



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 15, 21 and 24 September 2026

Site visit made on 15 September 2026

by Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6008529

Land at Shortlands Farm, Guildford Road, Ash, Surrey GU12 6DF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Gleeson Land Limited against Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/P/01521.
 - The development proposed is described as *'Outline planning application with all matters except for the accesses from Guildford Road and Wyke Lane reserved for subsequent approval for the demolition of the existing buildings and hardstanding and the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings including affordable housing and plots for self-build (class C3); green and blue infrastructure and associated service and utility structures'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing buildings and hardstanding and the erection of up to 200 residential dwellings including affordable housing and self-build plots (Class C3), green and blue infrastructure and associated service and utility structures with all matters reserved except for the accesses from Guildford Road and Wyke Lane, at Shortland Farm, Guildford Road, Ash, GU12 6DF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 25/P/01521, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Inquiry was opened but adjourned on the 15 September 2026 due to a participant becoming unwell. It was also adjourned for a second time on the 21 September 2026 after I had been informed that there were no residual points of dispute between the Council and appellant. The second adjournment was granted to allow the parties time to firm up their positions through an updated Statement of Common Ground. Interested parties were kept informed of the adjournments and were afforded a chance to address the Inquiry at a virtual session on the 24 September 2026. Accordingly, no prejudice was caused.
3. During the Inquiry, several documents were submitted by active participants. Although some were provided very late in proceedings and were technical in nature, I accepted them because the submissions were relevant and capable of being addressed by the parties present without significant adjournments. The relevant documents are listed at the end of this decision letter.

4. The planning application was submitted in outline with all matters of detail reserved for future consideration save for the main access points into the scheme. I have assessed the proposal on this basis.
5. A Placemaking Plan was submitted with the appellant's proofs of evidence. If, as the Council suggests, the Placemaking Plan is intended to 'fix' or 'secure' elements of the design, then interested parties ought to have been offered a chance to comment on it as this would represent a material change to the submissions given that layout is a reserved matter. For example, the residents of Wyke may wish to indicate whether they are for or against the location and character of the 'Lane Edge' shown on the Plan. Interested parties were not afforded such an opportunity though. Consequently, there would be procedural unfairness if I were to treat the Placemaking Plan as setting firm proposals to be secured. As such, I have instead treated the Plan as being evidence in support of the appellant's case that an acceptable scheme could be devised.
6. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') was published shortly before the Inquiry opened. All parties were able to address this change through their written submissions and again at the inquiry.

Background

7. The Council failed to determine the planning application within the prescribed period and therefore the appellant exercised their right to submit this appeal. The Council initially confirmed through putative reasons for refusal that, had it still been able to do so, it would have refused the proposal due to concerns regarding the impact on the Green Belt, biodiversity, infrastructure and the character and appearance of the area. Nevertheless, the Council and appellant have subsequently reached agreement that the appeal should be allowed. After carefully considering the submissions, including the concerns of interested parties, I have arrived at the same view for the reasons given below.

Reasons

The effect on the significance of listed buildings

8. York House is a Grade II listed building believed to have origins in the 16th Century. The building is shown on the 1871 OS map as a remote public house, but it was probably built as a farmhouse or agricultural worker's dwelling. The public house shut in the 20th Century with the use reverting to residential. Thus, the building has architectural and historic value as a repository of traditional building techniques, architectural styles and social history. These values impart significance.
9. The setting of the building contributes to how its significance is experienced. This is because the building can still be viewed with a semblance of an undeveloped rural backdrop on account of surviving paddocks and fields, which hint at its original purpose and context. The extent of this contribution is generally limited though. This is because the fields are mainly to the southeast on account of recent development. Moreover, nearby intensive equestrian activity at the appeal site has weakened the agricultural backdrop, and intervening planting results in an enclosed feel to the listed building and an insulation from the wider landscape.
10. The proposed development would be a short distance to the east of York House. It therefore has the potential to encroach harmfully on the setting of the listed building

and result in cumulative impacts given the presence of new housing at Leyscroftes Road. However, the proposed houses would be located beyond a small intervening field which provides a modest buffer. Although useful, this buffer would need to be enhanced by positioning residential properties in from the boundary and behind an open space in a similar way to that shown on the Placemaking Plan. This would ensure the proposed housing to the east would be no closer to the listed building than the existing houses to the west.

11. Moreover, restricting the nearest houses to modest two storey properties, which can be secured at the reserved matters stage, would further minimise the visual impact as experienced from the listed building. Indeed, the architectural and historic value could still be experienced with a semblance of a rural backdrop. However, the open rural setting would be reduced. Accordingly, the proposal with mitigation would result in a low level of residual harm to the building's significance.
12. East Wyke Farm Cottages¹ is also Grade II listed. It was formerly a single house, now divided, and built in the mid-18th Century. Historic mapping from 1895 shows that the property was part of a small farmstead surrounded by open countryside. It has architectural value and significance as a good example of a dwelling built in the local vernacular. It also has historic value and significance in its illustration of the area's rural and agricultural origins.
13. The listed building is on a slightly raised area of land with open views across neighbouring fields to the north in the direction of the appeal site. Whilst its primary setting remains the immediate gardens and the collection of buildings along Pound Farm Lane, views out towards the surrounding open countryside contribute positively to its significance by re-enforcing the building's functional relationship with the surrounding land and the way it sits apart from any settlement. These views primarily take in the fields immediately north of the listed building, but the appeal site is visible in the backdrop. It is likely that the intervening fields, and potentially the appeal site, were part of the landholding of the historic farm and therefore have an historic association. The existing agricultural pattern of land use contributes to an understanding of the listed building's historic purpose. The extent to which the setting contributes to significance is therefore moderate.
14. The fields closest to the listed building would remain in their existing condition with the proposal in place. Furthermore, the proposal could be set behind new planting, principally in the form of new and enhance field boundaries in the form of hedges and trees. There would also be a buffer provided by an on-site open space. The distance between the designated heritage asset and the development would also soften the impact provided the scale of buildings is minimised.
15. Although the proposed development would be visible from the vicinity of the listed building, the immediate rural setting would be largely unaltered. However, the wider open setting would be diminished and its land use changed to a more suburban character. Additionally, the historic association between the listed building and the surrounding fields would be eroded. This would result in an adverse impact on the ability to experience the listed building's significance. The impact would be greater to East Wyke Farm than York House, but still low.
16. Policy D3 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 (the 'LP') explains that proposals which effect heritage assets will be considered in

¹ The building is referred to West Wyke Farm on historic maps

accordance with the Framework. To this end, Policy HE6(4) of the Framework states that harm to significance should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. In calibrating this balance, the Framework explains that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and that any harm should have a clear and convincing justification. Indeed, there is a statutory presumption in favour of preservation (doing no harm) when applying Section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Thus, Policy HE6(3) states that harm to a designated heritage asset is a matter of considerable importance and weight.

17. The proposal would result in a low level of harm to the significance of two listed buildings through development within their setting. Their settings would not be preserved. As explained above, this is a matter which carries considerable importance and weight against the scheme. That said, for reasons I go into, the public benefits of the proposal are collectively matters which carry weight of a very high order. Indeed, the benefits would be of sufficient force to outweigh the harm to the designated heritage assets in this instance. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policy HE6 of the Framework and by extension Policy D3 of the LP.

The effect on landscape character and the countryside

18. The appeal site is a parcel of land in the countryside located in the Wanborough Wooded Clay Lowland as defined in the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment. This explains that the sparse historic pattern of scattered farmsteads, manors and old villages is overlaid by more recent 20th Century settlement. Indeed, map regression demonstrates the dramatic changes to the countryside around Ash Station in the last 100 years. Remnants of the older pre 20th Century landscape are however discernible, especially in the field pattern.
19. The Guildford Landscape Character Assessment is a finer grained analysis than the County study and locates the site in Area E1, Tongham Rural-Urban Fringe. Positive landscape attributes are identified as traditional farmsteads, mature woodland blocks and belts, hedgerows and green fingers providing a connection between the countryside and urban areas and footpaths. The assessment goes on to explain that Area E1 is a rural urban fringe landscape that is in poor condition with poor quality horse pastures and unmanaged land creating a degraded setting. Sensitivities are identified as views towards the 'Hog's Back', woodland, hedgerows and hedgerow trees and the setting of historic farm buildings. The assessment was written in 2007, but these findings are still relevant and accurate. That said, the assessment does not account for the significant change to Area E1 on account of the large urban extension to the west of Harper's Road.
20. The appeal site and its immediate surroundings are generally typical and representative of the positive and negative aspects of Area E1. Taking the positive qualities first: there is still a semblance of the older underlying pre 20th Century rural landscape. Indeed, historic field boundaries are marked by mature hedges and several impressive hedgerow trees. In respect of scenic qualities, there are views across the appeal site from Guildford Road towards the open countryside and distant 'Hogs Back' beyond. These views are also apparent when walking along Footpath 365, which passes through the site.
21. The northern part of the site provides a pleasant open 'gateway' on the approach into Ash. There are also pleasing views over this area from Footpath 365 towards the period housing along Guildford Road. Furthermore, the site has some natural

heritage value as demonstrated by the Ecological Impact Assessment and limited cultural value on account of being in the setting of two listed buildings.

22. Conversely, the condition of the area is relatively degraded because the hedgerows are of variable quality, with some being gappy. Ad hoc equestrian activity, including the subdivision of historic fields into smaller paddocks with fencing, has resulted in a localised reduction in the scenic quality of the site immediately south of Footpath 356. The former farm buildings, ménage, extensive fencing and lighting are visual detractors. There are some distinctive features in the locality, such as the Special Protection Area to the north or Week Wood to the south, but the appeal site and its immediate context is generally unremarkable, albeit with some features of value.
23. The footpath through the site linking Wyke Lane and Harper's Road is short and probably more of a movement corridor than a recreational destination. The appeal site is not especially tranquil or deeply rural given the presence of the A323 and development on three sides. There are no known cultural or artistic associations with the site. Although it is used for equestrian activities, it is not open access land. The site plays a functional role in separating the Wyke estate and the village of Normandy from Ash, but this is not a defined green wedge or gap, and the Wyke estate is not a historic settlement. The value of this functional role is modest.
24. Considering the forgoing, the landscape value of the appeal site and its immediate context is middling. Its susceptibility (vulnerability) to change is quite low given its condition, location on the edge of a large built-up area and the presence of residential enclaves to its immediate north and east. Combining value and susceptibility gives an indication of the area's sensitivity to change. In this instance, the sensitivity is generally low-moderate.
25. The appeal scheme would urbanise the appeal site, dramatically altering its character from a parcel of land with an underlying rural character to a modern housing estate. The landscape value of the site would therefore be diminished. The proposal would also erode the gap between Ash and Normandy but not significantly given the enclosing presence of the Wyke estate, a belt of trees beyond this and housing along Guildford Road. Overall, the magnitude of change to the landscape character could potentially be high adverse.
26. That said, the drawings submitted with the appeal demonstrate that the scheme could be delivered with nearly all the existing mature trees and hedges retained and the hedgerows strengthened and improved. Importantly, the housing could be set amongst generous areas of open space to the north and south linked by a central 'green corridor'. This would improve recreational access and retain a spatial and visual connection between Guildford Road and the open landscape to the south, including views towards the Hogs Back. The northern open space could be a very pleasant feature on the approach into Ash, having the character of a green or common. The row of TPO protected trees along the public footpath would soften the development and retain a sense of maturity². The proposal can therefore respond to several of the positive qualities that make up the landscape character of the site. Thus, the harmful impact can be moderated such that the residual magnitude of change could be moderate adverse.

² This is of course provided there is no post development pressure to remove them due to the effect on the living conditions of future occupants from loss of light or nuisance. This need not occur with a sensitive layout.

27. As demonstrated by the zone of theoretical visibility in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), there is generally low potential for the scheme to be visible beyond the immediate site boundaries. Indeed, the Council has taken no issue with the eight representative viewpoints identified. The impact on views from Guildford Road would be of high magnitude, despite the screening effect of the TPO trees. This is due to the scale and extent of the development.
28. The same can be said of views from Wyke Lane where, at present, the built form of Ash is generally subservient to soft landscaping due to the presence of mature trees and hedges along Harper's Road. Furthermore, views towards the spire of St Peter's Church from Wyke Lane would likely be obscured. The visual impacts from Harper's Road, including from the recreation ground, would be less pronounced given the extent of existing intervening landscaping.
29. Receptors walking around the edge of the appeal site would be moving slowly and thus more sensitive to the change. The impact would be even more noticeable from the footpath through the site, as the houses would be visible at close range. Residents in several nearby properties would also have their current view of the appeal site harmed by the development, although private views are of less concern.
30. That said, landscaping, including street trees, and careful treatment of building heights and materials (such as muted colours) at the reserved matters stage would soften the impact in views from the wider landscape, including Harper's Lane in the vicinity of Viewpoint 08 (in the LVIA). The proposed open spaces could be designed to be visually positive landscape features as they mature, especially if coupled with attractive buildings of an appropriate scale orientated to overlook them. The front cover of the Design and Access Statement hints at what could be achieved. As such, the localised visual impact would be of a high magnitude although this would dissipate quickly the further one is from the appeal site. Overall, the visual impact would be moderate adverse.
31. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the landscape character and visual amenity of the area. However, the impact can be mitigated to an extent and would be localised. Overall, the harm would be moderate adverse, in that there would be a clear and noticeable change but, with mitigation, the area is capable of absorbing it without an impact of a higher order. Consequently, although the impact would not be of a high order, it would nevertheless be at odds with Policies P3 of the LP and D4 of the Guildford Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2023 (DMP), in so far as they seek to safeguard the character of the countryside.
32. Moreover, there would be a conflict with Policy N2(1)(a) of the Framework, which seeks to ensure developers consider the environmental qualities of land, including landscape character and the natural beauty of the countryside, and then identify opportunities for those qualities to be conserved or enhanced. I so no reason why conservation could not have a protective component. In this instance, the scheme would conserve some important and valued features, but the underlying rural character of the site is an inherent quality that would not be conserved because it would essentially be lost.

Whether the proposal could be well-designed

33. Policy DP3 of the Framework seeks to secure development that is well-designed. In this respect, Policy DP3(1) states that a proposal should respond to, and

integrate with, its context. Policy DP3(2) sets out aspects of a well-designed place that should be evident in a scheme (where relevant).

34. Although the appeal site has an underlying rural character and is contiguous with the open countryside to the south, its context is also heavily influenced by its location on the fringe of a built-up area. Indeed, the presence of this large built-up area means a scheme of up to 200 homes would not be out of scale with the settlement of Ash. Thus, the key question when assessing whether the proposal would respond to its context is whether the proposal could integrate with local patterns and forms of development and the urban/rural fringe character.
35. To the east of the appeal site is the small housing estate of Wyke, which is characterised by modest two storey semi-detached houses of a repeated 'cottage' style with dark roofs and chimneys. The houses are positioned behind generous front gardens and at the centre is a large open space. This layout affords a high degree of harmony and coherence. The low density also facilitates a verdancy and a comfortable transition to the more open countryside.
36. To the north of the appeal site is the cluster of houses along Guildford Road and Pinewood Road. Unlike at Wyke, the styling is more varied, but the houses do not exceed two storeys in height and follow clear building lines. This again results in harmony and coherence. Houses face onto the public realm in both Wyke and the Guildford Road cluster resulting in a clear pattern of development. Mature trees also provide a backdrop. I did not observe, and have not been directed to, any three storey properties in the immediate context of the appeal site.
37. The large built-up area of Ash is located to the west of Harper's Road. This incorporates housing estates of various ages that have been constructed incrementally. That said, the housing west of Harper's Road is generally screened from the appeal site by a deep belt of mature trees and hedges. Receptors in the area would be aware the urban area is there, especially as they would likely be moving to and from it, but it presents less of a contextual influence on the appeal site than the housing at Wyke or Guildford Road.
38. The Council initially raised concerns about whether the design of the scheme could respond to its context. These reservations centred on the appropriateness of three storey properties at the appeal site, the overall net density of the scheme and the relationship of the built form with Wyke Lane, where the illustrative layout shows houses backing onto this road.
39. Taking each in turn: the scheme would have a net density of around 35 dwellings per hectare (dph). This would be about twice that of the housing at Wyke and along Guildford Road. The density of development is higher to the west of Harper's Road but, as explained above, this has less contextual influence on the site. As such, the density of the scheme would not respond to the immediate context.
40. Similarly, there are no three storey buildings anywhere near the appeal site. The provision of such in the appeal scheme would therefore be out of character, with the associated risk of appearing strident and thus prominent. The Placemaking Plan suggests that three storey buildings could be confined to the 'entrance' area along the public footpath and therefore behind the TPO trees. However, the three-storey scale would still be very apparent despite the softening effect of the trees, especially in the winter. As screening can only mitigate negative impacts rather than remove them, it ought not to be regarded as a substitute for well-designed

contextually appropriate development. The massing would also have a greater impact on the visual connection between Guildford Road and the open countryside to the south than if two storey homes of a similar scale to those around the site were proposed. This is demonstrated by the Proposed Parameter Section Plan.

41. Housing backing onto Wyke Lane would clearly be an alien arrangement and contrary to basic urban design principles. It is therefore very difficult to understand how such a layout made its way into the illustrative masterplan.
42. Accordingly, the Council were correct to raise these concerns, which were informed by the Urban Design Officer. However, it is important to note that Policy DP3(3) of the Framework requires a scheme to respond to, and integrate with, its context unless there is "clear justification" not to. The appellant and Council agree that this means a clear design justification. Policy DP3(1) outlines what could be a clear design justification with reference to Policy L3 of the Framework, which sets out a minimum density of 35dph on sites within a reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station. The appeal site meets these criteria.
43. Consequently, in this instance national policy seeks a density higher than that of the immediate context. Moreover, Wyke is a product of its time with a very low density by modern standards. Building at that density is unlikely to be an efficient use of the site given contemporary pressures on land. The built form of the scheme can also be softened by street trees, planting in front gardens, retaining mature trees and hedges and from the provision of generous open spaces. Therefore, the higher density would not preclude a verdant well-designed scheme being devised. As such, there is a clear justification for the proposed density.
44. In respect of building heights, the appellant has confirmed that three storey properties are not required to achieve the minimum target density of 35dph. This is because the plot ratio method could be employed whereby the density is increased elsewhere in the scheme without additional built form. For example, a pair of semis can occupy the same built form as a detached house. Consequently, there is no clear justification for including three storey buildings. Such inclusion could therefore be a reason to refuse when applying Policy DP3(3) of the Framework given the impact. However, 'scale' (and thus height) is a reserved matter to be considered in the future. Reference to three storey buildings at this stage is therefore indicative rather than a firm proposal. It follows that this potentially significant flaw in the indicative design is not fatal to this outline scheme because it does not go to the principle of whether up to 200 homes can be provided successfully.
45. The same applies to weaknesses in the proposed layout as shown on the illustrative masterplan, such as the relationship with Wyke Lane, awkward plot sizes and shapes and the ad hoc orientation of houses resulting in a lack of coherence and composition to building lines and street scenes. However, this can all be addressed at the reserved matters stage. Indeed, the Placemaking Plan demonstrates that tighter building lines and active edges to the perimeter blocks could be achieved. The visualisation on the front of the Design and Access Statement also hints at what could be achieved in terms of design quality, with a simple cottage style architecture and high levels of landscaping combining to deliver a semi-rural contextually appropriate character.
46. In respect of Policy DP3(2), the Placemaking Plan demonstrates at a high level that a scheme can be devised which priorities walking and incorporates focal points,

internal views, active edges and attractive street scenes framed by buildings and incorporating trees. The layout can also include high levels of soft landscaping and space for nature as a response to the urban/rural fringe location. Again, the Council has complete control over the layout through the requirement to submit reserved matters for approval. The Placemaking Plan demonstrates that there is nothing inherent in the scheme or local context that would prevent the principles in Policy DP3(2) being realised. Moreover, added comfort can be drawn from Policies D1 of the LP and DP4 of the Framework, which outline an expectation that schemes such as proposal should be subject to an assessment by a Design Review Panel and informed by an appropriate use of other design tools.

47. In conclusion, arriving at a successful design would be a challenge and may require some imaginative thinking rather than a standardised approach. However, when taking the foregoing points together, an appropriate well-designed scheme would not be inherently unachievable. Thus, a conflict with Policy DP3 of the Framework need not occur. Similarly, I am satisfied the proposal could adhere to Policies D1 of the LP and Policy D4 of DMP, in so far as they seek high-quality design.

Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt

48. Policy P2 of the LP explains that inappropriate development in the Green Belt will not be permitted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. It states that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reasons of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The policy goes on to explain that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt will constitute inappropriate development unless they fall within a list of exceptions identified in the Framework. The policy is therefore materially consistent with the most recent version of the Framework.
49. Policy GB6 of the Framework states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within a closed list of categories outlined in Policy GB7. The appellant principally relies on the exception in Policy GB7(g) in making a case that the appeal scheme would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Taking the points in Policy GB7(g) in turn below:

Whether the development would utilise grey belt land

50. Grey Belt is defined in the Framework 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)³, (b)⁴ or (d)⁵. In respect of Purpose (a), the Planning Practice Guide outlines considerations that can be used to inform a judgment as to whether land makes a strong contribution to checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area(s). A strong contribution is likely to be made by land that is adjacent or near to a large built-up area and:

- Is free of existing development;
- Lacks physical feature(s) in reasonable proximity that could restrict and contain development; and

³ Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

⁴ Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

⁵ Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- If developed, would result in an incongruous pattern of development (such as an extended “finger” of development into the Green Belt).
51. Whereas the PPG suggests a moderate contribution is likely to be made by land that is adjacent or near to a large built-up area, but includes one or more features that weaken its contribution to Purpose (a), such as (but not limited to):
- Having physical feature(s) in reasonable proximity that could restrict and contain development;
 - Is partially enclosed by existing development, such that new development would not result in an incongruous pattern of development; and
 - Is subject to other urbanising influences.
52. The appeal site is on the edge of, and thus adjacent to, a conurbation of merged and contiguous settlements which includes Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham. This is a large built-up area. When considering whether land is free of existing development, I do not consider this means any development at all, as otherwise a single fence or access track could be indicative of land not strongly contributing to Purpose (a). That said, the level of existing development in the appeal site goes beyond a minor level. Indeed, it includes a large equestrian facility in a broadly central position which includes extensive hardstanding and a cluster of buildings. Accordingly, the site is not free of existing development.
53. To the east of the appeal site is Wyke Lane and beyond this is a mid-20th Century housing estate. Similarly, to the north is Guildford Road and beyond this is housing focussed on Pinewood Road. The presence of the roads and houses together combine to provide physical features to the north and east that would naturally restrict and contain development within the appeal site. This existing development also partially encloses the appeal site.
54. There are no obvious features along the southern boundary of the appeal site which would naturally contain development. However, the proposal would not project beyond the southern extent of Wyke Avenue. This is significant because an extension of built form beyond Wyke Avenue would appear as an incongruous finger of development. It follows that the southern boundary of the Wyke estate provides some indirect containment. Thus, the considerations in the PPG indicate the appeal site makes a moderate contribution to Purpose (a), not a strong one.
55. In addition to the criteria in the PPG, it can also be relevant and helpful to consider the contribution made to Purpose (a) by the wider land parcel within which the site is located. This is because a site may be part of a wider land parcel that makes a strong contribution to Purpose (a). This could be an important indicator that the site strongly contributes to Purpose (a). To this end, both the appellant and Council consider the Guildford Green Belt Assessment 2026 (GGBA) is a relevant consideration. This study places the appeal site in land parcel BV-003. It concludes that this land parcel makes only a Moderate contribution to Purpose (a). Accordingly, this conclusion reinforces my own view regarding the site.
56. The conclusion in the GGBA is different to that in the Council's 2009 Green Belt study, which found the land parcel (then called H17) to be ‘high sensitivity’ because three of the four Green Belt purposes were ‘met’. I am not satisfied that simply meeting a purpose can automatically be taken to mean a strong contribution to that

purpose. It is possible land can meet a Green Belt purpose but do so in a way that only moderately contributes to it. In any event, the sensitivity score appears to include Purpose (c), which is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, Purpose (c) is not relevant to the question of whether land is Grey Belt. Consequently, I afford limited weight to the findings of the 2009 study, because it seems to be assessing something different.

57. There has been some suggestion that the appeal site prevents neighbouring towns merging into one another. However, as Wyke and Normandy are not towns, and Guildford is several miles to the east, what contribution there is to Purpose (b) is not a strong one. There is no convincing suggestion from any party that the appeal site makes a strong contribution to Purpose (d). Indeed, this was the finding for land Parcel H17 in 2009 and again in the more recent GGBA of 2026. The finding in respect of the latter, which I share, is that 'the land parcel is not adjacent to or within the setting of a historic town and as such makes no notable contribution to Purpose (d)'. Accordingly, the appeal site makes a moderate contribution to Purpose (a) and weak contributions to Purposes (b) and (d). It is Grey Belt land.

Whether the proposal would fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan

58. The GGBA concludes that land parcel BV-003 makes a strong contribution to Purposes (a) – (d) when they are taken together i.e. Purpose (c) is included. However, in quantitative terms the appeal site accounts for a very limited portion of the Green Belt within the borough. Qualitatively, it does not make a strong contribution to three of the purposes. It is also away from the main town of Guildford. It is therefore very difficult to see how developing it would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Whether there is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed

59. On behalf of the Council, Mr Johnson has confirmed within his proof of evidence that the housing land supply currently stands at 2.98 years. Consequently, there is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed when applying Footnote 41 of the Framework.

Whether the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to Policy TR3 of the Framework

60. The appeal scheme would be a large development which would generate a significant number of movements. Some of these movements need not be by private motorised transport because there are several facilities listed in the Transport Assessment within a 1500m (20 mins) walking distance. It is of note that Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) refers to the concept of 20-minute neighbourhoods. Future residents would be able to access these facilities by walking along pavements on the southern side of Guildford Road or using Footpath 356. The latter would be upgraded as part of the scheme. In particular, Consequently, the walking routes are generally flat, direct and safe, especially that to Ash Station, a well-connected station only 800m away.
61. However, few of the other facilities listed in the Transport Assessment are within a reasonable walking distance (of 800m). This would negatively affect the desirability of walking. For example, a parent or guardian would face a 30min round walk, twice a day, to escort their child to and from the nearest primary school. Moreover,

cycling would be a challenge as there is insufficient width to upgrade the busy Guildford Road with a dedicated cycle path. This would likely suppress cycling as a realistic choice of transport modes for most future occupants.

62. However, the proximity of Ash Rail Station and bus stops along Guildford Road would provide a very good level of public transport connectivity. Pedestrians using the station would need to pass over the level crossing, but there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest this presents a notable barrier for commuters arriving at the station on foot. That said, the proximity of public transport is in some ways secondary to walking because active travel (such as walking) has health benefits and aids resilience on account of being free.
63. The Connectivity Tool in Policy TR3 of the Framework supports this mixed picture, as the appeal site scores lower on measures such as walking to health facilities, education and workplaces but high on public transport connectivity to education and shopping. The overall connectivity score ranges between 48/100 and 55/100 in absolute terms, which is unremarkable. However, when considered in relative terms the site is within the top 10% of locations in the “rural village” classification. Nevertheless, that simply means that the site performs well in a category which is second bottom (out of six) in terms of connectivity. Moreover, the site scores poorly in a borough that is otherwise one of the more connected (the borough being ‘B’ on an A-J scale). That said, Ash is a logical location in the borough for new homes given its relative size. Indeed, it was allocated an urban extension, which indicates it is a sustainable location for significant levels of housing.
64. Considering the foregoing, the site is not in a very sustainable location, but that is not the relevant test in the Framework. On balance, the ability to walk to some facilities and the very good public transport combine to ensure the appeal site is a sustainable location for a development of up to 200 homes.

Whether the development would comply with the “Golden Rules” in Policy GB8

65. The submitted planning obligation would secure 50% of the homes as affordable housing and necessary improvements to local and national infrastructure. The green infrastructure parameter plan, alongside planning conditions and the planning obligation, would secure provision of new green space, which is accessible to the public, makes a positive contribution to the landscape setting of the development and supports nature recovery. Indeed, by retaining and enhancing the identified acid grassland and riparian habitats next to the watercourse, the proposal satisfies the requirement that green space contributes to the Local Nature Recovery outcomes. There is nothing before me to suggest the scheme would not meet relevant local standards regarding the provision of green space. The scheme would therefore comply with the Golden Rules.

Overall conclusion

66. Given the assessment outlined above, the appeal scheme would adhere to all the criteria in Policy GB7(g) of the Framework. It would therefore fall within the list of exceptions identified by the Framework. It follows that the proposal would not be inappropriate development when applying Policy P2 of the LP. In the circumstances, there is no need to consider the effect on Green Belt openness.

The effect of the proposed development on biodiversity

On-site habitats and priority species

67. The Council and appellant have submitted a Statement of Common Ground on biodiversity prepared by expert Ecologists. It confirms that the Ecological Impact Assessment and associated surveys meet good practice guidelines and are acceptable in establishing a baseline against which to consider the proposal.
68. In respect of bats, the appellant's assessment accords with guidance prepared by the Bat Conservation Trust and has sufficiently identified the bat species assemblage. The overall conclusion is that, subject to mitigation, the proposal can proceed without harming bats. Mitigation includes the retention of dark corridors and details of external lighting to be approved. Bat boxes would also be installed alongside habitat enhancement. This would all be subject to conditions.
69. Reptile surveys identified a low population of slow worms. However, the majority of suitable reptile habitat will be retained. The habitat lost would be largely contained to areas of very limited suitability. This, taken with habitat creation and a precautionary working method statement for passive displacement, secured by planning condition, would provide sufficient mitigation.
70. The impact on Great Crested Newts would be addressed through the NatureSpace district level licensing scheme. This would be subject to the imposition of a planning condition linking the permission to the District Licence and requiring submission of the NatureSpace delivery certificate prior to commencement.
71. The appellant has carefully considered the suitability of the site for over wintering birds and has concluded that it is of limited value. The Council shares this view. The site supports an assemblage of breeding birds. However, there is agreement between the Council and appellant that the effects of the proposed development can be appropriately avoided and mitigated by following a construction environment management plan. And then compensation provided through the planting of new hedges on site, the creation of species rich grassland and installing bird boxes. I have no reasons to disagree.
72. Five of the eleven hedgerows on the Appeal Site (including hedgerow H2) are Habitats of Principal Importance (HPI) for the purposes of Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. All native hedgerows and treelines are to be retained save for minor losses to create the proposed access. The loss would be compensated by new native species hedgerows elsewhere in the site. In fact, a net increase in hedgerow habitat units of around 95% could occur.
73. Some grassland habitat would be lost but this has been found to be of low quality. In respect of neutral grassland this is mainly due to grazing pressure, areas of bare ground and relatively limited botanical diversity. To compensate, other areas of neutral grassland would be created in the south of the site whereas the lowland acid grass to the north along Guildford Road would be retained and improved as part of the green infrastructure. Moreover, the submitted Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan shows an undeveloped buffer of at least 8 metres retained on both sides of stream along the southern site boundary. There is nothing of substance before me to demonstrate this would not be adequate.

74. Although originally an area in dispute, the Council is now satisfied that the appeal scheme can achieve the statutory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The updated calculations submitted with the appeal include reference to the Surrey Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Policy P7 of the DMP requires a 20% BNG. However, Policy N2(3) of the Framework is unequivocal in stating that decision makers should not give weight to policies which require BNG beyond the statutory framework.
75. In conclusion, the proposed development would not harm biodiversity through a combination of avoidance, mitigation and enhancement. In arriving at this conclusion, I have had regard to my statutory duty in Section 40(1) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (as amended) to conserve biodiversity. It would therefore adhere to Policy P5 of the LP and Policies P6 and P7 of the DMP taken as a whole. These policies seek to protect and enhance priority species and habitats. Save for the point outlined above regarding BNG, these policies are otherwise broadly consistent with Policy N2 of the Framework.

The effect on the integrity of Habitat Sites – Appropriate Assessment

76. The appeal site is located within 15km of several internationally designated Habitat Sites⁶. I have no reason to doubt the findings in the Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment - that the appeal scheme is likely to have a significant adverse effect, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA⁷, the Thursley Hinkley and Frensham Common SPA and the Thursley and Ockley Bogs Ramsar site on account of recreational disturbance. Potential significant effects on other Habitat Sites have been screened out due to the absence of any pathways of effect. This assessment included an analysis of air quality impacts from traffic and noise. Natural England has reviewed the information and concurs with the findings.
77. As the proposal is likely to have a significant adverse effect through recreational disturbance on the Habitat Sites identified above, an appropriate assessment is required pursuant to Regulation 63 Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) to consider the implications of the proposal on the integrity of the Habitat Sites in view of their conservation objectives.
78. The Thames Basin Heaths SPA is designated on account of the Nightjar, Woodlark and Dartford Warbler it supports, which are its qualifying features. The Thursley Hinkley and Frensham Common SPA has the same qualifying features and those of the Thursley and Ockley Bogs Ramsar are similar. The conservation objectives of these sites can be summarised as ensuring their integrity, by maintaining or restoring the habitats and populations of the qualifying features.
79. Policy P5 of the LP states that all proposals for new residential development within the 5km zone of influence (ZoI) placed around the Thames Basin Heaths SPA must comply with the relevant Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMM) and must also provide, improve or maintain a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The SAMM aims to mitigate potential recreational disturbance to the breeding bird populations by providing on site management of recreational pressure from new residents. To address this, a financial contribution,

⁶ Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Thursley Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Thursley, Hinkley and Frensham Commons SPA, Thursley and Ockley Bogs Ramsar site, Wealden Heath Phase II SPA

⁷ The SPA designations overlap with the Ash to Brookwood Heaths SSSI

in accordance with the applicable tariff, must be secured to support the long-term implementation of the SAMM.

80. The provision of SANG would provide a range of recreational opportunities for future residents and those in the local area, thereby reducing the need to travel to the relevant Habitat Sites. The proposed development would not provide a SANG onsite and I understand that all Council owned SANGs within the catchment area of the site are at capacity. Accordingly, an offsite SANG within the relevant catchment area would be located and capacity purchased. Guildford's Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document states that SANGs have a catchment within which they can provide avoidance. For SANGs of 20 or more hectares the catchment is five kilometres. As such, the appellant is currently exploring capacity at Wood Street Knoll SANG, approximately 3.6km east of the site. Furthermore, no houses would be located within 400m of the SPA and the on-site open space and the A323 would provide a buffer.
81. Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons SPA has a Zol of 9km, whereas Thursley and Ockley Bogs Ramsar does not have a specific Zol. However, the appellant's Ecologists have assumed that it is similar to that of Thursley, Hankley and Frensham Commons SPA as the designations overlap. There are no specific mitigation measures for recreational disturbance on these two designated sites. However, the provision, improvement, or maintenance of a SANG would reduce the need for residents to travel to these designated sites.
82. Natural England, Surrey Wildlife Trust and the Council have all reviewed the suite of proposed mitigation measures and are satisfied the proposal would not have an adverse residual effect on any of them with the measures secured. I afford these expert views significant weight. The mitigation would be secured through the submitted planning obligation. Thus, the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the relevant Habitat Sites or their qualifying features. The proposal would therefore adhere to Policy P5 of the DMP and Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan, which are consistent with Policy N6(1) of the Framework.

The effect of the proposed development on highway safety

83. Several interested parties have raised concerns regarding the effect the scheme would have on highway safety and capacity. I therefore asked the appellant to provide a note in response (ID22). I have carefully considered this alongside the Transport Assessment (TA) and the comments of the Local Highway Authority. In the absence of substantive technical evidence to the contrary, I afford the comments of the LHA significant weight. In this respect, the LHA are satisfied the proposed access from Guildford Road would have sufficient visibility and operate safely. Motorists exiting may need to wait around 16 seconds in the peak hours, but this was not considered unacceptable. The access was also subject to a successful Road Safety Audit, the findings of which were endorsed by the LHA.
84. The wider impacts on traffic have been modelled with reference to Automatic Traffic Counts that occurred after the Chester Bridge was opened and in the context of other new development in the area. No severe impacts were identified following an audit of the modelling by the LHA. Indeed, the LHA are satisfied all junctions would function within capacity. The LHA also reviewed the scope and conclusions of the accident analysis in the TA and raised no concerns. Considering the foregoing, I am satisfied the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway

safety or a severe impact on the transport network. A conflict with Policy TR6(4) of the Framework would not occur.

Other Matters

85. A proposal for a large residential development of the appeal site was previously refused by the Council. However, the scheme before me is materially different in that the number of homes is much reduced. Moreover, the policy context is now altered on account of the new Framework. As such, there is no inconsistency between my findings and those previously arrived at by the Council.
86. Reference has been made to Policy S2 in the LP, which is the spatial strategy for the borough. This policy sets a minimum housing requirement and outlines a housing supply distribution across spatial locations. It is a broad, high-level policy that does not explicitly set out any development management tests. It is nevertheless implicit, especially when reading the supporting text to the policy, that Ash and Tongham are considered a sustainable location capable of taking significant levels of growth. As such, the proposal, as an urban extension, would not offend the broad principles underpinning Policy S2.
87. Concerns have been raised regarding surface water flooding, but the area identified as most at risk would be green infrastructure rather than homes. The area at risk is an isolated depression that could flood in an extreme event. It would not sit on a pathway conveying flood water either onto or off the site. A drainage strategy, to be submitted with the reserved matters, would address the low risk posed by this low point. Greenfield runoff rates have been ascertained with reference to intrusive ground investigation, and has inform the drainage strategy, which will be further developed at the reserved matters stage. In this respect, flows from the appeal site would enter the ordinary watercourse ditch at existing greenfield rates due to attenuation and would then be conveyed west towards the wider drainage network. The Lead Local Flood Authority has not objected to this approach and are satisfied there would be no displacement of flood water onto neighbouring land or property. I have no substantive reason to disagree.
88. The appellant relies on the professional opinion of their acoustician that a detailed noise survey is not required to support the planning application because the site is in a quiet area, as documented in the technical note submitted with the application. The Council's Environmental Health Officers share this view. Accordingly, a desktop assessment was a proportionate approach in this case. The proposal is not anticipated to generate significant levels of operational noise and therefore harm in this respect is unlikely to occur. Construction noise would be time limited and mitigated by a construction management plan.
89. Although this part of Surrey is under water stress, South East Water has undertaken a formal assessment of the proposal and has confirmed that no off-site reinforcement works are required to provide a water supply. Indeed, the provision of water resources and network capacity is a matter for the statutory undertaker not the developer. Similarly, Thames Water has not objected in respect of foul water capacity subject to a condition which would require the development to be phased so that wastewater infrastructure is in place when required, which I understand is before the occupation of 70 homes.
90. In respect of air quality, the Council's Environmental Health Officers have assessed the submitted Air Quality Assessment (AQA), which included a cumulative

assessment. They are content that the AQA demonstrates the impact of the proposal would be negligible and therefore “not significant”. Monitoring locations were not along Guildford Road, but the findings have been adjusted to account for this. The Council and appellant agree that no further air quality mitigation is required given the requirement for a travel plan and other measures, such as the electric vehicle car club.

91. The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) concludes the proposal would preserve the significance of The Lion, a non-designated heritage asset, the Grade II* listed Ash Manor and Old Oak Cottage, and the Grade II listed Ash Manor Oast and The Oast House and Oak Barn. I share these views for the reasons outlined in the HIA. There are views from Wyke Lane of the spire of St Peter’s Church, which I understand is Grade II* listed. However, this view is more a feature of the landscape rather than something that meaningfully contributes to the significance of the Church. Therefore, I have factored the loss of this view into my assessment of the scheme’s impact on character and appearance. I note that Historic England were consulted and did not raise any concerns.
92. The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 includes a duty to ‘seek to further’ the statutory purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Surrey Hills National Landscape (NL). The duty also applies to functions undertaken outside of the designated boundary which affects land within it. As such, the effect of the scheme on the setting of the NL is an important consideration. Indeed, Policy N4 of the Framework states that development proposals within the setting of Protected Landscapes should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the Protected Landscape.
93. Despite this legal duty, the intervisibility with the Hogs Back, and Natural England’s proposal to expand the National Landscape north towards the appeal site, the Council has not taken expert landscape advice. Nevertheless, the Surrey Hills Management Plan 2025-2030 identifies “hills and views” as a special quality and explains that views are often diminished by developments outside the NL.
94. With the above in mind, the LVIA explains that the proposed development has been located sensitively relative to the NL because the appeal site has reduced tranquillity and is located close to the large built-up area of Ash. I share these views. The LVIA goes on to list several measures that can avoid or minimise the scheme’s impacts. These include retaining the existing network of hedges and trees and providing a view through the site from Guildford Road to the Hogs Back.
95. In addition to this, careful lighting, generous levels of new planting (including trees to break up the roof scape) a carefully considered material pallet and low building heights would soften the impact and integrate the scheme with the wooded landscape in views to and from the NL. With these measures in place, the proposal would minimise its effect on the NL such that its special qualities would be conserved. Furthermore, substantive evidence has not been provided which demonstrates the scheme would adversely affect any functional connections with the Surrey Hills by, for example, adversely impacting water catchments, biodiversity networks or rights of way.

Planning Obligation

96. In considering the proposed planning obligations, I have carefully reviewed the Council’s CIL Compliance Schedule (as amended) and note the agreement

reached between the Council and appellant. The following obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable when applying the requirements of the development plan and are directly, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposal and its impacts. As a result, I have taken them into account.

97. *Affordable Housing* – To adhere to Policy H2 of the LP and the Golden Rules in the Framework, it is necessary to secure 50% of the proposed homes as affordable housing. The affordable housing would encompass an appropriate mix and tenure split with an acceptable delivery and cascade mechanism.
98. *Healthcare* – To adhere to Policy ID1 of the LP and the Golden Rules in the Framework, it is necessary to upgrade healthcare infrastructure. In this instance, the mitigation has been calculated by the NHS Surrey and Sussex Integrated Care Board to be £240,748. This would be spent on upgrading local GP surgeries with a view to increasing capacity to cater for the population increase.
99. *Education* – Again, to adhere to local policy and the Golden Rules, it is necessary to upgrade education infrastructure. This has been calculated by the Local Education Authority to be £192,556 for early years, £982,444 for primary education and £908,875 for secondary. The funds would be spent in the relevant planning areas to increase capacity to cater for the uplift in population.
100. *Green Infrastructure* – It is also necessary to secure on site green infrastructure (GI) to adhere to the Golden Rules. The GI would be a mix of play areas, open spaces and land for biodiversity mitigation and enhancements. The deed would ensure these areas are properly accessible and managed and monitored, especially where they relate to biodiversity net gain.
101. *SANG and SAMM* – I have already outlined the need for mitigation given the potential for a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the SPAs without such. In this instance, the obligation provides for £1,541,210 towards SANG capacity (or equivalent provision) and £180,828 for SAMM.
102. *Police* – To adhere to Policy D1 of the LP it is necessary to include measures to reduce opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour. In this instance, the obligation makes provision for £650 towards Automatic Number Plate Recognition given the potential for an increase in incidents on account of the development
103. *Sustainable Transport and Air Quality* – This includes £5,000 towards travel plan auditing, an electric vehicle car club, cycle vouchers and a contribution of £54,450 to offsite upgrades to Footpath 356. They are necessary to promote sustainable transport and mitigate impacts on air quality as required by the Local Transport Plan and Policies TR3 and TR6 of the Framework.
104. *Self and Custom Build Homes* – To adhere to the LP it is necessary for 5% of the proposed dwellings to be custom and self-build plots. The developer would need to lay out serviced plots and market them. However, if there is no demand following a period of approved marketing, then the plots would revert to conventional housing.
105. The Council had originally also sought £435,200 for upgrades to Ash Rail Station. However, when the appellant sought further justification, including evidence regarding any issues with capacity and how the sum had been calculated, the Council no longer sought the contribution. Other obligations originally sought by

the Council, such as bus stop and junction improvements, are addressed through planning conditions.

Planning Conditions

106. Many of the concerns raised with the scheme are capable of being addressed through the imposition of planning conditions. In this respect, I have considered the advice in the Planning Practice Guide and the conditions suggested by the Council and appellant. I have made minor changes where necessary in the interests of precision.
107. As the application has been submitted in outline it is necessary to secure details of the reserved matters before development commences (Conditions 1-3). As the immediate and pressing need for housing is a significant component of why the scheme is acceptable, I have shortened the implementation period.
108. To mitigate the effect on habitat sites and adhere to the Golden Rules regarding open space, it is necessary to ensure compliance with the Land Use and Green Infrastructure Parameter Plans (4). Indeed, such matters go to the principle of the scheme's acceptability. I have not included the storey heights parameter plan because it shows three storey properties, which I do not consider to be acceptable. It has been suggested that if I were to find three storey buildings to be unacceptable a condition should be imposed to limit the height of buildings to two storeys. However, as scale is a reserved matter this would be unnecessary.
109. The Placemaking Plan is not included in the list of approved drawings either. This is because it is a high-level concept drawing that demonstrates how good urban design principles could be incorporated into a scheme of up to 200 homes. In this respect, the appellant has outlined design principles to assist decision making as suggested by the Planning Practice Guide (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 26-010-20191001). Through the imposition of Conditions 1-3 the Council would retain complete control over the detailed design and layout and can therefore test the reserved matters submissions to ensure the design principles are achieved.
110. The Council indicated that it would be necessary to require a Design Code if the Placemaking Plan is not secured by condition. Policy D4 of the DMP explains that a design code will be required when it is considered necessary to set design parameters. The appeal scheme is not a complex or multi-phase proposal and is unlikely to be brought forward by several developers or on a plot-by-plot basis. As such, it is not apparent why a free-standing design code would be necessary. Instead, the reserved matters would set out firm proposals for the Council to assess against urban design principles. That said, a limited design code is necessary to ensure there is some coherence to the custom and self-build plots (29).
111. In the interests of precision and highway safety it is necessary to ensure the scheme is carried out in accordance with the submitted access drawings (5), a Copenhagen crossing, visibility splays and emergency access are in place and retained (13) and parking provided (26). In the interests of safeguarding biodiversity, it is necessary to secure a Construction Environment Management Plan (6), a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (11), a lighting strategy to include details of dark corridors (17), construction in accordance with a Great Crested Newt licence (24) and biodiversity enhancement measures (25).

112. In the interests of protecting living conditions and minimising flood risk it is necessary to secure a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Scheme (7). To ensure adequate water and drainage infrastructure is in place as required, it is necessary for an infrastructure phasing plan to be submitted and adhered to (8). In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area and biodiversity it is necessary to secure an Arboricultural Method Statement (9).
113. In the interests of safeguarding and recording cultural heritage, it is necessary to secure a scheme of archaeological investigation (10). In the interests of adapting to climate change and promoting sustainable construction it is necessary to secure an Energy and Water Strategy (12) and a Site Waste Management Plan (23).
114. To promote sustainable transport, it is necessary to secure cycle facilities and pedestrian improvements (14,15, 28), a Travel Plan, the draft having been reviewed and endorsed by the Local Highway Authority (22) and bus stop improvements (27). To protect living conditions and highway safety it is necessary to require a Construction Transport Management Plan (16). To promote a healthy and active lifestyle and support social interaction, it is necessary to secure outdoor play facilities (18). To protect living conditions, it is necessary to investigate and remediate any land contamination (19, 20) and secure a noise impact assessment and any subsequent mitigation (21).

Other Considerations

The benefits of the scheme

115. The Council and appellant agree that substantial weight should be separately given to the delivery of both market and affordable homes. I share this view given the significant shortfall in the housing land supply (currently at 2.9 years), the scale of the contribution the scheme would make and the acute shortage of affordable housing. In respect of the latter, the appellant's undisputed analysis demonstrates that since 2015/16 the supply of affordable homes has fallen short of the need by 4,287 properties. To put that in context, this deficit is greater than the total number of homes (around 3,655) identified as being deliverable in the next five years. The real-life implications of this under delivery is stark.
116. Constructing a scheme of up to 200 homes would result in significant levels of investment and job creation. The subsequent occupation would result in additional spending, some of which would be on local services and facilities. The economic benefits therefore carry significant weight in favour of the proposal. The appeal scheme would include additional tree planting and measures to boost biodiversity. Given the national nature crisis, this is a notable benefit. The proposal would also deliver new green space as required by the Golden Rules. The open space to the north of the site would be particularly beneficial as it is close to existing houses and would provide a pleasant gateway into Ash. The delivery of open space is another significant point in favour of the scheme.
117. The improvement to local infrastructure is primarily required to make the development acceptable. There may be some wider incidental benefits, such as better bus stops and footpaths, but these matters carry no more than moderate weight. The proposal could deliver up to 10 custom and self-build plots (5% of all homes). This is a benefit of the scheme, but I have little before me demonstrating the extent of unmet need. I am also mindful that if the demand is not there, the homes would revert to conventional housing. Accordingly, this is a limited benefit.

118. The ability to bring the homes forward in a sustainable location is to be expected as a cornerstone of good planning. Indeed, it is unlikely the scheme would be supported if that were not the case. As such, this is no more than a moderate benefit. Policy DP3(3) states that substantial weight should be given to compliance with development management policies when assessing the design quality of proposals. This is effectively saying that adherence to local policies is an important matter when deciding whether a scheme is well designed. I do not read this as saying that a well-designed scheme should automatically attract substantial weight in a planning balance. In any event, the design of the appeal scheme is yet to crystallise and therefore it would be premature to afford any meaningful weight to design quality. The proposal could afford views of the Surrey Hills from within the site, but it would also partially obscure them from Guildford Road and the footpath. The overall impact on the setting of the National Landscape would be neutral.
119. The Framework no longer states that a development which complies with the Golden Rules should be given significant weight in favour of the grant of permission. Instead, Policy GB8(2) of the Framework states that substantial weight should be given to the importance of complying with the Golden Rules. It is unclear whether this change in wording is intended to mean something different. For example, the new wording could be read as simply setting out the Government's expectation that adherence to the Golden Rules is an important matter which should not be set aside lightly in the decision-making process. As this matter is not determinative to this case, it is not something I have considered further.
120. Although I do not entirely share the appellants views regarding all the benefits and weightings, it is nevertheless the case that the benefits of the scheme collectively carry weight of a very high order in favour of the scheme.

Policies S3 and S5 of the Framework

121. Policy S3 of the Framework outlines a presumption in favour of sustainable development through the application of Policy S5. Policy S5(5) states that where development would not be inappropriate in the Green Belt, then it should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework, and Policy S5(2).
122. I take the reference to 'development' in Policy S5(5) to mean the types listed a) – j) in the policy. In this respect, the appeal scheme falls under Policy S5(1)(j) as it would meet an evidenced unmet need on account of the housing supply deficit and would be of an appropriate scale for the reasons already given. Moreover, the proposal would be physically well related to an existing settlement, being on the edge of Ash with good interconnections and the ability to integrate with local patterns of development.
123. Policy S5(2) explains that the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development proposals are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include, but are not restricted to, situations where the development proposal would fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.
124. Policy DP3(3) states that development proposals should be refused if they would not respond to their context and integrate with and enhance their surroundings. I have concluded that the proposal would harm the landscape character and visual

amenity of the countryside. This could be an indication the appeal scheme would not respond to its context. However, the level of harm would be moderate and broadly inherent to the delivery of housing on a green field site. In respect of the latter point, in this instance Policy S5 of the Framework permits housing in the countryside as a matter of principle due to the evidenced unmet need.

Consequently, the effect on context needs to be considered through the prism that some impact on the countryside is to be expected.

125. Conversely, I have found that the physical form of the appeal scheme, in terms of its design and layout, could respond to the surrounding built context. The proposal could also incorporate existing landscape features such as trees and hedges whilst delivering landscaping and open spaces as an enhancement. In other words, the proposal could respond to the site's urban rural edge character. The density would not be in context, but there is a clear justification for this. Overall, as a matter of judgment I have found that the scheme could respond to its context. Consequently, in this instance, the proposal need not be at odds with Policy DP3(1) and by extension Policies DP3(3) and S5(2) of the Framework.
126. It is conceivable that the application of Policy HE6(4) could be a circumstance where the benefits of approving a development proposal are likely to be substantially outweighed by its adverse effects. This is due to the importance placed on harm to designated heritage assets. However, I have already concluded that in this instance the harm to the significance of designated heritage assets would not outweigh the benefits of the scheme.
127. Overall, the proposal would moderately harm the character and appearance of the area and result in limited harm to the significance of two listed buildings. The latter would not result in a conflict with the development plan for the reasons given, but it is nevertheless an adverse impact of considerable importance. These points cumulatively carry notable weight against the scheme, but they would not substantially outweigh the benefits. Thus, the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development in Policies S3 and S5 of the Framework is a material consideration that strongly indicates permission should be granted.

Conclusion

128. The proposal would harm the existing character and appearance of the countryside resulting in a conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. However, material considerations, principally the benefits of the scheme and the provisions of the Framework, indicate the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, when having regard to all matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Graham Chamberlain,
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Zack Simons KC and Kimberley Ziya, Counsel for the appellant
Instructed by Daniel Lampard

Called:

Daniel Lampard
BA (Hons) DipTP Dip (PD&D) MRTPI,

Senior Director, Lichfields

Alec Philpott
BEng (Hons) FCIHT FCILT MTPS,

Director, Mayer Brown Limited

Paddy Hynes

Senior Planner, Lichfields

Rachel Clements

Director, Lichfields

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ben Du Feu, Council for Guildford Borough Council
Instructed by Guildford Borough Council

Called:

Ian Johnson
BSc (Hons) MA PG UD MRTPI

Managing Director, Luken Beck

Justin Williams

Team Leader, Guildford Borough
Council

INTERESTED PERSONS

Simon Schofield

Chairman, Normandy Parish Council

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

ID1	Ecology SOCG Addendum 17.09.26
ID2	Additional representations from Normandy Action Group
ID3	Draft of the S106 Agreement and Summary Note - 18.09.26
ID4	Email dated 18.09.26 confirming common ground has been reached between the appellant and Council on design matters
ID5	Updated Placemaking Plan DE_763_03A
ID6	Note on Education Contributions from appellant
ID7	Note on Healthcare Contributions from appellant
ID8	Note on Rail Infrastructure Contribution from appellant
ID9	Legal judgment (<i>R. (on the application of University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust) v Harborough DC</i>) and cover note
ID10	Final SOCG on planning matters
ID11	Response to my written questions from the appellant
ID12	Response to my written questions from the Council
ID13	Updated list of suggested conditions
ID14	Surrey County Council response ID6
ID15	Copy of Mr Schofield's comments to the Inquiry
ID16	Opening submissions from Mr Simons
ID17	Opening submissions from Mr Du Feu
ID18	Email from NHS in response to ID7
ID19	Green Belt Assessment update – August 2026

ID20	Updated CIL Justification Statement
ID21	Email from the Council confirming a financial contribution towards air quality mitigation is not required
ID22	Note from the appellant in response to my request for comments relating to several matters raised by interested parties, including the effectiveness of the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace
ID23	Note from the appellant regarding the Surrey Hills National Landscape Boundary Review
ID24	Final list of suggested planning conditions
ID25	Copy of engrossed planning obligation dated 7 October 2026 – this included only very minor changes from the draft that had been available for review
ID26	Briefing Note on Cycle Infrastructure
ID27	Closing submissions from Mr Du Feu
ID28	Closing submissions from Mr Simons

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission, or before expiration of 18 months from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.
- 3 Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout (including the layout of the internal access roads and footpaths), and scale, hereinafter called "the reserved matters" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins (save for the access works approved herewith) and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 4 Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the submitted Reserved Matters shall accord with the following plans and documents:
 - Site Location Plan (ref: S101 REV-B);
 - Land Use Parameter Plan (ref: 25019/C102B); and
 - Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (ref: 25019/C104).
5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Emergency Access off Wyke Lane (Ref: MJGWYKELANE.1/06 REV-P2); and
 - Proposed Access of Guildford Road (Ref: MJGWYKELANE.1/01 REV-P4)
- 6 Prior to the commencement of the development, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It will include details of:
 - a) A site walkover by a qualified ecologist to identify important/sensitive Biodiversity feature and inform assessment of potentially damaging construction activities on them, setting out appropriate mitigation where necessary
 - b) Identification of and necessary "biodiversity protection zones"
 - c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction
 - d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features
 - e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works
 - f) Responsible persons and lines of communication
 - g) The role and responsibilities on site of an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) or similarly competent person

- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs
- i) Measures to prevent pollution of watercourses and controls on the storage and use of materials/chemicals on site
- j) Vegetation clearance methods used for passive displacement methods used to avoid harm to, and relocation of, any reptiles and nesting birds found during construction.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.

- 7 No above ground development shall commence until a detailed Foul and Surface Water Drainage Scheme for the site and maintenance arrangements for the Scheme have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The Scheme shall include the final design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The required drainage details shall include:
- a) The results of further infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 in the location of proposed soakaways and confirmation of groundwater levels. Where infiltration is proposed confirmation is required of a 1m unsaturated zone from the base of any proposed soakaway to the seasonal high groundwater level and confirmation of half-drain times.
 - b) Evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the management of everyday rainfall (interception) requirements of the National standards.
 - c) Hydraulic calculations to demonstrate the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 (+35% allowance for climate change) & 1 in 100 (+45% allowance for climate change) storm events and 10% allowance for urban creep. If infiltration is deemed unfeasible, associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 3.5 l/s/ha.
 - d) Detailed design drawings for all sustainable drainage elements including cross sections and detailed drainage layout plan.
 - e) 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.
 - f) Evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the water quality requirements of the National standards.
 - g) Evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the amenity requirements of the National standards.
 - h) Evidence that the surface water drainage system meets the biodiversity requirements of the National standards.
 - i) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for all drainage elements.
 - j) 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.

The Scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved phasing arrangements and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Prior to the first occupation of each phase of the development, a verification report must be submitted to and approved 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.

8. The development shall not be occupied or constructed other than in accordance with a development and infrastructure phasing plan for drainage and foul sewerage, which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
9. Prior to the commencement of development, an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details will:
 - a) Identify of existing trees, hedgerows, shrubs and other vegetation to be retained,
 - b) Include details of any pruning/felling required as part of the development
 - c) Details of tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837:2012 (or succeeding and/or replacement legislation) to be maintained throughout construction,
10.
 - a) Prior to any demolition and the commencement of the development an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - b) Following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in part a), and prior to any demolition on the site and the commencement of the development (other than in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation), a staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within two years of the completion of the archaeological fieldwork.
11. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (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:
 - a) A non-technical summary;
 - b) The roles and responsibilities of the persons or organisation(s) responsible for implementing and overseeing the HMMP;

- c) Full details of the habitat creation and enhancement works required to achieve the approved biodiversity net gain, in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
- d) Detailed management measures to maintain and secure the created and/or enhanced habitats for a period of not less than 30 years from the completion of the development; and
- e) v. A monitoring strategy, including methodology and frequency of monitoring, together with arrangements for submitting monitoring reports to the Local Planning Authority and provisions for remedial measures where required.

The development shall thereafter be carried out and managed in full accordance with the approved HMMP for the duration of the 30-year management period.

12. As part of any submission for reserved matters, a detailed Energy and Water Strategy for the site demonstrating how the energy hierarchy will be followed shall be submitted for approval. The Strategy will include details showing how energy use will be reduced through design and construction detailing; how space heating and hot water will be provided without the use of fossil fuels on site; how solar photovoltaic panels shall be provided as an integral part of the scheme; and strategy to reduce overheating in homes. A layout showing location of any external air source heat pump units and PV panel shall be included. The Strategy shall also provide details which show how water use will be minimised to achieve the enhanced Building Regulations standard of 110l/person/day, and include a specification of fixtures and fittings. The Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Strategy.
13. The development shall not be occupied until the proposed access to Guildford Road has been provided with a Copenhagen crossing and visibility splays and the proposed emergency and pedestrian/cyclist access to Wyke Lane has been provided with visibility splays in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the visibility zones shall be permanently clear of any obstruction over 0.6m high
14. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until the following have been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - a) Provision of footway improvements at the northern end of Harpers Road (in general accordance with drawing 07-P2);
 - b) Provision of Copenhagen crossing at the northern end of Wyke Lane (in general accordance with drawing 05-P2);
 - c) Provision of signage and road markings to improve the bridge where Harpers Road meets Ash Green Road.
15. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until the following cycle facilities have been provided within the development site:
 - a) Secure, lit and covered cycle parking;
 - b) Charging points with timers for e-bikes within said facilities;

- c) Clear hardstanding routes between the cycle stores and the site access; and
- d) 20% of all bikes (including disabled and adaptive cycles) within communal storage areas should be able to be charged at any one time. 5% of communal cycle storage spaces should cater for disabled/adaptive cycles.

Thereafter the said approved facilities shall be provided, retained and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

16. No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to include details of:
- a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
 - b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - c) storage of plant and materials
 - d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
 - e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
 - f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation
 - g) vehicle routing
 - h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
 - i) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
 - j) the contractor shall not permit any HGVs associated with the development at the site to be laid up, waiting, on Wyke Lane, Harpers Road and Guildford Road
 - k) on-site turning for construction vehicles

Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

17. Prior to or concurrently with the submission of the first application for approval of Reserved Matters, a detailed Lighting Strategy, including the timetable for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Lighting Strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The details to be submitted shall include:
- i. Lighting for play
 - ii. Lighting for public realm and walking and cycling routes
 - iii. Areas of ecological sensitivity where lighting will be prohibited, this will be prepared in accordance with ILP/BCT Guidance Note GN08/23 'Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night' (or any document superseding it). This will be supported by:
 - iv. a modelled lux contour plan;
 - v. plan showing unlit dark corridors alongside all retained boundary hedgerows and tree lines, of at least 5 metres wide measured from the

- boundary (the width in each location to be justified by reference to the LUX contour plan, and not less than 5 metres). The dark corridors shall exclude private gardens, buildings and external lighting;
- vi. details of the number, location, type, colour temperature (2700 Kelvin or lower), mounting height, orientation and beam angle of all external luminaires.
 - vii. A strategy for roads and development parcels.
 - viii. A strategy for mitigation to reduce light pollution during construction
18. Prior to or concurrently with the first Reserved Matters submission shall include the details for the provision of formal play facilities shall include full details including site levels, play features, seating, pathways, planting and landscaping relating to that play facility and a management strategy for it. The development shall thereafter be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
19. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until further investigation and a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
20. Any remediation scheme submitted in accordance with Condition 21 (above) shall be carried out as detailed in the applicant's submission. Documentary proof shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority together with a quality assurance certificate to show that the works have been carried out in full accordance with the approved remediation strategy. Details of any post remediation sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the closure report together with the necessary documentation detailing what waste material has been removed from the site before the development hereby permitted is occupied by any person not directly involved in constructing the development.
21. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Noise Impact Assessment shall be undertaken, and a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that:
- a. The internal noise levels within the residential units will conform to the "indoor ambient noise levels for dwellings" guideline values specified within BS 8233: 2014, Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - b. The external noise levels within the curtilage of residential units will conform to the "design criteria for external noise" upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq,T, as specified within BS 8233:2014, Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise.

The work specified in the approved scheme shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the premises and be retained thereafter.

22. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied unless and until a Travel Plan has been submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the sustainable development aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Surrey County Council's "Travel Plans Good Practice Guide". And then the approved Travel Plan shall be implemented upon first occupation and for each and every subsequent occupation of the development. Thereafter it shall be maintained and developed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
23. 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:
1. any waste generated by construction, demolition and excavation activities is limited to the minimum quantity necessary; and
 2. opportunities for first, re-use and secondly, recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste on the application site are maximised.

The development shall be carried out and operated in accordance with the approved SWMP and it 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.

24. No development hereby permitted shall take place except in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Council's Organisational Licence (WML-OR175, or a 'Further Licence') and with the proposals detailed on plan "Land at Shortlands Farm: Impact Plan for great crested newt District Licensing (Version 1)", dated 6 August 2026.
25. No dwelling shall be occupied until a Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall accord with the principles set out in the approved Ecological Impact Assessment and shall include:
- i. the type, number and location of integrated swift bricks, in accordance with Policy N2(1)(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework
 - ii. the type, location and number of externally mounted bird boxes, including models suited to urban species such as house sparrow, house martin and starling
 - iii. the type, location and number of integrated and externally mounted bat boxes
 - iv. the location and number of log piles and hibernacula;
 - v. location and details of hedgehog highways / gaps not less than 13cm by 13cm at ground level in boundary treatments to facilitate hedgehog movement, where relevant
 - vi. a timetable for installation, to be completed prior to first occupation of the relevant dwelling or phase

The development shall thereafter be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved scheme, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

26. Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling, details of the vehicle parking and turning areas serving that part of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied unless and until the parking and turning facilities required to serve that dwelling, together with the associated visitor parking and shared turning facilities required for that part of the development, have been laid out in accordance with the approved details, so as to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter, the approved parking and turning areas shall be retained, maintained and kept permanently available for their designated purposes.
27. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted improvements to the two sets of bus stops closest to the site, known as Nightingale Road and Wyke Lane should be provided. This should include the provision of Real Time Passenger Information (RTPI) displays, accessible kerbing, bus stop cages, power, and (where space permits) seating and shelters. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with a scheme that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the County Highway Authority. The approved facilities shall be delivered as part of the associated highway works pursuant to an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 and shall be operational before the development is first occupied.
28. Details of the on-site upgrade works to Footpath 356 shall be set out in the first reserved matters application. No more than 100 dwellings shall be occupied until those footpath upgrades have been provided in accordance with the approved plans and made available for use in accordance with the approved details.
29. Applications for reserved matters are required to identify the location of any custom/self build housing within the wider layout and provide 'plot passport' material for agreement that demonstrates how the custom/self-build dwellings would be a coordinated part of a high-quality design approach. Development shall thereafter adhere to the plot passports.

End of Schedule