

# Planning Committee

## 20<sup>th</sup> September 2021 at 7:30pm

### Addendum

---

- Item 5.1      2021/1040  
Nutfield Green Park, The Former Laporte Works, Nutfield Road, Nutfield, Surrey  
Construction and operation of Nutfield Green Park with access from Nutfield Road and Nutfield Marsh Road comprising the construction of an outdoor activity park using imported inert materials, the operation of an outdoor activity park, the construction and operation of an associated wellbeing centre (GP surgery, pharmacy, community diagnostic hub, community shop, restaurant/cafe, creche, office hub, event space, indoor and outdoor gyms together with ancillary uses such as 2 staff accommodation units, treatment rooms and storage) together with development of up to 239 residential units, a 70 bedroom rehabilitation and respite care facility with an associated up to 100 extra care units and staff accommodation for up to 21 staff together with infrastructure, landscaping and open space. (Outline for Access and Layout).
- 

- 1.0      Section 10.12 of the officer's report should be replaced with the following,

Nutfield Parish Council – objects on the following grounds

- The site lies within a Tier 4 Settlement and is **NOT** suitable for this level of development
- Inappropriate development within the green belt
- Harm to openness
- Harm to the character and appearance of the area
- Adverse impact on landscape
- Harm to adjoining occupiers for example, noise, dust, air pollution etc
- Unsustainable location
- Air quality
- Ecology
- Flood Risk
- No grounds for very special circumstances

- 1.1      Since the report was published on the 10<sup>th</sup> September 2021 a letter from the applicant's agent was received on the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2021 asking that the application be deferred for the applicant to address the concerns of the consultees. Officers are of the professional opinion that such discussions and/or amendments would not overcome the in-principle objections against this proposal. Members are therefore advised to fulfil their statutory duty and determine the application before them this evening.

- 1.2      The applicant's agent has also raised concerns regarding the accuracy of the report in respect of sections 2.2 and 12.1. Under Section 2.2 of the officers

report it states that the site was subject of a Tree Preservation Order, this is incorrect. Regardless of this error, which is acknowledged, this does affect the concerns of officers in respect of visually important and prominent trees which contribute to the verdant and sylvan character of the area. The grounds for refusal remain unchanged as a result.

- 1.3 Under 12.1 of the Officers report it states that no comments were received from Environmental Health colleagues however it has now become apparent that comments were received on the 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2021 which are provided below for easy reference:

*I refer to your recent request for observations on the above application, I would like to make the following comments.*

### **Construction Phase**

*Providing the developer adheres to the mitigation measures specified in the Environmental Assessment with regards to noise and dust, including the limiting of hours of operation to-*

*7.30am to 5.30pm Monday to Friday and  
8am to 1pm on Saturday, with no noisy works Sundays or Bank  
Holidays, I would have no objection on Environmental Health grounds.*

### **Operational Phase**

*Residential/Rehabilitation Centre/Staff Accommodation*

*In order to protect the amenity of the residents, if planning permission is granted, prior to the commencement of the development, a scheme to demonstrate that the noise levels within the development will conform to the design criteria for noise guideline values as specified within British Standard 8233:2014 Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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.*

*If the applicant needs to rely on closed windows to meet the guide values, there needs to be an appropriate ventilation system that does not compromise the façade insulation. The use of trickle vents, acoustic or otherwise, is unlikely to be satisfactory for summer ventilation, and the applicant would need to install a mechanical ventilation system that allows for summer ventilation without relying upon the opening of windows.*

*Wellbeing Centre*

*In order to protect the amenity of the residents, all plant, machinery or equipment installed or operated in connection with the Wellbeing Centre shall be so designed or attenuated so that the rating level of noise emitted does not exceed the background sound level when measured according to BS4142: 2014.*

*Please contact David Bryant on extension 2849 if you wish to discuss the application or require more information.*

*Mr D Bryant  
Environmental Health Officer*

- 1.4 While comments have been received from colleagues in environmental health this would not alter the conclusions reached in the report that the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the residential amenities of future or existing residents.
- 1.5 Finally the applicant's agent raises issues with the use of the word 'objects' within the Officers report in sections 11-12. The comments received by consultees have been reviewed by Officers and based on the wording of the responses have been summarised as objections. Clear concerns have been expressed by statutory and non-statutory consultees and the use of the word 'objects' is not a matter that should prevent the application from being discussed and determined.
- 1.6 Paragraph 38.8 should be deleted and replaced with the following,

Policies of the Local Plan can be considered 'out of date' in their own right. However, such an assumption does not mean that the Local Plan is set wholly aside. In a recent appeal at Frith Manor Farm (Ref No: APP/M3645/W/19/3237774) the Inspector rightly considers whether policies are out of date on an individual basis; he did not disregard the plan in its entirety. The LPA accept that its housing policies are inconsistent with the framework and can be classed as 'out of date'.