



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2025

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/W/24/3349120

St Anns Lodge, Ruxbury Road, Chertsey, Surrey KT16 9NH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Giles of Wooldridge Developments Ltd and Igloo Care Ltd against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is RU.23/1508.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 38 residential units, associated access, parking and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the application form. It accurately describes the proposal, and I have not been made aware of any agreement for it to be changed.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024 and later amended on 7 February 2025. Both main parties have been given the opportunity to comment on how the changes affect their respective cases, and any responses received have been taken into account in my decision.
4. Regarding reason for refusal no. 4, the Council has confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed affordable housing provision comprising 13 no. units for rent and no longer seeks first homes. The appeal has been determined on this basis.
5. The appellant has provided a Unilateral Undertaking in respect of developer contributions, but it was not signed, consequently I have been unable to take it into account in my decision.

Main Issues

6. Taking into account the reasons for refusal, the main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to siting, design, scale, layout, appearance and trees;
 - Whether the proposal would make an acceptable contribution towards open space provision;

- The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of future occupiers of properties yet to be constructed to the rear of the appeal site with regard to privacy;
- Whether a contribution towards affordable housing provision is reasonable and necessary to make the development acceptable;
- The effect of the proposal on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA); and,
- Whether contributions towards off site highway improvements are reasonable and necessary to make the development acceptable.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site contains St Ann's Lodge, a residential property, and its gardens, garage, and stables, along with its manège and paddock areas, it has a wide frontage onto Ruxbury Road. To one side of the appeal site is The Grange Care Home, a large three storey property finished in white painted render under a slate roof with an 'L' shaped footprint, it has a commanding presence near to the junction between Pycroft Road, St Ann's Road and Ruxbury Road. To the other side of the appeal site is St Ann's Cottage, a detached dwelling with a landscaped setting. The appeal site is a small part of a much larger residential allocation at Pycroft Road that extends significantly beyond its rear boundary and is currently under construction in two separate parts¹. There is a considerable ground levels change across the appeal site (said to change by some 7.5 metres or so) with the levels raising significantly when travelling along Ruxbury Road in a direction away from Chertsey.
8. There is also substantial landscaping on and around the appeal site, including along this part of Ruxbury Road, giving the immediate area a verdant appearance. There is some variety in the scale of properties nearby but most of them have pitched roofs, many being clad with slate, and they are set within spacious plots. Collectively these aspects, along with the low density of buildings, positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
9. There are two listed buildings nearby, The Golden Grove Public House, which is opposite the proposed access and the Mausoleum Chapel which is located farther along Ruxbury Road and nearly opposite St Ann's Cottage, to the other side of St Ann's Hill Road. Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, S66(1) requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects the setting of a listed building, special regard is to be had to the desirability of preserving that setting. Paragraph 212 of the Framework also requires great weight to be given to the conservation of the setting of listed buildings.
10. St Ann's Lodge is not locally listed but is said by the Council to be a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) as it appears on an 1844 map as a "School Cottage" and because they say it provides local interest as a Victorian dwelling, said to be designed in the gothic revival style. However, I saw on my site

¹ Ref. Grange Farm (RU.22/1569) and Chilsey Green Farm (RU.21/0893)

inspection that St Ann's Lodge has been much altered, some of which is unsympathetic to its original appearance, and it was in part in a poor state of repair. There is also no recognition of the building within Policy SL6 of Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, adopted July 2020 (RLP) relating to the wider housing allocation it sits within. Nevertheless, its age and some of its remaining architectural features, indicate to me that it is a NDHA.

11. RLP Policy EE8 says proposals should preserve the character and significance of locally listed and other non-designated heritage assets, their setting and any features of architectural or historic interest. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states the significance of NDHA's should be taken into account for proposals that directly or indirectly affect NDHA's, it says a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
12. There are no objections from the main parties to the loss of the NDHA, providing a condition is imposed on any planning permission to ensure a recording of the building is undertaken prior to its demolition. From my own site observations, I see no reason to disagree.
13. With the exceptions of The Golden Grove, which sits between St Ann's Hill Road and St Ann's Road, and Pycroft Grange School on the opposite side of the road, the other nearby properties along Ruxbury Road and Pycroft Road are located near to the road. Unlike the appeal proposal that has a significant setback from Ruxbury Road and would be sited behind both of its neighbouring properties, with a large car parking area proposed between the building and Ruxbury Road, creating a distinctly different form of development, and out of character with other buildings in the immediate area.
14. Although there are some larger buildings in the immediate area with parking in front of them, including The Golden Grove, Pycroft Grange School and The Grange Care Home, these buildings differ from the proposed development as they do not have a regular shape, and they each have parts of the buildings that extend from their main part. In addition, their parking areas are much smaller than those proposed at the appeal site, which would also be visible through the wide access into the site, even if the proposed new front hedge were to screen part of it. The appeal site's location is also not directly comparable to the locations of other three storey pitched roof apartment buildings that are built or approved elsewhere on the allocation, as they sit side-by-side with other new housing.
15. It is acknowledged that the siting of the proposal may take account of the narrower plot width at the front of the appeal site. However, the proposed development's siting and scale, including the largely rectangular footprints, large areas of parking, and the limited separation between the buildings and boundaries would create an illegible form of development in this part of Ruxbury Road, and introduce an alien form of development that would not respect the pattern of surrounding buildings or the character and appearance of the area.
16. In view of the three-storey height of The Grange Care Home, and notwithstanding the change in ground levels nearby, the three-storey height of the proposed development would not be objectionable at the appeal site. In addition, the proposed heights of the buildings, including their proposed respective ground level changes, broadly reflect the rising ground levels along Ruxbury Road, to the extent

that such changes to the ground levels would also not on their own be objectionable.

17. The design of the proposed buildings would be contemporary, and they have not sought to replicate the design of properties nearby. I don't doubt that the proposal is a well-designed scheme and reflective of modern architecture. However, its considerable mass and scale, busy elevations with different projecting parts, which make it appear hard edged (as shown on some of the visuals), and its flat roof, would appear incongruous in this location. Moreover, its appearance would harmfully contrast with the immediate area's low-density and verdant character that contains mainly pitched roof properties set within spacious plots. Its setback from the road, along with the set-in at second floor level, lower two storey parts to its sides and different external materials do little to lessen its harm or acceptably reduce its mass.
18. The proposed external materials are mostly acceptable and high quality. However, the use of lighter colours towards the top of the buildings would appear discordant against mainly darker coloured roofs on other properties in the area.
19. In view of the combination of intervening planting, the respective separation distances and ground level changes, the proposed development would have a neutral effect upon the setting of The Golden Grove, and the Mausoleum Chapel.
20. RLP Policy SL6 requires the retention of boundary vegetation and boundary planting. The appellant's BS5837:2012 Arboricultural Impact Assessment, prepared by TGA Arboricultural Consultants, dated October 2023 (AIA) identifies 10 no. trees and 2 no. groups of trees to be removed as part of the development, which have all been identified as either C or U category trees and are mainly away from the boundaries of the appeal site. These trees have a low amenity value, and with most of the trees on the appeal site's boundaries shown to be retained, there are no objections to their loss, providing suitable new planting is undertaken, which could be secured by a suitably worded condition.
21. Notwithstanding the Council's concerns, the AIA has assessed the trees shown to be retained in respect of future shading and from pressure for felling, arising from the proposed development, it has not identified any such unacceptable risks, saying that in the event future felling was needed it would have to be undertaken in accordance with the relevant British Standard. If there was future pruning of the trees, given that they are part of a group and that they are largely seen in the context of other nearby planting, it would be unlikely that any pruning would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. There is also adequate separation between the trees to be retained and the new buildings, and in view of the large extent of the communal areas any overshadowing of them would be unlikely to be significant. Moreover, if the Council had wanted to retain any of the trees it could have sought a Tree Preservation Order, if it were appropriate.
22. The loss of the existing hedge along part of the appeal site's frontage, due to its tall height and close proximity to the road, would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In addition, the proposed new hedge along the entire frontage of the appeal site (except the access) would help to create a consistent appearance on this boundary and open views into the appeal site. The Council has not disputed the condition suggested by the appellant in response to their concerns about the effect of construction works for new pathways and level

changes on nearby trees. In the event the appeal was to be allowed, such a condition should be capable of being imposed in this respect.

23. The appellant has said that the proposal would result in the minimum of 275 dwellings across the entire allocation, as required by RLP Policies SL6 and SD2, and make an efficient use of land as required by RLP Policy EE1. However, as proposed, the quantum of development across the whole allocation would disproportionately be accommodated at the appeal site, which is said to be less than 10% of the whole allocation. Whether or not the Council accepted a lower density of development across the other parts of the allocated site, which is said to have land at a higher risk of flooding, this should not be a reason to allow an unacceptably high density of development at the appeal site, particularly in view of the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area, and that it has a distinctly different location to other parts of it.
24. RLP Policy SL6 also says that within the area of the allocation that is shaded (which includes the appeal site) there should be a minimum of 100 dwellings provided, if it does not come forward as part of the whole allocation. It is understood 68 no. dwellings have been approved on the shaded area already, and it is further noted that the proposal would mean 105 no. dwellings would be located on the shaded area in total (above the minimum specified in Policy SL6).
25. The appellant has also said that the Framework and the National Planning Design Guide, dated 2021 (NDG) refers to well-designed places not always needing to copy their surroundings. Whilst that may be so in some cases to enhance particular areas, the NDG has to be read as a whole and its pursuit of well-designed places, requires careful consideration of many aspects of an area, including its context, identity and built form. Moreover, the proposed development has been found to be harmful for the reasons outlined above, and its different design approach does not enhance the character and appearance of the area in this case.
26. To conclude, although I find the effect of the proposed development on the existing trees, the NDHA, the proposed change in ground levels, and the principle of three storey accommodation at the appeal site to be acceptable, for the reasons outlined above the siting, design, layout, scale and appearance of the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and there would be conflict with RLP Policy EE1 that amongst other things requires high quality design that responds to the local context including the built, natural and historic character of the area with particular regard to its layout, form, scale, materials and contributes to and enhances the quality of the public realm. In addition, there would also be conflict with paragraph 135 of the Framework that seeks to ensure new development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.
27. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the key objectives and design standards 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 13 of Runnymede's Design Supplementary Planning Document, adopted 2021 (DSPD) which collectively seek to create development that is of high quality and responds to an areas distinctive character and special qualities.

28. I also find the proposal due to its inappropriate scale and design to be inconsistent with the key objectives of NDG Policies I1 and C1, insofar as they seek to ensure well-designed development that responds to local character and the built context.

Open space provision

29. RLP Policy SL26 requires residential developments of 20 dwellings or more to provide new or enhanced provision of open space, in accordance with its specified requirements relating to children and teenagers, open space and allotment/community gardens. It says development proposals, including allocated sites should aim to incorporate the required amount of open space on-site. It further states when it is not feasible or viable to make on-site provision, an off-site financial contribution to improve the quality of existing nearby open spaces can be sought.
30. The appellant has said that on other parts of the same allocation, open space has already been provided or approved; some 1.3 hectares of open space at the Chilsey Green Farm site, including a Locally Equipped Area of Play, a meandering hoggin path, walking route, community orchard and a trim trail; and some 0.07 hectares of open space on the Grange Farm development. It is further said that the appeal site is the smallest part of this allocated land, and that the proposed units each have their own private amenity space that meet minimum space requirements.
31. Notwithstanding the points above, the Council state that 0.11 hectares of outdoor sports facilities is required on the appeal site, including 550 square metres of space for children and teenagers (split into 171 square metres of equipped play space and 379 square metres as unequipped). Whether this is so, the appellant has said that there is approximately 850 square metres of communal space to the side and rear of the proposed buildings which could be used as open space, it is also said that it would be south facing and provide some natural shading, and that it could include some natural play equipment and be secured by condition.
32. It is unclear whether the appellant intends that the proposed on-site communal space is to be available for public use, which the Council's policy indicates it would need to be. In this event, its position behind and to the sides of the buildings would not necessarily be well-located to be meaningful open space that would be accessible for those not living at the appeal site. Its location and use could also adversely affect the living conditions of future occupiers of the nearest new units. As such, the appellant's suggested on-site open space is not considered to be appropriate or feasible to fulfil the requirements of RLP Policy SL26 in this case.
33. It is noted that the proposed units are unlikely to attract many occupiers with children, though some families may choose to live there. Providing an equipped and unequipped play space for children and teenagers, along with open space would appear to serve a limited purpose from the appeal scheme itself. Although not requested by the Council, applying Policy SL26 to require a contribution towards off-site provision nearby, such as an enhancement to that provided on the remainder of the allocation, could be the most appropriate way of complying with the policy in this case.
34. To conclude, there is no suitable provision before me for either an on-site or off-site contribution towards meaningful open space provision, and the proposed

development is contrary to RLP Policy SL26 the requirements of which are set out above.

Future living conditions – privacy

35. RLP Policy EE1 states development should ensure there is no adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. DSPD Design Standard 24 says normally rear garden depths should be 11 metres and there should be a separation distance of 22 metres between back-to-back new properties and that 22 metres between facing habitable rooms is acceptable as a rule of thumb for flatted development, although it says greater separation may be required between taller properties to avoid overlooking.
36. The properties to be constructed behind the appeal site² are to be two storeys high and said to be located at a lower ground floor level, they have their rear elevations facing the rear boundary of the appeal site. I also saw on my site inspection that there is planting, including mature trees on the boundary between the appeal site and the new houses yet to be constructed.
37. The appellant's documentation shows that like the proposed development, the adjoining two storey dwellings to be constructed also correspond to the changing ground levels. Furthermore, with the proposed development in part set into the ground, its two-storey level is not a dissimilar height to some of the two storey levels on those adjoining properties. It is also noted that the Council has accepted closer distances between some of the apartment buildings and other development recently constructed elsewhere on the Chilsey Green Farm part of the allocation, albeit with a road in-between (said to be some 13.5 metres apart).
38. The appellant's sectional drawings indicate that a minimum separation distance of 22 metres would be retained between the rear elevations of the appeal scheme and the dwellings yet to be constructed, and slightly greater between the second floor of the proposed buildings at the appeal site. As the appeal scheme would not be significantly taller than the new two-storey houses that adjoin the rear boundary of the appeal site, a separation distance greater than 22 metres would not be justified in this case.
39. The proposed buildings also include balconies at first and second floor level that reduce the separation distance to approximately 20.5 metres (first floor) and 21.5 metres (second floor), slightly below the distances set out in DSPD Design Standard 24. However, those separation distances are not definite requirements in every case, but normal expectations. The minor reduced separation distances arising from the balconies, particularly considering the landscaping on the appeal site's rear boundary and taking into account the ground level changes, would still be sufficient to ensure that there would not be harmful privacy effects for future occupiers of those new dwellings to the rear of the appeal site.
40. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would provide future occupiers of the housing yet to be constructed behind the appeal site with satisfactory living conditions and the proposal would satisfy the requirements of RLP Policy EE1 insofar as it requires new development not to have adverse effect upon the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. In addition, the

² Ref. Grange Farm permitted under RU.22/1569

proposal would also comply with paragraph 135 of the Framework that requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

41. Whilst there is some minor conflict with the separation distances referred to within Design Standard 24, as set out above, the proposed development would be consistent with one of the key objectives of the DSPD of ensuring new development does not have an adverse effect upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Affordable Housing

42. RLP Policy SL20 requires a 35% on-site affordable housing contribution from developments of 10 or more dwellings. The scheme proposes 13 no. affordable units, of the net increase of 37 no. units as a result of the proposed development, which would comply with the requirements of Policy SL20. The Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document, dated April 2022 (AHSPD), also reflects the requirements of RLP Policy LP20 and says the Council's preference is for affordable housing to be provided and managed by established affordable housing providers or by the Council, and for the affordable housing to be secured by a legal agreement.
43. There appears to be no dispute between the main parties regarding the affordable housing provision at the appeal site. However, no signed planning obligation has been provided to secure the affordable housing.
44. To conclude, without a signed planning obligation that would ensure the affordable housing would be secured should the appeal be allowed, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of RLP Policy SL20, the requirements of which are set out above.
45. The Council referred to conflict with RLP Policy SL19, which relates to housing mix. Within the submitted documentation the Council did not find any conflict with the proposed mix of housing when considering it alongside development on the other parts of the allocated area, and I also see no reason to disagree. Consequently, I did not find that policy to be directly determinative on this main issue.

Effect on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA

46. The site is located within the 5km zone of influence of the SPA, a European site, designated to protect important habitat for bird species, namely the Dartford Warbler, Woodlark and Nightjar. These birds nest on or near the ground and as a result are vulnerable to predators, as well as to disturbance from informal recreational use, such as walking and dog walking. It is likely that occupants of the proposed development would visit the SPA for recreational purposes causing disturbance to this area. In this regard, and considering the evidence before me, the proposal, when combined with other developments in the area, would likely have significant effects upon the qualifying features of the SPA.
47. RLP Policies LP6, EE9 and EE10 all require the effects from residential development within the zone of influence to be mitigated through off site financial contributions before occupation of the new dwellings, to safeguard the SPA from recreational activity.

48. The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, Supplementary Planning Document, dated April 2021 (SPASPD) further says that off-site measures must be based on a combination of Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) and the provision and/or improvement and/or maintenance of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). The SPASPD sets a charging schedule for development based on bedroom sizes. Natural England have been consulted and raise no objections to the proposed development, subject to there being the required off-site financial contribution to off-set the likely significant effects upon the SPA.
49. The appellant has not provided a signed planning obligation to deliver the required contribution to mitigate the likely significant effects upon the SPA.
50. I therefore conclude in the absence of suitable mitigation the proposal would have adverse effects on the SPA and conflict with the requirements of RLP Policies LP6, EE9, and EE10, which amongst other things, require development to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. In addition, there would also be conflict with paragraph 193 of the Framework that states when harm to habitat sites cannot be avoided, such harm is appropriately mitigated or compensated for, and if not, planning permission should be refused.

Off-site highway contributions

51. The Council have requested a planning obligation for contributions to highway improvements; a financial contribution to The HIF Scheme of £246 per square metre due to likely impacts on the A320; an informal pedestrian crossing point to the east of the proposed access with tactile paving; that tactile paving is also provided to all pedestrian crossing points at the roundabout junction with St Ann's Hill Road, Ruxbury Road and Pycroft Road; and that a speed activated sign is provided on Ruxbury Road.
52. RLP Policy LP26 says measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network and take account of impacts on the strategic road network, including the A320, will be required as well as contributions to any other infrastructure identified at application stage which is necessary to make the site acceptable in planning terms. RLP Policy SD3 seeks to enhance the accessibility and connectivity between people and places by active and sustainable forms of travel, and RLP Policy SD4 requires proposals to maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network. In addition, RLP Policy SD5 says development including those on allocated sites, which give rise to a need for infrastructure improvements, will be expected to mitigate their impact, which would be secured in a range of ways including by planning obligation.
53. There is very limited information regarding The HIF Scheme, and whilst reference is made to an SPD, no copy has been provided. As a result, it is unclear where it is, what the contribution would be used for, when it will be delivered and why it is related to the proposed development. Therefore, based on the information before me I am unable to conclude that a contribution to The HIF Scheme would be necessary to make the proposed development acceptable.
54. It is unclear where a proposed speed activation sign would be located on Ruxbury Road and if there is adequate space within the highway for it to be located near to the appeal site. Whilst I don't doubt that it would be useful in highway safety terms

to slow the speed of vehicles along Ruxbury Road, the access to the appeal site is located very near to a roundabout where vehicle speeds are likely to be below the 30-mph speed limit in any case. There is therefore insufficient information provided to show how the contribution would be directly related to the appeal scheme, or in the event it was necessary, that it could not be secured by a planning condition relating to works within the highway.

55. The contributions requested regarding the pedestrian improvements and crossing point are related in kind and scale to the proposal and would improve the safety of pedestrians using the footpaths near to the appeal site. However, these are also likely to be works within the highway or within the red line, and not on third party land, a pre-commencement condition could therefore be used to secure these works are delivered, part of which is referred to in the appellant's Transport Statement, prepared by Motion, dated October 2023. It is therefore not clear why such works have to be secured by a planning obligation.
56. On the basis of the information before me, and subject to a suitably worded condition in regard to the off-site pedestrian improvements, the other required off-site contributions have not been shown to be reasonable and necessary to make the development acceptable and requiring a planning obligation to secure them would not be necessary to accord with RLP Policies SL6, SD3, SD4, and SD5, the requirements of which are set out above.

Other Matters

57. There is no dispute between the main parties that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing, it is said to have a 3.98-year supply of housing. However, the presumption in favour of sustainable development embodied in paragraph 11d) ii of the Framework does not apply in this instance, because the application of policies in this Framework that protect the SPA, provide a strong reason for refusing the development, in accordance with paragraph 11 d) i, and footnote 7 of the Framework.
58. I have been made aware of the appellant's pre-application engagement with the Council and the evolution of the proposed scheme along with the community consultation undertaken. It is regrettable that an acceptable scheme was not presented at application stage, nevertheless I have assessed the appeal scheme based on its planning merits.
59. The appellant has referred me to evidence showing a need for affordable housing in Runnymede and that the Council has substantively under delivered in respect of affordable housing provision in the past. In addition, I have been referred to appeal decisions where very significant weight was attached to the provision of affordable housing, including when there was a 5-year supply of housing, which was also confirmed by a court challenge. However, in this case with there being no suitable mechanism in place to secure the affordable housing provision, I am unable to attach any weight to it, and for the same reasons I did not find the appeal decisions and the court case referred to as entirely comparable, and I attach limited weight to them.
60. It is acknowledged that the appeal site is allocated for housing, that there are no objections from statutory consultees; that there is no requirement to provide gypsy and traveller pitches; there is an acceptable housing mix; that the proposal meets minimum space requirements; there would be no unacceptable harm to existing

and future occupiers living conditions; it would not have unacceptable effects on ecology, protected species, ground conditions, flood risk, and drainage; and there would be no adverse heritage impacts. However, these are likely to be requirements of any such well-designed scheme and are neutral factors that do not weigh in favour or against the proposal.

61. It has also been said that the proposed development is in a sustainable and accessible location; that it would provide security on site and prevent anti-social behaviour and reduce the perception of crime; it would provide a biodiversity net gain; and incorporate sustainable energy features. These points are noted, and they weigh in favour of the proposal.
62. The appellant has referred to various parts of the Framework in support of their appeal, including paragraph 125 c) that says substantial weight should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes which should be approved unless there would be substantial harm, and paragraph 125 d) that says the development of under-utilised land and buildings should be promoted, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing. These along with the other parts of the Framework that are mentioned are noted, and although they provide some support for the proposal, the Framework should be read as a whole, and complying with certain parts of it does not result in complying with it as a whole, particularly given the above identified conflicts. Furthermore, in accordance with paragraph 125 c) of the Framework, substantial weight cannot be given in this case to the proposed re-use of the brownfield site, because of the substantial harms that have been identified above.
63. There have been issues raised by local residents and others in addition to the above issues, including but not limited to, highway safety and the impact of the development on the surrounding highway network; whether it should have been a comprehensive development of the allocation; heritage impacts; ecology and biodiversity impacts; green belt; flood risk and drainage; effect on local services, facilities, and infrastructure; environmental impacts; whether the Council has consulted properly on the application; the effect on The Grange Care Home; the sustainability of the site; and ground conditions. Whilst I can understand the concerns, subject to planning conditions as would be appropriate, there is no compelling evidence before me that would lead me to come to a different conclusion to the Council on these matters. It is also noted that the appeal site is not within the designated Green Belt, and in addition to contributions already requested, the Council has not identified any unacceptable harm to local services and facilities, or sought direct contributions to them, and I find no reason to disagree. There is also no substantive evidence submitted that consultation on the planning application has not been appropriately undertaken.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

64. In my decision above I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the SPA and the character and appearance of the area, it would not provide adequate open space provision and that there is no mechanism to secure the required affordable housing contribution. As such, there would be conflict with RLP policies SL6, EE1, EE9, EE10, SL20, and LP26, and in this case I regard the proposal to conflict with the development plan as a whole. I attach significant weight to this conflict. In addition, the proposal also conflicts with the relevant parts of the Framework, as set out above.

65. The benefits of the proposal include making an effective and efficient use of an underutilised brownfield site, boosting housing supply and contributing towards Runnymede's overall housing supply, on an allocated housing site and providing a net increase of 37 no. units. The proposal would also provide new accommodation for future occupiers to own or rent, in a well-connected area, which is accessible, and near to services and facilities. There would also be economic benefits associated with its construction. Additionally future occupiers would likely help support the vitality of the local community facilities and services. There would also be benefits from providing a biodiversity net gain and from incorporating sustainable design features, including charging points. Although there are said to be benefits relating to reducing the risk of crime and anti-social behaviour, these would likely be minimal, particularly given that the dwelling at the appeal site is understood to be occupied, and because I am not aware of any history of crimes or anti-social behaviour occurring at the appeal site. These benefits, even when taken collectively, attract moderate weight.
66. I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including those raised by the appellant and the Framework, which outweigh that conflict. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR