Application Number	Expiry Date	Parish	Ward
213106	13 May 2022	Woodley	Bulmershe and Whitegates;

Applicant	HE2 Reading 1 GP Limited
Site Address	Land at Headley Road East, Woodley, RG5 4SN
Proposal	Full planning application for the proposed erection of 5 no. buildings for commercial development to provide flexible light industrial, general industrial, and storage and distribution uses, with ancillary offices, associated car parking, formation of new accesses, and landscape planting, following demolition of existing buildings
Type	Full
Officer	Graham Vaughan
Reason for determination by committee	Major application

FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Planning Committee on Wednesday, 11 May 2022
REPORT PREPARED BY	Assistant Director – Place

SUMMARY

The site is located at Headley Road East and Viscount Way within Woodley. In policy terms, it is within a Core Employment Area and part of a major development location. The scheme is for the redevelopment of the existing industrial site to provide ten units across five buildings which would be used for activities associated with use classes E(g)iii, B2 and B8. Given the existing and proposed use and the associated increase in floor space, the scheme would help provide economic development within a designated area and is acceptable in principle.

The proposal is for the erection of new buildings typically following the boundaries of the site with parking and landscaping (and a new access road) provided in the centre. Although detached from the main site, a smaller building would be located on an area of hardstanding (but still part of the Core Employment Area). The scheme is appropriate to the character of the area given the established industrial uses on and surrounding the site. Additionally, the scheme would have a comprehensive landscaping scheme which would make a positive contribution.

A major consideration of the scheme however has been the loss of a non-designated heritage asset. This has stemmed from the site and buildings being part of the former Woodley Aerodrome and the association with Miles Aircraft in particular. Nonetheless, through the assessment of a listing request, Historic England have recommended the buildings are not listed primarily due to the lack of remaining historic fabric, the lack of expression of the original use and the overall loss of the airfield which has already occurred. In consideration of planning policy relating to non-designated heritage assets, as part of a balanced judgement, the benefits of the scheme outweigh the loss of this asset.

Through the construction of a new access road with improved access onto Headley Road East and Viscount Way, it is considered the scheme would satisfactorily mitigate any impact in highway terms. Indeed, the scheme would provide sufficient parking for cars

and HGVs which would relieve pressure of on-street parking around the site and would meet or exceed standards in terms of cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points. Subject to other conditions, the proposal would not detrimentally impact in terms of highway safety with satisfactory visibility splays achieved.

With regard to residential amenity, it is acknowledged that the scheme would result in the reprovision of large-scale buildings near to residential properties. In most cases however, the new buildings would be further away from shared boundaries than the existing, which is considered a material improvement. Additionally, the scheme has been designed so that the general activity associated with a building would occur on the opposite side of a residential property which again is considered to result in an improved relationship. A minor loss of light is indicated at a few properties which does weigh against the proposal but is not a substantial impact.

The application has been subject to extensive discussions regarding environmental health impacts but ultimately it is considered that, subject to conditions, no detrimental impact would occur in terms of noise, air pollution or contamination. Whilst residential properties remain nearby, it should be noted that the site is already in use as industrial and has been for a significant amount of time.

Subject to other conditions, the scheme is considered acceptable in terms of its impact regarding flooding and drainage, tree and landscape, sustainable design and construction, ecology, employment skills and CIL. A planning balance exercise is required due to minor conflicts but overall, the positives of the scheme are considered to demonstrably outweigh this. As such, the scheme is recommended for conditional approval subject to the signing of a legal agreement.

PLANNING STATUS

Contaminated Land Consultation Zone
Local Authorities
Affordable Housing Thresholds
Borough Parishes
Core Employment Areas
Scale and Location of Development Proposals
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Public Open Space (adjacent)
Replacement Mineral Local Plan
Tree Preservation Orders
Borough Wards
Landscape Character Assessment Area
Land Terrier
Local Plan Update Submitted Sites
SSSI Impact Risk Zones

RECOMMENDATION

That the committee authorise the GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following:

A. **Completion of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the Council's employment skills plan and a monitoring fee for a travel plan associated with the development.**

B. Conditions and informatives:

1. Timescale - The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: In pursuance of s.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by s.51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. Approved details - This permission is in respect of the submitted application plans and drawings numbered '11359 PL100 Location Plan', '11359 PL101 Existing Site Plan', '11359 PL102 Existing Elevations', '11359 PL103 Proposed Site Plan Rev C', '11359 PL104 Proposed Site Sections Sheet 1', '11359 PL105 Proposed Site Sections Sheet 2', '11359 PL106 Detailed Site sections', '11359 PL110 Proposed Floor Plan Unit 1 and 5 Rev A', '11359 PL111 Proposed Floor Plan Unit 6', '11359 PL112 Proposed Floor Plan Units 7 and 8', '11359 PL113 Proposed Floor Plan Unit 9', '11359 PL114 Proposed Floor Plan Unit 10', '11359 PL120 Proposed Elevations Units 1 to 5 Rev A', '11359 PL121 Proposed Elevations Unit 6', '11359 PL122 Proposed Elevations Units 7 and 8', '11359 PL123 Proposed Elevations Unit 9 Rev A', '11359 PL124 Proposed Elevations Unit 10 Rev A', '11359 PL130 Proposed Roof plan Unit 1 and 5', '11359 PL131 Proposed Roof plan Unit 6', '11359 PL132 Proposed Roof plan Unit 7 and 8', '11359 PL133 Proposed Roof plan Unit 9 and 10', '11359 PL157 Landscape Sections Sheet 1', '11359 PL158 Landscape Sections Sheet 2' received by the local planning authority on 15 September 2021 and revised plans 17 December 2021 and 11 March 2022. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless other minor variations are agreed in writing after the date of this permission and before implementation with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the application form and associated details hereby approved.

3. Construction environment management plan - No development, including demolition and site clearance, shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to control the environmental effects of the demolition and construction work has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include measures for:
a) the control of dust, odour and other effluvia
b) the control of noise (including noise from any piling and permitted working hours)
c) the control of pests and other vermin (particularly during site clearance)
d) the control of surface water run-off)- The control of noise from delivery vehicles, and times when deliveries are accepted and when materials can be removed from the site
e) mitigation of any impact of construction upon protected species on or near the site
Construction of the development hereby approved shall not be carried out unless in accordance with the approved CEMP.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity. Relevant Policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3

4. Construction method statement - No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors,
b) loading and unloading of plant and materials,
c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development,
d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate,

e) wheel washing facilities,
f) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction,
g) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety & convenience and neighbour amenities. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

5. Contamination - Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until parts A to D have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until part D has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

A. Site Characterisation
An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
a) human health; b) property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes, c) adjoining land, groundwaters and surface waters, ecological systems, archaeological sites and ancient monuments; d) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).
This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'

B. Submission of Remediation Scheme
A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

C. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme
The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the

remediation carried out must be produced and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

D. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination
In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of part A, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of part B, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with part C.
Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified at the outset to allow remediation to protect existing/proposed occupants of property on the site and/or adjacent land. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 15 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment) and Core Strategy policies CP1 & CP3.

6. Building recording - No development shall take place, including any works of demolition and/or stripping out any buildings on the site, until a building recording document has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The document shall be submitted by the applicant (or their successor in ownership of the property/site) and shall be completed to, as a minimum 'Recording Level 2', as set out in the Historic England guidance document 'Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practise' (May 2016)' and be deposited with Berkshire Archaeology's Historic Environment Record Officer. No demolition works shall take place until the applicant (or their successor in ownership of the property/site) has received written confirmation from the local planning authority that the submitted information satisfactorily documents the buildings on site.
Reason: To ensure a proportionate response to the loss of a non-designated heritage asset and that the understanding and significance of the asset can be recorded. Relevant policy: NPPF paragraph 205

7. External materials - Prior to the commencement of the development (other than demolition and ground works) hereby permitted, samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building/s shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the so-approved details.
Reason: To ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.

8. Landscape management - Prior to the commencement of the development (other than demolition and ground works) hereby permitted, a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities, timescales and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.
Reason: In order to ensure that provision is made to allow satisfactory maintenance of the landscaping hereby approved. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21.

9. Highway construction details - Prior to the commencement of development (other than demolition and ground works) hereby permitted, full details of the construction of roads

and footways, including levels, widths, construction materials, depths of construction, surface water drainage, internal visibility splays and lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The roads and footways shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details to road base level before the development is occupied and the final wearing course will be provided within 3 months of occupation, unless other minor variations are agreed in writing after the date of this permission and before implementation with the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that roads and footpaths are constructed to a standard that would be suitable for adoption as publicly maintainable highway, in the interests of providing a functional, accessible and safe development. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

10. Access - Prior to commencement of the development (other than demolition and ground works) hereby permitted, details of the proposed vehicular accesses on to Headley Road East and Viscount Way to include visibility splays of 2.4m by 43m shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The access shall be formed as so approved, and the visibility splays shall be cleared of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height prior to the occupation of the development. The accesses shall be retained in accordance with the approved details and used for no other purpose and the land within the visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any visual obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height at all times.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience in accordance with Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

11. Highway signage – Prior to commencement of development (other than demolition and ground works) hereby permitted, details of all highway signage (internal and external of the site) to ensure the main point of access would be from Headley Road East shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The signage shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be permanently retained for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety and minimising access via Viscount Way. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

12. Accommodation of construction vehicles and deliveries - No development (other than demolition and ground works) shall commence until provision has been made to accommodate all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site during the construction period, in accordance with details to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The provision shall be maintained as so approved and used for no other purposes until completion of the development or otherwise as provided for in the approved details
Reason: To prevent queuing and parking off site, in the interests of highway safety and convenience. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP6.

13. Cycle parking details required - Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted details of secure and covered bicycle storage/ parking facilities for the occupants of [and visitors to] the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The cycle storage/ parking shall be implemented in accordance with such details as may be approved before occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be permanently retained in the approved form for the parking of bicycles and used for no other purpose.
Reason: In order to ensure that secure weather-proof bicycle parking facilities are provided so as to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel. Relevant policy:

NPPF Section 9 (Sustainable Transport) and Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 & CP6 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC07.

14. Electric vehicle charging - Prior to occupation of development hereby permitted, details for Electric Vehicle Charging points serving the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Electric Vehicle Charging points shall be implemented in accordance with such details as may be approved before occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall be permanently retained in the approved form for the charging of electric vehicles and used for no other purpose.
Reason: In order to ensure that secure electric vehicle charging facilities are provided so as to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 & CP6 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC07.

15. Biodiversity enhancement - Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of biodiversity enhancements, to include a minimum of 12 bird or bat boxes, bricks or tiles built into the new buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The biodiversity enhancements shall thereafter be installed as approved and remain in situ for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: To incorporate biodiversity in and around developments. Relevant policy: Paragraphs 179 and 180 of the NPPF and Core Strategy policy CP7

16. Noise management - Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, a noise management plan for each individual unit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved noise management plans shall thereafter be implemented as agreed and remain in place for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: To protect residential amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP1 and CP3.

17. External lighting strategy - Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, an external lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details to mitigate external lighting impact upon wildlife, residential amenity and highways including:
a) A layout plan with beam orientation, location, height, type, hours of operation, direction of light sources and intensity of illumination
b) A schedule of equipment
c) Measures to avoid glare
d) An isolux contour map showing light spillage to 1 lux (including lux level predictions beyond the site boundary)
The approved lighting plan shall thereafter be implemented as agreed and remain in place for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority. No further external lighting shall be installed without the written approval of the local planning authority.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety and to seek to protect habitat and species of principal importance. Relevant policies: NPPF Section 15, Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP3, CP6, CP7, CP11 and MDD Policies TB21 and TB23.

18. Details of boundary walls and fences - Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of all boundary treatment(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development or phased as agreed in writing by the local

planning authority. The scheme shall be maintained in the approved form for so long as the development remains on the site.
Reason: In the interests of amenity and highway safety. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3 and CP6.

19. Parking management strategy - Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Parking Management Strategy for the management of the parking arrangements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted Parking Management Strategy shall include details of the management of all parking spaces, monitoring of all parking including the local residential streets and the monitoring and the delivery of additional electric vehicle charging spaces when required. The approved parking strategy shall thereafter be implemented as agreed and remain in place for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: To ensure satisfactory development in the interests of amenity and highway safety in accordance with Wokingham Borough Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP6, CP13 and CP21 and MDDLP policies CC07 and TB20.

20. Parking and turning space details required - No part of any building (s) hereby permitted shall be occupied or used until vehicle parking and turning space has been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The vehicle parking and turning space so approved shall be retained in accordance with the approved details and the parking space remain available for the parking of vehicles at all times and the turning space shall not be used for any purpose other than vehicle turning.
Reason: To provide adequate off-street vehicle parking and turning space and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear in the interests of road safety and convenience and providing a functional, accessible and safe development and in the interests of amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC07.

21. Travel Plan - Within 6 months of occupation of each unit, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The travel plan shall include a programme of implementation and proposals to promote alternative forms of transport to and from the site, other than by the private car and provide for periodic review. The travel plan shall be fully implemented, maintained and reviewed as so approved.
Reason: To encourage the use of all travel modes. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 9 (Sustainable Transport) and Core Strategy policy CP6.

22. Hours of work - No work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall take place other than between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays.
Reason: To protect the occupiers of neighbouring properties from noise and disturbance outside the permitted hours during the construction period. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC06.

23. Access to be stopped up - The existing vehicular access(es) to the site shall be stopped up and abandoned, and the footway and/or verge crossings shall be re-instated within one month of the completion of the new access(es) in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and convenience. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

24. Landscaping - The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out unless in accordance with the submitted landscaping details including General Arrangement Plans Sheets 1 to 4 Rev D and Landscape Tree Pit Details Rev A. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a timetable approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved and permanently retained.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21 (and TB06 for garden development).

25. Noise impact assessment - The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details as agreed in 'Noise Impact Assessment (version 3), Accon UK, A4199/N/0003, 1 December 2021' received by the Local Planning Authority on 17 December 2021 including the acoustic barrier. The measures contained within the report shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.
Reason: To protect residential amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP1 and CP3.

26. Drainage and flood risk strategy - The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details as agreed in 'Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy Report, Baynham Meikle Partnership Limited, R01, September 2021' received by the Local Planning Authority on 15 September 2021. The measures contained within the report shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.
Reason: To prevent increased flood risk from surface water run-off. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 14 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Core Strategy policy CP1 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC09 and CC10.

27. Energy strategy - The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details as agreed in 'Energy Strategy Report, Shepherd Brombley Partnership, Issue 1, 30 July 2021' received by the Local Planning Authority on 15 September 2021. The measures contained within the report shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.
Reason: To ensure developments contribute to sustainable development. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 14 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Core Strategy policy CP1, Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC05 & the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document

28. Vegetation removal - All trees, hedges and shrubs or similar vegetation where birds may nest which are to be removed as part of the development, are to be cleared outside the bird-nesting season (March - August inclusive) or if clearance during the bird-nesting season cannot reasonably be avoided, a suitably qualified ecologist will check the areas to be removed immediately prior to clearance and advise whether nesting birds are

present. If active nests are recorded, no vegetation clearance or other works that may disturb active nests shall proceed until all young have fledged the nest.
Reason: To ensure that wildlife is not adversely affected by the proposed development in line with Policy CP7 of the core strategy and wildlife legislation.

29. Protection of trees - a) No development or other operations shall take place except in complete accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Assessment by SJ Stephens Associates dated 3rd March 2022 (hereinafter referred to as the Approved Scheme).
b) No operations shall commence on site in connection with development hereby approved (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) until the tree protection works required by the Approved Scheme are in place on site.
c) No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the Approved Scheme.
d) The fencing or other works which are part of the Approved
Scheme shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works including external works have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials removed from the site, unless the prior approval in writing of the local planning authority has first been sought and obtained.
Reason: To secure the protection throughout the time that the development is being carried out of trees shrubs or hedges growing within or adjacent to the site which are of amenity value to the area, and to allow for verification by the local planning authority that the necessary measures are in place before development and other works commence Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21.

30. BREEAM - The development hereby approved shall achieve BREEAM level 'Very Good' in accordance with the requirements of BREEAM [or such national measure of sustainability for non-residential design that replaces that scheme] and shall remain as such unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: To ensure developments contribute to sustainable development. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 10 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Core Strategy policy CP1 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policy CC04

31. Restriction of permitted development rights - Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning, (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re- enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows or similar openings shall be constructed in the first floor level or above in the eastern elevation of units 1 - 5 and the western elevation of unit 10 hereby permitted except for any which may be shown on the approved drawing(s).
Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3.

32. Deliveries - No deliveries shall be accepted or dispatched between the hours of 23:00 and 07:00 from Units 9 and 10 as stated on plan '11359 PL 103 C Proposed Site Plan' unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: To protect residential amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP1 and CP3.

33. Doors and windows - During occupation of the development hereby permitted, doors and windows of each unit shall be kept closed when noisy activity is taking place. No noise activity shall be carried out between the hours of 23:00 and 07:00 when deliveries are accepted or dispatched unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: To protect residential amenity. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP1 and CP3.

34. Restriction of use - During occupation of the development hereby permitted, B2 use/activities shall not exceed more than 35% of the floorspace contained within the site (as identified on the approved plans) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
Reason: Reason: To encourage a mix of uses and to ensure adequate parking to serve the site. Relevant policy: NPPF Section 9 (Sustainable Transport) and Core Strategy Policy CP6

Informatives
1. The applicant is reminded that this approval is granted subject to conditions which must be complied with prior to the development starting on site. Commencement of the development without complying with the pre-commencement requirements may be outside the terms of this permission and liable to enforcement action. The information required should be formally submitted to the Council for consideration with the relevant fee. Once the details have been approved in writing the development should be carried out only in accordance with those details. If this is not clear please contact the case officer to discuss.

2. This permission should be read in conjunction with the legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act dated [INSERT], the obligations in which relate to this development.

3. The Head of Highways at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham [0118 9746000] should be contacted for the approval of the access construction details before any work is carried out within the highway (including verges and footways). This planning permission does NOT authorise the construction of such an access or works.

4. Adequate precautions shall be taken during the construction period to prevent the deposit of mud and similar debris on adjacent highways. For further information contact the Highway Authority on tel.: 0118 9746000.

5. Any works/ events carried out by or on behalf of the developer affecting either a public highway or a prospectively maintainable highway (as defined under s.87 New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA)), shall be co-ordinated and licensed as required under NRSWA and the Traffic Management Act 2004 in order to minimise disruption to both pedestrian and vehicular users of the highway.

Any such works or events, and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site must be co-ordinated by the developer in liaison with the Borough's Street Works team (0118 974 6302). This must take place AT LEAST three months in advance of the intended works to ensure effective co-ordination with other works so as to minimise disruption.

6. The applicant's attention is drawn to the presence of a c.2m wide service strip running adjacent to the surfaced roadway. The service strip forms part of the adopted public highway. It is an offence for any works to be undertaken within this service strip without

express permission in writing from the highway authority. The Head of Technical Services at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham (0118 9746000) must be contacted for the approval of any such works.

7. The requisite Travel plan would need to comply with the latest national and local guidance: a) NPPF Section 9 (Sustainable Transport), b) The Essential Guide to Travel Planning (DfT, March 2008), c) Delivering Travel Plans Through the Planning Process (DfT, April 2009), d) A Guide on Travel Plans for Developers (DfT) e) Making Residential Travel Plans Work (DfT, June 2007) All accessible at gov.uk. Additionally: a) WBC Transport Plan 3 and Active Travel Plan 2011 – 2026, b) WBC Workplace Travel Plan Guidance and Residential Travel Plan Guidance. All accessible at Wokingham.gov.uk

8. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received. This planning application has been the subject of positive and proactive discussions with the applicant in terms of: a) addressing heritage matters, b)resolving technical highway and tree matters, c)extending the determination period of the application to allow for additional information to be received to overcome concerns relating to neighbour amenity. The decision to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF is considered to be a positive outcome of these discussions.

9. The applicant is advised to take note of the response from Thames Water including the provision of a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes

10. The applicant is advised to take note of the response from Southern Gas Networks.

PLANNING HISTORY

The site was previously part of the Adwest Engineering business but is currently occupied by Arlington Automotive. Whilst there have been numerous applications relating to Adwest buildings in the past, these typically relate to alterations/modifications of the buildings at that time. In this respect, other than the fact that similar uses to the current use have occurred in the past, the planning history specifically relating to the site is not materially relevant to the current application.

SUMMARY INFORMATION

For Commercial	
Site Area	3.06 hectares
Previous land use(s) and floorspace(s)	13,715m^2 of B1 (c), B2, B8 (GIA)
Proposed floorspace of each use	16,301m^2 of E(g)iii, B2, B8 (GIA)
Change in floorspace (+/-)	+2586m^2 (GIA)
Number of jobs created/lost	+70-281 (Using HCA Employment Density)
Existing parking spaces	156
Proposed parking spaces	188

CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Crime Prevention Design Officer	No comments received
Historic England	Designation decision received
National Grid	No comments received
Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue	No comments received
Southern Gas Networks	No objection subject to informative
Thames Water	No objection subject to informative
WBC Built Heritage	No objection subject to conditions
WBC Cleaner & Greener (Waste Services)	No comments received
WBC Drainage	No objection
WBC Ecology	No objection subject to conditions
WBC Economic Prosperity and Place (Community Infrastructure)	No objection subject to ESP contribution
WBC Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions
WBC Growth and Delivery (Planning Policy)	No comments received
WBC Highways	No objection subject to conditions
WBC Tree & Landscape	No objection subject to conditions

REPRESENTATIONS

Town/Parish Council: Objection received from Woodley Town Council with regard to the following:

- Highway infrastructure around the site would not be able to cope with the increase in heavy goods vehicles including Viscount Way due to its width and proximity to residential properties (note that another company increased their HGV vehicle movements recently through changes to their vehicle operator's licence).
- Increase in HGV movements would detrimentally harm neighbouring properties in terms of noise and air pollution which is contrary to policy CP1 of the Core Strategy.
- The proposed buildings to the east of the site would be overbearing to properties on Gemini Road.

Members of Parliament: Objection received from Matt Rodda MP with regard to the following:

- Noise and air pollution would be made worse by the development and current issues with the neighbouring site remain unresolved.
- Additional HGVs would pose danger to children walking to school and contribute further to noise and air pollution.
- The building is historically significant being an architectural jewel and structural testament to the local aircraft industry. Demolition would show a complete disregard for an important chapter in Woodley's history.

Local Members: Objections received from Councillor Younis, Councillor Boyt, Councillor Baker and Councillor Shepherd-DuBey with regard to the following:

- Increase of HGV traffic with adverse impact on local residents in terms of air and noise pollution especially the occupants of Lilly May Court and surrounding areas.
- The building is of historical significance due to its role in the Second World War and it would be detrimental to the history of Woodley if it was demolished. The building was designed in an 'art deco' style and should be preserved.
- Resident's right to quiet enjoyment of their homes will be compromised further (a noise impact assessment commissioned by local residents states the existing business are having an adverse impact on the occupants of Lilly May Court).

- Existing residents have reported health issues linked to the existing haulage activities.
- Too many HGV already use Viscount Way.
- Unit 10 would have an overbearing impact on residential properties.
- The building on the site is a significant non-designated heritage asset. It is the last remaining Art Deco building from the golden age of flying at Woodley Aerodrome of the 1930s and 1940s and is a much-loved local landmark and shouldn't be demolished.
- The scheme is contrary to policy CP3 and TB24 with regard to heritage assets.
- The building has an impressive façade which is unique to the area and the historical nature of the site should be considered

Neighbours:
7 Letters of support received with regard to the following:

- Scheme will be great for the area
- It will increase jobs and improve infrastructure
- The submitted information indicates a reduction in vehicle movements
- The site is located in a sustainable location
- The buildings will achieve a 'Very Good' BREEAM standard
- The scheme complies with local and national planning policy
- Apprentices for school leavers could be offered
- It will improve Headley Road
- Supports the local economy
- Better than houses going on the site

213 letters of objection received with regard to the following:
Access and Movement

- Bike and car movements occur at unsociable hours
- Roads are not broad enough to bring in additional industrial traffic
- Heavy vehicles and non-residential traffic travel through residential roads, and it is unsafe for children
- There are too many passing visitors making it unsafe for residents
- There is a safeguarding problem with trucks driving really fast down Viscount way putting children at risk
- Recent development of industrial units along Headley Road East caused numerus construction vehicles to use residential roads as a cut-through
- Proposal shows existing car parks will be used for the new units so parking on residential roads will occur
- The road network is not sufficient to support additional traffic on the surrounding routes
- Children use the adjoining roads to walk to school and are already in danger from existing traffic
- Traffic pollution is already high in the area and the scheme will make this worse
- The Council should be encouraging more people to walk and cycle and thinking of the health and welfare of families in the area
- Occupiers of the existing units already use the residential roads as cut throughs
- The application should include the introduction of speed humps and traffic calming measures on Gemini Road
- Vehicles use Viscount Way to park as there are no restrictions
- Drivers use HGV cabs to stay in overnight

- Children play in the woods, park and surrounding roads and there have already been accidents with fast moving trucks. Adding to this will only make it worse.
- Lorries cause houses to shake as they drive past
- The link between Viscount Way and Headley Road East will cause additional traffic and be used as a rat run
- Roads have been poorly resurfaced which will cause lorries to skid
- There are many schools in the area and the surrounding roads are used by school children
- There is no mention of improving road crossing facilities
- Traffic is already an issue in the area and the roads are poorly maintained
- The existing road infrastructure can't cope with HGV traffic
- The speed of existing HGV traffic is already dangerous
- Increase of HGV vehicles using link roads from A329M which are already badly damaged
- Indiscriminate parking on surrounding roads would increase as people can just park and walk to the site
- Area of landscaping adjacent to Gemini Road will provide another cut through for pedestrians
- Other units in the area encourage parking on residential roads due to not having enough parking on their own sites

Officer response: The concerns regarding impact of vehicular movement are noted including the use of residential roads for site related traffic. It is considered the scheme will reduce the use of Gemini Road for this given the ability to access both Viscount Way and Headley Road East from the site. A condition is also suggested to enable highway signage to be agreed which would encourage such movement. The impacts of construction would be mitigated using conditions including a construction management plan which would be agreed with the LPA. Parking provision is considered sufficient for the mix of uses proposed however a further condition restricting the amount of B2 floor space to a certain level is proposed to ensure that this remains the case.

Character

- Houses are adjacent to the proposed industrial site
- The area has been changed by the introduction of residential development
- Detrimental effect of proposed development on the character of the local area
- Units 9 and 10 are near to a local park which will cause disturbance for people relaxing there
- The area is in the middle of private housing
- Building warehouses may disturb people relaxing in the local park
- Having industrial units next to residential area will change the character of the area
- The area is residential with a small amount of industry and not the other way round
- The recent replacement buildings are ugly and unsightly
- The development should be broken up to lessen its impact
- The size and scale of the redevelopment does not take into account the scale of residential properties
- The area is looking scruffy due to new buildings
- The new units are bigger and more obtrusive

Officer Response: The site and the wider area are designated a Core Employment Area in the development plan and industrial uses have occurred on the site for a substantial amount of time. As such, the relationship between residential and industrial uses is well

established. It is accepted that the boundary between the two has moved in recent years but nonetheless, the provision of industrial uses within Woodley, or any large settlement is not an unusual occurrence. The design of the buildings is considered appropriate to their use and whilst of a large scale, would not dominate the character of the area.

Heritage

- The building is important and iconic in Woodley and is part of the wartime history
- A compromise should be made, and the building façade be kept
- The building is the last remaining part of the Miles Aircraft Factory which contributed significantly to the production and maintenance of aeroplanes during World War II
- The building should be listed and preserved for future generations
- The building has an art deco design which should be preserved
- Much of the local heritage has already been lost due to development in the area and this shouldn't continue
- The building (and others in the area) were designed by Guy Morgan & Partners and is a great example of the importance of Woodley in aviation history. Many buildings have already been lost and this should stop.
- After the war, the production of the biro pen took place on the site which is another part of the history of Woodley
- The building has a unique design
- The building could be used to house the Berkshire Museum of Aviation
- At the very least the façade of the building should be kept given the historic importance and last link to Woodley's past
- The site should be used for educational purposes
- Other buildings including Hawkhurst House have already been demolished and lost
- The building should not be lost as it is the last link to the aviation history of which Woodley was built upon
- The building should be renovated and preserved
- Local history should be preserved
- Development across Woodley has not taken into account the heritage of the area
- Retaining the building would be the basis for high quality locally distinctive design
- The building should be considered a non-designated heritage asset
- There has been no assessment of the building as a heritage asset
- The social importance and contribution to local history of the building should be retained
- There are few other examples of existing headquarter buildings for major aircraft manufacturers
- No information has been provided on why the building could be converted and reused rather than demolished

Officer response: The comments regarding the history of the site and indeed the wider history of Woodley are noted. Through the course of the application, it has become apparent that the buildings on the site are non-designated heritage assets. As such, there should be a consideration against the national and local policy framework. In part, this has been informed by a listing designation request to Historic England. Further details are set out below but ultimately, Historic England considered the building should not be listed. In recognition of the history of the site however and given its loss because of the scheme, it is considered a recording of the building should be made and stored with the Historic Environment Record for Berkshire.

Environmental Health

- Bright lights are used by occupier
- Current occupier creates noise
- Vibration and noise of heavy traffic around the area is damaging to residential properties and the number of lorries needs to be reduced not increased
- Additional noise pollution and other disturbances
- Use of heavy vehicles leads to air pollution
- Concerns have been raised with the Council regarding existing industry
- Homes around the site are not built to the correct standard making the impact worse
- Demolition and construction of new buildings will create noise, disturbance and pollution
- Quality of life for residents will be harmed in terms of noise, traffic and safety.
- Increase of noise in evenings, early morning and night due to 24-hour operating license
- Noise Impact Assessment hasn't properly considered the impact as noise receptors set away from residential buildings
- Light pollution is already bad
- Noise occurs between 5am and 11pm already and the proposal is for 24 hours
- Dust pollution will increase which will result in chronic and severe health conditions of local community and local residents
- Noise is currently minimal, but the development of the site will cause this to increase
- Noise and pollution will have a detrimental impact on sleep patterns, mental health and the ability to work from home
- Existing houses haven't been built correctly and are already suffering from noise and pollution
- The current business operates 24/7 but this would be made worse if multiple businesses did the same
- More units with 24/7 operating licenses which conflicts with planning policy in terms of avoiding areas where pollution may impact upon future occupiers
- A report commissioned by the Council indicates that air quality is already below regulatory standards and the scheme, with significant uplift in vehicle movements, will only worsen this

Officer Response: The issues surrounding environmental health matters are complex, but it has to be understood that a planning application cannot seek to rectify existing issues. It should however demonstrate that a scheme would not have a detrimental impact to the extent a reason for refusal could be substantiated. Whilst concerns regarding the submitted reports and existing impacts are noted, it is ultimately considered the scheme does not have a detrimental impact subject to several conditions which would ensure the LPA has relevant controls over noise management and deliveries. The 'fall-back' position of the scheme is also a material consideration in that, in planning terms, there is nothing preventing the site being used more intensively than present i.e., the application offers an important opportunity to reconsider various aspects and put in place more effective mitigation to the concerns raised.

Residential Amenity

- Light to property will be affected by the development
- Lack of privacy for homes that back on to the proposed development
- There will be a loss of light to properties as a result of the scheme
- Planning policies protect residential amenity

Officer Response: It is noted there are some properties which may be negatively impacted by the scheme, but this would be very minor in terms of the scale of impact. Balanced against this is the improvement for many properties in terms of built form being pulled away from the boundary and areas of most activity being relocated towards the centre of the site (on the opposite side of the building from residential properties). As such, it is not considered sufficient harm is caused to substantiate a reason for refusal.

Alternative Options

- Other units in Headley Road East are empty so why aren't these being used
- Why should this area be redeveloped in the middle of residential and it should have been converted for something for the local community
- The site should be used for housing
- The area should be used as green space
- There are existing empty units in the area, so more aren't needed
- The site should be used for recreational use including sports such as the local football club
- The site should be used for doctors' surgery or allotments
- The site should be used for sports facilities
- There are empty units near the site and in areas like Suttons Business Park
- The area needs community facilities accessible by foot and a better retail food outlet
- There is not enough green space and enough new buildings have already been built
- Given the loss of industrial units circa 5 years ago, why is the site not being used for further housing
- There are other areas in the Borough which could be used for this development
- The building should be used for arts/live music
- The air museum could utilise the site
- What need is there for the industrial units and what evidence substantiates the increase in jobs
- The existing buildings could be reused and repurposed to be more environmentally friendly

Officer Response: A local planning authority's role is to determine valid planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is not for an authority to determine if a scheme is a good/bad idea or if there are uses/ideas that could be developed. In this sense, these comments are unable to be given weight in the overall planning balance. With regard to need, this is set out in further detail below but the growth of the Borough through sustainable development comprises of fulfilling environmental, economic and social objectives. The development plan encourages the growth of industrial uses within core employment areas as part of sustainable development. The scheme accords with this part of the development plan.

Ecology

- There is protected wildlife in the area
- The development would have a negative impact on ecology

Officer response: Specific details would be agreed through conditions however bird and bat boxes would be provided to ensure no detrimental impact is caused. In this case, it is not considered a metric of biodiversity net gain is required and, ultimately, the scheme is in accordance with planning policy.

Non-material matters

- Reports of strangers walking around and knocking on doors have been reported to the police
- The plans would bring additional footfall to the estate and burglaries have been reported to the police
- Home and car insurance premiums would be increased
- 24-hour licence will cause antisocial activities at night including burglaries
- Building work will cause rats to move into residential gardens
- This will lower the value of properties
- Enforcement of existing homes hasn't occurred, and the Council has no moral responsibility for residents
- The scheme would be inconvenient
- Support for Woodley United winter training sessions
- Increased robberies would occur
- The buildings will be empty for a long time

Officer Response: These elements are not material planning considerations and therefore cannot be taken into account.

Other matters

- Further tests/assessments are required as set out in the submitted reports
- The submitted surveys have not been conducted correctly particularly in terms of noise and are biased towards gaining approval
- Large tree not shown on the plan
- Littering and fly tipping are a regular occurrence
- There is already a lot of litter left around the site
- There is a contradiction with the Council's strategy of 'Right homes right places'
- There would be no job opportunities for local people
- Demolishing and replacing buildings are a contributor to the climate crisis
- Buildings such as this are an asset to the community

Officer Response: The submitted information is considered sufficient in order to determine the planning application. Whilst litter may be an issue around the site, it is not for this planning application to resolve. The location of the site is within a core employment area i.e., not where housing was envisaged. The planning system cannot allocate specific jobs but there is no prevention on local people accepting jobs on the site. The demolition of buildings is acknowledged as having an impact in terms of climate change, but the buildings are considered nearing the end of the usable life and the provision of a new

building would allow for the use of modern technology and meet up-to-date sustainability requirements in order to reduce the impact of the scheme.

APPLICANTS POINTS
• The site lies within a Core Employment Area in the adopted Local Plan which encourages employment redevelopment. As such it is considered the principle of development is acceptable. • The design of the building is of the highest standard for modern industrial units that will attract investment to the site and locality and will fulfil the Council aspiration to maximise the development of the site for employment purposes. • There will be no undue overshadowing or over dominance resulting from the proposal. There are no highway safety or capacity issues, and the scheme provides parking in accordance with current standards.

PLANNING POLICY		
National Policy	**NPPF**	National Planning Policy Framework
Adopted Core Strategy DPD 2010	**CP1**	Sustainable Development
	CP3	General Principles for Development
	CP4	Infrastructure Requirements
	CP6	Managing Travel Demand
	CP7	Biodiversity
	CP9	Scale and Location of Development Proposals
	CP15	Employment Development
Adopted Managing Development Delivery Local Plan 2014	**CC01**	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
	CC02	Development Limits
	CC03	Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping
	CC04	Sustainable Design and Construction
	CC05	Renewable energy and decentralised energy networks
	CC06	Noise
	CC07	Parking
	CC09	Development and Flood Risk (from all sources)
	CC10	Sustainable Drainage
	TB11	Core Employment Areas
	TB12	Employment Skills Plan
	TB20	Service Arrangements and Deliveries for Employment and Retail Use
	TB21	Landscape Character
	TB23	Biodiversity and Development

	TB24	Designated Heritage Assets
Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)	**BDG**	Borough Design Guide – Section 7
		CIL Guidance + 123 List Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document Woodley Design Statement

PLANNING ISSUES

Description of Development:

1. The scheme is for the redevelopment of an existing industrial site within the Headley Road East industrial area of Woodley. This would involve the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and the erection of five new buildings with associated landscaping and parking, plus the creation of two new accesses. The main part of the site is currently accessed from Headley Road East and is occupied mostly by existing structures. There is an area to the 'rear' of the site which is open and generally used for storage purposes. The application site also includes an area of hardstanding to the south of Viscount Way which is currently used for storage for vehicle rental.

2. On the main part of the site, units 1 – 5 would be contained within a building which would be, at most, 202 metres in length and 33 metres in width. It would have a hipped roof with an eaves height of 9.9 metres and a ridge height of 11.2 metres. On the southern elevation, a parapet element would have a total height of 10.4 metres. Unit 6 would be located on the opposite side of the site with a length of 68 metres and a width of 34 metres. It would have the same roof form as units 1 – 5 but with a ridge height of 11.6 metres. Units 7 and 8 would be located north of unit 6 and would be 108 metres in length, at most 40 metres in width and again have a very similar roof form with a total ridge height of 11.5 metres. Unit 9 would be located south of Viscount Way and would be 42 metres in length, 29 metres in width and have a total ridge height of 11.2 metres. Unit 10 would be located west of unit 9 and would be 42 metres in length, 25 metres in width and have a total ridge height of 11.0 metres. It is proposed to provide metallic elevation and roof cladding as well as timber cladding at first floor level for all the units.

3. Through the centre of the main site, a new access road is proposed which would link Headley Road East and Viscount Way. On opposite sides of the road would be HGV, car and cycle parking. To the edges of the site, tree planting is proposed including an area for swales to be provided to allow for a drainage system. On the site south of Viscount Way, most of the site would be utilised for HGV, car and cycle parking with some additional landscaping. The trees to the edge of the site (protected by a tree preservation order but not located within the site) would be retained. The units are proposed as a mixed-use scheme for activities within the E(g)iii, B2 and B8 use classes.

Planning History of Site:

4. As noted above, previous applications on or around the site related to the operations of the former 'Adwest' business and, in this respect, are not considered materially relevant. However, the development of the wider area that has occurred over time

is relevant. The area to the east of the site i.e., Gemini Road, Martinet Road and Messenger Road, and the area to the southwest of the site i.e., Millers Grove and Bakers Place was originally within the Core Employment Area (CEA) agreed through the adoption of the Core Strategy (2010). As part of the 'call for sites' for the adoption of the MDD Local Plan, the two areas were put forward for residential development.

5. Whilst an application for development of the area to the east was determined before the adoption of the MDD Local Plan, at the time, it was considered there was an over provision of 'B use' floor space in the Borough and there was a recognised need for housing. Therefore, subject to mitigation against site specific impacts, application O/2012/0320 was approved. It followed that the area to the southwest of the site was also acceptable to change from industrial to residential use, reference F/2014/2105. As a result, the adoption of the MDD Local Plan also confirmed the reduction in size of the CEA.

Principle of Development:

6. The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7. Policy CC02 of the MDD sets out the development limits for each settlement as defined on the policies map and therefore replaces the proposals map adopted through the Core Strategy, as per the requirement of policy CP9. Policy CP9 sets out that development proposals located within development limits will be acceptable in principle, having regard to the service provisions associated with the major, modest and limited categories. As the site is within a major development location, the proposal is acceptable in principle subject to any other site allocations as set out in local planning policy.

8. The site is within a CEA, as defined by policies CP15 and TB11, which aim to promote development for business, industry, and warehousing. Policy CP15 states that proposals in these areas should not lead to a net loss of B use floor space across the Borough and that *"provision will be made for a range of sizes, types, quality and locations of premises and sites in order to meet incubator/start up, move on, expansion and investment accommodation needs".*

9. The buildings on the site have been used for industrial purposes typically falling within the (now revoked) B1 (c) use class as well as B2 and B8. The total amount of existing gross internal area (GIA) is stated as 13,715m^2. The proposal seeks the redevelopment of the site to allow for five new buildings comprising of 16,301m^2 (GIA) of B2 (general industrial), B8 (storage and distribution) and E(g)iii (industrial processes). Whilst the provision of E(g)iii is technically a different use class, it is the same as the revoked B1 (c) class and therefore is considered acceptable with regard to policy CP15. As such, the uplift of 2586m^2 (GIA) of 'B use' floor space, would accord with policy CP15 as there is no net loss across the Borough. The scheme has also been designed to provide units of varied sizes ranging from 980m^2 to 2980m^2 (gross external area). It is considered this is in accordance with policy CP15

by meeting the needs for different size businesses. On the basis of the above, the scheme is considered to accord with policy CP15 of the Core Strategy and TB11 of the MDD Local Plan.

10. Some representations have raised whether there is a need for this development; that there are empty units within Headley Road East and other sites in the borough; and suggest a wide range of alternative uses for the site including housing, community space, retail, recreation space or education. As stated in the NPPF and reflected in policy CC01 of the MDD Local Plan, planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As noted above, the site is designated as a CEA, and it is considered there is no conflict with this policy.

11. The development of the Borough, through sustainable development achieved by planning policy, includes a requirement to meet environmental, social and economic objectives. One of these is the provision of a range of employment opportunities. Specifically, the preparation, adoption and implementation of the Core Strategy and MDD Local Plan was informed by the 'Employment Commitments Report (2010)', the 'Employment Land Monitoring Report 2013 – 2014', the 'Economic Development Needs Assessment 2016' and the 'Functional Economic Market Area Report 2016'. These reports identified the needs to protect and enhance employment opportunities across the Borough and this was achieved by designating CEAs. As stated above, there was a reduction in the original size of the CEA due to the circumstances at the time but not a complete removal i.e., it was envisaged that employment opportunities would and should remain at the site and surrounding area. It should also be noted that, as stated by many of the submitted comments, the site has historically been used for industrial process and resultant employment opportunities.

12. As such, given the historic use of the site, the commitment to provide employment opportunities and meet the needs of a range of businesses through the adopted local plan and the benefits associated with the replacement of ageing commercial buildings, the development is supported in principle. Notwithstanding the above established position, the Council's Economic, Prosperity and Place team have confirmed their support of the proposal in helping to meet the economic needs of the Borough.

Character of the Area:

13. Headley Road East has historically been a central road through an industrial area within Woodley. On either side are warehouse style buildings which typically have a large footprint and low pitched or flat roofs. There are examples of single storey and two storey buildings but, through their design and use of materials, it is clear they are for a commercial rather than residential use. Many comments have been submitted regarding the 'Art Deco' design of the main building on the site. Whilst the frontage is perhaps distinctive, it is not considered an exemplary example of such a design and, in any case, is not reflective of any wider or prevailing character.

14. Whilst landscaping buffers are less apparent to the eastern section of the road, there are still mature trees and hedgerows which help to filter views into some of the sites. It is also noted that around the industrial area are residential properties located on

different roads. Whilst there are other uses within the wider Woodley area (the retail uses of Loddon Centre to the east, Crockhamwell Road to the west and Addington School to the south), there is clearly a distinct area of commercial uses ultimately as a 'pocket' within residential areas. It is noted that south of Viscount Way is Vauxhall Park, a dedicated area of public open space, and an area of hard standing which is used in relation to commercial activities.

15. There have been recent changes around the site including the change of use of industrial buildings to residential dwellings i.e., the former 'Linpac' and 'Allied Bakeries' sites. Whilst this has had the effect of reducing the industrial area, it hasn't altered the character of the area as noted above. Instead, it has moved the boundary between the two uses. Adjacent to the site, the previous buildings have been demolished and new units (including a builder's merchant) have been erected in the past year. Although less recent, parts of the area to the northeast of the site have also been redeveloped through the demolition of buildings and erection of new units.

16. The proposal seeks erection of five warehouse style buildings. On the main part of the site, this would include one long building occupying the length of the site to the east and two smaller buildings but still occupying the length of the site to the west. Parking for cars and lorries would be provided within the centre of the site off the access between Headley Road East and Viscount Way. Landscaping is proposed to the north, south and eastern edges along with trees within the parking area. The eastern edge also includes a drainage area through the use of swales. On the secondary part of the site, south of Viscount Way, would be two separate buildings with parking located to the east of the buildings. Existing tree planting on the eastern and southern edge would be retained and proposed planting would be located on the western edge. All the buildings would utilise metallic cladding to the elevations and roof but also timber cladding at first floor.

17. The provision of two storey scale buildings with a large footprint and low-pitched roofs are considered to be in keeping with the established character within the industrial area. Additionally, the proposed layout of the site would be similar to the area northeast of the site (Base 329) and would not be out of keeping with other sites in the vicinity. Whilst the provision of buildings to the area south of Viscount Way would be a change in terms of built form, it is noted that the site is within the CEA so, at the time of the adoption of current local policies, it would have been envisaged this area would potentially be built upon. In any case, the existing area clearly relates to the other commercial uses and the provision of buildings would not detrimentally impact this.

18. Furthermore, the design and style of the buildings, as well as the material palette proposed are considered to be appropriate to the industrial appearance of the area but also of high quality and would help improve design in the area. Finally, the proposed landscaping would not only enhance the design of the site by providing some break-up of hard standing but would also maintain a sufficiently sized landscape buffer to Headley Road East and the residential properties on Gemini Road. On the basis of the above, the scheme is considered to accord with policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy and CC03 of the MDD Local Plan.

Heritage Status:

19. Through the course of the application, the heritage status of the buildings and the site has been considered in detail due to the former use of the site as part of Woodley Aerodrome. A listing request for the buildings on the site was submitted to Historic England, prompting the submission of a Heritage Statement by the applicant and consideration of the scheme by the Council's Built Heritage Officer. Prior to the application, the site was not recognised as having any formal heritage designation however the history of the buildings and the use of the site has been well documented through the listing process and is considered by the LPA in this application. For this reason, whilst not benefiting from any formal legal protection, these buildings would be recognised by the NPPF as 'non-designated heritage assets' (NDHAs). For clarity, the PPG provides a definition of non-designated heritage assets in paragraph 39: *"non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified by plan-making bodies as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets."*

Policy Context

20. The effect any development proposal would have on a NDHA must be considered carefully and in accordance with local policy and the overarching sustainable development objectives of the NPPF. This approach is consistent with any other building of heritage value that is not afforded legal protection of the statutory list under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

21. Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states the following regarding non-designated assets: *The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.* Unlike those tests relevant to a Designated Heritage Asset, which impose a presumption against the grant of permission which would cause harm to a heritage asset, Paragraph 203 merely requires a 'balanced judgement' to be made by the decision maker. As established by Case Law, Paragraph 203 does not seek to prescribe how that balance should be undertaken, or what weight should be given to any particular matter. This is a matter for the LPA, with Officers required to apply the policy test in Paragraph 203 of the NPPF to this proposal alongside the relevant local plan policies. As the proposal results in the total loss of the buildings on site, it is necessary to consider the asset's significance prior to considering the 'balanced judgement' as to whether any benefits identified as a whole, would outweigh the consequences of the development.

22. In first establishing the asset's significance, it is helpful to consider Annex 2 of the NPPF which provides the following definition of 'Significance'. This is defined as *"The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting".* In understanding 'significance,' it is also necessary to consider what information is available to inform the LPA conclusion on such matters.

23. There is no specific reference to the building itself within any adopted development plan documents or adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). As the building is not within a Conservation Area, there is no Conservation Area Appraisal that contains an identification of the building's significance to the area in question. The building is also not located within a distinct character area that benefits from an adopted area design appraisal, nor is there a specific Heritage SPD which outlines the Council's approach to NDHAs. Alongside national guidance, and general local policy there is a need for officers to consider the information contained within the applicant's Heritage Statement and input from the Council's Built Heritage Officer in order to inform a view as to the significance of the building and its contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

Historic Context

24. The significance of the site and the buildings derives primarily from its historic use however it is noted there is some potential architectural significance as well. As such, a summary of the history of the site is provided: The development of civil aviation grew particularly in the 1920s and 1930s with major aerodromes being constructed as well as smaller ones: Woodley aerodrome was one of these. It was managed in part by 'Phillips and Powis Aircraft Ltd' who promoted aeronautics and aerial navigation. Notably, Amy Johnson (first woman to fly solo from London to Australia) and Douglas Bader (famous World War II fighter pilot) flew at Woodley Aerodrome. Later, FG Miles formed a partnership with 'Philips and Powis Aircraft Ltd' for the maintenance and manufacturing of aircraft on the site. This prompted the construction of the Hawk, the Hawk Trainer II and the 500 Miles Master 1 over the next eight years resulting in the growth and expansion of buildings and manufacturing facilities across the site. This included a head office fronting Headley Road East which was designed by Guy Morgan (who had also designed Miles' home – a grade II listed dwelling to the north-east).

25. During the Second World War, the aerodrome was used as a RAF training site and a Spitfire manufacture and repair centre. Later, the development of the world's first supersonic aircraft, the Miles M52, occurred however the project was subsequently cancelled by the Government before the first flight. It is also claimed that the first mass production of the Biro pen occurred at the site due to a joint venture with the 'Biro brothers' and 'Miles Aircraft'. Production however moved elsewhere after nine years. Although 'Handley Page' continued aircraft production on the site, this ceased in 1962 and, after this, the site was used by light engineering companies. Most noticeably, was 'Adwest' who made changes and alterations to the buildings over time. With this and the gradual change to housing, much of Woodley Aerodrome is now removed and, principally, the headquarters building, and surrounding manufacturing sheds are all that remains.

26. As noted above, the applicant submitted a heritage statement. In summary, this concludes that the buildings have undergone considerable alteration and ongoing deterioration due to multiple occupancy. Whilst the main building survives, it is only representative of the general trends in the design and construction of work buildings during that period. Specifically, they do not contain any building fabric or machinery legible as being related to wartime aircraft production or servicing.

Significance

27. The buildings on the site have been subject to a listing request to Historic England. Whilst this does not lead to determination of a planning application, the listing designation decision is useful to understand the significance of the buildings. Historic England would recommend listing based on the special architectural or historic interest of a building. To be of special architectural interest a building must be of importance in its architectural design, decoration or craftsmanship; and to be of special historic interest a building must illustrate important aspects of the nation's social, economic, cultural, or military history. The designation decision of Historic England notes that some aircraft factories can claim historical importance and indeed the works of the 'Phillips and Powis' flying school, particularly buoyed by the association with FG Miles contributed to the development of British Aviation. Furthermore, that the development of the supersonic aircraft cannot be overstated. However, it also notes that none of the buildings associated with Woodley aerodrome were identified as significant in the English Heritage Guidance for Listing Civil Aviation Buildings of 1994 and that much of the redevelopment of the airfield, resulting in the demolition of the former buildings, has eroded the context of those that remain and reduced the historic interest of the site overall.

28. As a result of the above, Historic England have stated they do not recommend listing the buildings due to both the headquarters building and manufacturing sheds being altered externally and internally leaving a modest amount of original fabric; and aircraft manufacturing is no longer expressed through the buildings which is compounded by the loss of context due to the loss of the aerodrome over time. It should be noted that the Council's Built Heritage Officer ultimately agrees with Historic England's assessment.

29. It is acknowledged there is a clear level of local concern at the potential loss of the building and certainly Woodley Aerodrome was a key factor in the growth of the area but also in supporting the country during the Second World War. Specifically, it is noted a comment submitted critiques the applicant's Heritage Statement in not fully acknowledging the development of the site and who was involved. Nonetheless, it must be recognised that the buildings have spent a considerable proportion of their lives in wider commercial use rather than for their original aviation purpose. In this regard, the buildings are considered to be of notable local significance through specific association with aviation history, however, their isolated and disconnected context, along with their altered condition results in limited visual and public value.

30. In addition to this, Woodley Aerodrome was never granted any heritage protection since its conception or after aeronautical activity ceased. The site has been used for industrial purposes since prompting a specific planning protection in more recent development plans through the establishment of a core employment area. As such, the material consideration of whether the buildings are historically important enough to retain (and therefore potentially warrant a reason for refusal of the scheme) lies with the LPA and is informed by the assessment undertaken during the listing application to Historic England.

31. Notwithstanding this established level of significance, it remains necessary for the benefits of the development to be identified before an accurate assessment can be undertaken against Paragraph 203 of the NPPF. So far, it has been identified that the proposal would provide a positive economic contribution. However, an

assessment of character/design, natural environmental credentials, sustainability, amenity and transport remains. Therefore, the 'balanced judgement' as required by Paragraph 203 of the NPPF should be carried out after the benefits and disbenefits of the proposal have been appropriately considered.

Access and Movement:

General

32. The site is accessed primarily from Headley Road East but there is a gated access to Viscount Way. Although connecting to adopted highway, the section of Viscount Way included in the site is privately owned. As stated on the application form, there are 156 spaces across the site. The application has been supported by a Transport Assessment including sustainability assessment, road safety audit, framework travel plan, framework delivery service plan and a framework demolition/construction method statement. Through the course of the application, additional information/clarification on highway matters has been submitted.

Highway Safety

33. The site would be accessed from Headley Road East and Viscount Way with new accesses being created. The visibility splays for these have been assessed and are acceptable. Additionally, a road safety audit has been submitted which considered the proposal could be satisfactorily accommodated. Swept path analysis also indicates that the scheme could be used by HGVs and refuse vehicles in a safe manner. On this basis, no issues are raised by the Highways Officer, subject to conditions.

Traffic Impact

34. As the scheme is for a mixed-use, the Council does not have specific trip rates relating to this. In this instance, it is considered acceptable to use the trip rates according to other comparable sites highlighted by the applicant. On this basis, the trip rates would be slightly lower than the existing site being occupied at full capacity and therefore the Highways Officer does not object to this. It is acknowledged that the movement of vehicles in and around the site has caused concern. However, to ensure the proper use of roads near the site, a signage strategy, to be agreed by condition is recommended. It should also be noted that the provision of an access road linking Headley Road East and Viscount Way makes it more 'attractive' for users of the site to use this instead of surrounding roads. As such, this is considered a material improvement over the existing situation.

Parking

35. In terms of vehicle parking, 188 spaces at a size of 2.5 metres by 5.0 metres are proposed. As the scheme is for a mixed use however, it does not conform to typical parking provision by use class as set out in the adopted standards. Nonetheless, planning policy makes it clear that the standards should be used as a starting point and other circumstances may indicate a different parking level is required. In this instance, the applicant has demonstrated that similar sized sites in a similar use class (from TRICS data) would generate a parking demand of 161 spaces and therefore the site layout would 'over-provide' in terms of parking. The Highways

Officer has confirmed this is acceptable in principle but there remains a concern that the mixed-use nature of the site could lead to an increased parking demand i.e., the site could have a high B2 use in terms of floorspace and, according to the parking standards, this would generate a demand of more than 188 spaces. To overcome this, a condition restricting the amount of B2 floorspace is proposed. It is noted this could be subject to further applications in the future but, at that stage, additional information relating to occupants of the site could be submitted.

36. It is understood that parking has been raised as an issue with vehicles being left on surrounding roads. Whilst the application should not be used as a means of resolving existing issues, it should be noted that the re-development of the site would allow for greater parking to occur on the site and, a parking management strategy is able to suitable monitor surrounding roads. Furthermore, the provision of clear HGV access/deliveries would help prevent them being parking along Viscount Way.

37. The submitted site plan indicates that a total of 94 cycle spaces would be provided, and these would be split for each building. Whilst specific details would be agreed by condition, these would be sheltered, accessible and secure and therefore considered acceptable. Motorcycle parking is also indicated and above the recommended standard which is considered acceptable.

Sustainability

38. The site is within an established core employment area, and it is noted there are bus links, pedestrian accesses, and vehicular access to the highway network. The submitted sustainability assessment highlights this and identifies that pedestrian/cycle access is included into the site. Additionally, electric vehicle charging points, above the required standard are proposed across the site including active and passive provision. Finally, a framework travel plan has been submitted which indicates how reliance on the private car would be reduced as part of occupation of the development. Specific details would be agreed by condition but overall, this is considered acceptable. A monitoring fee, to allow the Council to assess further work on the travel plan is considered necessary and therefore an amount of £4,500 would need to be secured through a legal agreement. Subject to this, the site is in a suitable and sustainable location.

Other

39. The submission also includes a delivery and service plan which, from a highway perspective, is considered acceptable. Additionally, details regarding external lighting can appropriately be dealt with via condition. Likewise, whilst information regarding demolition and construction is satisfactory, further details would need to be agreed and therefore a construction method statement is required. This would help alleviate concerns raised given that it would specifically control elements of construction from a highway's perspective. However, given the scale of development, it is considered appropriate to limit the hours of construction by condition.

40. Given the above, and subject to conditions, the Highway Officer does not object to the scheme, and it is considered to be in accordance with policies CP1, CP3, CP6 of the Core Strategy and policy CC07 of the MDD Local Plan.

Residential Amenities:

41. The site is immediately adjacent to residential properties to the east on Gemini Road. This was considered in the design of these dwellings with those located closest to the site orientated 'side-on' and those facing the site set back by gardens. Furthermore, the relationship between the two sites is well established with part of the existing buildings in the site set against the boundary and residential properties benefitting from an existing acoustic barrier.

42. As there are no windows proposed on the elevation of units 1 – 5 which faces these properties, it is considered that no overlooking impacts would occur. A condition can be appropriately used to ensure that no windows are inserted into this elevation in the future. In terms of overbearing, the building would be located a minimum of 7.5 metres from the boundary (allowing for the creation of swales and landscaping). This would result in an improvement in overbearing terms particularly for 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26 and 42 Gemini Road. It is acknowledged that the ridge height of the proposal is greater than the existing buildings but nonetheless the scheme is still considered to result in an improved relationship. Conversely, due to the gaps between existing buildings, the proposal would result in a minor overbearing impact to 2, 14, 40, 52, 54, 56, 58 and 60 Gemini Road in the sense their outlook would be affected. However, the buildings would be set back by a reasonable distance, with enhanced landscaping located to the front of the buildings and the appearance would be softened with the use of timber cladding. As such, any perceived overbearing caused is not considered significantly harmful to the extent that a reason for refusal could be substantiated.

43. With regard to daylight and sunlight, a report has been submitted which assesses the impact in line with Building Research Establishment (BRE) publication (2011), *"Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight. A Guide to Good Practice".* The submitted site sections also detail that the scheme would not infringe the 25 degree and 45-degree angles regarding potential loss of light for windows as a result of development. However, the report notes that in a more urban environment, the calculation of the vertical sky component, and following that daylight distribution, is more appropriate. The report indicates that two windows across the properties on Gemini Road would experience a potential loss of light greater than the BRE guidelines. One of which would be a ground floor window of 14 Gemini Road. However, the report notes that good daylight would be retained in any case. The other is a ground floor window at 20 Gemini Road, but this is already covered by a canopy on the property, and as such the impact of the proposal would not be considered harmful. In terms of daylight distribution, the report notes that 8 out of 28 windows serving habitable rooms would experience a reduction in daylight distribution beyond BRE guidelines. However, the reduction would be minor e.g., not more than 10% below, and good amounts of daylight would still be received. In addition, the report considers the impact of sunlight and overshadowing but concludes that there would not be a harmful impact to properties in line with BRE guidelines.

44. The new units to the south of Viscount Way are near Millers Gove and Bakers Place. Unit 10 would be located at a minimum of 19.5 metres from 30 Millers Grove, a minimum of 20 metres from 19, 21 and 23 Bakers Place and a minimum of 22 metres from Lilly May Court. There are no windows proposed on the western elevation of

unit 10 so it is considered no overlooking impact would occur. Due to the orientation of Lilly May Court and the proposed unit, as well as the fact there are no windows on the side elevation of 30 Millers Grove, no overbearing impact would occur towards these properties.

45. With regard to 19, 21 and 23 Bakers Place it is noted that ground and first floor windows serving habitable rooms would be facing the proposal site. In this respect, there would be a change to the outlook from these windows through the presence of a new building. Nonetheless, with a ridge height of 11 metres and a separation distance of at least 20 metres, it is considered this would not result in an undue overbearing impact. Similarly, the separation distance ensures that ground floor windows would not be impacted in terms of a loss of light when assessed using the Building Research Establishment's 25-degree loss of light guidance for windows facing developments. Indeed, the daylight and sunlight report states that the vertical sky component of these windows would not be adversely impacted.

46. Overall, there are benefits arising from the scheme in regard to residential amenity due to the movement of buildings away from the boundary of the site and the fact that no overlooking impact would occur. However, there are some minor negative impacts in that the building would result in some loss of outlook and a minor reduction in the light for some properties. However, these impacts are not considered significantly harmful to the extent that a reason for refusal could be substantiated and therefore the scheme accords with policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Environmental Health:

External Lighting

47. An external lighting proposal has been submitted which indicates energy efficiency, light pollution and the impact upon neighbouring sites. The report concludes that no adverse impact would occur due to the use of LED lighting, motion sensors and reflectors to control upward lighting. As such, the Environmental Health Officer does not raise any objection in this regard subject to a condition.

Contamination

48. Due to previous uses of the site, it is noted that potential contamination of the ground could have occurred. A phase 1 contamination risk assessment has been submitted which does not identify any significant areas of concern but notes that further investigation is required through a phase 2 assessment. The Environmental Health Officer has considered this and is satisfied with the conclusion of the report, requiring a condition for a phase 2 survey to be carried out.

Air Quality

49. An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted which considers the impact of concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and particulates (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) at nearby receptors. It uses the Breeze Roads modelling system to assess this impact and ultimately concludes that would be negligible increases, but this would not exceed air quality objectives. The Environmental Health Officer agrees with the methodology and conclusion of the report and does not raise objection in this regard.

It is noted that the impact upon air quality through demolition and construction has not been considered but details of this could reasonably be agreed through a construction environment management plan by condition.

50. It is acknowledged that many comments have been submitted regarding air quality. However, a distinction has to be made between existing impacts and the impacts arising from the proposed scheme. An application for planning permission has to demonstrate that it would not make any situation worse (in this case in terms of air quality) and, through the report identified, does so. It cannot be used to attempt to fix existing problems. In the planning balance, it should also be noted that the site could be used more intensively than current without the benefit of any restrictive conditions over the use of the site.

51. It is noted that a comment has been submitted which specifically highlights an air quality report that was commission by the Council in relation to an on-going issue at Lily May Court. Whilst this is acknowledged, the report relates to a specific existing issue at this location and is not caused as a result of this planning application. On this basis, no weight can be attributed to this report in relation to assessing the current planning application.

Noise

52. A Noise Impact Assessment, which has been subject to further revision, has been submitted. This assesses various noise sources from the proposal on receptors including properties on Gemini Road (which are in part protected by an existing 3.0 metre acoustic screen), Bakers Place and Concorde Way. Noise measurements were carried out in multiple areas in and around the site across a period of 24 hours and in calm weather. The report concludes that the level of plant and breakout noise would not exceed background sound levels. Delivery noise however would have an adverse impact but due to the site context, this would not be significant. In respect of non-residential receptors, no harmful impact would occur.

53. The scheme has been subject to numerous discussions with the applicant and Environmental Health Officer. In response to the latest revision of the Noise Impact Assessment and site layout plan, the Environmental Health Officer has the following comments. In respect of plant noise, it is accepted levels would be below background sounds and therefore not harmful. With regard to breakout noise, a worst-case scenario has been applied which is appropriate given the variation of noise throughout a day. As such, the conclusions on breakout noise are accepted however it is noted that this relies on doors being shut when noisy work takes place It is considered a condition is required to ensure that this would take place.

54. An assessment into noise from service yards, and in particular through deliveries, highlights that there would be an adverse impact during the day and a significant adverse impact at night. However, when considering the scheme in more detail, it has become apparent that the adverse impact arises due to units 9 and 10 in part due to their orientation. It is noted that units 1 – 8 would effectively shield significant noise from other residential receptors due to the way they are orientated. Units 9 and 10 however are less likely to do this. It should also be noted that actual movements of products into and out of HGVs would occur within internal loading bays which would substantially reduce noise impacts. The Noise Impact Assessment states that the existing site context should be taken into account i.e.,

whilst night-time deliveries do not currently occur, there are no restrictions on this, and night-time operations do occur. The Environmental Health Officer accepts this but notes that due to night-time deliveries not occurring there may be a higher impact than predicted. As such, they have recommended that deliveries for units 9 and 10 are restricted to ensure they do not occur during the hours of 23:00 and 07:00. In addition, a condition requiring a noise management plan to be submitted for each unit is recommended which would further allow for control of specific noise impacts.

55. It is noted that numerous submitted comments have highlighted the impact of noise. Certainly, noise impacts would occur as a result of the development, given the proximity to residential receptors. However, the context of the scheme is important in that the site is not fully utilised and could operate without any restriction on hours of operation or delivery. Additionally, the buildings are nearing the end of their service life and are not of a modern construction. The replacement buildings would be of a much higher quality, achieving a 'very good' BREEAM level for example and benefiting from modern insulation and construction materials. Furthermore, the scheme has been designed to reduce noise impact by locating noise generating external activities to the centre of the main site. Given this, the restrictions on operation and delivery via condition and the submission of individual noise management plans, it is considered with the development complies with policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Flooding and Drainage:

56. As the site is above a hectare in size, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted. This indicates that the site is within flood zone 1 and therefore at low risk from surface water flooding. The proposed use is considered as a 'less vulnerable use' in terms of the NPPF and, as such, satisfies the sequential test and negates any need for an exception test.

57. With regard to drainage, the FRA states that foul water would be discharged into an existing Thames Water connection and surface water would continue to drain via an existing surface water pipe. This would be attenuated by geo-cellular storage, oversized pipes, permeable paving and the use of swales and the assessment notes that yard areas would be connected to an oil separator.

58. The Drainage Officer has considered the FRA and does not object to the methodology nor the conclusion. As such, subject to a condition requiring the recommendations of the FRA to be carried out, it is considered the scheme accords with policies CC09 and CC10 of the MDD Local Plan.

Landscape and Trees:

59. There are a limited number of trees (either individually or within groups) around the site which is reflective of the industrial uses/size of the buildings. Nonetheless, the boundaries with Viscount Way and Headley Road East have some visible trees and this fits into the wider character of the road. Additionally, there is a woodland protected by a tree preservation order (TPO) south of Viscount Way/adjacent to Vauxhall Park.

60. A Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment has been submitted and this indicates the loss of six trees and two groups of category U trees, 15 trees and

six groups of category C trees, three trees considered between category C and B and one category B tree i.e., a total of 25 trees and eight groups. Whilst there is a proposed loss of some of the higher-grade trees, it is noted that there are no trees of significant merit and no impact upon the TPO would occur. In conjunction with this, a comprehensive planting scheme is proposed with over 100 trees planted across the site. Given this, the loss of existing trees is considered acceptable.

61. In terms of landscape strategy, the scheme has been designed to replicate and augment the Viscount Way area providing a landscaping area between buildings and the site boundaries. Additionally, appropriate planting is proposed through the central area of the site which helps to mitigate against the increase of built form. A planting line along Headley Road East would improve the relationship of the site with road particularly as there are other trees present on the opposite side.

62. Due to the set-back of buildings from the eastern edge of the site, an area for swales and landscaping is proposed. This helps to 'soften' the appearance of buildings along the site boundary but is also considered an improvement in terms of landscaping across the site. Furthermore, the use of timber cladding at higher levels of the building along the elevation facing residential properties helps embed the scheme into the area.

63. Specific details in terms of species and amounts have been agreed and would be controlled by condition. Similarly, tree protection for retained trees is considered acceptable and controlled by condition. In terms of longer-term management, a condition requiring a plan to be agreed with the local planning authority is considered necessary. Overall, the scheme is considered to accord with policies CP1, CP3 of the Core Strategy and CC03 of the MDD Local Plan.

Sustainable Design and Construction:

64. In As per policy CC04 of the MDD, non-residential proposals of more than 100m2 should achieve the necessary mandatory Building Research Establishment Assessment Method (BREEAM) requirements. The application submissions indicate that a 'Very Good' rating would be achieved indicating 'advanced good practice' design ideals. Subject to a condition requiring this, it is considered the scheme would be acceptable and in accordance with policy CC04.

65. As per policy CC05 of the MDD, non-residential proposals of more than 1,000m2 gross floor space should provide for a minimum 10% reduction in carbon emissions through on-site renewable energy or low carbon sources. The application submissions indicate this would be achieved by air source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels on the roof. Subject to a condition requiring this, it is considered the scheme would be acceptable and in accordance with policy CC05.

Ecology:

66. The submitted information includes a preliminary ecological appraisal, a preliminary bat roost assessment and a dusk emergence bat survey conducted by Middlemarch Environmental. The surveys included a desk study assessment and walkover site survey which concluded that the site is primarily occupied by buildings and hard standing with little vegetation cover. Nonetheless, in and around the site are potential habitats for protected species and therefore the survey sets out several

recommendations. The Ecology Officer has considered the reports and provided comments on the species/habitats set out below.

Breeding Birds

67. Some evidence of breeding birds using the buildings for nesting is identified in the reports but there is not significant detail on the type of species. However, suitable mitigation for this could be agreed though a construction environment management plan which would be secured by condition.

Bats

68. The survey identifies that some buildings provide limited bat roost potential and therefore no further survey work is required. However, there are other buildings on the site where the potential is much higher and therefore additional survey work through an emergence/re-entry survey should be conducted. Since completion of this work, it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that bats are unlikely to be roosting in the building. Enhancement through bat boxes could be agreed through a condition to enable biodiversity enhancement

Reptiles and amphibians

69. As there would not be a net loss of suitable habitat, it is considered the existing survey work is sufficient in this regard. Should any protected species be present, mitigation could be suitably provided though a construction environment management plan.

Badgers

70. The survey found no setts within a 30-metre buffer of the site boundary and therefore it is unlikely that the scheme would result in any risk to a badger sett. The report sets out that further checks would occur prior to construction, and this could be provided through a construction environment management plan. Due to the introduction of landscaping at the eastern side of the site, it is considered there is a marginal improvement for this species; specific recommendations for ecological permeability would however need to be agreed by condition.

Biodiversity net gain

71. Given the limited ecological value of the site which would be slightly improved by the proposal, it is not considered a site-specific biodiversity net gain calculation is required in this instance. The provision of green roofs would help improve this further however it is noted that the design would limit the scope of this and there is no policy requirement to do so. In terms of tree species, subject to a minor change to the landscaping scheme, no objection is raised.

Lighting

72. Due to the potentially detrimental impact of external lighting on biodiversity, it is considered an appropriate lighting strategy should be agreed. However, this can be secured through the use of a condition.

73. On the basis of the above, and subject to appropriate conditions, it is considered the scheme would not have a detrimental impact in terms of biodiversity and therefore accords with policies CP7 of the Core Strategy and TB23 of the MDD Local Plan.

Employment Skills:

74. As per policy TB12 of the MDD Local Plan, all applications for major development are required to demonstrate how the proposal would create opportunities to offer training and apprenticeships or other vocational initiatives to develop employment skills in local people. This is typically achieved through the submission of an Employment Skills Plan or a financial contribution to the Council's own employment skills strategy.

75. The Community Infrastructure team have calculated this as being either "11 Community Skills Support places, 7 Apprenticeships and 7 Jobs Created or £52,500". The applicant has opted to contribute to the Council's strategy and therefore, subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure this, the scheme is compliant with policy TB12.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

76. As the proposal is not for new retail or residential floor space, it would not be liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy, in line with the Council's adopted charging schedule.

Planning Balance:

77. The application is determined against the normal planning balance as set out in section 38(6) of the 2004 Act. Planning law requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

78. The scheme is acceptable in principle and accords with the development plan by providing economic development within a core employment area. Specifically, it would increase the amount of B use floor space in the borough. As such, it clearly contributes to the economic factor of sustainable development. The scheme would also create employment opportunities above and beyond what is currently available on the site contributing to the social element of sustainable development. Additionally, there are no adverse impacts on the character of the area with the use of high-quality materials proposed and the fact the scheme would be an industrial style building amongst other similar buildings. Subject to conditions, the scheme would have an acceptable impact in terms of highways, flooding and drainage, sustainable design and construction, ecology, employment skills, CIL and would incorporate a comprehensive landscaping scheme. These elements all contribute positively to all aspects of sustainable development.

79. As a result of the scheme however, there would be negative social and environmental impact due to the loss of a non-designated heritage asset which would be noticeable at a local level. Nonetheless, the impact of this loss is not considered to be high given the disconnect between the current use of the buildings and the original use of the site. Additionally, there are some negative impacts in terms of residential amenity due to a very minor loss of light and overbearing impact.

However, these elements are less than substantial and do not weigh significantly against the proposal. Finally, it is acknowledged there are some adverse impacts from environmental health aspects given the proximity to residential receptors. Notwithstanding this, it is considered these aspects could be mitigated using appropriate conditions and there are some aspects that are beneficial. Therefore, this is only a minor negative impact in terms of social and environmental factors.

80. As the benefits and disbenefits of the proposal have been identified, it is now necessary to return to the tests imposed by Paragraph 203 of the NPPF, which requires a balanced judgement to be made by the decision maker. As described in the heritage status section of this report, the identified level of significance is prevented from being at the 'upper end' on the spectrum of local 'significance' given the supporting evidence submitted with this application, the condition of building and the limited role it currently performs.

81. It has been identified that the proposal would provide a positive economic contribution within the borough. It has now been established in the above sections that the overall design of the replacement building, its natural environmental credentials, sustainability, and overall environmental health outcomes would themselves result in compliance with the Local Plan and the sustainability objectives of the NPPF. Importantly, the scheme would result in significant and wider ranging public benefits in the form of additional controls and mitigation to activities on site. As the overall public benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh the asset's identified significance, the development is considered to pass the test imposed by paragraph 203 of the NPPF.

82. In light of this balancing exercise, the development is considered to contribute to sustainable development and be in accordance with the development plan. On this basis, the scheme is recommended for conditional approval which includes a 'Historic England Level 2' photographic record and descriptive summary.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010)

In determining this application, the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or belief. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues, and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts upon protected groups as a result of the development.

CONCLUSION

Subject to the conditions set out in the report and the signing of a legal agreement, the scheme is considered to accord with local and national planning policy and is therefore recommended for approval.

This page is intentionally left blank