

LOCATION: CADET TRAINING CENTRE FRIMLEY PARK, FRIMLEY ROAD, FRIMLEY, CAMBERLEY, GU16 7HD

PROPOSAL: Demolition of the Quartermaster's (QM) block and adjacent outbuildings. Conversion of part of the Admin block to re-house the QM department. New build block to provide kitchen/dining hall, multifunctional space and 6No bedrooms. Remedial work to the external facade of the Grade II listed mansion and conversion of redundant kitchen area to other uses.

TYPE: Full Planning Application

APPLICANT: Mr Belcher
SERFCA

OFFICER: Mr N Praine

This application would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation, however, it is being reported to the Planning Applications Committee at the request of Councillor E Hawkins.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This application seeks planning consent for the part demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a new building to provide improved facilities at this Ministry of Defence (MoD) site. Officers conclude that the proposals would not harm the character of the area including the Grade II Listed Building, impact upon residential amenity, highway safety or ecology matters. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The Cadet Training Centre, Frimley Park Mansion lies to the north eastern side of the Frimley Road. The building is a Regular Army Unit for various military and civilian personnel attending residential courses, conferences and meetings. The Frimley Park mansion was built approximately in the mid-18th Century. In 1949 the estate was sold to the War Department and became the Women's Royal Army Corps (WRAC) Staff College. In 1959 Frimley Park became the Cadet Training Centre. The northern half of the Park has since been developed into Frimley Park Hospital. The remainder of the site has been retained as an Army Cadet Training Centre, owned by the Ministry of Defence.

- 2.2 The building is Grade II listed and its gardens and land are registered as a Historic Park and Gardens by English Heritage for its special historic interest as early 20th century formal gardens accompanying a country house, surrounded by 19th century pleasure grounds and parkland.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 SU/15/0182 - Erection of a single storey security building with associated parking. *Granted 30/04/15.*
- 3.2 SU/16/0837 - Listed Building Consent for the demolition of the Quartermaster's (QM) block and adjacent outbuildings. Conversion of part of the Admin block to re-house the QM department. New build block to provide kitchen/dining hall, multifunctional space and 6 No bedrooms. Remedial work to the external facade of the Grade II listed mansion and conversion of redundant kitchen area to other uses. *This proposal is considered elsewhere on this agenda.*
- 3.3 SU/16/0693 - Erection of a 3.4 metre security perimeter fence, single storey security building with associated parking. *This proposal is considered elsewhere on this agenda.*

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This full planning application is for the following works:
- The demolition of the existing 1950's quartermaster's (QM) building together with various outbuildings (293 sqm to be demolished);
 - The erection of a new 590sqm building to comprise a new kitchen, dining hall, multifunctional space (e.g. lecture theatre, study area etc) and six additional bedrooms. This building will measure approximately 36m x 12m in width and depth and offers a maximum height of 7.7m. Principal materials will include a white rendered finish to visually tie in with the existing walls of the mansion and a grey zinc roof; and
 - Minor alterations to part of the ground floor of the existing administration building to re-house the QM department and minor alterations to the interior of a Grade II listed mansion to remove the redundant kitchen area.
- 4.2 In support of the application the applicant has provided the following need and reasoning for the proposal. The Cadet Training Centre (CTC) at Frimley Park is a Regular Army Unit and National Centre of Excellence providing training for in excess of 2000 personnel attending residential courses. It hosts numerous conferences and meetings throughout the year. Cadet expansion within the region is a longer term goal for the MoD and this will translate into an increase in the usage of the site.
- 4.3 In June 2012, the Prime Minister announced the Government's Cadet Expansion Programme (CEP) to increase the number of state funded schools with their own cadet force unit.

The programme has been given £10.85 million by the Department for Education (DfE) and Ministry of Defence (MoD) so that more young people can benefit from the cadet experience in school and to increase in the number of state schools benefiting from having a cadet force as part of school life. The CEP is a government commitment to deliver 500 parading units in schools by March 2020. Key to the success in the programme is the delivery of trained Cadet Force Adult Volunteers able to deliver training. These volunteers will pass through the National Cadet Training Centre, Frimley and to facilitate the increased volume from this programme the National CTC Frimley Park has to be expanded and improved to meet the demand.

- 4.4 The option of relocating the Centre to a location in central England had been considered. However, having been a CTC since 1959, the MoD has concluded that the CTC should be retained in Frimley. To fulfil current and future needs of the CTC there is a need to improve the existing facilities to accommodate up to 60 adult volunteers and 8 trainers at any one time and therefore this planning application has been lodged to meet these requirements.

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 5.1 | Surrey County Council
Highway Authority | No objection. |
| 5.2 | Surrey Wildlife Trust | No response at the time of writing this report <i>[Officer comment, see paragraph 7.5.1 below and if any updates are received, these will be verbally reported to the Committee]</i> |
| 5.3 | SHBC Drainage Officer | No objection. |
| 5.4 | SHBC Tree Officer | No objection. |
| 5.5 | SHBC Environmental
Health Officer | No objection. |
| 5.6 | SHBC Historic Buildings
and Conservation
Advisor | No objection. |
| 5.7 | The Garden History
Society | No response at the time of writing this report <i>[Officer comment, if any updates are received, these will be verbally reported to the Committee]</i> |
| 5.8 | Historic England | No objection. |

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 At the time of writing one letter of support has been received. The letter of support states:
- The existing buildings to be demolished are an ‘eyesore’ and the new design is a positive enhancement to a historic building; and,
 - The proposal would be a positive benefit to the lives of young people.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

7.1 The application site falls within the curtilage of a Grade II Listed Building. The relevant policies relating to the above proposal are Policies CP14, DM9, DM11 and DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Western Urban Area Character SPD are also material planning considerations.

7.2 The impact of the development on the character of the area and the Listed Building

7.2.1 Given these national requirements set out at paragraphs 4.2 – 4.4 above and the need to balance these with the character of the wider area including the Grade II Listed Building, meetings have been held on site with both Surrey Heath Planning Officers, Surrey Heath Heritage and Conservation Officer and the applicant’s team to discuss the MoD’s aspirations for the site. The submitted design follows detailed discussions between all these parties.

7.2.2 The Council’s Historic Buildings and Conservation Advisor has considered the application and in his ‘no objection’ response states that:

“Following detailed pre-application discussions I am happy the proposals will not harm the special interest of the listed building. The existing Q.M. huts are of little if any historic significance and of no architectural significance. They do not relate well to the eighteenth century country house and their removal is welcomed. These buildings are reflective of the generally unsympathetic changes made to the building in the twentieth century. The dividing walls on the first floor of the house are particularly damaging and the provision of modern accommodation elsewhere will allow for the removal of these divisions. The proposed building is intended to improve the facilities and accommodation at the training centre. The architectural approach has sought to present an ancillary wing to the main house. It reflects certain architectural details under a modern metal roof. This will be a conspicuous roof form but I am satisfied this will not be an uncomfortable contrast. The building will be more overtly modern at the rear but the garden wall will act as a foil to some degree. I am confident the proposed building has an architectural confidence and robustness that will complement the setting of the historic building. I am satisfied the proposed building will not harm the setting of the grade II registered park. The replacement of the prefabricated buildings with the proposed dining hall and accommodation will improve the setting of the garden”

7.2.3 One mature tree is also to be felled, however this is in close proximity to the buildings and is well separated from public vantage points. Likewise given the significant mature tree screening across the whole site and the positive benefits the proposal delivers, it is considered that the removal of this tree is not contentious. In conclusion, having regard to the comments of the Council's Historic Buildings and Conservation Advisor and noting the separation of the proposals from public viewpoints, the retained boundary screening and the sympathetic design of the extension, it is considered that the proposal can be accommodated within the local area without significant harm to the character of the area or setting of the listed building, gardens or park. On this basis no objections are raised on these grounds. The proposal would not conflict with Policy DM9 (Design Principles) or DM17 (Heritage) of the CSDMP.

7.3 Impact on residential amenity

7.3.1 Given the location and separation distances from the nearest residential properties (108 – 120 Gilbert Road), which are a minimum of 25m from the proposal, no undue loss of residential amenity is anticipated by the proposed development to the occupiers of any other adjoining or nearby residential properties.

7.3.2 In conclusion it is envisaged that the proposal would not conflict with Policy DM9 (Design Principles) of the CSDMP.

7.4 Impact on highway safety

7.4.1 The County Highway Authority has undertaken an assessment in terms of the likely net additional traffic generation, access arrangements and parking provision and are satisfied that the proposal would not have a material impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining public highway. The County Highway Authority therefore have no highway requirements. In conclusion it is envisaged that the proposal would not conflict with Policy DM11 (Traffic Management and Highway Safety) of the CSDMP and it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and no objections are therefore raised on these grounds.

7.5 Other matters

7.5.1 An ecological survey, written by a qualified ecologist, has been submitted as part of this application and the methods of the survey accord with current good practice guidelines. Surveys of this type are valuable in terms of helping to determine whether or not wildlife particularly species with special legislative protection are likely to be present in the locality and if so whether they might be affected by development. The survey concludes that general wildlife including statutorily protected and notable species would not be adversely affected should the development proposals be implemented. No objections are therefore raised on these grounds. The proposal would not conflict with Policy CP14 (Biodiversity and Nature Conservation) of the CSDMP.

8.0 ARTICLE 2(3) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) ORDER 2012 WORKING IN A POSITIVE/PROACTIVE MANNER

8.1 In assessing this application, officers have worked with the Applicant in a positive and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the NPPF. This included:

a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.

b) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.

c) Have suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.

d) Have proactively communicated with the Applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 This application seeks planning consent for the part demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a new building to provide improved facilities at this Ministry of Defence (MoD) site. Officers conclude that the proposals would not harm the character of the area including the Grade II Listed Building, impact upon residential amenity, highway safety or ecology matters. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Prior to the commencement of development, the following details must be approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the works must not be executed other than in complete accordance with these approved details:

- a) Drawings to a scale not smaller than 1:5 fully describing:
 - i. new/and/or/replacement windows, external doors, roof lights.

These drawings must show: materials, decorative/protective finish, cross section of frame, transom, mullions, glazing bars, etc, formation of openings including reveals, heads, sills, arches, etc, method of opening and method of glazing
 - ii. Roof details including sections through: eaves, verges and parapets
- b) Samples or specifications of external materials and surface finishes

Reason: To ensure that the historic and architectural character of the Listed Building and surrounding area is maintained with regard to Policies CP2 and DM17 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3. If hidden features are revealed during the course of works, they should be retained in situ. Works shall be suspended in the relevant area of the building and the Local Planning Authority notified immediately. Failure to do so may result in the execution of unauthorized works that would constitute a criminal offence

Reason: In order to protect the Listed Building adjacent to this proposal and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4. No new plumbing, pipes, soil stacks, flues, vents, ductwork or the like, shall be fixed to any external face of the building other than as shown on the drawings hereby approved.

Reason: In order to protect the Listed Building adjacent to this proposal and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved plans: 3819-GA-02 C, 3819-GA-01 B and 3819-GA-04 A, unless the prior written approval has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning and as advised in ID.17a of the Planning Practice Guidance.

Informative(s)

- 1. Building Regs consent req'd DF5
- 2. Decision Notice to be kept DS1