

ROYAL BOROUGH OF WINDSOR & MAIDENHEAD
PLANNING COMMITTEE

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PANEL

2 March 2022

Item: 1

Application No.:	20/00969/FULL
Location:	Land To The North Lynwood Crescent Sunningdale Ascot
Proposal:	The development of a community health hub (Use Class D1) with associated parking, access and landscaping.
Applicant:	
Agent:	Sarah Isherwood
Parish/Ward:	Sunningdale Parish/Sunningdale And Cheapside

If you have a question about this report, please contact: Sian Saadeh on 01682 796164 or at sian.saadeh@rbwm.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The proposal is for a new healthcare facility for the Ascot area. The proposed development would be in the green belt and on a site designated as a gap between the villages of Sunningdale and Sunninghill.
- 1.2 The proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would cause harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. It would also reduce the gap between the two villages and the green infrastructure provided by the current open site. The building has been positioned to minimise the loss of the gap as far as possible but this has resulted in the loss of trees, in particular category A trees.
- 1.3 The application is supported by information which has demonstrated the need for a new facility in the local area and the new integrated care model which has driven the size and design of the proposed building. It has also been shown that there are no other reasonable alternative sites.
- 1.4 The proposal would deliver a high quality, sustainable building which would have sufficient parking provision and would not result in any harmful impacts on the highway network. It would be acceptable in relation to its impacts on neighbouring buildings, flooding, ecology and biodiversity.
- 1.5 It is concluded that very special circumstances exist in this case given the need for the proposed development and the lack of alternative sites. The benefits of delivering a new healthcare facility with the associated improvements for both patients and staff outweigh the harms of the development.

It is recommended the Committee authorises the Head of Planning:	
1.	To grant planning permission on the satisfactory completion of an undertaking to secure the carbon off-set contribution set out Section 10 of this report and with the conditions listed in Section 15 of this report.
2.	To refuse planning permission if an undertaking to secure the carbon off-set contribution set out in Section 10 of this report refuse planning permission as the proposal would fail to meet the terms of the Council's Interim Sustainability Position Statement and Borough Local Plan policy SP2

2. REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION

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

3. THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The application site is an area of open land on the southern side of Rise Road within the Green Belt. The site lies to the east of Sunninghill Village and to the west of Sunningdale Village. There is an area of hardstanding to the front of the site with the remainder as grassland with mature trees to the rear of the site as well north-western and south-western boundaries of the site. A Tree Preservation Order covers the north-western part of the site and the neighbouring site.
- 3.2 The site is adjoined to the north-west by the Lynwood Care Village and to the south-west by the railway line. To the south-east are residential properties on Lynwood Crescent which are predominantly two storey semi-detached houses. Opposite the site, on the other side of Rise Road, are residential properties along Park Crescent which are again predominantly two storey with a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties. The residential areas surrounding the site are defined in the Townscape Assessment as the character type "Post-War Suburbs".

4. KEY CONSTRAINTS

- 4.1 The planning constraints relating to the site are:
- Green Belt
 - Tree Preservation Order no 10 of 1986
 - Identified Gap between Villages in Neighbourhood Plan
 - Flood Zone 1

5. THE PROPOSAL

- 5.1 The proposed development is for a new community health hub centre (Use Class E). The plans and supporting information were amended in August 2021 which are the basis for this report. The key amendments made were revisions to the positioning and design of the building alongside a review of the supporting evidence.

Building

- 5.2 The proposed building would be located towards the north-western corner of the site close to the boundaries with the railway line and Lynwood Care Village. It would be set back from the road frontage by approximately 100m at the nearest point. To the front of the building would be the parking area with vehicle and pedestrian access from Rise Road.
- 5.3 The building would be two storeys, with the first floor set towards the rear. The single storey element would have a maximum height of approximately 4m and the two storey element would have a maximum height of approximately 8.5m. The footprint would be 1224 sq m.
- 5.4 The building would have a modern design with an angular roof form. The main materials would be timber cladding and brick. Windows would be a mix of timber and aluminium framing. There would be a canopy projecting over the main front entrance.

Parking and Access

- 5.5 The parking area would be located to the front of the site and would provide 100 parking spaces. 35 spaces are being provided for staff and 65 for visitors, including 5 accessible spaces. 20 electric vehicle charging spaces would also be included with provision to convert the remaining spaces. 10 cycle parking spaces will be provided. There will be a separate pedestrian access

point with a separated path leading to the entrance. A servicing bay would also be provided for the proposed building.

Landscaping

- 5.6 The proposed development would result in the loss of six individual trees, including two category A trees which are in good condition, and three groups of smaller trees. Other smaller self-seeded trees would also be removed. The trees to be removed would be on the north-western boundary with some also removed to the front and centre of the site.
- 5.7 The proposed landscaping would include the retention of the hedge to the front of the site with access created, new hedgerow within the site along the pedestrian access, new tussock grassland on the undeveloped part of the site and new native trees and shrubs within the site. In addition new planting mixes are proposed to supplement the dormice habitat.

6. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Reference	Description	Decision
13/03511/FULL	Erection of a community health centre	Refused – 28/07/2014
17/01188/FULL	Erection of a community health centre to accommodate the relocated Kings Corner and Magnolia House surgeries alongside a pharmacy and associated parking and landscaping.	Withdrawn – 21/10/2019

- 6.1 The above applications relate to the same site and are for similar development. However, there are key differences with the current application which are set out below.
- 6.2 Application 13/03511/FULL was refused for the harm to the Green Belt, harm to character and open nature of the gap between villages, lack of parking and impact on protected trees. It is important to note that this scheme was significantly larger than the current scheme and was positioned more centrally and further forward. It was also linked to adjoining sites which is not part of the current proposal.
- 6.3 Application 17/01188/FULL was withdrawn following concerns raised by officers and in public consultation. Again this scheme differed from the current proposal in its size and positioning.

7. DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 7.1 The main relevant policies are:

Adopted Borough Local Plan 2013-2033

Issue	Policy	Compliance	
Spatial Strategy for the Borough	SP1	Yes	
Climate Change	SP2	Yes	
Sustainability and Placemaking	QP1	Yes	
Green and Blue Infrastructure	QP2		No
Character and Design of New Development	QP3	Yes	
Development in Rural Areas and Green Belt	QP5		No
Managing Flood Risk and Waterways	NR1	Yes	
Nature Conservation and Biodiversity	NR2	Yes	

Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	NR3		No
Environmental Protection	EP1	Yes	
Air Pollution	EP2	Yes	
Artificial Light Pollution	EP3	Yes	
Noise	EP4	Yes	
Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	IF1	Yes	
Sustainable Transport	IF2	Yes	
Community Facilities	IF6	Yes	

Adopted Ascot, Sunninghill & Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2026

Issue_Policy	Compliance		
Gaps between villages	NP/EN1		No
Trees	NP/EN2		No
Biodiversity	NP/EN4	Yes	
Respecting the Townscape	NP/DG1	Yes	
Density, footprint, separation, scale, bulk	NP/DG2	Yes	
Good quality design	NP/DG3	Yes	
Energy efficiency and sustainability	NP/DG5	Yes	
Parking and access	NP/T1	Yes	
Cycle routes	NP/T2	Yes	

8. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework Sections (NPPF) (2021)

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Section 4- Decision-making

Section 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities

Section 9 - Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 11 – Making effective use of land

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 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Borough Wide Design Guide
- RBWM Landscape Assessment

Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other Strategies or publications material to the proposal are:

- RBWM Townscape Assessment
- RBWM Parking Strategy
- Interim Sustainability Position Statement
- Corporate Strategy
- Environment and Climate Strategy

9. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Comments from interested parties

Letters were sent out on 23rd September 2021 notifying local residents directly of the application.

The planning officer posted a notice advertising the application at the site on 28th April 2020 and the application was advertised in the Local Press on 7th May 2020

Amended scheme

99 letters were received supporting the application, summarised as:

Comment	Where in the report this is considered
1. Existing surgeries no longer fit for purpose given limited facilities, issues of accessibility, dated buildings and lack of parking	Section 10 ii
2. Community needs better modern facility to provide the best healthcare and to respond to growth in area	Section 10 ii
3. Additional provision in new hub would be of benefit to local community, is required and would prevent need to travel outside local area for certain treatment	Section 10 ii
4. Need for and benefits of proposed development constitute Very Special Circumstances to allow development in Green Belt	Section 10 i, ii and Section 12
5. Location best for catchment area of surgeries	Section 10 ii
6. Adequate parking would be provided	Section 10 vii
7. Building would occupy only small part of site and have very limited visibility in wider area	Section 10 i
8. Need is urgent and project has been much delayed	Section 10 ii

7 letters were received objecting to the application including from the Ascot Sunninghill and Sunningdale Neighbourhood Plan Delivery Group, summarised as:

Comment	Where in the report this is considered
1. Loss of green and undeveloped land between Sunningdale and Sunninghill; inappropriate development in the Green Belt and no VSC to justify it	Section 10 i, ii and Section 12
2. Facility should be located on an alternative brownfield site	Section 10 ii
3. Increased traffic and access position would be hazardous and create safety issues for the highways network especially given traffic speeds	Section 10 vii
4. Additional traffic would cause pollution	The proposed development is not considered to give rise to additional traffic which would have any material impact on air or other pollution in the local area
5. Proposed facilities included more than just replacement of existing and a substantial amount of office and administrative space	Section 10 ii It is considered that the facilities are appropriate for the nature and use of the proposed building
6. Require assurances that remaining area will be protected in perpetuity	Section 10 i

7.	Proposed facilities do not appear to have been designed to reflect post-Covid changes in ways of working and appears an over-provision; why are separate remote consultation rooms needed? What are non-medical roles and how many need to be accommodated in the building?; not taken account of proposed smaller units for growth	Section 10 ii
8.	Size of building has not actually been reduced	The amended plans are considered on their own merit and not simply as to whether or not there has been a reduction compared to the originally submitted scheme.
9.	Transport statement is inaccurate and places unrealistic reliance on elderly and sick patients to walk/cycle to the site; majority of patients will drive to site; travel plan should be in place ahead of occupation	Section 10 vii The travel plan will be secured by condition and the proposed development would have to comply with the measures set out within it
10.	Impact of external lighting on wildlife and local residents	Section 10 iv
11.	Site should be being reinstated from temporary car park which has degraded the site and should not be considered the baseline for biodiversity enhancements	Section 10 iv
12.	Lease for use of site is only for 25 years	Comments regarding the lease are noted but these are not material to the consideration of the planning application. The planning permission is for the proposed development and no other. A condition is recommended limiting the use of the building. The lease would be a matter for the occupier and freeholder.
13.	Loss of mature trees harmful to the area and harm to local wildlife and biodiversity	Section 10 iv

Statutory consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Highway Authority	<p>Unlikely to lead to a significant increase in traffic generation that would lead to a severe highway safety concern.</p> <p>Section 278 agreement recommended to secure pedestrian highway improvements (increased pavement width and zebra crossing c.20m from Park Crescent). TRO required to reduce speed from 40 to 30 mph.</p> <p>100 car parking spaces proposed in accordance with acceptable methodology; 35 staff spaces, 65 visitor space, 4 electric vehicle charging bays requested.</p> <p>Cycle parking spaces proposed at rate of 1:20 car parking spaces, should be in enclosed and secure facility.</p> <p>Trip generation based on the trips existing</p>	<p>Where in the report this is considered</p> <p>Section 10 vii</p> <p>Given the location and undeveloped nature of the site, it is not considered that a construction management plan is reasonable in planning terms. It should be noted that regulation of construction sites and highways obstructions exist under environmental protection and highways legislation. It is not necessary for a planning condition to duplicate this legislation.</p>

	<p>on the highway network already (given existing staff and visitors to other clinics). Travel plan should include robust measures to promote sustainable modes of travel, discourage car use and reduce parking demand.</p> <p>Recommended conditions regarding construction management plan, cycle parking details, parking layout, S278.</p>	
LLFA	<p>Increased impermeable surface under amended plans which surface water drainage system has been designed to accommodate and previously agreed discharge rate is retained. Scheme considered acceptable. Conditions recommended regarding details of proposed surface water drainage scheme.</p>	Section 10 v

Consultees

Consultee	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Ecology Officer	<p>No significant impact on any statutory designated sites.</p> <p>Loss of some habitat (woodland, scrub, hedgerows, grassland) from development.</p> <p>CEMP: Biodiversity condition recommended to protect existing habitats to remain, management of new habitats to be created, protection/enhancement for dormice and nesting birds.</p> <p>Mitigation proposed for impact on slow worm, common lizard and grass snake.</p> <p>Condition on external lighting recommended to ensure bats and other nocturnal animals not adversely affected.</p> <p>Condition to secure biodiversity net gains recommended.</p>	Section 10 iv
Berkshire Archaeology	<p>Potential for archaeological remains to be disturbed by works. Condition recommended to require written scheme of investigation.</p>	Condition requiring a written scheme of investigation is recommended.

Others (e.g. Parish)

Group	Comment	Where in the report this is considered
Sunningdale Parish Council	<p>Changes to who would be being provided services at the new facility – all Ascot Primary Care Network patients – require clarification on which patient services would be transferred as this would influence building design as well as configuration/size.</p> <p>Current proposal best position of any previous schemes which lessens impact on Green Belt and maintains a smaller distinct gap between villages.</p> <p>Possibility of building creep also minimised</p>	<p>Section 10 i, ii, iv, vii and Section 12</p> <p>The comments regarding the size of the building are noted. It is not considered that the proposed building is including unnecessary facilities nor has it been based on incorrect assumptions. As a change to a multi-functional hub, the provision of facilities differs from the traditional GP practice.</p>

	<p>Supportive of overall design approach GIA virtually identical with marginally reduced footprint and car park Require clarification about actual number of professional and administrative personnel that are envisaged for the site. Having reviewed information consider that hub could serve a patient population of 34,708 which is twice the projected patient population and building is therefore far bigger than needed. Where is parking for administrative staff? Car parking on site currently being used as overflow for neighbouring site so the proposed development needs to control use of the car park Additional patients travelling from wider area will result in increased traffic on Rise Road Loss of two Category A trees Clarity about lease arrangement is required Cannot fully support as building appears oversized for the needs of local residents and is not matched by related increase in professional health care personnel</p>	<p>Comments regarding the lease are noted but these are not material to the consideration of the planning application. The planning permission is for the proposed development and no other. A condition is recommended limiting the use of the building. The lease would be a matter for the occupier and freeholder.</p>
<p>Sunninghill and Ascot Parish Council</p>	<p>Supports the principle and the revised proposals are a significant improvement on previous proposals Unconvinced that VSC exist but ask if considered they do that agreements are put in place to prevent development of any kind in the remaining gap in perpetuity Opening hours and clinical spaces reduced to the detriment of patients Queries regarding the space and provision of administration support Parking assumptions are flawed and nonsensical Hub is not in a sustainable location and should be minimum of 112 spaces as otherwise will be overspill parking onto nearby streets Number of primary care clinicians required if significantly higher and will be operating at maximum capacity unless hours are extended Unclear if services being transferred from Skimped Hill and Frimley Hospital Pedestrian environment around site not well lit or easy to use</p>	<p>Section 10 i, ii, iv, vii and Section 12</p> <p>The comments regarding the size of the building are noted. It is not considered that the proposed building is including unnecessary facilities nor has it been based on incorrect assumptions. As a change to a multi-functional hub, the provision of facilities differs from the traditional GP practice.</p>

10. EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATION

10.1 The key issues for consideration are:

- i Green Belt and Gap Between Villages
- ii Community Facility
- iii Climate Change and Sustainability
- iv Natural Environment
- v Flooding
- vi Design and Character
- vii Parking and Highways Impacts
- viii Impact on amenity of neighbouring buildings

i. Green Belt and Gap Between Villages

10.1 The application site lies entirely within the Green Belt. It is also designated within the Neighbourhood Plan as a gap between Sunninghill and Sunningdale.

Whether or not the proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt

10.2 Paragraph 137 of the NPPF establishes that *“the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”*. Paragraph 149 sets out that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt is inappropriate and as per paragraph 148 substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt in the planning balance. Paragraphs 149 and 150 set out a limited number of exceptions where development can be considered acceptable in the Green Belt. Borough Local Plan policy QP5 follows the guidance set out in the NPPF as to what can be considered exceptions for development within the Green Belt.

10.3 It is not considered that any of the exceptions to inappropriate development set out in the NPPF and policy QP5 apply to the application site and therefore any development on the site must be regarded as inappropriate within the Green Belt. Substantial weight is given to this harm in the Planning Balance.

Impact on openness and purposes of Green Belt

10.4 In addition to determining whether the proposal is appropriate development or not, an assessment must also be made as to the impact on the openness and the purposes of the Green Belt.

10.5 It has been established through case law that openness is not simply the absence of development. The spatial and visual impact of the proposed development need to be considered to determine its impact on the openness of the Green Belt. National Planning Practice Guidance also sets out that the degree of activity generated has an impact on openness.

10.6 In relation to the current application, the site is currently free from development. The proposed building has a footprint of 1224 sqm. It has been designed as a two storey building to reduce its overall footprint on the site and the volume of the first floor has been carefully designed so as to minimise its massing. Nevertheless, as a new building in a previously undeveloped plot, there is a spatial impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The visual impact of the proposed building also needs to be considered. The positioning and design of the building are relevant to this. The building has been sited well back into the site, approximately 100m from the frontage and towards the rear corner of the site. The positioning would result in the proposed building being surrounded by, and seen in the context of, by mature planting, as well as the proposed landscaping scheme which seeks to further screen the building. The slope of the site, rising from the rear to Rise Road, also means that positioning the building to the rear corner of the site limits its visibility in the wider area. The first floor has been pushed back so that it sits towards the rear of the building to minimise the impact of its massing. The roof form has also been designed with a series of angled elements to further break up the massing of the building. The proposed timber

cladding on the exterior of the building also helps to soften its appearance. These elements help to limit the visual impact of the proposed building.

- 10.7 As noted above, the degree of activity is also a factor in determining the impact on openness. In this instance, the proposed access and parking area would be to the front of the site. With 100 parking spaces proposed, and given the nature of the use meaning activity as people arrive and leave from appointments across the day, there would be a high degree of activity created at the site which does not currently occur. Taking this into account alongside the spatial impact of the building, whilst the visual impact seeks to mitigate this, it is considered that the proposal would result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- 10.8 Paragraph 138 sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt. In relation to this proposal the following are considered relevant:
- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

As the site is currently free from development, the proposed development would result in encroachment into the countryside. The positioning of the building has sought to minimise its encroachment but the development including the parking and access would occupy a significant area of the site. The layout and the proposed landscaping scheme have minimised this encroachment by retaining a large, continuous undeveloped area as part of the site. It is not considered that the proposal would result in the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas nor of neighbouring towns merging into one another. This is discussed in more detail below in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan designation of the site as a green gap. However, the development would cause harm to one of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

Green Belt Conclusion

- 10.9 As discussed in the above paragraphs, the proposal would be for inappropriate development in the Green Belt, would cause harm to openness and would conflict with one of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The weight to be given to these harms, cumulatively, is substantial and is further set out in Section 12 of this report.
- 10.10 Paragraphs 147 and 148 state that inappropriate development should only be approved in very special circumstances 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”*. Borough Local Plan policy QP5 reiterates that inappropriate development can only be approved in Very special circumstances. Any other harm arising from the development is considered in the following sections and the case for Very special circumstances is discussed in Section 12.

Impact on Gap between Villages

- 10.11 Neighbourhood Plan policy EN1, which is part of the Development Plan, designates the site as part of a gap between the villages of Sunninghill and Sunningdale. BLP policy QP2 also seeks to retain green infrastructure, such as open sites. The site forms part of the wider gap between the two villages which extends on the other side of the railway line. The majority of the gap is on the other side of the railway line. The policy sets several criteria for any development within these gaps.
- 10.12 Whilst the proposed development does not fully comply with the policies as it would clearly reduce the gap between the villages, the openness of the Green Belt and the level of green infrastructure, there are a number of factors which limit the harm it causes to the gap.

- 10.13 The positioning of the development has been pushed as far as possible to one side of the site, as close as possible to the development at the Lynwood Care Village. This has enabled a clear gap to still be maintained to the residential development on Lynwood Crescent. The layout has been designed so that the proposed landscaping scheme maintains and enhances the green character of the remaining gap. This will help to create a clear separation between the proposed development and the neighbouring properties as well as helping it to integrate with the character of the area. In addition, given the remaining area of the wider gap unaffected by the development, the proposal would not entirely close the gap between the two villages.
- 10.14 It is understood that there are concerns regarding potential future development on the remaining part of the site and the gap. The current application cannot preclude future applications from being made. However, any future application would need to comply with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and the site remains designated as Green Belt and a gap between villages. Any future application would have to be properly assessed at the time but it should be noted that policy QP5 sets criteria for what can be considered infilling and that any such proposal would have to be limited in nature and scale. Moreover, as is set out in this report, the reduction in the gap is clearly harmful and is only considered acceptable given the specific nature and circumstances of the proposed development.
- 10.15 It is considered that there is harm from the proposed development to the gap between villages and this should be given moderate weight in the planning balance.

ii Community Facility

- 10.16 Borough Local Plan policy IF6 supports proposals for new community facilities where there is an identified local need. It also states that they should be located in accessible locations for walking, cycling or public transport. NPPF paragraph 93 encourages planning decisions to ensure that communities have the social, recreational and cultural facilities that they need.
- 10.17 The application has been supported by evidence to demonstrate the need for the facility. This evidence has been reviewed and updated to consider the size of the building and implications of post-Covid ways of working on how services will be provided in the future. The new health centre is required to replace existing primary care facilities at Magnolia house and Kings Corner which are no longer considered fit for purpose or able to provide the services required in the local area. It will also provide various community services which are currently provided at Skimped Hill and Frimley Park for the local Ascot population. The hub would return the provision of these services to the local area.
- 10.18 As well as the need to replace existing old facilities, the hub is also required to accommodate the predicted population growth and additional residents following planned new developments. The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan underlines the need for new primary healthcare provision because of the rising and ageing population as well as a number of existing facilities no longer being fit for purpose. An update to the IDP prepared as part of the examination for the Borough Local Plan has identified the need for a new build facility to replace the Kings Corner and Magnolia surgeries. The new development would also enable the provision of primary and community healthcare to be delivered in line with modern NHS ways of working. The delivery of these types of healthcare is moving towards multi-disciplinary hubs such as the one proposed. There are many benefits from this delivery model to both staff and patients. It enables patients to access more types of service in their local area and within the same hub. This is considered to result in better healthcare outcomes for individuals with better access to a range of clinicians and professionals to treat them. There are benefits to the staff in being co-located with a range of services to enable better delivery of care as well as training to help with existing recruitment and retention issues. A shift towards this form of delivery is a fundamental part of the reasoning behind the design and size of the building.
- 10.19 It is noted the comments in objection have raised queries over the size of the building and the assumptions that underpin this. However, it is considered that the submitted information has clearly set out the need for the proposed hub and explained the drivers behind the number and types of room proposed. The table below sets out the number and type of rooms being proposed. It is not considered that the development is including unnecessary facilities which are

increasing the size of the building. The submitted information has also set out the size requirements of individual rooms and area to further explain how the design and scale of the building has been arrived at:

Figure 8. Summary of clinical accommodation

Type of Room	Number
Primary Care	
Consultation/Treatment	13
Interview	2
Minor Procedures/Bariatric Treatment	1
Recovery Room	1
Digitally enabled rooms	7
Community Services	
Consultation/Treatment	6
Interview Rooms	2
Physiotherapy Gym	1
Group Room	1
Digital Consultation	2

It is considered that the need for a proposed hub of this size and scale has been clearly demonstrated.

10.20 Policy IF6 also requires new community facilities to be in sustainable locations. It is accepted that the proposed site is located outside an established centre, is some distance from a nearby railway station and is only served by a single bus route. As is set out further below, it is proposed to improve the pedestrian environment surrounding the site and there would be cycle access as well. Whilst the site may therefore be limited in terms of the sustainability of its location, the supporting information has set out why other sites cannot be utilised for the proposed development. These sites were those that were within the area of the Ascot Primary Care Network as it is residents of this area that are to be served by the new facility. The main other potential site that has been assessed in detail was Broomhall car park. However, this has been reasonably discounted given its allocation as a mixed use development and the additional requirements that would place on any development coming forward. The applicant's analysis has also shown that this site would not be more sustainable in terms of location for the geographical range of patients proposed to use the new hub. On balance, it is therefore considered that the proposed location is acceptable and it has been demonstrated that there are no realistic alternatives. In addition, the proposed nature of the hub to include a variety of health services would make this a more sustainable facility than traditional GP practice sites. By housing a range of facilities in one place, there is a reduction in patients needing to travel to different buildings including those outside the local area. The nature of this hub has therefore been designed to maximise use by the local community in line with Policy IF6 which also supports the co-location of facilities.

10.21 As the need for and benefits arising from the proposed hub in this location are clearly linked to its proposed use, it is considered reasonable to limit the use of the proposed building. It is recommended that a condition be included to limit the use of the building to *Use Class E (e) Provision of medical or health services*. Any other use of the building would therefore be restricted. It is considered that the proposal complies with policy IF6. The benefits of delivering a new community healthcare hub should be given substantial weight in the planning balance.

iii Climate Change and Sustainability

10.22 Policies SP2 and QP3 require new developments to be designed to incorporate measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The Council seeks for developments to make the fullest contribution to reducing CO2 emissions, including a minimum 20% reduction in CO2 emissions is sought over that brought about via current Building Regulations, with 12% of the energy demand being met by on site renewables as stipulated in the Council's Interim Sustainability Position Statement. The proposed building incorporates a number of sustainable design measures,

including materials to reduce heat loss from the building, passive methods to reduce overheating and heat gain, inclusion of photovoltaic panels and measures to minimise water usage. 25.8% of the proposed building's energy demand would be provided by the photovoltaic panels which exceeds the requirements of the ISPS.

- 10.23 The building will not be net zero carbon emissions. The current design proposals would achieve a 20.5% reduction on the target emissions rate for this nature of building and so comply with the ISPS. In accordance with the Interim Sustainability Position Statement, the applicant has agreed to make an offset contribution which will be secured by legal agreement. The off-set contributions would be £34,403.40. A condition is recommended to ensure that the proposed building is built in accordance with the sustainable design measures and to secure further details where required. The proposal complies with BLP Policies SP2 and QP3. Moderate weight should be given in the balance to the sustainability benefits of the building, in particular the level of energy demand to be provided by renewable sources.

iv Natural Environment

- 10.24 Policies QP3 and NR3 require development to consider the impact on trees and seek to retain them. The proposed development would result in the loss of a number of trees including two category A trees. It is understood that the loss of these trees is a result of the positioning of the building which has been chosen to minimise the impact on the Green Belt and the gap. The category A trees would be lost due to the retaining wall which is required given the sloping nature of the site. Its location has taken account of the existing mature trees that remain on the northern edge of the site and neighbouring site.
- 10.25 The proposal includes proposed landscaping which seeks to introduce replacement planting. A final proposed soft landscaping scheme would be required to be submitted and approved by condition to ensure that a high quality landscape is delivered. Plans have also been submitted to demonstrate that the retained trees would not be harmed by the development. Full details would be required to demonstrate that the proposed building, associated servicing and the proposed drainage system would be constructed in a manner which would protect the retained trees. This would need to be secured by condition prior to development commencing. However, the loss of trees and in particular the category A trees cannot be mitigated by the replacement planting and the proposal fails to fully comply with Borough Local Plan policies QP3, NR3 and Neighbourhood plan policy NP/EN2. This is therefore a harm of the proposed development which should be given moderate weight in the Planning Balance.
- 10.26 The proposed site includes a range of habitats and evidence has shown the presence of dormice, slow-worm, common lizard and grass snake. There would be an impact on these habitats and species arising from the proposal. Details of mitigation have therefore been provided showing the creation of new habitats on site and translocation of species where required. The proposed landscaping scheme for the undeveloped part of the site would seek to improve habitats on site. A condition is recommended requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of works. This will ensure that the development is carried out with appropriate measures in place to safeguard and limit the impact on the ecology of the site. It is also proposed that a management plan is secured by condition to ensure that the new habitats and landscaping created are managed to protect and enhance the ecology of the site. In addition, a condition is recommended requiring further details of any external lighting prior to their installation. The details will need to set out measures to ensure the lighting does not have a harmful impact on protected species. The proposal complies with BLP policy NR2 and Neighbourhood Plan policy NP/EN4. The biodiversity and ecological enhancements to the site are benefits of the scheme to be given moderate weight in the Planning Balance.
- 10.27 Comments have been raised regarding whether or not the existing hardstanding and parking area should be taken into account for biodiversity and ecological assessments. As an existing element on the site it is correct they form part of the existing habitat and so ecological assessments have taken them into account.

v Flooding

- 10.28 The site does not lie in an area of high flood risk but policy NR1 requires that the impact on surface water runoff is fully considered as part of any development. The proposed development would create potential risk from surface water given it is an existing green space and significant areas of built form would be introduced. The proposal includes provision for a sustainable urban drainage system which would ensure a suitable runoff rate for the site and minimise risk. Full details of the proposed SUDS are required by condition to be submitted and approved prior to commencement. The proposal would comply with BLP policy NR1.

vi Design and Character

- 10.29 Policies QP1 and QP3 require all development to contribute positively to the local area and be of high quality sustainable design. The proposed building is considered to be high quality design. As a stand alone building on a currently open site it is able to establish its own context. Its form and architectural style is appropriate for a building of the proposed use. Its irregular shape and roof form create visual interest whilst helping to break up the bulk and massing. The proposed external materials are appropriate and, in particular, the timber cladding help the building to sit comfortably within the surrounding natural environment. Final Details of the materials are required to be submitted and approved by condition to ensure that a high quality building is delivered. The proposal complies with policy QP1 and QP3 and relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies.

vii Parking and Highways Impacts

- 10.30 The proposal includes 100 car parking spaces which are to provide 35 staff, 65 patient and include 5 accessible parking spaces. BLP policy IF2 takes the Council's existing parking standards as a guide. The parking standards for a site in an area of poor accessibility would require 75 parking spaces for a GP practice of this size. However, given that care hub would provide more services than a traditional GP practice, a further 25 spaces have been provided in line with the parking standards for other community facilities. Whilst development should seek to reduce reliance on the private car, given the nature of the use and the profile of visitors the level of parking is considered acceptable in this instance. It is noted concerns have been raised about the level of parking given the location of the site and mobility of patients. As the proposed parking levels meet the parking standards, it is not considered there is any basis for requiring additional parking in this case. The spaces would be split with 35 spaces being provided for staff and 65 for visitors. The visitors would not all be arriving at the site at the same time so there would be suitable provision across the day for visitor parking. It is not considered that the proposed use would give rise to harmful levels of overspill parking on surrounding road.
- 10.31 It is proposed to make improvements to the surrounding footway and a new crossing under a Section 278 agreement to improve the pedestrian environment around the site. In addition a Traffic Regulation Order would be required to reduce the speed limit from 40 to 30 mph. A condition is recommended to ensure that these works have been carried out prior to first use of the building which will ensure that pedestrian access to the site is improved. 10 cycle parking spaces are being provided at a ratio of 1 stand per 20 car parking spaces (1 stand giving two parking spaces). The level of cycle parking provision is acceptable. Details of the stands and their enclosures is required to be submitted via condition. A travel plan has also been submitted which sets out measures to promote sustainable modes of transport to access the site. The measures include providing public transport information, cycling and walking route maps, cycle hire, encouraging car sharing and the introduction of car clubs. The travel plan sets out monitoring and review mechanisms to ensure that it can adapt as required once the development is occupied, including appointing a travel plan coordinator. A baseline survey within six months of occupation is considered appropriate as it will enable any changes to reflect the actual situation rather than a theoretical exercise. Annual surveys of users will be carried out with monitoring to be submitted to the Council for the first five years of occupation. The travel plan will be secured by condition. It is considered that the submitted Travel Plan strikes an appropriate balance between seeking to encourage future staff to use more sustainable modes of transport against the sustainability and accessibility constraints imposed by the site's location and surrounding highways infrastructure. With the proposed measures in place the development is

considered to have sought to promote sustainable modes of travel and discourage private car use. It would therefore meet the objectives of Borough Local Plan policy IF2 and Neighbourhood Plan policy NP/T1.

- 10.32 A further concern is the volume of traffic that the development may create and its impact on the highway network. The methodology used to assess this is considered acceptable by officers. It is noted that comments have raised users coming from a wider area. Whilst the amended proposals make reference to the closure of other facilities, the primary purpose of proposal is to replace those facilities for the local population. The assessment has been carried out on a worst-case scenario basis as if all the associated journeys were new to the local network, where as in reality the majority of journeys to the site already exist within the local highway network. Any additional journeys are not considered to be of volume to result in a severe impact on the highway network. Moreover, given the nature of the use they would spread across the opening hours of the clinic and the majority of patients live where the site could be accessed via public transport or sustainable transport means. Provision has also been made on site for waste and servicing so that these vehicles would also not place additional pressure on the surrounding highways network.
- 10.33 Concerns have been raised regarding continued use of any parking area as overspill parking for the neighbouring site. The parking provided as part of this application is for use by the development only. The end user of the building would need to ensure that the parking area is used by staff and patients only. In this instance, it is considered appropriate to require a car parking management plan to be submitted via condition. This plan should address how access to the car park will be managed and how the spaces for different users of the building will be managed, including the electric vehicle charging spaces. Subject to this condition and the other points outlined above it is considered that the parking provision for the site is adequate and the development would not give rise to any harmful highways impacts.

viii Impact on amenity of neighbouring buildings

- 10.34 Given the separation to neighbouring properties, the proposal would have no impact on them in terms of privacy, loss of light or overshadowing. Whilst the nature of the use would create additional activity at the site this would still be a significant distance from any other property and would not give rise to additional noise or disturbance. Whilst there is plant to be installed at the building, it is shown to be screened and would be set a considerable distance from any adjoining properties. The properties opposite the access would not be disturbed by activity in this location given the road in between. Equally there would be no harmful light pollution arising given the distance. The proposal would comply with BLP policies QP3 and EP1 -4.

11. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 11.1 The development is not CIL liable.

12. VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES AND PLANNING BALANCE

Case for very special circumstances

- 12.1 It has been set out in this report that the proposed development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt as well as harming the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. This cumulative Green Belt harm is afforded substantial weight in accordance with paragraph 148 of the NPPF. The other harms identified in the report include the reduction of the gap between villages and loss of protected trees. Both these harms are afforded moderate weight. As such, the proposal should only be approved if very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and identified other harms of the scheme.
- 12.2 The material considerations put forward to be considered as very special circumstances that have been detailed in this report are:
- Need for new healthcare facility in the local Ascot area to provided services currently located at dated and unsuitable facilities.

- Need for modern healthcare facility in line with new delivery model of integrated care hubs which provided care benefits for patients as well as benefits to staff of being co-located with a wider range of services
- Need for increased capacity to meet population growth and needs of future residents from planned developments
- Lack of alternative sites which can deliver the required facility

12.3 The benefits of delivering a new community health hub at this site are afforded substantial weight.

12.4 Other benefits identified in section 10 are:

- Delivery of biodiversity enhancements through the proposed landscaping scheme. This has been given moderate weight.
- Provision of a sustainable building including a high percentage of energy demand being provided by renewable source (photovoltaic panels). This has been given moderate weight.

12.5 The substantial weight afforded to the provision of a new health care facility along with the moderate weight afforded to both the biodiversity enhancement delivery of sustainability measures, cumulatively would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other identified harm such that Very Special Circumstances exist in this case to justify the development in the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

12.6 Whilst the proposal has been defined as inappropriate development in the green belt which causes harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt, the harm to the Green Belt has been clearly outweighed by other considerations such that Very Special Circumstances exist in this case to justify the development in the Green Belt.

12.7 As set out in the report and highlighted in Section 12 the development does not comply with policies in relation to Green Belt, the gap between villages, green infrastructure and the retention of trees.

12.8 The proposed development would be acceptable and comply with relevant planning policies, subject to conditions, in relation to its impact on neighbouring buildings, the impact on the highways network, the level of parking provided, the high quality design of the building, surface water drainage, impact on the ecology of the site and the sustainability of the proposed building. There would be social benefits to the local area from the provision of a new healthcare facility which has been designed to improve health outcomes for the local population.

12.9 There is a clear need for the new facility and there are no reasonable alternative sites. The design and positioning of the development has sought to limit its impact on the gap between the villages and moderate the harm that it is causing. This has led to the loss of trees but it is considered that this is the result of seeking to minimise the overall impact of the building on the gap between the villages and ensure a substantial area of the site remains open and undeveloped. The proposal has sought to strike a balance between these two competing constraints.

13. CONCLUSION

13.1 It is considered that the substantial benefit of delivering a modern healthcare facility for the local area outweighs the harms of the proposed development and it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

14. APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

- Appendix A - Site location plan and site layout

- Appendix B – plan and elevation drawings

15. 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 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.
- 3 The development hereby approved shall only be used for the purposes set out in Use Class E (e) (for the provision of medical or health services, principally to visiting members of the public, except the use of premises attached to the residence of the consultant or practitioner) and for no other use or purpose, including any other use set out in Use Class E (a) - (d), (f)-(g), set out in the Use Classes Order 1987 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).
Reason: The site is in the Green Belt and the development the subject of this permission is only considered acceptable on the basis of very special circumstances related to the need for the proposed use. An alternative use would not benefit from the same very special circumstances, Relevant Policies - Borough Local Plan QP5
- 4 No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts on the protected and priority species during construction including habitats, reptiles, dormice and nesting birds (may be provided as a set of method statements).d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
Reason: To minimise impacts on biodiversity in accordance with Paragraphs 170 and 175 of the NPPF and Borough Local Plan policy NR2.
- 5 Works are to be carried out in full accordance with the reptile mitigation strategy given in section 3.5 of the submitted ecology report (Clarkson & Woods Ecological Consultancy, August 2021) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the council. A closing-out report including details of all the methods used, and any reptiles or signs of reptiles found, is to be issued to the council.
Reason: To ensure that reptiles, a group of protected species, are not adversely affected by the proposals. Relevant policy - Borough Local Plan NR2.
- 6 No external lighting shall be installed at the site until a report detailing any new external lighting scheme, and how this will not adversely impact upon wildlife, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The report shall include the following figures and appendices:o A layout plan with beam orientation o A schedule of equipment o Measures to avoid glare o An isolux contour map showing light spillage to 1 lux both vertically and horizontally, areas identified as being of importance for commuting and foraging bats, and locations of bird and bat boxes. The approved lighting plan shall thereafter be implemented as agreed.
Reason: To limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on nature conservation in accordance with paragraph 180 of the NPPF and to comply with Borough Local Plan NR2.
- 7 Prior to the commencement of the development above slab level, a landscape and habitat management plan which should include details of biodiversity enhancements, including native and wildlife friendly planting, habitat creation and management, incorporation of integral bird and bat boxes, tiles or bricks on and around the new building and trees, installation of dormice boxes and gaps in fences for hedgehogs and other wildlife, and the long-term management plan for the landscape, habitats and biodiversity enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council. The biodiversity enhancements shall thereafter be installed as approved and a

brief letter report confirming that the enhancements have been installed, including a simple plan showing their location and photographs of the enhancements in situ, is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved management plan.

Reason: To incorporate biodiversity in and around developments in accordance with paragraph 175 of the NPPF and to comply with Borough Local Plan NR2.

8 No part of the development shall be occupied until covered and secure cycle parking facilities have been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall always thereafter be kept available for the parking of cycles in association with the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport. Relevant Policies - Borough Local Plan IF2.

9 No part of the development shall be occupied until a car park management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall show how car parking at the site will be managed to be used solely by staff and visitors associated with the use, how vehicle parking space will be laid out at the site, including details of charging facilities for electric cars (fast charge and rapid charge points) and how car parking would be managed for the different users of the site. The approved parking layout shall be provided at the site prior to the first occupation of the building.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety and ensure that the development encourages sustainable travel. Relevant Policies - Borough Local Plan IF2 and complies with Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

10 Prior to the first occupation of the site details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing how off-site highways improvement works have been secured.

Reason: To improve the pedestrian environment surrounding the site and to ensure that the development encourages sustainable travel. Relevant Policies - Borough Local Plan IF2 and complies with Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

11 Prior to commencement (excluding demolition) a surface water drainage scheme for the development, based on the submitted sustainable drainage strategy, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include: o Full details of all components of the proposed surface water drainage system including dimensions, locations, gradients, invert levels, cover levels and relevant construction details.; o Supporting calculations confirming compliance with, the Non-statutory Standards for Sustainable Drainage, and the agreed discharge rate as mentioned in the approved strategy and the attenuation volumes to be provided. o 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 and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, and to ensure the proposed development complies with Borough Local Plan Policy NR1.

12 A) No 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: Berkshire Archaeology An Archaeological Service for: Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, Reading Borough Council, Slough Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council & Bracknell Forest Council 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) The Development shall take place in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition (A). 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: The site lies in an area of archaeological potential, particularly for, but not limited to, Roman remains. The potential impacts of the development can be mitigated through a programme of archaeological work. This is in accordance with national and local plan policy. In view of the nature and scale of the development and the low likelihood of the potential archaeology, should it exist, meriting preservation in situ, therefore, field evaluation through trial trenching would represent an appropriate initial phase of work in order to determine the archaeological potential and levels of previous truncation and the need for any further phases of work. Berkshire Archaeology would be pleased to discuss the approach with the applicant or their archaeological consultant should permission be granted. If the applicant can demonstrate previous widespread impact on below ground deposits which specifically affects the archaeological potential, then this advice can be reviewed.

- 13 Prior to any equipment, machinery or materials being brought onto the site, details of the measures to protect, during construction, the trees shown to be retained on the approved plans, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full prior to any equipment, machinery or materials being brought onto the site, and thereafter maintained until the completion of all construction work and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been permanently removed from the site. The measures shall include details of the proposed servicing and surface water drainage system and ensure that these elements protect the trees shown to be retained on the approved plans. These measures shall include fencing in accordance with British Standard 5837. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made.

Reason: To protect trees which contribute to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area. Relevant Policies - Borough Local Plan NR3

- 14 No development above slab level shall take place until details of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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 - Borough Local Plan QP3

- 15 No development above slab level shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works, have been 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. 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 - Borough Local Plan QP3, NR2 and NR3

- 16 The development hereby approved shall be carried out and occupied in accordance with the Employment Travel Plan doc ref 332110563/5501 date August 2021.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking facilities to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety and ensure that the development encourages sustainable travel. Relevant Policies - Borough Local Plan IF2 and complies with Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

- 17 The development hereby approved shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the Sustainability measures set out in the Planning Design and Access Statement dated July 2021.

Reason: To ensure that the building incorporates suitable sustainability measures and to comply with Borough Local Plan Policies SP2 and QP3.

