Item No.	Application No. and Parish	Statutory Target Date	Proposal, Location, Applicant
(2)	19/02979/OUTMAJ Lambourn	17 February 2020[1]	Outline application for the erection of a new logistics warehouse building (for occupation by Walker Logistics) (Use Class B8) with ancillary office floorspace, an aircraft museum building (Use Class D1), and associated access, car parking and landscaping. Matters to be considered: Scale Land South of Tower Works, Ramsbury Road, Lambourn Woodlands, Hungerford Walker Logistics Limited

[1] Extension of time (date to be confirmed)

The application can be viewed on the Council's website at the following link:
http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=19/02979/OUTMAJ

Recommendation Summary:	To **DELEGATE** to the Head of Development and Planning to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the schedule of conditions (Section 8 of the report)
Ward Member(s):	Councillor Howard Woollaston
Reason for Committee Determination:	More than 10 letters of objection received
Committee Site Visit:	N/A

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Simon Till
Job Title:	Team Leader (West)
Tel No:	01635 519111
Email:	Simon.till@westberks.gov.uk

1. Introduction

1.1 This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of a logistics warehouse, together with ancillary office space and an aircraft museum. In this outline application the scale of the building is to be considered, while detailed considerations in respect of access, appearance, landscaping and layout are to be held over to a subsequent "reserved matters" application should outline planning permission be granted.

1.2 In terms of scale the applications is supported by drawings indicating that the proposed building would have an overall footprint of approximately 12,560 square metres and a maximum height of 12.587m. The proposed museum building would have a maximum height of 11.4 metres.

1.3 The application site is located outside of any defined settlement boundary in land defined as countryside under Policy ADPP1 of the Core Strategy. It consists an agricultural field that to the west is bordered by a dense boundary of trees separating it from the Membury airfield runway. To the north and south adjoining the site are industrial buildings within the Membury Protected Employment Area, which to the east is the Ramsbury Road and open agricultural land.

2. Planning History

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

Application	Proposal	Decision / Date
19/01123/SCREEN	EIA Screening Opinion made under Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017 (as amended)	Response issued 03/06/2019

3. Procedural Matters

3.1 The latest proposed development falls within the column 1 description at paragraph 10 (a) (Industrial Estate Development Projects) of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (EIA) Regulations 2017. An EIA screening exercise has been completed (reference 19/01123/SCREEN issued 03 June 2019). The proposed development exceeds the threshold in column 2 of Schedule 2 (more than 0.5 hectares of industrial development). Taking into account the selection criteria in Schedule 3 it was not considered that the proposed development was considered likely to have significant effects on the environment within the meaning of the regulations, and that the development is not EIA development. Therefore an Environmental Statement is not required in terms of the EIA Regulations.

3.2 A site notice was displayed on 09 December 2019. An advertisement was published in the Newbury Weekly News on 12 December 2019. The application was advertised as a departure from policy and a major development in line with the requirements of legislation. The deadline for representations expired on 23 December 2019.

3.3 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a levy charged on most new development to pay for new infrastructure required as a result of the new development. CIL will be charged

on residential (C3 and C4) and retail (A1 - A5) development. CIL is not considered in this report.

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.

Lambourn Parish Council:	Object: Outside Protected Employment Area; setting a precedent for more development in green fields; unacceptable within the AONB; visual impact within the AONB; additional vehicle movements; unacceptable development creep; PEA should not be joined up with loss of open space.
WBC Planning Policy:	National and local planning policies seek to support a sustainable rural economy, whilst also protecting nationally designated landscapes such as AONBs which this site falls within. The case officer will therefore need to ensure that sufficient justification has been given for the need for the development in this particular location. ADPP5 states that the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape will be the paramount consideration in assessing sites, and as such the case officer will also need to satisfy themselves that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to show that the proposals are appropriate in this regard. The Employment Land Review (ELR) is an important evidence document when considering the economic case, and the balance to be applied when assessing whether the scheme is sustainable development. The demand for space at the site, adjacent to the existing business during the pandemic is also an important factor. The Local Plan Review to 2037, at Policy SP21, seeks to extend the Designated Employment Areas (known in the Core Strategy as Protected Employment Areas), and allocated space for 27,600 square metres of B2 and B8 employment floorspace on a larger area at the application site. The policy is at an early stage, and the recent consultation highlights comments which require further consideration and refinement of the policy prior to the next stage, Regulation 19. Therefore, whilst the Local Plan Review shows the direction of travel, limited weight is to be attached to the emerging policies. Current local policy also seeks to assess the compatibility of the proposal with uses in the surrounding area as well as any potential impacts on those uses; and, the capacity and impact on the road network and access by sustainable modes of transport. It is also considered necessary to seek the views of the Council's Highways and Transport Policy teams with regard to the impact on the road network and sustainable transport modes.

	Overall, there are balancing issues to weigh up in the consideration of whether the scheme represents sustainable development. The policy response aims to provide an update on the evidence and information that has emerged since the last planning policy response, which are important in this balancing exercise.
WBC Economic Development:	After considering the evidence submitted, and reviewing what alternative sites may be available within the district, I would suggest that the impact of the proposal would have significant economic benefits to West Berkshire and that it should therefore find favour. The plans as described would lead to a number of new jobs, both during and after construction, and the additional capacity that a logistics firm such as Walker Logistics would need in order to grow resilience post-Covid 19 and post-EU Exit. I was alarmed to read the assessment of alternative options for the company and would be very concerned about the prospect of them leaving the district for elsewhere in the country. At a time when local unemployment is higher than at any point in recent memory, I would be gravely worried about the loss of these roles to another area. The growth of a business such as Walker Logistics is also welcome because of possible new training opportunities it may create. I would welcome the chance to discuss with them what further employment opportunities, perhaps through use of recently announced government schemes, they might be able to offer to some of the district's young people who have been most Impacted by Covid-19. In summary, from an Economic Development point of view, I would be supportive of this application as it allows a significant local employer to not only remain in West Berkshire, but to expand and consolidate its future success.
WBC Highways:	Walker Logistics, Ramsbury Road, Membury 10,381 sqm of B8 use with an ancillary 1,143 sqm B1 office use. 1. I refer to my previous response dated December 31st 2019. I also refer to the traffic survey results received on February 27th 2020. <u>Traffic Generation</u> 2. As stated previously, to project traffic generation, data has been obtained during November 2017 from traffic surveys carried out at the existing Walker Logistics site located off Ramsbury Road. It is understood that the proposed logistics building will operate in a similar manner and therefore traffic levels have been increased on a pro rata basis to project traffic levels. I am content with this approach which projects the following:

	Arrivals Total Vehicles (HGV's)	Departures Total Vehicles (HGV's)	Two-Way Total Vehicles (HGV's)
Weekday AM 08.00 to 09.00	9 (3)	3 (2)	12 (5)
Weekday PM 17.00 to 18.00	5 (4)	11 (5)	16 (9)
Weekday daily	76 (47)	77 (48)	153 (95)

Projected additional development traffic levels

3. The TA states on page 14 that "as per the existing Walker Logistics operations, the proposed development will primarily operate on weekdays, Monday to Friday only, and will be closed at weekends. However, if requested by customers, it will open on the occasional weekend for stock checks. It is estimated that weekend stock checks will occur 4-6 times per year at most" with "2 to 6 staff". It would therefore appear that any weekend traffic would be somewhat minimal, but I would expect conditions for opening hours to be applied in the usual way, should the proposal be approved.

Traffic Impact

4. As requested in my previous response, the applicants commissioned the attached seven day classified traffic survey using an Automatic Traffic Counter (ATC) on the B4000 Ermin Street in Lambourn Woodlands, situated to the east of the staggered junction with the B4000 and Hilldrop Lane. The following five weekday average in data was obtained between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 with HGV figures in brackets:

2,337 (63) eastbound

2,327 (74) westbound

5. To attempt to ascertain any particular trend in traffic levels along the B4000, I have compared this data with two sets of data taken nearby previously. The first and more recent set was taken on the B4000 Ermin Street in Lambourn Woodlands near Battens Farm Cottages. The following was obtained between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 with HGV figures in brackets:

25/05/2012 1,188 (59) eastbound

39/05/2012 1,147 (51) eastbound

30/05/2012 1,117 (48) eastbound

25/05/2012 1,256 (102) westbound

29/05/2012 1,059 (107) westbound

30/05/2012 1,002 (101) westbound

6. I have also found a further earlier set again taken on the B 4000 Ermin Street, in Woodlands St Mary near Inholmes. The

	following was obtained between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00, again with HGV figures in brackets: 15/10/2009 2,063 (111) eastbound 16/10/2009 2,093 (81) eastbound 15/10/2009 1944 (114) westbound 16/10/2009 2168 (89) westbound 7. The data that I have found is not as extensive as I would have liked it to have been. Batten Farm Cottages is to the west of the staggered junction with the B4000 and Hilldrop Lane which has provided a significantly lower figure than traffic flows to theeast of the junction. Comparing the data to the 2009 data, I would consider that overall there is some evidence to suggest that there has been an increase in overall traffic since 2009, but levels of HGV's do seem to be constant or may even have reduced since 2009 and 2012. Either way, from the data, it is difficult to argue that there has been an increase in HGV traffic over the years. 8. What is often asked, is what limit is there of traffic that can be accommodated on a road such as the B4000? As stated previously, there is no particular threshold or formula that would provide a limit for how much traffic the B4000 can accommodate, particularly as the highway authority is unaware of any significant traffic congestion in the area. What could provide a limit is whether there is a Personal Injury Accident (PIA) issue along the route, and from my previous response I determined that there wasn't one. 9. There is a potential further unit of measurement contained within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 5 Section 1 Part 3 TA79/99 Amendment No 1: Traffic Capacity of Urban Roads sets out one way hourly flows in each direction for urban roads. (I appreciate that this isn't an urban road, but this would be a more onerous standard for the applicant. A 6.75 metre wide road is given a capacity of 900 vehicles in each direction per hour of 10,800 per day. Much of the B4000 has this width of road, and clearly traffic levels are nowhere near this threshold. 10. Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 states 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". 11. I can therefore conclude that while the expected traffic increases from the development particular HGV's is not insignificant, from the evidence obtained, it is not in my view significant to be "severe" enough to raise objection. Sustainability

	12. As stated previously, I am concerned regarding how unsustainable this site is. The nearest bus stop is 1.9 km away and is served by just one service each way per day. Along Ramsbury Road there are no footways present on either side of the carriageway and no street lighting. Therefore it is not desirable or even possible to walk to the nearest bus stop. I would also add that it is also not desirable to cycle to the vicinity, particularly along the B4000. In response CEC have provided a Travel Plan (TP). 13. The main proposal within the TP is to provide and operate a staff mini-bus service between Swindon and the site. It is understood that the majority of existing permanent staff are based in Swindon with anticipation that the catchment area of future staff will also largely be from Swindon. 14. It is also understood that Walker Logistics currently employ a proportion of temporary contract staff at their existing premises, with this continuing for the proposed development. Temporary staff are recruited via an agency (Gravity Personnel) who have offices in both Reading and Swindon. Gravity Personnel currently provide an in-house mini-bus service for their staff between Reading and the existing Walker Logistics site. It is anticipated that this service will continue to operate and will serve both Walker Logistics' sites in the future and could be expanded to link the Swindon area should Agency staff also be employed from there. A further measure is that staff will be encouraged to car share where possible from an in-house car-sharing database to assist staff to find car sharers that live near them. 15. Colleagues in Transport Policy will need to comment on the TP in further detail, but I can state that in my view, a TP does not resolve the significant sustainability issues raised above. I would state that I would not expect a TP to be particularly effective or useful in this location. It cannot be guaranteed that staff will be a certain type or be recruited from a certain area. The highway authority is also aware of previous sites across the district where the provision of a mini bus has been promised, but then due to costs it then isn't retained for that long. The latest example being the Harrods Distribution Centre that is a much larger site than this proposal, and is in the relatively sustainable location of Thatcham. A further issue is that there isn't staff resourcing within the Council to monitor TP's for smaller developments of this size. <u>Conclusion</u> 16. I conclude that no objection is raised by the highway authority on traffic grounds. However objection could be raised by the highway authority on sustainability grounds. It has been policy of the Highways Development Control for some time to try and resist expansion of the Membury Industrial Estate due to how unsustainable the location is. It could be considered that if the Climate Emergency is to be taken seriously then this proposal should be resisted.

WBC Transport Policy:	It is clear that the site is unsustainable location, with non-car access to the site virtually impossible. Bearing this in mind, the accompanying Travel Plan Statement outlines the measures (particularly the commitment to provide a staff bus service and car-sharing scheme) that the occupier will look to use to reduce car journeys to the site. These measures will need to be effectively delivered and sustained if they are to make an effective and lasting contribution towards reducing car trips to the site. This is especially pertinent when considering the Council's Declaration of a Climate Emergency. However, I have concerns regarding the coverage of the bus service given that only two collection points are proposed in the Swindon area and that there appears to be no committed time period for which the service would operate. The latter is especially concerning as the service could be at risk of withdrawal should the site operator deem it not to be viable. Given that the bus service is considered to be the main focus outlined in the TPS for supporting sustainable travel to the site, greater certainty and commitment needs to be provided that the service will operate for a sustained period of time.
WBC SuDS Drainage engineer:	No objections subject to a condition requiring provision of SuDS.
WBC Environmental Health:	No objections subject to conditions in respect of noise impact, construction management and lighting.
WBC Landscape Consultant:	Consultation response: The site is set within the North Wessex Downs AONB. As stated within ADPP5, new development will need to conserve and enhance the local distinctiveness, sense of place and setting of the AONB whilst preserving the strong sense of remoteness. Development will need to respond positively to the local context and respect identified landscape features and components of natural beauty. The site is considered major development within the AONB, therefore para 172 within the NPPF will apply which states "planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of: c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities." A Landscape Visual Assessment (LVA) has been provided as part of the application to assess the impact and effect on the landscape. As detailed above the LVA has been overly biased towards the proposals withinits assessment and has omitted key aspects which has led to a number of conclusions which I cannot agree to or support. The proposal will result in a direct loss of an open field of pasture which contributes to a key characteristic as described as the

	mixed mosaic of woodland/ arable and pasture farmland within the Lambourn Wooded Downs of the NWD AONB. The proposal will not conserve or enhance this area of the AONB by replacing a field of pasture with a large scale building, a large area of hardstanding for over 100 cars, an entrance with signage, which will all result in a further change of the landscape character from rural to more suburban all set within the AONB. The proposal will also exacerbate the visual impact of existing development which is out of character at this location which will further detract from the rural qualities of the area. Increased traffic will have a further adverse impact on the rural quality of Ramsbury Road and tranquillity levels within the wider area. The proposals therefore do not comply with Policy ADPP5 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy. As stated within Policy CS 14: New development must demonstrate high quality and sustainable design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area. The proposals have been developed over time to produce the best layout for the site. Primary mitigation measures have been designed to reduce the visual impact of the building, by sensitive siting, colour and location; secondary mitigation measures have been proposed which includes extensive native tree planting, which is not out of context within the surrounding landscape pattern. However, the proposed development would still merge two PEAs and initially cause a loss of the rural character of this section of Ramsbury Road. Although the main building's present siting is towards the rear of the site with a wide band shown for landscaping; any proposed planting will take time to mature to be effective in screening and mitigating the massing and scale of the proposal, although the entrance and signage would always be visible from Ramsbury Road. The proposal would also intensify the impact of commercial development within this part of the AONB, including increased traffic on the rural road network, which would also be contrary to conserving and enhancing adjacent areas of the AONB. Additionally, developing this site would then weaken the case for developing the site adjacent the silo towers, which would have an adverse effect on the amenity value of adjacent Honeysuckle Cottage and Cuckoo Cottage. Furthermore, allowing a gap to be included within the woodland belt could also open up the western area of this site to development pressure. A further response was provided to the case officer in seeking clarification on certain matters: Question: In respect of the site, we have discussed its level of importance within the AONB. Whilst not seeking to detract from the protected landscape status, my feelings are that the views of this site are quite localised, and that their main contribution to landscape quality is to the openness of views, particularly from Ramsbury Road. What are your views on this? Answer: The views are localised and they do contribute to a sense of openness along the short adjacent section of road

	Question: In respect of its contribution to landscape quality, in light of its position alongside the existing protected employment area and its associated industrial character buildings, and in consideration of the dense belt of trees to the boundaries of the site, my view is that the loss of this site in those views would be of a considerably lesser level of harm to the character and setting of the AONB than that of a more exposed site that was visible from more public view points. What are your views on this? Answer: I agree, although the LVA overplayed the visibility of the surrounding industrial buildings (including the silo towers) and their degrading effect on the landscape character of the site. The site is well contained along its northern, western and southern boundaries mainly by trees/woodland, while also forming part of the more open landscape to the east. Question: We discussed the possibility of a landscaping strategy that accommodated both elements that could provide shorter term softening of the impacts of the development and longer term a greater level of screening, and that with such a landscaping strategy the impacts of the development on the key views from Ramsbury Road, secured by the appropriate conditions for long term retention, management and maintenance, could be partially mitigated. The resultant impact would be in effect to move the visual impact of the belt of trees from the rear of the open field to closer to Ramsbury Road, with the accompanying loss of the views over the open field. What are your views on this? Answer: By setting the building towards the rear of the site this would allow space for mitigation measures within the area to the front and adjacent Ramsbury Road. There would be sufficient space for a planting plan, where a number of faster growing trees planted at a higher density to encourage growth could be included then felled at a later date as a more appropriate woodland tree mix became established. However, the trees will take time to grow and this would replace a loss of views over an open field. A positive of this site is that there is space for mitigation which in time will be effective in reducing the adverse visual effect. Question: We discussed that in this case there is a fine balance to be struck between the need for economic development in supporting an existing, reputable and well-established local business in its need for growth and the landscape impacts of the proposed development which, while resulting in a level of harm in respect of the erosion of the openness of localised views, are not severe in my view provided that appropriate mitigation landscaping is provided and maintained, which in this case there is clear justification to do. What are your views on this? Answer: I agree, although the application might not conserve and enhance the AONB and there will be a loss of openness, in the long term an extensive mitigation plan including subtle mounding, extensive tree planting could reduce the level of effect, but this will take time.

WBC Tree officer:	No objections subject to provision of further details of planting included in a landscaping condition.
WBC Ecologist	No objections. Recommends conditions requiring provision of a CEMP and LEMP.
WBC Conservation officer:	No objections. The setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets will not be affected.
WBC Archaeologist:	The applicants have submitted a Heritage Desk-Based Assessment which examined the site of the proposed development and known heritage assets in the vicinity. The land was formerly part of the Second World War Membury military airfield, and appears to have contained part of two turning circles, with the rest being used to park planes. Prior to this wartime use, it was agricultural land. Due to the 20th century changes, I consider the archaeological potential to be low: the evidence suggests there will be no major impact on any features of archaeological significance from this proposal.
NWD AONB Board:	The North Wessex Downs in this instance would object to the development proposed on this greenfield site. The primary purpose of the AONB designation is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area, as confirmed by Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW Act). Section 85 of that Act confirms that there is a duty on all relevant authorities to have regard to this purpose in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect land in AONB's. The North Wessex Downs (NWD) is particularly sensitive to developments that are visually prominent, of an urban, suburban or industrial nature or are noisy. The site is not within the protected employment area of Membury and therefore is not in accordance with the local plan. The development in the opinion of the NWD AONB unit is major development which in a greenfield site is inappropriate and contrary to para 172 of the NPPF. We do not believe the development meets the test of appropriates as it has failed to demonstrate that there is no other alternative location, or that the redevelopment of their existing Walker Logistics site (within employment area) cannot accommodate the larger warehouse whilst smaller offices buildings could accommodate part of the proposed site. The agents state in their recent letter that the company tried previously working from separate sites, but it failed to work and state the reasoning is given in earlier documents, yet I see no reason as to why it failed. Logistic companies are by nature large as they involve warehouses and HGVs yet several national logistic companies mange to work from different locations across the country, which suggests that the attempt previously by Walker Logistics was not well executed. Another option is to set

	up a sister company which sits within the Walker family but operates independently, or to split the company into areas with hubs located close to existing supplies. The application demonstrates that applicants are taking the easier option which is not landscape led and fails to either conserve or enhance the AONB. The addition of a small museum is not of a public interest that outweighs the landscape harm. The employee location details demonstrate that the bulk of the workforce come from Swindon, therefore this would make the logical option for a new site or even location of the business where there is more than sufficient space, given Swindon's heavily industrial character. Dorcan industrial estate and the new Symmetry Park both have amble available space with easy links to the M4, A419 and A420. The current site due to its open character merging with the wider open countryside provides a sense of separation and spaciousness which reinforces the isolated character of the former airfield. The industrial nature of the business and the scale of the building proposed will erode the character of this part of the AONB. The current Walker Logistics buildings are located on the former camp where buildings and a few small hangers existed. The current site formed part of the wider runway network which was open, the full scale of openness has been affected by the tree planting carried out, but the site still retains an open character which merges with the wider open countryside. The proposed development would urbanise the site to the detriment of the AONB. The loss of this green space would not result in any environmental or business benefits that outweigh the landscape harm. Nor would the development including its landscape mitigation conserve or enhance the natural and scenic beauty of the AONB, this is therefore contrary to the purpose of the AONB in addition to para 172 of the NPPF, the NWD AONB Management Plan and Area Plan 5 and policies CS9, CS10 and CS19 of the WB Core Strategy. We would disagree with findings of the Landscape Appraisal and the proposed mitigation; the buffer line of trees and hedgerow fails to reflect the local context of the existing landscape. The buffer of trees would only act as a wall preventing any interconnectivity, hiding the development, which demonstrates harm. Therefore, the proposed landscaping cannot be considered mitigation as it fails to mitigate the harm but merely reinforces the adverse effect caused to the natural and scenic beauty of the AONB. Ponds are not characteristic of this landscape character area. A linear pond adjacent to the hedgerow would have the character of a drainage ditch which is more appropriate. The importance of AONBs has further been heightened by the Glover Review which seeks to give further protection to AONBs. In terms of the museum, we commend the efforts of the family and their interest in keeping the memory of the airfield alive but do not consider the proposed museum stuck o the end of the development the most appropriate. The applicant has

	demonstrated that there are two smaller sites available within the membury employment area which would be more appropriate for the location of the museum as an independent building, however the services where an existing memorial is positioned (agents document states there isn't one) that commemorates USAAF and the RAF, would be the best location given its exposure to number of people that pass through. There were over 1000 temporary airfields like Membury constructed for WWII, a number of which were within the AONB but do not have museums attached. The C47s were linked with Ramsbury and Greenham Common (outside AONB), an aircraft that flew from Greenham Common has also been restored and airworthy in the UK (Drag 'em out). The large American Air Museum in Cambridgeshire would however be the location to give the best exposure. The local area is void of street lights. It must be noted that introducing lighting columns or increased building floodlights into this locality would significantly impact upon the dark sky environment, a special quality of the AONB. The building has a number of windows which will cause light spill into a dark environment. Low transmittance glass should be conditioned if the officer is minded to approve. The colour of the building will not fade into the landscape, it will appear as a contrast to the natural greens and browns that make up the natural colour system of this landscape character area. Using the natural colour system to identify colours in the landscape which can aid in choosing more appropriate shades of green would have been a more responsible approach within a protected landscape. Overall, the use, scale, siting and design of the development would fail to comply with policy CS9, CS10, CS9 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Area Plan 5, paras 8, 127, 170 and 172 of the NPPF and Policies within section 7.39 of the NWD Management plan. The development fits within the key issues identified in the NWD management plan, including loss of rural character, impact on dark skies, new noise creating activities and suburbanisation. Para 23 of NPPF (2018) underlines the need to have objectively assessed land use designations and allocations identified on a policies map for which West Berkshire do and it does not include the proposed application site. There are existing redundant/vacant industrial and commercial sites around Swindon that are available for development and could accommodate the uses and scale of development proposed. The development and use proposed would not provide any overriding benefits to outweigh the harm caused to the AONB.
Thames Water:	No objections.

Public representations

4.2 Representations have been received from 37 contributors, 17 of which support, and 20 of which object to the proposal. A petition of 61 signatures has been received in support of the application and a petition of 176 signatures has been received objecting to the application. The applicant and agent have both submitted

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 in objection:

- Increase in traffic
- Loss of agricultural land/green field
- Health impacts
- Inadequate information on haulage and bus routes
- Highways safety impacts
- Loss of tranquillity of AONB
- Traffic pollution
- Detrimental impact on character and appearance of area
- Disruptive nature of logistics (unsociable hours)
- Inadequate highways network
- Damage to property due to vibrations from vehicles
- Impact on heritage value of WW2 airfield
- Suburbanisation due to managed landscaping
- Outside of designated PEA
- Industrial development should be contained to existing PEAs
- Light pollution
- Impact of lights on bats and biodiversity
- Impact on air quality having negative impact on local horse racing industry
- Employment from outside District/local area
- Visual prominence of building and intrusion on views
- Environmental impact of carbon emissions
- Impact on local wildlife
- Concerns regarding a precedent being set for future expansion
- Incremental impact on the cumulative scale of development at Membury
- Impact on local tourism
- Other brownfield sites should be considered
- The AONB is a fijnite resource
- Potential for increase in floorspace via insertion of mezzanines

The following issues/points have been raised in support:

- Benefit of museum to preserving heritage of airfield
- Locating industrial development alongside an existing industrial area
- Scheme will preserve landscape quality
- Will retain and increase local employment in vicinity of an existing area of employment
- Improving on the limited local employment opportunities in the vicinity of Lambourn
- Bus transport reduces need for separate vehicle journeys
- Existing road infrastructure is adequate
- Logistics is a particularly valuable business in current pandemic circumstances

The following other matters have been raised:

- Applicant has been a benefactor of the location and its heritage

- Inadequate public consultation
- Impact on house prices
- Littering from parked vehicles
- Improvement to visual amenity associated with the applicant's existing business

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, ADPP5, CS5, CS9, CS10, CS13, CS14, CS15, CS16, CS17, CS18, CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (WBCS).
- Policies OVS5, OVS6, TRANS1 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)
- North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-2024
- WBC Quality Design SPD (2006)
- Planning Obligations SPD (2015)
- The West Berkshire SuDS Supplementary Planning Document (Dec 2018).

6. Appraisal

6.1 The main issues for consideration in this application are:

- The principle of development
- The landscape impact
- The highways impacts
- Noise and disturbance
- Heritage and tourism
- Ecological impacts

Principle of development

6.2 The application proposes the development of a storage and distribution warehouse, along with ancillary office accommodation and a museum building. In terms of the main proposal for storage and distribution use, the application proposes major development in the North Wessex Downs AONB. The NPPF states that planning permission should be refused for major development in designated areas, including the AONB other than in exceptional circumstances where is can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Policy ADPP1 of the Core Strategy requires that only appropriate, limited development is allowed in the countryside, focussed on addressing identified needs and maintaining a strong rural economy. Policies ADPP5 and CS9 of the Core Strategy seek to direct new industrial development, including storage and distribution (B8) uses to the existing protected employment areas in the District. Therefore, in considering these proposals and whether a departure from the requirements of these policies is justified consideration must be given to the exceptional circumstances that support the application.

6.3 The applicant is the owner of an existing logistics business that operates from within the PEA to the south of the application site. The Economic Impact Report submitted with the application confirms that at the time the report was written that the existing business employs 81 FTE (full time equivalent) staff. It details a proposed increase in numbers of employees of an additional 40 FTE posts. The report sets out that the existing business has growth and expansion needs that cannot be accommodated by its existing premises.

6.4 The NPPF states that significant weight should be afforded to the need to support economic growth and productivity. The economic development officer was consulted and has assessed the potential for an alternative preferable site outside of the AONB to provide a sufficient amount of floorspace to accommodate the expansion needs of the existing business and has confirmed that in her view there are no alternative sites better situated for these works. This response is reflected in the planning policy assessment of the proposals, which notes that the site is currently being considered for allocation for industrial uses in the forthcoming local plan update that will, inter alia, review the boundaries of the existing Protected Employment Areas. While it is noted by the planning policy officer that limited weight can be attached to the potential allocation of the site, the response recognises that there is a need for growth in terms of providing land for industrial employment uses, and that this has impacted on the lack of availability of an appropriate site within the District to accommodate the needs of Walker as a medium sized business. It also recognises that the expansion needs of a successful medium sized business such as Walkers need to be supported where it is reasonable to do so. Consideration of the associated landscape harm is crucial to the assessment of whether in this case allowing the development would be reasonable. Both consultation responses also recognise that the need for expansion in order to facilitate the ongoing response to both the current global pandemic by Walker as a logistics business, and to build resilience against the financial uncertainty of Brexit provide justification in terms of need for the development, and in the case of the economic development officer the need is considered exceptional in order to prevent circumstances that might lead to this successful business needing to re-locate away from the District with the resultant impacts on local employment and the local economy, as well as the economic impact on the business itself. The applicant's submissions make clear the economic contribution that the business currently makes in terms of revenue, employment and business rates, and highlights that it is of national importance for planning decisions to allow opportunities to support economic development.

6.5 Policy CS9 requires that proposals for industry and distribution uses are directed towards the existing PEAs, but goes on to note that proposals for development outside of these areas will be assessed against the compatibility with uses in the area surrounding the proposal, the potential impacts of the proposed uses and the capacity and impact on the road network and access by sustainable modes of transport. In consideration of the location of the site, sandwiched between two existing areas of PEA, and in a site that is visually and physically constrained on its boundaries by industrial buildings, highway infrastructure and a dense belt of trees to the west, subject to the detailed considerations outlined below it is your officers' view that the proposed works would meet with the intentions of policy in this respect, and given the exceptional need for business expansion to support growth and economic development and retain the existing logistics business, on balance the principle of development should be accepted in the case of this particular application and site.

6.6 In respect of the proposed use of part of the site for providing a museum for the applicant's World War 2 aircraft and memorabilia, while it is noted that this would increase the built form associated with the development of the site, and as an isolated development may not be supported due to the limited associated benefit of such works, in the context of the proposed larger industrial development it would provide a heritage

and tourism benefit as discussed below, and therefore is considered to be on balance acceptable in the context of allowing industrial character development on the site.

Landscape impact

6.7 The application site is an open agricultural field that is mainly viewed from Ramsbury Road for a stretch of approximately 50 metres, and from the open fields beyond to the east. It is not situated in close proximity to any public right of way, but is located within the North Wessex Downs AONB. The site currently has an open, agricultural character, although this is viewed in the context of the industrial buildings to the south and the grain silos to the north.

6.8 The proposed works would introduce a substantial industrial warehouse building into these views, along with an associated access, parking area and yard. The indicative plan shows the building itself being located to the north western part of the site, alongside the existing tree belts, where it would relate more directly to the grain silos to the north east in views. Nevertheless, the impact is of a major industrial development in land that is currently open in views from the east up to the tree belt to the west of the site. This is recognised in the indicative layout which has confined the proposed works to allow a substantial space for new landscaping to mitigate and buffer the associated impacts on views from Ramsbury Road.

6.9 As part of consideration of this application a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment was commissioned, which was reviewed by the Council's landscape consultant. The landscape consultant notes the situation of the site in the AONB, and that the proposed works would result in its loss from views. However, the landscape consultant also notes that these views are, by virtue of the relatively confined boundaries of the site, including the tree belt to the west and north and, industrial development and grain silos to the north and the industrial sheds to the south, relatively confined, and less sensitive than those in a location with a greater variety of public views and less surrounding industrial development might be. The landscape consultant has further noted that planting to screen the grain solos has begun to establish itself well, providing an effective screen to soften the impact of these substantial structures, and that similarly a sensitively designed scheme of landscaping, including faster growing plants that could at a later date, once deeper screening is established, be removed, could help to considerably soften the impact of the development over time, effectively mitigating much of the loss of the openness of the views across the site, rather than a more significantly detrimental impact that might be engendered by a larger or less well situated development with less scope for landscaping on the site.

6.10 While the proposals would lead to the effective merging of two developed parts of the PEA care has been taken to confine development to the west of the site, allowing considerable space to the east for mitigation via landscaping. This is crucial in both the landscape consultant's balanced assessment and your officer's recommendation, as it confines the development into a single parcel of land rather than providing obvious visual opportunities for further encroachment into the AONB, and therefore confines and limits the associated detriment to the open character of views to the visual receptors along this 150 metre stretch of Ramsbury Road. The landscape consultant notes that the space provided for landscaping offers an excellent opportunity to provide a well-designed scheme that will have some benefit in reinforcing surrounding gree infrastructure.

6.11 Your officer notes the objection of the AONB board, and has taken consideration of these matters. It is noted that the response from the AONB Board considers that the relocation of the existing business would be an acceptable outcome and has suggested potential for sites outside of the District to accommodate the proposed works, but takes the stance that the level of impact on the AONB would be unacceptable. This stance is

not reflected in the landscape consultant's comments, which provide a more balanced view of the outcome of the works at their proposed scale and the potential for landscaping to mitigate some of the associated landscape harm, while recognising that the circumstances of the site, tucked between two parts of the PEA and offering significant landscaping opportunities, while already providing a dense tree belt that confines views beyond the existing field, are quite unique, and that there is a need in this case to balance landscape harm with supporting a successful business to develop and meet its needs in the locality and addressing this economic need in a manner that minimises harm to the character of the surrounding area while recognising that the area is part of the AONB and has an important role to play within this valuable landscape.

6.12 The landscape consultant notes that there is a potential benefit to allowing development of the site to incorporate the economic needs of the applicant, which is that in reserving land to the east of the site as a thick woodland buffer it would allow for strategic integration of this woodland with a further woodland buffer opposite Honeysuckle Cottage and Cuckoo Cottage to the north east of the site, weakening the case for additional development on this land outside of the application site, while serving to enhance some of the views from Ramsbury Road.

6.13 In consideration of these matters, and the fact that detailed landscaping proposals can be developed at the reserved matters stage, your officer's view is that much of the landscape harm associated with this particular development and site could be substantially mitigated over time, and therefore would not be sufficient to merit a reason for refusal given in particular the significant weight attributed to supporting local business development and case for their being an exceptional need supported in this application.

Highways and transport

6.14 A number of objections refer to the impact of the proposed works on highway in terms of infrastructure capacity and highway safety. The applicant has provided traffic surveys and supporting data which have been assessed by the highways officer, who has stated that he is satisfied that the proposals will not result in a significant increase in vehicle movements that will be to the detriment of highway safety in the area or beyond the capacity of highway infrastructure to accommodate. He has also raised no objections in terms of the indicative layout and access arrangements.

6.15 Your officer notes that the highways officer has raised an objection in terms of the sustainability of the location for the use proposed. This is due to the lack of access by sustainable modes of transport, and is a concern that is repeated by the transport policy officer. While these objections are important material considerations, the application site is directly adjacent to the PEA, an area that is stated in policy to be one of the focal points for industrial development of this kind, and were it to be within the PEA then it would be hard to resist such development on grounds of sustainability. Similarly, in this case where officers accept the need for expansion of the business and recognise that the District is unable to yield a better situated location for this expansion to be directed the sustainability of the location must be balanced against this need. The documents accompanying the application note that a bus service currently operates for employees, and car sharing is also explored. There is also some opportunity for local journeys to be undertaken by bicycle, and a number of the representations on the application note local journeys by bicycle, but it is accepted that this would make up a small proportion of associated journeys due to the remoteness of the location from any settlement.

6.16 Your officer notes that the transport policy officer has raised concerns in respect of the submitted travel plan and the commitment to operation of a bus service. As access forms part of the reserved matters it is considered that a condition requiring submission of a travel plan prior to the site being taken into use will allow for these matters to be revisited.

6.17 In consideration of the location of the site alongside the existing PEA and the economic benefits associated with the proposed development, on balance it is not considered that the concerns raised in respect of the sustainability of the location of the site would merit refusal of this application.

Heritage and Tourism

6.18 The conservation officer and archaeologist have reviewed the proposed works in terms of impact on the World War 2 runway as a heritage asset. Neither have raised objections in respect of this matter while noting that the proposed aircraft museum provides a benefit to preservation and conservation of the heritage of the Membury airfield area. Your officer notes that while the museum is proposed to house a private collection, the applicant has proposed that public access to the proposed museum could be secured as a public benefit to the proposals, and agrees that this would add weight to the proposals in terms of supporting the local heritage value of the airfield and local tourism. As such a condition is recommended in respect of providing arrangements for public access to the museum on 28 days per year.

Ecology

6.19 The ecologist has considered the application and raises no objections. He has, however, requested conditions in request of a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP). A condition requiring details of external illumination is recommended, and an informative regarding construction techniques for the building is also proposed as the ecologist is of the view that certain techniques including green wall/roof could be explored in the design of the building.

Noise and environment

6.20 While the application site is situated between industrial sites in an area that is predominated with industrial character development alongside open agricultural land, the nearest residential properties, Cuckoo Cottage and Honeysuckle Cottage, are located approximately 100 metres from the site boundary, and objections to the application raise concerns in respect of noise and disruption due to working hours and the hours of operation of logistics. The environmental health officer has assessed the application and has made recommendations in respect of conditions for noise management and control of external lighting. It is noted that a number of uses exist in the nearby area that historically have no controls on either noise management or external works, and operate vehicle movements in an unlimited fashion. Additionally the highways officer has noted that the increase in numbers of vehicle movements would not be significant by comparison to the number of movements overall in the area, and as such it is not considered that the proposals would engender a significant amount of additional disruption to the amenitry of local residents. Conditions on levels and type of external illumination and limiting external working hours are recommended in the interests of nearby residential amenity.

Other matters

6.21 Agricultural land: The application site is Class 3 agricultural land, which falls under the categorisation “Best, most versatile” agricultural land. While it is therefore the case that the land in its current use contributes to the rural economy, and the planning statement confirms that part of it is currently in use for grazing sheep, as your officers accept the economic justification for development as an exceptional need in this case, it is considered that the benefits of the proposed change of use of the land would attract

more weight in the planning balance than its retention as agricultural in this particular case.

6.22 Personal permission: The planning statement supporting the application offers the applicant's agreement to a personal permission. While it is noted that a number of letters of support refer to tidiness of the applicant's existing site and his character as an advocate for the Membury area, these are not matters for consideration under this application. Objections to the application state concerns regarding the reasoning behind a personal permission. However, in this case your officer has reviewed the justification and is satisfied that in terms of matters relating to the applicant's particular model of business, including associated vehicle movements and matters such as the need for external lighting, there is justification to recommend a condition granting a personal planning permission in order that these matters can be revisited in detail in the event of the site changing hands in future.

6.23 In terms of concerns regarding the number of floors and potential future increase on floor area of the building, conditions are recommended to secure broad compliance with the submitted block plan, to remove permitted development rights for mezzanine floors and to stipulate that the floorspace and height are no greater than that shown on the block plan and given in the application details.

6.24 BREEAM and Zero Carbon: Policy CS15 requires non-residential development to meet a construction standard of BREEAM excellent and zero carbon. Conditions are imposed in respect of addressing these matters.

7. Planning Balance and Conclusion

7.1 In the case of consideration of this application your officers have careful evaluated the environmental impacts of development of the site for the proposed use against the associated economic benefits of doing so. While it is important to note that the NPPF states that major development in the AONB should only be supported in exceptional circumstances, it also states that significant weight should be afforded to the need to support economic growth and productivity. The application has identified a need for this form of development and a shortfall of available space in the District to support it. As such, on balance officers accept the exceptional need for the development, and recommend that the application is approved.

8. Full Recommendation

8.1 To delegate to the Head of Development and Planning to GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the conditions listed below.

Conditions

1.	**Reserved Maters** Details of the access, appearance, layout and landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
2.	**Time limit**

	The development to which this permission relates shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the approved matters to be approved, whichever is the later. Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
3.	**Indicative plans** The layout of the site shall be in broad accordance with the indicative block plan reference number 03100-00-C. The building hereby approved shall be a maximum of 12.6 metres in height. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, and in the interests of visual amenity in the North Wessex Downs AONB in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012.
4.	**Permitted Development restriction** Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country General Permitted Development Order 2015, as amended, or any subsequent revision thereof no addition floors or mezzanines shall be inserted in the building hereby approved. Reason: In order to prevent the overdevelopment and intensification of use of the site in a manner that might otherwise result in harm to the tranquillity of the AONB, highway safety and residential amenity in accordance with the NPPF, Policies CS9, CS13, CS14, CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007)
5.	**Maximum floor areas** The floor areas for the building hereby approved shall be limited to the maximum following floor areas: -Museum and military vehicle storage area 2180 sq.m -Class B8 storage and distribution warehouse 9060 sq.m -Ancillary office area 1150 sq.m -Ancillary welfare and security area 180 sq.m Reason: In order to prevent the overdevelopment and intensification of use of the site in a manner that might otherwise result in harm to the tranquillity of the AONB, highway safety and residential amenity in accordance with the NPPF, Policies CS9, CS13, CS14, CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007)
6.	**Construction Method Statement** No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The statement shall provide for: (a) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors (b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials (c) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development (d) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing (e) Wheel washing facilities (f) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction (g) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

	The provisions of the Construction Method Statement shall be implemented in full and retained until the development has been occupied. Any deviation from the approved Construction Method Statement shall be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS5, CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).
7.	**Noise management plan** A scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the site. Thereafter, the use shall not commence until the approved scheme has been fully implemented. Reason: To protect the occupants of nearby residential properties from noise in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Policies OVS5 and OPS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).
8.	**BREEAM** The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a post construction review demonstrating that the approved building has achieved a construction standard of BREEAM Excellent has been submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. Reason: In order to ensure a sustainable development of high quality construction in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS15 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.
9.	**Zero carbon** No development shall take place until a plan demonstrating how the building hereby approved will meet with the requirement for zero carbon development including construction, monitoring and reporting measures has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan. Reason: In order to secure zero carbon development in accordance with Policy CS15 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012.
10.	**Construction Environmental Management Plan** No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include the following: (a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities. (b) Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”. (c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements). (d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features. (e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works. (f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.

	(g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person. (h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs. The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Reason: A pre-commencement condition is required because the CEMP will need to be adhered to throughout construction. This condition is imposed in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012.
11.	**Landscape Ecological Management Plan** No development shall take place until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (also referred to as a Habitat or Biodiversity Management Plan) has been submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The content of the LEMP shall include the following: (a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed. (b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management. (c) Aims and objectives of management. (d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives. (e) Prescriptions for management actions. (f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period). (g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan. (h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures. The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) 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. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details. Reason: A pre-commencement condition is required because the LEMP may need to be implemented during construction. This condition is imposed in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012.
12	**Lighting strategy** No external lighting shall be installed until a lighting strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall: (a) Identify those areas on the site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance. (b) Show how and where external lighting will be installed so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species. (c) Include and isolux diagram of the proposed lighting. (d) Ensure all lighting levels are designed within the limitations of Environmental Lighting Zone 1, as described by the Institute of Lighting Engineers. (e) Include a plan of timings for external lighting to minimise external lighting at times when the external areas of the site are not in use.

	No external lighting shall be installed on the site except in accordance with the above strategy. Reason: To ensure the conservation and enhancement of the biodiversity assets of the site, to conserve the dark night skies of the North Wessex Downs AONB and in the interests of the amenity of nearby residential occupants. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-24, Policies CS14 CS17 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and Policies OVS5 and OVS 6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.
13.	**SuDS** No development shall take place until details of sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall: a) Incorporate the implementation of Sustainable Drainage methods (SuDS) in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (March 2015), the SuDS Manual C753 (2015) and West Berkshire Council local standards, particularly the WBC SuDS Supplementary Planning Document December 2018; b) Include and be informed by a ground investigation survey which establishes the soil characteristics, infiltration rate and groundwater levels; c) Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site; d) Include detailed manufacturer's information to ensure adequate sizing and water cleaning operation of the propose sewage treatment plant and oil interceptor; e) Include detailed hydraulic run-off calculations, discharge rates, infiltration and storage capacity calculations for the proposed SuDS measures based on a 1 in 100 year storm +40% for climate change; f) Include flood water exceedance routes, both on and off site; g) Include a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. This plan shall incorporate arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a management company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime; h) Include a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the development as the site area is larger than 1 hectare; i) Include a Contamination Risk Assessment for the soil and water environment (assessing the risk of contamination to groundwater, develop any control requirements and a remediation strategy); The above sustainable drainage measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the use hereby permitted is commenced. The sustainable drainage measures shall be maintained in the approved condition thereafter. Reason: To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner; to prevent the increased risk of flooding; to improve and protect water quality, habitat and amenity and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system can be, and is carried out in an appropriate and efficient manner. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Part 4 of Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006) and SuDS Supplementary Planning Document (Dec 2018). A pre-condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; sustainable drainage measures may

	require work to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place**.**
14.	**Hours of external operation** To be confirmed on update sheet.
15.	**Personal permission** To be confirmed on update sheet.
16.	**Levels** No development shall commence on the site until full details of ground and floor levels as existing and proposed have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The site shall be constructed in accordance with the approved levels. Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in the North Wessex Downs AONB in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2012.
17.	**Public access to museum** To be confirmed on update sheet.
18.	**Travel Plan** To be confirmed on update sheet.

Informatives

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.	Ecology & construction The applicant's attention is drawn to the following comments from the ecologist and the AONB officer in respect of detailed design: Ecologist - We recognise that one of the concerns of this development is that it is in the NWD AONB, the concern relates to the visibility of the new structure(s) we propose that one way that this these concerns could be reduced is the installation of green vegetated walls. This would be best achieved with rainwater harvesting to feed into a reservoir to help maintain the watering of the vegetated green walls around the building. These green walls will; soften the landscape views of the building, improve internal thermal stability lowering energy bills with the associated environmental sustainability benefits, increase carbon capture and slow the peak flows in high rain fall events. AONB officer - The local area is void of street lights. It must be noted that introducing lighting columns or increased building floodlights into this locality would significantly impact upon the dark sky environment, a special quality of the AONB. The building has a number of windows which will cause light spill into a dark environment. Low transmittance glass should be conditioned if the officer is minded to approve. The colour of the building will not fade into the landscape, it will appear as a contrast to the natural greens and browns that make up the natural colour system of this landscape character area. Using the natural colour system to identify colours in the landscape which can aid in choosing more appropriate shades of green would have been a more responsible approach within a protected landscape. The detailed design of the building accompanying the reserved matters application should demonstrate how these matters have been considered in choice of materials.