

| Item No. | Application No. and Parish | Statutory Target Date | Proposal, Location, Applicant |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| (1) | 25/00357/FUL Aldermaston | 8 th August 2025. | Retrospective change of use of land to B8 storage use with retention of ancillary temporary office use. Compound A3. Youngs Industrial Estate, Paices Hill. Youngs Estates. |
| ¹ Extension of time agreed with applicant until 7 th November 2025. | | | |

The application can be viewed on the Council's website at the following link:

<https://publicaccess.westberks.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=SS12R3RD0HE00>

Recommendation Summary: The Development Control Manager be authorised to GRANT planning permission.

Ward Member(s): Councillor Boeck

Reason for Committee Determination: The Councillor is concerned on behalf of the parish that increasingly new development is being approved in the DEPZ under delegated authority which is putting public safety at risk potentially.

Committee Site Visit: 1st October 2025.

Contact Officer Details

Name: Michael Butler
Job Title: Principal Planning Officer
Tel No: 01635 519111
Email: Michael.butler@westberks.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is for the Committee to consider the proposed development against the policies of the development plan and the relevant material considerations, and to make a decision as to whether to approve or refuse the application.
- 1.2 This application seeks planning permission for the regularisation of an existing storage use at Compound A3 with the use of an ancillary office in the Youngs Industrial Area., It is understood that this use commenced in 2021. The operator is CSE a vacuum excavation Company employing 7 employees. The site area is 0.1ha and the area of the temporary portacabin to be retained is 60m2. On site will be 5 HGV spaces and 2 car park spaces. The operation of the site involves up to 5 drivers of the lorries being used daily depending on demand and the site office for welfare and administration purposes.
- 1.3 The application site is largely concrete hard standing at present with no structures upon it apart from the “offsite” temporary portacabin also within the Youngs Yard and in the submitted red line application site.

2. Planning History

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

| Application | Proposal | Decision / Date |
|-------------|----------|-----------------|
| | | |

- 2.2 The planning history of the site is very long and complex so a separate appendix summarises all of the relevant history and this can be used in addition for the “partner” application 25/00395/ful.

3. Legal and Procedural Matters

- 3.1 **Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA):** Given the nature, scale and location of this development, it is not considered to fall within the description of any development listed in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. As such, EIA screening is not required.
- 3.2 **Publicity:** Publicity has been undertaken in accordance with Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, and the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement. Site notice was displayed on the 20th June at the site entrance with a deadline for representations of the 11th July. No public notice was required. 9 neighbours were consulted with an overall expiry date of the 11th July.
- 3.3 **Local Financial Considerations:** Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. Whether or not a ‘local finance consideration’ is material to a particular decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to make a decision based on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority or other government body. The table below identifies the relevant local financial considerations for this proposal

| Consideration | Applicable to proposal | Material to decision | Refer to paragraph(s) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) | No | No | |
| New Homes Bonus | No | No | |
| Affordable Housing | No | No | |
| Public Open Space or Play Areas | No | No | |
| Developer Contributions (S106) | No | No | |
| Job Creation | Yes | Yes | |

- 3.4 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):** Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a levy charged on most new development within an authority area. The money is used to pay for new infrastructure, supporting the development of an area by funding the provision, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure. CIL will be used to fund roads and other transport facilities, schools and other educational facilities, flood defences, medical facilities, open spaces, and sports and recreational areas. Subject to the application of any applicable exemptions, CIL will be charged on residential (Use Classes C3 and C4) and retail (former Use Classes A1 – A5) development at a rate per square metre (based on Gross Internal Area) on new development of more than 100 square metres of gross internal area (including extensions) or when a new dwelling is created (even if it is less than 100 square metres). CIL liability, and the application of any exemptions, will be formally confirmed by the CIL Charging Authority under separate cover following any grant of planning permission. More information is available at <https://www.westberks.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy>
- 3.5 **New Homes Bonus (NHB):** New Homes Bonus payments recognise the efforts made by authorities to bring residential development forward. NHB money will be material to the planning application when it is reinvested in the local areas in which the developments generating the money are to be located, or when it is used for specific projects or infrastructure items which are likely to affect the operation or impacts of those developments. NHB is not considered to be a relevant material consideration in this instance ,but can be noted for information.
- 3.6 **Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED):** In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The Council must have due regard to the need to achieve the following objectives:
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 3.7 Having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to—

- (a) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
 - (b) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;
 - (c) encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- 3.8 The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage, the duty is to have regard to and remove or minimise disadvantage. In considering the merits of this planning application, due regard has been given to these objectives. It is necessary to take into account those who are disabled in the light of emergency evacuation procedures.
- 3.9 **Human Rights Act:** The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act, including Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of property), Article 6 (Right to a fair trial) and Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life and home) of the Act itself. The consideration of the application in accordance with the Council procedures will ensure that views of all those interested are taken into account. All comments from interested parties have been considered and reported in summary in this report, with full text available via the Council's website.
- 3.10 Any interference with property rights is in the public interest and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 regime for controlling the development of land. This recommendation is based on the consideration of the proposal against adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.
- 3.11 **Listed building setting:** Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 16(2) has the same requirement for proposals for listed building consent. No listed building settings are affected by this proposal.
- 3.12 **Conservation areas:** Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Whilst there are no conservation areas in the area, the site does lie adjacent to the Aldermaston Historic Registered Park to the east which is required to be taken into account.
- 3.13 **National Landscapes (AONB):** Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000 (as amended) provides a general duty for public bodies: "Any relevant authority exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to effect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty in England must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty)." AONBs have been rebranded to be known as National Landscapes, although their legal AONB status continues. This designation does not wash over the site.

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.

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Aldermaston Parish Council: | <p>Resolved to object to the application. The following issues are relevant</p> <p>This is a retrospective application dating from March 2021 (as per application form), which we assume covers both the B8 open air storage and office since not stated otherwise <input type="checkbox"/> the planning statement summarises the development as B8 and ancillary temporary office, and then states 'Accordingly, no new non-residential development shall be proposed to meet the requirements of Policy CS15.'</p> <p>Actually, Policy CS15, relating to Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency, covers residential and non residential development with the latter required to meet a minimum standard of construction BREEAM Excellent.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The application form states that the site has 7 full time employees, but no information is given about hours of work and how many work from the office.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Planning statement says an Estate Site wide 'AWE specific emergency plan, which sets out details of emergency action including evacuation, alerting the staff, and safety equipment' has been submitted. This is not on the website . Officer note -now public.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There is no opinion as at 08/07/25 from WBC Emergency Planning as to whether this development can be accommodated in the OSEP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AWE and the MOD have submitted a strongly worded Objection (see comments submitted by APC under application 25/00395/FUL)</p> <p>APC has question marks about why the office facility is apparently regarded as temporary given that it appears to date back to 2021, and why is should not be measured against planning policy applicable to non-residential development. There is also no timeframe given for how long this temporary building will be required for. APC also shares AWE and the ONR safety concerns, especially with regards to the potential cumulative effect of so many developments in the area which might individually be regarded as insignificant. For these reasons, APC agreed to respond OBJECT.</p> |
| Highways: | <p>No objections raised. Site has good overall access to the principal main road network of the A340 and beyond. Recommend limitation of use class by condition.</p> |
| Suds | <p>No objections raised.</p> |
| Gardens Trust | <p>Do not wish to comment on the application at this stage.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| AWE [Mod] | Object strongly to the application. It comprises additional employment development within the DEPZ for which there is no exceptional need or indeed economic justification. Accordingly with the potential for a cumulative impact of such schemes over the years this could compromise the future operational capability of the AWE in terms of using ionising radiation in its research with implications for national security. This should take precedence in the decision making process. The application is contrary to policy and so should be refused. |
| Council Emergency Plan officer | The EP officer has examined the submitted Emergency Plan for the site and is content that it can be conditioned with appropriate revisions agreed. An updated EP has been submitted and the Plan can be conditioned. No objections are raised accordingly. |
| Office for Nuclear Regulation. | Notes that given the removal of the objection from the EP officer of the Council the ONR no longer advise against the development. |

Public representations

4.2 Representations have been received from NIL contributors.

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.

| Development Plan Document | Relevant Policies |
|--|--|
| West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2023-2041 | SP1 Spatial Strategy SP3-Settlement hierarchy. SP4 AWE sites SP9 Historic Environment SP17 Strategic approach to employment land. DM3-Health and wellbeing. DM12-Registered Parks and Gardens. DM31 Designated employment areas. DM35-Sustaining a prosperous rural economy. |

5.2 The following material considerations are relevant to the consideration of this application:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- Quality Design SPD (2006)

6. Appraisal

6.1 Policy position

The most important policies for assessing the principle of development are Policies SP1, SP3, SP17, and DM35 of the Local Plan Review. These are assessed below. The previous appeal decision and the economic benefits are also important material considerations in this assessment.

Policy SP1 sets the overarching spatial strategy for West Berkshire, which directs development to areas of lower environmental value, optimises use of previously developed land, and optimises the density of development to make the best use of land whilst conserving and enhancing the distinctive character and identity of the built, historic and natural environment.

The application site is located within the spatial area known as the Eastern Area. The policy states that the area will continue to be important for business development with the retention of designated employment areas. Outside of settlement boundaries, land will be treated as open countryside where development will be more restricted, as set out in policy DM35 for economic development.

Policy SP3 provides a settlement hierarchy to focus development based on the function and sustainability of settlement across the District and promote sustainable communities. Development outside of these settlements, in other rural hamlets and in isolated groups of development will be restricted to that which is appropriate in a rural area.

The application site is located outside of any settlement boundary, and is therefore treated as open countryside where development is more restricted, and policy DM35 applies. A detailed assessment against Policy DM35 follows, but it is considered that the proposed development complies with Policy DM35 and therefore is also in accordance with Policies SP1 and SP3.

Policy SP17 sets the strategic approach to employment land. It states that through the LPR the Council will seek to facilitate the growth and forecasted change of business development over the plan period through site allocations and by promoting the supply of B8 storage space in the District.

According to Policy SP17, appropriate proposals for business development (offices, industrial, and storage and distribution) will be supported where they are located:

- (a) On sites allocated for business development in accordance with the individual site specific policy (ESA1 -ESA6) in this Plan or any subsequent neighbourhood plans; or
- (b) On a suitable site within a settlement boundary; or
- (c) Within a Designated Employment Area (DEA) in accordance with policy DM31, and as listed in Appendix 4 and as defined on the Policies Map; or
- (d) On previously developed land within existing suitably located employment sites; or
- (e) Within the countryside provided the proposal is in accordance with other relevant policies within the Plan, in particular policy DM35.

The proposed development would contribute a small level of storage and distribution (Class B8) to meet the needs of the district. The application site is not allocated for development, within a settlement boundary, or within a DEA. However, it is on previously developed land within an established industrial estate, part of which (the Youngs Industrial Estate) is designated a DEA, and is therefore considered to be a suitably located employment site. As assessment against Policy DM35 follows, but the proposal is considered to comply with this policy. As such, the application is considered to comply with Policy SP17 in terms of the location of the application site.

Policy SP17 further states that the redevelopment and regeneration of existing employment sites for business uses will be supported. A range of types and sizes of employment sites and premises will be encouraged throughout the District to meet the needs of the local economy. Proposals for business development should be of a high quality design and in keeping with the surrounding environment.

The application site comprises brownfield land. The proposal therefore constitutes the redevelopment and regeneration of existing employment sites for business uses, in accordance with Policy SP17. The proposal provides for an established local business need, in keeping with the surrounding industrial estate environment.

Overall, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy SP17.

Policy DM35 (sustaining a prosperous rural economy) states that development proposals that contribute to sustaining a prosperous rural economy will be encouraged. To support the rural economy, proposals for economic development in the countryside will only be permitted where they satisfy the given criteria.

It should be noted that Policy DM35 applies to all forms of economic development in the countryside. It constitutes a change in approach from previous policy CS10 which had a greater focus on forms of rural economic development that had an intrinsic connection to a rural location. This is consistent with paragraph 88 of the NPPF which states that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed, new buildings.

The criteria of policy DM35 are set out below, with an appraisal of the proposed development.

a. The proposals demonstrate that the business can make a positive contribution to the rural economy.

Paragraph 24 of the Hoad Way Theale appeal decision (APP/W0340/W/25/3360702) reinforces that “the [current Local Plan Review] policies are not worded to specify or limit the particular nature of the proposed development to rural enterprises, rather look to a generalised benefit of the rural economy.” The proposed uses do not have an intrinsic connection to a rural area. However, given their location in the countryside of the Eastern Area, it is reasonable to conclude that a number of future employees may live in the local area which is predominantly rural, and to this extent will contribute positively to the generalised benefit of the rural economy.

b. The use/development is suitable for a rural location.

This must be assessed in the context of each application site. In this case, the development would form part of an established industrial estate (albeit beyond the designated employment area), in an area which is also heavily influenced by industrial/military character development at AWE Aldermaston. The site is on the periphery of established existing industrial estate development.

c. The proposals are compatible with uses in the surrounding area.

The adjoining development is industrial in character. There is residential further north; 48-49 Paices Hill immediately abuts the site to the north (albeit currently damaged and vacant following a fire), there are a few dwellings interspersed along Paices Hill before reaching the Aldermaston settlement. There is also residential development to the south (two gypsy/traveller sites). In both directions there is intervening existing industrial development, therefore it is not considered that this development would have any greater impact than existing development in that respect.

d. Where new buildings are proposed the landowner has not disposed of, or converted, any buildings to a residential use in the previous 3 years which could have met the needs of the development proposed.

No conflict has been identified with this criterion.

e. Any proposals are of a high quality design, are appropriate in terms of siting scale, form, massing, character and appearance having regard to the surrounding rural area and its setting in the wider rural landscape.

It cannot be said that the portacabin is of high quality design, but given the local context it is considered to be neutral in relation to this criterion.

f. New or replacement buildings are located within or adjoining an existing group of buildings and further expansion into the open countryside is avoided.

The existing building is located on the periphery of an existing group of buildings, with buildings to the north, east and south. It is a brownfield site, and there would be no further expansion into the open countryside.

g. It would not generate traffic of a type or amount inappropriate for the rural roads, byways or restricted byways affected by the proposal or require improvements to these roads, byways, or restricted byways which could be detrimental to their character and use by motorised and non-motorised traffic.

Whilst recognising that the application site is located in a rural area which is heavily reliant on private motor vehicle, it is also located within an established employment area (albeit beyond the area designated as a DEA) and the A340 (Paices Hill) is identified as a 'district access route to key destinations' on the West Berkshire Freight Route Plan in the Freight Strategy of the Local Transport Plan. The proposal does not, therefore, generate inappropriate traffic for the access road as it links directly to the localised network. The Highways officer has not objected to the scheme.

h. It would not have a detrimental effect on the fabric, character and setting of historic buildings or other heritage assets.

No conflict has been identified with this criterion.

i. Appropriate proposals which make more efficient use of previously developed land will be encouraged.

The development is an existing area of hardstanding and a low profile commercial building. It therefore represents efficient use of previously developed land.

Policy DM35 also states that, insofar as a planning application is required, proposals resulting in the loss of existing business sites and premises in the countryside, will only be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate that no alternative economic use can be found, and that the proposal does not have a significant negative impact upon the vitality and viability of the local economy of the surrounding rural area.

The proposal does not result in the loss of existing B8 space, but the expansion of such a use,[if permitted,] and so are considered to have a positive benefit in terms of the vitality and viability of the local economy.

Overall, the proposed development complies with Policy DM35.

Taking the above policies together, it is accordingly considered that the principle of development is in accordance with the current Local Plan.

The DEPZ

- 6.2 It is necessary to identify the wording of policy SP4 in full in order for the Committee to make an informed decision upon the application.
- 6.3 “Within the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) land use planning consultation zones surrounding AWE Aldermaston and AWE Burghfield development will be managed in the interests of public safety, and to ensure that any proposed developments do not adversely affect the defence related operation or capability of the AWE sites. Development proposals within the land use planning consultation zones that pose an unacceptable risk to the operation of the AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan (OSEP) and/or adversely affect the defence related operation or capability of the AWE sites will be refused planning permission. In determining applications, the ONR and AWE/MOD will be consulted on development proposals in the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ), Outer Consultation Zone (OCZ) and 12km Consultation Zone which meets the ONR consultation criteria as detailed on the ONR website. The ONR and AWE/MOD will be consulted on any proposal that is likely to lead to any increase in the residential or non-residential population (including visitors and workers) of the DEPZ. Development within the DEPZ is likely to be refused planning permission where the ONR, as regulator of the nuclear licenced sites, advise against the proposed development.”
- 6.4 The Committee will note that the AWE has objected to the application. This objection is on the basis that the cumulative impact of applications which will increase resident and non resident populations across the DEPZ should be resisted in the interest of both public safety and the future operational capability of the AWE [A] site. It is apparent that at Youngs Industrial Estate on a number of sites outside the defined Designated Employment Area as identified in the West Berkshire LPR a range of new employment sites have been operated without planning permission. Following an extensive visit from the Council Enforcement officer a range of retrospective applications have been submitted to the LPA for determination. This proposal is one such application.
- 6.5 Although relatively small in scale, the concerns of the AWE in objecting to the application are noted. It is the cumulative aspect of the continuing approvals at the Youngs site that is causing increasing concern.
- 6.6 The Committee should also be made aware of a very recent appeal decision made by the Secretary of State for a housing scheme in Wokingham District for 148 dwellings in the DEPZ for the AWE [B] site. The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector in dismissing the appeal principally on the grounds of public safety and how that could affect the operation of the AWE off site evacuation plan [OSEP] if an incident were to occur at the AWE site in Burghfield. However, it is noted that the magnitude of the development proposed [about 360 potential new residents] as opposed to the additional 7 employees on the application site [ie not resident anyway] should be taken into account, by the Committee in their determination.
- 6.7 It is noted that the ONR have not advised against the application so de facto there is no objection in place to the application. Similarly, the Council EP officer has not objected to the scheme subject to the necessary condition being related to the updated Emergency Plan on the application file.
- 6.8 Accordingly, notwithstanding the AWE objection your planning officers are required to adhere to the advice in the very recently adopted LPR policy SP4 since the ONR have

not advised against the application. If the application is accepted in relation to the overall DEPZ issue and so off site public safety will not be compromised, if an incident should occur at the AWE in the future.

Character and appearance

- 6.9 The application site lies in the northern section of the Youngs Industrial Area and is relatively modest in scale. Members will note from their site visit that it is surrounded on a number of aspects by existing built form which screens the scheme and mature trees to the west. Whilst the fact that the site is well screened does not automatically make it acceptable, the visual impact of the site, being in character with the nature of surrounding buildings/uses, is appropriate and not considered to be harmful. Accordingly, it is considered by officers that the scheme complies with the advice in policy SP8 in the LPR which notes that [inter alia] new development should be sensitively located in its immediate context, appropriate in scale, form and design. The local capacity for change should be taken into account: the scale of surrounding buildings on the site are largely far more significant than the current proposal.

Aldermaston Parish Council objection.

- 6.10 The Parish Council have objected to the application on a number of grounds -these will be responded to in turn. Firstly, policy CS15 no longer applies to the proposal as this has been formally superseded by policy DM4 in the LPR relating to sustainable homes and business. In the latter the policy only corresponds to increases in floorspace of more than 100m² and this temporary office building is 60m². Secondly it is correct that the applicant has not specified how long the portacabin would be on site for. Officers consider that should the application be approved a time scale of 5 years from the date of decision would be appropriate. Thirdly, the other points relating to the DEPZ issue have already been covered off in the report above..

7. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 7.1 This is a balanced application. On the one hand the worries and concerns of the APC are legitimate and well understood and officers appreciate why the application has been called to Committee whatever the officer recommendation, in the light of ongoing security needs at the AWE and off site public safety. On the other hand, it is not an offence to submit a retrospective application, but this is done at entirely the applicant's risk. And the employment benefits of the scheme are recognised, particularly in relation to assisting the local economy and policy support for this position in the adopted LPR.
- 7.2 In the light of no objection from the ONR and the Emergency Planning Officer, and the fact that the scheme will comply with extant Development Plan policy for employment as noted above, the application is recommended for approval with conditions.

8. Full Recommendation

- 8.1 To delegate to the Development Manager to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the conditions listed below.

Conditions

| | |
|----|-----------------------|
| 1. | Emergency plan |
|----|-----------------------|

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>The continuing operation of the development hereby permitted shall comply with the Emergency Plan version 1.1 dated October 2025. .</p> <p>Reason. The site lies in the DEPZ for the AWE [A] site where policy SP4 applies in the WBLPR as adopted 2023 to 2041. Employee /Public safety is an important matter which must be taken into account accordingly.</p> |
| 2. | <p>Approved plans</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:</p> <p>The development must continue to be carried out in strict accord with plan number 13418 -pay001c plus location plan dated 23/12/24 serial number 300642.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Use class</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be used only for use class B8 with ancillary office and for no other use.</p> <p>Reason. To clarify the use and control this in the future in the light of policy SP4 in the WBLPR</p> |
| 4 | <p>5 year date</p> <p>The portacabin on the application site shall be removed on or before the date of 5 years post this decision date and the site left in a neat and tidy condition.</p> <p>Reason. The building is temporary only and its presence should not be permanent in the light of policy SP1 in the WBLPR of 2023 to 2041.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Emergency Plan</p> <p>Any site-specific Emergency Plan in effect for the site shall be kept up-to-date, and relevant to the current occupant at all times. An amended version of the plan may be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval pursuant to this condition. The Local Planning Authority may at any time require the amendment of the Plan by giving notice pursuant to this condition; in which case the amended plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within 1 month of notice being given. In any event a review of the Plan shall be submitted to the LPA no more than 7 years from the date of this decision. This, once approved shall be implemented on the site.</p> <p>Reason: A site-specific Emergency Plan is necessary to mitigate the residual risk posed to public safety by the close proximity of AWE Aldermaston, to ensure appropriate preparedness and response in the event of an incident at AWE, and to ensure that the development does not adversely affect the AWE Off-Site Emergency Response Plan. It is essential that the plan is kept up-to-date, and that there are provisions for enabling its revision in the future. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy SP4 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2023-2041.</p> |
| | <p>Emergency Plan</p> <p>The site shall not be occupied by any new occupant until a new/revised site-specific Emergency Plan tailored to that specific occupant has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Reason: The approval and implementation of a site-specific Emergency Plan is necessary to mitigate the residual risk posed to public safety by the close proximity of AWE Aldermaston, to ensure appropriate preparedness and response in the event of an incident at AWE, and to ensure that the development does not adversely affect the AWE Off-Site Emergency Response Plan. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy SP4 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2023-2041.</p> |
|--|---|