

Item No.	Application No. and Parish	Statutory Target Date	Proposal, Location, Applicant
(2)	25/00395/FUL Aldermaston	14 TH April 2025.	Retrospective change of use of land to B8 storage use Compound A, A3 and A5. 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=SSAC6DRD0PL00>

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 open storage use on existing concrete hardstanding at 3 Compounds in the Youngs Industrial Area., It is understood that the B8 use of one part of the application site commenced in 2013. Accordingly the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated to the LPA [albeit not formally by way of submission of a certificate of existing lawful use] by way of evidence on the file, that the site in part has been used continuously in excess of 10 years -however this relates to only one section of the site. It was decided that an application be submitted to cover the whole of the application site concerned.
- 1.3 The application site is largely concrete hard standing at present with no structures upon it , lying to the north and west of the Estate.

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 25/00357/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 18th June at the site entrance with a deadline for representations of the 9th 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. Such persons may be employed on the application site.
- 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. It is noted that a listed building lies to the north east of the application site being 48-49 Paices Hill listed grade 2 at about 40m from the site. It is accordingly necessary to take into account the setting of this building in the determination of the application.
- 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 north 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>Objects as follows---part of this site is immune from enforcement having been in continuous use for over 10 years. The part of the site identified as Compound A appears to be that area for which immunity could be claimed. There is no information on the length of use of the sites A1 & A4 which appear to be approximately half the overall site area.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a lack of information about the exact use of Compounds A1 and A4 and no trip generation information to give an indication of how many vehicles travel to/from the application site is available</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Planning's opinion that the application's Emergency Plan is 'not fit for purpose'. The EP Officer shares WBC guidelines on how to produce an acceptable Emergency Plan and recommends Conditions that could require the applicant to produce a 'completely revised emergency plan' within 3 months.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> AWE's Objection on behalf of AWE and the MOD dated 08/07/25 on the grounds that additional industrial and commercial developments within the DEPZ is directly contrary to public safety and emergency planning advice. AWE articulates specific concern about; the failure of the application to produce a site EP plan, the cumulative effects of similar developments that could collectively result in a tipping point that renders the OSEP inadequate, and that additional developments could put unreasonable restrictions on AWE in the event that the ONR concludes that the OSEP is inadequate, and AWE has to cease work with ionising radiation.</p> <p>APC is aware that restricted resources within WBC Emergency Planning mean that it is unable to follow up on Conditions. This makes us nervous about considerations relating to Emergency Planning being addressed by Conditions after approval and risking the safety of residents. For this reason, and the fact that AWE/MOD has issued such a strongly worded objection, APC agreed to respond OBJECT.</p>
Highways:	No objections raised. Site has good overall access to the principal main road network of the A340 and beyond. No parking is proposed on the site. Recommend limitation of use class by condition.
Suds	No objections raised, subject to a condition being attached on suds
Gardens Trust	No views received.
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	Views awaited.
Office for Nuclear Regulation.	Consulted on the 20 th June 2025. No response.
Environmental Health	No objections but given the proximity of the dwelling to the north a condition limiting the times of use of the site should be applied.

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 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.

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

Principle of development and the DEPZ

6.1 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.

- 6.2 “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.”
- 6.3 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.
- 6.4 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.
- 6.5 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 almost nil employees on the application site [ie not resident anyway] should be taken into account, by the Committee in their determination.
- 6.6 It is noted that the ONR have not responded to the application so de facto there is no objection in place to the application. Similarly, the Council EP officer has not responded although she is aware of the application. Her views will be noted on the update report.
- 6.7 However, at the time of writing this report, 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.
- 6.8 It is noted that one of the conditions recommended to be attached to any permission will relate to the submission, and approval of a satisfactory Emergency Plan for the site, within a certain timescale of the decision date.
- 6.9 **Employment Policy.**

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 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. However it was of course originally greenfield. The proposal therefore constitutes the development of land adjacent to an existing employment site 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 forms 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 two 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. ie no buildings are proposed.

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.

Hardstanding with the associated fencing is clearly not of a high quality but given the local visual context it is considered to be acceptable.

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

No buildings are proposed.

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.

This has been assessed above in relation to the setting of the listed buildings to the north.

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

The development is an existing area of hardstanding. It was however greenfield originally. This criterion is not satisfied.

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 is taken to comply 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.

Character and appearance/ setting of the listed building.

- 6.2 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 to the east by the A340 road with trees, by existing built form to the south 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. However, it is necessary for the Committee to take full account of the potential visual impact on the southern setting of the grade 2 listed building to the north east as identified above.
- 6.3 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.
- 6.4 Policy SP9 in the WBLPR notes that [inter alia] any harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset must be justified. It is the officer view that a limited degree of harm will occur to the listed building setting from the continued use of Compound A4 to the east of the application site. However, there are 2 points in mitigation-firstly there is the economic benefit of approving the application to be taken into account and secondly the setting of the listed building is already compromised by the large unit to the south of the application site recently constructed. On balance it is not considered that the harm to the setting is so great as to merit a refusal.
- 6.5 In addition, any impact on the setting of the Registered Historic Park of Aldermaston Manor also needs to be taken into account. It is noted that this designation is separated by the intervening A340 corridor which is well treed so it is considered that the possible impact on the setting will be minimal. Accordingly it is considered that the application complies with policy SP9 in the LPR.

Aldermaston Parish Council objection.

- 6.6 The Parish Council have objected to the application on a number of grounds -these will be responded to in turn. Firstly, the highways officer has not objected to the application on access/parking or indeed traffic generation grounds. Secondly, the matters related to administration of the have been examined previously in this report. Thirdly, officers have carefully taken into account the ongoing objections from the AWE in relation to the DEPZ factor, but in the absence of any formal objection from either the EP officer or the ONR the application is considered to meet the advice in adopted policy SP4 in the LPR.

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. In addition the potential effects of the application on the setting of the listed building to the north and the setting of Aldermaston Park have also been carefully taken into account in arriving at a positive recommendation to the application.

8. Full Recommendation

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

Conditions

1.	<p>Emergency Plan</p> <p>Within 3 months of the date of this decision the applicant shall submit an Emergency Plan for the application site to the LPA. The plan shall then be considered by the LPA in concert with the Council EP officer. Once the Plan is approved it shall be implemented with immediate effect on the site as an ongoing initiative and reviewed every 3 years. If the applicant fails to submit such a Plan within the date specified the planning permission hereby granted by the LPA will be null and void.</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. 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 – P AY 001A, 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 restriction</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be used only for open storage use class B8 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>SUDS</p> <p>Within 3 months of the date of this decision the applicant shall submit to the LPA details of sustainable drainage methods (SuDS) to be implemented within the site .Once approved , the planning, design and implementation of sustainable drainage methods (SuDS) should be carried out in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (2015), the SuDS Manual C753 (2015) and the WBC SuDS Supplementary Planning Document December (2018) with particular emphasis on green SuDS that provide environmental/biodiversity benefits and water re-use.</p> <p>Reason. To ensure that the site does not cause flooding in accord with policy SP6 in the LPR of 2023 to 2041.</p>

5	<p>Times of use.</p> <p>The operation of the B8 site hereby approved shall only be between the hours of -</p> <p>7:00 am to 7:00 pm to Mondays on Fridays;</p> <p>7:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturdays;</p> <p>No use on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Reason -to protect local amenity in accord with the advice in policy DM5 in the LPR of 2023 to 2041.</p>
---	--