

# WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

## ON 15 JANUARY 2014

### UPDATE REPORT

**Item No:** (1)      **Application No:** 13/01978/COMIND      **Page No.** 35 - 48

**Site:** Building 302, Greenham Business Park, Greenham, Thatcham

---

**Planning Officer** Michael Butler  
**Presenting:**

---

**Member Presenting:** N/A

---

**Parish Representative speaking:** Mr Tony Forward

**Objector(s) speaking:** Mr Jeremy Bartlett      South Greenham Common Residents Association  
Mrs Shirley Huxtable      South Greenham Common Residents Association

**Support(s) speaking:** N/A

**Applicant/Agent speaking:** Mr Steven Smallman

**Ward Member(s):** Councillor Swift Hook  
Councillor Drummond

#### **Update Information:**

Hampshire County Council, as the adjacent Highway Authority, were consulted on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2013. No response has been received.

The Parish Council have responded on the updated Acoustic Report upon which they are still objecting. Their concerns are as follows:-

Residential amenity in the area is paramount. Planning policy is there to protect such amenity and the local residents concerns should be fully taken into account. The report should take into account the very low historic background noise levels, not those presently experienced. There are a number of additional residents outside the GPC area who will also be adversely affected. The true height and locations of the acoustic fencing should be indicated, given the local change in ground levels - (NB - this point was made on the site visit, as Members will recall). The report does not take full account of the AOD levels of the first storey elements of the local housing such as The Larches and Happy Valley.

All access should be via Albury Way, not Main Street. Noise will inevitably increase when the future cumulative impact of the extant Pro Logis scheme is taken into account, which the report does not do. More details needed on the precise elevational changes to Building 302. Design of the roller shutter doors should be supplied. Lighting needs to be controlled. The improvements by the applicant at the junction of the private access onto Main Street have not been completed.

Two further letters of objection from local residents. Similar objections as per the Parish Council, and in addition, the precise location of the acoustic fencing should be made clear. It would have been helpful to have cross sectional drawings of the acoustic fencing in relation to dwellings to the south east. No access should be via Wofford Way. Fulton Court was not completed as this would have closed off Wofford Way. Main Street should not be used as the main access route into the site. Local tree loss in the area has caused a diminution of noise suppression, which the report prays in aid. Noise levels should have been taken from the actual facades of the housing affected. The Pro Logis application ensured acoustic suppression measures far in excess of that which is now proposed.

It is understood following the site visit that the applicant will consider the need of increasing the height of the 3m barrier to the staff car park, but no information received to date.

Colleagues from Public Protection will be attending Committee to respond to any points raised on the revised acoustic report.

Just for clarity, some of the objectors appear to believe that one of the conditions attached to the Pro Logis consent 08/00349/comind [Condition 9], as allowed at appeal, controlled all access to that site via Albury Way. This is incorrect. The Condition ensures access is only via Communications Road, and in any event this current application is completely distinct from that Pro Logis permission.

DC