

**COMMITTEE AGENDA REFERENCE: 5A**

<b>APPLICATION REF:</b>	<b>RU.23/1066</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	Weybridge Business Park, Addlestone Road, Addlestone, Surrey, KT15 2UP
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Demolition of existing buildings and the development of employment units (Classes E(g)ii, E(g)iii, B2 and B8) with ancillary office accommodation, vehicular accesses, associated external yard areas, car parking, servicing, external lighting, hard and soft landscaping, infrastructure, and all associated works.
<b>TYPE</b>	Full Planning Application
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	25/10/2023
<b>WARD</b>	Addlestone South
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Christine Ellera
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION</b>	Major planning application
<i>If you have questions about this report please contact Ashley Smith, Victoria Gibson or the case officer.</i>	

**1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

<b>It is recommended the Planning Committee authorises the HoP:</b>	
<b>A.</b>	<b>The HoP be authorised to grant planning permission subject to Active Travel England not raising any unresolved objections to the development and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and conditions as recommended in section 11 of this report. AND</b>
<b>B.</b>	<b>The HoP 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 HoP would warrant refusal of the application. Reasons for refusal relating to any such matter are delegated to the HoP.</b>

**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, formerly occupied by Toshiba accessed via a single entrance from Addlestone Road (over the River Bourne). This part of the site has been vacant since Autumn 2018.
- 2.2. 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. Units known as 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 and has been vacant since summer 2020.
- 2.3. Key constraints include:
  - Designated 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 x11 units (contained within 5 buildings). The site is split into two parts, plot 1 forming the “main” site to the south and plot 2 which is a more enclosed part of the planning application site where the former Toshiba offices are located.
- 3.2. The scheme on plot 1 is formed of 4 buildings:
  - Block A (containing of 3 units): up to a total width of 77m and 36m in length with a maximum height of 14.2m
  - Block B (containing 2 units): up to a total width of 64m and 39m in length with a maximum height of 14.4m (unit B1 also has a single storey projection)
  - Block C (containing 2 units): up to a total width of 61m and 34m in length with a maximum height of 13.5m
  - Block D (containing 2 units): up to a total width of 118m and 46m (max) in length with a maximum height of 16.2m(all dimensions approx.).
- 3.3. Plot 1 is designed with a central service area, with main access via Addlestone Road this service area access is positioned relatively central to the northern elevation of the site. Secondary access to the site are also proposed further along Addlestone Road, in a

relatively similar location to the existing access to Bridge House and also one along Hamm Moor Lane these secondary access points would be for cars. Overall, plot 1 provides a total of 107 car parking spaces (including 17 accessible parking spaces). The internal service yard can accommodate at least 25 lorries/ large vans.

- 3.4. Plot 2 to the north is formed of Block E (2 units) and is 95m in width and 35.5m (max) in length. The existing access to this site, over the River Bourne, is proposed to be widened to allow for vehicles to pass and also provide a pedestrian foot path. 48 Car parking spaces are proposed for this part of the site (including 4 accessible parking spaces) and space to park at least 5 lorries/ large vans.
- 3.5. Both units would provide 20% active Electric Vehicle charging parking spaces. All other parking spaces will be passive EVC to cater for potential future demand, this includes lorry parking bays.
- 3.6. 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.

- 3.7. The applicant is seeking planning permission for these buildings to have the ability to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

#### 4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1. The following history is considered relevant to this application:

Reference	Details
RU.23/1142	Prior approval for the demolition of 7no. office buildings. Prior approval Granted: 07/09/2023
RU.22/0776	<b>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</b>

	<b>works following the demolition of existing buildings. Refused: 24/03/2023</b>
<p>The above planning application was refused for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed 'Building 100' by reason of its position, form, scale, mass and significant bulk would result in an overtly prominent, dominant and visually overbearing form of development which would have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020), Runnymede Design Guide (2021), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the National Design Guide (2019).</li> <li>2. The proposed use would result in a loss of residential amenity to surrounding residential properties. This loss of amenity would be due to due noise and disturbance from both the on-site operations as well as disturbance from the likely significant numbers of comings and goings of large goods vehicles that the proposed uses would attract, particularly at anti-social hours of the day and night. This is contrary to Policy EE2 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the associated National Planning Policy Guidance relating to Noise and disturbance.</li> <li>3. In the absence of a completed legal agreement the proposed development has failed to secure the provision of the necessary infrastructure needed to make this development acceptable in planning terms. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies SD3, SD4, SD5 and EE9 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and its associated guidance.</li> </ol>	
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 history at adjoining sites is considered relevant to this application:

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 September 2023)- 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

6.1. Consultees responses can be summarised as follows:

Consultee	Comments
National Highways	No objection
Highway Authority	No objection subject to conditions
Active Travel England	No comments yet received (discussed further within the report due to an omission the consultation did not take place until later in the consideration process)
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection- We are satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements set out in the aforementioned documents and are content with the development proposed, subject to conditions.
Environment Agency	No comments received
Heritage Advisor	The proposals would constitute a scheme which would lead to 'less than substantial' harm to the Conservation Area and an assessment of public benefits to outweigh the harm will be needed.
Ecology advice (Surrey Wildlife Trust)	No objection subject to conditions
Environmental Health (noise)	No objection subject to conditions
Contaminated Land	No objection subject to conditions
Drainage Officer	No objection subject to conditions

Waste and recycling team	No comments to make
Archaeology Officer	No objection
Surrey Fire and Rescue Service	No objection
National Trust	No comments received
Secured by Design (Surrey Police)	No comments received
Thames Water	No objection
Network Rail	No comments to make
Elmbridge Borough Council	No objection- but do wish to highlight that Weybridge is an Air Quality Management Area

6.2. Representations and comments from interested parties:

6.3. 557 Neighbouring properties were consulted on this planning application (this includes every address whom made a representation on the last planning application). In addition to being advertised on the Council's website a notification was also placed in the local press and x5 site notices were placed at different places around the site.

Following this consultation exercise 283 letters of representation have been received. Comments made can be summarised as follows:

- Proposed development would be visually overbearing on the wider area including the Wey Navigation
- Development out of character with the area
- Impact on Heritage Assets and the Wey Navigation
- Concerns about traffic and congestion resulting from the proposed development in the locality and wider area
- Cumulative impact regarding congestion
- Concerns about highway safety from more vehicle on the road including increased HGV's and concerns about pedestrian safety from increased vehicles, including those walking to and from local schools
- Insufficient parking for the proposed development
- Queries the robustness of the submitted Transport Assessment
- Concerns about noise relating to the 24-hour operations of the proposed development
- Increase in noise, air pollution to wider area
- Loss of light, noise and disturbance and overbearing impact on those living in adjoining houses and flats

- Concerns about cumulative impact were other businesses to open 24 hours a day.
- Object to the noise and disturbance associated with the construction process
- Impact on ecological and local wildlife both at construction and at operational stage.
- Insufficient infrastructure including drainage to support the development
- Increased pressures on local services

## **7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **7.1. Introduction**

7.1.1. Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material circumstances indicate otherwise. With reference to the above planning history, this is a revised scheme following the refusal of planning application RU.22/0776. There's been no material change in planning policy since this previous decision which would affect the consideration of this scheme and conditions on site have not changed. Accordingly, the grounds for refusing the previous planning application on this site form a strong and material consideration when assessing a revised scheme.

7.1.2. In making this assessment officers have had regard for the fact that no objection was previously raised in principle regarding the proposed uses under the last planning application. Furthermore, 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 and that Policy IE3 promotes business competitiveness and allow for flexibility to cater for the changing needs of the economy. 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. This is a benefit which weighs in favour of the scheme and will be considered further below as part of the planning balance.

7.1.3. Therefore, the key considerations are if this revised planning application overcomes the previous grounds for refusal and/or if the revisions raise any further issues or planning matters:

The following assessment will therefore consider:

- Refusal Reason 1- Design
- Refusal Reason 2- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Refusal Reason 3- Provision of the necessary infrastructure
- Impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area
- Highways Considerations
- Flooding Considerations
- Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
- Ecology and Biodiversity



- Wider Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Other Considerations

## 7.2. Refusal Reason 1- Design

7.2.1. The last refused planning application on the site was formed of 3 units in two blocks. Building 100 proposed on the “main” part of Weybridge Business Park, this part of the site is now referred to as plot 1 as part of this planning application. Buildings 200 were proposed on the former Toshiba offices, now referred to as plot 2. The refusal reason under the last planning application was focused on building 100. Due to its position, form, scale, mass and significant bulk and the harm this would have on the character and appearance of the area.

7.2.2. It was considered under the last planning application that the visual appearance of building 200 was acceptable. The overall building position, form and scale of the building proposed on plot 2, as part of this planning application, is largely the same as that referred to as building 200 under the last planning application. Therefore, the officer assessment is largely focused on revisions to the part of the site now referred to as plot 1. Building 100 proposed was 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 as shown on the proposed elevations but what was not fully shown in the proposed plans was an internal ridge height behind the proposed parapet which was up to around 16m in height.

### *Layout*

7.2.3. The planning application site is split into two parts. The proposed development of plot 1 (referred to as building 100 under the previous refused planning application) is formed of 9 units split into 4 blocks; unit A located to the south east; unit B to the north west; unit C to the south east and unit D to the north east of the plot. In terms of proposed layout, the key revision from the previous refused planning application is the “breaking up” of what was one large warehouse building into smaller units and the creation of a central service yard area. However, the distances from the proposed boundary fronting Hamm Moor Lane have not significantly changed as part of this planning application. Units A are set back marginally from where building 100 was previously positioned, however part of Units B are set further forward within the street scene. At single storey level and to provide some articulation to break up the massing and visual interest Unit B is further forward towards Hamm Moor Lane than that previously proposed.

7.2.4. In terms of Addlestone Road, the central courtyard also creates a further visual break between buildings, however Unit D in particular is positioned closer to the road than the previous refused scheme. In addition, both Units C and D are closer to the River Wey than the previous refused scheme and the potential impact on the adjacent Conservation Area is considered further below in a separate section of this report.

### *Form, scale and massing and architectural appearance*

7.2.5. The previous planning application was for one large and substantive building with the visual height of the parapet being 15m, with a continuous 150m length along Hamm Moor Lane and 105m along Addlestone Road.

- 7.2.6. This scheme results in the breaking up of the massing along Hamm Moor Lane, by not only having a visual break between the units, but also staggering the built form to create articulation and variation, not just through the units themselves but also through the proposed roof form and overall massing and scale of the buildings. Whilst the perceived overall heights along Hamm Moor Lane are marginally less than the scheme proposed under the last planning application, with proposed units A and B only around 0.5m less in height, the wider approach to massing and articulation of the built form significantly differs from the large monolithic structure proposed under the previous planning application.
- 7.2.7. A similar approach can be said to the views and visual appearance along Addlestone Road. Whilst building D towards the north eastern corner is proposed to be some 16.2m to the ridge (marginally higher than the previous refusal) this forms one part of a larger site and does provide variation between units in a position where buildings proposed are set further away from residential properties. The articulation and overall approach to massing means that instead of having one large and substantive building some 105m in length with a rear service yard areas the bulk of the proposal and the containment of the service yard area to a central location is a significant visual improvement to the previous refused planning application.
- 7.2.8. A Townscape Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application. The views proposed as part of this document are verified views and provide an accurate representation of the scheme proposed. These show how the visual breaks between blocks and the approach to massing of the units have sought to reduce the scale and visual prominence of the buildings now proposed when compared to the last planning application.
- 7.2.9. It is also not considered that the revisions proposed to plot 2, which are largely the architectural approach to the proposed units, as well as the reconfiguration to the parking layout to move parking spaces away from the neighbouring properties is considered to raise any design objections under this planning application.

*Approach to landscaping including trees*

- 7.2.10. The approach to the proposed layout of the buildings on plot 1 does mean that buildings are “pushed out” towards the edges of the site. Having to balance this against parking provision means there is limited areas for soft landscaping to assist in creating a setting for a scheme. However, there are a number of enhancements proposed as part of the planning application. This includes along either side of the proposed service entrance on Addlestone Rod some small areas of swales/ water feature areas and some tree planting is also proposed along Addlestone Road. Green walls are also proposed to units C, D and E, as well as a green roof to the single storey front projection to Block A.
- 7.2.11. A number of trees are proposed to be removed as part of this planning application. This includes 16 Category B trees; trees of not particularly high-quality trees but still make a significant impact on the local environment and have a significant life expectancy and 31 individual C category trees, as well as a group and 3 hedges also considered of the same category; smaller trees or ones considered to be of low quality. 6 category U trees are also proposed to be removed due to their poor condition. All other trees are proposed to be retained and detailed in an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection

Plan will be required prior to commencement, were planning permission forthcoming.

- 7.2.12. A total of 44 new trees are proposed as part of the landscaping strategy which includes strengthening the existing retained planting along the eastern boundary with the Wey Navigation. The landscape strategy does set out that trees removed along the edge with the Wey Navigation are of mixed species and are considered in the arboriculture report to be of relatively small size and have poor future growth potential. The proposed landscape strategy is seeking to improve this landscaping screen in the longer term. Additional tree planting is also proposed along Hamm Moor Lane and the corner bend with Addlestone Road.
- 7.2.13. It is noted that one of the letters of representation raised queries about the categories of the existing trees as part this planning application when compared to the details submitted as part of a previous 2015 planning application. The applicants have confirmed that the categories have been made based on their Arboriculturist Assessment of the quality of the trees in 2023.

*Conclusion: Refusal Reason 1- Design*

- 7.2.14. 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. Whilst the buildings proposed as part of this application have an overall height greater than the existing surrounding buildings a number of positive revisions and enhancements have been undertaken as part of this revised application. It is considered that whilst the layout is one which has sought to maximise on the form and scale of the buildings and provide parking service areas associated with the proposed uses the approach to scale and breaking up the massing of the proposed units is one which has gone some way to overcome the previous refusal.
- 7.2.15. It is considered that the verified views submitted as part of this application, contained within the Townscape Visual Impact Assessment, show that whilst this proposal will result in a marked change from the existing buildings on site the visual appearance of the proposed units is one which is appropriate in this mixed-use area where there are currently a number of large warehouse buildings located to the immediate self of this application site. The landscape approach to the proposal by reason of the proposed layout is largely limited to planting an amenity space around the edges of the site. However, having regard for the existing character of the site, that of the wider area and the wider biodiversity enhancements as listed below it is considered that the landscaping strategy is appropriate for the character of the area. In summary, the revisions proposed as part of this application when considered as a whole are considered to overcome the previous grounds for refusal regarding scale mass and design.

**Refusal Reason 2- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity in terms of noise and disturbance**

- 7.2.16. Policy EE2 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020) states that development proposals resulting in or being subject to external noise impacts above Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level will be expected to implement measures to mitigate and reduce noise impacts to a minimum. Any development proposals resulting in or being subject to external noise

impacts above Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level will not be supported unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the social and economic benefits of the proposal outweigh noise impacts and unless the scheme's design and layout has been optimised to avoid, mitigate and reduce impacts to a minimum. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the associated National Planning Policy Guidance relating to Noise and disturbance.

7.2.17. The previous planning application on the site was refused as:

*“The proposed use would result in a loss of residential amenity to surrounding residential properties. This loss of amenity would be due to due noise and disturbance from both the on-site operations as well as disturbance from the likely significant numbers of comings and goings of large goods vehicles that the proposed uses would attract, particularly at anti-social hours of the day and night.”*

This was found to be contrary to the above planning policies.

- 7.2.18. It remains that the applicants are seeking for a flexible employment use and the operations which could take place under these 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. Whilst this may depend on the end user the applicants are clear they are applying for a 24 hour use. However, this does not mean that future tenants would be utilising the buildings consistently through the evening/ night. There are no conditions in place on the rest of the trading estates and activities outside of typical working hours are limited. However, the ability to operate 24hrs a day does give modern day business the ability to flexibly access and use their buildings as and when required to respond to modern day business needs. Nonetheless, the officer assessment needs to assume a worst-case scenario and if the revised layout has sought appropriate noise mitigation to ensure the proposed development would not affect the amenities of the nearby residential properties.
- 7.2.19. It should also be noted that it is not for planning to replicate that which is covered by separate legislation. There are provisions under Environmental Protection Act 1990 to deal with statutory nuisance, whereby noise unreasonably and substantially interfere with the use or enjoyment of a home or other premises. Therefore, whilst there is a need to assess potential impact on amenity were an individual occupier to operate a business in a manner which would unreasonably affect the enjoyment of a local residents home then such matter would be dealt with by way of separate environmental health legislation, in much the same manner as if such issues would arise from an existing operator currently in the wider trading estate.
- 7.2.20. A Noise Assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application, this seeks to demonstrate that the proposed development with additional mitigation would not affect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties both during the day or at night. However, this was the position under the last planning application. What this revised scheme also offers above the previous planning application is that the proposed layout of plot 1 means that the activities associated with the development are largely contained within the central service yard and that the buildings themselves offer a permanent and effective noise barrier to prevent noise overspill to surrounding residential properties. This revised layout also moves the proposed access to the service yard to a a similar

position to that for the existing offices, further away from the residential houses to the east of the site along Addlestone Road. In terms of plot 2 parking towards the south eastern corner has now been removed and with increased landscaping and buffer planting at the point closest to the nearby residential properties. Acoustic fences are proposed in key parts of the site to contain any potential noise overspill.

7.2.21. The Noise Assessment, submitted in support of this planning application seeks to demonstrate how the proposed development would not result in any undue noise on neighbouring properties. To do this, measurements of existing background noise were taken at 4 separate locations across the site over a week period in February 2022. This forms the baseline for assessing the potential impact associated with this planning application. The development proposals are for 24-hour operations seven days a week. As the end users are not known a number of assumptions have been made within the Noise Assessment to create a worst case scenario based. Most of the assumptions are based on the traffic data which informs the overall number of vehicles which come to and from a site based on likely uses and a number of worst case scenario assumptions for deliveries during the day and evenings.

7.2.22. A mitigation strategy of installing acoustic barriers has been proposed to ensure that the noise levels at surrounding noise receptors (i.e., residential properties) are not affected by the development. The report sets out that during the day, subject to the mitigation measures proposed, the scheme will assist in reducing existing noise levels to be below existing background level to surrounding noise receptors. At nighttime in some locations the scheme will assist in noise reduction and in many others it will not result in any increase. However, in four locations there would be a marginal increase in noise levels; in two locations there would be an increase of just 1db and at two others, a change of 4db. An increase of 1-4 db is not considered to be perceptible and is less than +5 dB above the background sound level, which is within the industry recognised standards for the level of increase which is in an acceptable tolerance.

7.2.23. In addition to this the applicants have agreed as part of the legal agreement to include an Operational Service Management Plan. Through this the applicant will agree certain measures for how they will manage the proposed operations to ensure they undertake operations in a manner which will seek to minimise impact on neighbouring amenity. Such matters will include; continual noise monitoring to ensure the proposal does not result in increase noise and that mitigation measures do work, long terms management of acoustic screening and a clear point of contact for residents to speak to if issues take place.

### 7.3. **Refusal Reason 3- provision of the necessary infrastructure**

7.3.1. As part of the previous planning application the following planning obligations were considered necessary in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms:

- Travel Plan
- £6150 Travel Plan auditing fee.
- Prior to the occupation of any building by a new user a Delivery Service Management Plan. To be updated every year for the first 3 years of any new occupier of the relevant building.

7.3.2. This third refusal reason related to the above planning obligations not being secured by way of a legal agreement. Such matters can be overcome through a legal agreement. The solicitors for both applicant and the Local Planning Authority are working on a without prejudice basis to secure a legal agreement to secure the above provision (the need for which are detailed further within this report.) Members of the planning committee will be updated at the meeting on the status of this document, the completion of a section 106 legal agreement will result in this refusal reason being resolved.

#### 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. 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.

7.4.2. The NPPF (2023) 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. The guidance sets out that 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. The NPPF (2023) further states that:

*“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”*

7.4.3. The site adjoins the River Wey and the Wey Navigation Conservation Area (designated August 1999) and forms part of its setting. It is also located in close proximity to several heritage assets including the Grade II listed Western Block of Coxes Lock Mills, the Grade II listed Eastern Block of Coxes Lock, and the Grade II listed Southern Block of Coxes Lock. All of which have the potential to be impacted through change within their setting.

7.4.4. Currently the offices which occupy the site are not considered to make a positive contribution to the setting or significance of the Conservation Area. It is considered that most buildings have neutral impact, however Bridge House, by reason of its position, form and scale and materiality is considered to result in a negative contribution to the setting and significance of the River Wey and the Wey Navigation Conservation Area. However, the impact of Bridge House is mitigated to some extent by the intervening trees and vegetation along the eastern boundary of the Site. This existing landscaping, also contributes to the sense of tranquillity and enclosure experienced from within this part of the Wey Navigation Conservation Area.

7.4.5. As existing, Bridge House is positioned adjacent to the Conservation Area boundary with all other buildings set around 17m from the boundary. The current height, form and scale

of the existing offices is varied. This proposal will bring development just over 15m from the Wey Navigation, with a more continuous position and higher in scale. This will result in a noticeable increase in the built form fronting Wey Navigation Conservation Area as the footprint, height, mass, and scale of the buildings sited alongside the western boundary of the conservation area will be markedly increased and visually prominent. As discussed in further detail above the proposal seeks to remove a number of trees, hedges, and shrubs along the western boundary of the Conservation Area, reducing the level and value of screening. Whilst replacement planting is proposed this will take a number of years to bed in.

- 7.4.6. There is no statutory duty regarding the setting of a Conservation Area. However, both policy EE2 and the NPPF (2023) seek to preserve or enhance the special interest of a Conservation Area. The applicant's position that the proposed development would assimilate into the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Areas and so will sustain the significance of the Wey Navigation Conservation Area. However, the proposed structures fronting the Wey Navigation Conservation Area by reason of their siting, scale, massing, and height will be visible from within the Conservation Area. It is also considered that due to the overall form and prominence that the proposal will result in an adverse visual impact on the designated heritage asset. As such, it is considered that proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the significance of the Wey Navigation Conservation Area and the proposals would constitute a scheme which would lead to 'less than substantial' harm to the designated heritage asset. Whilst this harm is considered to be limited given the existing position form and scale of buildings on the site, it remains that the NPPF (2023) is clear that an assessment is therefore required to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 7.4.7. The National Planning Policy Guidance on Historic Environment sets out that public benefits could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives. It is clear that they should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.
- 7.4.8. One of the key benefits of this site is the redevelopment of strategic employment land to bring it back into employment use on a site which has been designated for such uses in the Council's Local Plan. The other public benefits which flow from the development are largely those set out at the end of the report regarding the economic benefits of the proposed development including the creation of construction and operational jobs. Overall and given the level of harm associated with the impact on the significance of the Conservation Area it is considered that the public benefits outweigh the harm. As such the proposed development is considered acceptable adjacent to the 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 (2023) 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. No objection on highways grounds was raised under the last planning application. Therefore, for a concern to be raised regarding highways matters it would have to be demonstrated that this revised planning application introduces new grounds of objection regarding highways capacity and/ or safety above those presented under the last planning application. This planning application results in a modest reduction in floorspace when compared to previous refused planning application RU.22/0776 (a reduction of circa 724 sqm). As there were no ground for refusing the previous planning application for highway issues it would be very difficult to now justify a refusal reason which is for a scheme of less floor space.
- 7.5.3. It remains that the applicant is seeking planning permission for a “flexible” employment use where a variety of different end users could occupy the proposed buildings. The vehicle activities associated with these different uses can widely differ. In this context Surrey County Council in their role as the highway authority have requested that the applicant “model” the worst case scenarios. The applicants are keen to highlight that the proposed layout would mean that future occupiers are unlikely to seek to occupy units which do not provide specific bays. However, this does not mean that either would be no HGV movements associated with granting such a planning application. There is no ability under such a planning application to ensure that no third party HGV delivery vehicle would not access the site. Therefore, the applicant’s submission has assumed that this proposed development could result in HGV movements coming to and from the site. However, the manner in which plot 2 is designed means that HGV’s could not access this plot due to the access arrangement across the Bourne.

*Highway capacity impact*

- 7.5.4. 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.
- 7.5.5. A Transport Assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application. This document seeks to assess the number of vehicle movements associated with this proposed development to understand potential impact on the wider highway network. Given the matter is about highway capacity the focus of the assessment needs to be one of peak hours where the surrounding road networks are more heavily congested. 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. The applicant has looked at the vehicle trips which would likely take place against the proposed vehicle trips associated with this proposed development and have demonstrated that the proposed development would result in less vehicle trips at peak hours than the existing lawful uses. Therefore, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the wider surrounding highways network in terms of potential cumulative impact. No objection has been raised from the highway’s authority



nor from National Highways.

- 7.5.6. A number of objections from local residents have been raised in terms of the comparison between the lawful use and the proposed. Part of the objections are that the lawful use (i.e., the vacant offices) has not been fully occupied for a number of years and should not be relied upon as a benchmark for vehicle movements proposed as part of this planning application. However, case law has established that the prospect of the “fallback position”, the alternative option 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” in order for it to be sufficient to make the position a material consideration.” The assessment for the last planning application was made in line with this position. There is nothing to indicate as part of this planning application to justify an alternative position in this regard.
- 7.5.7. Further objections have been raised that the proposed development does not seek to make a contribution towards upgrading or enhancing the wider highway network. However, such a planning obligation can only be sought where it is necessary to make the development acceptable in highways terms. The evidence in front of officers both in terms of the Transport Assessment, as well as the assessment from the Highway Authority who manages the highway network across Surrey and would be responsible for undertaking any such works is that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact in terms of wider highway capacity issues. As such there is no justification towards such a contribution.

#### *Highways safety*

- 7.5.8. No objection was raised under the previous planning application in terms of highway safety. Whilst the access point to the service yard for plot 1 has been revised, the revised arrangement has been reviewed by the highway authority who have advised that subject to conditions the proposed access is acceptable and would not raise any issues in terms of highway safety. 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. 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 Road Safety Audit is undertaken which looks at the detailed implementation of these measures.
- 7.5.9. There have been a lot of local concerns from 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.

- 7.5.10. To assist in highway safety and visibility the highway authority has 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 provision*

- 7.5.11. 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's 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. However, the 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.
- 7.5.12. 107 spaces are proposed for plot 1 and 48 spaces proposed for plot 2, total of 155 car parking spaces. This equates to 1 space per 103 sqm, the parking ratio is marginally higher than that previously proposed under the refused planning application (which was 1 spaces per 108 sqm). The internal service road for plot 1 can accommodate at least 25 lorries and plot at least 5. A TRICS parking accumulation assessment forms part of the applicants Transport Assessment. This shows that parking provision would be sufficient for the scheme proposed. The highway authority has considered that this parking ratio is acceptable in order to provide suitable off-street parking for a development of this scale and nature. In view of this and given the parking ratios are not dissimilar to the previous planning application which was considered by the Local Planning Authority which no

parking objections were raised this level of parking is considered acceptable, (subject to wider sustainability consideration set out below).

- 7.5.13. It should also be noted that further to the submission the applicants have confirmed that the proposed development will provide 20% active Electric Vehicle Charging points (EVC). In addition to this all-other parking space (including those for lorries) will be fitted out as passive EVC spaces in the form of EV ducts running to each car parking space, so that pillars and cables can be connected at any time in the future. This would go beyond the 20% provision required by planning policy is one measure which they are seeking to go beyond policy to “future proof” the buildings so that parking for the site is adaptable to future needs as required.

*Sustainable Travel- including active and public transport*

- 7.5.14. 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 developers to submit and implement Travel Plans demonstrating how active and sustainable travel options have been considered.
- 7.5.15. There are pedestrian footways on both sides of the Addlestone Road carriageway serving all proposed accesses 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 Weybridge Road, less than 350m from the centre of the 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. 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 fairly sustainable location where active and public transport modes can be utilised by those who work at the site.
- 7.5.16. 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. 106 cycle parking space are proposed as part of this planning application. Indicative locations of this parking as shown on the proposed plans as being evenly split across the application site. Full details can be secured by way of condition. In addition, shower facilities are proposed as part of every unit in support of encouraging active modes of transport for future employees.
- 7.5.17. 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.

- 7.5.18. It should also be noted that in July 2023 a new government agency, Active Travel England were set up as a statutory consultee. Due to an oversight, there was a delay in undertaking this consultation. Members will be updated on the response in the Planning Addendum. It should be noted that their role is regarding how schemes seek to incorporate active travel as part of new development. They are not a consultee on matters pertaining to highway capacity or highway safety. Their remit is if this planning application provides suitable means of including active travel as part of the planning application. The Highway Authority also considers matters regarding active travel as part of assessing any planning application and have advised that the approach sought as part of this planning application is appropriate.
- 7.5.19. In addition to the above, officers recommend a planning obligation regarding an Operational and Delivery Service Management Plan. This will have many strands of how to manage proposed deliveries, including identifying deliveries that could be reduced, re-timed or even consolidated, particularly during busy periods in the interest of sustainable transport.

#### *Highways Conclusion*

- 7.5.20. In conclusion, it is not considered that the revisions proposed as part of this planning application would result in highways implications not considered and accepted under the previous planning application. The proposed development would not result in severe pressures on highway capacity. 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 increase highway safety issues. The proposed development provides a suitable level of off-street parking for the development proposed. Through Travel Plans and delivery management plans further sustainable transport measures can be secured and monitored.

### **7.6. Flooding Considerations**

#### *The Sequential and Exception Test*

- 7.6.1. The site is in flood zone 2, partly in flood zone 3a and the access to the former Toshiba office goes over the River Bourne (as existing) which is in flood zone 3B. The NPPF (2023), as well as policy EE13 of the Local Plan sets out how to consider the principle of such development in the flood zone. The proposal is on a designated not an allocated site and notwithstanding the assertions in the previous committee report the assessment required the sequential test is required. The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding.
- 7.6.2. A sequential test has been submitted in support of this planning application. The applicants sequential test has not recognised that part of the site is in flood zone 3B however this is a small part of the site (i.e., the access bridge over the river to Plot 2) and the sequential test does equally look at other sites which are in flood zone 3B. The area of search for the sequential test is borough wide. However, given the sites designation as a designated employment area, the area of search is to be kept to Designated Strategic Employment

Areas and sites allocated for employment use as set out in the Local Plan 2030. The site search resulted in a total of 7 sites which met the search criteria. These sites were then assessed as to whether they are sequentially preferable and available and suitable for the proposed development. A further assessment of if the sites were available for development in the short to medium term and suitable for a development similar to the proposed scheme was also undertaken including contact with local listing agents.

- 7.6.3. Based on this evidence it is considered that it has been demonstrated that the application passes the sequential test and that there are no other reasonably available sites in a flooding sequentially preferred location which would be available for this proposal.

#### *Flood protection and mitigation*

- 7.6.4. 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.
- 7.6.5. A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of this planning application, prepared by HDR Consulting. 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.
- 7.6.6. The details provided show that the proposal provides level for level-for-level flood water storage compensation to be incorporated into the development design with no loss of floodplain capacity. A minimum new building finished floor level of 12.80 m AOD (for Units A to D) provides finish floor levels above the maximum flood level. With reference to consultation response from the Councils drainage officer it is not considered in this specific instance that means of escape or a flood evacuation plan is necessary for an employment generating use. This is not the type of development whereby users will seek to remain within the building when there is a fluvial risk of flooding.
- 7.6.7. It should be noted that whilst the Environment Agency have not commented on this planning application, they did not raise any objection to the previous planning application. Whilst some of the buildings proposed as part of this planning application are closer to the Wey Navigation they remain in the same flood risk zone. The flood protection and mitigation principles proposed as part of this planning application are the same as the previous planning application. This scheme is for less floor area. Overall, it is considered that the proposed approach to flooding is acceptable.

#### *Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs)*

- 7.6.8. 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. The NPPF (2023) 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.

- 7.6.9. The proposed SuDs strategy involves below-ground storage with off-site runoff being attenuated to greenfield rate. All flows are to be directed into the existing adjacent surface watercourse (part of the Addlestone Bourne), subject to the necessary consents. The Lead Local Flood Authority is satisfied that the proposed drainage scheme meets the requirements set out in the above policies subject to conditions recommended below.
- 7.6.10. 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.

## **7.7. Renewable and Low Carbon Energy**

- 7.7.1. 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.
- 7.7.2. A Sustainability and Energy Statement has been submitted in support of this planning application. This Statement seeks measures to deal with sustainability and energy efficiency within the development to meet BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) standard of "excellent". BREEAM is an industry recognised standard to ensure that buildings are compliant when it comes to sustainable construction, operation and design. The BREEAM New Construction regime is comprised of a series of categories which serve to address criteria to achieve sustainable development.
- 7.7.3. Despite there being no explicit Local Plan requirement for non-residential developments in the Borough to achieve a BREEAM rating, the proposed development seeks to achieve a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating, which would in turn help to demonstrate sustainable design and energy considerations have been comprehensively addressed. In addition to this, a Circular Economy Statement has been submitted which outlines measures to reduce waste and apply a circular economy approach during the design and construction of the proposed development, drawing on targets from the London Plan (in the absence of Runnymede currently having any-specific targets).
- 7.7.4. Policy SD8 does require larger developments to supply a minimum of 10% their energy needs from renewable and/or low carbon technologies unless it can be demonstrated with evidence that this is not feasible or viable. The Statement satisfactorily

demonstrates that, after pursuing a fabric-first approach to reduce energy use at the first stage of the energy hierarchy, the 10% requirement has been exceeded at this early design stage, primarily through the use of air source heat pumps (ASHPs) and solar photovoltaic (PV) panels. Solar panels are shown to be proposed on the roof of buildings on all buildings and the indicative location of Air Source Heat pumps are shown to be in x10 condenser compounds across the site, adjacent to the proposed buildings.

- 7.7.5. Overall, the proposal goes beyond current Local Plan policies in regard to sustainable construction and energy requirements. This is a benefit which weights in favour of the proposal and will be considered further as part of the wider planning balance.

## 7.8. **Ecology and biodiversity**

- 7.8.1. Policies SD7 and EE9 of the Local Plan sets out that development should protect existing biodiversity and include opportunities to achieve biodiversity net gain. The National Planning Policy Framework requires planning decisions should minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity. No objection was raised regarding the last planning application. However, this proposal does affect the proposed layout, landscaping and lighting associated with the redevelopment and as such these matters needs to be considered as part of this new planning application. The submission by the applicants includes a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment, Ecology Additional Note Biodiversity Metric 4.0 Calculation Tool, Biodiversity Net Gain Plan and Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The former documents have been updated during the consideration of this planning application.
- 7.8.2. *Avoidance*- There are no identified protected species on this site. Jersey cudweed was identified in the northern part of the site which is protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). A separate licence will be required from Natural England to take Schedule 8 plants (such as Jersey cudweed) for conservation purposes. The woodland and hedgerow habitats around plot 2, are considered to represent Habitats of Principal Importance and are proposed to be retained as part of this planning application.
- 7.8.3. *Mitigation*- The site is located immediately adjacent to the River Wey. The Woburn Park Stream SNCI is located within 0.5km of the Site boundary. During the construction phase of the development mitigation measures can be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure pollutants and dust associated with construction works do not affect the surrounding environment. A draft document has been submitted as part of the planning application and full details can be secured through conditions.
- 7.8.4. A lighting assessment has also been submitted in support of this planning application and is supported by an ecological lighting sensitivity assessment. This show that through the incorporation of lighting columns with integral backlight control optics, there would be negligible backlight spill onto the River Wey. The same lighting is proposed adjoining the woodland corridor lining the Bourne River. An overshadowing assessment has also been provided which shows that given orientation that the proposal would not result in increased overshadowing on the watercourse when compared to existing built form.

- 7.8.5. *Enhancements-* In terms of biodiversity net gain, a detailed landscaping and biodiversity plan has been submitted in support of this planning application, as well as a biodiversity net gain metric. The proposed enhanced landscape includes species-rich grassland, riparian planting, modified grassland, bioswales, sedum green roofing, mixed scrub and scattered trees, with enhancements to existing areas of woodland. Based the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric (which has become the industry recognised standards for assessing biodiversity net gain) the proposal would result in a 58.21% increase in habitat units and an 81.69% increase in hedgerow units. It is recommended that measures to ensure the successful creation and long-term management of proposed habitats are outlined in a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) for the Site. This can be secured by way of condition.
- 7.8.6. The submission as a whole has been reviewed by Surrey Wildlife Trust in their role as our ecological advisors and have agreed with the findings contained in the applicant's submission, subject to conditions regarding (as set out above) Construction Environmental Management Plan and a Landscape Environmental Management Plan, these are recommended below.
- 7.8.7. It should also be noted that whilst the Environment Agency have not commented on this planning application under the previous planning application, they raised objections due to the lack of an undeveloped 8m buffer to the Bourne River (not for flood risk reasons but due to ecology). As per the previous planning application, policy EE12: Blue Infrastructure of the Local Plan does seek, where appropriate, undeveloped buffer zones. Works within 8m of the River Bourne include fencing, gates and an improved access. However currently development on the site is all laid to hardstanding along this boundary. In contrast, this proposal would increase planting and biodiversity enhancements in this location. Thus, the approach is considered an appropriate balanced strategy and in line with policy.
- 7.9. **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity- sunlight, daylight, overbearing impact and lightning**
- 7.9.1. 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. 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.
- 7.9.2. A Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by Hollis has been submitted in support of this planning application, this is based on industry recognised British Research Establishment (BRE) standard guidelines. The assessment has looked the properties mostly likely affected by the proposed development (due to their orientation), notably:
- Navigation House (the block of Flats opposite Hamm Moor Lane)
  - 14 Hamm Moor Lane (the flat above Sophie's café)
  - New House Addlestone Road



- 66 Addlestone Road (flats above the Mazda Garage)
- 20 Hamm Moor Lane

It should be noted that the properties assessed are slightly different to those considered under the previous planning application. This is due to the revisions in the position of buildings affect the properties which would potentially be affected.

- 7.9.3. The assessment has looked at the industry recognised standards regarding 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 report also looks at the Daylight Distribution, this assessment 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.
- 7.9.4. In addition, the report looks at 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.
- 7.9.5. The conclusion of this report is that any impact in terms of sunlight and or daylight falls within acceptable standards based on the industry recognised criteria, indeed for most of the windows facing the proposal any impact is fairly limited when compared to the existing relationship. This is a slight betterment when compared to the previous refused planning application where some limited/marginal loss of daylight distribution was noted to the windows in 14 Hamn Moor Lane and windows in Navigation House.
- 7.9.6. In terms of overshadowing, the proposed modelling demonstrates that the proposed development would not result in significant overshadowing of adjoining properties amenity space, this includes any potential acoustic fences, notably New House located to the south of the former Toshiba Offices. 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.

#### 7.10. **Other Considerations**

##### *Air Quality*

- 7.10.1. In terms of air quality, the site is not within an Air Quality Management Area, however Addlestone Town Centre in in one, and Weybridge Town Centre in the adjoining Borough of Elmbridge is also within one. 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.

7.10.2. In terms of operational impact, the proposed development will also result in vehicles coming to and from the site including large delivery vehicles. The Air Quality Assessment submitted as part of this planning application has done some initial modelling using receptors around the site, along Weybridge Road, within Addlestone Town Centre and Weybridge Town Centre to understand the “Baseline” of air quality. They have also looked at some of the data held by both Runnymede and Elmbridge Council to understand existing and historic Air Quality levels. They have then modelled the activities associated with this scheme to see what impact the proposal would have to overall Air Quality in these locations. The outcome of this modelling shows that there would be negligible impact in air quality levels resulting from this proposed development.

#### *Contaminated Land*

7.10.3. No objection was raised under the last planning application in terms of contaminated land, and it is not considered the revisions would raise any issues in this regard, subject to conditions. Similar information has been submitted as part of this planning application, as well as additional ground investigation works to demonstrate that land contaminates on this site is likely limited. Conditions can secure remediation works should contaminates be found in undertaking works on this site.

#### *Archaeology*

7.10.4. Similarly, it is not considered that this proposal raises any issues in terms of archaeology. A desk-based assessment has been submitted in support of this planning application. The Archaeological Officer at SCC has confirmed under the previous planning application 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.

#### *Economic benefits*

7.10.5. As set out at the beginning of the planning assessment the proposed development is for employment generating uses on land designated for employment and thus the principle of the development is actable. In addition to this, there are further economic benefits which flow from the redevelopment of this site for employment generating purposes. A Industrial and Logistics Needs Assessment has been submitted as part of the planning application which seeks to demonstrate that the proposed development would meet a significant need in a growing economy for such spaces. It is note that objections from residents highlight existing occupancy at units at Brooklands Industrial Estate within Brooklands. However, this does not dispel the growth in this sector and the need for such provision within the wider area. In addition to this that the proposed development will result in:

- Support direct and indirect construction jobs.
- At operational stage would generate approximately 250 gross on-site jobs Full Time Equivalent (FTE).
- And indirect jobs and local spend which flow from redevelopment.

7.10.6. The benefit of the above will be considered further below as part of the wider planning balance.

## **8. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS/COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)**

8.1. In line with the Council's Charging Schedule the proposed development would be CIL liable. However, 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 CONSIDERATIONS**

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 imposes 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 AND PLANNING BALANCE**

- 10.1 The principle of the development is acceptable and would bring vacant (but previously developed land) back into an employment generating use on land designated for employment generating use. This is a key benefit which weigh significantly in favour of the proposed development.
- 10.2 It is considered that the revisions to the proposed redevelopment overcome the previous grounds for refusing planning application RU.22/0776 in terms of design and visual impact and in terms of impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of the activities associated with the proposed development.
- 10.3 It is considered that the revised design approach would result in less than substantial harm on the significance of the adjoining Conservation Area, but that public benefits exist which outweigh the harm. It is not considered that the revised planning application raises any further issues in terms of highway considerations, flooding matters or in terms of the impact on neighbouring amenity (in terms of loss of light and/or overbearing impact). The proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of ecological considerations, air quality, contaminated land and archaeology. There are economic benefits which flow from this proposed development, including bringing the site back into use which weighs significantly in favour of the proposed development.
- 10.4 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 proposed development overcomes the previous grounds for refusal

## **11. FORMAL OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

### ***Recommendation Part A:***

***The HoP be authorised to grant planning permission subject to Active Travel England not raising any unresolved objections 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 measures based on the Framework Travel Plan.
2. £6150 Travel Plan auditing fee.
3. Prior to the occupation an Operational and Delivery Service Management Plan to be submitted to deal with the following:
  - Provide x1 notice board in a publicly accessible location displaying any information on the site deemed appropriate to its operation including a point of contact for local residents for any issues which may arise.
  - Continue to monitor and provide 6 monthly reporting on noise levels to the Local Planning Authority for the first 5 years from when the site is at least 50% occupied, or 3 years from being 100% occupied, whichever is longer. Where noise impact exceeds those within the submitted Noise Report provide details of mitigation measures proposed to reduce noise levels and additional monitoring as required
  - Demonstrate that goods and services can be achieved, and waste removed, in a safe, efficient, and environmentally friendly way at operational stage.
  - 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.

***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 "Bridge Point Weybridge - Planning Register" dated 18/07/2023 revision P01. 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

Prior to the commencement of any works hereby approved, including any demolition implemented under this planning permission, a Full Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval and then subsequently approved tree protective measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved Tree Protection Plan.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved protection plan and method statement. The protective measures shall remain in place until all works are complete and all machinery and materials have finally left site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition, nor shall any fires be started, no tipping, refuelling, disposal of solvents or cement mixing carried out and ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation or vehicular access, other than that detailed within the approved plans, be made without the written consent of the LPA.

There shall be no burning within six metres of the canopy of any retained tree(s). Where the approved protective measures and methods are not employed or are inadequately employed or any other requirements of this condition are not adhered to, remediation measures, to a specification agreed in writing by the LPA, shall take place prior to first occupation of the development, unless the LPA gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect the trees to be retained, enhance the appearance and biodiversity of the surrounding area and to comply with Policies EE1, EE9 and EE11 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan and guidance within the NPPF.

#### 4. Construction Transport Management Plan

- A. Prior to commencement of any development (including any demolition implemented under this planning permission) 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.
- on-site turning for construction vehicles
- provision of 1 x notice board in a publicly accessible location with information of the build out process and a point of contact for local residents for any issues which may arise

this document shall be based on the Construction Logistics Plan dated July 2023 and 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.

5. Construction and Environment Management Plan

- A. Prior to commencement of any development (including any demolition implemented under this planning permission) 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. 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.

6. 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 revised Lighting Strategy prepared by MKA Ecology and dated 14.10.22 and 4.09.2023 respectively 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

#### 7. 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.

#### 8. 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);

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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Proposed Access

Prior to any building within plot 1 and plot 2 respectively hereby approved being brought into first use the modified vehicular accesses to Addlestone Road and/or Hamm Moor Lane (to the plot of the respective 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.

13. 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.

14. 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), 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 80% 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. Land Affected by Potential Contamination

(i) 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.

(ii) 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.

(iii) 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 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 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.

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.

### **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](http://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. Construction hours

Noisy construction work (audible outside the site boundary) should be restricted to the following hours: Monday to Friday 8am to 6pm, Saturdays 8am to 1pm. Noisy work is prohibited on Sundays and bank holidays.

7. Landscaping

With reference to condition 9 (landscaping) details submitted shall be based on the Landscape Strategy and illustrative Landscape Master Plan submitted as part of this planning application, the mitigation measures set out in the Noise Assessment prepared by Air and Acoustic Consultants.

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 on site 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 6 regarding the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan including the sensitive lighting plan.
- Details of the acoustic fences should provide minimum height as specified within the approved site plan; with no gaps or holes in the

barrier, below the barrier or between panels and; with a minimum surface density of 16 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, in order to reduce noise rating levels at the receptors to less than 5 dB above the background sound levels at nighttime

8. 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.

9. Flues and/or plant equipment

For the avoidance of doubt and for clarification external flues, plant equipment (such as air-conditioning units of otherwise) and/or ducting are operational development which will require separate full planning permission (unless they are considered "de-minimus").

**Recommendation Part B:**

The HoP 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 HoP would warrant refusal of the application. Reasons for refusal relating to any such matter are delegated to the HoP.