



## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 8 February 2023

Site visit made on 8 February 2023

**by Mr JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 20 March 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/22/3311359**

**The Robin Hood, 38 Sydenham Road, Guildford, Surrey GU1 3RT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
  - The application Ref 22/P/00569, is dated 25 March 2022.
  - The development proposed is a 4-storey new build apartment building with a single commercial component (wine bar – sui generis) located at ground floor and 5 flats above across 3 floors, following demolition of The Robin Hood Public House.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 4-storey new build apartment building with a single commercial component (wine bar – sui generis) located at ground floor and 5 flats above across 3 floors, following demolition of The Robin Hood Public House at The Robin Hood, 38 Sydenham Road, Guildford, Surrey GU1 3RT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/P/00569, dated 25 March 2022, and subject to the conditions in the Conditions Schedule below.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Following agreement with the parties at the Hearing, in the description I have clarified that the commercial component would be a wine bar that was sui generis under *The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987* (as amended). It was also agreed at the Hearing that the address above identified the building more clearly than the one on the planning application form.

### Main Issues

3. In the light of the submissions, the main issues in this case are
  - a) whether there would be unacceptable harm through the demolition of a locally listed building;
  - b) whether the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Guildford Town Centre Conservation Area and so harm its significance;
  - c) whether it would prejudice the redevelopment of the neighbouring allocated site and

- d) whether it would have a likely significant effect, when considered alone or in combination with other plans and projects, on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (the SPA).

## Reasons

### ***Issues (a) and (b) The demolition of the locally listed building and the effect on the Conservation Area***

4. The *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* (the Act) says that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) goes on to state that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. When considering development that affects an asset, the decision-maker should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing its significance and putting the asset to a viable use consistent with its conservation. It confirms that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset.
5. Turning to the development plan, saved Policy HE9 from the *Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003* (the 2003 Local Plan) says development involving demolition in a conservation area will be permitted where either the existing building makes little or no contribution to the character or appearance of the area (criterion 1) or its potential for repair, retention and beneficial use is limited (criterion 2). In providing this basis for considering demolitions, it does not expressly distinguish between buildings that are listed nationally, those that are locally listed, non-designated heritage assets that are not locally listed, and other properties. It also makes no reference to how compliance with that policy sits against the emphasis on significance found in the Framework. Policy D3 in the *Guildford borough Local Plan: strategy and sites* (the 2019 Local Plan) says the effect on the significance of heritage assets, whether or not they have been designated, would be considered in accordance with the Framework amongst other things.
6. Although identified as being a building of townscape merit in the *Town Centre Conservation Area Character Appraisal*, the appeal property is a locally listed building, and has been so for about 20 years. It was agreed therefore that it was a non-designated heritage asset. Even if I were to accept it had a high local significance (and this will be something I explore below), it is not subject to the statutory requirements in the Act that are given to nationally listed buildings, and indeed I have no basis to consider it should be afforded the same level of protection.
7. The Robin Hood stands on the south-east side of Sydenham Road. It was built as a public house in about 1865 as part of Guildford's first Victorian suburb, and has remained in that use more or less continually since, up until its recent closure. It originally stood on a street corner, with terraced housing of a similar scale and age lining Sydenham Road to the south-west and (across the side street) to the north-east, as well as along the side street itself. However, all this housing was demolished over 40 years ago, and since then the site has had car parks on 3 sides with Sydenham Road on the fourth.
8. I was pointed to a number of elements that the Council contended contributed to the building's significance as a heritage asset. Firstly it had a historical

significance, as the land for its construction had been sold by Dr Sells, the man behind the growth of this suburb, and I was given a list of owners, occupiers and brewing companies that had been connected with it since. However, based on what I was told at the Hearing, I consider it likely that Dr Sells at some point owned the sites of numerous buildings in this part of the town, and it could equally well be possible to trace occupancy back for many older properties nearby. The contribution these factors make to the significance of the building is therefore exceptionally limited.

9. I was also told that, as the last remnant from the Victorian period on this length of Sydenham Road, its significance lay as a reminder of the wider suburb that used to stand there. I accept that its general scale and form are what would be expected of a mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century suburban development and, from the submitted photographs, appear to reflect the terraces that were to either side. I recognise too that few if any Victorian buildings are still present on this stretch of Sydenham Road. Furthermore, if maintained, The Robin Hood has the potential to be relatively attractive.
10. However, it has been subject to much work over the years, with rear extensions of little merit and a rendering that has not only concealed its original brick finish, but has also masked much of the detailing that might have been present. While originally no doubt part of a bustling community, it now stands in isolation, away from other buildings. To my mind this loss of context and detail erode its understanding and appreciation. I accept that the adjacent car parks are allocated for development, and when this comes forward the building would no longer be isolated, but I have no details of the scheme against which it would sit. Therefore, while it is perceived as being of some age, I do not share the Council's view that it somehow acts like a remaining fragment, allowing an appreciation of the Victorian development that was around it but has now otherwise been removed. This is especially so as Victorian housing that clearly demonstrates this phase of the town's history can be found just to the north-east and south-west. Therefore, its role in this regard contributes little to its significance.
11. Finally it was contended it was a landmark building. Whilst its design would have responded to its corner location, that would have been common on many similar plots at junctions. However, despite now being isolated, it is not a particularly striking building and, notwithstanding its chamfered corner, it does not display dramatic architectural features. Indeed, the submitted photographs show it was very much in keeping with the nature of the buildings that used to stand around. As a public house it would have had some community role, but its size and location lead me to suspect that would have been localised.
12. Accordingly, as a heritage asset I accept it has some historical significance because of its age but, given it is not nationally listed and mindful of its design, alterations and context, I consider any such significance is limited. Its demolition would nonetheless cause a total loss of this significance.
13. The appeal property is in the Guildford Town Centre Conservation Area, an extensive conservation area that covers the older heart of the town. The buildings it contains are of a range of styles and together span many centuries. When taken with the intervening street layout and open space around and between them, they contribute positively to the character and appearance of

- this designated heritage asset, illustrating its evolution over time. I therefore consider its significance is partly historical and partly architectural.
14. As a 19<sup>th</sup> Century building, albeit notably altered, The Robin Hood plays a role in reflecting the historic growth of the town. Therefore, I accept that its effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area can be deemed to be positive to some extent, and it adds to a limited degree to its significance as a designated heritage asset. However, given the more extensive areas of Victorian development to the north-east and south-west along Sydenham Road, and mindful of its isolated and altered nature as well as its poor condition, all discussed above, this positive contribution is slight. Overall, The Robin Hood therefore contributes little to the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such, its demolition would not conflict, in this regard, with criterion 1 of Policy HE9 in the 2003 Local Plan.
  15. Despite that policy, the loss of this building would cause harm to the significance of the conservation area. Given the size of the conservation area, the isolated nature of the building, its condition, and the presence of Victorian development nearby, that harm would be less than substantial, and would be at the lowest end of that range.
  16. When a previous appeal for the demolition of the building was considered in 2016 (the 2016 decision) the Inspector then also found the public house had a historical significance, and complemented the conservation area. I have scant knowledge of the evidence before that Inspector. Despite that, my findings do not differ from those earlier ones.
  17. Turning to criterion 2 of Policy HE9 in the 2003 Local Plan, the building is clearly in a poor state of repair and, from what I was told, for a number of years it has been unoccupied and subject to limited maintenance. I have no reason to question that inside would need extensive refurbishment, and while the structure was generally sound, the roofing on the main element and the rear extension would need significant works.
  18. The appellant has submitted costings for repairing the building to continue it in its existing use or another single use, and also for repairing it and changing it to a flat with a separate commercial operation below. At the Hearing it was further confirmed that changing the building to 2 flats would be a comparable expense to the repair and change to a flat over an independent commercial use. None of these though were shown to be viable. In contrast, while the proposal would require the most financial outlay in absolute terms, it would be justified economically as its returns would be far greater.
  19. The Council contended that further options, such as extensions or roof alterations, could possibly be viable. Those options though were not articulated by the Council in any detail, and roof work, enlarging the property at the rear, or even just converting it to residential usage could serve to undermine whatever historical associations remain as a consequence of the way its scale and appearance reflect its origins as a Victorian public house.
  20. Accordingly, on the evidence before me and offered at the Hearing, I am satisfied that its potential for repair, retention and use can fairly be described as limited. As such, the demolition of the building does not conflict with 2003 Local Plan Policy HE9(2).

21. Furthermore, having found its repair has been shown to be unviable, it clearly follows that, if I dismissed the appeal, I consider it likely that the building would remain in its current dilapidated, vacant state, so despoiling the conservation area. Therefore, although I find that the loss of the building would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area, this factor reduces that harm.
22. In reaching this view I am aware that in the 2016 decision the scheme was found to be contrary to Policy HE9 in the 2003 Local Plan, because of a lack of evidence to show real efforts had been made to find a compatible alternative use. To my mind the financial information before me shows that the likelihood of such a use coming forward is extremely limited, and so puts me in a materially different position to that of that previous Inspector.
23. Furthermore, on the evidence before me I am not satisfied that the building's condition is, in whole or in part, a consequence of '*deliberate neglect*'. However, if it was, it has added to the repair costs and reduced the prospects of the building's reuse. If I then did not take such neglect into account, as advised by paragraph 196 in the Framework, it would not mean the repair, retention and use of the building would be any more viable or its retention any more likely. Consequently, dismissing the scheme, in whole or in part, on the grounds that some of its condition was due to '*deliberate neglect*' would not bring the reuse of the building any further forward, but would mean the adverse effects of its condition on the conservation area would remain into the future.
24. It was also said too that if the wine bar now proposed was viable then so should be the public house. The wine bar though would be in a very different building with different maintenance costs, and so I accept that the situation with regards to viability would not be comparable.
25. Finally, I was referred to a former public house on Cooper Road that was converted to flats. I am unaware of the condition of that building before the conversion took place, and I understand from the appellant for the proposal before me (who implemented that scheme) that it also involved the erection of houses on an adjacent car park. As such, it is reasonable to assume the viability situation was different.
26. Accordingly, I find that the demolition of The Robin Hood would not conflict with Policy HE9(1) or (2) of the 2003 Local Plan. However, there would be a total loss of significance of this locally listed building, and its removal would fail to preserve the character of the conservation area, causing less than substantial harm to its significance.
27. Turning now to the building to be erected in its place, this would be 4 storeys high and, with the exception of a set back to the front, would result in 100% site coverage. The first and second floors would project forward as far as the front elevation of the existing building, while the ground and third floors would be set back.
28. The Council accepts it is to be of an architectural language that reflects a number of new developments in the vicinity. It also acknowledges that the concerns about height and design that were raised in the 2016 decision are addressed in this proposal. Noting the large, modern buildings further along Sydenham Road, as well as the scale of the older Adult Learning Centre to the

north-east, I agree with the Council. Such a position is therefore a material difference between this scheme and the one subject of the previous decision.

29. Furthermore, to the east of the premises on the far side of the car parks, is what the *Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document* identifies as Viewpoint 08. This viewpoint offers wide-ranging views over central Guildford, across the High Street towards the Cathedral and the rising hills up to the Hogs Back. However, the fall of the land is steep, and the proposal is to one side, and so I consider what is before me would do little to impede or disrupt these views. Rather, from where it could be seen it would be set against relatively modern bulky buildings in the foreground.
30. The Council's concern though related to the development's isolated location, with open car parks on 3 sides. Visually, because of the rising land, there is not a strong sense of openness to the rear. The car parks mean the scheme would stand apart from the Cobbetts Place development to the south-west, and also from the Adult Learning Centre to the north-east. However, a similar level of isolation is experienced in relation to the existing building. Furthermore, given its scale I consider it can command a certain degree of isolation and indeed, with the car parks allocated for redevelopment, this could well be a temporary situation anyway, albeit of unknown duration.
31. There is little in the design that actively alludes to the Victorian history of the vicinity. However, it would nonetheless replace a dilapidated building with little prospect of being repaired, retained and used, and it would also respect the other buildings on this length of Sydenham Road. Overall, and putting aside the necessary loss of The Robin Hood, I therefore consider the erection of this new building would not be of a design or presence that would harm the character or appearance of the conservation area, and would not harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
32. Accordingly, although I find that the demolition of the locally listed building would accord with Policy HE9 in the 2003 Local Plan it would nonetheless result in a loss of its significance. Moreover, although I recognize that the new building, of itself, would not be harmful, when taken with the removal of The Robin Hood, the proposal would fail to preserve the character of the conservation area and would cause harm, albeit less than substantial and at the extreme lowest end of that scale, to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

***Issue (c) The effect on the neighbouring allocated sites***

33. Under Policy A11 in the 2019 Local Plan, the car parks to either side of and to the rear of the site are together allocated for approximately 40 homes, but with the requirement to retain as much public car parking as possible. With the Policy A11 allocation having an area of 0.47ha, the development envisaged would be at a relatively high density. As the scheme before me would have windows and balconies on the appeal site's side and rear boundaries, the Council contended it would prejudice the redevelopment of the Policy A11 allocation, due to a need to safeguard the mutual privacy of occupiers in the appeal proposal and on the adjacent development.
34. However, it is to be expected that any redevelopment site in a tight urban area will have constraints that have to be addressed in the eventual scheme. No layout has been offered to illustrate the potential effect of the proposal, or

show how it would constrain the delivery of the allocated site. Indeed, the topography would limit the impact on any development behind The Robin Hood, while the high-density nature of the scheme on the allocated site would no doubt have to address overlooking within its layout in any event. With the car park to the south-west elevated slightly above Sydenham Road, it is unclear as to the ground level that would be used to redevelop that side of the allocated site. It is also reasonable to assume any public car parking would be off Sydenham Road, nearest to the demands of the town centre, and so could be close to the appeal site and be used as a 'buffer' in this regard. Furthermore, if the existing building remained, whilst it may not generate issues of overlooking, it could also serve as a constraint to some degree by requiring the scheme on the car parks to have regard to its setting.

35. Accordingly, I conclude it has not been shown that this scheme would unacceptably inhibit the redevelopment of the Bright Hill Car Park under Policy A11 of the 2019 Local Plan, and so would not conflict, in this regard, with Policy D4(7) of the emerging *Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies Submission Local Plan*, which requires new development not to hinder the potential delivery of adjoining development sites.

***Issue (d) Impact on the SPA***

36. Having regard to the *Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017* (the Regulations), any proposals that may affect a designated habitat site should be considered with the aim of maintaining or restoring, at favourable conservation status, its natural habitats and species.
37. The site is within 5km of the SPA, which is a designated habitat site. As an area of lowland heath, it supports an internationally important bird population, and I consider it to offer irreplaceable habitats. I understand that this is a popular place to walk and exercise, yet such activities can result in a pressure that causes harm to habitat and birdlife through trampling, erosion, general plant destruction and so on. Therefore, by increasing the number of residents who may choose to use the SPA for recreation, the proposal could adversely impact on the SPA's integrity through greater disturbance and damage.
38. I appreciate that only 4 extra flats are proposed. However, the impact must be considered both alone and in combination with other plans and projects. Therefore, whilst the effect of the residents in these extra flats, by themselves, may be slight, when taken with other similar proposals around the SPA there could be a cumulative harm arising.
39. An appropriate assessment under the Regulations is therefore required. As a part of this, any avoidance or mitigation measures that may be necessary must be considered. Mitigation is offered by the appellant through a Unilateral Undertaking, which proposes to make proportionate payments towards the access management of the SPA and towards upgrading alternative green spaces elsewhere for recreation. I have no reason to find this would not deliver sufficient monies for purposes that would allow the likely significant effects arising from the scheme to be adequately mitigated.
40. I therefore conclude that, when considered in combination with other plans and projects, the development would adversely affect the integrity of the SPA, but this would be suitably mitigated by the measures secured under the submitted Unilateral Undertaking. As such, the proposal would not conflict with the

Regulations or the Framework, which seek to protect the SPA from adverse effects on its integrity.

### ***Planning Balance***

41. I have concluded there is no basis to consider the scheme would unacceptably prejudice the redevelopment of the adjacent allocated site, and whilst it would have a likely significant effect on the integrity of the SPA that could be addressed through mitigation.
42. However, I have also found there would be less than substantial harm, albeit at the lowest end of that scale, to the significance of the conservation area, while the significance of the existing building, which is locally listed and a non-designated heritage asset, would be lost.
43. In relation to designated heritage assets, the Framework states that any harm to their significance should require clear and convincing justification. Moreover, if less than substantial harm is caused to the significance of any such asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits. Concerning the effect on the significance of non-designated heritage assets, the Framework says a balanced judgement will be required, having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the asset. No specific advice is given in this regard in relation to locally listed buildings.
44. To my mind, the poor condition of The Robin Hood and the extremely limited potential for its repair, retention and beneficial use constitute a clear and convincing justification for its demolition.
45. In support of the scheme the appellant has cited public benefits relating to the delivery of housing, reduced carbon emissions from the new build, the securing of a commercial use, and economic and employment benefits.
46. I was told the Council can demonstrate a supply of deliverable housing sites that exceeds the 5-year requirement in the Framework, but that requirement is a minimum and not a maximum. Mindful of the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, I consider that the delivery of housing, even if it goes above that 5-year figure, is a benefit of the scheme to which I attach notable weight. I have little evidence on the carbon emissions of the new build when compared to the existing once it is repaired, and so that is not a matter to which great weight is afforded. I appreciate though that while it is unlikely a commercial use would resume in the existing building, one would be provided for in the proposal, and so there would be associated economic and employment benefits arising from the scheme. I attach moderate weight to these.
47. Overall, when taken with the clear and convincing justification for the demolition, I consider these factors amount to public benefits that are sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have identified to the designated heritage asset of the conservation area, given I have found the level of harm would be at the lowest end of that scale.
48. Furthermore, mindful of these benefits, and taking into account the compliance with Policy HE9 in the 2003 Local Plan, the limited significance of the building, its condition, and the limited prospect of it being repaired, restored and used, then a balanced judgement leads me to the view that the loss of this locally listed, non-designated heritage asset is justified.



49. Accordingly, I consider the public benefits identified by the appellant outweigh the less than substantial harm that would be caused to the significance of the Guildford Town Centre Conservation Area and to its character and appearance, while, taking a balanced judgement, the factors cited justify the loss of significance of the locally listed building.
50. I recognise that in the 2016 decision, the Inspector concluded that the loss of this public house and its replacement by the building then proposed, when taken together, would cause less than substantial harm, and that combined harm was not outweighed by the public benefits. I recognise too that decision was made at a time when there was a housing land supply of less than 5 years. As stated above though, I appear to have more conclusive evidence before me about the limited prospects of the repair, retention and beneficial use of the existing building, while, with a modified design, even the Council fairly accepts the impact of the proposed replacement is reduced. As a result, when making a balanced judgement and weighing the public benefits, the weightings in that decision were materially different, and so its conclusions do not bind me in this instance.

### **Conditions**

51. A commencement condition is justified [Condition 1], whilst a condition stipulating the plans is also necessary for the purposes of defining the permission [2].
52. Having regard to the character and appearance of the locality, conditions are required to agree materials [5], to agree and maintain the limited landscaping [6], and to ensure there is adequate refuse storage [7]. I consider though that the submitted plans give sufficient information to mean a further agreement of levels is unnecessary. In relation to the landscaping, I see no reason why the maintenance schedule should run for 10 years, while the refuse storage details should be agreed before damp proof course level is exceeded, as it could affect how the development is taken forward.
53. A condition should ensure any bats that may be present in the existing structure would be addressed appropriately [4]. To protect the living conditions of residents within the scheme there should also be an approved noise management plan [8]. For reasons of sustainability details of cycle storage should be approved [9] and in the interests of highway safety the dropped kerb should be removed from the front of the site [10].
54. Framework paragraph 204 states that the loss of a heritage asset should not be permitted without taking '*reasonable steps*' to ensure the new development proceeded, and this position is broadly reflected in criterion 3 of Policy HE9 in the 2003 Local Plan. As was agreed at the Hearing, under planning legislation it is difficult to require and enforce the construction of a new building following the demolition of an existing one, and indeed no such condition was suggested beforehand by the parties [3]. To my mind, given the scale of harms in this case, and having regard to my reasoning, I consider the requirement of a timetable of works to constitute proportionate and '*reasonable steps*'. This though would need to be worded as a 'pre-commencement' condition because the timetable would need to be agreed before the demolition works started.

**Conclusion**

55. Accordingly, in the light of the above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

*JP Sargent*

INSPECTOR

## Conditions Schedule

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Unless otherwise amended under the conditions below, the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the following plans and drawings:  
2005-001 Existing Location Plan & Block Plan; 2005-002 Proposed Block Plan & Site Plan; 2005-003 Proposed Ground Floor, First & Second Floor Plans; 2005-004 Proposed Third Floor & Roof Plan; 2005-005 Proposed North Elevation (Front); 2005-006 Proposed South Elevation (Rear); 2005-007 Proposed East Elevation (Side); 2005-008 Proposed West Elevation (Side); 2005-009 Proposed Section; 2005-010 Existing & Proposed Street scene; 17950621/FP Existing Cellar 1 of 4; 17950621/FP Existing Ground Floor 2 of 4; 17950621/FP Existing First Floor/Ground Floor Roof Plan 3 of 4; 17950621/FP Existing Main Roof Plan 4 of 4; 17950621/ES Existing Elevations 1 of 5; 17950621/ES Existing Elevations 2 of 5; 17950621/ES Existing Elevations 3 of 5; 17950621/ES Existing Elevations 4 of 5; 17950621/ES Existing Elevations 5 of 5.
- 3) No development shall take place until a timetable for the works and the intended timeframe for the construction of the new building to proceed has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the construction of the new building shall then proceed in accordance with that approved timetable and timeframe.
- 4) If works do not start before August 2023, no development shall take place until an updated bat survey and implications assessment of the building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any habitat mitigation measures identified in the approved updated survey and implications assessment shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved updated bat survey and implications assessment.
- 5) No development above damp-proof course shall be undertaken until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No development above damp-proof course shall be undertaken until full details of both hard and soft landscaping, including a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved landscape scheme shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved and maintained in accordance with the approved schedule of landscape maintenance. Any plants that, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, die, become diseased or are removed, shall be replaced with plants of a similar size and species before the end of the next planting season.
- 7) No development above damp-proof course shall be undertaken until details for the separate storage of waste on the premises for the flats and the commercial component, including the design and position of storage facilities for bins and recycling, shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter maintained for the duration of the development.

- 8) No development other than works of demolition shall be undertaken until details of a noise management plan concerning the operation of the ground floor commercial component (including noise and vibration from any plant and machinery), together with a timetable for the implementation of that plan, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The noise management plan shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and thereafter any physical measures shall be retained and the activity shall be in accordance with any approved practices in the plan.
- 9) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, secure cycle parking and cycle e-charging facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development shall be provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and those facilities shall thereafter be retained for such use at all times.
- 10) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the existing access from the site to Sydenham Road must be permanently closed and the kerb and footway fully reinstated.

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Dr J Edis	Heritage consultant
Mr J Escott	Planning consultant
Mr K Marsh	Viability consultant
Mr M Mintern	Viability consultant
Mr D Page	Architect

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms L Bloxall	Policy Officer (Design and Conservation)
Ms H Craig	Assistant Planning Officer
Mr G Durrant	Senior Environmental Protection Specialist
Ms J Fitzpatrick	Development Management (Applications) Lead

## **DOCUMENTS**

### SUBMITTED BY THE APPELLANT:

A3 versions of photographs found in Appendix 8 of its Statement of Case  
Email to the Planning Inspectorate (dated 14 February 2023) containing a signed Statement of Common Ground and an executed legal agreement  
Email to the Planning Inspectorate (dated 10 March 2023) concerning Condition 3.

### SUBMITTED BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Letter of notification of Hearing date and venue  
Policies D4 and ID9 from the *Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies Submission Local Plan* (June 2022)

### SUBMITTED BY NATURAL ENGLAND

Email to the Planning Inspectorate (dated 24 February 2023) concerning the SPA