

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL**

15 July 2020

Item: 1

<b>Application No.:</b>	19/02521/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	The Walled Garden Frogmore Windsor
<b>Proposal:</b>	Erection of a structure for a temporary period of 5 years, alterations to ground levels and associated hard and soft landscaping.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr Maynard
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Phil Hiscocks
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Windsor Unparished/Old Windsor
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Susan Sharman on 01628 685320 or at <a href="mailto:susan.sharman@rbwm.gov.uk">susan.sharman@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

**1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The application seeks temporary planning permission, for a period of 5 years, for the erection of a modular building for the storage of items from Buckingham Palace whilst it is undergoing comprehensive reservicing works.
- 1.2 The site is located in the Green Belt and within the 19<sup>th</sup> Century walled gardens of the Grade I Royal Estate. The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would result in less than substantial harm to the heritage assets.
- 1.3 However, the proposed store is urgently required as the works at Buckingham Palace have commenced and there are no alternative sites or facilities that meet the specific and necessary storage requirements. The public benefits of the proposal, arising from its association with Buckingham Palace, are substantial and long-term compared to the temporary harm that would be caused from the proposal.
- 1.4 On balance, the public benefits of the proposal outweigh its harm so that very special circumstances exist in this case to justify approving the application.
- 1.5 Should the Panel be minded to approve the application, the Planning Authority is required to refer the application to the National Planning Case Work Unit prior to issuing a formal decision. This referral is required as the proposal exceeds 1000sqm and is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and to provide the Secretary of State the opportunity to call-in the application for his determination should he decide it necessary.

**It is recommended the Panel defers and delegates the decision to GRANT planning permission to the Head of Planning subject to the conditions listed in Section 13 of this report and there being no call-in from the Secretary of State to determine the application himself.**

**2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION**

- The Council's Constitution does not give the Head of Planning delegated powers to determine the application in the way recommended as this is a major application; such decisions can only be made by the Panel.

**3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

- 3.1 The application site of 0.72 hectares is located towards the east side of the Windsor Castle Estate and falls within the Windsor Home Park (Grade I) listed area. The site currently comprises two areas of walled garden located to the North-West of the Windsor Farm Shop. Part of one of

the walled gardens (Garden B) is currently used for storage in association with the shop, with the remaining area and Garden A disused. The application site is accessed via the farm shop car park located off Datchet Road.

- 3.2 The Royal Gardens lie immediately to the North of the application site with Windsor Hall and Frogmore further North. To the East is the storage facility (warehouse) for the Windsor Farm Shop which is adjacent to Datchet Road. Open fields lie to the South and West of the site bounded by the Albert and Datchet Roads.

#### **4. KEY CONSTRAINTS**

- 4.1 The main planning constraints relating to the proposal are that the application site is located within the Green Belt and the walled gardens, being part of the Grade I Royal Estate: Windsor castle and Home Park Registered Park, are curtilage listed.

#### **5. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 5.1 The application seeks temporary planning permission, for 5 years, for the erection of a modular building for the storage of items from Buckingham Palace whilst it is undergoing comprehensive reservicing works. The building would provide approximately 2171 sqm of floor area and measure approximately 25m wide, by 84m long and 6.3m high. It would be constructed of laminated wooden beams, insulated aluminium side wall panels and a PVC roof. The exterior materials would be finished in a dark green colour. The building would be positioned roughly in the centre of Garden A on a new, temporary hard surface, (comprising terram (porous) membrane overlaid with 200mm of compacted MOT type 1 aggregate). It would be enclosed to all sides by the existing 3.4m high wall, but set back from the wall by at least 3.7m and over 7m from the South East wall facing the Windsor Farm Shop. No physical works are proposed to the walls. After the 5 year period, the temporary storage structure and hardsurfacing would be removed and replaced with topsoil.

- 5.2 There is no planning history relevant to the consideration of the application.

#### **6. DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

##### **Adopted Royal Borough Local Plan (2003)**

- 6.1 The main Development Plan policies applying to the site are:

Issue	Adopted Local Plan Policy
Green Belt	GB1, GB2 (A),
Listed Buildings and/or their settings	LB2
Historic Gardens and Formal Landscapes	HG1
Area of Special Landscape Importance	N1
Trees	N6

These policies can be found at

[https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/downloads/download/154/local\\_plan\\_documents\\_and\\_appendices](https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/downloads/download/154/local_plan_documents_and_appendices)

#### **7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

##### **National Planning Policy Framework Sections (NPPF) (2019)**

Section 4- Decision-making

Section 12- Achieving well-designed places

Section 13- Protecting Green Belt land

Section 14- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 16- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

##### **Borough Local Plan: Submission Version**

Issue	Local Plan Policy
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	SP2, SP3
Flood risk	NR1

### **Borough Local Plan: Submission Version Proposed Changes (2019)**

Issue	Local Plan Policy
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	QP1, QP3
Flood risk	NR1

- 7.1 The NPPF sets out that decision-makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation. The Borough Local Plan Submission Document was published in June 2017. Public consultation ran from 30 June to 27 September 2017. Following this process the Council prepared a report summarising the issues raised in the representations and setting out its response to them. This report, together with all the representations received during the representation period, the plan and its supporting documents was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in January 2018. The Submission Version of the Borough Local Plan does not form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough.
- 7.2 In December 2018, the examination process was paused to enable the Council to undertake additional work to address soundness issues raised by the Inspector. Following completion of that work, in October 2019 the Council approved a series of Proposed Changes to the BLPSV. Public consultation ran from 1 November to 15 December 2019. All representations received will be reviewed by the Council to establish whether further changes are necessary before the Proposed Changes are submitted to the Inspector. In due course the Inspector will resume the Examination of the BLPSV. The BLPSV and the BLPSV together with the Proposed Changes are therefore material considerations for decision-making. However, given the above both should be given limited weight.
- 7.3 These documents can be found at:  
<https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/blp>

## **8. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

### **Comments from interested parties**

No neighbours were directly notified of the application.

The planning officer posted a notice advertising the application at the site on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2019 and the application was advertised in the Local Press on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2019.

### **Consultee responses (summarised)**

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Historic England	<p>The Royals Gardens retain their historical significance and clear evidential and communal values. The walls surrounding the former kitchen gardens and the gardener's house survive as a reminder of the original function of the site as an ancillary structure to the Castle and help demonstrate how the great manorial complex as a whole once functioned. Forming part of the setting of the Castle, The Royal Gardens make an important contribution to its significance.</p> <p>The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting</p>	9.9 – 9.14 & section 11

	<p>of the listed building and the overall landscape surrounding the Royal Gardens, notwithstanding the reversibility of this harm due to the intrinsic provisional nature of the proposed building. In particular, the large scale and sizable massing of the intended structure would entail disruptive views of its top section above the walls along Albert Road to the south and Datchet Road to the east; an area particularly sensitive as the former tree cover has been significantly eroded over the last decades.</p> <p>We also have slight concerns about the potential harm to buried archaeological deposits due to the required construction of soakaways, associated with the proposal, within this archaeological rich landscape. Accordingly, your archaeological advisor's recommendation on the need for an archaeological watching brief should be sought.</p> <p>Alternative locations for the temporary structure explored by the applicants have proved unsatisfactory and thus impracticable on size, accessibility, environmental-conditions, commercial and security grounds. On account of this, we believe the preferred location could be considered acceptable, if the accruing heritage harm were mitigated by the restoration of the historical character of the former kitchen garden. Historic maps and descriptions record the original symmetrical arrangement of four central compartments surrounded by an outer slip and including a granite fountain in the centre, while straight rows of trained orchard trees lined the encircling walls. These records can act as sources of inspiration for the production of feasible garden scheme. In particular, provision of trees along the surviving walls would play a fundamental role for screening the proposed development from key street views and provide much needed green cover to the currently blighted landscape, helping re-establish its distinctive historic character and appearance.</p> <p>HE recognises the justification for the preferred site, as well as the temporary nature of the proposed structure, however it considers the degree of harm it would cause to the significance of the setting of the designated Windsor Castle and registered Home Park would need to be mitigated by provision of clear heritage and public benefits. The recommended development of a scheme for restoration of the former kitchen garden would address this issue through enhancement of the character and appearance of the Castle's setting, and provision of rows of trees, gardens and green areas for the present and future enjoyment of the local and wider community.</p>	
Berkshire Gardens Trust	<p>Considering the application on its merits, we note this is a temporary structure serving a particular need for the next 5 years. No doubt the security of this site is a relevant consideration for the applicants.</p> <p>We recognise the care taken in choosing the site to minimise impact on the setting of the registered gardens. It is important that at the conclusion of the 5 years, the site is restored to its present condition or improved. Subject to that we have no objection.</p>	9.13

Berkshire Archaeology	Historic England has confirmed concerns about potential harm to buried archaeological deposits resulting from the groundwork required to facilitate the development. As such it has made recommendations that the scheme should be reviewed to take these factors into account, and furthermore that the grant of any permission should be conditioned to undertake an archaeological watching brief over any excavations required to facilitate the development. This would likely mitigate harm caused to buried archaeological deposits. Berkshire Archaeology is in agreement with these findings.	9.12
Conservation	No objection in principle. Some initial concerns with regards to height and design of the proposed building and the potential harm to the setting of the walled garden and Grade I Registered Park. Insufficient details with regards to the impact of ground works and the impact of any security installations.	9.10
Trees	There are a few young and semi-mature trees on site, but these are not protected by statutory controls. The trees are predominantly self-seeded aspen, the larger of these are within a metre or so of the historic wall. These older trees are not sustainable, some are already in conflict with the wall and are likely to cause damage. Aspen stems growing within 3m of the wall should be removed.	9.20 – 9.22
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objections subject to a condition requiring a surface water drainage scheme.	9.18, 9.19
Highway Authority	The proposal raises no highway concerns.	9.24

## 9. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

9.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i The principle of development (Green Belt);
- ii The impact of the proposal on the significance of heritage assets;
- iii The impact on the character and appearance of the area;
- iv Surface water drainage;
- v Trees;
- vi Other material considerations (ecology, highways); and
- vii The Planning Balance and conclusion.

### **The principle of development (Green Belt)**

9.2 The application site is located within the Green Belt. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate, with the exception of certain types of buildings. In this case, the proposal is for a type of building that is not included in the 'exceptions' list and accordingly, the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, i.e. the principle of development is not acceptable.

9.3 The NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances, (paragraph 143). The NPPF states further that, when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, and that 'very special

circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, (paragraph 144). In terms of other harm to the Green Belt, while the proposed building would be surrounded by the 3.4m high wall, there would be loss of openness (a key characteristic of Green Belt) resulting from the upper section of the proposed building rising above the wall, representing a loss of openness of approximately 6000m<sup>3</sup>.

- 9.4 The application submission includes detailed information on the need for the proposed building and specifically its proposed location at the application site. In summary, the building is required to facilitate the temporary storage of items from Buckingham Palace, as part of the major reservicing programme currently underway; (The reservicing of Buckingham Palace involves the urgent and complete overhaul of its electrical cabling, plumbing and heating in order to prevent long-term damage to the building and its contents - full details of the programme of works can be found at: <https://www.royal.uk/reservicing-buckingham-palace-0> ). The initial option of installing a store within the London estate was assessed, but discounted on the grounds of lack of space for the size of storage facility required and the imposition on the daily operation of the various sites, which are used regularly for functions and events, and for which security would be compromised as a result.
- 9.5 The application submission advises that external storage providers have been reviewed, including assessment of the storage volumes available, commercial storage costs, security, travel distances and access to stored items. However, the use of external storage providers has been ruled out due to the excessive costs involved and poor accessibility for the staff currently working for the Royal Household at the established sites, including Windsor Castle.
- 9.6 To maximise efficiencies in construction, ensure the temporary building is to some extent recyclable (once dismantled) and to provide a solution that can accommodate the environmental conditions and storage volumes required, a modular building is proposed. Whilst this option will meet the time frames, security and environmental conditions required, and provide the most economically viable solution, modular buildings are only available in pre-determined heights and widths. In this case, the size of the building has been selected to suit the volume requirements of the items to be stored and the height of the specialist racking that is required to safely store larger items.
- 9.7 The items identified for storage comprise a diverse mix of objects of differing materials, weights, heights, fragility and vulnerability to movement and environmental conditions. The special requirements of the building include:
- Provision of a dry, insulated, heated, watertight structure that can accommodate and maintain a carefully controlled range of both temperature and humidity within different zones of the building;
  - Provision of a floor structure that can accommodate significant weight loads from both storage racking and specialist items including the use of forklift/assisted lifting equipment;
  - Provision of a ceiling height that can accommodate the specialist racking required for the safe storage of items (4m clear internal height);
  - Provision of specialist lighting suitable for the long-term storage of items;
  - Security of the facility to meet the existing level of security required across the Windsor and London Estates;
  - Access for the monitoring and care of stored items, including the ability to remove items to the workshops and facilities already located on the Windsor Estate for planned work whilst the items are not in use;
  - Ability for the structure to be dismantled safely at the end of its use with the minimum of environmental impact on surrounding areas, and the ability to recycle as much of the dismantled structure as possible; and
  - To provide a well-insulated, efficient and watertight structure that will support the minimum mechanical and electrical equipment necessary to meet the environmental conditions required, whilst minimising costs and reducing the impact, as far as practicable, on the environment.

- 9.8 Consideration of the justification for the proposal, as outlined above, is set out further in the Planning Balance section of this report, which weighs up the benefits and harm of the proposal, (that is, harm to the Green Belt and any other harm outlined further in this report), to assess whether 'very special circumstances' exist in this case to justify approving the application.

### **The impact of the proposal on the significance of heritage assets**

- 9.9 The application site is located within the 19<sup>th</sup> Century walled gardens that form part of a group of garden and service buildings associated with the Royal Gardens and which form part of the Royal Estate. They are located within the Grade I Royal Estate: Windsor Castle and Home Park Registered Park.
- 9.10 The application submission is required (by paragraph 189 of the NPPF) to assess the significance of the walled garden and consider the impact of the proposal on its setting and its wider setting within the Grade I historic park. A subsequent revised heritage statement (HS) was submitted in response to the Conservation Officer's initial concerns (outlined in Section 8 of this report), which identifies and assesses the significance of the heritage assets. In summary, the HS sets out that no physical works to the walls are proposed and that the proposed groundworks are to be kept clear of the brickwork. In terms of significance, the HS concludes that although the walled gardens have a high historic and aesthetic value, they have a low communal and evidential (evidence of past human activity) value. Accordingly, the level of impact affecting the significance of the heritage assets was noted as being less than substantial, and whilst the impact on the aesthetic value of the heritage assets is considered to be at the upper end of less than substantial, this may be acceptable given the temporary arrangement proposed with the complete removal of the building and reinstatement of the ground works after the expiry of the 5 year period.
- 9.11 Historic England (HE) and Berkshire Gardens Trust were consulted, as statutory consultees, on the application and their respective advice is also set out in Section 8 above. HE's advice in respect of the suggested mitigation measures are noted. However, while it is agreed that the proposal would have less-than substantial harm to the heritage assets and that the potential harm has to be weighed against the potential public benefits it would bring, the mitigation measures suggested by HE are considered excessive and disproportionate to the proposed scheme. The applicant has provided clear and convincing justification for the proposal, (set out in paragraphs 9.4 to 9.7 above). Furthermore, the public benefits of the proposal, by enabling and facilitating the works being undertaken at Buckingham Palace, to protect and secure this (BP) heritage asset in the long term (well beyond 5 years) are substantial. The mitigation measures suggested by HE would involve substantial and costly works beyond the boundaries of the application site and would be permanent, while the proposed development would be confined to the walled garden areas and would be temporary. Any tree planting, suggested by HE, would take a number of years to establish to provide meaningful screening to the development. Accordingly, the mitigation measures suggested by HE are unreasonable and unnecessary.
- 9.12 With regard to potential archaeological finds, Berkshire Archaeology has recommended a condition be attached to any approval in respect of an archaeological watching brief, covered by condition 7 in Section 13 below.
- 9.13 Berkshire Gardens Trust raised no objection to the proposal subject to a condition that the site is restored to its present condition or improved after the temporary period has lapsed and the building removed from the site. This is covered by condition 2 in Section 13.
- 9.14 The applicant's submission, together with Historic England's and Conservation responses, concur that the impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage assets is "less than substantial". Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states where this is the case, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal and this 'balancing' assessment, as with the Green Belt considerations, is set out in the Planning Balance section of this report below.

## **The impact on the character and appearance of the area**

- 9.15 The area surrounding the site is largely open to the south and west with the walls visible from the Albert Road and roundabout to the South. A substantial belt of trees within Home Park runs adjacent to the north side of the B3021 (Southlea Road), to the west of Albert Bridge and to the north-east of the application site. These trees provide screening of the application site when viewed from the raised elevation of the Albert Bridge, approximately 400m from the site, such that only minor glimpses of the roof of the development will be visible from the bridge. Given the separation distance and existing landscaping, it is not considered that the proposal will harm the setting of the River Thames at this point.
- 9.16 As the top section of the proposed store would rise above the existing walls, it will be partially visible from the south and west. However, at its closest point, (which is to the South-East from Datchet Road), the proposed store would be approximately 220m from the public highway. The building itself would also be set back at least 7m from the South-East facing wall and would be finished in a dark green colour.
- 9.17 In terms of visual impact only and having regard to the fact that the application site is located within a working farm, where large agricultural buildings would not look out of place, together with the fact that it would be predominantly screened by the walls and is for a temporary period of 5 years, the rural and largely undeveloped character of the area would be maintained and not harmed as a result of the proposal.

## **Surface water drainage**

- 9.18 The initial consultation response from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) advised that it notes from the application form that surface water runoff will be drained to soakaways. However, no details of the proposed surface water drainage had been submitted to demonstrate that the development complies with the relevant requirements of the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (DEFRA, March 2015). Accordingly, the LLFA advised that the applicant be given the opportunity to provide this information or otherwise recommended refusal of the application.
- 9.19 In response to the LLFA's initial advice, additional information has been received to which the LLFA raises no objections subject to a condition (No. 7 in section 13 below).

## **Trees**

- 9.20 The Council's Tree Officer has advised that there are a few young and semi-mature trees present on the application site, but that these are not protected by statutory controls. The trees are predominantly self-seeded aspen, the larger of which are within a metre or so of the historic garden wall. The Tree Officer has advised that the older trees are not sustainable and that some are already in conflict with the wall which is likely to cause damage. It is recommended that aspen stems within 3m of the wall be removed.
- 9.21 The Tree Officer has advised that the loss of soft ground and associated plants and trees needs to be compensated for nearby, outside of the application site boundary, and has suggested additional tree planting be undertaken along Albert Road, where tree cover has become eroded over the years, together with the reinstallation of a pond linked to the Battle Bourne. The trees and pond would complement the current land use, which is understood to be grazing; the trees providing shade and the pond a potential watering hole.
- 9.22 The longer term issues with regard to tree planting and biodiversity enhancements across this part of the Estate have been discussed with the Royal Household and its agents, who have confirmed their willingness to engage with the Council on this matter at a later date. However, at this time, the priority of the applicant is to provide the storage building as soon as possible as the reservicing works to Buckingham Palace have already commenced. Having regard to the fact that the trees on the application site could be removed without formal consent and immediately, irrespective of the current application, and as the Tree Officer has advised that some trees on site should be removed, it is not reasonable to impose conditions in this case on any planning



permission requiring tree replacement planting. Biodiversity enhancements to the site are recommended (see Other Material Considerations below), but these need to be reasonable and in proportion to the scale of the development being proposed, so the installation of a pond is not considered necessary to mitigate the impact of this current proposal.

## **Other Material Considerations**

- 9.23 Ecology – A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and Reptile Survey Report (RSR) were submitted with the application. At the time these surveys were undertaken, the site was overgrown and would have provided habitats for a number of wildlife species. However, at the time of the site visit, the site had been cleared, with just the boundary trees remaining, thus largely removing its potential to support wildlife habitats. Essentially, however, the reports found that the proposal was highly unlikely to have an adverse impact on Great Crested Newts; that no reptiles were found and therefore no mitigation measures would have been necessary for these; that no badger setts were found on the site; and the site had no potential to support Hazel Dormice or bats. There would have been some potential to support hedgehogs but this would have been lost due to the site being cleared. In the circumstances, it is considered reasonable and necessary to impose a condition with any planning permission that requires appropriate biodiversity enhancements.
- 9.24 Highways – Access to the site is via the Windsor Farm Shop car park, which provides direct access to the Datchet Road. Specifically, entrance to the site will be through a 5.0m width gate. The application states that some alterations to the car park will be required in order to ease vehicular access. The site provides sufficient parking spaces to serve the temporary structure. The Highway Authority has advised that the proposal raises no highway concerns.

## **10. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)**

- 10.1 The development is CIL not liable.

## **11. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION**

- 11.1 This report outlines above that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would also lead to some loss of openness. As the NPPF states, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. In addition, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the identified heritage assets and that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Although there is substantial and less than substantial harm as a result of the proposal, it is material to the consideration of the application that this harm is limited by the fact that the development is of a temporary nature.
- 11.2 In terms of the other planning considerations, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area or any trees or to highway safety. Ecological matters and an appropriate surface water drainage system can be sufficiently secured by conditions.
- 11.3 In support of the application, the proposed store is required to enable the major reservicing works currently being undertaken at Buckingham Palace. Buckingham Palace is one of the most iconic buildings of the world and instantly recognisable as home of The Sovereign. It is also a working building, hosting almost 100,000 guests and attracting over 15 million tourists every year. The reservicing of Buckingham Palace involves the complete overhaul of its electric cabling, plumbing and heating in order to prevent long-term damage to the building and its contents. The work is necessary and urgent.
- 11.4 The application has demonstrated that there are no alternative sites to the one proposed and has sufficiently justified the need for the size and type of store building proposed. The building would be sited within the walled garden, which would largely screen it from public view, and would be finished in a dark green colour to limit its visual impact. The building would be removed in its entirety after 5 years with the site restored to its current condition.

- 11.5 In weighing up the issues, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the Green Belt and less than substantial harm to the heritage assets. This harm would be limited however due to the temporary nature of the proposal. On the other hand, the public benefits of the proposal, by enabling and facilitating the works being undertaken at Buckingham Palace, to protect and secure this heritage asset in the long term (well beyond 5 years) are substantial. Accordingly, the other considerations in this case outweigh the harm resulting from the proposal and very special circumstances exist to justify approving the application. The proposal therefore complies with Policy GB1 of the Local Plan and paragraph 144 of the NPPF.

## 12. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan
- Appendix B – Site layout
- Appendix C – Proposed elevations

## 13. CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED FOR INCLUSION IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- 2 Prior to installation a scheme of works to restore the site to its existing condition, (which shall include details of the existing condition of the site including site levels) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The development shall be discontinued, all structures removed from the site and the land restored to its former condition (as agreed in the approved scheme of works) on or before 5 years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: The proposal does not constitute a form of development that the Local Planning Authority would normally permit. However, in view of the particular circumstances of this application temporary planning permission is granted. Relevant Policies - Local Plan GB1, LB2.
- 3 The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development shall be in accordance with those specified in the application unless any different materials are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.
- 4 Prior to installation, details of any external lighting, security systems, venting, ducting, extraction equipment and/or any other plant or equipment to the exterior of the building, other than that shown on the approved drawings, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be implemented and maintained as approved for the duration of the development.  
Reason: To ensure the proposed equipment does not harm the appearance of the building in the interests of the visual amenity of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.
- 5 The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the locations and specifications of biodiversity enhancements, which shall include but not be limited to, bird boxes, have been submitted and approved in writing by the council. The biodiversity enhancements shall be installed as agreed.  
Reason: To incorporate biodiversity in and around the development in accordance with paragraph 175 of the NPPF.
- 6 Prior to the commencement of the development (other than demolition to ground level) a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include: i) Full details of all components of the proposed surface water drainage system including dimensions, locations, gradients, invert levels, cover levels and relevant construction details; ii) Supporting calculations confirming compliance with the Non-statutory Standards for Sustainable Drainage, proposed discharge rates and attenuation volumes to be provided. The supporting calculations should be based on infiltration testing undertaken in accordance with BRE365; and iii) Details of the maintenance arrangements relating to the proposed surface water drainage system, confirming who will be responsible for its maintenance and the maintenance regime to be implemented. The surface water drainage system shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.  
Reason: To ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), its associated guidance and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage

Systems, and to ensure the proposed development is safe from flooding and does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

7 A) No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

B) No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A).

C) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A) and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure the continued preservation in situ or by record of any finds made in this area of archaeological interest. Relevant Policies - Local Plan ARCH2, ARCH4 and paragraph 199 of NPPF 2019.

8 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved particulars and plans.





