

| <b>Item No.</b> | <b>Application No. and Parish</b>   | <b>Proposal, Location and Applicant</b>  |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>(1)</b>      | 13/01978/COMIND<br>Greenham Parish. | Change of use of existing building to B8 Use Class [Storage and Distribution] with ancillary vehicle workshop, offices and external car and HGV parking.<br>Building 302, New Greenham Park.<br>Greenham Common Community Trust. |

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:

<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=13/01978/COMIND>

**Recommendation Summary:**      **The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to GRANT planning permission, subject to the completion of a s106 planning obligation.**

**Ward Member(s):**      Councillors Swift Hook and Drummond.

**Reason for Committee Determination:**      Council has received in excess of 10 letters of objection.

**Committee Site Visit:**      13<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

#### **Contact Officer Details**

|                        |                            |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Name:</b>           | Michael Butler             |
| <b>Job Title:</b>      | Principal Planning Officer |
| <b>Tel No:</b>         | (01635) 519111             |
| <b>E-mail Address:</b> | mbutler@westberks.gov.uk   |

## **1. Site History**

145585 - Outline planning permission for B1, B2, B8 and Sport and Leisure Park. Granted 1995.

152079 - Use of land for storage and distribution - Walon Limited. Approved August 1998.

01/01734/rem - B8 Development for Sainsburys supermarkets. Approved October 2002. Now lapsed.

08/00349/comind - Pro Logis Limited. Demolition of buildings and erection of new Distribution Park. Allowed at appeal on 30<sup>th</sup> December 2008. Extant.

Variation to Unilateral Obligation attached to 08/00349/comind. Dated 12<sup>th</sup> April 2012.

## **2. Publicity of Application**

Press Notice Expired: End September 2013.

Site Notice Expired: 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2013.

Amended plans site notice - expiry on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

Re-consultation on revised acoustic report - consulted on 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2013.

Neighbours and Parish Council.

## **3. Consultations and Representations**

**Parish Council:** Object to the application. Many errors on application form. More details required. Restrict PD rights on mezzanine floors. Impact on local residential amenity, in particular, noise. Errors on traffic movements surveys - need rectifying. Query over future need for s106 monies to highways. More information needed. Further detailed comments on first submitted noise report – number of factual errors in the Report - need rectifying. Also queries over which access route will be utilised in the Park.

Amended acoustic report - comments awaited - see update sheet.

**Highways:** Conditional planning permission is recommended, following an update of the applicant's submitted Transport Assessment. This indicates a daily movement total of HGV's on weekdays of 200, and 100 other vehicles i.e. 300 in total. This is an acceptable impact on the local network. A s 106 obligation contribution of £185,600 is required. For local road junction improvements and possibly local bus subsidies. 55% to WBDC and 45% to HCC.

**Public Protection.** Initially recommended refusal on noise impact grounds. Conditional planning permission is now recommended, following substantial negotiations with the applicant's agent over the submitted acoustic impact report, and proposed mitigation measures.

**Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council:** No objection is raised.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>South Greenham Common Residents Association:</b> | Submitted an acoustic report which examines the applicant's own report. Considers the conclusions to be flawed. The application should be rejected. NB - this was on the initial report, since amended in December 2013 and formally re-consulted upon. Object to the application on traffic and noise grounds. Also light pollution and local access problems, possible drainage implications in addition, and errors in the submitted application forms.   |
| <b>Council Economic Development Officer:</b>        | Supports the scheme. Will bring local jobs to the area and will assist in three of the District's economic objectives. Improving local business infrastructure being one.  |
| <b>Archaeologist :</b>                              | Building 302 has some Heritage Significance, being a relic of the Cold War when the USAF were operating Greenham Common. It has been the subject already of building recording and as it is not being demolished, no objections are raised.  |
| <b>Environment Agency:</b>                          | No objections. Existing drainage is not being revised.   |
| <b>Natural England:</b>                             | No objections. No impact upon nearby SSSI. Need to check local advice on any protected species implications. Potential biodiversity enhancements possible.   |
| <b>Council Ecologist:</b>                           | No objections - nil ecological implications.   |
| <b>Libraries:</b>                                   | S106 contribution of £3,302 requested under SPG4/04 as amended.  |
| <b>Public open space:</b>                           | S106 contribution figure of £16,240 requested under SPG4/04 as amended - based on net gain of 66 employees, not 110.   |
| <b>Thames Water:</b>                                | No objections on water or sewerage grounds, but recommend oil interceptors are placed on site where vehicle washing occurs.  |
| <b>Correspondence:</b>                              | 14 letters of objection received from local residents. All concerned about increased traffic impact, and serious impact on local amenity via increased noise impact. Suggest a number of mitigation measures if the application is to be approved. Also impact on wildlife and will cause light pollution. Not an appropriate site for a Distribution Park. 5 additional letters received at a later date, disagreeing with the conclusions of the revised acoustic report. Two further letters received following re consultation on acoustic report. Believe Council should commission own noise report, still worries over lighting, traffic, tonal beepers, acoustic fence will not be adequate to protect residents, change in ground levels, loss of trees, need an acoustic bund plus fence. Application should be refused. |

#### **4. Policy Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026. Policies ADPP2, CS5, CS9 and CS13.

West Berkshire District Local Plan saved September 2007. Policies OVS6 and ECON6.

## **5. Description of Development**

- 5.1. The application site is 1.8 ha in extent and comprises Building 302, a former aircraft hangar, now vacant, on land in the north east sector of New Greenham Park [NGP]. The building itself is some 15.6m to its ridge, 45m in length, and 55m in width. It has a floorspace of 4640m<sup>2</sup>. Although the formal applicant is the Greenham Common Community Trust, it is known that the occupant of the site will be QTR Transport, a Distribution Company who are looking to relocate from Reading to NGP. It is proposed to change the use of the building to B8 purposes, with the area of hardstanding around the building to be used for HGV parking. To the south of the building will be an area for staff car parking, to the east will be the HGV parking area, and to the north will be the refuelling facility. To the eastern perimeter, with a dog-leg to the south, it is proposed to construct a 4m high acoustic barrier, whilst a further small section to the south will have a 3m high acoustic barrier. The site is to be accessed via Third Street East and then Ministry Road, with all workshop access now being to the west elevation of Building 302. Inside the building will be the HGV workshop, ancillary offices and staff facilities, with the remainder being storage with racking up to 11m in height. There will be no external changes to the building itself i.e. no physical extensions. To the north of the red line application site lies a further extensive area of concrete hardstanding, which then ceases at the northern bund of NGP with the Common itself.

## **6. Consideration of the Proposal.**

- 6.1 Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011.

The application is major, since it exceeds 1000m<sup>2</sup> in floor space, and exceeds 0.5ha in extent. Accordingly, it falls to be considered as an Industrial Estate Development Project, under part 10[a] of Schedule 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations of 2011. By letter dated the 23rd September 2013, the Development Control Manager determined that the application did not require a formal Environmental Statement to be submitted, having regard to the advice in Schedule 3 of the Regulations. That is, sufficient environmental information had been submitted on noise and transport impacts, for the LPA to adequately assess the planning application before it. The application needs to be determined on the following grounds – policy, highways, and noise impact.

### **6.2. Policy**

#### **6.2.1 NPPF.**

The National Planning Policy Framework, published in March 2012, has a number of points which would support this planning application. To take a selection of salient examples: para 17, bullet point 3 notes, inter alia, that one of the 12 core planning principles for Local Planning Authorities is to pro actively drive and support sustainable economic development, to deliver the ... industrial units, and infrastructure that thriving local places need. Bullet point 8 encourages local planning authorities to use land effectively by permitting applications on brown field

sites. This application achieves both these issues. However, in addition, paragraph 123 notes that planning schemes should not be permitted if significant adverse impacts on local health and the quality of life will be caused, and noise is one such factor to be taken into due consideration, when balancing the level of harm that can arise from new development. Mitigation of such impacts, assuming such mitigation is achievable, should be agreed in the planning process. It is apposite to note that bullet point 3 in the same paragraph states....” Recognise that development will often create some noise, and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established”. All these factors will be taken into consideration by officers below.

#### 6.2.2. Core Strategy

The application site lies within the defined area of NGP. This is accordingly, a protected Employment Area as identified within both policy ADPP2 and CS9 in the Adopted Core Strategy for West Berkshire. In the employment section of ADPP2 it is noted [interalia] that “business development within other existing employment areas, including NGP, will be supported to ensure that the vitality of the District’s economy is maintained. Secondly, under policy CS9 a similar encouragement to new employment is supported, indicating that NGP is of strategic importance to the local economy, being one of the principal employment parks in the whole of West Berkshire.

#### 6.2.3. Saved Local Plan.

In the Saved Local Plan, policy ECON6 is still relevant, since this is directed solely towards NGP. This sets out 5 criteria against which new B1, B2 and B8 schemes must be addressed. Criterion [b] relates to amenities and features of the local area - it is under this criterion that highways and acoustics will be considered later. As to the other criteria, [a] corresponds to the scheme not impinging upon the available area for sporting and waste related uses. Building 302 is not identified in any local plan policy or commitment for such specific uses, in the Waste Local Plan or any Council wide sporting strategy. Under criterion [c], it is recognised that appropriate s106 developer contributions should be achieved, in order to mitigate the impact the new development will have upon the local highway network etc, in accord with policy CS5 in the Core Strategy. After considerable negotiation, officers have arrived at a mutually agreed figure with the applicants on the sum of £185,600 for highways contributions, plus the two additional figures for public open space and libraries. The total sum is thus in excess of £200,000. Officers consider that this is sufficient, and will not only recognise the site history of NGP, but will also comply with the advice in policy CS5, the NPPF, and ECON6. Indeed, within criterion [c] the future restoration of Greenham Common is noted, to which the public open space monies will be directed towards in the future.

- 6.2.4 Criterion [d] seeks to ensure that any new office space created is only ancillary to the main use. It is clear in this application that the office space will be just that, but to ensure it does remain ancillary an appropriate condition will be placed on any planning permission, if granted. This will limit the B1 [a] floor space to no more than 10% of the floor area of building 302 i.e. 464m<sup>2</sup> maximum.

- 6.2.5. Finally, criterion [e] of the policy seeks to ensure that drainage is not a difficulty, when associated with any new development, in order to mitigate potential impacts arising from contaminated land. Neither Public Protection colleagues nor the Environment Agency have raised any objections in this regard, and it is known that the existing drainage around the building will be adequate to accept the new Distribution hub.
- 6.2.6 Accordingly, subject of course to criterion [b] being met [see below], Policy ECON6 is satisfied in its entirety.

### **6.3. Transport Matters.**

- 6.3.1. The Company that is envisaged to occupy the Building 302, if the application is permitted, is QTR Transport, however it is important to recognise that the planning permission will not be personal to that company, so any distribution company could “utilise” the planning permission. Having said that, there is a nationally recognised trip rate that can be applied to such B8 schemes, which are reasonably accurate in forecasting predicted traffic movements, onto the local highway network. The Pro Logis permission [now extant by virtue of the completion of the first phase of the access road prior to December 2011], permitted 44,115m<sup>2</sup> of B8 space with ancillary offices. This current QTR application proposes a total of 4640m<sup>2</sup> which is just over 10% of the total Pro Logis floor space. However, the projected traffic figures for QTR is 20% overall [and 33% HGV] of the Pro Logis scheme. The QTR scheme will generate 400 traffic movements per weekday, roughly 50% HGVs and 50% light vehicles. The Pro Logis application, once built and fully occupied, would have generated circa 2050 movements daily.
- 6.3.2 Accordingly, although some local objections have been raised on traffic grounds, in late 2008 a Planning Inspector allowed the Pro Logis scheme which would have created significantly more [over 500%] traffic than the present proposal. He also took into account traffic growth up to 2012 and beyond. Having said that, it is important to note that assuming the Pro Logis application is built out around the site now under consideration, this would mean that Unit 4 [16,420m<sup>2</sup>] as permitted under 08/00349/comind, could not be implemented. This is some 3.5 times larger than Building 302, so would be expected to generate substantially more traffic. In fact Unit 4 comprises 37% of the total Pro Logis permitted floorspace. On a pro rata basis this would be some 761 movements per day, as opposed to QTR of c400 per day. So, even if QTR is fully operational, and the remainder of the Pro Logis scheme is implemented, the total additional flows onto the network would still be less than envisioned by the Planning Inspector.
- 6.3.3. In terms of the s106 highways figures, Members should be aware that, as in accord with the extant [amended] Unilateral Undertaking as attached to 08/00349/comind, the highways payments are split on the basis of 45% to Hampshire County Council and 55% to West Berkshire Council. Accordingly, to be clear, if the application is permitted, this Council will receive, out of a total of just over £185,000, the sum of £102,080 towards local highways improvements on the A339 and possibly bus subsidies. This will mitigate the impact of the development in accord with the advice in the NPPF, policy CS5 in the Core Strategy, and para. 122 of the 2010 CIL Regulations.

- 6.3.4. On a more prosaic note, the applicants have been requested to submit a formally revised red line plan, which will identify the precise access route to Building 302, via NGP itself. This is important, not specifically for highways reasons, but for acoustic reasons. It is envisaged that after Main Street [or Lindenmuth Way] is used from the A339, then only Third Street East and onto Ministry Road is used, which will lead directly into the application site from the west, so reducing any noise impact on dwellings to the east. That is, Wofford Way should not be used at any time, unless in an emergency. Indeed this access route can then be conditioned, once the red line plan is submitted. There is no highways disadvantage here, since, in examining the submitted location plan, both access routes are roughly equidistant to Building 302.
- 6.3.5. To conclude, having due regard to the provisions, and advice contained in Policy CS13 in the Core Strategy, the application is considered to be entirely acceptable in traffic terms.

#### **6.4. Noise Considerations.**

- 6.4.1. Policy OVS6 in the Saved District Local Plan 1991 to 2006, sets out how the Council will determine planning applications, which have noise implications, so potentially causing harm through disturbance to local amenity. The policy sets out, in the explanatory text, how noise exposure categories and the presence of nearby sensitive receptors [such as housing] are important material factors in assessing such proposals. It also outlines how appropriate mitigation measures should be undertaken to reduce any adverse impacts, where feasible and practicable. In addition para. 123 in the NPPF has also been addressed above. Finally, policy CS14 in the Core Strategy notes, inter alia, that new development must ... respect and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.4.2. The context of NGP is this. It is now 16 years since the Park was formally set up in 1997. In that time, it has been highly successful, contributing not only significant amounts of employment space to the District and beyond, but also significant sums to the local community. Clearly the latter is not a planning consideration, but the first issue is. It is also correct to recognise that the majority if not all of the dwellings in close proximity to the Park were there prior to 1997, and indeed some were there prior to the Second World War when the airbase was first constructed. It is thus right that the noise implications of the new QTR scheme must be properly addressed via this application.
- 6.4.3. The nearest dwelling to the Building 302 will be The Larches, some 120m distant. The next is The Holt at 255m. These distances are considered to be quite substantial, having regard to the intervening vegetation on the edge of the NGP boundary. However, there are two factors to take into account. The first is that the background noise levels around the Park are actually quite low, particularly at night, notwithstanding the relative proximity of the A339 to the south. Accordingly, the introduction of new noise, especially over a 24 hour day, needs to be carefully considered. Secondly, for whatever geo-morphological reason, the manner in which noise travels around the Greenham Common Plateau can in fact appear to accentuate it, in particular weather conditions, which can result in noise disruption, and so annoyance. As a result, the Council has received a number of objection letters largely concerned about this issue.

- 6.4.4. Consequently, the applicants have produced a number of acoustic reports, which have been continually refined and amended in the light of corrections and new proposals by the applicant to mitigate the impact of noise on local residents. This has resulted in the 4<sup>th</sup> Version of the Ian Sharland Report being received on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2013. It is this report which has been formally re-consulted upon.
- 6.4.5 This report is summarised as follows. The conclusions on page 28 note that by constructing a new 4 m high acoustic barrier on the eastern perimeter, [100m length] with a further return of some 40m on the southern boundary at the same height, plus another section of about 12m at 3m height, will, in part be sufficient to mitigate the noise caused by the operation of QTR. These barriers will of course be conditioned as part of any permission. The next principal compromise on the applicant's part is to ensure no access at any time [unless in an emergency] from the eastern section/ doors of the building, but only from the west. The refuelling section will be to the north-west away from any dwellings, and all QTR lorries will have broadband alarms. In addition, the eastern yard will only be used between the hours of 7am to 7pm, and the vehicle workshop [internal] will be relocated within the building from the north east to the northwest section.
- 6.4.6 On the above basis the Council's Public Protection Officer, who specialises on acoustic matters and is very familiar with NGP, has duly recommended that conditional permission may be granted. Her conclusions are as below:-  
"The acoustic assessment undertaken has considered the noise contribution of all the noise related activities that would be undertaken on site, and assessed from the worst case scenario of all these activities occurring at the same time thus giving rise to a maximum noise disturbance. Noise from these activities has been compared to the prevailing noise climate, and to the design guidance detailed with BS8233 and WHO Guidelines for living and sleeping accommodation. The report summarises that the noise from the activities proposed, in conjunction with the control measures detailed, will have a slight impact on the nearest residential properties. The predicted noise levels at the nearest properties are thus below the guidance given within the British Standard and WHO Guidelines."
- 6.4.7. In summary, officers concur with the above, considering that the application, if implemented, will fully comply with the policy OVS6 in the Saved Local Plan and the advice in the NPPF of 2012. There will be some slight adverse impact on local residents, but balanced against this is the need for the Council to encourage local business on a designated employment park.

## **7. Conclusion**

- 7.1. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF of 2012 requires all Planning Authorities to determine applications in the light of three roles - economic, social and environmental. In economic terms there is little doubt that the application will be of benefit to the local economy bringing new jobs to the area [although some will transfer from Reading] and will re-use a vacant building. It is noted that the Council Economic Development Officer supports the application. Secondly, it is considered that the social aspects are neutral. Thirdly however, in environmental terms there is some benefit in that a brown field site is being "recycled" in effect, with negligible/ minor impact on matters of noise and traffic. In this regard, given the full compliance with



National and Local policy, officers consider that the economic benefits clearly outweigh any environmental impacts which might arise.

- 7.2. In summary, having regard to the strong reasons to support the proposal, the development proposed is considered to be acceptable and a conditional approval is justifiable for the above reasons as set out in the agenda report.

## **8. Full Recommendation**

The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission, subject to the first completion of the required s 106 Planning Obligation.

Should the obligation be not completed before the end of March 2014, the application, if expedient, be refused for the following reason.

“Notwithstanding the Planning Authorities acceptance of the scheme in principle, the applicant has failed to enter into the required s106 planning obligation which would mitigate the impact the scheme would have upon the Districts roads, and infrastructure. Accordingly, the application is contrary to the advice in the NPPF, policy CS5 in the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026, and the advice in the Council's Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development SPD, adopted in June 2013. The application is thus unacceptable.”

## **CONDITIONS**

1. The development shall be started within three years from the date of this permission and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development against the advice in the DMPO of 2010.

2. Notwithstanding the permitted development rights as set out in Schedule 2, Part 8 of the GPDO 1995 as amended, no mezzanine flooring or any extensions to the warehouse use hereby permitted shall be undertaken, without the express planning permission from the Council.

Reason: To ensure there is no further intensification or expansion of use on the site, which could impact local amenity and the highway network, in accord with policies CS13 and CS14 in the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

3. The permitted ancillary office space shall remain as ancillary at all times [less than 10% of the overall floorspace].

Reason: To accord with the advice in policy ECON6 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 to 2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

4. The access route for all vehicles attending the application site shall be via Third Street East, and Ministry Road, and not Wofford Way.

Reason: To reduce the potential noise impact of lorries accessing the site, on neighbouring property, in accord with policy OVS6 in the Saved Local Plan for West Berkshire 1991 to 2006.

5. The use of the Eastern Parking Area by HGV's shall be restricted to the hours between 07:00 -19:00, every day.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, in accord with policy CS14 in the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

6. No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of the 3 and 4 metre high acoustic barriers (nominal mass 28kg/m<sup>2</sup>, faced on the internal face with absorptive lining), on the eastern and southern boundary of the site, as detailed in the acoustic report dated 10 December 2013 by Ian Sharland - version 4 - has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All works forming part of the scheme shall be completed before use of the building commences.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. In accordance with the objectives of policies ADPP1 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

7. Installation of air handling equipment, if any, shall not commence until details of any proposed air handling plant equipment have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the scheme shall include;

(a) written details concerning any proposed air handling plant associated with the development including

(i) the proposed number and location of such plant as well as the manufacturer's information and specifications

(ii) the acoustic specification of the plant including general sound levels and frequency analysis under conditions likely to be experienced in practice.

(iii) the intended operating times.

(b) The findings of a noise survey (undertaken in accordance with BS4142 or such other standard acceptable to the Local Planning Authority) to determine noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed development and calculations showing the likely impact of noise from the air handling plant;

(c) a scheme of works or such other steps as may be necessary to minimise the effects of noise from the air handling plant;

The agreed scheme shall be implemented in full, with installation timing to be agreed as part of the agreed scheme and kept in full operational order for as long as the building, hereby approved, is occupied and used.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. In accordance with the objectives of policies ADPP1 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

8. All of QTR's HGV's and fork lift trucks operating on the Application Site shall be fitted with non tonal (white noise) reversing warning alarms. In addition, no reversing tonal

beepers shall be used on any vehicles on site between the hours of 23:00-07:00, nor at any time on Sundays, bank or public holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. In accord with policy OVS6 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 to 2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

9. No development shall take place until details of the vehicle parking and turning space / areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall show how the parking spaces are to be surfaced and marked out. The use shall not commence until the vehicle parking and turning spaces / areas have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The parking and / or turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

10. No development shall take place until details of all accesses for vehicles and pedestrians into the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The use shall not commence until the access has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

11. No development shall take place until details of the cycle parking and storage space have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The use shall not commence until the cycle parking and storage space has been provided in accordance with the approved details and retained for this purpose at all times.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate and safe cycle storage space within the site. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

12 Details of floodlighting of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The floodlighting shall be installed, maintained and operated in accordance with the approved details unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to the variation. This installation shall be done prior to the operation of the site commencing.

Reason: to protect the appearance of the area and local residents from light pollution. In accord with policy ECON6 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan - saved 2007.

## **INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to secure and accept what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.
- 2 This decision letter must be read in conjunction with a s106 planning obligation dated the yyyy. You are advised to make yourself aware of the contents.

DC