ITEM NO: 6Application No.Ward:Date Registered:Target Decision Date:07/00852/FULWarfield Harvest Ride21 September16 November 2007

2007

Site Address: The Warfield Green Medical Centre 1 County Lane

Warfield Bracknell Berkshire RG42 3JP

Proposal: Erection of single storey extension to waiting room and first floor

extension forming 3no. additional consultation rooms.

Applicant: The Gainsborough Practice
Agent: The Solway Brown Partnership
Case Officer: Sarah Horwood, 01344 352000

environment@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Site Location Plan (for identification purposes only, not to scale)



1 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (If Any)

00/00333/FUL Validation Date: 07.04.2000 Erection of two storey extension to north end of doctors surgery.

Approved

617226 Validation Date: 28.06.1991

Outline Application - Erection of a retail food store, 4 unit shops, petrol filling station, community facilities, car parking and access.

617891 Validation Date: 12.03.1992

Reserved Matters - Submission of reserved matters comprising siting and means of access of super-store, unit shops, petrol filling station, land for community uses and associated works and design and external appearance. Siting and design of footpath/cycleway. (s. 106)

Approved

618401 Validation Date: 30.09.1992

Reserved Matters - Submission of details of landscaping pursuant to outline planning permission 617226

620528 Validation Date: 01.03.1995

Erection of building to form Doctors surgery with associated parking and access (including access onto Warfield Park Farm Drive for ambulances and doctors' vehicles in cases of medical emergency)

Approved

624493 Validation Date: 08.02.1999

Formation of dormer extension to accommodate staircase and installation of 4 no. rooflights.

Approved

2 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Key to abbreviations

BSP Berkshire Structure Plan 2001 – 2016

BFBLP Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan

BFBCS Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Submission)

RMLP Replacement Minerals Local Plan WLP Waste Local Plan for Berkshire SPG Supplementary Planning Guidance SPD Supplementary Planning Document

RPG Regional Planning Guidance

RSS Regional Spatial Strategy (also known as the South East Plan)

PPG (No.) Planning Policy Guidance (Published by DCLG)
PPS (No.) Planning Policy Statement (Published by DCLG)

MPG Minerals Planning Guidance

DCLG Department for Communities and Local Government

Note: The BSP and the BFBLP contain some policies with the same title, e.g. EN1. In such cases, the policy will be suffixed with an "_S" for the BSP and an "L" for the BFBLP, e.g. EN1_S, EN1L..

Plan Policy Description (May be abbreviated)

BFBLP E5 Hierarchy Of Shopping Centres

BFBLP EN20 Design Considerations In New Development

BFBLP M9 Vehicle And Cycle Parking

3 CONSULTATIONS

(Comments may be abbreviated)

Transportation Officer

The Transportation Officer has been consulted on the application and recommends the proposal for refusal, due to insufficient parking provision.

Warfield Parish Council

Warfield Parish Council observes that the proposal to erect a first floor extension will result in the loss of the walkway access to the building and no provision for an alternative access has been shown.

4 REPRESENTATIONS

No letters of representation have been received.

5 OFFICER REPORT

Summary Of Key Aspects Of The Proposal (If Any)

This application is reported to the Planning and Highways Committee at the request of Councillor Thompson insofar that the failure of the proposal to comply with the Council's Parking Standards may be acceptable, having regard to the sustainable location of the site and the arrangement of non-designated parking spaces.

i. Proposal

The application as originally submitted was for the erection of single storey extension to waiting room and first floor extension forming 3no. additional consultation rooms. Following further discussion with the agent, the agent has clarified that the proposal would result in the addition of 2no. consultation rooms and an interview room. The extension to the waiting room will comprise of additional space for the insertion of a lift to provide disabled access to the first floor. The additional consultation rooms are required, not for an increase in the number of patients served by the Practice but for the provision of additional services which the Government requires medical practices to provide at a primary care level. One of the 3 rooms will be used as an interview room, given the existing interview room will be lost to accommodate the disabled access lift.

ii. Site

The Warfield Green Medical Centre is a detached building, within the Whitegrove Neighbourhood Centre. The surrounding area is of mixed use, with Tesco Superstore to the north of the site, and a Library and Youth Centre to the north-east. There are residential properties to the east, south and west of the site. The Medical Centre is screened along all four boundaries by estimated 2.5m high railings. There is a path and cycle track that runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. There are parking spaces to the north and south of the building. Along the western boundary of the site, there is a car park serving Tesco superstore.

iii. Planning considerations

1. Principle of development

The proposal site is within defined settlement and the Whitegrove Neighbourhood Centre as designated under the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan, whereby the principle of development is considered acceptable.

2. Impact on the character and appearance of surrounding area

The proposed dormer extension in the western elevation would project approximately 1m from the existing roof plane of the building. The proposed single storey extension to the existing waiting area would project 2.2m from the south elevation of the building.

The proposed dormer extension would appear visible when viewed from the north, west and south of the site, but given the limited projection beyond the existing roof plane of the building of 1m, the proposal would not appear visually intrusive when viewed from public vantage points, principally the Tesco car park along the western boundary of the site.

The nearest residential properties to the site are to the south, there is a distance of approximately 45m to properties at John Place and a distance of 75m to properties to the west. The western boundary of Tesco car park is screened by established shrubbery and trees and therefore the proposal would not appear visually prominent to the occupiers. Properties at John Place would have views of the medical centre but given the limited projection of the first floor dormer, the proposal would not appear visually intrusive to these properties.

The materials for the proposed single storey extension and first floor extension would match those of the host building, with matching brickwork and tiles. The proposed velux windows would appear sympathetic to the design of the host building - there are already 15no. velux windows in the rear or west elevation of the building. There is an existing dormer extension on the eastern elevation of the building, therefore the design of the extension would appear sympathetic to the host building.

3. Transportation Implications

The Council's Transportation Officer has been consulted and raises the following issues:-

The proposed first floor extension would create 3no. consulting rooms. No additional staff would be employed as a result of the proposal. In accordance with the Council's Parking Standards, 9 additional spaces would be required on site to accommodate for the increased use. The existing car park on site has 30 spaces, in accordance with the

current requirements of the surgery. It is considered that no additional parking could be provided at the site, which would result in overspill parking within the Tesco site which could lead to road safety issues for other road users, including pedestrians.

The proposal could further result in an increase in the number of trips to and from the site on a daily basis. The level of traffic is unlikely to have an adverse impact upon the capacity of the local road network but would result in increased pressures upon local infrastructure. It has therefore been requested that a Section 106 towards integrated transport and highway safety measures is provided.

Since the submission of the application, the agent has clarified that only 2no. additional consultation rooms would be provided and therefore the parking requirements in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards, would be for an additional 6 spaces to be provided on site.

In response to the comments raised by the Transportation Officer, the agent has provided a copy of a legal agreement between Tesco Stores Ltd and Charles Church Developments Ltd (the developers of the site), which highlights an absolute right for the medical practice to use 19 parking spaces within the Tesco site. It is however considered that the agreement between the two parties is not a binding planning agreement, which the Local Planning Authority could control. Furthermore, the parking spaces are not designated for the use of the surgery only and when Tesco car park is full, the additional parking would not be available for visitors to the surgery or staff. The current agreement is one that could be terminated at any time by Tesco. In order for the Council to control the use of 19 car parking spaces, both Tesco and the Medical Practice would need to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the additional parking. The absence of a Section 106 Agreement to secure contributions would be a further reason for refusal of the application.

It is considered that contributions in the form of a Section 106 would be required because the development would result in a increased number of trips to and from the surgery because of the additional floor area created by the extension. It is acknowledged that the site is within a sustainable location but there would still be an impact upon highway networks and infrastructure because of increased movement and therefore contributions would be required, as outlined in Limiting the Impact of Development 2, adopted July 2007.

4. Accessibility Implications

There are no accessibility issues for disabled people relating to this application.

5. Conclusion

It is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties or impact upon the character of the area. It is however considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon the parking facilities on site.

The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal on insufficient parking provision in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards adopted July 2007 and in the absence of a Section 106 Agreement to secure contributions towards integrated transport and highway safety measures.

6 RECOMMENDATION

That the application be **REFUSED** for the following reason(s):-

- 01. The proposal would result in insufficient parking provision which would result in overspill parking within the surrounding site, to the detriment of other road users. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy M9 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan.
- 02. In the absence of planning obligations in terms of a Section 106 Agreement that are satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority, and which secure contributions towards integrated transport and highway safety measures, the proposal is contrary to policy DP4 of the Berkshire Structure Plan, policy SC1 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan, Policies CS6 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Submission) and Supplementary Planning Guidance contained in Limiting the Impact of Development 2 as approved July 2007 (including any subsequent revisions).

Informative(s):

01. Informative

This refusal is in respect of drawing nos. 1356.04.001, 1356.04.002, 1356.04.11 received 10 September 2007 by the Local Planning Authority.

Doc. Ref: Uniform 7/DC/Agenda

The application file to which this report relates can be viewed at the Council's Time Square office during office hours or online at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk