

COMMITTEE AGENDA REFERENCE: 5A

APPLICATION REF:	RU.22/0776
LOCATION	Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone Road, Addlestone, Surrey, KT15 2UP
PROPOSAL	Industrial redevelopment to provide x3 units within Classes E(g)ii (Research and development), E(g)iii (Industrial processes), B2 (General industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) use, 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 following the demolition of existing buildings
TYPE	Full Planning Permission
EXPIRY DATE	Extension of time agreed until 25 March 2023
WARD	Addlestone South
CASE OFFICER	Christine Ellera
REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION	Major application
<i>If you have questions about this report please contact Ashley Smith, Victoria Gibson or the case officer.</i>	

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the Planning Committee authorises the CHDMBC:	
1.1.	To approve the application subject to the Environment Agency Withdrawing their objection to the development and the completion of a section 106 and recommended planning conditions.
1.2.	To refuse planning permission at the discretion of the CHDMBC should the S106 Agreement not progress to their satisfaction.

2. DETAILS OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1. The site comprises of two parcels of land forming part of Weybridge and Bourne Business Park and Waterside Trading Estate. The application site is separated by Addlestone Road. The northern land parcel comprises a vacant, office building, accessed via a single entrance from Addlestone Road (over the River Bourne). The southern land parcel comprises several vacant office buildings which in combination have two accesses via Addlestone Road and one via Hamn Moor Lane. This part of the site backs onto the River Wey and its

Conservation Area.

2.2. It is understood that units 4, 5, and 6 to the rear of the business park were refurbished in 2017, but never attracted a new occupier. Units 2 and 3 have been vacant since summer 2018 and summer 2019 respectively. Bridge House, to the east which affords its own access and has been vacant since summer 2020. To the north, across Addlestone Road is the former Toshiba offices which have been vacant since Autumn 2018.

2.3. Key constraints included:

- Allocated as strategic employment land
- Flood zone 2 (across the site) and 3A (part)
- The access to the former Toshiba offices to the north crosses the River Bourne and therefore part of the site falls within flood zone 3B
- Biodiversity Opportunity Area

2.4. Adjacent to:

- Site of Nature Conservation Importance (River Wey)
- Conservation Area (River Wey)
- Green Belt (Land to the east and north of the application site).

3. APPLICATION DETAILS

3.1. This is a full planning application for the redevelopment of the site to provide 3 large industrial buildings. The applicants are applying for a flexible planning permission whereby each of the buildings could be used for a variety of industrial uses, these are as follows:

- **Classes E(g)ii- Research and development** (an example can include a research lab),
- **E(g)iii- Industrial processes** (being a use, which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit),
- **B2- General industrial** (an example can include vehicle repair company),
- **B8- storage and distribution** (many uses fall within this definition, such as warehouse used for distribution, a self-storage company, indeed the nearby Screwfix with a trade counter would fall under B8.)

Ancillary office accommodation is also proposed. The applicant is seeking planning permission for these buildings to have the ability to be open and to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

3.2. The largest of the buildings, which would be positioned where the current offices comprising Weybridge Business Park and Bridge House are located is referred to as building 100. This building would have an overall proposed external floor area of 14,258 sqm (including ancillary offices) and up to 15m in height. This building would have two vehicle accesses, one from Moor Lane, opposite Ruxley House, which would provide 45 car parking spaces. A further access is proposed off Addlestone Road this would be the main gated access for delivery vehicles whereby a further 32 car parking spaces are proposed as well as 14 HGV docks and 4 further HGV parking spaces. Landscaping including boundary treatments, refuse storage and cycle parking also proposed.

3.3. To the north is buildings 200 which would be formed of two units, referred to as building 210 and 22. These building would have overall proposed external floor area of 1,493 sqm and 1,743 sqm (including ancillary offices) respectively and up to 15m in height. A total of

54 car parking spaces are proposed on this part of the site and 5 spaces for larger vehicles. Similarly, landscaping including boundary treatments, refuse storage and cycle parking also proposed.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1. It is not considered that there is any planning history directly relevant to this planning application, the most recent is.

Reference	Details
RU.21/0432	Hybrid planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site, consisting of: (i) Outline planning permission with all matters reserved (other than access) for hotel accommodation (Use Class C1), leisure and health club and bar/restaurant with associated vehicle parking, landscaping and associated works; and (ii) Full planning permission for a multi storey car park and surface parking, internal roads, vehicle access, landscaping, together with associated and ancillary works including utilities and surface water drainage; and (iii) Full planning permission for replacement plant and new building entrances for Buildings 5 and 6. Withdrawn 13.01.22
RU.15/0798	Refurbishment and extensions to Units 4-8 including their part demolition to provide two separate two storey office buildings; and the demolition and redevelopment of Unit 9 to provide a new three storey B1 office building within the southern part of Weybridge Business Park; retaining the associated car parking (261 spaces) and landscape improvement works. Now k/as Units 4, 5 & 6. Approved: 06.08.15

- 4.2. The following applications in the surrounding area are also of some relevance:

Reference	Details
1 Bourne Business Park	
RU.21/0205	Refurbishment and extension of the existing office building, comprising a lobby extension and the addition of second floor, including hard and soft landscaping works, changes to the car park layout and a new cycle store. Permitted: 30.05.22
8 - 12 Hamm Moor Lane	
RU.05/0238	Erection of three storey building comprising 15 apartments (9 no x one bed and 6 no x two bed apartments) with parking and vehicular access off Byron Road following demolition of the existing buildings. Permitted 02.08.05

5. SUMMARY OF MAIN RELEVANT STRATEGIES AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

- 5.1 The Borough's current adopted Development Plan comprises of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan which was adopted on 16 July 2020 and the policies have to be read as a whole. The relevant policies are considered to be:
- SD1 – Spatial Development Strategy
 - SD2 – Site Allocations
 - SD3 – Active & Sustainable Travel
 - SD4 – Highway Design Considerations
 - SD5 – Infrastructure Provision & Timing
 - SD7 – Sustainable Development
 - SD8 – Renewable & Low Carbon Energy
 - SL1 – Health and Wellbeing
 - EE1 – Townscape and Landscape Policy
 - EE2 – Environmental Protection
 - EE9 – Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation
 - EE11 – Green Infrastructure
 - EE13 – Managing Flood Risk
 - Policy IE1: Employment allocations
 - Policy IE2: Strategic Employment Areas
 - Policy IE3: Catering for modern business needs

Other Material Considerations

- 5.2 National Planning Policy Framework (revised July 2021)- acts as guidance for local planning authorities and decision-takers, both in drawing up plans and making decisions about planning applications. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The document, as a whole, forms a key and material consideration in the determination of any planning permission.

The supporting National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) is also a material consideration for decision making, as is the National Design Guide (2019) and the Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)

- 5.3 SPDs which can be a material consideration in determination:
- Runnymede Borough Parking Guidance (2022)
 - Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2022)
 - Runnymede Design Supplementary Planning Document (2021)
 - Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (2021)
 - Thames Basin Heaths Supplementary Planning Document (2021)
 - Infrastructure Delivery and Prioritisation (2020)
 - Parking Strategy: Surrey Transport Plan (2020)
- 5.4 Other material considerations include the Runnymede Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2016 and 2017)

6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Consultees responses

Consultee	Comments
Environment Agency	Outstanding objection- Due to its size of Building 100 this building would present an obstruction

	<p>which could impede flood flow thereby increasing the risk of flooding to the surrounding area. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has not assessed what impact this impedance may have and whether the proposed location and design of the building would increase flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>The proposed development entails hard landscaping within the buffer zone of the Addlestone Bourne. The area to the north-west and south-east of the northern site has hard landscaping within the buffer zone.</p> <p><i>Case Officers notes- The applicants have since provided updated evidence based on the revised position and have sought to show how the proposed development would not affect flood flow. The EA have been consulted and we are awaiting a response.</i></p>
National Highways	No objections- the proposed development would not have significant effect on the strategic road network
Ecology advice (Surrey Wildlife Trust)	No objections subject to further information of jersey cut weed
Tree Officer	No objections subject to conditions
Environmental Health (noise)	<p>Currently Raise objection- requests further acoustic mitigation to aid property known as Wey Meadows Farm.</p> <p><i>Case Officers notes- Discussed further below in section Potential Impact in terms of Noise and Disturbance, further mitigation has now been proposed by the applicants.</i></p>
Contaminated Land	No objections subject to conditions
Conservation Officer	No objections.
Drainage Officer	No objections- subject to conditions
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objections- subject to conditions
Highway Authority	No objections- subject to conditions and legal agreement
Archaeology Officer	No objections
Surrey Fire and Rescue Service	No objections
National Trust	The Trust still considers that the building would be visible in views along the Wey Corridor and, because of its height and mass, would impact adversely on the appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, the service yard, which is now proposed adjacent to the Wey Navigation, would have an adverse impact on the visual amenities along the Wey Navigation.

	<p>To some extent this impact would be mitigated by the proposed landscape planting and acoustic fencing along the boundary between the development site and the Wey Navigation but the Trust considers that even when the landscape planting matures the service yard would be visible from the Navigation.</p> <p>Of perhaps greater concern is the adverse impact of vehicle noise on the amenities currently enjoyed by boat users on the Navigation (passing through and at the moorings) and by pedestrians and cyclists using the towpath. Given the likelihood of 24-hour operations the Trust remains to be convinced that acoustic fencing would be sufficient to attenuate noise to an acceptable level at night-time.</p> <p>Unless additional measures can be incorporated to reduce night-time noise levels it is likely that the occupiers of residential boat moorings on the Wey Navigation would experience disturbance and significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>The National Trust remains concerned about the potential for light pollution along the Navigation, a concern exacerbated by the proposed siting of the service yard along the Wey Navigation frontage. Enhanced lighting close to the Navigation would be detrimental to its night-time character and may be prejudicial to bats along the waterway.</p>
Secured by Design (Surrey Police)	No comment received
Thames water	No objections
Network Rail	No comment received
Elmbridge Borough Council	No objections

Representations and comments from interested parties

6.2 107 Neighbouring properties were consulted in addition to being advertised on the Council's website, x4 site notices being displayed around the site and a publication in the local press. Following the initial consultation exercise and the re-consultation on the revised plans a total of 557 letters have been received from individual addresses (at the time of writing this report). These which can be summarised as follows:

- Development out of character with the area
- Concerns about noise relating to the 24-hour operations of the proposed development
- Concerns about traffic and congestion resulting from the proposed development in the locality and wider area
- Concerns about highway safety from more vehicle on the road including increased HGV's
- Insufficient parking for the proposed development
- Loss of light, noise and disturbance and overbearing impact on those living in adjoining houses and flats

- Increase in noise and air pollution
- Proposed development would be visually overbearing on the wider area including the Wey Navigation
- Insufficient infrastructure including drainage to support the development
- Increased pressures on local services including GP surgeries
- Impact on ecological and local wildlife
- the HGV's coming to and from the site would damage already poorly maintained roads
- Proposal would result in loss of light to those using the adjacent canal
- Object to the noise and disturbance associated with the construction process
- Lighting scheme should avoid impact on residents and on wildlife
- Concerns about pedestrian safety from increased vehicles, including those walking to and from local schools
- Cumulative impact regarding congestion, including when having regard for barriers being down for further period in Addlestone
- Impact on heritage assets and the Wey Navigation
- This site could deliver increased recreational open space lacking in the area
- concerns that increased congestion will affect emergency vehicles being able to access wider roads
- Concerns about cumulative impact were other businesses to open 24 hours a day.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1. In the determination of this application regard must be had to the Development Plan and National policy within the NPPF. The application site is located within the urban area where the principle of such development is considered to be acceptable subject to detailed consideration. This must be considered in light of the presumption in favour of sustainable development advocated by the NPPF. The following key planning matters are also considered relevant:

- Principle of development and the presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Design considerations
- Impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area
- Highways Consideration
 - Highway Capacity
 - Proposed access and wider highway safety considerations
 - Parking Considerations
 - Sustainable transport/ highways capacity considerations
 - Highways Conclusion
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
 - Potential impact in terms of noise and disturbance
 - Potential impact in terms of loss of light and/or overbearing impact
 - Potential impact in terms of lighting
 - Neighbouring Amenity Conclusions
- Flooding Considerations
 - The need for the Sequential and Exception Test
 - Flood protection and mitigation
 - Sustainable Urban Drainage
- Ecology and biodiversity
- Renewable Energy
- Other Considerations
 - Air quality

- Contaminated Land
- Archaeology

7.2. Principle of development and the presumption in favour of sustainable development

- 7.2.1. Paragraph 2 of the NPPF (2021) highlights that the National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements.
- 7.2.2. Paragraphs 11 of the NPPF (2021) deals with the “presumption in favour of sustainable development” and sets out that:

“For decision-taking this means: approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.”*

- 7.2.3. Policy IE2: Strategic Employment Areas of the Local Plan identifies this site as forming part of SEA5: Strategic Employment Areas. Within such areas the policy is clear that the refurbishment and redevelopment of sites in these areas for employment use, and proposals for the intensification of sites for employment use will be permitted.
- 7.2.4. Policy IE3 seeks to attract businesses to the Borough; support the retention, creation and development of local businesses, promote business competitiveness and allow for flexibility to cater for the changing needs of the economy.
- 7.2.5. In addition to the above, paragraph 81 of the NPPF (2021) sets out that decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. The NPPF also states that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.
- 7.2.6. The site is formed of 3 separate sites, which contain a total of 7 office buildings. Overall, the floorspace of these buildings is in the region of 16,536 sqm. The proposal is for the redevelopment of the site to provide a total of 16,925 sqm of flexible employment floor space, which fall under the use class order of being Classes E(g)ii (Research and development), E(g)iii (Industrial processes), B2 (General industrial) and/ or B8 (storage and distribution) use, with ancillary office accommodation. In terms of the principle of the proposed development, the proposed development results in an increase of 389 sqm of floor space and the policies seek to support proposals such as this which seek to intensify employment generating uses. As such the principle of the development accords with the Development Plan policies and is appropriate development subject to wider considerations set out below.
- 7.2.7. The Planning Statement dated May 2022, prepared by Savills in support of this planning application highlights that the above policies. The planning statement also sets out that the Local Plan, whilst recently adopted was prepared before the covid pandemic and that major changes to the occupational office market and the significant growth in demand for logistics space have now taken place. In support of the planning application Savills have also provided

a Market Assessment dated April 2022. Overall, the assessment sets out why the site is in a strong location for large industrial and logistics premises because of its good access to the M25 and M3 motorways, which is critical infrastructure to facilitate this type of development. This report also highlights that there is a significant increase in demand for larger flexible and adaptable employment spaces that can adjust to change. The above report also provides a property market assessment for the area of Sunbury, Chertsey, Egham and Addlestone. This evidence presented by the applicants seeks to demonstrate that there is effectively no availability of large units and no new supply coming forward. In summary, the arguments put forward by the applicants is that not only does the proposed development comply with the above policies, but that the quantum of floorspace proposed at the site, particularly the larger warehouse Unit 100, is appropriate for existing market conditions and should be seen as a benefit of the proposed development, in terms of meeting employment floor spaces needs in the locality and bringing forward vacant office space into employment generating uses.

7.2.8. Currently the Council's most recent published Runnymede Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, this evidence base document is currently being updated. Part of the time being taken to update this evidence base document is that the long-term impact of the pandemic and how it has affected the way people work and live, and thereby demand for various employment floorspace is unknown. Nonetheless the Council's policies for strategic employment areas seeks to be adaptable and looks to retain and support employment generating uses and thus can still be considered to be up to date. That being said, Officers consider that the submitted market appraisal seems reasonable although the Property Market Area is drawn fairly tightly, especially in terms of how far south it goes (for instance it does not include Brooklands). The Council's above evidence shows 2 market areas, one serving the north Egham/Heathrow area and the other Addlestone and the south including Brooklands. Regardless of the size of the Property Market Area, availability online of sizable units are limited (60,000sq.ft unit at Brooklands, 100,000sq.ft+ units are at Prologis Park near Drayton to the north of Heathrow where several very large units are on the market with Savills and a unit at Slyfield industrial estate in Guildford). Currently it is considered that it is difficult to verify demand for large units in this area, however national occupier take-up of 100,000sq.ft. and over warehouse "sheds" in 2022 was 8.3%, higher than the 5-year annual average. The low vacancy rate for B8 overall and lack of large units in the South East M25 quadrant suggests that supply is struggling to keep up with demand.

7.2.9. Accordingly, there is strong "in principle" support for the proposed development. Moreover, the proposal would bring vacant (but previously developed land) back to an employment generating use. Moreover, the proposal would provide an intensification of use to deliver an increase in employment floorspace. This is a benefit which weighs in favour of the proposed development, this will be considered further as part of the below planning balance.

7.3. **Design considerations**

7.3.1. Policy EE1 sets out that all development proposals will be expected to achieve high quality and inclusive design which responds to the local context including the built, natural and historic character of the area while making efficient use of land. In particular development proposals will be supported where they:

- Create attractive and resilient places which make a positive contribution to the Borough's townscape, public realm and/or landscape setting.
- Create developments which promote social interaction and design out crime
- Contribute to and enhance the quality of the public realm/ and/or landscape setting through high quality and inclusive hard and soft landscaping schemes.

7.3.2. The NPPF (2021) sets out that there is a clear focus that proposed developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the

lifetime of the development and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping. The NPPF (2021) sets out that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve, with an emphasis that development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

- 7.3.3. It is important to remember that whilst there are some residential properties in this location, the character of this area has largely been one for employment generating uses of large block of built form, surrounded by parking. In terms of context the wider built form in the area includes large warehouses and buildings. The existing buildings on site are 3 office floors (8.5- 12m in height) and most recently an office development across the road (at Bourne 100) is up to 12m in height. Irrespective of this none of these building display the wider overall scale and massing of the buildings proposed as part of this planning application. A Townscape Visual impact assessment (TVIA) has been submitted in support of this planning application.
- 7.3.4. Building 100 is one large building some 150m in width and 105m in length with a service yard to the rear. At a height of up to 15m it will result in a visually prominent and highly visible building on a key corner location as you enter an established Business Park and Trading Estate. The overall form and scale the proposed building is informed by facilitating a B8 use. Within such facilities a large and fairly rectangle floor plan is necessary to maximise on efficiencies and ensure storage areas are easily accommodated. This is explored in detail in the applicants supporting Design and Access Statement. The position of building 100 has been revised since the initial submission to move the building away from the way navigation and its associated Conservation Area in order to minimise impact on the designated heritage asset this in turn brings the proposed building closer to Hamm Moor Lane and Addlestone Road.
- 7.3.5. The applicants have sought to balance the requirements which inform the layout of the building against “breaking up” the scale by looking at the office element associated with the proposed use being two storey, along Addlestone Road and how this can add variation and interest on this corner. They have also looked at options for the proposed panelling and have proposed a vertical panelling to the proposed building to try and break up the wider massing.
- 7.3.6. The TVIA has looked at key views and potential sensitivity to change the magnitude of that effect. The conclusions of the report are that the impact of the development is limited to the surrounding area in proximity to the site. The largest effects on visual receptors would occur along Addlestone Road and Hamm Moor Lane to the north and east of the Site, as well as for users of the Wey Navigation and associated tow path adjacent to the north-eastern boundary of the southern parcel of the Site. From some vantage points in these locations the impact will be major/moderate adverse. Having a building on such a visually prominent corner as you enter this established area is not necessarily unacceptable as it can assist in defining the area as one of employment generating uses and whilst it remains a large and substantial building it is not considered it would result in an overbearing or incongruous form of development which would warrant objection in this regard (the wider consideration of impact on neighbouring amenity is considered below.)
- 7.3.7. In relation to the northern part of the site, the part of the planning application forming the “200” buildings, on this part of the site, there is a currently a ‘T’ shaped building. This building has an overall height of around 8.5m with large central panelling/ plant equipment on top up to 12.2m in height. The existing building on the site is at approximately 1m higher level then Addlestone Road. However currently the building does not appear to be a visually prominent feature within the existing street scene. This is because of the dense woodland that surrounds the site both along Addlestone road but also to the rear where site abuts Weybridge Road.

- 7.3.8. Whilst the building now proposed would be greater in width, floorspace and height (some 15m), the overall position of the building is set further back than the main forward projection of the current building. More importantly the existing site boundaries, areas of hardstanding and woodland which surrounds this part of the site would not be affected by the proposal. Thus, whilst these buildings have large floorplate and scale, they will have limited visual impact within the wider street scene.
- 7.3.9. In terms of landscaping, a landscaping strategy and detailed landscaping plans have been submitted in support of this planning application. Overall, the strategy is looking at strengthening landscaping at boundary locations to soften and mitigate some of the view of the proposed development over time. The strategy includes retaining any category A and B trees along the boundaries, with proposed new hedgerows and trees, designed to screen or soften the built form and improve ecological connectivity and biodiversity. Due to the large floorplate of the proposed buildings and the parking provision much of the proposed landscaping will be focused on edge conditions with a mix of small and new large evergreen tree to be supplied as semi-mature stock along the edges. Full details can be secured by way of recommended conditions. Further biodiversity enhancements and strengthening of the existing woodland area around buildings(s) 200 are discussed further below.

7.4. **Impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area**

- 7.4.1. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Areas. The NPPF (2021) states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
- 7.4.2. Policy EE5 of the Local Plan also sets out that development within or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area, including views in or out, should protect, conserve, and wherever possible enhance, the special interest, character, and appearance of the Conservation Area
- 7.4.3. The site adjoins the River Wey and the Wey Navigation Conservation Area (designated August 1999). The designation of the Runnymede section of the Wey Navigation as a Conservation Area formed part of the comprehensive strategy to designate a linear conservation area along the total length of the Wey and Godalming Navigations. It was considered that this whole area, some 20 miles in length, merited Conservation Area designation by reason of its antiquity, appearance and special quality.
- 7.4.4. The existing built form is about 15- 18m from the Wey Navigation, with office blocks some 10- 14 m in height. The revised design approach now sets the building, some 15m in height to circa 45m from the Conservation Area with the rear service yard/ compound being adjacent to the Conservation Area. Whilst the proposed development remains one of a large solid built form given the separation distance, the building would not dominate the setting of the Conservation Area and would be perceived as an element in the backdrop of the Conservation Area, as would the service yard area. The building and the wider uses are industrial in character, which is the prevalent character along this short part of the Wey Navigation and indeed historically the reasoning for the Conservation Area designation of the canal. Overall, the proposed development is considered to have a neutral impact on the setting of the adjoining Conservation Area. Development, which is considered to have neutral impact, is established to preserve the setting of a Conservation Area.

7.5. Highways Considerations

- 7.5.1. Policy SD4: Highway Design Considerations states 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. The NPPF (2021) is clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 7.5.2. The applicant is seeking planning permission for a “flexible” employment use where a variety of different end users could occupy the proposed buildings. Future users are unknown, and it is important, in supporting employment generating uses that permission allows for flexible uses to occupy the building. However, this in turn means ensuring that the matters regarding highway safety, capacity and parking are fully considered from the onset. For example, the vehicle activities associated with a Research and Development building could be significantly different from a General Industrial Building which operated as, for example a car repair/ MoT garage. The vehicle movements associated with buildings used for a timber yard, self-storage or a parcel distribution centre can be widely different, yet all these uses fall within a B8 (storage and distribution) use. In this context the Surrey County Council in their role as the highway authority have requested that the applicant “model’s” the worst case scenarios.
- 7.5.3. Following discussion with Surrey County Council in their role as the highway authority and due to some objections from local residents the applicant has updated their transport evidence and have modelled the following 3 options of what all 3 units could be occupied as to assess potential impact on the highway network, parking provision and access and overall highway safety:
- Industrial Estate
 - Commercial Warehouse
 - All units in Parcel distribution use.
- 7.5.4. The applicants are keen to highlight that the proposed configuration, floor area and levels of loading bays for the proposed 200 buildings would not be suited for a typical Parcel Distribution occupier. As such, realistically only Unit 100 *could* potentially be occupied by any Parcel Distribution occupier. Nonetheless this evidence has been presented and assessed.

Highway Capacity- residual cumulative impacts on the road network.

- 7.5.5. One of the key areas of discussion is the activities associated with the proposed use of these buildings. In highways terms one of the considerations is the impact on both the local road network and the wider strategic network (which includes local motorways and junctions- i.e., the M25 and Junction 11, and to some lesser extent the A3 and the Cobham junction). Again, it is important to highlight that the NPPF (2021) is clear that a refusal on cumulative impacts on the road network should only be where it is demonstrated that a proposal would have a severe impact.
- 7.5.6. When this site was allocated under Policy IE2 as a Strategic Employment Areas in the Local Plan, high level highways capacity work was undertaken to assess the potential impact the proposed Plan would have on existing traffic networks, particularly given the Council’s strategy to intensify these sites for employment generating uses. However, given this was high-level and the varying uses which could take place for an employment generating use it is necessary to assess in further detail.
- 7.5.7. The manner in which this is modelled is based on using Trip Rate Information Computer

System (TRICS) which is an industry recognised standard for assessing trip generation of new developments. It is noted that a third-party objector has submitted their own Transport Assessment and their own TRCIS assumptions. However, TRCIS assumptions are based on large technical background data which has not been provided as part of their objection. Moreover, the manner in which they have assumed trip generation outside of peak times also lacks a robust justification as it looks to assume the same number of vehicles trips take place across the day continuously yet do not provide clear linkages between this and impact on highway capacity. Nonetheless the overall objection about assessing worst case scenario was noted and the applicants have provided updated Transport information based on these concerns.

- 7.5.8. The Transport Evidence submitted by the applicants includes all the supporting TRIC information to understand fully the assumptions which have been made. This has all been reviewed by the Highway Authority. The applicants have modelled the potential trip generation of all 3 buildings operating in the above uses, including as a parcel distribution centre.
- 7.5.9. In addition to the above, some objectors consider that transport impact should not have regard for the former use. They claim that as the office use ceased several years ago and no realistic prospect of that use returning the “fallback position” (i.e., the site in office use) should be given very little weight. However, these assertions are not supported by case law which is clear that the prospect of the fallback position does not have to be probable or even have a high chance of occurring. It has to be only “more than a merely theoretical prospect” to be given weight. Assessing the vehicle movements against the lawful use of the site in terms of assessing highway capacity is an accepted methodology to consider potential impact on the highway network. The assessment is also one where you look at potential vehicle trips, with a focus on peak hours. The focus on peak hours is to assess if the proposed development would result in increased pressures on the local and strategic highway network, notably at peak rush hours times where there is inherently a greater level of traffic. That is not to say that there would be no vehicle movements outside of peak hours, only that the potential impact on highway capacity would not be as great an issue.
- 7.5.10. Were the existing office buildings occupied, it would generate a significant level of vehicle movements with employees coming to and from said offices, particularly during peak times (08:00- 09:00 and 17:00- 18:00). The TRICs data shows that during the morning peak there could be up to 257 vehicle trips in the AM peak (largely those coming to the site) and around 225 vehicle trip in the PM peak (largely those leaving the site). Whilst the TRICS data is the industry recognised method of assessing potential vehicle trips it is based on a number of assumptions. This includes that given office uses are usually based on “passenger car units” (PUC) they have assumed that one HGV is the equivalent of 2.5 passenger car units. The applicants proposed that this accurately compares the existing and proposed land uses, by giving more weight to the HGV numbers which are more prevalent for the proposed land uses.

Floor Area		AM Peak (08:00-09:00)			PM Peak (17:00-18:00)		
		Arrivals	Departures	Total	Arrivals	Departures	Total
Existing Office - Transport Assessment Table 6.1							
Existing Office – 16,536sqm	Vehicular Trip Rate	1.344	0.208	1.552	0.181	1,181	1.362
	Vehicular Trips	222	34	257	30	195	225
Industrial Estate - Transport Assessment Addendum Table 1.1							
All Units – 16,925sqm	Vehicular Trip Rate	0.379	0.143	0.522	0.168	0.426	0.594
	PCUs (vehicles)	69 (64)	27 (24)	94 (88)	28 (28)	74 (72)	103 (101)
Net compared to office use	PCUs	-153	-7	-163	-2	-121	-122
Commercial Warehousing - Transport Assessment Addendum Table 1.2							
All Units – 16,925sqm	Vehicular Trip Rate	0.11	0.034	0.144	0.012	0.068	0.08
	PCUs (vehicles)	28 (19)	12 (6)	39 (24)	4 (2)	15 (12)	19 (14)
Net compared to office use	PCUs	-194	-22	-218	-26	-180	-206
Parcel Distribution - Technical Note 005 Table 3.1							
All Units – 16,925sqm	Vehicular Trip Rate	0.45	0.463	0.913	0.446	0.606	1.052
	PCUs (vehicles)	97 (76)	113 (78)	211 (155)	86 (75)	121 (103)	207 (178)
Net compared to office use	PCUs	-125	79	-46	56	-74	-18

Summary Table: vehicle trips modelled

- 7.5.11. Whilst some of the offices may have been in various stages of occupation over the years the fall back position and what should be considered baseline for the assessment is a strong material consideration. Overall, it is considered that there is robust and clear supporting transport information submitted by the applicants and reviewed by the highway authority and National Highways (which considers potential impact on the Strategic Highway Network). The evidence provided demonstrates that the vehicle movements associated with the proposed development would not result in increase in overall vehicle trips (those to and from the site) during peak hours, apart from if all the units were in a parcel distribution use whereby the overall increase in vehicle trips would only be 10. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a severe impact on the road network.

Proposed access and wider highway safety considerations

- 7.5.12. Building 100 would have x2 accesses, x1 off Hamm Moor Lane, close to an existing access point which would serve the parking for 45 vehicle spaces, and a further access close to the position currently where Bridge House is currently positioned, from Addlestone Road. This latter access would serve some 32 car parking spaces but also the access for the service area compound with large dock loading doors for larger vehicles, including HGVs. The 200 building(s) would utilise the existing access but slightly widen it in order to provide pedestrian access, crossing over the River Bourne.
- 7.5.13. The applicant has undertaken an external Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for the accesses which is submitted in the appendices of the Transport Assessment and its addendum. A Stage 1 Audit is an independent assessment of the key design and operating arrangements of the highway works. The Road Safety Audit identifies potential road safety issues or problems that

may affect all users of the highway and to recommend measures to eliminate or mitigate these problems. An Audit is based on the principals of the National Highways document, as described in the Design Manuals for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standard - GG119 Road Safety Audit. The audit has highlighted matters which need to be taken into account as part of the design of the proposed accesses, and measures to improve viability for access. All of the matters raised through the audit have been accepted by the applicant's team and the design has been formed having regard for this. The proposed accesses to the relevant buildings have therefore been shown to provide suitable access to the buildings which would not raise issues in terms of highway safety. The applicant will need to enter into a separate section 278 agreement with the highway authority to make alterations to the existing highway layout. At this stage the Highway Authority will ensure that a Stage 2 and 3 RSA is undertaken which looks at the detailed implementation of these measures, which includes removal of unused street furniture, cutting back trees to improve visibility and adding on street parking restrictions at the proposed access points as needed.

- 7.5.14. There have been a lot of local concerns from local residents that the scheme could result in increased HGV movements in the area and the potential impact this could have on highway safety. It should first be noted that currently there are HGV movements providing deliveries to the wider trading estate and there is nothing to indicate that this results in any highways safety issues. Notwithstanding this, the Highway Authority have requested that tracking of HGV's be shown at all local crossing points, and routes for pedestrians to demonstrate that any additional HGV's will not have any highways safety impacts for pedestrians. The submitted plans show that all HGV's can be accommodated on the local roads/junctions without causing any harm to pedestrians. However, to assist in highway safety and visibility the highway authority have recommended the single yellow line be upgraded to a double yellow line on the north side of Addlestone Road from the roundabout continuing along in front of the Mazda car showroom eastwards up to the railings on the bridge before the access to the building(s) 200 to help the movement of HGV's. The Highway Authority also request single lines be upgraded to new double lines along Hamm Moor Lane, from the roundabout to the proposed new vehicular access on Hamm Moor Lane on both sides of the road. It is noted that some of the representations have expressed concerns about pressures on existing on street parking. The increase of double yellow lines will result in the loss of what could be perceived as existing on street parking spaces. However, these double yellows are being proposed in order to improve highway visibility and safety in an area where concerns have been expressed. They would more than likely be necessary for any future development coming forward on this site (given this is positioned where there is an existing vehicle access).

Parking Considerations

- 7.5.15. Policy SD4 of the Local Plan states that parking standards for vehicle and cycle parking within development proposals will be assessed against the Council's current adopted guidance. The Council have recently adopted Parking Guidance SPD in November 2022. This guidance sets out recommended parking standards for different uses. However as set out above the uses being sought for permission vary in terms of the need for parking provision. The recommended parking for a B2 (general industry) use is 1 space per 30sqm with no lorry parking required and a warehouse (distribution) use would require 1 space per 100 sqm with 1 lorry space per 100sqm. This SPD sets out that some larger scale non-residential developments may benefit from a bespoke car parking scheme, appropriate to that use and/or its location, particularly when taking account of other policies and practices in place and which are associated with the operation of the development. In such circumstances, a site-specific parking and travel plan can take detailed account of the location of the development, the ability of people to walk, cycle or travel by public transport to the development and the policy of the institution to provide or subsidise public transport services, and/or restrict car travel to their site. It is considered that this is one of such planning applications where a bespoke car parking scheme is

necessary in order to ensure that the correct level of parking is provided to cater for such a wide-ranging uses which could take place.

- 7.5.16. A total of 77 car parking spaces for Unit 100 are proposed including 4 disabled bays, with 18 docking bays and a further 4 parking spaces for HGVs. 56 car parking spaces are proposed for the 200 buildings(s) also including 4 disabled bays, with x4 spaces large delivery vehicles.
- 7.5.17. The applicant's Transport Assessment and Addendums(s) have utilised the trips rates to predict the vehicular trip generated by the proposed development (B2 General Industry, B8 Warehousing, and/or E Light Industry) a TRICS based car parking accumulation has been undertaken which looks at parking demand for a 16 hours weekday period. This data shows that for the potential uses (excluding a parcel distribution centre), the maximum parking accumulation for the number of occupied spaces across the day would be 152 spaces. Therefore, there would be sufficient off-street parking to accommodate the likely vehicle movement associated with the proposed use.
- 7.5.18. However, when modelled against all the buildings being in a parcel distribution use the evidence showed that when all buildings were in such a use an additional 27 car parking spaces would be needed above the existing parking provision. The applicants are keen to show how this could be accommodated by creating further car parking spaces within the service yard of Building 100 in the event this was needed. This plan is shown in the Appendices of the most recent Transport Note dated 24.01.2023, provided by the applicant's highway consultant. This is not a proposed site plan, because this additional parking is not being proposed more generally as part of this planning application as a balance is needed between landscaping, parking and the day to day operations of the site. The indicative plans shown by the applicant would also result in further vehicle parking in a service compound area dedicated for HGV deliveries. Whilst the indicative plans submitted show this could be accommodated without any highway safety issues, it would be a less than desirable location and would only be necessary for one specific use. The highway authority has suggested this parking arrangement be secured by conditions were a parcel distribution use to come forward on this site, however officers do not believe this would meet the relevant tests for conditions. However, a Travel Plan will be required as part of this development (discussed further below). A Travel Plan would have to be secured by way of a planning obligation and legal agreement. As such it is considered that a clause in this legal agreement can be that were any of the buildings to be used as a parcel distribution centre that a further parking scheme should first be provided to show how any potential additional parking demands would be met within the site based on the details which have already been provided

Sustainable transport/ highways capacity considerations

- 7.5.19. Policy SD3 of Local Plan deals with Active and Sustainable Travel. This sets out that the Council will support proposals which enhance the accessibility and connectivity between people and places by active and sustainable forms of travel. This includes supporting developments which integrates with or provide new accessible, safe and attractive active and sustainable travel networks and routes to service and employment centres and rail interchanges. The policy also requires proposals which generate significant traffic movement to submit and implement Travel Plans demonstrating how active and sustainable travel options have been considered.
- 7.5.20. Ultimately a number of the likely uses associated with the proposed development could result in increased deliveries and HGV movements. The impact of this in terms of highway capacity or highway safety is considered above. However irrespective of the proposed uses there would be a number of employees working at the proposed buildings and it is important

to support that future users seek to utilise sustainable modes of transport.

- 7.5.21. There are pedestrian footways on both sides of the Addlestone Road carriageway serving all proposed access points to the site. Hamm Moor Lane also benefits from a pedestrian footway on both sides of the carriageway. The closest bus stops to the site are located on the A317 to the east of the A317/Link Road (southbound) junction, approximately 350m from the centre of the northern site and 325m from the centre of the southern site, all in walking distance of the site. This bus stop services the 461 which does provide a fairly frequent service runs between St Peters Hospital and Kingston (via Ottershaw, Addlestone, Weybridge and Walton). The site is also in walking distance of Addlestone Train Station with trains running between Weybridge and London, as well as the wider town station. There is also, to some lesser extent Weybridge Train Station (which has faster trains which run between London and Portsmouth). Overall, the site is in a fairly sustainable location where active and public transport modes can be utilised by those who work at the site.
- 7.5.22. A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted in support of this planning application which sets out ways in which staff can reduce the number of vehicle trips to any given site by promoting more sustainable travel options. This Framework Travel Plan seeks to encourage the promotion of walking and cycling. Unit 100 is providing a minimum of 40 cycle spaces, while Units 210 and Unit 220 are providing a minimum of 20 cycle parking spaces each. To support active transport cycle storage and shower facilities are proposed. This can be secured by way of condition.
- 7.5.23. In terms of public transport, travel packs are proposed for new employees to make them aware of options. In terms of monitoring and reporting it is suggested that the travel plan last for a 5 year period from commencement. The requirement of the overall travel plan would need to be secured by way of a planning obligation.
- 7.5.24. In terms of Electric vehicle charging points, the Energy Statement sets out that they will provide 10% active and 10% passive provision for staff car parking. However, this does not comply with the standards in Runnymede's Parking Standards SPD, Appendix 3, which reflects SCC's latest EV parking standards which the Local Plan directs development to be aligned with. For commercial development, at least 20% of available space is to be fitted with a fast-charge socket (i.e. active charging points); and a further 20% with the power supply to provide additional sockets (i.e.. passive charging points). The SPD also sets out how a minimum of one EV parking space is expected to be provided for disabled users. Conditions requiring details to comply with this provision is recommended.

Highways Conclusion

- 7.5.25. In conclusion, the transport movements associated with various uses which could take place at this site have been modelled. Even when assuming proposed HGV movements are equal to 2.5 car movements the proposed development is unlikely to result in any increase vehicle trips at peak hours above the existing use. Therefore, it is not considered the proposed development would result in severe pressures on highway capacity.
- 7.5.26. In terms of highway safety, the applicants have provided tracking information demonstrating that the proposal and the vehicles associated with potential future uses would not give rise to increased highway safety issues.
- 7.5.27. The proposed development provides a suitable level of off-street parking for the development proposed. Through Travel Plans and conditions mechanisms can be secured that in the event that a parcel distribution centre operates from any of these buildings further parking provision is required.

7.6. **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

- 7.6.1. As set out above the proposal is for flexible employment use and the operations which could take place under these uses employment uses vary significantly. The applicants are looking for the buildings to operate as flexibly as possible and that means the operations could take place 24 hours a day, seven days a week, however this will very much depend on the end user. As the end user is currently unknown the following officer assessment, in terms of impact on neighbouring amenity, is taken on a worst-case scenario.
- 7.6.2. The closest residential properties potentially affected by the proposed development include the residential properties located to the West of building 100, most notably Navigation House which form a block of residential flats with balconies facing Hamm Moor Lane and Weybridge Business Park across the road. There is also an upper floor flat above 14 Hamm Moor Lane where the ground floor is a cafe. Bourneside House, 66 Addlestone Road also has flats registered on the upper floor flats (above the Mazda Garage). Further along Addlestone Road and to the east of building 200 are a line of detached and semi detached houses the closest being New House and Bourneside. Across the canal is the residential property at Wey Meadows Farm.

Potential impact in terms of noise and disturbance

- 7.6.3. In addition to the above considerations the justification for policy EE1 highlights how the Government's Noise Policy Statement (NPSE) for England sets out the importance of promoting good health and quality of life through the effective management of noise in relation to sustainable development. The NPPG on Noise also sets out a noise exposure hierarchy of when action including mitigation, avoidance or prevention is likely to be required where external noise impacts exceed the Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) or the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL).
- 7.6.4. The NPPF (2021) requires new development to be appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impact resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life.
- 7.6.5. As set out above, the site forms part of a wider established business park and trading estate where currently vehicles and deliveries can come to and from sites without any limitations or restrictions. That being said, this proposal could introduce more industrial uses than those currently found at the site. Accordingly, the following assessment is regarding the potential impact on noise and disturbance due to the activities associated with the proposed development which could have an impact on the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties. However, the focus of this assessment is in terms of potential impact during late evenings, night-time, and early mornings and weekends where there would be an expectation of a greater level of amenity than that experienced during other times of the day.
- 7.6.6. A Noise Assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application and has identified potential noise receptors (albeit it has referred to the residential property now called Wey Meadows Farm as the former name of Blackboy Farm). The assessment has been undertaken on both daytime and night time periods.
- 7.6.7. Unit 100 will have 14 HGV docks on the eastern façade, as well as four level access doors, this design means that HGVs will be unloaded at the level access inside the building to enable any unloading with forklifts. Therefore, the primary sources of operational sound likely to be

produced by the proposed development has been identified as deliveries arriving and departing from the site and the loading and unloading operations. Unloading may use trolleys or forklifts *inside* the buildings or trailers and have been included in the source terms.

- 7.6.8. The Noise Assessment is however based on a number of assumptions including that the data provided to the noise consultants assumed there will be 58 HGVs in a day serving the northern site (buildings 200) and 79 HGVs serving the southern site (building 100). No indication of whether certain hours will be busier than others were provided to the assessors, so the Noise Assessment has made some assumptions on how many HGVs in the worst-case hours using the traffic predictions and the number of loading/unloading docks shown on the plans. For building 100 a maximum of eight HGVs arriving and unloading have been assumed in the daytime assessment period and two during the night-time period. A single HGV loading/unloading event is likely to take longer than the 15-minute assessment period and so during the night-time the HGV loading/unloading events have been assumed to last for the whole assessment period.
- 7.6.9. The predicted noise rating levels at nearby residential properties have been assessed based on existing background noise levels. The industry recognises standards of BS4142:2014+A1:2019 outlines that a *'difference of around +5 decibel is likely to be an indication of an adverse impact, depending on the context'*. The Noise Assessment demonstrates that the level of background noise to properties along Hamm Moor Lane would be reduced based on this proposal, as the position of the buildings effectively acts like acoustic barriers. In contrast there would be a greater impact of noise on properties along Addlestone Road, closest to the access points of both building 100 and building(s) 200.
- 7.6.10. In order to mitigate against this impact a 4.5m high acoustic fence is proposed on the southwestern corner of the part of the site serving building(s) 200 to minimise noise impact. No mitigation was initially proposed to reduce any impact on the occupiers of Wey Meadow Farm. This is because the applicant's submission claims that because the assessment shows that the proposal would result in a +4.5 decibel increase at night-time, as this falls below the 5 decibel increase highlighted in the above standard they consider that mitigation is not required. However, the above standards state that a +5 decibel is likely to be an indication of an adverse impact, officers struggle to understand how the same position could not be advised for an increase on 0.5 decibels below this advice and the Council's Environmental Health Officer has, in their initial response raised concerns regarding this. The applicants noise consultants has responded to this, but their response does not fully assist and has simply suggested the installation of a 0.5m high acoustic fence in order to comply with the relevant criteria for assessing such matters as set out above. Officers have requested that the applicants provide a 2m high acoustic boundary along the entirety of this elevation (as opposed to that only proposed to part of the elevation) to reduce noise impact. The applicants have agreed to this and confirmed their noise consultant believes this would translate to a reduction of 3-4db to Wey Meadow Farm and would therefore make a genuine contribution toward reducing noise impact (as opposed to simply looking at measures to argue below the need for any mitigation). Details of this can be secured by way of condition.
- 7.6.11. Building 100 and the associated service yard backs onto the Wey Navigation moorings. The maximum time that boats can stay at the moorings is 48 hours and as such these are not considered to represent residential properties whereby wider amenity considerations would need to take place for the purpose of planning applications.

Potential impact in terms of loss of light and/or overbearing impact

- 7.6.12. Policy EE1 sets out that "all development proposals will be expected to ensure no adverse impact ...to neighbouring property or uses". The Runnymede Design SPD states that "All dwellings must be designed with high quality internal and external space, in an appropriate

layout, to accommodate different lifestyles and a range of private and communal activities. Accommodation must be designed to provide suitable levels of natural daylight and sunlight to new and existing properties ...”. The document also provides further guidance of such matters including, sunlight and privacy.

- 7.6.13. Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework also sets out that all proposals are expected to provide high standard of amenity for all existing and future users.
- 7.6.14. In support of this planning application a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been submitted which is based on industry recognised British Research Establishment (BRE) standard guidelines. The BRE guidelines do not distinguish between urban or rural locations, so as a guide for a suburban location the BRE standards can offer a good base line for assessing potential impact in a location such as this. The applicants have confirmed that this assessment has regard for all boundary treatments including the 4.5m high acoustic fence which is located on the south-eastern corner of the building 200 site, close to the boundary with New House.
- 7.6.15. In terms of daylighting, the assessment has looked at the amount of light which reaches neighbouring *windows* (Vertical Sky Component- VSC). The target figure for VSC recommended by the BRE is 27% to provide a “relatively good level of daylight” for habitable rooms with windows on principal elevations. The BRE guide also sets out an assessment of Daylight Distribution, this test deals with the line that divides the point which you can and cannot see the sky (also referred to as “No-Sky Line”- NSL). For existing buildings, the BRE guide states that if, following the construction of a new development, the NSL moves so that the area beyond the NSL increases by more than 20%, then daylighting is likely to be seriously affected. Together these tests look to ensure that existing windows maintains a suitable level of daylight.
- 7.6.16. In terms of daylighting, the report shows that the proposed development would affect the level of daylight received to both properties in Navigation House and 14 Hamn Moor Lane (the flat above Sophie’s café), both positioned some 25- 30m from the proposed development at the closest point and New House to the east of Building 200. However, in terms of the level of daylighting (the Vertical Sky Component) all windows would retain a good level of lighting (i.e., over 27% VSC) apart from one window, located on the ground floor of Navigation House, this window would receive 26% lighting i.e., 1% below the level which is considered would still offer an “acceptable level of daylight” and as such falls only marginally below the target figure.
- 7.6.17. In terms of the second test listed above, Daylight Distribution assessment, the level in which you can see the sky from both flats in Navigation House and 14 Hamn Moor Lane would also be affected by the proposed development. Of the 18 windows facing the development in Navigation House, the impact on 14 of these windows would be within the BRE standard guidelines for ensuring that the proposed development would retain a suitable level of lighting. 4 of these windows are located within Navigation House and serve living/kitchen spaces. These rooms within Navigation house are themselves deep and contain returns towards their rear sections, which are already unable to receive direct skylight. In summary whilst the proposed development does affect the amount of skylight these rooms receive, the existing shape of the rooms has an impact on their ability to meet the target.
- 7.6.18. Of the two windows in the upper floor flat of 14 Hamm Moor Lane neither of the windows would comply with the BRE guidance. The guidance suggests that more than a 20% reduction would result in an impact on daylighting to a room. This proposal would result in a 35% and 25% reduction in the level of lighting these rooms afford. The applicant’s assessment has sought to justify the impact on the upper floor flat of 14 Hamm Moor Lane

as they understand that these windows serve bedrooms where 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. This guidance is acknowledged, although it is important to recognise that a level of amenity should still be maintained for bedrooms.

- 7.6.19. Turning to the potential impact on sunlight, a building's window's orientation and the overall position of a building on a site will have an impact on the sunlight it receives but, importantly, will also have an effect on the sunlight neighbouring buildings receive. Unlike daylight, which is non-directional and assumes that light from the sky is uniform, the availability of sunlight is dependent on direction. The assessment shows that whilst the proposed development would affect the level of light in Navigation House and the upper floor flats of Bourneside House (the flats above the Mazda Garage) these would still fall within the target values recommended in the BRE guide for both, summer and winter months for sunlight amenity and therefore no objection is raised on this account.
- 7.6.20. In terms of overshadowing on amenity space etc, the proposed modelling demonstrates that the proposed development would not result in a significant overshadowing on adjoining properties amenity space. The mitigation described above would result in a 4.5m high acoustic fence to the south eastern corner of the site forming part of the building(s) 200. However, given the orientation between this part the site and New House, as well as the separation distance it is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant overbearing impact on the amenities of the occupiers of this property.
- 7.6.21. Wey Meadows Farm is positioned some 70+ metres from this application site and so the amenities of this property would not be affected in terms of overlooking/ overbearing impact

Potential impact in terms of lighting

- 7.6.22. A detailed External Lighting Assessment Report and lighting scheme has been submitted in support of this planning application, prepared by MBA consulting engineers. These documents seek to demonstrate how suitable lighting can be delivered without causing undue disturbance which would affect the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties. A light overspill diagram has also been submitted as part of this assessment.
- 7.6.23. Overall, the details provided shows how any potential light spill over the boundaries into adjoining areas has been kept to the minimum. No lighting overspill will extend into the residential properties across Hamm Moor Lane. The greatest level of lighting overspill would be at the access to building(s) 200 and the area of land between the access bridge over the River Bourne and New House. Any lighting to the access of building 100 across Addlestone Road is designed as such to prevent any undue lighting overspill to properties across the road.
- 7.6.24. Wey Meadows Farm is positioned some 70+ metres from this application site and so whilst the lighting will be seen from this property it is not considered that it would affect their amenity.

Neighbouring Amenity Conclusions

- 7.6.25. In summary, the applicant has provided a number of supporting documents and assessments which provide evidence on the potential impact on the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties. This includes a noise assessment which demonstrates that subject to mitigation measures, notably the installation of acoustic fences at various site boundaries the proposed development would not result in a significant increase of noise over existing background levels, particularly at night-time.

- 7.6.26. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted in support of this planning application does show that the level of daylighting to habitable rooms *windows* would not be unduly impacted upon by the proposed development (i.e., the Vertical Sky Component). In terms of the second test, the Daylight Distribution assessment, the proposed development would result in a reduction in the level of daylighting some rooms receive in both the flat at 14 Hamm Moor Lane and the flats in Navigation House. Whilst recognising this, given the proposal largely complies with the Vertical Sky Component Assessment and as both Navigation House and 14 Hamm Moor Lane are also both positioned some 25 to 30 m from the proposed development, it is not considered that the reduction in the level of daylight to these rooms would be significant as to warrant refusal.
- 7.6.27. In terms of external lighting, this site is located on the edge of a suburban setting where there is already some level of background lighting. The supporting lighting assessment shows that any potential lighting overspill will largely be contained to the site and lighting overspill has been designed to minimise impact on residential properties.

7.7. **Flooding Considerations**

7.7.1. The need for the Sequential and Exception Test

- 7.7.2. The site is in flood zone 2, partly in flood zone 3a and the access to the “200” buildings go over the River Bourne (as existing) which is in flood zone 3B. The NPPF (2021), as well as policy EE13 of the Local Plan sets out how to consider the principle of such development in the flood zone. As the proposal is for a conforming use on an allocated site, i.e., is a proposed employment scheme on designated Strategic Employment Land the Sequential Test is not required.
- 7.7.3. The proposal would fall within the category of “less vulnerable” development. As set out in the National Planning Guidance which supports the NPPF (2021) the Exception Test is not required for development located in flood zone 2 or 3a. The Exception Test is required for development located in flood zone 3b. the proposed access to building 200 is over the River Bourne. Whilst part of the development proposal includes the carriageway being extended from 5.6m to 6.8m in width with a 1.2m footway on the eastern side the proposal would not result in the introduction of a more vulnerable *use* in the functional flood plain, it only seeks to improve an existing access arrangement currently in situ to such an existing use. Therefore, it is not considered that Exception Test is required for the proposal.

Flood protection and mitigation

- 7.7.4. Policy EE13: Managing Flood Risk identifies that development must not materially impede the flow of floodwater, reduce the capacity for the flood plain to store water or cause new or exacerbate existing flood problems. In addition, the NPPF (2021) requires that development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where; the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk within the site; is appropriately flood resistant and resilient; incorporates sustainable drainage systems, any residual risk can be safely managed, and safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate.
- 7.7.5. A flood risk assessment has been submitted as part of this planning application, prepared by HDR Consulting as well as an Addendum. This report sets out how the proposed development would not result in a loss of flood storage compensation and that there would be no material change in flood flow path under the proposed development layout. It should be noted that the Environment Agency have objected on these grounds as they consider that proposed Unit 100 could present an obstruction which could impede flood flow thereby increasing the risk of flooding to the surrounding area. It should be noted that this objection was based on the initial plans and position of this building. The applicants have since provided updated evidence

based on the revised position and have sought to show how the proposed development would not affect flood flow. The Environment Agency were reconsulted on the revised plans in October 2022. They had advised that a response would be provided by 31 Jan 2023 however at the timing of writing the EA have not yet provided a formal response but have indicated a response should be forthcoming. Members will be updated on this position as part of any forthcoming Addendum.

- 7.7.6. In terms of being is appropriately flood resistant and resilient the details provided show that the existing site levels are higher than the EA's flood modelling for the potential highest flood level on the site. Due to this the proposed finished floor level of the units would be above any likely flood levels and thus due to this would be appropriately flood resistance/resilient. Safe access and egress during the flood event can also be achieved.
- 7.7.7. In terms of managing any residual risk, based on the details provided it is considered that the site has a low risk of flooding from fluvial sources and any residual risk from flooding is limited.

Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs)

- 7.7.8. In terms of Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs), Policy EE13 of the Local Plan requires all new development to ensure that sustainable drainage systems are used for the management of surface water unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. Paragraph 169 of NPPF (2021) states that all 'major' planning applications must incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. SuDS must be properly designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation costs are proportionate and sustainable for the lifetime of the development.
- 7.7.9. In accordance with The Flood and Water Management Act 2010, Surrey County Council in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), is a statutory consultee for all major applications. The proposed SuDs strategy involves; below-ground storage systems and an above-ground basin be used at source to attenuate runoff to the equivalent of a greenfield rate prior to discharge into the Addlestone Bourn watercourse. The LLFA is satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements set out in the above policies. This is subject to recommended conditions 8 (surface water drainage) and 12 (drainage verification).
- 7.7.10. Overall, the proposed development is considered to demonstrate it would not cause new or exacerbate existing flooding problems, either on the proposed development site or elsewhere. The risk of flooding is also considered to be low and a suitable drainage strategy can be employed subject to conditions already set out above.

7.8. Ecology and biodiversity

- 7.8.1. Policies SD7 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan sets out that development proposal will be supported where they protect existing biodiversity and include opportunities to achieve net gain in biodiversity. Policy EE9 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan also sets out that the Council will seek net gains in biodiversity, through the creation/expansion, restoration, enhancement, and management of habitats and species, especially where adjacent to trees and hedgerows protected by a Tree Preservation Order.
- 7.8.2. Paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity and paragraph 180 sets out that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design.
- 7.8.3. It is therefore necessary for proposed development to first protect and avoid against any impact on ecology, where this is not possible mitigation should be necessary they should

then mitigate and then provide biodiversity net gains. The submission by the applicants includes a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Biodiversity Metric 3.0 Calculation Tool and a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan.

- 7.8.4. The site where building 100 would be positioned is largely laid to hardstanding with some limited landscaping. However, the areas where the 200 buildings are located the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies that the woodland and hedgerow habitats are considered to represent Habitats of Principal Importance and therefore are proposed to be retained.
- 7.8.5. Instances of Jersey cudweed were identified in the northern Site parcel. This species is protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and it is an offence to intentionally pick, uproot or destroy this plant. A licence will need to be obtained from Natural England to take Schedule 8 plants (such as Jersey cudweed) for conservation purposes. An appropriate mitigation strategy will need to be agreed with Natural England as part of this licence. Surrey Wildlife Trust advise that these details should be provided up front as part of this planning application. However, such matters are dealt with under separate licenses and not for planning to replicate.
- 7.8.6. In terms of nearby sites, the Site is located immediately adjacent to the River Wey. Given the proximity of these watercourses, pollutants and dust associated with construction works are likely to run into these waterways. Additionally, the Woburn Park Stream SNCI is located within 0.5km of the Site boundary, which would also be at risk from pollutants and dust from construction. Mitigation measures during the construction phase of the development can be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) a draft document has been submitted as part of the planning application and full details can be secured through conditions.
- 7.8.7. Whilst there are no identified protected species on this site the proposed development has the potential to impact on local wildlife, including hedgehogs during construction. Again, such details can be secured through the CEMP.
- 7.8.8. In terms of biodiversity net gain the site, the proposed habitats include species rich grassland, introduced shrubs, riparian planting, mixed scrub and scattered trees, with enhancements to existing areas of woodland. Overall, the proposed landscaping plan would result in a biodiversity net gain in excess of 60% on the existing site value.
- 7.8.9. It should also be noted that the Environment Agency have also raised an objection in terms of the impacts on nature conservation and there not being an adequate buffer zone to the Addlestone Bourne (which is adjacent to the part of the site forming building(s) 200). Officers are unaware of any policy forming a certain buffer zone regarding the River Bourne and in any event the current development on site is all laid to hardstanding along this boundary. In contrast, this proposal would increase planting and biodiversity enhancements. An overshadowing assessment has also now been provided for building(s) 200 which show the buildings and the 4.5m high acoustics fence, all located north of the River Bourne, and as such any overshadowing would be limited. In addition, the site boundaries as existing are defined by woodland planting, which is not assessed as part of overshadowing assessments and is proposed to be retained and enhanced as part this planning application. Thus, it can be concluded that the proposal in terms of built form would result in less development adjacent to this river and the built form also would not result in any increased overshadowing on the water course.
- 7.9. **Renewable Energy**
- 7.9.1. New development is expected to demonstrate how it has incorporated sustainable principles

into the development including construction techniques, renewable energy, green infrastructure and carbon reduction technologies.

- 7.9.2. Policy SD8: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy sets out that new development will be expected to demonstrate how the proposal follows the energy hierarchy (Be lean; use less energy, Be clean; supply energy efficiently and Be green; use renewable energy). For a scheme of this scale, it is also expected for the development to incorporate measures to supply a minimum of 10% of the development's energy needs from renewable and/or low carbon technologies. In addition, development proposing 10,000sqm - 50,000sqm of net additional floorspace should consider whether connection to existing renewable, low-carbon or decentralised energy networks is possible.
- 7.9.3. Despite there being no explicit policy requirement for non-residential developments in the Borough to achieve a BREEAM rating, the proposed development seeks to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent' as a means of demonstrating that sustainable design and energy considerations have been comprehensively addressed.
- 7.9.4. The design stage BREEAM pre-assessment submitted in Appendix A of the applicant's energy statement suggests that the proposal is on track to achieve an excellent rating. A planning condition can secure a final post-construction certificate be submitted to the Council upon completion/occupation. The Energy Statement also demonstrates that the 10% renewable energy requirement has been exceeded at this design stage, primarily by using air source heat pumps (ASHPs) and solar Photo Voltaic panels. In conclusion, the proposed energy and sustainability measures are acceptable in order to achieve the requirements of Policies SD7 and SD8.

7.10. **Other Considerations**

Air quality

- 7.10.1. In terms of air quality, the site is not within an Air Quality Management Area (although Addlestone Town Centre is in one). Nonetheless an Air Quality Assessment and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) have been submitted in support of this planning application. This states that the development will seek to minimise possible disruption to the adjacent properties and the public and to reduce the impact of activities on air quality during construction. It is proposed that this will be undertaken by utilising measures set out in best practice for minimising noise, dust and vibration control on construction sites. The CEMP can be secured by way of recommended condition 6 (Construction and Environment Management Plan). The above assessments on highways matters set out the considerations regarding sustainable modes of transport which will seek to reducing the need for private vehicles and thereby the wider impact on Air Quality.

Contaminated Land

- 7.10.2. Policy EE2 seeks, where relevant, contaminated land surveys are to be submitted as part of applications to determine the source of any pollutants and any remedial measures necessary. Paragraphs 174 and 183 of the NPPF (2021) seek to ensure that through decision making that suitable land remediation is secured through redevelopment.
- 7.10.3. A Phase I Geoenvironmental and Geotechnical Site Assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application. The overall conclusions are that the site historically operated as a saw mill, works buildings, a depot, business park, and residential property. There is potential for contamination related to these operations to have impacted underlying soils and groundwater, however the assessment considers that potential migration pathways may be limited due to the presence of sitewide hardstanding. However further investigation is required to determine whether they have impacted underlying soils and groundwater. In addition, there is potential for Made Ground (Ground is of unknown origin) at the Site which

could possibly contain contaminants such as asbestos, heavy metals, and hydrocarbons.

- 7.10.4. It is not considered that the proposed commercial warehouses would introduce more sensitive receptors on the site and development design features such as site wide hardstanding and ground gas mitigation may provide protection to human health without the requirement to perform active remediation of contamination. However, the outcome of the report was that further investigation was needed to determine whether there is contamination present that could present a risk to controlled waters and would require remediation. The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has reviewed the report and is satisfied with the assessments. The above matters can all be secured through suitably worded Contaminated Land conditions requiring further ground investigations before any approved works are undertaken at the site.

Archaeology

- 7.10.5. As the application site is over the 0.4 hectares an archaeological assessment and evaluation is required under policy EE7 of the Local Plan. A desk-based assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application that contains a review of information currently held in the Surrey Historic Environment Record together with other relevant sources in order to determine the potential for significant archaeological remains to be present.
- 7.10.6. The assessment indicates that that the site has a theoretical potential to contain archaeological remains, and some fragments of Iron Age pottery were recorded during foundation digging in 1915, but that successive redevelopment of the site will have caused extensive and widespread disturbance to any potential archaeological remains
- 7.10.7. The Archaeological Officer at SCC has confirmed that the site has been comprehensively developed several times in the past and that a previous application for a large part of the current site clearly shows extensive areas of modern made ground over the area. On this basis it is very unlikely that significant archaeology will be present on this site and no further archaeological investigations are required.

8. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS/COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 8.1. In line with the Council's Charging Schedule the proposed development would be CIL liable- the rate for such a development in our adopted charging schedule is however £0.
- 8.2. As set out above the following planning obligations are considered necessary in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms:
- Travel Plan which shall include that, in the event any of the buildings are brought into a use which would fall within a "Parcel Distribution Centre" use an updated parking layout plan shall be submitted to and an approved in writing to show additional parking necessary to support this use in line with the details submitted in the Transport Note prepared by Mode Transport dated 24.01.2023.
 - £6150 Travel Plan auditing fee.
 - Prior to the occupation of any building by a new user a Delivery Service Management Plan to be submitted to deal with the following:
 - Demonstrate that goods and services can be achieved, and waste removed,

in a safe, efficient and environmentally-friendly way.

- Identify deliveries that could be reduced, re-timed or even consolidated, particularly during busy periods. Improve the reliability of deliveries to the site.
- Reduce the operating costs of occupants and freight companies.
- Reduce the impact of freight activity on local residents and the environment.
- To be updated every year for the first 3 years of any new occupier of the relevant building.

9. EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATION

- 9.1. Consideration has been given to Articles 1 and 8 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights. It is not considered that the decision would result in a violation of any person's rights under the Convention.

Consideration has been given to s149 of the Equality Act 2010 (as amended), which has imposed a public sector equality duty that requires a public authority in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to:

- a. Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act
- b. Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- c. Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

It is considered that the decision would have regard to this duty.

10. CONCLUSIONS

- 10.1. The principle of the development is acceptable and would bring vacant (but previously developed land) back into an employment generating use and provide intensification of use to deliver increase employment floorspace. These are key benefits which weigh significantly in favour of the proposed development.
- 10.2. The transport movements associated with various uses which could take place at this site have been modelled and shows that the proposed development would not result in severe pressures on highway capacity or raises any issues in terms of highway safety. The proposed development provides a suitable level of off-street parking for the development proposed. Through Travel Plans and conditions mechanism can be secure that the event a parcel distribution centre operates from any of these buildings further parking provision is required.
- 10.3. In terms of the impact on neighbouring amenity subject to mitigation measures, notably the installation of acoustic fences at various site boundaries the proposed development would not result in a significant increase of noise over existing background levels. The daylight and

sunlight assessment submitted in support of this planning application does show that the level of daylighting to habitable rooms windows would not be unduly impacted on by the proposed development. However, the proposed development would result in some reduction in the level of daylighting some rooms in both in the flat at 14 Hamm Moor Lane and the flats in Navigation House would have. Overall, whilst it is considered that the impact on daylight would result in limited harm, which weighs against the development, this would not be so significant to warrant refusal

- 10.4. In terms of lighting, this site is located on the edge of a suburban setting where there is already some level of background lighting. The supporting lighting assessment shows that any potential lighting overspill will largely be contained to the site and lighting overspill has been designed to minimise impact on residential properties.
- 10.5. The proposed development is considered an acceptable form of development in terms of flooding and air quality. The proposed development seeks to include Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and would not have an adverse impact on ecology and proposed biodiversity net gains. It is not considered that the proposed development raises any other environmental issues.
- 10.6. The development has been assessed against the relevant policies in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, the policies of the NPPF, guidance in the PPG, and other material considerations including third party representations. When applying the usual planning balance, it is considered that the significant benefits associated with this development including meeting the local plan objectives in terms of employment need and bringing an underutilised site back into use, as well as making efficient use of land, the notable energy benefits associated with this scheme which go beyond local plan policy as well as the 20% biodiversity net gains outweighs any identified harm. The harm identified is the impact on the levels of daylight to some of the nearby flats from the proposed building located some 25 to 30 m away. The decision has been taken in compliance with the requirement of the NPPF to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

11. FORMAL OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation Part A:

The CHDMBC be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the Environment Agency Withdrawing their objection to the development and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following obligations:

1. Travel Plan which shall include that, in the event any of the buildings are brought into a use which would fall within a “Parcel Distribution Centre” use an updated parking layout plan shall be submitted to and an approved in writing to show additional parking necessary to support this use in line with the details submitted in the Transport Note prepared by Mode Transport dated 24.01.2023.
2. £6150 Travel Plan auditing fee.
3. Prior to the occupation of any building by a new user a Delivery Service Management Plan to be submitted to deal with the following:

- Demonstrate that goods and services can be achieved, and waste removed, in a safe, efficient and environmentally-friendly way.
- Identify deliveries that could be reduced, re-timed or even consolidated, particularly during busy periods. Improve the reliability of deliveries to the site.
- Reduce the operating costs of occupants and freight companies.
- Reduce the impact of freight activity on local residents and the environment.
- To be updated every year for the first 3 years of any new occupier of the relevant building.

And the subject to the following planning conditions:

Recommended conditions

1. Standard three year time limit

The development for which planning permission is hereby granted must be commenced no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of Part 4 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Approved Plan

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved the drawings as set out in the submitted the document titled "Planning Drawing Schedule" dated 24/10.2022. This includes finish floor levels.

Reason: To ensure high quality design and to comply with Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance in the NPPF.

3. Tree Protection

The development hereby approved (including demolition) shall be undertaken in accordance with the tree protection details as shown in the Arboricultural Method Statement and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (and its associated appendices) prepared by Linga Consultancy and dated 14/10/2022.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the any tree protection details for the duration of the construction of the development.

Reason: To ensure the retention of trees in the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to accord with Policy EE11 of the Local Plan.

4. Land Affected by Potential 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 (i) to (iv) or otherwise agreed remedial measures 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 Condition (iv) has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

(i) Site Characterisation No development must take place until an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and shall assess any contamination on the site whether or not it originates on the site. The report of the findings must include:

(a) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(b) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes
- adjoining land
- ground waters and surface waters
- ecological systems
- archaeological sites and ancient monuments

(ii) Submission of Remediation Scheme If found to be required no development shall take place until 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 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, an appraisal and remedial options, proposal of the preferred option(s), a 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.

(iii) Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme If found to be required, the remediation scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works. Upon completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be submitted to the local planning authority.

(iv) 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 and once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination, development must be halted on that part of the site. An assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition (i) or otherwise agreed and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme, together with a timetable for its implementation must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the requirements of Condition (ii) in the form of a Remediation Strategy which follows the .gov.uk

LCRM approach. The measures in the approved remediation scheme must then be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a validation (verification) plan and report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with Condition (iii)

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with guidance in the NPPF.

5. Construction Transport Management Plan

A. Prior to commencement of any development (including demolition) a *Demolition* Transport Management Plan (DEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

B. Prior to commencement of any development (excluding demolition) a *Construction* Transport Management Plan (CEMP)

Both documents shall detail the following:

- parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials
- programme of works (including measures for traffic management)
- provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- HGV deliveries and hours of operation
- vehicle routing
- measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
- before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
- on-site turning for construction vehicles

Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details for construction of the development.

Reason: in the interest of highway safety and to satisfy the Runnymede Local Plan (2030) policies Policy SD3: Active & Sustainable Travel, Policy SD4: Highway Design Considerations, Policy SD5: Infrastructure Provision & Timing, Policy SD7: Sustainable Design.

6. Construction and Environment Management Plan

A. Prior to commencement of any development (including demolition) a *Demolition* and Environment Management Plan (DEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

B. Prior to commencement of any development (excluding demolition to ground floor slab level) a *Construction* and Environment Management Plan (CEMP)

Both documents shall detail how protected habitats and species, including woodland features will be protected from any adverse impacts as a result of construction and should be based on the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan prepared by Air and Acoustic Consultants. The DEMP and CEMP should include adequate details including:

- Map showing the location of all of the ecological features
- Risk assessment of the potentially damaging construction activities
- Practical measures to avoid and reduce impacts during construction including dust and air quality
- Location and timing of works to avoid harm to biodiversity features
- Responsible persons and lines of communication
- Use of protected fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details for construction of the development.

Reason: In the interest of protecting potential ecological value and species in the site as required by Policies EE9, EE11 and EE12 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

7. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan

Prior to commencement of any development (excluding demolition) a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, this includes a sensitive lighting plan that as a minimum, keeps the River Wey and River Bourne. The LEMP should be based on the proposed impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment prepared by MKA Ecology and dated October 2022 and should include, but not be limited to following:

- Description and evaluation of features to be managed
- Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management
- Aims and objectives of management
- Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives
- Prescriptions for management actions, together with a plan of management compartments
- Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period
- Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan
- Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures
- Legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the applicant with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.
- Monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.
- Sensitive Lighting Plan
- Ecological Enhancement Plan

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details for construction of the development.

Reason: In the interest of protecting potential ecological value and species in the site as required by policy EE9 of the Local Plan

8. Surface water drainage scheme

Prior to commencement of any development, excluding demolition, details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national NonStatutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:

- Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 & 1 in 100 (+20% allowance for climate change) storm events, during all stages of the development. The final solution should follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. Associated discharge rates and storage volumes shall be provided using a maximum discharge rate of 7.34 l/s for the southern site and 2.3 l/s for the northern site.
- Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout that follows the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.).
- A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e. during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk
- Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system.
- Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site.

9. Materials

Prior to commencement of any development above ground level (on a phased basis or otherwise), a detailed schedule and specification of the materials and finishes to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:

- Cladding;
- Windows and doors
- Roofing materials;
- Details of all rooftop structures including plant, lift overruns, cleaning cradles (as relevant);
- Plant enclosures (as relevant)

Sample boards on site showing the above as relevant shall be provided at the same time as an application is made.

The development shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the

approved details.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of amenity of the Grade II Listed Building and to comply with Policy EE1, EE3 and EE4 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

10. Landscaping

Notwithstanding the approved plans or any indication given otherwise, prior to any works above ground level full details of hard and soft landscaping scheme (including full details of acoustic boundary treatments) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This shall include a 'schedule of undertaking' the proposed works and samples of all hard surfacing, as well as a plan for the long terms management of the landscaped areas.

All approved landscaping details shall be undertaken and completed in accordance with the approved 'schedule of undertaking.'

All approved landscaping works shall be retained in accordance with the approved details. If within a period of five years from the date of planting of any tree or shrub shown on the approved landscaping plan, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the immediate vicinity, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its prior written permission to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the development is adequately landscaped and to comply with Policy EE9, EE11 and EE12 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

11. BREEAM

Following the practical completion of the relevant building a Post Construction BREEAM Review Certificate showing that the development is on course to meet an at least "Very Good" accreditation shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Any features that are installed in the development to meet this standard must remain for as long as the development is in existence.

Reason: To ensure sustainable measures are incorporated into the development and to comply with Policy SD8 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

12. Drainage verification

Prior to first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water

attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls).

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS.

13. Proposed Access

Prior to the relevant building hereby approved being brought into first use the modified vehicular accesses to Addlestone Road and Hamm Moor Lane (to access the relevant building) shall have been constructed and provided with visibility zones in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 0.6m high.

Reason: in the interest of highway safety and to satisfy the Runnymede Local Plan (2030) policies Policy SD3: Active & Sustainable Travel, Policy SD4: Highway Design Considerations, Policy SD5: Infrastructure Provision & Timing, Policy SD7: Sustainable Design.

14. Closure of existing access

Prior to building 100 being first brought into use the existing accesses from the site to Addlestone Road and Hamm Moor Lane shall have been permanently closed and any kerbs, verge, footway, fully reinstated.

Reason: in the interest of highway safety and to satisfy the Runnymede Local Plan (2030) policies Policy SD3: Active & Sustainable Travel, Policy SD4: Highway Design Considerations, Policy SD5: Infrastructure Provision & Timing, Policy SD7: Sustainable Design.

15. Vehicle parking

Prior to the relevant building hereby approved being brought into first use (on a phased basis or otherwise), details of the car parking allocated to that building shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The car parking spaces shall be laid in accordance with the approved details prior to the relevant building being brought into first use. Thereafter the parking and turning areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purposes.

Reason: in the interest of highway safety and to satisfy the Runnymede Local Plan (2030) policies Policy SD3: Active & Sustainable Travel, Policy SD4: Highway Design Considerations, Policy SD5: Infrastructure Provision & Timing, Policy SD7: Sustainable Design.

16. EVC Charging points

Prior to the occupation of the development (on a phased basis or otherwise), details of the proposed electric vehicle charging points (EVCPs), as shown on the approved plans, including details of how they will be managed, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved EVCPs, consisting of 20% active and 20% passive charging points, shall be installed prior to occupation and shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Active Electric Vehicle Charging point shall have a fast charge socket (current minimum requirements - 7 kw Mode 3 with Type 2 connector - 230v

AC 32 Amp single phase dedicated supply).

Reason: in the interest of sustainable development and to satisfy the Runnymede Local Plan (2030) policies Policy SD3: Active & Sustainable Travel, Policy SD4: Highway Design Considerations, Policy SD5: Infrastructure Provision & Timing, Policy SD7: Sustainable Design.

17. Scheme to support active travel

Prior to the relevant building hereby approved being brought into first use (on a phased basis or otherwise), full details to support active travel shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include:

- Details of the secure parking of bicycles within the development site,
- Facilities within the development site for cyclist to change into and out of cyclist equipment / shower,
- Facilities within the development site for cyclists to store cyclist equipment,

The approved arrangements shall be provided before any part of the development is first occupied and shall be permanently maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to provide adequate bicycle parking and mobility scooter facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car travel and ownership.

18. Parking Restrictions

Prior to any of the buildings hereby approved being brought into first use the proposed parking restrictions on Addlestone Road and Hamm Moor Lane and the associated Traffic Regulation Orders shall have been designed and implemented at the applicant's expense, in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to satisfy the Runnymede Local Plan (2030) policies Policy SD3: Active & Sustainable Travel, Policy SD4: Highway Design Considerations, Policy SD5: Infrastructure Provision & Timing, Policy SD7: Sustainable Design.

Recommended informatives:

1. Discharge of conditions application

The applicant(s) are advised that formal agreement with the Local Planning Authority can only be undertaken through an application for the discharge of conditions application. A decision on such applications can take up to 8 weeks. Such timeframes should be taken into account as part of the construction process. This will be longer if applicant(s) wish to submit additional information and/or revisions amendments to overcome issues and concerns raised. The Local Planning Authority will expect agreements to extend the timeframe to

consider discharge of conditions application where an applicant wishes to submit additional information and/or revisions amendments. Early engagement and pre-application discussions is encouraged to prevent lengthy delays.

2. Works to the Highway

The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme>. The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/floodingadvice.

3. Mud/debris on the highway

The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149). 3) Accommodation works The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition(s), the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

4. Detailed design of the highway

The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above conditions, the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.

5. Damage to the highway

The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels

or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

6. Landscaping

With reference to condition 10 (landscaping) details submitted shall be based on the Landscape Strategy and Landscaping Plan as set out in the Landscaping Drawing Schedule dated 21 Oct 2022, the mitigation measures set out in the Noise Assessment prepared by Air and Acoustic Consultants and the General Arrangement Plan Landscape numbered 8404_100 P£, as well as the email added 23.02.2022 agreeing 2.1m high acoustic fences on the boundary with the Wey Navigation.

The details submitted will need to include:

a full tree planting plan including detail of planting and schedules,

details of irrigation system within the site, including ground type of watering points.

Hard landscaping plans will include complete paving specification or various pavement elements, including thickness, colour etc.

Material samples should be provided as part of the condition

The landscaping proposal need to include reference to the suds/ drainage details and the requirements of condition 7 regarding the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan including the sensitive lighting plan.

7. Electric vehicle charging

With reference to condition 16 (EVC charging points) It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that any power balancing technology is in place if required. Please refer to: <http://www.beama.org.uk/resourceLibrary/beama-guide-to-electric-vehicle-infrastructure.html> for guidance and further information on charging modes and connector types.

With regards to the active points, the proposed method of payment for users should be specified. Additionally, the applicant will need to set out details of how EVCP's will be managed and maintained to meet the needs of intended users. The applicant should also address how parking spaces with EVCP's will be restricted for use by electric vehicles, when and how maintenance of EVCP will be carried out, and what procedures will be put in place to monitor EVCP use and trigger conversion of parking spaces from 'passive' to 'active' EVCP's.

Information regarding EV charging provision, capacity and future-proofing cabling/ducting, including opportunities for network upgrades to accommodate

increased demand, should also be provided.

With regards to the passive charging points, a ground level cap should be installed at each location to indicate the location of the cables. It is sometimes necessary to ensure that the passive charge points have their own separate distribution boards.

8. Flues and plant

For the avoidance of doubt and for clarification external flues, plant equipment and/or ducting are operational development which will require separate full planning permission (unless they are considered “de-minimus”).

Recommendation Part B:

The CHDMBC be authorised to refuse planning permission should the S106 not progress to his satisfaction or if any significant material considerations arise prior to the issuing of the decision notice that in the opinion of the CHDMBC would warrant refusal of the application. Reasons for refusal relating to any such matter are delegated to the CHDMBC.