

WINDSOR AND ASCOT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 2ND MARCH, 2022

At 7.00 pm

by

GREY ROOM - YORK HOUSE, ON [RBWM YOUTUBE](#)

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PART I

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE NO</u>
7.	<p><u>21/02792/REM- HEATHERWOOD HOSPITAL LONDON ROAD ASCOT SL5 8AA</u></p> <p>Proposal: Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, scale) pursuant to outline planning permission 16/03115/OUT Hybrid planning application comprising: 1) Application for full planning permission for the development of a new Elective Care Hospital and associated Admin Hub with associated parking, vehicle access, highway works, plant and landscaping 2) Application for full planning permission for the change of use of existing building to provide GP Practice, Office, Data Centre and Staff Restaurant in association with the Elective Care Hospital 3) Application for outline planning permission (access and layout determined with all other matters reserved for future consideration) for demolition of existing hospital and redevelopment of up to 250 dwellings with associated vehicle access and highway works 4) Application for full planning permission for the change of use of existing woodland to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) in association with the outline residential planning permission.</p> <p>Recommendation: Permit</p> <p>Applicant: Robin Pearmain, Taylor Wimpey</p> <p>Member Call In: N/A</p> <p>Expiry Date: 13 December 2021</p>	3 - 8

|

|

|

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR AND MAIDENHEAD PANEL UPDATE

Application No.:	21/02792/REM
Location:	Heatherwood Hospital London Road Ascot SL5 8AA
Proposal:	Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, scale) pursuant to outline planning permission 16/03115/OUT Hybrid planning application comprising: 1) Application for full planning permission for the development of a new Elective Care Hospital and associated Admin Hub with associated parking, vehicle access, highway works, plant and landscaping 2) Application for full planning permission for the change of use of existing building to provide GP Practice, Office, Data Centre and Staff Restaurant in association with the Elective Care Hospital 3) Application for outline planning permission (access and layout determined with all other matters reserved for future consideration) for demolition of existing hospital and redevelopment of up to 250 dwellings with associated vehicle access and highway works 4) Application for full planning permission for the change of use of existing woodland to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) in association with the outline residential planning permission.
Applicant:	
Agent:	Sarah Isherwood
Parish/Ward:	Sunninghill And Ascot Parish/Ascot & Sunninghill
If you have a question about this report, please contact: Jo Richards on 01628 682955 or at jo.richards@rbwm.gov.uk	

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This update relates to the following: -

1. Receipt of a further objection letter
2. Receipt of further comments from the Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan delivery group

1.2 There is no amendment to the recommendation which remains:

It is recommended the Committee DEFER and DELEGATES to the Head of Planning:	
1.	To grant planning permission on the satisfactory completion of an undertaking to secure a contribution to the Council’s Carbon Offset Fund and with the conditions listed in Section 15 of the main report.
2.	To refuse planning permission if an undertaking to secure a contribution to the Council’s Carbon Offset Fund, has not been satisfactorily completed as the proposal would fail to meet the terms of the Council’s Interim Sustainability Position Statement and Borough Local Plan policy SP2

2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional comments received, summarised as:

Comment	Officer response	Change to recommendation?
Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group Late Observations:		No
There are discrepancies between what was granted in 2017 and what is being proposed within the reserved matters	A legal view has been sought on this matter. See paragraph 10.81 of main report.	
Buildings E, F, G (flats) now replace individual dwellings	This is not contrary to the approved matters of access and layout or to the approved parameter plans. The scale parameter plan requires the buildings in 5, 6 and 7 to be 3-storey which they are. To achieve the 230 units requirement (one of the primary requirements of the proforma) the housing type has been varied but on the whole remains substantially in accordance with the hybrid permission.	
The hybrid permission approved 137 houses and 93 flats, the RM now proposed 105 houses and 125 flats which is contrary to approved housing mix	A legal view has been sought on this matter. See paragraph 10.81 of main report.	
There is a predominance of flats over family houses with private gardens, which impacts the overall character, scale and appearance	The housing mix is addressed at paragraphs 10.21 – 10.26 of the main report There is a predominance of 3-bed units (flats and houses) which meets the aims of policy HO2 and the Berkshire SMHA (2016)	
The proposal is not in line with the Amenity Space standards in the BWDG SPD. The amenity space for blocks A, B, C, D and H will not be screened from public view or be quiet and free of vehicles.	The approved layout has dictated the siting of the amenity space for the apartment blocks. All flats have balconies and access to outdoor amenity space. The overall amenity for these units is considered to be sufficient.	
The proposal does not deliver the requirements of policy QP1c (Ascot Placemaking by delivering good design)	Design matters are discussed at Section v.	
The proposal does not incorporate interesting frontages and design detailing as pedestrian level (QP3h)	Design matters are discussed at Section v. There is considered to be variety and	

	interest in the frontages and design detailing.	
QP3a – The proposal is contrary to the Tall Buildings criteria	Policy QP3a is discussed at paragraph 10.30	
Policy HO3 – the proposal should deliver 30% affordable housing on site	Affordable Housing is addressed at paragraphs 10.16-10.18 and was a matter for the hybrid permission	
Parking requirements for new developments have changed. The 2004 parking strategy should not be used on the Heatherwood site. NP/T1 now applies and requires adequate space for visitors and trades	Parking provision is addressed at 10.52-10.65 of the main report. The proposal has been assessed against all relevant policy requirements including, the 2004 parking standards, NP/T1, BLP policy IF2 and the NPPF (2021)	

Additional comments received from local resident		No
The amended plans are substantially different to both the hybrid permission and the original reserved matters submission	A legal view has been sought on this matter. See paragraph 10.81 of main report.	
The ratio of houses to flats is different to the hybrid permission	The housing mix is addressed at paragraphs 10.21 – 10.26 of the main report	
There is a reduction in 1 bed flats and 2, 4 and 5 bed houses. The proposal does not provide a broad range of dwelling types and sizes	The housing mix is addressed at paragraphs 10.21 – 10.26 of the main report There is a predominance of 3-bed units (flats and houses) which meets the aims of policy HO2 and the Berkshire SMHA	
There are flats in place of houses in parcels 5, 6 and 7	This is not contrary to the approved matters of access and layout or to the approved parameter plans. The scale parameter plan requires the buildings in 5, 6 and 7 to be 3-storey which they are. To achieve the 230 units requirement (one of the primary requirements of the proforma) the housing mix has been varied.	

<p>The application is substantially different to the terms and conditions of the hybrid permission. The developer must amend the application so that it complies with the terms and conditions or submit and new planning application.</p>	<p>A legal view has been sought on this matter. See paragraph 10.81 of main report.</p>	
<p>The new BLP requires 30% affordable housing on site</p>	<p>Affordable Housing is addressed at paragraphs 10.16-10.18 and was a matter for the hybrid permission</p>	
<p>There should be a least 46 visitor spaces. Visitor parking is inadequate</p>	<p>Parking provision is addressed at 10.52-10.65 of the main report. The proposal has been assessed against all relevant policy requirements including, the 2004 parking standards, NP/T1, BLP policy IF2 and the NPPF (2021)</p>	
<p>Parking should comply with policy NP/T1</p>	<p>Parking provision is addressed at 10.52-10.65 of the main report. The proposal has been assessed against all relevant policy requirements including, the 2004 parking standards, NP/T1, BLP policy IF2 and the NPPF (2021)</p>	
<p>The is insufficient information regarding the design and landscaping specifications for the Scheduled Ancient Monument</p>	<p>Impact on the SAM is addressed at 10.45-10.48</p>	
<p>The private amenity space for blocks A, B, C and D does not comply with principle 8.5 of the design guide. It is north facing, overlooked and fronting a road</p>	<p>The approved layout has dictated the siting of the amenity space for the apartment blocks. All flats have balconies and access to outdoor amenity space. The overall amenity for these units is considered to be sufficient.</p>	
<p>A number of requirements of the AL20 allocation proforma have not been complied with (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 21, 22)</p>	<p>Officers consider the vast majority of the proforma requirements to have been met. Where requirements haven't been met there is sufficient justification. It is pertinent to note that the hybrid and reserved matters applications straddle the</p>	

	adoption of the BLP.	
--	----------------------	--

