

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

16 December 2020

Item: 3

<b>Application No.:</b>	20/00979/FULL
<b>Location:</b>	Apple Hill Henley Road Hurley Maidenhead SL6 5LH
<b>Proposal:</b>	Extension to the lower ground floor to facilitate 20 additional new patient and ancillary rooms, alterations to fenestration, raised patio, external plant, log cabin, 3no. additional car parking spaces and associated landscaping works.
<b>Applicant:</b>	Henley Healthcare Limited
<b>Agent:</b>	Mr Douglas Bond
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>	Bisham Parish/Bisham And Cookham
<b>If you have a question about this report, please contact:</b> Haydon Richardson on 01628 796697 or at <a href="mailto:haydon.richardson@rbwm.gov.uk">haydon.richardson@rbwm.gov.uk</a>	

### 1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for a lower ground floor extension to facilitate 20 additional patient rooms (with ancillary spaces). The works also include alterations to the buildings fenestration, a new raised patio, associated external plant and log cabin and 3 additional car parking spaces with associated landscaping works.
- 1.2 The application site is located within the Green Belt and the primary consideration in the assessment of the merits of this proposed development is whether or not it amounts to appropriate development in the Green Belt. If it does not comprise appropriate development then it has to be considered whether or not any very special circumstances exist which outweigh any harm to the Green Belt (which is afforded substantial weight) and any other identified harm.
- 1.2 Due to the siting of the proposed extension at lower ground floor level, the set-back of the building from the road and screening by boundary treatments the proposal would not result in any material harm to the character or appearance of the site or surrounding area. The new patio and landscaping works would complement the existing grounds. The new log cabin and plant room are of a similar size to the buildings they would replace and a condition regarding their external finish is recommended to ensure their visual integration with the existing buildings on site.
- 1.3 The existing access would be retained, adequate parking spaces would be provided and appropriate turning areas already exist on site. The development would result in infrequent pick-ups and drop-offs as opposed to constant vehicle movements and consequently would not have an impact on the highway network.
- 1.4 Due to its location, the proposed extension would not have an overbearing impact on Apple Porch (the nearest neighbouring property), nor would it lead to any loss of light, privacy or outlook to or from that property. Nevertheless, a condition is recommended requiring that soft landscaping be added to the boundary treatment between Apple Hill and Apple Porch, in order to provide a noise barrier between the sites. The landscaping would also reduce views into the hospital from Apple Porch. In addition to the above, new residents of Apple Hill would be provided with adequate sized, well lit rooms as well as outdoor amenity space.
- 1.5 The report describes the very special circumstances considered to exist that would outweigh the in principle harm to the Green Belt.

- 1.6 For the reasons mentioned above the proposal is considered to comply with Local Plan Policies DG1, GB1, GB2, NAP3, T5 and P4, as well as all relevant planning guidance contained within the NPPF (2019).

**It is recommended the Panel GRANTS planning permission with the conditions listed in Section 13 of this report.**

## 2. REASON FOR PANEL DETERMINATION

- This item has been called to Panel by Cllr Brar if recommended for approval on the grounds that it would amount to an overdevelopment of the site and would provide inadequate recreation space for new residents of the facility.

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The application site lies on the north-east side of the A4130, Henley Road.
- 3.2 At present the site is comprised of a two storey building finished in a mixture of brick and render, a parking area and associated grounds. The building is currently used as an independent community mental health hospital. It is one of several buildings located within a small cluster on Henley Road. Apple Porch is located immediately to the north of the application site and Temple Golf Club is to the rear. Hurley House Hotel (formerly known as the Red Lyon pub) is located on the opposite side of the road, along with a dwellinghouse known as Apple Trees.

## 4. KEY CONSTRAINTS

- 4.1 The site is located entirely within the Green Belt.

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

- 5.1 This application seeks planning permission for lower ground floor extensions to facilitate 20 additional new patient and ancillary rooms, alterations to fenestration, raised patio, external plant, log cabin, 3 additional car parking spaces and associated landscaping works.

Reference	Description	Decision
19/03434/FULL	Single storey front extension and a two storey rear bay window extension.	Approved: 29.01.2020
17/01090/FULL	Part increase in roofspace, together with a minor increase in roof height to provide 12 additional bedrooms, 8 storage rooms, 2 assisted bathrooms, 2 assisted general rooms, a nursing station, a drug store, extension of stairs/lift, provision of a new escape staircase and extended car park.	Refused: 25.01.2018
16/01813/FULL	Construction of lower ground floor to facilitate 9 new patient and ancillary rooms, external staircase and bicycle shed with extension to car park,	Approved: 30.08.2016

	amendments to fenestration and associated landscaping works	
15/03870/CPD	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the conversion of the loft space into habitable accommodation is lawful	Permitted 29.02.2016
15/03834/FULL	Insertion of 6 roof lights	Permitted 29.02.2016
15/03297/CPD	Certificate of lawfulness to determine whether the conversion of the loft space into habitable accommodation and installation of 6 rooflights is lawful	Withdrawn 20.11.2015
13/01439/FULL	Use as a community mental health hospital	Appeal Allowed
08/02326/VAR	Variation of Condition 18 (Occupancy restricted to the Elderly) of permission 05/00894 to allow no age restriction	Appeal Dismissed
07/02538/VAR	Variation of condition 18 of permission 05/00894/Full to allow property to be used as residential care home not solely used for the elderly	Refused 19.11.2007
07/00905/FULL	Alterations to hipped roof end and ridge height to north elevation of existing building	Permitted 29.05.2007
05/00894/FULL	Construction of a part single/part two storey extension to existing nursing home to provide a total of 40 residential bedrooms and provision of additional parking	Permitted 11.07.2005
91/00451/FULL	Extension measuring 617m2 in floor space	Permitted 05.03.1992
87/00326/FULL	Change of use to residential nursing home	Permitted 30.11.1987

## 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
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	DG1
Appropriate development in the Green Belt	GB1
Acceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt	GB2
Acceptable impact on amenities	NAP3
Parking provision	P4
impact on highway safety	T5

## 7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

- Section 11 – Making effective use of land
- Section 12- Achieving well-designed places
- Section 13 – Green Belt

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

Issue	Local Plan Policy
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	SP2, SP3
Appropriate development in the Green Belt	SP5
Pollution (Noise, Air and Light)	EP1, EP2, EP3, EP4

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

Issue	Local Plan Policy
Design in keeping with character and appearance of area	QP1, QP3
Appropriate development in the Green Belt	QP5
Pollution (Noise, Air and Light)	EP1, EP2, EP3, EP4

- 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 were reviewed by the Council before the Proposed Changes were submitted to the Inspector. The Inspector has resumed the Examination of the BLPSV with hearings currently ongoing. The BLPSV and the Proposed Changes are therefore material considerations for decision-making. However, given the above both should be given limited weight.

### **Other Local Strategies or Publications**

#### **7.3 Other Strategies or publications **material** to the proposal are:**

- RBWM Townscape Assessment
- RBWM Parking Strategy
- RBWM Borough Wide Design Guide

## **8. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

### **Comments from interested parties**

8.1 3 letters of objection were received in response to consultation on the proposed development. The objections have been summarised below.

Comment	Officer Response
The proposed development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt due to the intensification of the site's use, as well as the extension, replacement buildings and additional parking spaces.	See paragraphs 9.2 – 9.15
The development would lead to additional noise and disturbance to my dwelling. We already experience spontaneous and loud outburst from the patients, and out of office hours callers from the temporary shift workers, who frequently and mistakenly ring our intercom.	See paragraphs 9.20-9.27 for responses regarding amenity.
The removal of all screening has resulted in our property, once again being overlooked, and the constant exposure to occupants using the facilities located at the bordering side of their building. Existing trees and fencing are in a poor state, so do not provide a good level of screening at present.	
The proposal would leave inadequate amenity space for existing residents.	
The new plant could add additional noise disturbance.	
A tank pump used by the site flooded my garden and the sites maintenance team did not respond adequately.	Noted, however this is not a material planning consideration.
The current property grounds are an eyesore, especially as there has been 30ft tall piles of excavated chalk and soil just left on the grounds for what may have been a number of years; this could happen again.	See paragraphs 9.15 – 9.19 for responses.
The development could have an adverse impact on highway safety due to increased vehicle movement associated with the proposal.	See paragraphs 6.28 – 6.33

8.2 The following responses were received from consultees:

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Highways Officer:	No objection subject to conditions and informatives.	Relevant conditions and informative(s) have been recommended for inclusion in the decision.
Environmental Protection:	No objection subject to conditions and informatives.	
Adult social care and health services	The application it is to cater for people with Mental Health neurological conditions and can support people who are detained under the mental health act then this is really specialist provision and it is outside the scope of what we would commission as a local authority. Having said that, there is a shortage of this type of provision so wouldn't object to it in terms of need as would if it were a generic care home.	Noted.

## Others

Group	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Hurley Parish Council	No objection	Noted.
Bisham Parish Council	The application represents an over-intensification of development on the site, there is a lack of recreational space for residents. The application should only be granted if the applicant can demonstrate that the design and proposed use of the space meets the appropriate guidelines concerning the well-being and safety of the residents.	See section 9 of the report.

## 9. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

9.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i the appropriateness of the development and its impact on the Green Belt.
- ii The impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- iii The impact upon the amenities of nearby occupiers and future occupants
- iv The impact upon highway safety and parking

### Issue i – Green Belt

- 9.2 Local Plan Policy GB1 sets out appropriate development in the Green Belt, it also advises that new development in conflict with the list of appropriate development(s) will only be allowed in very special circumstances.
- 9.3 Local Plan Policy GB2 advises that new development should not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt when compared with existing development on the site.
- 9.4 The policies are not entirely consistent with objectives of the NPPF in terms of its list of appropriate forms of development, however like the NPPF (2019), the policies seeks to protect the openness of the Green Belt and require that very special circumstances be demonstrated to outweigh the substantial weight given to any harm to the Green Belt. On this basis the policies are afforded moderate weight in this assessment. More weight is given to the NPPF (2019), as a material consideration.
- 9.5 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF (2019) states that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate, except in a number of limited circumstances. One of those circumstances is (c) 'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'.

- 9.6 The proposed log cabin would be of similar size and height to the maintenance shed it would replace. Similarly, the proposed plant room would be almost identical in size to the oil tank enclosure it would replace. Both of the proposed buildings, like the ones they replace, would be ancillary to the use of the community hospital. Taking into consideration these points, the new outbuildings are considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt. Additionally, the new parking spaces and patio alterations are considered to be appropriate engineering works, as referenced under paragraph 146 (b) of the NPPF.
- 9.7 Notwithstanding the above, the main hospital building has been extended substantially in the past. It has been difficult to establish the precise floor area of the original building. However historic imagery along with the scaling of drawings submitted as part of application No.91/00451/FULL indicates that the original building had a gross floor area of approximately 755m<sup>2</sup> split over 2 floors and an outbuilding which was also used for accommodation. Under application No.91/00451/FULL a two storey side extension was granted and the outbuilding demolished (84m<sup>2</sup>), the development resulted in a 524m<sup>2</sup> increase in floor space, which is a 69% increase when compared with the original building. Application no.05/00894/FULL proposed a part single, part two storey extension along with demolition works, the extension was constructed and resulted in the property being extended by a further 633m<sup>2</sup>, representing a cumulative increase of 153% over and above the original building. In terms of Green Belt policy, this was considered to be inappropriate development, however significant weight was given to the Very Special Circumstances (VSC) submitted in support of the application, which was approved. The works were subsequently carried out. In 2016, application no.16/01813/FULL was granted for a lower ground floor extension measuring approximately 385m<sup>2</sup>. Site visit and building control records suggest these works began in 2019. Completion of the works would result in a floor space increase of 204% when compared with the original building.
- 9.8 The proposed development the subject of this application would add approximately 877m<sup>2</sup> to the buildings useable floor space. This alone equates to a 116% increase in the floor space over and above the original building and is therefore considered to form a disproportionate addition to the building. When taken into consideration with the other extensions to the building (granted under 91/00451/FULL, 05/00894/FULL and 16/01813/FULL) the proposal would result in a 320% increase on the buildings original floor space, this is undeniably disproportionate. The lower ground floor extension would also add significant volume to the existing building (whether visible or not). Overall, it is considered that the proposed extension, along with former extensions would result in a building which is 3 times the size of the original building; the proposal is therefore disproportionate to the original building.
- 9.9 It is noted that much of the proposed extension would be sited at lower ground floor level, it would therefore have limited visual or spatial impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Nevertheless the 877m<sup>2</sup> extension sought under this application, along with former extensions (mentioned above) would result in the building being disproportionately extended and that is the test set out in paragraph 145 (c) of the NPPF (2019).
- 9.10 It should also be noted that the necessary excavation works alone would comprise substantial development in the Green Belt. No plan has been put forward for the removal or management of excavated soil and material. If left on the site, this could have an adverse visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt. A condition is therefore recommended to ensure that all excavated soil is appropriately removed (condition 3).

- 9.11 Taking into consideration the above, the proposed development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The inappropriate nature of the development is attributed substantial harm.
- 9.12 Paragraph 143 of the NPPF (2019) states that 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances'.
- 9.13 Paragraph 144 states 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'.
- 9.14 This report sets out below the very special circumstances set out by the applicants and considered to weigh in favour of the development:

- Apple Hill's model of care is to provide a nursing home and hospital which caters solely for those with dementia or neurological related mental health issues. The facility accepts and treats those detained under the Mental Health Act and/or restricted by the Mental Capacity Act. It has the capacity to cater for short term admissions, as well as those expected to stay indefinitely. The service provided by Apple Hill is therefore considered to be unique (a point reiterated by the RBWM adult social care team). The applicant has provided evidence which suggests that existing hospital facilities within the RBWM have a high number of mental health admissions, which take up valuable bed space for long periods of time. Additionally there has been annual rises in people with mental health issues in RBWM and the south east of England. As such there is a need for further bed space alongside specialist mental health care. Taking into consideration the foregoing, the extension of this facility to provide 20 additional beds and associated care is considered to alleviate some of the pressure on the NHS to provide bed space, whilst also meeting the growing needs for facilities that cater for people with mental health issues.

*This benefit weighs moderately in favour of the development as the council does not have an identified need for this type of facility set out in the adopted Local Plan or Borough Local Plan (under examination)*

- Delivering 20 additional bedrooms as part of an existing operational hospital that has the established infrastructure to cater and meet the needs of its residents, removes the need to create a new facility. It also ensures that the proposed development makes effective use of existing land which is supported by section 11 of the NPPF (2019).

*This weighs moderately in favour of the proposed development.*

- Planning application No.16/01813/FULL concluded that a similar lower ground floor extension was appropriate development due to its subterranean nature and lack of impact on the Green Belt. This extension is of a similar design (albeit larger) and there is a duty to be consistent in decision making (as set out in paragraphs 7.14 to 7.18 of the applicants planning statement).

*Due to the similarities in the proposals, this point is considered to weigh substantially in favour of the proposed development given the difference in size of the proposed development.*

- The proposed extension is at lower ground level and due to its location and design it would have no visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt, or upon the character and appearance of the site. The replacement buildings would be of similar size to those existing and the proposed grounds works to create patios and parking space would complement the building and its surrounds. The works are unlikely to harm neighbouring amenities or to reduce highway safety. The fact that the development can be delivered with no significant adverse impacts is considered to provide limited weight in favour of the scheme.

*Only limited weight is afforded to this consideration as avoiding harm is a policy requirement outside of this VSC assessment.*

- Bed space is currently needed for Covid 19 patients in hospitals and provision of additional bed spaces at this facility would help to free up NHS bed space.

*This point is given limited weight in favour of the proposed development as the current situation may have changed by implementation of the proposal.*

- 9.15 Taking into consideration all of the above, it is considered that very special circumstances exist which outweigh the substantial harm resulting from the (in principle) inappropriateness of the proposed development. Furthermore, and as described above, it is considered that the proposed development, by virtue of its design, being formed as a lower ground floor sited beneath the existing building, would have very little impact on the visual or spatial openness of the Green Belt.

#### **Issue ii - Impact upon the character and appearance of the area**

- 9.16 Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework aims to achieve well designed places. Paragraph 127 specifically advises that planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate landscaping, they should also be sympathetic to local character, history and the surrounding built environment. Local Plan Policy DG1 places similar emphasis on achieving good design and creating new development which sympathetically integrates into existing environments, without causing harm to the character or appearance of the area. Policy DG1 is considered to be consistent with the aims and objectives of the NPPF.
- 9.17 The proposed log cabin and plant room would be of similar size to the buildings they would replace. A condition has been added to ensure that they are of an external finish which complements the site and surrounding area. Use of red brick, stone, render and French casement windows would ensure that the extension and proposed fenestration works integrate well with the existing building. Due to their size and location (next to the sites existing car park) the new parking spaces would not harm the visual amenities of the area. The light well surrounding the majority of the building would obscure views of the lower ground floor extensions and consequently the building will look almost identical from within the site. Due to their design and the site's set back from the street, none of the proposed works would have any impact on the character and appearance of the area. External amenity space would remain to the front of the site and an internal courtyard area would also provide walking space.
- 9.18 For the reasons mentioned above, the proposal would not be harmful to or out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area or site.

#### **Issue iii- Impact on neighbouring amenity and amenity of future occupants**

- 9.19 Paragraph 127 of the NPPF states that development should 'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience'.
- 9.20 At present the building hosts 51 bed spaces for patients. Those patients have access to the outdoor amenity space at the front of the site, as well as other space within the grounds. The proposal would provide capacity for 20 additional patients. Taking into consideration that patients are very rarely allowed to roam free around the site (due to the risk involved with their medical conditions), additional amenity space is not considered necessary. Patients using the outdoor space would mostly do so under supervision.
- 9.21 Further to the above, the proposals would not visually increase the levels of activity at the site and neither would they result in a material increase in vehicle movements, rather there would be an increase in infrequent pickups and drop offs. Adequate parking space and turning areas would exist for the proposed development. Taking into consideration these points the increased use associated with the 20 new patient rooms is not considered to cause a detrimental increase in activity at the site.
- 9.22 Apple Porch is the nearest property to the site and thus is most likely to be impacted by the proposal. A condition is recommended to ensure that the proposed plant does not emit noise louder than existing background noise in the area (condition 4). The extension directly opposite Apple porch has already been approved and is under construction (16/01813/FULL), thus its impacts are out with this application. The extension proposed under this application is further away from the neighbouring property, is similarly located at lower ground floor level and is within the footprint of the existing building. Consequently, it would not cause any loss of light to Apple Porch, nor would it be overbearing or cause a loss of privacy. The site's main outdoor amenity area is at the front of the building (approximately 70m from Apple Porch), and any increase in use of this area would not cause noise disturbance to the residents of Apple Porch.
- 9.23 A condition is recommended requiring additional landscaping between the application site and Apple Porch that would improve privacy and also provide an additional noise barrier (condition 5).
- 9.24 Room sizes proposed are similar to those previously approved and in existence at the site. Light wells and internal courtyards have been created to allow light to reach habitable rooms. Outdoor amenity space exists at the front of the site, providing an area for supervised recreation and walking. For these reasons it is considered that new patients of the extended facility would be provided with adequate accommodation and living conditions.
- 9.25 The sites operations manager has provided the following commentary to supplement the above:

*In summary, the extension will accommodate 20 additional bedrooms, but the nature of health care requirements and complexities presented by residents mean that they will not undertake usual activities associated with normal day-to-day life, such as leaving the site frequently, using the grounds to exercise with any intensity, or receiving high numbers of visitors. Accordingly, the existing grounds can*

*accommodate the existing and additional residents having regard to the wellbeing and safety of the residents. The very nature of the use means that the activity levels arising would be relatively low key, and as a consequence, the proposal will not result in a notable level of intensification of use above that already consented at the hospital'*

#### **Issue iv – parking provision and impact on highway safety**

- 9.26 Local Plan policy T5 requires all development proposals to comply with adopted highway design standards, policy P4 requires all development proposals to accord with adopted car parking standards, and policy T7 seeks to ensure that new development makes appropriate provision for cyclists including cycle parking. The policies aim to ensure that new development does not have an adverse impact on highway safety and is provided with adequate vehicle and cycle parking.
- 9.27 The site's existing access and turning area would be retained and utilised.
- 9.28 The site has a bike storage facility already and it is unlikely that new occupants would be using bikes or that staff would choose to cycle to the site due to its secluded location. The provision of additional cycle storage space is therefore not considered necessary.
- 9.29 The Borough's Parking Strategy (2004) suggest that the proposal would attract a demand for 37 car parking spaces in total, based on the parking ratio of 1 space per 4 bedrooms and with there being a total of only 19 members of staff at the site at any one time. The applicants propose 40 spaces that are illustrated in drawing number 92 (Rev C) [Proposed Site Plan]. It is therefore considered that adequate parking would be provided for the proposed development.
- 9.30 The Transport statement also remarks that the Travel Plan for a former planning application is now in place and that the applicants currently operate a mini-bus service which picks up a number of the staff for work and takes them home at the end of their shift. The highways authority have requested that the Travel Plan be updated. However taking into consideration that there is expected to be no increase in staff numbers and that adequate parking exists at the site for the proposed development, the condition is not considered necessary.
- 9.33 The highways officer has made no objections to the proposed development subject to conditions and for the reasons mentioned above the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the Highways network.

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

- 10.1 The development is not CIL liable.

#### **11. Conclusion**

- 11.1 The proposed replacement buildings comprising of a log cabin and a maintenance shed are considered to constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt under paragraph 145(d) of the NPPF. Likewise the extended patio and provision of additional parking spaces are considered to comprise appropriate development under paragraph 146(b) of the NPPF. It has been established above that in floorspace and volumetric terms the proposed extensions to the main hospital building, when considered cumulatively with previous extensions undertaken to the building, would amount to inappropriate development. Paragraph 143 of the NPPF makes it clear that

inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This harm to the Green Belt must be afforded substantial weight in accordance with paragraph 144 of the NPPF and 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. It has been established above that the proposals do not cause any other harm.

- 11.2 As described above, this proposed development would fulfil a recognised need without the requirement to provide a new facility. It follows on from the approval of the same form of development at the site which is currently being built out. It would make best use of an existing facility by taking advantage of under-utilised land in the form of a lower ground floor that would not extend beyond the envelope of the existing building. This is considered to amount to very special circumstances. Outside of this VSC assessment, the proposals would make more effective use of this site, but would result in little to no greater impact on the visual or spatial openness of the Green Belt.

## 12. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Location Plan
- Appendix B – Existing site plan
- Appendix C – Proposed Site Plan
- Appendix D – Proposed Floor plans
- Appendix E – Proposed and existing elevation plans

## 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 the construction of the proposed log cabin and plant room building, details of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the those buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.  
Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area. Relevant Policy DG1 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF (2019).
- 3 Prior to the carrying out of any demolition or excavation works associated with the proposed development, details of how excavated soil and materials will be managed and safely removed from the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. Thereafter the excavated soil and materials shall be removed in accordance with those details.  
Reason: To maintain the openness of the Green Belt and the visual amenities of the site. Relevant Policies DG1, GB2 and Chapters 12 and 13 of the NPPF (2019).
- 4 The rating level of the noise emitted from the plant shall be lower than the existing background level (to be measured over the period of operation of the proposed plant and equipment and over a minimum reference time interval of 1 hour in the daytime and 5 minutes at night) by at least 10dB(A). The noise levels shall be determined 1m from the nearest noise-sensitive premises The measurement and assessment shall be made in accordance with BS 4142: 1997 'Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial area'.  
Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the area. Relevant Policy Local Plan

NAP3.

- 5 Prior to the occupation and use of the proposed extension, full details of both hard and soft landscape works, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season following the substantial completion of the development and retained in accordance with the approved details. The submitted works should include details of the landscape works to screen the development site from Apple Porch. If within a period of five years from the date of planting of any tree or shrub shown on the approved landscaping plan, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the immediate vicinity.  
Reason: To ensure a form of development that maintains, and contributes positively to, the character and appearance of the area. Relevant Policies - Local Plan DG1.
- 6 No part of the development shall be occupied until vehicle parking and turning space has been provided, surfaced and marked out in accordance with the approved drawing. The space approved shall be kept available for parking and turning in association with the development.  
Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which could be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety, and to facilitate vehicles entering and leaving the highway in forward gear. Relevant Policies - Local Plan P4, DG1.
- 7 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).