residential development must conform to the nationally described space standards as set out by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)'.

As can be seen from the table below, all of the house types proposed as part of the development comply with the relevant space standards in terms of their overall size. The bedroom size and storage provision is also compliant. The proposal is therefore deemed to be acceptable in this regard.

| NDSS Compliance Table | Occupation | Proposed Size (Nett) | Target | NDSS Compliance |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|--------|-----------------|
| | | Sq. m | Sq. m | |
| Market | | | | |
| BLOCK D - 2BF | 2B4P | 70.16 | 70 | Yes |
| 2BC.1 | 2B4P | 81.03 | 70 | Yes |
| 2B.1 | 2B4P | 87.47 | 70 | Yes |
| 2B.3 | 2B3P/2B4P | 100.57 | 79 | Yes |
| 3B.1 | 3B5P | 114.93 | 93 | Yes |
| 3B.2 | 3B5P | 111.29 | 93 | Yes |
| 3B.3 | 3B5P | 129.09 | 93 | Yes |
| 3B.4 | 3B6P | 141.94 | 102 | Yes |
| 4B.1 | 4B7P | 152.16 | 115 | Yes |
| 4B.2 | 4B7P | 160.51 | 115 | Yes |
| 4B.3 | 4B7P | 166.23 | 115 | Yes |
| 4B.4 | 4B7P | 150.81 | 115 | Yes |
| Affordable | | | | |
| 1BF - BLOCK A | 1B2P | 50.43 | 50 | Yes |
| 2BF - BLOCK A | 2B4P | 70.28 | 70 | Yes |
| 1BF - BLOCK C | 1B2P | 50.43 | 50 | Yes |
| 2BCA.1 | 2B4P | 81.03 | 70 | Yes |

| | | | | |
|---------------|------|--------|-----|-----|
| 2BA.1 | 2B4P | 82.10 | 70 | Yes |
| 2BA.2 - M4(3) | 2B4P | 110.69 | 70 | Yes |
| 3BA.1 | 3B5P | 96.60 | 93 | Yes |
| 3BA.2 | 3B5P | 96.65 | 93 | Yes |
| 4BA.1 | 4B7P | 116.13 | 115 | Yes |

All of the proposed houses would have adequate areas of private amenity space. All of the apartment blocks, apart from Block B, would have access to their own communal outdoor amenity space. However, particularly in the case of Blocks C and D, these would be very small spaces and generally located beside the associated parking courtyards. However, notwithstanding this, all of the apartments would be just a short walk to large areas of public amenity space on the development including the new village green on the eastern side of the site and the central open space area.

It is again acknowledged that there are a number of commercial premises located a short distance off the northern boundary of the site comprising of a veterinary practice and a catering company. It is understood that both of these businesses have large areas of plant and equipment. On this point it is noted that the applicant has submitted noise assessments which considers the impact of existing noise sources from both of the neighbouring commercial premises. The noise assessment has also considered the approved development at the veterinary practice for extensions and general plant compound. The report and further response conclude that the existing noise sources do not raise any concerns in relation to 'Agent of Change' principles, and the new development will be protected by means of inherent mitigation measures incorporated in the design proposal. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has accepted this conclusion based on the information provided and no objections are raised in this regard.

In addition, it is noted that many of the proposed dwellings will be served with air source heat pumps. These can result in noise and disturbance. The applicant has agreed to a condition which would control and mitigate any unacceptable level of noise from the air source heat pumps if this is found to be needed. The Council's Environmental Health Officer is satisfied with this approach and a condition has been agreed between the parties.

As such, the amenity of the proposed units is deemed to be acceptable.

Highway/parking considerations

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios'.

The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) which has been assessed by the County Highway Authority (CHA). Amended and additional information was also submitted, following initial concerns which were raised by the CHA.

Capacity of highway network

On traffic generation, the CHA notes that 'the proposed trip generation assessments are based on multi-modal trip rates obtained from the TRICS database. The Highway Authority has assessed the assumptions used by the applicant to calculate the trip rates and is

satisfied that they are fit for purpose. It should be noted that, in line with good practice, the TA assesses the 'worst case' morning and evening peak hours. This worst case 'peak period' scenario provides a suitable basis to assess the development proposal. To accord with the requirements of the NPPF, the trip generation assessment has followed a vision-based approach. The Travel Plan and sustainable travel strategy for the proposed development aims to achieve at least a 10% mode shift from car driver to other, sustainable, modes of transport. The traffic impact assessment assesses the local highway network on this basis, i.e. that the transport vision will be achieved'.

In terms of traffic growth, the CHA note that a future assessment year of 2030 has been used to assess the impacts on the local highway network. Traffic growth has been applied using the DfT software TEMPRO (version 8.1). The TEMPRO software presents the output of the DfT's National Trip End Model, which forms part of the National Transport Model. It should be noted that growth rates also allow for traffic growth due to new development. Committed development has been accounted for specifically and separately as part of the assessment. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the traffic growth applied to the baseline survey data accounts for the background growth in traffic flows and the cumulative impact of new development in the local area.

Traffic generated by the development has been distributed and assigned to the local network using 2011 census travel to work statistics for commuting and business trips, and a gravity model for other journey purposes. The resulting traffic distribution shows 57% of development traffic turning right and 43% turning left onto Eashing Lane. The Highway Authority has assessed the trip distribution and assignment methodology and is satisfied that it is robust, realistic and suitable for modelling the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network.

Capacity assessments have been undertaken for the weekday morning and evening peak periods, at the main junctions around the site. The assessments have been carried out for the following scenarios:

- 2030 without development.
- 2030 with development but not allowing for the transport vision.
- 2030 with development and allowing for the transport vision.

It is noted that the transport vision is to prioritise active travel ((i.e. trips made by walking, cycling and wheeling); encourage the use of other sustainable modes of travel (such as bus and rail services); and thereafter facilitate the use of low carbon alternatives to internal combustion engine powered vehicles).

The outputs from the modelling assessment are summarised below:

- Main site access onto Eashing Lane

The modelling outputs demonstrate that the proposed site access will operate within capacity with minimal queuing and delay during both AM and PM peak periods.

- Eashing Lane/A283 Priority Junction

The junction assessment indicates that the junction would operate well within its design capacity during the evening peak hour in all scenarios. In the morning peak hour, the Ratio

of Flow Capacity (RFC) of the Eashing Lane to A283 movement increases to 1.03 with the proposed development (i.e. just over capacity), reducing to an RFC of 0.99 allowing for the vision (i.e. under capacity). The additional traffic added by the development (not allowing for the vision) in the morning peak hour to the Eashing Lane to A283 movement is 49 vehicles over the peak hour period, i.e. less than one vehicle per minute. With the vision, the predicted queue length on Eashing Lane increases from 2 to 8 vehicles, for a 30-minute period during the AM peak hour. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the impact at the junction, both with and without the vision falls below the NPPF severe impact tests.

- Eashing Lane/The Hollow Priority Junction

The traffic model shows that this junction will continue to operate within capacity with minimal queuing and delay during the AM and PM peak periods.

- Eashing Lane/A3100 Portsmouth Road Priority Junction

The junction assessment indicates that the A3100 / Eashing Lane priority junction would operate well within its design capacity during the evening peak hour in all scenarios. In the morning peak hour, the additional development traffic (not allowing for the vision) on Eashing Lane is 36 vehicles during the morning peak hour, circa one vehicle every two minutes. With the vision, the predicted queue length on Eashing Lane increases from 11 to 22 vehicles, for a 30-minute period during the AM peak hour. The Highway Authority is satisfied that the impact at the junction, both with and without the vision falls below the NPPF severe impact tests.

In conclusion, the traffic modelling assessment has been independently audited by the CHA and is considered to be robust. The model outputs show that the additional development generated traffic (combined with background traffic growth and committed development) would result in a modest increase in queuing and delay on the local highway network. This falls below the severe test in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. As such, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable in this regard.

Access and highway safety

The main access into the site would be from Eashing Lane, re-using and improving the Ockford Park construction access. A secondary vehicular access would be provided onto Ock Way, although it is noted that this access is located in Waverley Borough Council and is being assessed under a separate planning application (details already provided above). In addition to these main vehicular access points, the following is also proposed:

- a pedestrian/cyclist access on to Halfway Lane in the northwestern corner of the site, i.e. connecting with the existing Eashing Lane footway north of Halfway Lane.
- a pedestrian/cyclist access on to Eashing Lane in the southwestern corner of the site, i.e. connecting with the proposed Eashing Lane crossing improvements and the new cycle route to Milford. This access also includes a new parking layby to replace the existing one (which will be replaced by a new footway) and that is used predominantly by those picking up and dropping off at the Hedgehogs Nursery School.
- works on Eashing Lane to complement Surrey County Council's scheme between The Hollow and the A283.

In terms of the two main vehicular access points, it is noted that the County Highway

Authority (CHA) has raised no objections to this element of the proposal. Both access points would be provided with suitable visibility splays in both directions and have been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit which has not identified any unresolvable safety problems with the proposals.

The access from Eashing Lane is already in place but will require modifications as part of the proposals. These can adequately be secured by condition and the works will be completed before the occupation of the new units. As mentioned above, the secondary access onto Ock Way is being determined by Waverley Borough Council. While the delivery of the access will be secured by a condition on the Waverley permission (if it is approved), a condition would be imposed on this application which states that no occupations can commence until the access is open and operational. This ensures that both access points would be made available for use before any residential vehicle movements begin.

In addition, it is noted that the recommendation to approve this application is contingent on the approval of the Ock Way access application which is being determined by Waverley Borough Council. This is set out in the formal recommendation at the beginning of this report.

As regards highways safety it has been noted above that both proposed access points have passed a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. As set out by the CHA in their formal response to the application, the Transport Assessment has analysed Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data for the latest five-year period, for the highway network in the vicinity of the site. In total, ten injury accidents occurred within the study area. The CHA notes that the 'overall number and pattern of injury accidents does not suggest a particular safety issue with the operation of the local highway network, however it is noted that two serious injury collisions included cyclist casualties, and one serious injury collision included a pedestrian'.

The Highway Authority has therefore secured a package of traffic speed reduction measures on Eashing Lane between Franklyn Road and The Hollow. This will be an extension of the speed reduction measures already secured on the southern section of Eashing Lane as part of the Hurst Farm development. The works include provision of a raised controlled parallel crossing on Eashing Lane which will provide a safer route to St Mark and All Saints Primary School. It is also proposed to introduce a 7.5t weight restriction on Eashing Lane and Lower Eashing, to reduce the volume of HGVs using these routes as a 'rat-run' between Godalming/Milford and the A3. This will further assist with improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists. It should be noted that the weight restriction would not apply to vehicles requiring access to premises or land adjacent to Eashing Lane and Lower Eashing, including access for the purpose of loading and unloading. In addition, a number of 'speed cushions' will be installed on the carriageway along the southern boundary of the site. Four road narrowings would also be installed between The Hollow and Halfway Lane. These would consist of 'build-outs' of reflective bollards into the carriageway.

This package of highway safety improvements could be secured by condition and it will be a requirement that the works are completed before any occupation of the new units begins. On this basis, the Local Planning Authority and County Highway Authority are satisfied that the proposal can be delivered and operated without harming highway safety.

Parking

As regards the Council's Parking Standards for New Development SPD, the following parking provision is required (noting that the site falls in a village/rural area):

- 1 bed flats - 1 space per unit
- 2 bed flats - 1.5 spaces per unit
- 1 and 2 bed houses - 1.5 spaces per unit
- 3 bed house - 2 spaces per unit
- 4+ bed house - 2.5 spaces per unit

Based on the proposed dwelling mix, 418.5 parking spaces would reach the Council's maximum standard. Where more than 50% of the spaces are allocated, an additional 0.2 spaces per dwelling are required for visitors.

According to the Design and Access Statement, the proposal provides 439 allocated spaces (in the form of normal parking spaces, car ports and garages). In addition, 12 spaces are provided for the M4(3) dwellings. As more than 50% of the spaces are allocated, 47 visitor parking spaces (including both car club spaces) are also provided throughout the site. This meets the Council's policy.

The proposal would provide slightly higher levels of on-site parking compared to the Council's maximum standards. While this is the case, at the same time, a package of measures will be introduced as part of the development to help encourage the use of more sustainable methods of transport. These measures will be discussed later in the report.

In terms of cycle parking each of the proposed dwellings would be provided with a 1.8x1.2 metre shed for storage. These will include an approved ground anchor for securing cycles. Each of the apartment buildings contain their own internal cycle storage areas with the buildings. These arrangements will allow the proposal to meet the Council's cycle parking standards and will be secured by condition.

Sustainable travel and pedestrian access

The applicant has agreed to provide a package of road safety improvements on Eashing Lane (as already set out above) which will help to reduce the reliance on the private car by making Eashing Lane a safer and more attractive route for walking and cycling. The applicant has also agreed to provide a S106 contribution to improve bus services between the site and the surrounding area. The contribution would be used to extend the Surrey Connect Digital Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT) service (Southwest Surrey Zone) to serve Ockford Park. The DDRT bus service contribution is to provide additional services specifically in the early morning and late evenings when existing frequency is very limited. Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Team have advised that the most cost-effective way of delivering this enhanced frequency is to extend the existing Surrey Connect DDRT service (Southwest Surrey Zone) to serve Ockford Park. The £250k contribution sought would fund the DDRT service for a period of 5 years i.e. £50k per annum. By this time, it is expected that the development would be fully occupied and there will be sufficient demand (including patronage from the existing Ockford Park and residents living in the vicinity of the site) to make the service financially sustainable. This improved service will benefit residents by providing a more reliable and attractive bus service, reducing the reliance on the private car particularly for journeys into Godalming town centre, from where a wider range of bus and train services are available to onward destinations.

A residential travel plan has also been secured, with measures to facilitate and encourage future residents of the development to travel by non-car modes. The measures include provision of a car club on the site and provision of a £250 sustainable travel voucher to all first-time occupiers, to be used towards the purchase of bus/rail tickets, purchase of a bike/cycling equipment etc.

While the site is already deemed to be located in a sustainable location, the measures listed above will further improve this and will help to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of travel.

In terms of travel by foot, it has already been set out in earlier sections of this report that the site is walkable to Godalming town centre and to a range of local services and facilities. That assessment will not be repeated here. However, it is noted that the existing Ockford Park development delivered surfacing improvements to Public Footpath No. 577 and Public Bridleway No. 6, that is suitable for year-round access by walking and cycling, providing a link to Godalming Railway Station and the town centre. However, concerns have been raised, including from the Surrey Police Designing Out Crime Officer regarding personal safety, particularly during hours of darkness, on New Way/Bridleway 6, due to the absence of lighting or any natural surveillance. As set out already in this report, there are alternative ways of accessing the site which do not raise safety concerns. As such, this proposal is not considered to be reliant on the use of New Way/Bridleway 6 to make the site sustainable. It is understood that the issues raised above regarding New Way/Bridleway 6 are being investigated by Waverley Borough Council (where these routes are located).

Overall, it is considered that the proposed access strategy, both within the site and between the site and the surrounding area, will provide safe and suitable access for all users. It is also considered that the measures being secured as part of the application will help to provide transport options to future residents which do not rely on the private motorcar.

Other highways matters

It is noted that concerns have been raised regarding the impact of additional development generated traffic on the historic Lower Eashing Bridge. The County Council's structural engineer has confirmed that the bridge has an assessed load capacity of full highway loading (40/44t) and the 7.5t weight restriction is for environmental reasons only. The CHA has confirmed they are satisfied that there would be no detrimental impact on the structural integrity of the bridge and the increase in vehicular movements associated with the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety for pedestrians and cyclists using the bridge. The impact of the proposal on the bridge in heritage terms has already been discussed above.

The CHA has also confirmed that it is satisfied that the internal site layout can safely accommodate refuse collection vehicles, delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles.

As regards highways impacts it is concluded that the proposal would not result in any material increase in traffic in the area and no capacity concerns are raised. It is noted that this conclusion is reached taking into account all approved, committed and likely development in the immediate area. With the mitigation measures proposed, there would be no adverse impact on highway safety. As such, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable in this regard.

Flooding and drainage considerations

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that 'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere'. Paragraph 181 goes on to note that 'when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that: a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment; c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate; d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan. This is also generally reflective of policy P6 of the LPSS and P11 of the LPDMP.

The various types of flooding which are likely to impact the site are assessed below.

Fluvial flooding

The site is located within flood zone one which is land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding (i.e. less than a 0.1% chance). The Environment Agency have been consulted on the application and they have noted that given the site is in Flood Zone 1, they are not required to provide formal comments.

The proposed development is classified as 'more vulnerable', however, as per the NPPF it is considered appropriate within Flood Zone 1, without the application of the exception test.

Groundwater flooding

In terms of groundwater flooding, the FRA notes that geological mapping indicates the site is underlain by sedimentary bedrock consisting of sandstones. It is stated that groundwater is located approximately 30 metres below ground level. As such, the FRA concludes that the overall groundwater flood risk is very low.

Surface water flooding

The Environment Agency mapping for the site shows that for the most part the site is at very low risk of surface water flooding. However, there is a high risk of surface water ponding within localised areas in the north-west, south-east and south of the site which are associated with low points on the land. The FRA notes that this is a result of run-off from the site naturally pooling in existing depressions rather than any indication of an overland flow path from off-site. The report also notes that the depth of any pooling is shallow; less than 20cm during very low to high likelihood scenarios.

It is noted that the proposed dwellings and main access routes on the site avoid these

surface water flooding areas. The sections to the north-west and south of the site would be open space and the area to the south-east would be a parking area and open space associated with apartment block A and plots 53-56. The FRA notes that these low points will be removed as a result of site levelling works associated with the development. The run-off that now pools in this area will be managed as part of the proposed drainage strategy (which will be discussed below) and then directed away from the dwellings (both existing and proposed) in a controlled manner. The FRA concludes that the surface water flood risk would be reduced to very low once the proposed drainage interventions are installed as part of the development.

Drainage strategy

The submitted FRA acknowledges that the proposal would inevitably result in an increase in impermeable areas on the site. It notes that infiltration will be the primary option to discharge surface water from the completed development.

The drainage strategy states that where possible individual dwellings will be designed to include private soakaways generally in the rear gardens. The highways, shared parking courts and any dwellings which are not suitable for private soakaways will utilise shared soakaways within the public open space areas. This includes an infiltration basin to the west of the site and geocellular tanks which will be located at various points throughout the site, but mainly to the east.

The FRA notes that the proposed system will be able to attenuate surface water runoff without flooding during a 1 in 100-year event, inclusive of 45% climate change. In addition, it is confirmed that all surface water runoff will pass through a treatment process of at least two features before eventually being discharged to ground.

Sequential test

It is acknowledged that paragraph 175 of the NPPF states that 'the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk)'. However, while this is the case, in December 2025 paragraph 027 of the PPG was updated to provide further clarification on the above. It states 'in applying paragraph 175 a proportionate approach should be taken. Where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development (therefore addressing the risks identified e.g. by Environment Agency flood risk mapping), without increasing flood risk elsewhere, then the sequential test need not be applied'.

As already noted above, the FRA states that the levelling strategy for the site will remove the low-points on the site where water pooling currently occurs and this will now be managed via the proposed drainage strategy. As such, there will be no increase in surface water runoff rates leaving the site and the development will be safe from a flood risk perspective, with no increase elsewhere. Therefore, as the site-specific flood risk assessment clearly demonstrates that the proposed layout, design, and mitigation

measures would ensure that occupiers and users would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk for the lifetime of the development, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, a sequential test does not need to be applied in this instance.

In conclusion on flooding, it is noted that the Environment Agency have decided that their input is not required on this site. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has also assessed the surface water drainage plans for the development and no objections have been raised. This is subject to standard conditions which can be applied if planning permission is granted.

On this basis, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable from a flooding and drainage perspective and is compliant with the relevant policies of the Local Plan as well as the NPPF.

Sustainable design and construction

Policy D2 of the LPSS requires new development to take sustainable design and construction principles into account, including by adapting to climate change, and reducing carbon emissions. Parts (3) and (11) of this policy require sustainability and energy statements to be submitted. Parts (5), (6), (7) and (9) of this policy have now been superseded by policy D16 of the LPDMP.

Policy D14 of the LPDMP requires development proposals to demonstrate how they have followed a 'fabric first' approach in line with the energy hierarchy, and that carbon emissions have been minimised. Major developments must consider the lifecycle of buildings, including the materials used to construct them to reduce lifetime carbon emissions. The policy also requires water efficiency measures to be provided, and the submission of a Site Waste Management Plan.

Policy D15 of the LPDMP requires new buildings to be designed for the impacts of climate change, inclusive of overheating and more severe rainfall.

Policy D16 of the LPDMP requires that new buildings must achieve an emission rate no higher than the relevant Target Emission Rate (TER) set out in the Building Regulations (Part L). Part (5) of this policy states that development proposals are strongly encouraged to improve upon these standards.

These policies are supported by the Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2024 which provides the framework for assessing the acceptability of sustainability and energy matters.

The applicant has provided a combined Energy and Sustainability Statement (ESS), the details of which are considered below.

Fabric first / energy hierarchy

The Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2024 sets out the sequence of steps that should be taken in order to reduce operational carbon emissions from new developments, known as the energy hierarchy. These are: eliminate energy need through design and a fabric first approach; use energy efficient building systems; supply energy from renewable and low carbon sources, and; offset carbon emissions. Measures

at each stage must be reasonably exhausted before moving onto the next stage.

The submitted ESS details that the energy demand reduction strategy for the development incorporates further improvements beyond a Part L compliant specification and initially concentrates efforts on reducing energy demand. Consideration has been given to building orientation and placement to maximise passive solar gain; landscaping, to control daylight, glare and mitigate heat island effects; and building design, to minimise energy demand through fabric specification. In accordance with LPDMP policy D14, the ESS states that the fabric first approach will be demonstrated by a 10% improvement on the dwelling fabric (TFEE/FDEE). This commitment is welcomed, and it is recommended that a condition is attached to secure this.

No BREL Compliance Reports/SAP output documents have been submitted, however indicative calculations have been provided within the ESS which show the site white reduction in carbon emissions will be 67%.

The indicative calculations also show the DERs for the houses will be 67.57-69.22% lower than the TERs, and the DERs for the flats will be 59.96-63.72% lower than the TERs, in accordance with 2021 Building Regulations Part L and therefore, LPDMP policy D16(4).

A condition is recommended to ensure energy modelling data for each standard dwelling model is submitted to confirm this.

Low and zero carbon energy

The ESS details that a range of low and zero carbon energy technologies have been considered for potential incorporation into the scheme.

A combined heat and power (CHP) unit is considered to be unfeasible on economic and technical viability grounds. There are currently no district heat networks which extend near the proposed development, and high network heat losses associated with distribution to individual houses mean that a new heat network to serve the area is not considered viable or an environmentally preferred option. A preliminary examination of the BERR wind speed database also indicates that wind turbines at this site are unlikely to generate sufficient quantities of electrical energy to be cost effective. Wind turbines are also therefore not considered feasible.

Biomass heating, solar thermal systems, solar photovoltaic systems, air source heat pump systems, hot water heat pumps, and ground source heat pumps are all considered technically feasible for buildings within the proposed scheme. However, the cost and difficulties associated with the provision of ground source heat pumps and biomass heating systems at this site mean that they are not the preferred low carbon technologies.

The ESS concludes that solar photovoltaics and air source heat pumps are the two main technologies with significant potential and concludes that the development will incorporate air source heat pump systems to all dwellings.

Air source heat pumps are an appropriate low carbon option for the development. To ensure their delivery and accordance with policy D16(4), a condition is recommended.

Waste and resources

While the ESS notes that consideration has been given to household waste and construction waste management, no site waste management plan has been submitted.

To ensure compliance with policy D14(5), it is recommended that a condition is attached to secure a Site Waste Management Plan prior to commencement of works.

To ensure reasonable efforts are made source all materials locally to reduce embodied carbon emissions, a condition requiring details of materials' source and manufacturer is also recommended.

Water efficiency

The ESS includes indicative calculations demonstrating a commitment to the 110 per person per day standard, in accordance with 2013 Building Regulations Part G.

To ensure this standard can be achieved in practice and compliance with D2(1d) of the LPSS, a condition is recommended requiring the submission of water consumption calculations.

Climate change adaptation

The submitted FRA considers an allowance for climate change, in accordance with policy D15(4) of the LPDMP.

Risk of overheating will be assessed through Building Regulations Part O, however the application documents set out how the design of the scheme mitigates overheating through the use of glazing and consideration of ventilation.

Overall, as conditioned, the proposal meets the requirements of policy D2 of the LPSS, policies D14-D17 of the LPDMP (as relevant), and the Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy SPD 2024.

Open space provision

Policy ID6 of the LPDMP sets out the open space requirements for various types of planning applications.

Table ID6b notes that for a scheme of 234 dwellings, amenity / natural green space and children's play space are required to be provided on site as part of the development. Based on the predicted population of the development (as per the Council's open space contributions calculator), the proposal generates a requirement for 266sqm of children's play space and 5,326sqm of amenity / natural green space. These must both be provided on site.

The proposal includes one equipped area of play for children which would be located relatively centrally within the development. Its size, along with the various play trails across the site would amount to a total of 300sqm. This is well above what is required by policy ID6. The details of the play equipment will be secured by condition, and their delivery and maintenance will be controlled through the s106 agreement.

In terms of amenity / natural green space it is noted that the scheme includes the new

village green on the eastern boundary of the site where it adjoins Ockford Park, as well as a large central area of open space. In addition, a large area of open space is proposed around the northern, southern and western perimeters of the site. This equates to an area of 2.48 hectares which is far greater than the 0.533 hectares that is required by the policy. Again, delivery and maintenance of the open space will be controlled through the s106 agreement.

The proposal would offer a range of different spaces from walks around the perimeter of the development to more formal areas of landscaping which will include seating at various points. In qualitative terms it is considered that the open space provision on the site has been well considered and would be of high quality, providing an attractive resource for new residents.

Policy ID6 also notes that contributions for off-site works may be required for parks and recreation grounds, allotments and youth play space. These do not need to be provided on the development site. At the present moment there are no projects that the Council is aware of that would justify a contribution for these three typologies. As such, without an identified project, the collection of these contributions would not meet the relevant CIL/Regulation 122(2) tests and cannot be secured.

The proposal is considered to be compliant with policy ID6 in this regard.

Impact on trees and ancient woodland

Policy P6 of the LPDMP states, *inter alia* that development proposals for sites that contain significant trees, including ancient and veteran trees and ancient woodland, are expected to incorporate the trees and their root structures and understorey in undeveloped land within the public realm, and to provide green linkages between them.

There is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) in place along the western and south-western boundary of the site (TPO 4 of 2025). This protects trees in two separate areas of the boundary, which in total contain 21 broadleaf species. There are also a number of trees along the southern boundary of the site, as well as a hedgerow that runs along the southern side of Halfway Lane.

Off-site but in close proximity to the boundaries is an area of ancient woodland. This is on the western side of Eashing Lane off the north-western corner of the site. In addition, close to the north-eastern boundary of the site is a further TPO, which affords protection to an Oak and a False Acacia (TPO 2 of 2016).

The application has been submitted with an Arboricultural Report. This notes that the individuals and woodlands within or adjacent to the site, whose attributes we consider meet the criteria in policy P6 are as follows:

- the off-site English oak trees nos. 65, 66 and 67 south of Eashing Lane along the southern boundary of the site;
- the two off-site sections of woodland (W1 and W2) to the northwest and south of Eashing Lane fronting the western boundary of the site;
- there are seven mature trees growing on or immediately adjacent to the site; some of these are readily visible in views from public viewpoints and so make a significant contribution to the landscape; others do not;
- there are no category 'A' trees and 14 category 'B' specimens. The remaining 22 trees

are assessed as category 'C' trees, being either of low quality, very limited merit, only low landscape benefits, no material cultural or conservation value, or only limited or short-term potential; or young trees with trunk diameters below 150mm; or a combination of these; and

- of the groups of trees, hedges and woodlands, none have been assessed as category 'A', two as category 'B', and the remaining four as category 'C'.

It is noted that one tree (T121) to be removed to accommodate the proposed development, because it is situated within the footprint of the proposed access road between the proposed development and the road known as Ock Way. Two groups of trees (G1 and G2), and one hedge (H1) are also to be partially removed as part of the proposals. It is noted that T121 is a recently planted small ornamental tree installed as part of the Ockford Park development. The proposed partial removal of group G1 is to reduce a natural boundary growth back to the curtilage and to facilitate the installation of the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings along the southern boundary. The partial removal of group G2 is the short reduction of its southern terminal end by removing 3 metres in length to facilitate the proposed pedestrian footpath connection to Eashing Lane. The remaining length of group G2 is retained along the eastern boundary to maintain screening. A small section of hedgerow would also be removed at the western end of Halfway Lane. This would accommodate access into the proposed pumping station in the north-west corner of the site. One tree to be retained is to be pruned to facilitate implementation of the proposals. This is the off-site semi-mature copper beech tree T69. The pruning will involve the reduction of its northwest canopy extents by up to two metres, leaving this lateral extent no closer to the trunk than 4.5 metres and leaving wounds no greater than 80mm in diameter, which will maintain the existing screening this tree provides.

Parts of the proposed access roads and hard surfacing will encroach within the root protection areas (RPAs) of two of the trees to be retained. Parts of the incursions into the RPA of tree T106 (an Ash) is by a proposed internal access road, and subject to proposed levels, some degree of excavation will be required. To minimise impacts on this specimen, excavation within its RPA will be undertaken manually, under the direct control and supervision of an appointed arboricultural consultant, so that any over dig into the RPA is avoided, and any roots encountered can be treated appropriately. It is also noted that as a species ash has been identified as moderate at tolerating root pruning and disturbance. In addition, it is confirmed that the incursion into the RPA of ash T106 equates to only 7.2% of its RPA. The incursion into the RPA of sycamore tree T54 is by an area of proposed hard surfacing in the form of a cycle/pedestrian link to Eashing Lane and Halfway Lane. This area extends to no more than 8.7% of the trees individual RPA, and does not exceed the 20% maximum incursion into currently unsurfaced ground recommended in the relevant British Standard.

The proposed development does not encroach into the ancient woodland adjacent to the northwest boundary. However, a small section of the proposed pedestrian/cycle link connecting to Eashing Lane encroaches within the minimum 15 metre ancient woodland buffer. The Arboricultural Report notes that the incursion into the 15-metre buffer is confined to a small 2.8sqm section of hard surfacing at the southeast extremity. The proposed pedestrian cycle link is to be constructed to tie in with an existing site access in the north-west corner of the site adjoining the junction between Eashing Lane and Halfway Lane, used by agricultural plant to access the site from Eashing Lane which is located entirely within the 15-metre buffer. As the ancient woodland is situated to the west of Eashing Lane, root growth will be restricted to the western side of the road and less

prevalent to the east and encroaching into the application site. In addition, the proposed hard surfacing by the cycle/footway will not encroach into the RPAs of any of the individuals that comprise the ancient woodland. Accordingly, the report states that there will be no impact on the root systems of any of the trees that comprise the ancient woodland caused by the installation of this small section of hard surfacing.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer has reviewed that application and has raised no objections. The following assessment is noted: The development proposals have very limited impact on the existing trees. The proposed removal of one small young individual tree and the partial removal of two groups of trees and one hedge will represent no alteration to the main arboricultural features of the site, a negligible alteration to the overall arboricultural character of the site and will not have a significant adverse impact on the arboricultural character and appearance of the local landscape. There will be some minor incursions into the root protection areas (RPAs) of some retained trees, but subject to the implementation of the measures recommended in arboricultural implications report and tree protection plan, no significant or long-term damage to their root systems or rooting environments should occur. Located off site on the western side of the development site and the opposite side of Eashing Lane, is a small strip of woodland that has been identified as ancient woodland. There will be no direct incursion into the adjacent ancient woodland and only a very minor and negligible incursion into the associated 15 metre minimum buffer zone...The proposals will not result in any loss of ancient woodland, and avoid any potentially harmful effects on this woodland, and will comply with current UK planning and development guidance.

Subject to a condition securing the above, the proposal is deemed to be acceptable in this regard.

Impact on ecology and biodiversity

Ecology

An Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) has been submitted with the application. This notes that the application site is ecologically unremarkable, comprising predominantly of a cultivated arable field of low ecological distinctiveness. A central portion of the arable field was utilised as a construction compound and access for the adjacent Ockford Park development and now comprises sparsely vegetated urban land, also of low ecological distinctiveness. Other semi-natural habitats within the site are limited to small areas of modified grassland, individual trees and localised linear woody features at the northern and south-western margins. It is noted that the individual trees and the vast majority of boundary linear habitats are proposed for retention. Losses proposed to other baseline habitats are of low ecological significance and can readily be mitigated for through the proposed landscaping regime for the site. It is noted that the proposed landscaping regime, which will secure significant new areas of meadow grassland, tree and hedgerow planting and scrub provision.

The EIA goes on to note that the sites limited habitat interest greatly tempers its value for faunal species. Targeted surveys have confirmed the site to be subject to generally low levels of bat activity, overwhelmingly pipistrelle bats. No evidence of badger activity was recorded. Given the site's context, and separation from potentially suitable waterbodies, great crested newts are deemed absent. Given the limited extent of linear wooded habitat, and that this is proposed to be largely retained, potential impacts on dormouse (if present

locally) can be scoped out. Regarding reptiles, only incidental suitable reptile habitat is present. Nonetheless, reptiles are assumed present in small numbers given their presence in the adjacent development. The site is of low value as a breeding bird resource, primarily on account of the paucity of woody habitats. The open habitats are also of poor suitability for ground nesting birds, and no evidence of ground nesting birds (e.g. skylark) was recorded within the site.

A suite of appropriate avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures are identified in respect of protected and notable species with the potential to be present within the application site. These include sensitive habitat clearance, targeted habitat creation, sensitive lighting strategies and the provision of a large number of integrated bat and bird boxes (equivalent to 50% of built form). These measures will collectively avoid adverse impacts arising and ensure positive outcomes, post-development.

It has been noted earlier in the report that while there is no ancient woodland within the site, an area of off-site ancient woodland is located just under 15 metres from the north-west boundary. This off-site woodland is separated from the application site by an existing road (Eashing Lane). It is noted that the proposals will avoid adverse impacts on this off-site woodland. While a very minor incursion into the 15-metre buffer will arise (totalling 2.8sqm), the incursion is outside any RPAs, on the far side of a road, and will take the form of a no-dig cycle path only. It has negligible potential to adversely impact the ancient woodland, nor amount to deterioration of this irreplaceable resource.

As regards designated sites, the application site is located within a 5km zone of influence around Thursley, Hankley & Frensham Common (Wealden Heaths Phase I) SPA. Given this proximity, potential recreational impacts cannot be scoped out. Accordingly, the proposals seek to secure an appropriate quantum of SANG at the nearby Eashing Field SANG. The application site is within catchment of Eashing Field SANG, which has sufficient remaining capacity to accommodate the proposals. This will be secured by way of a legal agreement and a further assessment is provided later in the report below. In this regard, the proposals would ensure compliance with the Habitat Regulations 2017 (as amended).

The avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures set out in the EIA can be secured by condition.

It is noted that Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) has reviewed the EIA and raise no objections to the development. It is noted that concerns were initially raised about the potential removal of Wych Elm on the site and as a consequence the impact on White-letter Hairstreak butterflies. SWT notes that the Ecological Technical Note (Aurochs Ecology, dated 12 May 2026) details a site visit undertaken in May 2026 which confirms the absence of Wych Elm in the section of H1 (hedge 1) that will be removed / impacted by the proposal. Therefore, the location of Wych Elm will be retained within the hedgerow. It is also understood that the proposed hedgerow strategy for the scheme will include the planting of Wych Elm. The hedgerow strategy would be secured as part of the biodiversity net gain strategy and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan. On this basis SWT have confirmed that they are now content with this element of the proposal.

SWT have recommended conditions to control the submission of a construction and environmental management plan (CEMP), a sensitive lighting management plan, the submission of a habitat management and monitoring plan and an ecological enhancement plan. These can all be secured by condition.

Based upon the Ecological Technical Note (Aurochs Ecology, 12th May 2026) we have no further comment in relation to Wych Elm and White Letter Hairstreak.

The proposal is therefore deemed to be acceptable in this regard.

Biodiversity

Policy ID4 of the LPSS requires that new development must aim to deliver gains in biodiversity, whilst policy P7 of the LPDMP requires a minimum net gain of 20% in biodiversity. The NPPF requires a net gain in biodiversity on all development sites.

The habitat baseline within the application site has been documented in detail across the technical appendices submitted with the application. It is noted that the application site has a baseline value of 19.58 habitat units, generated primarily by the cropland (14.54 habitat units), in addition to the area of vacant or derelict land (4.26 habitat units). The only other semi-natural habitat within the application site comprises modified grassland (contributing 0.42 habitat units) and five individual trees, which contribute a combined 0.36 habitat units. The application site has a baseline value of 2.33 hedgerow units, from a single native hedgerow, measuring 0.32km, and a line of trees measuring 0.1km.

The habitat assessment confirms that there will be a net gain in biodiversity value as a result of the proposed development, subject to full delivery of the proposed habitat creation measures. These include the creation of vegetated gardens, neutral grassland, SuDS features, modified grassland, mixed scrub and the planting of 385 small individual trees. In addition, 0.25km of native hedgerow will be planted along the northern boundary of the application site, connecting to the existing hedgerow and extending its total length to 0.48km. An additional 0.63km of native hedgerows will be planted within the application site in the public realm.

The above interventions achieve a post-development score of 23.61 habitat units, equating to a net gain of 4.04 habitat units (equivalent to +20.62%) and a post-development score of 4.38 hedgerow units, equating to a net gain of 2.06 hedgerow units (equivalent to +88.47%).

No objections have been raised by SWT in relation to biodiversity net gain. The biodiversity interventions will all be delivered on site and their monitoring and management will be secured through a s106 agreement.

The proposal is therefore deemed to be acceptable in this regard.

Impact on air quality

The two closest Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) to the site are Guildford town centre and Godalming. It is noted that an Air Quality Assessment has been submitted with the application.

While the above is acknowledged, it is noted that the proposal includes various measures which will help to reduce its impact on the AQMAs to an acceptable degree. This includes the fact (as explained in detail above) that the site is sustainably located in walking and cycling distance to a range of shops, schools, employment opportunities and public

transport, including the railway station. In addition, the proposal will include electric vehicle charging facilities for all of the dwellings, bicycle charging and secure storage facilities. These measures will all help to encourage the use of transport which is less polluting and that align with good air quality management which in turn will mitigate the impact of the development on the AQMAs.

These measures will be secured by condition, as well as a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which will manage dust from the construction process. On this basis, the Council's Environmental Health Officer raises no objection to the proposal in this regard.

Wealden Heaths SPA

The application site is located within the 400 metre to 5-kilometre buffer of the Wealden Heaths Special Protection Area (WHSPA). Natural England advise that new residential development in proximity of the protected site has the potential to significantly adversely impact on its integrity through increased dog walking and an increase in general recreational use. The application proposes a net increase of 234 residential units and as such has the potential, in combination with other development, to have a significant adverse impact on the protected site.

Where a significant effect has been identified (subject to an Appropriate Assessment) consideration will be given to SANG based solutions within the Wealden Heaths SPA zone of influence. It is however recognised that the form of SANG may not necessarily need to rigidly comply with the Thames Basin Heaths provision standards, provided the SANG as a whole presents a large and suitably attractive semi-natural greenspace. For these reasons SANG based approaches are considered to represent appropriate avoidance measures for the Wealden Heaths SPA.

The applicant has confirmed that SANG capacity for this development will be provided at Eashing Fields. This SANG is currently operational, has a catchment which includes the site and has the capacity to accommodate the mitigation generated by the proposal (4.26096 hectares). This capacity will be secured before the commencement of the development and will be enforced through a planning condition.

It is noted that at present, there is no regime to charge or secure SAMM payments for the WHSPA. As such, this is not be secured as part of this application.

If the above mitigation was secured by way of a condition, the Local Planning Authority is content that the proposed development will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the European site (separate to urbanisation and recreational pressure).

An Appropriate Assessment has been completed by the Local Planning Authority and it has been agreed with Natural England.

Waverley Borough Council element

As noted above, a small section of the development is within the Waverley Borough Council boundary. This has an area of approximately 110sqm and it projects roughly six metres from the Guildford Borough boundary and into Waverley.

This area of land includes the eastern access / egress into the site, comprising of the carriageway, pavements on either side and associated landscaping. As already discussed above, the access would connect into the existing Ock Way.

This element of the application is being assessed by Waverley Borough Council (WBC) through a separate application. As such, the eastern access is not under consideration through this proposal. It is understood that the WBC application will be considered by their Planning Committee after this application is heard by the Guildford Borough Council Planning Committee.

As the application includes the eastern access as part of the transport modelling etc, it is recommended that if planning permission is given for the GBC application, it will be subject to the WBC element also gaining planning permission.

Planning contributions and legal tests

The three tests as set out in Regulation 122(2) require s.106 agreements to be:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

If all other aspects of the application were deemed to be acceptable, then the following contributions could be secured by way of a s.106 agreement.

Affordable housing

The requirement for affordable housing has been set out above. The legal agreement would secure the provision of the number of affordable units, as well as their tenure and mix, so that the proposal is compliant with local and national policies. The legal agreement will also secure the delivery of the affordable units. The obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements of Regulation 122.

Education

Primary and secondary education:

It is noted that Surrey County Council, as the Education Authority, originally requested contributions towards primary and secondary education. However, the request did not set out how or where the contributions would be spent. Without this information, and in particular, details setting out the specific projects at specific schools, the Local Planning Authority cannot be confident that the request meets the three Regulation 122 tests set out above.

Surrey County Council have been given every opportunity to provide details of specific projects and have since confirmed that they 'will not be submitting an education justification for planning application 25/P/01474, as we do not currently have any projects to identify and do not anticipate any in the area in the near future'. The Local Planning Authority notes that this is a very regrettable situation, but given the circumstances presented above, there is no option but to proceed with a determination without securing primary and secondary

education contributions.

Early years education:

The Education Authority have submitted a separate Justification Statement in relation to early years education.

The response notes that Surrey County Council's Childcare Sufficiency Assessment identifies where additional early education provision may be needed by considering current and planned provision, population estimates, take up rates, current setting occupancy rates, the annual census and projected demand for funded early education places. Based on housing trajectories received from the borough and district councils, Surrey County Council states that it is working with local early education and childcare settings to increase the number of funded early years places available to meet the anticipated demand from new housing and delivering infrastructure projects to provide increased capacity.

It is further noted that the early years provision needs to provide funded early education places for children aged from nine months, allowing families to access up to 30 hours of funded childcare in a variety of models. The early years sector is made up of a broad range of providers from maintained school nursery settings to voluntary committee run charity preschools, and to privately owned full day care providers. Surrey County Council recognises that a mix of providers and models often delivers the variety and flexibility that meets the needs of the local community and does not express a preference towards a particular model. A significant proportion of early years places are delivered by the private, voluntary and independent sector which is subject to market fluctuations and can result in settings opening and closing with some frequency. This creates challenges in predicting exactly which early education and childcare providers will meet the resulting demand over the course of housing development projects as early years businesses change ownership and move premises. This is in contrast with primary and secondary schools which tend to be static and enable pupil movement to be much more predictable.

Current analysis indicates that early year's provision in the area is operating at or near capacity, with limited scope for expansion without additional investment. The development is therefore likely to exacerbate existing pressures on early years services. For this development, Surrey County Council would request a contribution of £225,291 towards early years education infrastructure in the local area. The contribution will be used to deliver a project that provides the additional 16.38 early years places generated by the development, the location of which will be determined prior to commencement of the development.

While a specific project or setting has not been identified for the early years contributions, for the reasons given above, it is very challenging for the authorities to provide this information given the way the sector operates. As such, it would be reasonable to secure this contribution with a trigger to ensure that it is spent on an early years setting within the local area.

For these reasons, the early years contribution is required to mitigate the impacts of the development, the obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements of Regulation 122.

Healthcare

The proposal will have an effect on the demand for primary health care services in the area. The NHS (through Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Board (ICB)) note that it is necessary for measures to be put in place so the impacts to local healthcare as a direct result of this development are addressed. They note that the level of contribution (£182,975) is reasonable in scale and kind because it is based on the size and nature of the development. The ICB have indicated that these funds will be used at either Witley Surgery, Mill Medical Practice or Binscombe Medical Centre (or a combination of these sites).

As the contribution is required to mitigate the impacts of the development, the obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements of Regulation 122.

Policing

The proposal as a whole has the potential to increase pressures on existing policing resources in the area. Surrey Police note that the application site is currently a greenfield site which when built upon will create an additional demand upon the police service that does not currently exist. The police will need to recruit additional staff and officers and equip them. The development will also require the services of a police vehicle. Staff and officers will also need to be accommodated in a premises that will enable them to serve the development.

The Police note that their request for a contribution of £46,266.30 is proportionate to the size of the development and is intended to pay for the initial, additional costs resulting directly from the development for those areas where the police do not have existing capacity. Surrey Police note that the application site consists of greenfield land (agricultural), that has a negligible impact on policing. Once developed this site will create an additional demand upon the Police Service that does not currently exist. The police will need to recruit and equipment additional staff and officers. The development will also require the services of a police vehicle and investment into Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) infrastructure and speed control measures. Staff and officers will also need to be accommodated in a premises that will enable them to serve the development. This request is resulting directly from the development for those areas where the police do not have existing capacity. The request also explains how the police service is funded, outlines National Planning Policy support for policing contributions and references numerous appeal decisions where police requests for developer contributions have been upheld. The response goes on to note that Police forces nationally, are not in a position to support major development of the scale now being proposed for many of the nation's town and cities without the support from the planning system. If they were obliged to do so using their own resources only, then it is reasonable to conclude that there would be a serious risk of service degradation as existing coverage is stretched to encompass the new development and associated population growth. They note that this is already evident across Surrey due to the significant numbers of housing being developed and clearly shown by the increasing numbers of recorded crimes in Surrey over the last year.

As the contribution is required to mitigate the impacts of the development, the obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements of Regulation 122.

Highways

The County Highway Authority have requested a number of contributions and s106 requirements as part of the application. These have already been discussed in the report above. In summary, the following highways contributions are being secured:

- a Travel Plan auditing fee of £5,000;
- a contribution of £30,000 towards securing a TRO for the Eashing Lane 20mph Zone and 7.5t Weight Restriction Scheme; and
- £250,000 towards the provision of an improved Digital Demand Response Transport (Bus Service) which will cover the new development.

The legal agreement will also secure the operation of a car club from the site.

These measures all help to mitigate the impact of the proposal on the surrounding highway network and are necessary, directly related to the development and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements of Regulation 122.

Open space and biodiversity

A number of elements relating to open space will be secured through the legal agreement. These include a manner of securing the delivery of the public open space throughout the development including the children's play areas and the new village green. This is required to ensure that adequate amenity space is provided at the various stages of construction and to ensure that all of the approved facilities are in place once the development has been completed.

The s106 will also secure the establishment of a management company for the development. The management company will be responsible for the management and maintenance of the public open spaces within the site.

Furthermore, the legal agreement will secure the biodiversity net gain which is to be provided on site, as well as its ongoing management and maintenance.

These matters are required to ensure that the proposal meets the objectives of the Local Plan as regards open space provision and therefore, the obligation is necessary, directly related to the development and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements of Regulation 122.

Other s106 matters

The s106 agreement will also secure the custom-build units, including their marketing etc and details of how and when they can be disposed of if there is no interest in their purchase.

In addition, monitoring payments (including BNG monitoring) will be secured as part of the legal agreement.

Final balancing exercise

Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged in this instance, as the relevant policies for the determination of the application are considered to be out-of-date. The application should therefore be determined in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, unless the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.

In circumstances where the tilted balance is engaged, the decision-maker is not undertaking a level or even-handed planning balance. The Framework intentionally applies additional weight in favour of sustainable development, reflecting the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Consequently, planning permission should be granted unless the identified harms would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme.

In terms of the harm generated by the proposal it is noted that the development would result in the permanent loss of subgrade 3a best and most versatile agricultural land. The PPG notes that decisions 'should avoid unnecessary loss of BMV land' and policy E5(3) (rural economy) of the LPSS states that 'agricultural land will be protected as set out in national policy and the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land will be taken into account'. Whilst not ideal, the proposal would result in the loss of just 9.7ha of arable farmland which is currently in active use. Given the size of the holding and the loss, **moderate weight** is afforded to its loss.

The proposal would also inevitably result in some harm to the local landscape surrounding the site. As discussed above, the harm would be very localised and would be mitigated to some extent by the additional landscaping proposed through the development. Given this, **moderate weight** is afforded to this harm.

No other harms which flow from the proposal have been identified.

In terms of the benefits of the proposal, these will be set out below.

The proposal would deliver a total of 234 dwellings in a mix which is generally compliant with the SHMA. Given the Council's five-year housing land supply and that paragraph 158 of the NPPF states that 'development which complies with the Golden Rules [which this proposal does] should be given significant weight in favour of the grant of permission', this matter is afforded **significant** weight in the planning balance.

Of the 234 dwellings, 117 would be affordable properties. While it is acknowledged that this what policy requires, nevertheless, the provision of a large number of affordable dwellings with an acceptable mix, in a borough where there is significant demand for such properties is deemed to be a benefit of the proposal. Given the level of need and what is set out by paragraph 158 of the NPPF, this matter is afforded **significant** weight in the planning balance.

It is noted that a number of residents have raised concerns about highway safety in the area. As part of the application, the applicant has agreed to implement and fund a range of measures which will help to improve highway safety. These include the reduction of the speed limit along Eashing Road, the provision of traffic calming measures and new crossing points for pedestrians. These measures will help to improve highway safety in the area, not only for future residents of the development but also for other road users.

Moderate weight is afforded to this matter.

The applicant has agreed to a wide range of contributions which will help to improve community facilities in the area including early years education, healthcare and policing. While it is acknowledged that these contributions are required to mitigate the impacts of the development, nonetheless they will result in some public benefits. **Moderate** weight is afforded to this matter.

The proposal would result in job opportunities during the construction phase. While it is difficult to quantify the benefit to the local / national economy and even though it is acknowledged that the jobs would be of a temporary nature, nonetheless the development would result in the generation of some additional economic activity. **Moderate** weight is afforded to this matter.

The proposal includes large areas of open space and play areas which will be available for the public to use. While again it is noted that open space and play areas of high quality are a fundamental requirement of the planning process, nonetheless, the development would bring tangible benefits in this regard. **Moderate** weight is afforded to this matter.

The benefits of the proposal are wide ranging and long lasting. The harm resulting from the proposal relates to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and some local landscape harms. However, as noted above, these harms are clearly outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. As such, the adverse impacts of granting permission would, in this instance, be significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

The proposed development would deliver 234 dwellings, including 117 affordable homes, together with associated infrastructure, public open space, landscaping, biodiversity enhancements and pedestrian and cycle connections. The proposal has been carefully assessed against the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and all other material considerations.

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and, therefore, paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged. In this context, significant weight is attributed to the delivery of market and affordable housing on a sustainable site adjoining the existing built-up area of Godalming.

Having regard to the updated provisions of the NPPF, Officers conclude that the proposal would not constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The site is considered to be Grey Belt and it meets the relevant Golden Rules set out in the Framework. The development has been designed in a manner which produces a high-quality residential environment to a good design.

The proposal has also been assessed in relation to heritage impacts. It is concluded that the development would preserve the setting and significance of nearby designated and non-designated heritage assets, including Westbrook Registered Park and Garden, Eashing Bridge and other surrounding heritage assets. No harm has been identified to the significance of heritage assets as a result of the development.

The proposal would provide a policy-compliant level of affordable housing and would deliver a range of wider improvements, including new publicly accessible open space, children's play areas, sustainable drainage infrastructure, biodiversity net gain, active travel improvements and financial contributions towards local infrastructure and services. Subject to the recommended planning conditions and completion of the section 106 agreement, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable impacts in relation to highways, flooding and drainage, ecology, neighbouring amenity, design, arboriculture or environmental impacts.

The site occupies a sustainable location adjacent to the urban area of Godalming, with future residents benefiting from access to existing schools, services, employment opportunities and public transport connections. The proposed development would therefore represent a sustainable form of development in accordance with the overarching objectives of the NPPF.

However, it has to be acknowledged that the development would result in some loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and some harm to local views and landscape.

Overall, Officers conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan when read as a whole and that there are no material considerations which indicate that planning permission should be withheld. The adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. Accordingly, subject to the completion of the section 106 agreement and the planning conditions set out above, the application is recommended for approval.