
Planning Statement Addendum

**Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone Road
Addlestone, KT15 2UP**

On behalf of Bridge UK Properties 7 LP

October 2022



Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Summary of Scheme Revisions	8
3.	Assessment of Revised Proposals	14
4.	Conclusion	25



1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Planning Statement Addendum has been prepared to supplement the full Planning Statement submitted in support of Planning Application Ref. RU.22/0776 at Weybridge Business Park, KT15 2UP.
- 1.2 The above application was submitted to Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) in May 2022, seeking:

“Demolition of existing buildings and the development of three employment units within Classes E(g)ii, E(g)iii, B2 and B8, with ancillary office accommodation, new vehicular access, associated external yard areas, HGV and car parking, servicing, external lighting, hard and soft landscaping, infrastructure and all associated works”.
- 1.3 The May 2022 proposals sought permission to construct three employment units across two sites, separated by Addlestone Road (one to the north and one to the south). The southern site was proposed to accommodate a single, larger employment unit (referred to as ‘Unit 100’), with two smaller employment units (referred to as ‘Unit 210’ and ‘Unit 220’) on the northern site.
- 1.4 Unit 100 previously comprised circa 158,795sqft of employment floorspace, predominantly given over to the warehouse area with a smaller area of ancillary office space at first and second floor. The proposed layout of the southern site sought to locate the servicing yard adjacent to Hamm Moor Lane, along the western site boundary with access from Addlestone Road. Staff parking was proposed in the north-eastern area of the site. Unit 100 was located adjacent to the eastern site boundary, near to the River Wey Navigation. The Wey Navigation Conservation Area boundary sits adjacent to the eastern site boundary.
- 1.5 During post-submission correspondence with RBC officers, concerns were raised regarding the general siting and scale of Unit 100, in close proximity to the River Wey Conservation Area. As such, the applicant and project team have sought to liaise with RBC officers constructively in order to revise the site layout for Unit 100 and adjacent land, in order to directly address the comments received. The revised proposals, which are the subject of this Planning Statement Addendum, comprise an updated layout wherein Unit 100 has been relocated further west to provide a significant set-back from the Wey Navigation Conservation Area, this being the main focus of officer’s concern. The servicing yard is now located along the eastern site boundary.
- 1.6 In addition to the above revisions, comments from the Environment Agency were received concurrently requesting a 10 metre undeveloped ‘ecological buffer’ from the bank top of the Addlestone Bourne. The landscaping proposals for the northern site, comprising Units 210 and 220, have subsequently been revised to address the EA comments, though the siting and form of the two smaller units remains otherwise unchanged.

Supporting Revised Documents

1.7 This Planning Statement Addendum summarises the revised application proposals and provides an assessment of the revised development proposals in the context of the previous scheme design alongside consideration of any relevant material considerations. This Addendum should be read in conjunction with the accompanying plans and drawings submitted as part of the revised application, as well as the following specialist addendum reports, all dated October 2022.

- **Revised Planning Application Forms and Certificates** prepared by Savills;
- **Revised CIL Form 1** prepared by Savills;
- **Updated Site Location Plan and Block Plan** prepared by UMC Architects;
- **Updated Existing and Proposed Floorplans, Elevations and Sections** prepared by UMC Architects;
- **Updated Proposed Site Levels and Finished Floor Levels** prepared by UMC Architects;
- **Design and Access Statement Addendum** prepared by UMC Architects;
- **Air Quality Assessment Addendum** prepared by Air and Acoustic;
- **Arboricultural Impact Assessment Addendum** prepared by Ligna Consultancy;
- **Arboricultural Method Statement** prepared by Ligna Consultancy;
- **Biodiversity Net Gain Report Addendum** prepared by MKA Ecology;
- **Construction Environment Management Plan Addendum** prepared by Air and Acoustic;
- **Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS Strategy Addendum** prepared by HDR;
- **Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment Addendum** prepared by Savills;
- **Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment Addendum** prepared by LDA Design;
- **Landscape Statement Addendum and Updated Landscape Drawings** prepared by LDA Design;
- **Noise Impact Assessment Addendum** prepared by Air and Acoustic;
- **Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Addendum** prepared by MKA Ecology; and
- **Revised Energy and Sustainability Statement** prepared by SWH and MBA;
- **Revised External Lighting Assessment** prepared by MBA;
- **Transport Assessment Addendum** prepared by Mode.
- **Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment** prepared by Hollis

Planning Statement Addendum

Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone



1.8 The following table explains clearly where the documents listed above either supersede the earlier submitted version completely, or where they should be read alongside the previous version. The architectural drawings are set out in a separate table in Section 2 of this document.

May 2022 Submission		October 2022 Re-submission	
Document & Version	Status	Document & Version	Status
Planning Statement, May 2022 (Savills)	-	Planning Statement Addendum, October 2022 (Savills)	Addendum to be read alongside May 2022 document.
Landscaping Strategy, April 2022 (LDA)	Superseded	Landscaping Strategy P1, October 2022, (LDA)	Revised Strategy supersedes May 2022 version.
Planning Application Forms and Certificates, May 2022 (Savills)	Superseded	Planning Application Forms and Certificates, October 2022 (Savills)	Revised Forms & Certificates supersede previous May 2022 version.
CIL Form 1, May 2022 (Savills)	Superseded	CIL Form 1, October 2022	CIL Form 1 updated.
Site Location Plan and Block Plan (UMC Architects)	Superseded	Site Location Plan and Block Plan (UMC Architects)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Existing and Proposed Floorplans, Elevations and Sections inc. Site Levels and Finished Floor Levels, (UMC Architects)	Superseded	Existing and Proposed Floorplans, Elevations and Sections inc. Site Levels and Finished Floor Levels, (UMC Architects)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Topographical Survey, May 2022 (Interlock)	-	No change.	Extant.
Design and Access Statement, May 2022 (UMC Architects)	Superseded	Design and Access Statement Addendum, October 2022 (UMC Architects)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.

Planning Statement Addendum

Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone



Landscape Strategy and Landscape Drawings, May 2022 (LDA Design)	Superseded	Landscape Strategy and Landscape Drawings, October 2022 (LDA Design)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment, May 2022 (LDA Design)	Superseded	Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment, October 2022 (LDA Design)	TVIA updated reflect revised scheme design.
Air Quality Assessment, May 2022 (AAC)	Superseded	Air Quality Assessment Addendum, October 2022 (AAC)	Air Quality Assessment updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Arboricultural Impact Assessment including Tree Survey & Protection Plan, May 2022 (Ligna Consultancy)	Superseded	Arboricultural Impact Assessment including Tree Survey & Protection Plan, October 2022 (Ligna Consultancy)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
-	-	Arboricultural Method Statement, October 2022 (Ligna Consultancy)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Biodiversity Net Gain Plan, May 2022 (MKA Ecology)	Superseded	Biodiversity Net Gain Plan, October 2022 (MKA Ecology)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Outline Construction Environment Management Plan, May 2022 (AAC)	-	Outline Construction Environment Management Plan, October 2022 (AAC)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Energy and Sustainability Statement, May 2022 (SWH/MBA)	Superseded	Energy and Sustainability Statement, October 2022 (SWH/MBA)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS Strategy, May 2022 (HDR)	-	Flood Risk Assessment and SuDS Strategy, October 2022 (HDR)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design and EA comments. To be read alongside earlier version.

Planning Statement Addendum

Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone



Surface Water Drainage Summary Proforma, May 2022 (HDR)	Superseded	Surface Water Drainage Summary Proforma, October 2022 (HDR)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Framework Travel Plan, May 2022 (Mode)	-	Framework Travel Plan, May 2022 (Mode)	Extant.
Geo-Environmental Assessment, May 2022 (TRC)	-	Geo-Environmental Assessment, May 2022 (TRC)	Extant.
Green and Blue Infrastructure Checklist, May 2022 (Savills)	-	Green and Blue Infrastructure Checklist, October 2022 (Savills)	Extant.
Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (inc. Heritage and Archaeology), May 2022 (Savills)	Superseded	Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (inc. Heritage and Archaeology), October 2022 (Savills)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
External Lighting Assessment, May 2022 (MBA)	Superseded	External Lighting Assessment, October 2022 (MBA)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Noise Impact Assessment, May 2022 (AAC)	Superseded	Noise Impact Assessment Addendum, October 2022 (AAC)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Outline Construction Logistics Plan, May 2022 (Mode)	-	Outline Construction Logistics Plan, May 2022 (Mode)	Extant.
Delivery & Servicing Plan, May 2022 (Mode)	Superseded	Delivery & Servicing Plan, October 2022 (Mode)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, May 2022 (MKA)	Superseded	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, October 2022 (MKA)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Statement of Community Involvement, May 2022 (Connect)	-	Statement of Community Involvement, May 2022 (Connect)	Extant.

Planning Statement Addendum

Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone



Transport Assessment, May 2022 (Mode)	-	Transport Assessment Addendum, October 2022 (Mode)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Daylight & Sunlight Technical Note, June 2022 (Hollis)	Superseded	Daylight & Sunlight Assessment, October 2022, (Hollis)	Updated to reflect revised scheme design.
Economic Benefits & Social Value Assessment, June 2022 (Savills)	-	Economic Benefits & Social Value Assessment, June 2022 (Savills)	Extant

2. Summary of Scheme Revisions

- 2.1 As stated above, during post-submission dialogue with planning officers, concerns were expressed regarding the height and general scale, plus the siting of Unit 100 in close proximity to the River Wey (and adjoining Wey Navigation Conservation Area). The Conservation Area was considered to be the most sensitive receptor, therefore feedback suggested the southern site should be re-designed to ensure a greater degree of separation.
- 2.2 Officer comments were also received regarding the need to avoid excessive operational noise and HGV movements along Hamm More Lane. Placing other uses such as car parking and office accommodation on the western side of the southern site was recommended. Officers also asked whether Unit 100 could be reduced in height, whilst recognising that this has operational consequences. Retaining HGV access along Addlestone Road as before was considered to be the best approach. Finally, the importance of high-quality landscaping along the site boundaries was agreed to be of importance.
- 2.3 To address these concerns, a revised approach to the siting of Unit 100 was developed and subsequently discussed with officers. The layout of the southern site has been revised which addresses the officer comments and now provides a significant setback between the built form of Unit 100 and the Conservation Area, which is considered to be the most sensitive receptor affected by the southern site.
- 2.4 As mentioned, comments were also received from the Environment Agency (EA) and the revised scheme design responds to this feedback. In their consultation response the EA requested a 10m undeveloped ecological buffer zone along the Addlestone Bourne which runs between the northern and southern sites. When this theoretical zone was drawn, it was noted that there are already areas of existing hardstanding within it. It would not be reasonable to require this existing hardstanding to be removed, therefore this has been retained within the revised scheme design for the northern site and will be used for car parking etc. However, the applicant's revised design has removed any new hardstanding which was previously proposed from the 10m zone, therefore providing the undeveloped 10m buffer requested. In summary, where there is existing hardstanding within the 10m buffer zone, this will be retained, however there will be no increase within the buffer zone.
- 2.5 The feedback and the changes summarised above have subsequently led to other amendments in the proposals when compared to the scheme originally submitted for planning in May 2022. However, the description of development remains unchanged for the current planning application, LPA Ref. RU.22/0776.
- 2.6 A full description of the scheme's design evolution is contained in the Design and Access Statement Addendum, prepared by UMC Architects and the other key supporting documentation. The key revisions to the previously submitted proposals are outlined in a succinct, comparative manner as requested by RBC planning officers during post-submission discussions within this section of the Planning Statement Addendum,

for the sake of brevity. For further details of the revised changes, the suite of updated information should be referred to.

2.7 It is important to note that the proposals continue to provide three new employment units, with a sole unit on the southern part of the site and two smaller units on the northern site. The proposals also continue to provide ancillary HGV and operational staff car parking, along with integrated landscaping and drainage features.

2.8 The design ethos of the development proposals remains unchanged from the objectives originally set out:

- To create a wide range of job opportunities through the development of high-quality employment floorspace in a recognised employment location;
- To create a commercial development which provides modern, fit for purpose employment facilities to meet existing and future market demand;
- A development which strengthens the economic vitality of the Weybridge and Bourne Business Park and Waterside Trading Estate Strategic Employment Area and Runnymede as a whole, without prejudicing adjoining land uses and the amenity enjoyed by them; and
- To provide a development that seeks to embed principles of environmental sustainability whilst not prejudicing the operation of the occupiers.

Comparison of Proposed Layouts



Figure 2.1: Proposed Site Layout Plan (May 2022)



Figure 2.2: – Revised Site Layout Plan (October 2022)

2.9 The key scheme revisions are outlined in the below table for clarity:

Consideration	May 2022 Proposals	October 2022 Proposals
Floorspace Quantum (GIA)	Unit 100: 14,752sqm Unit 210: 1,407sqm Unit 220: 1,660sqm Total: 17,820sqm	Unit 100: 13,859sqm Unit 210: 1,411sqm Unit 220: 1,655sqm Total: 16,925sqm
Location of Unit 100	Located adjacent to River Wey (refer to Figure 2.1 above) with operational yard fronting Hamm Moor Lane.	Location revised to front Hamm Moor Lane, with operational yard separating the building from the River Wey (Figure 2.2 above).

Planning Statement Addendum

Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone



Separation Distance between Unit 100 and the River Wey	12 metre set back	46 metre set back (compared to 18m existing)
Unit 100 Building Heights (to parapet)	18.5 metres	15 metres
Car Parking Spaces Proposed	180	131
Site Access	<p>Unit 100: Staff car park access from Addlestone Road.</p> <p>Operational access from Addlestone Road (close to Hamm Moor Lane roundabout).</p> <p>Units 210/220: Access from Addlestone Road retained.</p>	<p>Unit 100: Staff car park access off Hamm Moor Lane but moved further north away from existing point of access directly opposite Navigation House.</p> <p>Operational access from Addlestone Road moved further eastwards away from roundabout.</p> <p>Units 210/220: Access from Addlestone Road retained.</p>

2.10 The following table outlined the architectural drawing revisions which support the October 2022 revised proposals:

Drawing	Prior Revision	October 2022 Revision
P0501 – Existing Site Layout	Revision B	Revision C
P0502 – Site Location Plan	Revision C	Revision D
P0503 – Demolition Plan	Revision B	Revision C
P0602 – Proposed Site Layout Plan	Revision L	Revision V

Planning Statement Addendum

Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone



P0701 - External Surfaces	Revision K	Revision K
P0702 - Fencing Details	Revision F	Revision L
P0703 - External Compound Details	Revision E	Revision K
P1010 - Unit 100 - Proposed Building Plan	Revision F	Revision G
P1011 - Unit 100 - Proposed Office Layouts	Revision C	Revision D
P1012 - Unit 100 - Proposed Roof Plan	Revision D	Revision E
P1013 - Unit 100 - Proposed Section	Revision B	Revision D
P1014 - Unit 100 - Proposed Transport Office	Revision E	Revision A
P1020 - Unit 210 & 220 - Proposed Building Plan	Revision C	Revision C
P1021 - Unit 210 - Proposed Office Layouts	Revision B	Revision B
P1022 - Unit 220 - Proposed Office Layout	Revision B	Revision B
P1023 - Unit 210 & 220 - Proposed Roof Plan	Revision C	Revision C

Planning Statement Addendum

Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone



P1025 - Unit 210 & 220 - Proposed Section	Revision A	Revision A
P1313 - Unit 100 - Proposed Elevations Double Graduated	Revision E	Revision G
P1322 - Unit 210 & 220 - Proposed Elevations Graduated Parapet	Revision C	Revision C

3. Assessment of Revised Proposals

- 3.1. This section of the Planning Statement sets out the main planning issues arising from the application proposals with reference to the planning policy framework set out in the original Planning Statement, May 2022.

Principle of Redevelopment

- 3.2. The principle of the site's redevelopment for the proposed uses is clearly established by the site's allocation within the Development Plan. There is no in-principle objection to the proposed use and this has been agreed with RBC officers previously during pre and post application discussions.
- 3.3. For completeness, the RBC Local Plan acknowledges that Runnymede is strategically positioned at the junction of the M3 and M25 motorways, giving good access to the wider Southeast region by road. One of the main objectives of the Plan is to maintain the Borough's economic role in the wider area and to sustain economic growth and competitiveness by protecting the most valued employment sites so they can be used for that purpose. RBC officers have confirmed that the proposed redevelopment of the site would accord with these principles.
- 3.4. Likewise, it is acknowledged that the site sits with the Waterside Trading Estate and the Bourne Business Park Strategic Employment Area (SEA). The 5 SEAs in the borough are the highest tier of employment sites, where employment land uses are promoted.
- 3.5. The minor reduction in the amount of proposed floorspace is a consequence of the revised scheme design in response to officer's feedback. The scheme still represents an efficient, optimised scheme that seeks to make sustainable re-use of this vacant, brownfield site and ensures that economic growth and vitality will be delivered with associated benefits for the borough.
- 3.6. Noting the above, the proposals remain in accordance with key planning policy at all levels, including NPPF Paragraphs 81, 83 and 119 and Local Plan Policies IE2 and IE3. The proposals help to promote economic growth and productivity, making effective use of employment-designated land and thus remain wholly acceptable and appropriate.

Design

- 3.7. At the time of the May 2022 submission, Unit 100 in the southern part of the site comprised circa 158,795sqft of employment floorspace. The proposed layout of the southern site sought to locate the warehouse yard adjacent to Hamm Moor Lane, along the western site boundary with access from Addlestone Road. Staff parking was proposed in the north-eastern area of the site. Unit 100 was located adjacent to the eastern site boundary, near to the River Wey Navigation.



- 3.8. As noted above, during post-submission correspondence with RBC officers and relevant consultees, concerns were raised regarding the general siting and scale of Unit 100, in close proximity to the River Wey Conservation Area. As such, the applicant and project team have sought to liaise with RBC officers constructively in order to revise the site layout for Unit 100 and adjacent land, in order to directly respond to comments received. In addition to the above, comments from the Environment Agency requested a 10-metre undeveloped 'ecological buffer' from the bank top of the Addlestone Bourne.
- 3.9. Following the comments received from the above consultees, UMC Architects in coordination with the wider project team have sought to identify a sympathetic design intent which seeks to address the comments raised and better respond to the adjacent Wey Navigation Conservation Area, whilst also ensuring that this currently vacant, brownfield site can be brought back in to positive use in an optimised, effective manner.
- 3.10. As such, the layout of the southern part of the wider site, comprising Unit 100, was revised. The site has effectively been 'flipped' in its layout, with the operational yard now located adjacent to the River Wey, which enables Unit 100 to be set far back from the Navigation at a distance of circa 46m. This actually improves upon the existing site arrangement where there is c.18m distance between the nearest building and the Navigation. It also improves significantly upon the previous design which proposed a setback of 12m from the river. In conjunction with the increased setback, the proposed height of Unit 100 has also been reduced by 3m in total across the whole of the building, from 18m to 15m.
- 3.11. The design amendments described above address the concerns raised by officers and consultees, and as the below 'Heritage' sub-section demonstrates avoids any perceived harm to the setting of the Conservation Area. The separation distance included in the revised proposals helps to distance the built form from the Navigation to a greater degree than the existing built form on-site, thereby providing a betterment in this respect. The revisions to Unit 100 and the southern site therefore continue to preserve the setting of the Wey Navigation Conservation Area.
- 3.12. There have been limited amendments to the northern site. One key revision to the proposals however follows the comments raised by the EA in regard to a 10-metre undeveloped buffer along the Addlestone Bourne. Whilst existing built development (i.e. hardstanding) currently exists in this area, the proposals have been revised so as to not encroach into this 10 metre zone any further. This has consequential impacts on the parking layouts which serve Units 210 and 220, which are discussed in further detail below.
- 3.13. Likewise, the landscaping proposals have subsequently been updated in line with the scheme aforementioned revisions. The landscaping scheme intent remains identical in practice; seeking to retain existing vegetation and tree cover where feasible to ensure continued ecological and screening benefits whilst also supplementing the existing landscape on-site with a varied landscaping strategy which will help to seamlessly integrate the proposed built form with the surrounding area. The landscaping strategy has been informed heavily through

various interrelated reports including the Preliminary Ecological Assessment, Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement amongst other reports.

- 3.14. The above documents, along with the full Landscaping Strategy prepared by LDA Design, and the Design and Access Statement prepared by UMC Architects, should be referred to for full details of the design and landscaping proposals for the revised scheme.
- 3.15. Summarising the above, the design intent is considered to clearly accord with planning policy at all levels, including NPPF Paragraphs 126 and 130 and Local Plan Policy EE1, amongst others.

Heritage

- 3.16. The previous iteration of the proposals sought to locate Unit 100 adjacent to the River Wey. The River Wey, as identified previously, falls within the Wey Navigation Conservation Area. Design features such as graduated coloured banding on the building façades, along with enhanced screening along the boundary between the site and the riverside were previously proposed, in order to effectively break up the massing and reduce the visual appearance of Unit 100 when viewed from the adjacent Conservation Area.
- 3.17. Following submission, concerns were raised by consultees regarding the location of Unit 100 adjacent to the Conservation Area. As mentioned, the layout of the southern part of the wider site, comprising Unit 100, was revised to effectively respond to these comments. Previously, the Unit 100 layout sought to locate the operational yard fronting Hamm Moor Lane, with the built form against the eastern site boundary. However, noting feedback received the site has effectively been 'flipped' in its layout, with the operational yard now located adjacent to the River Wey. Unit 100 is now set far back from the riverside by circa 46m. This contrasts with the existing built form which is c.18m from the river, and in contrast to the previous application which proposed Unit 100 being set c.12m from the river. The building height has also been reduced by circa 3m in total.
- 3.18. Noting the significant design revisions proposed, a Heritage and Archaeology Statement Addendum has been prepared by Savills in support of the revised proposals. The Addendum notes that by relocating Unit 100 further from the Conservation Area, the visual impact of the building when viewed from within the Conservation Area would naturally be reduced. This design alteration would also reduce any sense of domination that the previous scheme would have perceived to have had. The reduction in the building height of Unit 100, in addition to the re-siting of the building, would further minimise the visibility of the building from within the Conservation Area, provide a reduction in the legibility of the building when experienced from the Conservation Area, and, in being of a more similar height to the existing built form within the Site (which are c.10-14m in height), enable the existing character of the Site, and its relationship with the Conservation Area to be more closely maintained.
- 3.19. Unit 100 would not dominate the canalside, but it would, as the existing buildings in this location do, help frame it, being perceived as an element in the backdrop of the Conservation Area, with an industrial character, which

is the primary historic characteristic of the built form in this location. In having a much-reduced visual legibility, the ability to appreciate the existing character and appearance of the River Wey Navigation Conservation Area, in the vicinity of the Site, would be preserved.

- 3.20. The proposals would inevitably impact the visual understanding of the Conservation Area to a certain degree given the proposed changes to the built form on-site as existing and in comparison to the previous proposals. However, noting the new siting of the building, this element of change would be perceived to only a very minor section of the Conservation Area. The character of this specific part of the Conservation Area, that is, of industrial style activity and relatively large scale-built form, would remain. In the context of the whole River Wey Navigation Conservation Area, the proposals would have a neutral impact on its significance by way of change to its setting.
- 3.21. Noting the above, the significance and character of the Conservation Area would be wholly preserved, in accordance with the requirements of Policies EE3 and EE5 of the Runnymede Borough Council Local Plan, the NPPF (Chapter 16), and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (s.72). The revised design layout is therefore considered to be acceptable, responding effectively to the concerns raised.
- 3.22. For additional clarity, the revised proposals do not seek revisions to the layout or form of the built form of Units 210 or 220 on the northern part of the site. These buildings are not considered to impact the significance of the River Wey Navigation Conservation Area and have not been raised as being of concern previously. These buildings are therefore considered to have no impact upon the quality and character of this area.

Energy and Sustainability

- 3.23. Given the revised scheme design involves a minor reduction in the amount of proposed floorspace and volume, an updated Energy and Sustainability Statement has been prepared by SWH and MBA. The energy hierarchy has continued to be followed and defines the appropriate steps to achieve the requirements set out in by Building Regulations Part L2A and Policy SD8:
- 3.24. Be Lean: Proposals include for the incorporation of improved building envelope details and enhanced air tightness that seeks to better that required by Part L, efficient mechanical plant, and highly efficient lighting to reduce energy demand
- 3.25. Be Clean: Local heat network sites were reviewed, and the suitability of a community heating network was considered, but the location and lack of constant heat load profile meant these options were not feasible for this development.
- 3.26. Be Green: The proposed development includes the use of both photovoltaic arrays and air source heat pumps. These solutions have been appraised as the most viable for this development.



3.27. A combination of the fabric-first approach and renewable energies proposed provides a route to compliance with Approved Document Part L:2021 of the Building Regulations for the proposed development. This approach also demonstrates how the development will exceed the planning policy requirement for 10% of the development’s energy needs to be met by renewable and/or low carbon technologies, in accordance with Policy SD8 of the Runneymede 2030 Local Plan.

3.28. Table 1 from the document (excerpt below) outlines the total calculated annual CO₂ emissions for the proposed development, as well as the percentage of energy demand provided by renewables. The data enclosed in the table clearly demonstrates that the 10% requirement has been exceeded.

Table 1: Building Regulations Part L2a and energy demand met by renewables

UNIT	PART L2A (2121) - TARGET EMISSION RATE (TER) KGCO ₂ /M ²	PART L2A (2021) - BUILDING EMISSION RATE (BER) KGCO ₂ /M ²	%CO ₂ SAVING	% OF ENERGY DEMAND BY RENEWABLE
Unit 100	1.01	0.88	12.8	44.6
Unit 210	1.77	-1.34	175	44.1
Unit 220	1.76	1.05	40.3	37.9

3.29. The proposed development is being assessed against the BREEAM New Construction 2018 Industrial criteria, which further investigates the development’s sustainability credentials. The development is currently targeting 74%, achieving an “Excellent” rating.

3.30. Noting the above findings, it is clear that the revisions to the previous proposals have not adversely impacted the energy and sustainability considerations for the proposals. The scheme still achieves BREEAM Excellent and exceeds all various requirements by integrating key features of the energy hierarchy at the core of the building design.

3.31. Noting the above, the proposals clearly accord with NPPF Paragraph 8 and Local Plan Policies SD7 and SD8, demonstrating the acceptability of the revised proposals.

Transport and Highways

3.32. Noting the aforementioned changes to the layout of Unit 100 and also the revisions to the northern part of the site, relating to the inclusion of a 10-metre undeveloped ecological buffer zone, there have been several key revisions in relation to transport and highways matters. These are succinctly summarised below for clarity:

- The location of the main servicing vehicular access to Unit 100 has been revised and is now located further eastwards along Addlestone Road. This will also provide access to staff car parking whilst additional staff car parking will be accessed from Hamm Moor Lane.
- A total of 77 car parking spaces for Unit 100 including 4 disabled bays and 16 active EV parking spaces are provided, and 54 car parking spaces are provided for Units 210 and 220 including disabled and EV bays.

3.33. Mode have subsequently prepared a revised Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) in support of the latest proposals. The document summarises the key updated transport inputs including:

- Updated trip generation calculations (including HGV movements);
- Revised points of vehicular access; and
- Revised car parking arrangements.

Trip Generation

3.34. Section 1.3 of the TAA compares the updated proposals (with revised floorspace quantum) against the existing land uses, and the expected trip generation.

3.35. Data shown in Table 1.1 and 1.2 of the TAA clearly demonstrates that there continues to be a significant reduction in trips in comparison with the existing lawful office use, for the revised proposals. This is now a greater reduction than the previous scheme on the basis of the reduced floorspace for Unit 100.

3.36. For reference, other trip generation scenarios assessed and presented to National Highways (NH) as part of the previous proposals would only be reduced further on the basis of a reduced Unit 100, so have not been assessed again as part of the TAA.

Amended Access Arrangement

3.37. As noted previously, the previous access arrangement proposed for Unit 100 was solely from Addlestone Road along the northern boundary of the southern site.

3.38. As part of the development proposals, one of the existing vehicular access points along Hamm Moor Lane will be relocated further north to allow for greater levels of landscaping along the frontage. The repositioned access will serve 43 car parking spaces. HGV access will be repositioned for the Unit 100 site but will remain from Addlestone Road. The repositioned Addlestone Road access will accommodate all HGV movements (which remains consistent with the previous approach whereby all HGV movements would enter the site on Addlestone Road, and not Hamm More Lane).

- 3.39. The proposed access dimensions and arrangements within TAA Appendix C (Drawings J32-6431-PS005 Rev C and J32-6431-PS-007 Rev A) provide details of the swept path analysis and horizontal visibility splays and demonstrate the acceptability of the revised proposals and the access arrangements. All other existing access points to the Unit 100 plot will be stopped up as part of the development proposals.
- 3.40. The Unit 210 & Unit 220 site access proposals will not be altered as part of the scheme changes and so did not require additional modelling or revised tracking exercises to be undertaken.

Parking Provision

- 3.41. Noting the updated staff car parking numbers proposed, an updated car parking accumulation assessment for all units across both sites has been undertaken.
- 3.42. For Units 210 and 220 (providing 54 spaces), the revised parking assessment identifies that these units would generate a maximum parking demand of 30 spaces. Therefore, the proposed parking provision of 54 spaces will continue to more than adequately cater for the demand generated by the development, resulting in no overspill parking onto the surrounding local road network and helping to accommodate periods such as shift changeover between staff. Based on this conclusion, the reduction in 6 car parking spaces which resulted from the changes sought by the EA in order to establish the 10-metre undeveloped buffer will not adversely affect the scheme parking ratio.
- 3.43. 77 parking spaces will be provided for Unit 100 and the proposals would generate a maximum parking demand of 35 spaces on the southern site. Therefore, as with Units 210 and 220, the proposed parking provision of 77 spaces will more than adequately cater for the demand generated by the development resulting in no overspill parking onto the surrounding local road network, including the capacity to accommodate the crossover of staff shift patterns as identified above also.
- 3.44. It is clear from the above that highways safety will be maintained through the revised proposals, and no additional adverse impact will be caused upon the local highways network. The proposals more than sufficiently accommodate the expected parking demand so as to aid in dealing with potential overspill, and the revised accesses for Unit 100 are shown to work in terms of access and highways safety. As such, the proposals are considered to continue to accord in full with NPPF Paragraph 104 and Local Plan Policy SD4.
- 3.45. At a local level, Local Plan Paragraph 3.1 earmarks the borough as being “strategically located at the junction of the M25 and M3 motorways” with excellent road connections to the capital and the wider South East region. Subsequently, Local Plan Policy SD4 notes that the Council will support development proposals which maintain or enhance the efficient and safe operation of the highway network and which take account of the needs of all highway users for safe access, egress and servicing arrangements.

- 3.46. As per Local Plan Policy SD4, development proposals which generate significant traffic movements must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment or Statement which considers the impact of the proposal on the highway network and identifies the measures to mitigate impacts to acceptable levels.
- 3.47. It is important to highlight that Surrey County Council as Highways Authority, and National Highways were both previously consulted on the original proposals and both reached a conclusion that the proposals were acceptable. The revised parking arrangements should not alter these conclusions which will remain.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 3.48. Following revisions to the southern site layout, the resulting drainage and flood risk inputs for the proposals were required to be updated. These inputs have been prepared by HDR in support of the revised scheme.
- 3.49. As stated previously, in addition to these changes the EA raised concerns regarding flood risk and drainage considerations at the site. In particular, the EA response includes commentary in relation to fluvial flood risk and states that the proposed Unit 100 *“would present an obstruction which could impede flood flow thereby increasing the risk of flooding to the surrounding area”*.
- 3.50. HDR have sought to address these considerations as part of the revised drainage strategy for the revised proposals and have attempted to initiate a dialogue with the Environment Agency in order to resolve any misunderstandings or requests for additional information which may have led to concerns being raised initially.
- 3.51. Pertaining to the EA comments for fluvial flood risk, the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Addendum, prepared by HDR, states clearly that through updated calculations, there is no material change in flood flow path under the proposed development layout. This is illustrated on Drawing 608 in Appendix E of the Addendum, and should be referred to along with the wider document and supporting Pro Forma for further information.
- 3.52. HDR state that fluvial flooding would continue to enter the site from the Addlestone Road boundary, via the new proposed bell-mouth access. Existing levels along the Lower Wey boundary are to be maintained so there will be no overtopping from the south-east. Ponding will be contained within the site as per the pre-development scenario, eventually dissipating via the surface water drainage network. Furthermore, there is no impedance of flood water flow and there is no change in either on-site or offsite fluvial flood risk.
- 3.53. With regards to drainage strategy, an updated surface water drainage strategy for the development has been prepared. The principles are unchanged from those presented in the April 2022 Flood Risk Assessment.
- 3.54. The proposals comprise a combination of below-ground storage systems and an above-ground basin to attenuate runoff prior to discharge into the Addlestone Bourne. Development levels mean that a pumped system and rising main will be required to serve the southern sector (Unit 100), while a gravity system will be

used for the northern development (Units 210 and 220). Permeable paving is proposed to be installed to all external car parking areas of the southern part of the development.

- 3.55. The drainage network for both the northern and southern sites has been designed to accommodate the critical storm event up to and including the 1 in 100 year return period plus a 20% allowance for climate change, whilst still preventing off-site flooding. The drainage system will be designed in accordance with the requirements of BS EN 752:2017 which stipulates that no surcharging should occur during a critical storm event of 1 in 2 years return period. It also requires that no exceedance flooding should occur during a critical storm event of 1 in 30 years return period.
- 3.56. Noting the above, it is considered that the revised flood risk and drainage strategy is acceptable, effectively responding to the concerns raised by the EA whilst ensuring flood risk across the site is minimised as far as possible. Therefore, the proposals are considered to accord with NPPF and Local Plan requirements for flood risk testing and mitigation.

Noise

- 3.57. Noting the relocation of the operational yard for Unit 100 and revised car park layouts to accommodate this design change, a Noise Impact Assessment Addendum has been prepared in order to effectively understand the revised noise considerations for the proposed employment land uses.
- 3.58. The Addendum, prepared by Air and Acoustics, concludes that the predicted changes in road traffic noise as a result of the development are considered to be 'negligible'. Roads that have houses adjacent are affected by a maximum of +0.7 dB in the opening year of the development.
- 3.59. The predicted night-time maximum sound levels are found to be less than the noise that sensitive receptors experience from the existing sound level environment and the predicted noise levels from the car parks will also still be lower than the existing sound levels, demonstrating the negligible impacts of the proposals in this regard. The predicted noise rating levels at some of the closest residential noise sensitive receptors would be greater than the criterion level of 5 dB above the background sound level without any mitigation. Therefore, a mitigation strategy employing an acoustic barrier has been incorporated to ensure that the noise rating level at all of the noise sensitive receptors is less than 5 dB above the background sound level for Units 210 and 220.
- 3.60. However, it should be noted that following the removal of the operational yard fronting Hamm Moor Lane and its relocation adjacent to the River Wey, there is no identified need for an acoustic fence along Hamm Moor Lane as previously proposed. Likewise, given the moorings to the east of the site boundary on the River Wey are not permanent residential dwellings, no mitigation measures are required in this location to mitigate sound from the operational yard.

3.61. Noting the above findings and the proposed mitigation measures i.e. the provision of acoustic fencing in key locations, the Noise Impact Assessment Addendum clearly concludes that the revised proposals are unlikely to conflict with national, regional and local planning policy or guidance. Thus, the proposals accord clearly with NPPF Paragraph 174 and Local Plan Policy EE2, ensuring a noise environment which will not be to the detriment of local residents.

3.62. Please refer to the Noise Impact Assessment for detailed calculations of the noise testing undertaken and detailed findings resulting from these tests.

Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing

3.63. Noting the revised layout of Unit 100, an updated Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment has been prepared by Hollis to understand any potential implications for adjacent built form. In addition to these considerations, the Environment Agency also requested that an overshadowing assessment was undertaken.

3.64. As part of the Daylight Assessment, the following properties were assessed in accordance with the BRE guidance:

- Navigation House.
- 14 Hamm Moor Lane.
- Bourneside House.
- New House Addlestone Road.

3.65. 1 Dashwood Lang Road, 2 Hamm Moor Lane and 16 Hamm Moor Lane were not assessed, as these properties are understood to be non-residential and as such, do not require assessment for daylight and sunlight amenity in line with the BRE guidance.

3.66. The identified dwellings were assessed both on the basis of Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and Daylight Distribution (DD).

3.67. Concerning the VSC results, of the 31 windows assessments, all 31 were found to fully satisfy the target values by either attaining a VSC value of at least 27% or retaining at least 0.8 times their former values.

3.68. Concerning the DD results, of 29 rooms analysed across the four buildings tested, 23 rooms (79%) would fully satisfy the BRE guidance target values by retaining at least 0.8 times their current DD value achieved.

3.69. There were 6 rooms which fell short of the BRE guidance targets. Of these rooms, two are understood to be bedrooms within 14 Hamm Moor Lane. The BRE guidance states that while daylight within bedrooms should be analysed, it is generally considered to be less important compared to main living rooms. The retained values

of DD are 0.65 and 0.75 times their former value, which is close to the target of 0.8 and in both rooms, the majority of the floor areas will still be in front of the No Sky Line (and therefore will receive direct skylight).

- 3.70. The remaining 4 rooms which do not meet the guidance target are located within Navigation House and serve living/kitchen spaces ("LK"), achieving DD values between 0.59 and 0.77 (the latter just marginally below the 0.8 target recommended). These rooms within Navigation house have deep layouts and contain returns towards their rear sections, which are beyond the No Sky line in the existing scenario (and thus at present are unable to receive direct skylight).
- 3.71. However, it is important to consider that the BRE guide is not an instrument of planning policy and the numerical targets contained within are purely advisory. The guide makes this clear in the introduction at paragraph 1.6:
- 3.72. *"1.6 The guide is intended for building designers and their clients, consultants, and planning officials. The advice given here is not mandatory and the guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy; its aim is to help rather than constrain the designer. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout design (see Section 5). In special circumstances the developer or planning authority may wish to use different target values. For example, in a historic city centre, or in an area with modern high-rise buildings, a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable if new developments are to match the height and proportions of existing buildings. Alternatively, where natural light is of special importance, less obstruction and hence more sunlight and daylight may be deemed necessary. The calculation methods in Appendices A and B are entirely flexible in this respect. Appendix F gives advice on how to develop a consistent set of target values for skylight under such circumstances."*
- 3.73. Noting the above, it is therefore concluded that, when assessed in accordance with the latest BRE guidance, considering the context of the proposed development, the overall effect on the daylight and sunlight amenity of neighbouring properties is negligible. This demonstrates that the relocated Unit 100 will not have significant negative impacts upon the surrounding area in regard to daylight and sunlight levels, ensuring compliance with BRE guidance and Paragraph 123 of the NPPF.
- 3.74. Furthermore, in considering the results described above, it must be recognised that the properties discussed are located adjacent to a sustainably located, previously developed site where national planning policy prioritises new development. The site is also allocated within the recently adopted Runnymede Local Plan for strategic employment uses, thereby encouraging intensified employment development to meet the economic needs of the Council area. We are not aware that any objections were received concerning the site allocation. These factors combined mean that change to the existing site is reasonably to be expected.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 This Planning Statement Addendum has been prepared to supplement the full Planning Statement submitted in support of Planning Application Ref. RU.22/0776 at Weybridge Business Park, KT15 2UP.
- 4.2 The above application was submitted to Runnymede Borough Council (RBC) in May 2022, seeking:
- “Demolition of existing buildings and the development of three employment units within Classes E(g)ii, E(g)iii, B2 and B8, with ancillary office accommodation, new vehicular access, associated external yard areas, HGV and car parking, servicing, external lighting, hard and soft landscaping, infrastructure and all associated works”.*
- 4.3 The May 2022 proposals sought to construct the three employment units across two sites, separated by Addlestone Road (one to the north and one to the south). The southern site was proposed to accommodate a single, larger employment unit (referred to as 'Unit 100'), with two smaller employment units (Units 210 and 220) on the northern site.
- 4.4 During post-submission correspondence with RBC officers and relevant consultees, concerns were raised regarding the general siting and scale of Unit 100, in close proximity to the River Wey Conservation Area. As such, the applicant and project team have sought to liaise with RBC officers constructively in order to revise the site layout for Unit 100 and adjacent land, in order to directly respond to comments received. The revised proposals, subject of this Planning Statement Addendum, comprise an updated layout wherein Unit 100 has been relocated further west to provide a significant set-back from the Wey Navigation Conservation Area. The operational yard is now located along the eastern boundary of the southern site.
- 4.5 In addition to the above revisions, comments from the Environment Agency requested a 10-metre undeveloped 'ecological buffer' from the bank top of the Addlestone Bourne. The proposals for the northern site, comprising Units 210 and 220, have subsequently been revised in line with these comments.
- 4.6 This Planning Statement Addendum has assessed the revised proposals against the prevailing planning policy framework, including any relevant material considerations. The assessments, and findings, within this Planning Statement Addendum demonstrate that the proposals fully comply with the relevant national and local planning policy and guidance following the scheme revisions as set out in this document and in the revised re-submission pack. It is therefore requested that the proposals for the redevelopment of Weybridge Business Park are recommended for approval at the earliest opportunity.