

Item No.	Application No. and Parish	Statutory Target Date	Proposal, Location, Applicant
(2)	20/00737/COMIND Brimpton	19 <sup>th</sup> June 2020	<p>Full planning application for the conversion and redevelopment of existing land and buildings to create a mixed-use development comprising restaurant, estate farm shop, overnight accommodation, bakery, fermentary, cookery school and event space (local food production and ancillary education facility) and a biomass boiler together with associated works including the demolition of the existing garages and workshop building.</p> <p>Land at Shalford Farm Brimpton.</p> <p>Wasing Estates.</p>
<p><sup>1</sup> Extension of time agreed with applicant until 17<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</p>			

The application can be viewed on the Council's website at the following link:  
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=20/00737/COMIND>

<b>Recommendation Summary:</b>	Delegated to the Head of Development and Planning to refuse planning permission
<b>Ward Member:</b>	Councillor Dominic Boeck
<b>Reason for Committee Determination:</b>	Referred by the Development Control Manager because the Eastern Area Planning Committee determined the previous application.
<b>Committee Site Visit:</b>	Owing to social distancing restrictions, the option of a committee site visit is not available. Instead, a collection of photographs is available to view at the above link.

#### Contact Officer Details

<b>Name:</b>	Michael Butler
<b>Job Title:</b>	Principal Planning Officer
<b>Tel No:</b>	01635 519111
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:Michael.butler@westberks.gov.uk">Michael.butler@westberks.gov.uk</a>

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This application site is 0.6ha in extent, and the applicant is seeking planning permission for the conversion of existing redundant farm buildings (with some permitted extant commercial uses) along with some new build elements at Shalford Farm in Brimpton. The following is the detailed proposal:

- (a) The Old Dairy building is proposed to be used as a cookery school, with an adjoining bakery. This building is presently used as office space.
- (b) A new Dutch barn-style building is proposed to be erected in place of an unused storage building, accommodating an estate farm shop, fermentary and event space (e.g. for yoga classes). On the first floor of the Dutch barn, 7 number 1 bed units for overnight accommodation are proposed.
- (c) In the existing Great Barn it is proposed that there will be a restaurant of 67 covers with an associated kitchen and preparation space. There will be an outdoor kitchen garden with ancillary seating for guests.
- (d) The existing single storey piggeries building to the north east of the site is proposed to be converted to overnight guest accommodation, partially serving the existing wedding business centred at Wasing Park to the south east of the application site.
- (e) A new single storey farm biomass unit is proposed to the west of the application site facing open fields.
- (f) The site is proposed to have an improved vehicle access onto Back Lane with associated vehicle parking spaces for staff, visitors and disabled use, plus spaces for cycles and motorbikes.

1.2 The proposed floor space is as follows:

Use	Floor space (square metres)
A1 (shops)	153
A3 (restaurant)	393
C1 (hotel)	430
D2 (assembly and leisure)	139
B1c (light industrial)	172
Biomass unit ( <i>Sui Generis</i> )	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>1337</b>

1.3 This amounts to an overall net increase in floor space of 383m<sup>2</sup>. Given the fact that the application gross space is in excess of 1000m<sup>2</sup> it is a major development in terms of the Development Management Procedure Order definitions and that as identified in the annex to the NPPF. This is an important fact in relation to the sequential test which is discussed later in the report.

- 1.4 The application site lies in open countryside in the parish, well outside any defined settlement boundary as identified in the Local Plan. Aldermaston Village lies in excess of one mile to the east, whilst Woolhampton lies slightly further to the north with Brimpton equidistant to the west. The surrounding landscape has no special designation, and there are no sites of special scientific interest affected by the development.
- 1.5 The application site has good mature tree cover surrounding the former agricultural yard, and there are a number of estate cottages abutting the yard to the south, all owned by Wasing Estate, the applicant. To the north lies the original Shalford Farmhouse, which is grade II listed, and in separate ownership to the applicant. This was formerly attached to the yard but has apparently been severed for many years. None of the buildings on the site are listed, although the Great Barn could be considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.
- 1.6 The Wasing Park lying to the east of the application site is a designated heritage asset as it is a Registered Historic Park. Most of the site lies in Flood Zone 1, although the north-western extremity lies in Flood Zone 2. There are no physical buildings in Flood Zone 2. There are no public rights of way which run directly through the application site, the closest being a public footpath (Wasing 4/2) to the east beyond dense vegetation. The whole of the site lies within the AWE Aldermaston middle planning land use zone for ONR consultation purposes.

## 2. Planning History

- 2.1 The table below outlines the relevant planning history of the application site.

Application	Proposal	Decision / Date
Various	Collection of permissions since 1985 for a number of B1, B2 and B8 uses on the site. Most extant.	1985-2004
18/02635/COMIND	Redevelopment of the site to a range of commercial uses similar to the present application but with additional retail units for the adjoining wedding business at Wasing.	Refused March 2019. Now at appeal.

- 2.2 There is no question that the site, although once greenfield, is now undoubtedly a brown field (previously developed) site, as identified by the number of past permitted commercial mix of uses across the site as a whole.

## 3. Procedural Matters

- 3.1 The application falls below the identified thresholds for Environmental Impact Assessment as defined in part 10(b) of the Schedule 2 of the 2017 Regulations. Accordingly, no screening opinion was required for the application.
- 3.2 A site notice was displayed on the 20<sup>th</sup> March 2020, and expired on the 11<sup>th</sup> April 2020. A public notice was publicised in the local newspaper on the 26<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

- 3.3 The retail element of the scheme would be CIL liable. The application form notes a figure of 153m<sup>2</sup>. Other elements of the scheme do not attract a CIL charge. CIL liability will be determined by the CIL Charging Authority upon the grant of any permission

## 4. Consultation

### *Statutory and non-statutory consultation*

- 4.1 The table below summarises the consultation responses received during the consideration of the application. The full responses may be viewed with the application documents on the Council's website, using the link at the start of this report.

<b>Brimpton Parish Council:</b>	No objections.
<b>Highways Authority (WBC):</b>	Objection. Recommends refusal on the basis that the high level of mixed commercial use on the site will generate an unacceptable level of private car traffic on rural roads, so clearly contrary to extant policy.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority (WBC):</b>	No objections. Conditional permission is recommended.
<b>Emergency Planning:</b>	Does not advise against the issue of planning permission.
<b>WBC Archaeologist:</b>	The site is of some archaeological interest, so a watching brief is recommended as a condition, during site works.
<b>Thames Water:</b>	No objections subject to a site sewerage packet treatment plant being constructed on site should permission be granted.
<b>Environmental Health:</b>	No objections. Conditions if applied will mitigate any additional harmful noise arising, light pollution, possible contaminated land issues, and odour control, plus delivery times.
<b>Historic England:</b>	No objections. Advises that the Council seeks its own specialist advice on the application in regards to local heritage issues.
<b>WBC Conservation Officer:</b>	No objections. Whilst local assets of heritage significance adjoin the site, the development of this yard will not be harmful to the setting of those assets.
<b>WBC Minerals and Waste Planning Officer:</b>	Comment on the biomass boiler. This will be fed by wood chip pellets which is not a waste product. No objections.
<b>Natural England:</b>	No objections. The application is not in the sphere of influence of any SSSI so no impacts.
<b>Ministry of Defence:</b>	No safeguarding objections.

<b>Office of Nuclear Regulation:</b>	Does not advise against development.
<b>WBC Planning Policy:</b>	Whilst not objecting per se to the proposal, concerns are raised about the overall level of new build on the site in an unsustainable location, leading to high traffic levels locally. In addition has been prepared to justify the application.
<b>WBC Ecologist:</b>	Views awaited.
<b>Thames Valley Police:</b>	No comment.
<b>Canal and River Trust:</b>	No comment.
<b>WBC Housing:</b>	No comment.

### ***Public representations***

- 4.2 Representations have been received from 4 contributors all of whom object to the application.
- 4.3 The full responses may be viewed with the application documents on the Council's website, using the link at the start of this report. In summary, the following issues/points have been raised:
- Overdevelopment of the site, over ambitious, too intense.
  - Leading to impact on local roads to their detriment.
  - Lack of good supporting transport information.
  - Town centre uses in the wrong location, where is the justification?
  - Impact on amenity, increase in local noise and light pollution.
  - Detrimental impact upon local heritage, and impact on setting of listed farmhouse to the north.

## **5. Planning Policy**

- 5.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The following policies of the statutory development plan are relevant to the consideration of this application.
- Policies ADPP1, ADPP6, CS5, CS8, CS9, CS10, CS11, CS13, CS14, CS15, CS16, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (WBCS).
  - Policies OVS.5, OVS.6 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).
- 5.2 The following material considerations are relevant to the consideration of this application:
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
  - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

## 6. Appraisal

6.1 The main issues for consideration in this application are:

- Whether the proposed mix and extent of new commercial uses on the site should be accepted, given the unsustainable location of the application site.
- Whether the lack of a sequential test submitted by the applicant is acceptable in policy terms.
- Whether the nature and scale of the uses proposed means that it would amount to an overdevelopment of the application site.
- Other issues including landscape character, flooding, design, BREEAM, amenity, heritage issues.

### ***Sustainability***

6.2 According to Policy ADPP1, development in West Berkshire will follow the existing settlement pattern and comply with the spatial strategy set out in the Area Delivery Plan policies. Most development will be within or adjacent to the settlements included in the settlement hierarchy (the closest service villages being Aldermaston and Woolhampton), and related to the transport accessibility of the settlements (especially by public transport, cycling and walking) their level of services and the availability of suitable sites for development. The majority of development will take place on previously developed land. West Berkshire's main urban areas will be the focus for most development. The most intensively used developments, intensive employment generating uses, and intensive trip generating uses, such as major mixed use, retail or leisure uses, will be located in those town centre areas where the extent and capacity of supporting infrastructure, services and facilities is the greatest. The scale and density of development will be related to the site's current or proposed accessibility, character and surroundings. Significant intensification of employment generating and other intensive uses will be avoided within areas which lack sufficient supporting infrastructure, facilities or services or where opportunities to access them by public transport, cycling and walking are limited.

6.3 The application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundary, in open countryside, wherein Policy ADPP1 states that only appropriate limited development in the countryside will be allowed, focused on addressing identified needs and maintaining a strong rural economy.

6.4 The NPPF provides considerable guidance as to whether, in supporting a prosperous rural economy, local planning authorities should seek to support schemes such as this (i.e. commercial applications on run down brownfield sites). Reference is specifically made to the advice in Chapter 6 of the NPPF. For example, paragraph 83 states that "*planning decisions should enable (a) the sustainable growth of all types of businesses in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings (b) the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based businesses*", and (c) *sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside*".

6.5 Policy CS9 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy states that, in appropriate circumstances, the Council will promote the intensification, redevelopment, and upgrade of existing, vacant and/or derelict employment sites and premises for business development. This is to encourage flexibility and availability of local employment space. This keeps the local market attractive to investment. Policy CS10 is specific to the rural economy, it states that proposals to diversify the rural economy will be encouraged, particularly where they are located in or adjacent to Rural Service Centres and Service

Villages. Existing small and medium sized enterprises within the rural areas will be supported in order to provide local job opportunities and maintain the viability of smaller rural settlements.

- 6.6 The applicant is the Wasing Estate, who are seeking to diversify further their already diversified business. If this application were approved new investment would be directed towards a largely redundant farm complex, which is advantageous purely in terms of increased business assets across the district and the economy as a whole.
- 6.7 The principal concern with this application is its location. The site originates as a farm complex that has been subject to various conversions over time. Now that it is clearly underused, it is simply by opportunity that the applicant owns the site and wishes to redevelop it. What cannot be altered is its location, which as the highways officer has clearly set out in his consultation response, is not sustainable. The site is fairly remote and the nature of the local rural road network is not likely to actively encourage sustainable modes of transport. Significant new private vehicle movements (approximately 400 per day or more) onto these rural roads would be harmful to not only local road safety, but also contrary to all the local and national policies which seek to reduce carbon emissions through the reliance on the private motor vehicles. This is set out in Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy and Chapter 9 of the NPPF, which promote sustainable transport. In addition, there are no pedestrian or bus routes direct to the application site, and cycling will be difficult, particularly over the winter months since there is no street lighting around the site.
- 6.8 The applicants have prayed in aid the potential for a new funded local bus from the local rail station and beyond, but the Council officers have rightly made the point that these type of transport initiatives, whilst well meant, are difficult to monitor and fund into the future, unless for very large sites. And in addition, it is unclear how effective they would be in reducing the level of private car movements — perhaps for some staff, but little else. Whilst officers do not consider such a planning obligation sufficient to overcome the inherent unsustainable nature of the application site, should Committee be minded to grant planning permission it is recommended that such bus funding should be secured by a specific planning obligation as opposed to a planning condition, to ensure future funding for a minimum period of at least 5 years from occupation of the complex.
- 6.9 Overall, whilst the need to support rural enterprise is recognised, it is considered that the inherently unsustainable nature of this remote rural location renders a proposed development of this scale unacceptable, contrary to the aforementioned policies.

### ***Main town centre uses sequential test***

- 6.10 The sequential test is a method employed by planning decision makers as an aid for determining whether applications for “main town centre uses” should or should not be permitted in locations on the edge of, or outside of town centres. The principal purpose of this test is to ensure the ongoing commercial vitality and viability of town centres. Chapter 7 of the NPPF sets out the detail of the sequential test. Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses (including retail development, leisure, entertainment, restaurants, health and fitness centres, offices, culture and tourism development, hotels and conference facilities) which are neither in an existing centre nor in accordance with an up-to-date plan. Main town centre uses should be located in town centres, then edge of centre locations; and only if suitable sites are not available (or expected to become available within a reasonable period) should out of centre sites be considered.
- 6.11 Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states that the sequential approach should not be applied to applications for small scale rural offices or other small scale rural development. The NPPF does not define “small scale” in this context. However, (1) the proposal falls within

the definition of major development in the NPPF and the Development Management Procedure Order, and (2) as a matter of judgement the scale of development proposed in not considered small scale in terms of the context of the site or in relation to surrounding centres. It is therefore considered that the exception in paragraph 88 does not apply to this proposal.

- 6.12 Applicants are required to submit an analysis to demonstrate that a proposal can pass the sequential test, and to justify why the types of uses proposed in the application are acceptable in the location. No sequential test has been submitted by the applicant. It is apparent to the planning officers that the nature of the uses proposed (such as the restaurant, hotel, and leisure uses) could be located in suitable premises within or closer to identified centres (e.g. Aldermaston or Woolhampton).
- 6.13 Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy sets out the hierarchy of the districts retail centres with Newbury being at the top and lowest being local and village centres such as Aldermaston. Paragraph 5.69 of the supporting text identifies the need for the sequential test to be applied in the determination of planning applications. It is very clear that the application location comprises an out of centre site (i.e. the least preferred location). Accordingly, in the absence of such a test the Council officers consider that the types of commercial uses will indeed if permitted and built out, undermine nearby retail centres, their buoyancy and continuing attraction to investment now and in the future, to their overall detriment. The proposal is accordingly unacceptable on this basis.

### ***Overdevelopment***

- 6.14 Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy states that new development must demonstrate high quality and sustainable design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area. According to Policy CS19, particular regard will be given to (a) the sensitivity of the area to change; and (b) ensuring that new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character.
- 6.15 In terms of whether the proposals respects the character and appearance of the area, and if appropriate in context, some Members of the Committee may recall that this site was considered under a separate application, 18/02635/COMIND. This application was refused in March 2019, and is now at appeal. Members may recall that in the officer report the recommended reasons for refusal did not include overdevelopment of the site, and the local impact on amenity and tranquil nature of the site. However, in rejecting the proposal the Committee elected to include a specific additional reason for refusal on these grounds.
- 6.16 In this proposal the overall level of floorspace proposed on the site has been reduced by 303m<sup>2</sup> and this has been achieved by essentially deleting the narrow barn to the north of the proposed Dutch barn. This was to include the wedding shop and additional bedrooms for guests. Accordingly, notwithstanding the fact that the previous Committee resolved that the previous scheme overdeveloped the site, given the reduced scale of the current proposal compared to the rejected application, officers are not recommending a third reason for refusal on the grounds of overdevelopment.
- 6.17 It is not considered that this will weaken the Council case at the appeal on the first application since the Inspector will be aware of the original views of the case officer and, of course, it is entirely legitimate and reasonable for the Committee to take a different view to officers on the material facts and judgements of the case. This is to ensure officer advice remains consistent, but it is recognised that it is a matter of judgement whether the proposed development complies with the aforementioned policies.



### ***Sustainable construction and carbon reduction***

- 6.18 Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy identifies the need for non-residential development to achieve a BREEAM Excellent rating, and for all new major commercial development in the district to achieve a zero carbon development from 2019 (the latter subject to changes in Government aspirations). The applicant has submitted a BREEAM pre-assessment report with a covering letter, which notes that whilst BREEAM Excellent could be achieved, this would be at significant cost to the developer, owing to the “poor” location of the site on sustainability measures, makes a number of credits effectively impossible to achieve. Officers accept this point and whilst the scheme would be contrary to Policy CS15, no additional reason for refusal is recommended on this basis. However, the point is re-iterated that this highlights one of the difficulties in promoting this scheme at this location, and the inability to viably achieve BREEAM Excellent on such grounds supports the sustainability objection.

### ***Flood risk and drainage***

- 6.19 Although the application site lies in close proximity to the River Enborne, it does largely lie in Flood Zone 1. Flood Zone 2 covers the north-eastern extremity of the site but no new building is proposed here. It lies adjacent the piggeries building but not under it. There have been no flooding objections from the Environment Agency, and subject to conditions the Lead Local Flood Authority has no objections to the scheme. Accordingly, the application will comply with Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy.

### ***Biodiversity***

- 6.20 It is important to identify whether any protected species and their habitats would be harmed by the development should it proceed. The applicants have submitted a biodiversity report which has indicated that bat roosts do exist in the barns on the application site. It has been concluded that should the application be approved and implemented, this will harm the roosts so not only will a Licence from Natural England be required, but also the three “derogation tests” under the Habitats Regulations in relation to these protected species will need to be passed.
- 6.21 The three tests are: (1) ‘licences may be granted to ‘preserve public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences or primary importance for the environment’; (2) that a licence may not be granted unless the licensing authority is satisfied ‘that there is no reasonable alternative’; and (3) that a licence cannot be issued unless the licensing authority is satisfied that the action proposed ‘will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range’.
- 6.22 At the time of writing this report no specific response has yet been received from the Council ecologist. It is possible that an objection may be raised on the grounds of the loss of a maternity roost for soprano pipistrelle bats which were found in the workshop. If this is the case and the three tests above in his view cannot be satisfied then an additional reason for refusal will be recommended on the update sheet, relating to harm to protected species, so being contrary to the advice in policy CS17 in the Core Strategy.

### ***Heritage assets and landscape character***

- 6.23 The NPPF advises that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policy CS19 also requires due regard to such assets, which includes listed buildings, and registered parks and gardens. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 also places a duty

on planning decision makers in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

- 6.24 Lying to the north of the application site is Shalford Farm House. This is grade II listed building. It is, however, physically divorced from the yard to the south by existing tree screening, and a drainage ditch. It also enjoys a separate vehicle access. Accordingly, in the view of officers the buildings in the yard are not curtilage listed, by virtue of the above physical factors which create a distinction in context between the two sites. Having said that, the Council must have due regard as to whether the scheme would have any impact on the setting of the listed farmhouse.
- 6.25 To the east across Back Lane lies the Grade II listed Wasing Place, a nationally registered Park and Garden, itself containing some six listed buildings at its centre, including the Grade I listed St Nicholas Church.
- 6.26 Owing to the separation distances and intervening tree cover, the Conservation Officer concludes that the significance of these assets would not be materially affected, either directly or in terms of their setting. The farmyard buildings themselves are considered non-designated heritage assets, but the Conservation Officer raises no objections to the impacts of the development on them.
- 6.27 Members will note from the photographs that the current attractiveness of the yard is poor and does not make a particularly positive contribution to the setting of these assets. Officers consider that, if the application is approved, on balance whilst the physical massing and scale of the new buildings/conversions will be more dominant than before, the design and external facing materials will be acceptable in terms of the impacts on these assets, and thereby comply with the heritage parts of Policy CS19.
- 6.28 Policy CS19 also relates to landscape character. The application needs to be considered in the wider landscape context of the farmyard in which it is situated. The application site does not lie in the AONB, nor any other designated landscape protection area. It is low lying and is virtually surrounded by a good mature tree screen which assists in assimilating the buildings into the wider countryside. Officers consider that both the design and elevational treatment of the development (conservation and new build) would be of high quality and so will enable the rather dilapidated and run down site to be visually enhanced. Thus the likelihood of any wider visual harm to the surrounding nature and character of the rural area is low in the officer view. Accordingly, no recommended reason for refusal relates to a wider visual impact on the landscape.

### ***Neighbouring amenity***

- 6.29 The final main issue which the Committee should consider in the determination of this application is that of the potential impact on the amenity and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Whilst objections have been received on this matter in relation to Shalford Farm House, it remains important to consider the impact on the neighbouring farm cottages abutting the site. In this context, environmental health colleagues have not objected on matters of noise, odour or lighting, subject of course to conditions to control/mitigate any impacts which might be caused. It is, however, self-evident that should the development proceed there will be an inevitable impact on the hitherto tranquil quality of the site, in its rural setting. But this harm is not considered so significant as to merit an additional reason for refusal in this application, also considering the character of the existing permitted uses. The advice in Chapter 8 of the NPPF relating to healthy and safe communities is accordingly respected.

## 7. Planning balance and conclusion

- 7.1 In terms of the economic aspects of this application, it is clear that the application has considerable merit. It will not only provide new rural employment, but assist in sustaining an important local employer and business (i.e. the Wasing Estate). It will provide additional opportunities for new local businesses, such as the bakery. However, the Committee need to bear in mind that should planning permission be granted, this will not be personal to the applicant (i.e. the site could be sold on). However, the down side of the economic argument is the fact that there will be some continued impact on identified local centres, due to the lack of new investment which should be directed to such locations as opposed to this remote and unsustainable location. This is reflected in policy terms in the inadequacy of the sequential test.
- 7.2 In terms of the social aspect of the proposal, this is of benefit since new opportunities for social interaction may be created by the mini complex (e.g. the restaurant and the yoga classes), although such uses should again be directed towards more sustainable local centres.
- 7.3 In terms of the environmental issues, on the one hand there are advantages in that a rather unsightly and dilapidated site will be tidied up and improved, with good design and appropriate immediate access and parking, with natural mature screening around the site. In addition, there are no immediate amenity or flooding issues. However, the final principal policy reason why the application is considered unacceptable is the poor location of Shalford Farm, leading to a significant level of private motor vehicle traffic on a poor rural road network, leading to increased carbon dioxide emissions. The planning system seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations to address these wider objectives, and so this is a significant adverse effect of the proposals.
- 7.4 Officers are clear that the weighting of the balance in regards to the above material considerations lies in rejecting the application.
- 7.5 If Committee resolves to refuse planning permission, it is likely that an appeal will be submitted and likely conjoined with the present appeal and held some time later in the year. If the application is approved the applicant has stated that they will withdraw the current appeal in relation to application number 18/02645/COMIND. However, this application should be considered on its merits.
- 7.6 The application is accordingly recommended for refusal on the two grounds below, with the potential for an addition of an ecology reason.

## 8. Recommendation

- 8.1 Delegate to the Head of Development and Planning to **refuse planning permission** for the following reasons:
1. The proposal will significantly increase traffic in a remote rural location that has no pedestrian or bus routes and is accessible only by rural roads which are not conducive to cycling. Accordingly, by virtue of the nature, intensity and location of the development it would significantly increase traffic where the mode of travel can only reasonably be the private car. The proposal is therefore unsustainable and is contrary to Policies ADPP1, ADPP6, CS9, CS10 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, the Local Transport Plan for West Berkshire 2011-2026, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
  2. The application has failed to satisfy the sequential test for main town centre uses in Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The proposed

major development is not considered to be excluded from the sequential test by paragraph 88 of the NPPF, as it is not considered “small scale”. This is primarily because it comprises an intense mix of uses in the context of the rural location . The proposed development would accordingly contribute towards undermining the viability and vitality of local district centres, which would be preferable locations for the scale and type of proposed uses, contrary to Policy CS11 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.