
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 22 & 23 November 2016

Site visit made on 23 November 2016

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/16/3147135

Site of the former Redwood Care Home, 179 Epsom Road, Guildford, Surrey GU1 2QY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Linden Homes South against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/P/01304, dated 3 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2015.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the former Redwood Care Home and the provision of 24 dwellings comprising a mix of 1 & 2 bedroom apartments and 3, 4 & 5 bedroom houses, including affordable dwellings and off-street parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the former Redwood Care Home and the provision of 24 dwellings comprising a mix of 1 & 2 bedroom apartments and 3, 4 & 5 bedroom houses, including affordable dwellings and off-street parking at the site of the former Redwood Care Home, 179 Epsom Road, Guildford, Surrey GU1 2QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/P/01304, dated 3 July 2015, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule at the end of this decision.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Linden Homes South against Guildford Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

Amended Drawings

3. Annex M of the Inspectorate's Procedural Guide on Planning Appeals states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that what is considered at appeal should essentially be what was considered by the local planning authority. It states that the *Wheatcroft* judgement¹ established that "*the main, but not the only, criterion on which...judgement should be exercised is whether the development is so changed that to grant it would be to deprive those who should have been consulted on the changed development of the opportunity of such consultation*". Annex M makes clear that the deciding

¹ *Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [JPL, 1982, P37]*

Inspector has to consider if the suggested amendments might prejudice anyone involved in the appeal.

4. In this case the appellant publicised the amended scheme at a public meeting in a venue near the site on 20 April 2016 and wrote to residents and local Councillors who had commented on the original application on 29 September 2016. The Council confirmed that the amended drawings had been uploaded to its website this summer but maintains that the appellant's 'consultation' was inadequate because it did not give details of the appeal case reference or the Inspectorate's contact details so the consultees did not know to whom or where to write. It also points out that the amended scheme would result in the removal of four additional yew trees near the site frontage compared to the original scheme.
5. I agree that the appellant's 'consultation' exercise was not equivalent to a formal consultation that the Council would have undertaken. But the appellant's letter of 29 September did notify residents of the date and time of the Hearing and the Council had placed the amended scheme drawings on its website and had notified residents of the appeal reference and the Inspectorate's contact details as well as details of the Hearing. I also heard at the Hearing that the Merrow Residents Association (MRA) had notified their members of the amended plans.
6. More importantly the amended drawings seek to try and address some of the Council's criticisms of the proposed development, in particular by reducing the height of some of the dwellings. It is agreed that the amended scheme is immaterially different from the original scheme refused by the Council. Local residents were in attendance at the Hearing including two members of the MRA and I was able to hear their views on both the original and amended proposed schemes, as well as the Council's views about the loss of the four yew trees in the amended scheme. Although the MRA supported the scheme in its original consultation response Mr Meldrum said at the Hearing that it should not have done so and its position is now neutral in relation to both schemes.
7. For all these reasons I conclude that for me to consider the amended drawings (as listed in Condition 2 below) would not prejudice anyone involved in the appeal and I will accordingly do so in assessing the appeal.

S106 Agreement

8. Two signed 106 agreements dated 22 November 2016 were handed to me at the end of the Hearing, one in respect of the original scheme and the second in respect of the amended scheme as set out above. In view of my decision to accept the amended scheme drawings I assess the latter agreement in more detail below.

Main Issues

9. The main issues are:
 - (a) Whether the loss of the existing Class C2 use would be acceptable
 - (b) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including on protected trees

- (c) The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of future occupiers, including in regard to the adequacy of outdoor garden areas including their proximity to retained trees
- (d) Whether the clustering of the affordable housing in a single apartment block would create an inclusive and mixed community
- (e) Whether the S106 agreement overcomes the Council's concerns regarding the provision of affordable homes and the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA)

Reasons

Loss of the Class C2 Use

10. The large single-storey 1980s building on this 0.97 hectare site located within the urban area of Guildford was formerly occupied by the former Redwood Care Home until its closure in March 2014. The site was sold to the appellant by Surrey County Council (SCC) in July 2015. As such the authorised use is Class C2: use for the provision of residential accommodation and care to people in need of care (other than a use within Class C3 dwelling houses). I note that the Council describe the former Care Home as a dementia nursing home.
11. I agree with the Council that SCC's decision to close the Care Home and sell the site was a business decision². The inability of Shaw Healthcare to provide a service deemed adequate by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) was clearly influential in this decision. There is no suggestion by the CQC³ that the contractor's failings were attributable to the building itself.
12. But the phrase "*a property no longer considered suited to ongoing service delivery*" in the Cabinet Minutes leads credence to the Council's own acknowledgement that SCC has shifted its approach to adult social care over recent years. SCC is committed to provide flexible and needs-led support regardless of where individuals live; supporting people to live independently in the setting of their choice by providing relevant support services; and when people can no longer live independently and there is a shortage of publicly funded bed spaces to commission bed spaces in private nursing homes⁴.
13. There is little doubt that SCC's shift in this regard is due to financial pressures as a result of demographic trends for people to live longer and shrinking budgets generally. But it also reflects the trends set out in the SHMA⁵ regarding the housing needs of older people, in particular evidence nationally of falling demand for residential care in some areas, and a rapidly rising average age of people living in sheltered housing over the last 20 years with higher levels of support being required. Against this context new models of enhanced and extra care housing have emerged, which aim to meet the needs of those who require high levels of care and support alongside those who are still generally able to care for themselves and which often allow for changing circumstances *in situ*.
14. This is important because it backs up the appellant's argument that nursing care does not need to be provided exclusively through dedicated Class C2

² reason for disposal of the site in the Minutes of SCC's Cabinet meeting, 3 February 2015

³ CQC Inspection Report on the Redwood Care Centre, January 2014

⁴ Council's Hearing Statement, paragraph 4.12

⁵ West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Final Report, September 2015, Section 9

nursing or registered care homes. Rather, the appellant argues, such care is increasingly provided as part of Extra Care Housing schemes⁶, especially in the private sector, such as for example at the nearby Clockhouse development, the assisted living extra care scheme for the frail elderly currently under construction nearby by McCarthy and Stone, as well as by physical adaptations to and the provision of care in the homes of older people. I acknowledge that such Extra Care schemes cannot often be categorised as Class C2 but they are now often designed to cater for the needs of the frail elderly, and it is in the interests of developers to do so given the propensity for people to live longer and the concomitant increase in health conditions such as dementia.

15. Nonetheless, the SHMA makes clear that there is a need during the emerging Local Plan (ELP) period (2013-33) to provide 242 Class C2 bed spaces, an average of 12 a year. This is on the basis that such a need will inevitably arise given a 44% increase in the population of over-65 year olds in the Borough in this period. This figure would appear to be reasonable, albeit that it is possible that such C2 bed spaces would not actually be required given the new models of provision, which are often *sui generis* or Class C3 uses.
16. The Council argue that Extra Care Housing including the Clockhouse scheme is not a C2 use and does not therefore contribute to achieving the estimated need of 242 C2 bed spaces in the ELP period. Worse than that the loss of the existing 50 bed spaces on this site would increase the need to 292 C2 bed spaces. Whilst acknowledging that the ELP allocates two greenfield sites for care homes of approximately 60 bedrooms each (a total of 120 C2 bed spaces), there is no certainty that such sites will actually come forward because they are in the Green Belt and the ELP has not yet been examined. The Council also maintains that there is less likelihood and no guarantee of C2 bed spaces coming forward on windfall sites given the site allocations in the ELP and the 2016 Land Availability Assessment identifying sites specifically for certain uses.
17. However, the appellant has demonstrated that there has been a steady pipeline of permissions for C2 bed spaces amounting to an average of 38 a year over the last 7 years. Albeit that there has only been permission for 36 windfall bed spaces in total in the last 3 years, this still equates to 12 a year, which mirrors the annual requirement during the ELP period (admittedly ignoring the loss of the 50 bed spaces on this site).
18. But even assuming that 292 spaces are required during the ELP period (15 per year) and that the lower recent delivery rate would continue, I consider it very likely that any under provision would be overcome by the provision of equivalent bed spaces in Extra Care or similar schemes because such schemes often incorporate the need to provide nursing care including for dementia patients. This is simply a reflection of the market catering for the needs of older people who are often asset-rich and able to meet their own housing and care needs, as set out in the SHMA. Whilst there will be a sizeable minority of older people living in social housing who may still be reliant on residential institutions, SCC is committed to commission bed spaces in private nursing homes where necessary. It is clear that a number of these have continued to be built in the Borough in recent years, and although another was refused at

⁶ As defined in the SHMA, page 134, footnote 15

Worplesden in June 2016 this in itself demonstrates the market's resilience in seeking to provide additional C2 bed spaces.

19. So for these reasons I conclude that the loss of the existing Class C2 use would be acceptable because the market is likely to deliver the trajectory of C2 bed spaces or their equivalent in new models of provision such as Extra Care Housing.
20. Even if the market failed to do so, I note that the estimated need of 242 C2 bed spaces, 12 a year during the ELP period, is not a target. It does not therefore carry the policy importance that attaches to the five year supply of Class C3 dwellings (5YHLS), of which it does not form a part. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 5.30, 5.31, 5.36 and 5.37 of the appellant's Hearing Statement I also consider that there are inherent weaknesses in the accuracy of this forecast estimated need and it cannot be relied on in the same way that the objectively assessed need (OAN) for C3 dwellings can be.
21. The loss of the C2 use on the site must in any case be seen in the context of the Council's inability to demonstrate a 5YHLS; indeed at best the Council can only demonstrate a 2.5 year supply. There has been a serious under-delivery in the first two years of the ELP period based on the annual requirement in the SHMA.
22. In this context the Council acknowledges that Policies H5 and CF2 of the development plan, the Guildford Borough Local Plan (LP), are out-of-date, which triggers the last bullet point of paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Council argues that the last strand of this bullet point is applicable because NPPF paragraph 70 restricts the loss of valued community facilities, which includes care homes.
23. There would be a net loss of a specialised type of housing contrary to LP Policy H5 but there would be no loss of residential accommodation *per se*, and there is a pressing need for market and affordable dwellings, both of which would be benefits delivered by the proposed development. There would be conflict with LP Policy CF2 assuming care homes are community facilities. But the above benefits outweigh the conflict with these Policies, even assuming that the loss of the C2 use is contrary to NPPF paragraph 70 and that this is a 'restrictive' policy akin to the examples given in Footnote 9 relating to the last strand of the last bullet point of NPPF paragraph 14. The Council's arguments that there would be no care home in Merrow is not determinative because Guildford is a relatively small Borough and the need for C2 bed spaces is a Borough-wide need.

Character and Appearance

24. The Council is concerned that the street scene of the new cul-de-sac development would be dominated by parked cars; that the houses are too close to each other, which would result in a cramped development out of character with the surrounding area; that the houses on plots 9 and 10 remain too high at 11m; that although the design of the apartment building has been simplified this is at the expense of a larger area of flat roof out of character with the vernacular of the local area; and that the amended scheme involves the loss of three Yew trees on the Epsom Road frontage that are protected by a TPO and should be retained.

25. I disagree with all these criticisms of the proposed scheme's design. The cul-de-sac would be a shared surface where parking would front the dwellings but where parking spaces would be separated by generous landscaped strips, which would allow adequate tree planting as shown on the layout plan. The houses are close together but no closer than many of those in the recent developments cited by the appellant as local examples, which in my view are well designed and fit their urban context, and similar to the layout of the adjacent houses in Burwood Close and the adjoining streets.
26. There are many examples of much higher dwellings on the cited recently constructed local schemes, which are perfectly acceptable, and the topography of the plot in its local context means that the taller houses at plots 9 and 10 would comfortably fit into the local area. I can see no objection to the partial area of flat roof on the apartment building; this would help to reduce the building's overall height without compromising its now acceptable design.
27. The Council objects to the removal of the Yew trees (T8-10 on the Tree Protection Plan). But having had a good look at the site from both east and west and head-on from Epsom Road I agree with Mr Jones that the removal of these trees to create a better garden for the house at plot 24 would not adversely affect the character or appearance of the area. This is because this part of the frontage is dominated by the taller and bigger trees immediately adjacent to these yew trees: the Wellingtonia (T1), the Deodar Cedar (T3) and the Horse Chestnuts (T6 and T11); these trees dominate this part of the frontage and effectively block views of the rest of the site from the west. The trees to the east of the site entrance, another larger Yew (T37) and three Norway maples (T34-36) effectively block views of the rest of the site from the east. For these reasons there is no objection to the loss of these smaller Yew trees.
28. I conclude for the above reasons that the design and layout of the proposed dwellings would not harm the character of the area and would retain the important trees on the site. The proposed development would comply with LP Policies G5 and H4, which together require development in the urban area of Guildford to be in scale and character with the local area. It would also meet the requirement for good design in Section 7 of the NPPF.

Living Conditions

29. The Council argues that the dwellings would be too close to some of the trees. This is the reasoning behind the appellant's decision to remove the above Yew trees, to which I have concluded there is no objection. But it does not accept that any of the other trees to be retained would prejudice the living conditions of future occupiers of the dwellings, and therefore disputes that there would be pressure to lop, prune or fell these protected trees in the future.
30. The Council's new tree officer, Mr Holman, in particular considered that the dwellings would be too close to the Horse Chestnuts (T6 and T11). Having seen the proximity of these trees to the staked out west elevation of the house on plot 24 at the site visit, I consider that there would be an adequate distance between these trees and that dwelling.
31. Mr Holman also averred that the mature Wellingtonia (T43), the largest and most prominent tree on the site after which the former Care Home was named, could suffer limb failure that could seriously affect plot 23. However I agree

with Mr Jones that there are no major limbs that are growing towards the location of that proposed house. Furthermore, the tree is a fine strong mature specimen and there is no reason to suggest that it is unstable. He also pointed out that the bay window to the plot 23 house has been moved 2m further away from this tree, and I agree that this dwelling would not be significantly overshadowed by it.

32. The Council considers that the mature sycamore (T32) is also too close to the house at plot 9. I disagree. This tree is a considerable distance away from that house and would have limited impact on its occupiers.
33. The Council also argues that the gardens of some of the houses and the communal garden of the apartment block are too small and out of character with those in the local area. But the gardens of the proposed houses are similar in size to those of many houses in the local area, especially those built in more recent years. Equally the communal garden of the block of flats is of a comparable size with other recently built flat blocks in the area. The Council acknowledged at the hearing that it has no specific standards for such garden areas and I can see no reason to find the size of any of the proposed gardens to be unacceptable.
34. It is also argued that plot 24 is enclosed by roads and its garden will have little privacy. However, the appellant intends to plant a thick hedge screen to the road frontage to protect this garden. The relationship of this garden's northern boundary with the pavement and adjacent road is no different than that of many other existing houses in the surrounding area and would not be liable to suffer from large volumes of traffic on this cul-de-sac, which only gives access to Merrow village hall and the bowling green.
35. For these reasons I consider that the protected trees to be retained would be far enough away from the new dwellings such that the living conditions of their occupiers would not be adversely affected and thus there would not be likely to be any pressure to disturb these trees. I also conclude that the size of all the gardens would be acceptable and that plot 24's garden would not suffer from a significant lack of privacy. The proposed development would comply with LP Policies G1(3) and H4, which together seek to protect the amenities of building occupiers in terms of access to sunlight and daylight.

The Clustering of the Affordable Housing

36. LP Policy H11 requires affordable housing to be dispersed in the scheme rather than concentrated in one place. But the development is only of a modest size and I agree with the appellant that there is therefore a limited ability to disperse the affordable dwellings throughout the site; they would be after all very close to the market houses.
37. I also agree with the appellant that affordable housing providers prefer such dwellings to be grouped together to some extent for ease of management and this would be more difficult if say the flats were of mixed market and affordable tenures.
38. The appellant also states that 73% of forecast affordable housing need is for 1 and 2 bedroom apartments and a tenure mix of 71%:29% Social Rent: Intermediate Housing, which is what the proposal would provide (actually a

slightly higher level of 75%). The Council does not dispute this need for smaller affordable units.

39. Although the clustering of the affordable housing in the apartment block contravenes the wording of Policy H11 it does not in my view result in the failure to create an inclusive and mixed community because the scheme is a relatively small one and there would be houses either side of the apartment block. This clustering would not therefore transgress paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

Section 106 Agreement

40. The Section 106 agreement relevant to the amended scheme provides for the delivery of 8 affordable flats equating to 33.33% affordable provision, which complies with LP Policy H11. There would be 6 one-bedroom and 2 two-bedroom flats with an acceptable tenure mix of 75% Social Rent: 25% Intermediate.
41. The agreement also provides that the development shall not commence until the SANG and SAMM contributions have been paid to the Council, the relevant amounts being determined by reference to the mitigation measures to protect the Thames Basin Heath SPA in accordance with the Thames Basin Heath Avoidance Strategy. It also provides for payment of the highway contribution prior to development commencing to enable the pedestrian refuge on Epsom Road to be constructed.
42. The above contributions meet the requirements of the *Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010*. The S106 agreement overcomes the Council's concerns regarding the provision of affordable homes and the impact of the development on the Thames Basin Heath SPA.

Conditions

43. The Council has provided a list of 16 suggested conditions. I consider all but one of these to generally meet the tests in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance although I have amended some of the wording in the interest of brevity and precision. The condition in regard to energy use does not meet the tests because there is no reference in it to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes; I cannot therefore tell if it meets the requirements of the 25 March 2015 Ministerial Statement and so I cannot impose it. There are thus 15 conditions in total.
44. Samples of external materials, details of hard and soft landscaping and its maintenance for 5 years, boundary treatments and finished levels are necessary in order to ensure the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the area and in the interests of residents' living conditions. A tree protection condition is required in order to ensure there is no damage to the trees to be retained for the same reason.
45. A condition to ensure protected species are safeguarded in accordance with the submitted reports is necessary in their interests. No additional openings should be inserted in the side elevation of the house at plot 18 in order to prevent adverse overlooking of the nearest adjacent neighbour. A condition is required to ensure that the pedestrian refuge is installed on Epsom Road in order to ensure the safety of residents in the scheme when crossing this busy road.

46. Conditions are required specifying the provision of vehicle parking and manoeuvring and cycle parking to prevent congestion on the adjacent roads and to encourage use of sustainable modes of transport respectively. The agreement of a Construction Method Statement prior to works commencing is necessary to ensure highway safety and nearby residents' living conditions are not unduly affected. And finally, details of a sustainable surface water drainage scheme are necessary in order to prevent flooding in the immediate area.

Conclusion

47. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions below.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2277-A-1000-A; 2277-A-1005-N; 2277-C-1005-N; 2277-A-3000-G; 2277-A-3005-H; 2277-A-3010-F; 2277-A-3020-F; 2277-A-3021-E; 2277-A-3025-G; 2277-A-3026-E; 2277-A-3030-H; 2277-A-3031-H; 2277-A-3032-H; 2277-A-3040-H; 2277-A-3045-G & 2277-A-3100-B.
- 3) No development shall take place until samples of all external facing and any hardstanding materials have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.
- 4) No development shall commence until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscaping works (with the exception of planting, seeding and turfing) shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before any part of the development is first occupied.
- 5) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 6) No development shall start on site until the detailed treatment of all boundaries have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development or phased as agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be maintained in perpetuity.

- 7) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the tree protection measures set out in the amended Arboriculture Implications Report (dated March 2016 reference SJAair5002-02) and Tree Protection Plan SJATPP15002-03. No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purposes of development until fencing has been erected in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan. Within any area fenced in accordance with this condition nothing shall be stored, placed or disposed of above or below ground, the ground level shall not be altered, no excavations shall be made, nor shall any fires be lit. The fencing shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details, until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been moved from the site.
- 8) No development shall take place until the following information shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - i) a full site survey showing: the datum used to calibrate the site levels; levels along all site boundaries; levels across the site at regular intervals and floor levels of adjoining buildings;
 - ii) full details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and hard landscaped surfaces.

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

- 9) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accord with the recommendations and mitigation measures set out in the Bat Roost Survey and Tree Assessment Report (reference EB023-05&06); Badger Survey Report (reference EB023-04) and Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Assessment (reference EB023-02).
- 10) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no first floor (or above) windows, dormer windows or other forms of openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be inserted in the eastern (side) elevation or roof of plot 18.
- 11) Prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved a pedestrian refuge shall be provided on Epsom Road, in general accordance with drawing number ITB10289-GA-001A, with dropped kerbs on either side of the footway to provide access for all.
- 12) No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with drawing number 2277-C-1005-N for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear and that space shall thereafter be kept available at all times for those purposes.
- 13) The development hereby approved shall not be occupied unless and until secure parking of bicycles within the development has been provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 14) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved

in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:

- i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- iv) the erection and maintenance of security.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 15) No development shall take place until details of the implementation, adoption, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage system shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include:

- i) a timetable for its implementation; and,
- ii) a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the effective operation of the sustainable drainage system throughout its lifetime.

The sustainable drainage system shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

End of Conditions

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Rupert Warren QC	<i>Instructed by Vail Williams LLP</i>
Robin Pearman	Linden Homes
Jane Terry	Vail Williams LLP
Suzanne Holloway	Vail Williams LLP
Tom James	Omega Partnership Architects
Simon Jones	SJA Trees Arboricultural Planning Consultants
David Roe	Better Care Outcomes Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

John Busher	Planning Officer, Guildford BC
Kate Lines	Planning Policy Officer, Guildford BC
Laura Howard	Planning Policy Officer, Guildford BC
Christopher Todman	Solicitor, Guildford BC

FOR MERROW RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Keith Meldrum
John Dumbleton

End of Appearances

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Letter and list of addressees advertising date, time and place of the Hearing, 12 October 2016
2. A1 copy of Tree Protection Plan SJA TPP 15002-02 (original scheme)
3. A1 copy of Tree Protection Plan SJA TPP 15002-03 (amended scheme)
4. Signed 106 agreement dated 22 November 2016 (original scheme)
5. Signed 106 agreement dated 22 November 2016 (amended scheme)
6. Monitoring Report 2015/2016, October 2016
7. West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Final Report, September 2015
8. Letter from appellant notifying local residents of amended drawings and the Hearing, 29 September 2016

End of Documents