

**COMMITTEE REPORT
ITEM NUMBER 6:**

APPLICATION NO.	21/01800/FUL
LOCATION	Building 260, 270 and 280 Bartley Wood Business Park Bartley Way Hook Hampshire
PROPOSAL	Redevelopment of the site to provide 10 industrial units (14,122 sqm of floorspace for Flexible Use Class B2/B8/E(g)(i)-(iii)), together with associated parking, a new vehicular access off Griffin Way South, landscaping and other associated works (following demolition of existing buildings).
APPLICANT	c/o
CONSULTATIONS EXPIRY	10 May 2022
APPLICATION EXPIRY	28 October 2021
WARD	Hook
RECOMMENDATION	Grant, subject to planning conditions



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2000. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. **Please Note: Map is not to scale**

BACKGROUND

The original development proposal was for the construction of 9 industrial units (12,212 sqm of floorspace for Flexible Use Class B1/B8/E(g)(i) -(iii)) and 1 food store (1963 sqm of floorspace for Use Class E(a)), together with associated parking, a new vehicular access off Griffin Way South, landscaping and other associated works.

However, through the consideration process of this application, the foodstore was removed from the scheme and replaced with a further industrial unit of smaller footprint with a scale/form/design similar to the other 9 industrial units in the scheme.

Ward Members have requested the referral of this application to Planning Committee for determination with the agreement of the Chairman of the Planning Committee, due to their concerns about:

- Hours/timetable of operation.
- Noise & air pollution
- HGV parking in surrounding streets.
- Impact on Providence House and Holt Lane residents.
- Shielding of boundary to Holt Lane.

SITE

The 3.9-hectare site is located within the Bartley Wood Business Park, to the south and east of Bartley Way within Hook's defined settlement boundary. The site is occupied by three detached three-storey buildings which suffered from long term vacancy but with a lawful office use. The buildings are currently being stripped out internally as demolition is likely to occur in the near future (regardless of this application). Their surrounding grounds mainly accommodated car parking and vehicular circulation space. The larger green areas contained within the site adjoin its frontage with Griffin Way South and there are linear pockets of greenery in between car parking bays.

Adjoining properties to the north are also substantial buildings in business use with car parking courts. The closest residential properties are located on the opposite side of Griffin Way South to the west with a four-storey residential building and those along Holt Lane to the east from the subject site. Land to the east beyond existing dwellings and south of the site is countryside.

SITE/SURROUNDING DESIGNATIONS

- The site falls within the settlement boundary of Hook.
- The site falls within Flood Zone 1 from rivers. However, an area towards the western end of the site and other pockets along the boundary in the southeast corner of the site fall within an area of medium-high risk of surface water flooding.
- The site adjoins a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - Hook Common and Bartley Heath, which is also designated as Common Land.
- The site is also adjoined by areas subject to Tree Preservation Orders, located along the eastern boundary of the site and there is a TPO belt crossing the site in a north-south direction close to the western end.
- A Public Right of Way adjoins the site to the east, running along Holt Lane.
- The site falls within an Article 4 direction designation preventing change of use from employment (Land Use Classes B and E (g) i-iii) to residential uses (Land Use Class C3).

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to construct 10 industrial units (of 14,122 sqm floorspace) for Flexible Use Class B2/B8/E(g)(i)-(iii)), together with associated parking, a new vehicular access off Griffin Way South, landscaping and other associated works (following demolition of the existing buildings).

Note:

It should be noted that all the reports and statements submitted with this application requested as part of the proposed uses a general industrial use (Land Use Class B2), despite the initial application form stating light industrial (Land Use Class B1) being one of the proposed uses. Light industrial uses are now categorised under Use Class E and are part of the proposed uses sought under this permission, as described above.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

22/00559/PRIOR – Prior Approval Granted, 11.04.2022
Demolition of Buildings nos. 260, 270, 280 at Bartley Wood Business Park.

17/00814/PRIOR - Prior Approval Granted, 30.05.2017
Prior Notification requirement under Part O of the GDPO for the change of use of offices (Class B1a) to Dwellinghouse (Class C3).

18/02748/PRIOR - Prior Approval Granted, 31.01.2019
Request as to whether Prior Approval is required under Part 3, Class O of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) for the conversion of ground to second floors from offices (Use Class A1(a)) to residential (Use Class C3).

18/00624/PRIOR - Prior Approval Granted, 16.05.2018
Request as to whether Prior Approval is required under Part 3, Class O of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) for the conversion of ground to second floors from offices (Use Class A1(a)) to residential (Use Class C3)

19/01766/FUL - Refused, 18.11.2019
Conversion of attic space to create 32 no. apartments (25 x 1 beds and 7 x 2 beds) and associated external alterations including the installation of windows.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The relevant Development Plan for the Hart district includes the Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 (HLP32), the saved policies of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 (HLP06) and the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2032 (HNP32).

All of these adopted and saved policies within these documents are consistent with the July 2021 version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The relevant policies are:

Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 (HLP32):

Policy SD1 - Sustainable Development
Policy SS1 - Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Growth
Policy ED1 - New Employment
Policy ED2 - Safeguarding Employment Land and Premises (B-Use Classes)
Policy NBE2 - Landscape
Policy NBE4 - Biodiversity
Policy NBE5 - Managing Flood Risk
Policy NBE7 - Sustainable Water Use
Policy NBE9 - Design
Policy NBE11 - Pollution
Policy INF1 - Infrastructure
Policy INF3 - Transport

Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 'saved' policies (HLP06):

Policy GEN1 - General Policy for Development
Policy CON8 - Trees, Woodland & Hedgerows: Amenity Value
Policy CON23 - Development affecting public rights of way

Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2032 (HNP32):

Policy HK1 - Spatial Policy
Policy HK4 - Protecting and Enhancing the Biodiversity of Hook
Policy HK5 - Landscape
Policy HK8 - Control of Light and Noise Pollution
Policy HK9 - Pedestrian and Cycle Paths
Policy HK10 - Parking
Policy HK12 - Design
Policy HK15 - Employment site in Hook Village

Other relevant planning policy documents:

National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF)
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
National Design Guidance (NDG)
Parking Provision Interim Guidance (2008)
Hart's Strategic Floodrisk Assessment (2016)
Hart's Climate Change Action Plan
Hart's Equality Objectives for 2021 - 2023

CONSULTEES RESPONSES

Hook Parish Council

Objection to revised proposal on the following grounds:

- Introduction of Land Use Class B2 in this amended application should be rejected outright as it was not included in the original application, is a material change and is entirely inappropriate for this location.
- The PC appeal to the District Council to ask for Use Class B8 to be severely restricted in number in any proposals for re-development of any part of this site in order to avoid any severe impacts on the existing community.
- The PC request the imposition of Planning Conditions that impose restrictions on the hours

of operation to between 07.00 and 19.00 hours at this site, including prohibiting any arrivals or departures outside of such hours, again to avoid any severe impacts on the existing community.

- The parking provision on the site needs to be improved for both HGVs, to allow for early arrivals, and other vehicles, to allow for Land Uses Class E, together with parking restrictions imposed on the whole of Bartley Way.
- The PC ask for a planning condition that any HGV traffic generated on this site be prohibited from travelling northbound on the B3349 to avoid severe impacts on both residents and road safety to the north of the site.
- The PC ask for a condition that the applicant provides the two new cycleways that are shown on figure 9.1.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan, which is reproduced as Appendix D in the Transport Sustainability Report, in order to provide for safe cycle access to the site.
- The Parish Council ask for a Condition that prohibits any outside storage.
- The Parish Council would not object to the provision of Land Uses Class E on this site provided that any such proposals include the provision of new safe and commodious walking and cycling facilities to connect the site with the residential areas of the village.

HCC Local Lead Flood Authority

No objection, subject to planning conditions to secure:

- Implementation of drainage system in accordance with Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy.
- Details of long term maintenance arrangements.

Highways England

No objection.

Landscape Architect (Internal)

No objection in principle subject to conditions to secure:

- Larger number of large species trees, so good for canopy cover.
- Large volume tree pits will be crucial to the success of the tree planting
- All plant species in the soft landscape palette should have at least an eye to climate adaption.

Ecology Consult (Internal)

No objection subject to conditions to secure:

- Implementation of Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.
- Implementation of bat and bird boxes, invertebrate hotels and log piles.
- Restrictions on external lighting times, particularly along with the SSSI.
- Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Tree Officer (Internal)

Concerns raised,

- There is scope to adjust the layout and provide more details to achieve a more harmonious outcome in arboricultural terms.
- Woodland edges currently provide a hugely valuable boundary feature that both softens the built form and provides valuable habitat and ecosystem services.
- Final separation distances along the southern and eastern site boundaries adjacent to

units 3-8 and 9 is unacceptable.

- It is difficult to consider the issue of future pressure from encroachment.
- Tree loss must also be mitigated for elsewhere on the site.
- Choice of replacement tree genus and species needs to reflect climate-change resilience and the bulk of the tree selection should ideally be drawn from native, naturalised and European native trees.
- Trial holes to establish the underlying soil type and suitability for tree planting need to be carried out and the results shared with the council for comment.
- it is not advisable to plant larger canopied trees near buildings or other vertical infrastructure.
- It is also not advisable to plant trees such as field maple; with their associated "honeydew" issues, over parking areas.

Thames Water Property Services

- No objection with regards to Foul Water sewerage network capacity.
- The Local Lead Flooding Authority should be consulted on surface water drainage.
- There are public sewers crossing/close to the development. Applicant is advise to read TW guidance ' working near or diverting our pipes'.
- If approved, add TW informative about ground water risk management.

Hampshire County Council (Highways)

No objection.

Natural England

No objection, subject to conditions to secure:

- A construction environmental management plan

Environmental Health (Internal)

No objection, subject to conditions to secure:

- Overnight external servicing/operational restrictions for unit 9 only.
- Set of specific operational/servicing conditions (x8) for night-time activities in service yards of the other 9 units.
- Construction Management Plan.
- Construction hours restriction.
- External lighting Scheme and post installation light testing details and high- level luminaries maintenance scheme.

Chief Planning Officer (Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council)

No response received.

NEIGHBOUR COMMENTS

Originally, the 21-day public consultation expired on 27.08.2021. As part of this consultation exercise there were 74 representations received in response to the proposal, including 48 letters of support, 17 in objection and 9 general representations. The summary of comments is listed below. The representations include comments from Ward Councillor Selena Coburn, Tesco in Hook and Sainsburys (committed store in Hook) and from Hook Action Against Overdevelopment.

Relevant representations from the 1st consultation exercise are detailed below (comments associated with the food store (Land Use Class A1) have been removed, which mainly comprise all the supporting representations).

Supporting comments (relevant to the current proposal).

- Regeneration of Bartley Wood. Change in working practices means there is very little chance these offices will be re-occupied.
- Opportunities of employment for younger people.

Objecting comments (relevant to industrial uses formerly/currently proposed).

- The distribution centre is the size of two full size football pitches.
- Associated vehicles will increase the level of traffic in Hook and surrounding area. It will increase pollution, noise and traffic at all hours of the day.
- Existing on site uses gave the village very little additional traffic (except at peak times).
- Housing has been built right up to the roundabout where lorries would be constantly negotiating and passing by.
- Office blocks adjacent to new entrance have been converted to housing will be subjected to noise and pollution at unacceptable levels.
- Noise assessment does not consider increase noise (especially HGV traffic) along Griffin Way South and Griffin Way North, nor the bleachers 24 hours a day.
- Lorries travelling along Griffin Way at speed make a lot of pollution, noise and vibration, this is bound to increase if this development goes ahead.
- All units and layout laid out for HGV, which will result in likely on site and other streets congestion.
- We were not told these distribution hubs in the preliminary letters we all received. All it said was an Aldi store was being proposed. How come this has changed/been undeclared.
- We question whether sufficient consideration has been given to other employment uses on the site. Market review submitted focuses on office demand and not on other forms of employment.
- Modelling of traffic on A30/B3349 roundabout in support of the current application would be premature, in light of current Sainsburys discussions with the Highway Authority.
- There is no evidence provided as to why the whole of the site cannot be redeveloped to B2/B8 purposes.
- Council needs to be satisfied there is no demand for other employment uses before considering alternative uses.
- If accepted, every tree, hedge and greenery be retained at existing heights and places as it has taken years to reach some sort of maturity.
- The applicant has not adequately assessed the impacts of the proposed development on Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).

General/Neutral Comments (whilst supporting the food store (now removed) in principle, they also raise concerns about the industrial units):

- Concerns that all 9 units end up being B8 use.
- If only B8 uses then site would be a busy, noisy transport hub, problematic with parking and traffic.
- No more than 4 units should be in B8 use and HGV parking, noise and operating hours are restricted.
- There should be limitations on open-air storage and effective separation of pedestrian/vehicles for retail and industrial.
- A mixed use of industrial units is attractive but with closeness to the M3, there are concerns of the site becoming a transport hub.
- No need for new access point off the B3349.
- Vehicles are often given a time slot to be at a warehouse. If they arrive early, they need to park up until their designated time. This could cause problems on the business park.
- HGV's arriving to the area could have a negative impact on the local residents due to noise, arriving at all hours, and parking on Bartley Way whilst waiting for delivery times (HGV's parking overnight on Bartley Way is already an issue).

- Environmental impact to the habitat of the Heath if the area were to have light and noise spill onto it at night.
- If approved, there should be conditions to restrict a number of units in B8 use simultaneously, HGV parking restrictions in the surrounding area, operating hours and noise levels, separation of pedestrians and vehicles from the industrial units.

Since the development proposal was subsequently revised to propose industrial units only (food store was removed and replaced with an industrial unit as explained previously), a further 21-day consultation exercise was undertaken and expired on 10.05.2022. As part of this consultation exercise there were 17 representations received, 15 in objection, 1 general/neutral representation and 1 support. The representations include comments from Hook Action Against Overdevelopment.

Representations from 2nd consultation exercise.

Supporting representation.

- To decline the 'Aldi' build application is a mistake and that a 'change of use' should be made to allow the original plan to proceed.
- I find it difficult that anyone can object to the 'Traffic, Noise, Pollution etc which the latest proposal has invoked, when planning permission has been granted for a 'Sainsbury Supermarket' in the middle of all of the houses and living area in the village.
- I think that the Bartley Wood Business Park should be redeveloped with the best interests of all who live in Hook.
- If designated building use is unsuitable for some planning applications / uses, each application should be treated individually, and the designated use changed where it is beneficial to the village of Hook.

Objecting representations.

- All ten units are capable of receiving heavy goods vehicles.
- Being located near the M3 they would be attractive to transport operators.
- If all were occupied by the same operator it would become a significant transport hub.
- As well as the traffic and noise implications there is a parking issue. Vehicles are often given a time slot to be at a warehouse. If they arrive early, they need to park up until their designated time. This could cause problems on the business park.
- Residents at the nearby apartment development "Providence House" would likely be impacted by those traffic movements and parking issues and exposed to noise impact during early morning and late at night and even through the night.
- If approved HDC should impose conditions covering the following: maintain the proposed mixed nature of uses of the industrial units where no more than 4 shall simultaneously be used for B8 use, HGV Parking restrictions in the surrounding area, Control over operating hours, Control over noise levels, Limitations on amount of open-air storage.
- Too many industrial units, only reason we did not object against the original planning was the inclusion of Aldi.
- Restrictions on the level of HGV use are required.
- The proposed new junction is opposite an existing access off the B3349 into Bartley Way (West) which would make the B3349 much more dangerous for all road users at this point.
- The proposed Use Class B8 incorporates a wide variety of operations and commercial vehicle movements that would not be appropriate in proximity to the existing, and proposed, residential properties that surround this site.
- Without any restrictions HGVs are likely to use Bartley Way for rest stops/holding areas in the absence of any official rest stops/HGV parking areas in the locality.

- Imposition of sensible restrictions to B8 use to ensure the site becomes a good neighbour and not a source of excess noise, congestion and annoyance.
- Redevelopment will cause many issues in regard to traffic congestion, increased noise levels, impact on the nearby nature parks and the full thoroughfare within the village.
- Increase of larger HGVs entering the village or parking in an attempt to enter the area will damage the environment for residents of these new residential settings and do much damage to the village overall.
- This proposal is not in keeping with the change in demographic taking place in Hook.
- Little point in developing further units when there is little guarantee, based on existing evidence, that new lessees are out there.
- This land would be better used for the benefit of residents. A bowling alley, restaurants and pubs and a park linking with that public space behind the site.
- It will bring little benefit to our community but could inflict many negative effects unless some very specific conditions are imposed on the application.
- The speed limit along Griffin Way South is often disregarded and will only be made more hazardous with additional lorries/traffic.
- Serious consideration needs to be given to the operating hours (the current proposals are far too long when you live in the neighbouring properties and will be kept awake by the noise).
- I share the concern of others regarding increased logistics traffic and the various environmental concerns that accompany that.
- There are residential properties (flats) close to this site and the traffic noise and parking implications would undoubtedly become an issue.
- Hook is already plagued by the results of terrible planning decisions - I refer to the overwhelming number of large apartment blocks in the village.
- Now it seems that a previously reasonably attractive business park is about to be turned into a giant warehouse site.
- The Council are hoping to improve the centre of Hook, which is very much needed, but how can it be that at the same time they are happy for another part of the village to be turned into an intrusive, unsociable and unwanted logistical hub?
- The environment consultant mentions activity on the site until 23.00 hours which is totally unacceptable due to the position of residential properties nearby and along the B3349.

General/Neutral Comments (whilst supporting the development, it raises concerns about connectivity):

- I generally support the development proposal, there is an area where the development should be doing much more than it currently is.
- Better pedestrian crossing facilities on Griffin Way South.
- Other pedestrian/cycle enhancements and not those currently proposed which would be of limited benefit.
- Generally, more pedestrian/cycle enhancements, especially when it comes to crossing of the busy roads near the site and linking to existing infrastructure.

CONSIDERATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The relevant HLP32 policy that is applicable to accept the principle of employment proposals in the district is adopted policy ED1.

Adopted Policy ED1 supports Employment proposals (within Land Use Class B) in the following instances:

- a) within Strategic or Locally Important Employment Sites defined on the Policies Map; or
- b) on a suitable site within a settlement policy boundary;
- c) on suitable previously developed land appropriate for the proposed use; or
- d) within the countryside provided they comply with Policies NBE1 and ED3 or otherwise demonstrate a need for development at that location and the proposal complies with other plan policies.

The subject site is within a settlement boundary and is designated as a Locally Important Employment Site (LIES) within adopted policy ED2 of the HLP32.

The proposed development would be providing industrial units with a flexibility of employment uses ranging from general industrial, storage & distribution, and business/ services. The proposed development, therefore, would be fully compatible with the designation of the land as a Locally Important Employment Site, as per adopted policy ED1.

In terms of adopted policy ED2 of the HLP32, this policy clearly confers the designation of the subject site as LIES and clearly sets out a presumption against re-development of LIES if it involves loss of employment uses.

The current proposal would not result in loss of employment uses as such, but a minor loss in floorspace. The proposal involves the loss of 17, 296.5 sqm of office space, suffering from long-term vacancy and the re-provision of flexible employment uses with a total floorspace provision of 14,122 sqm.

It is worth mentioning that policy ED2 is not concerned with amounts of floorspace but with land uses and therefore the re-provision of flexible employment uses as proposed does not conflict with adopted policy ED2 in any respect, even when considering the modest reduction of floorspace set out above.

Policy HK15 of the HNP32 states that development proposals involving the loss of employment floorspace should demonstrate the uses are no longer viable and that there should be an active 12-month marketing of the premises (at least). On the other hand, this same policy supports the regeneration/intensification of employment sites, subject to such proposals not being detrimental to amenity of surrounding occupiers.

The site formerly accommodated a business park providing exclusively office accommodation. The submitted marketing report provides satisfactory evidence about the vacancy dates of the buildings and marketing efforts to re-let them, which were unsuccessful pre/post COVID.

The redevelopment proposal for employment uses of different nature to the ones formerly provided on site would comply with the overarching objective of maintaining a supply of employment land and premises which is crucial to enhance the economic competitiveness of the district and deliver sustainable economic growth. As such the principle of development is compliant with policies ED1 and ED2 of the HLP32, policy HK15 of the HNP32 and the economic aims of the NPPF 2021.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

Policy NBE9 of the HLP32 and saved policy GEN1 of the HLP06 seek to ensure that development achieves a high-quality design and that it would positively contribute to the overall character of the area. The NPPF 2021 (para. 130) also reinforces the need to promote good design in developments and states that decisions should ensure that developments will:

- Function well and add to the overall quality of the area not just for the short term but

over the lifetime of the development;

- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; and
- are sympathetic to local character ..., including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).

Policy 11 of the HNP32, requires development proposal to consider design principles and Policy 12 states that development should make a positive contribution to Hook's character. It requires the use of good quality materials, building styles and features in keeping with Hook, suitable boundary treatments, high quality routes for people/wildlife to connect green infrastructure, variety in type/size of buildings, good quality, well designed outdoor green space (private /shared) providing native tree cover and improved biodiversity, discrete siting of ancillary features (bin stores, recycling storage, cycle stores, meter boxes, flues and ventilation ducts).

The layout proposed focuses on the main provision of buildings close to the eastern/southern perimeter of the site with one unit being proposed more centrally positioned on the site. The vehicular circulation/manoeuvring space provided in the form of an internal road is therefore proposed along a central strip of land within the site. The layout and internal road proposed would result in an additional vehicular entrance/exit (intersection) off Griffin Way. The siting/orientation of the buildings, along with vehicular space and landscaping areas would be satisfactorily distributed across the site.

The scale of the buildings proposed would not be dissimilar to the scale of buildings in the locality, which mainly consist of employment uses, large scale office or industrial buildings at 3 or four storeys.

The proposed industrial units would comprise a development that is contemporary in its design and character as they would have a main core in their elevations with large areas of glazing to mark the main portion of the elevations where the entrance to the units are located and to provide a break to the metal cladding that would be used in the solid areas of the buildings. It should be noted that there would be metal cladding variations across the different elevations of the buildings which along with facing brickwork, glazing areas and a curved roof profile, would all result in a high-quality appearance of industrial character that would satisfactorily blend with the locality and other commercial/employment buildings in the locality.

As such, the proposal would be in accordance with Policy NBE9 of the HLP32, saved Policy GEN1 of the HLP06, Policies 11 and 12 of the HNP32 and the aims of the NPPF 2021 in terms of design, character and appearance of the development and contribution to the locality.

NEIGHBOURING AMENITY

Policy NBE11 of the HLP32 supports development which does not give rise to, or would not be subject to, unacceptable levels of pollution. Saved policy GEN1 of the HLP06 supports development that, amongst other requirements, causes no material loss of amenity to adjacent properties.

Policy HK15 of the HNP32 supports regeneration and intensification of employment sites where these would not detrimentally impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2021 advises that planning decisions should ensure that developments achieve a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and also do not undermine quality of life for communities.

There are residential developments in proximity to the site. The closest are two storey single dwellings/farmhouses close to the northeast corner of the site, on the opposite side of Holt Lane. Also, to the west of the Griffin Way South almost opposite to the proposed entrance to the site, there is a four-storey building set back from Griffin Way South that is in residential use, Providence House (formerly an office building). Other residential developments in proximity to the site are those found north of the railway tracks.

Public representations received and summarised above, mainly raise concerns about the noise created by comings/goings of heavy vehicles along Griffin Way associated with the proposal, movements of heavy vehicles within courtyards, and potential parking of heavy vehicles on neighbouring roads awaiting their scheduled slot to load/unload. Those concerns were raised particularly given the request of the applicant for flexibility to operate 24h a day.

The noise assessment submitted considered external noise to residential receptors, external noise to non-residential receptors, increase in road traffic noise, and noise to proposed commercial uses.

Noise surveys were carried out in a day in March 2021 between 1130 hrs and 1200 hrs to determine the extent to which the site and its environs are currently affected by noise from road traffic.

The noise modelling undertaken, provides noise predictions at nearest residential and non-residential noise sensitive receptors from fixed plant, predicted deliveries noise levels, breakout noises and public address systems. However, there were objections raised from Environmental Health Officer (EHO) about night-time operations (2300hrs - 0700hrs) and noise that could arise as a result of refrigeration units on lorries during deliveries, their engines, loading and unloading of HGVs, reversing alarms, forklift movements, etc. Therefore, there was a request to submit an overarching operational noise management plan (ONMP).

The ONMP submitted lists the background noise levels during the evening times with reference to Providence House (immediately west of the site), Hartley House (immediately to the north, not yet in residential use but benefiting from a PRIOR approval for conversion) and Holt Farm Cottage (immediately to the northeast of the site). These would be the worst affected Noise Sensitive Receptors as a result of the proposed development. The document sets out the mechanisms by which noise generated on the site would be controlled during the night-time.

The ONMP notes the proposed units' siting/layout and resulting location of service yards would play a role in reducing the noise impacts of the development, as the proposed buildings, in many instances, would serve as a shield to neighbouring noise sensitive residential receptors.

Additionally, the ONMP makes the commitment of strictly managing overnight operations (2300hrs -0700 hrs) by loading/unloading on designated bays only, transferring goods from loading bays directly into the buildings, undertaking a switch-off engine policy during loading/unloading or waiting, switch off policy on vehicle-mounted refrigeration units during loading/unloading or waiting, use of smart broadband noise reversing alarms, prohibiting external use of fork lift trucks and any other machinery relating to the loading and unloading of goods, roller shutters to be kept closed when not in use; reminding personnel to keep noise to an absolute minimum, HGV's to adhere to a 10mph speed limit throughout the site and no use of public address systems outside the approved buildings overnight.

The EHO assessed all the additional information submitted and is satisfied that, subject to planning conditions, impacts to sensitive residential properties adjacent/in close proximity to the site would not result in undue harm as a result of noise arising from the operations,

equipment and vehicles coming to/ departing from the site.

One of those planning conditions recommended and considered reasonable by planning officers is the restriction of external activities for industrial unit no.9, which is the one closest to Providence House. However, the EHO acknowledges that there can be additional measures considered, once operations in the units are known, to reduce noise level from external activities of this unit.

It is noted that the EHO questions the enforceability of the submitted ONMP because at this time the ultimate occupiers of the unit are not known, which is irrelevant in planning terms. The reason being that planning permissions, when granted, run with the land and not the occupiers of the development or the owners of the land on a personal/company capacity. The ONMP contains specific and clear mitigation measures that would be enforceable.

Moreover, during the daytime the noise prediction information accompanying the application determines that there would be a low impact on surrounding residential receptors. The EHO has never raised concerns about noise levels during the daytime and as such no concerns are raised.

The EHO also makes reference to the complaint procedure summarised on the ONMP, which in summary states that if the any complaint is not handled appropriately by the company creating the issue, any aggrieved person would have to approach the Council to report the matter, which is what currently happens with noise complaints in any event.

Furthermore, the representations received in objection also raise strong concerns to the proposal due to the fact that surrounding residents have experienced impacts from lorries that come off the M3 and park overnight on surrounding highways, as surrounding residents are concerned that the proposal could potentially aggravate such a situation and suggest that planning conditions to prevent overnight parking in public highway should be imposed if this application is supported. However, regardless of whether this application is supported by the Council or not, no such planning condition could be imposed as it would not comply with NPPF tests on conditions.

In terms of impacts on outlook, daylight/sunlight, privacy, overbearingness/enclosure, no impacts are anticipated to any building adjacent/in close proximity to any of the industrial units proposed. The reason being distances, siting/orientation and resulting relationship and mature landscaping along the southern and eastern boundary of the site.

Overall, therefore, subject to appropriate planning conditions, no material conflict would arise with adopted policy NBE11 of the HLP32, saved policy GEN1 of the HLP06, paragraph 130 of the NPPF 2021 and the aims of the HNP32 in this regard.

BIODIVERSITY/ TREES AND LANDSCAPING

With regards to biodiversity, Policy NBE4 of the HLP32 states that: 'In order to conserve and enhance biodiversity, new development will be permitted provided:

- a) It will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of an international, national or locally designated sites.
- b) It does not result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss;

c) opportunities to protect and enhance biodiversity and contribute to wildlife and habitat connectivity are taken where possible, including the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations. All development proposals will be expected to avoid negative impacts on existing biodiversity and provide a net gain where possible'.

Policy HK4 of the HNP32 states that 'Development in the village should take into account the importance of existing gardens, open space and features that provide for ecological connectivity, such as hedgerows.'

The NPPF 2021 also states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment (para 174).

The Council's Biodiversity Officer has raised no objection to the proposal, subject to the implementation of the biodiversity/ecological recommendations proposed in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report submitted, these being a rich landscape strategy, incorporation of bird and bat boxes, invertebrate hotels and log piles. The Council's Biodiversity Officer also recommends keeping external lighting to a minimum, particularly along the southern and eastern wooded boundaries of the site to minimise light pollution on the SSSI Hook Common and Bartley Heath and the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, if this application is ultimately supported by the Council.

It is worth noting that the EHO has also requested further details of external lighting and as such measures to minimise light pollution to the SSSI can be embedded into the details that are ultimately requested, if the Council is minded to approve this application.

Furthermore, with regards to Natural England's (NE) involvement with this application, they initially raised an objection to the proposal as a result of potential air quality impacts on designated sites within 10km of the site, forming part of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and other SSSI sites within 5km of the site, as the Air Quality Assessment accompanying the application was not robust enough.

After the receipt of additional/revised Air Pollution information from the applicant and consulting NE on it, they have withdrawn their objection and have recommended planning conditions to ensure impacts are minimised. The condition suggested, relates to the submission of a construction environmental management plan, which was also requested by the Council's Biodiversity Officer. As such, subject to appropriate planning conditions, the proposed development would be in compliance with adopted policy NBE4 of the HLP32, saved policy GEN1 of the HLP06, policy HK4 of the HNP32 and the aims of the NPPF 2021 in this regard.

With regards to trees, saved policy CON8 states that where development is proposed which would affect trees, woodlands or hedgerows of significant landscape or amenity value planning permission will only be granted if these features are shown to be capable of being retained in the longer term or if removal is necessary that new planting is undertaken to maintain the value of these features.

As informed at the beginning of this report, there are groups of trees within/adjoining the site that are the subject of TPO's. They are located along the eastern boundary of the site and there is a TPO belt crossing the site in a north-south direction close to the western end.

The redevelopment of the site would result in the removal of 57 individual trees and 9 groups of landscaping features (e.g., either trees, bushes, hedgerows, understorey planting). Out of these, there would be 17 individual trees and one landscape group that are category B Trees (moderate quality) and 3 trees that are category A trees (good quality).

The Council's Landscape Architect and Tree Officer raised concerns about the tree removal. It should be noted that only two trees proposed for removal are subject to a TPO and fall within the protected tree belt crossing the site, the remaining are all trees planted as part of the original office development for the site which do not benefit from any protection and could be removed at any time. The trees are mainly located along the western perimeter of the site and within the green pockets provided in the existing car parking areas of the site serving the former office development.

Since the layout, number and siting of buildings in the site inevitably varies from the existing, the removal proposed is necessary to accommodate the layout proposed.

Saved policy CON8 above, allows for tree removals if new tree planting is undertaken to maintain the landscape qualities of site/locality. The proposal is accompanied by a landscape proposal and in this regard, there were also a couple of specific concerns raised by the Council's Landscape Architect. These are namely, lack of tree pit details, inclusion of one tree species that is not drought tolerant and potential tree management complications along the eastern boundary, behind the proposed units.

As such, the landscaping proposal was revised by the applicant in light of initial comments and there was greater emphasis to provide landscaping (including tree planting) through the centre of the site, along the internal road and pedestrian routes. The revised landscape proposal would comprise the re-planting of 126 trees, which would reinforce the western perimeter of the site and would also be distributed in green pockets that are proposed in the edges of and in between car parking spaces. Therefore, the landscape qualities of the site and the locality would not be negatively impacted in the long term. As such, subject to securing tree pit details and a detailed landscape management and maintenance plan via planning conditions, if this application is supported, the tree removal/retention and the landscape proposals would not conflict with adopted policies NBE2 and NBE9 of the HLP32, saved policies GEN1 and CON8 of the HLP06 and the aims of the HNP32 and the NPPF 2021 in this regard.

ACCESS, PARKING AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

Policy INF3 of the HLP32 states that development should promote the use of sustainable transport modes prioritising walking and cycling, improve accessibility to services and support the transition to a low carbon future. Saved policy GEN1 of the HLP06 supports developments that do not give rise to traffic flows on the surrounding road network which would cause material detriment to the amenities of nearby properties and settlements or to highway safety.

Policy HK9 (Pedestrian and Cycle Paths) of the HNP32 states that the enhancement and creation of new footpaths and linked routes will be supported. Also, policy HK10 (Parking) requires that parking is well integrated to prevent it from dominating the public realm.

The NPPF advises that sustainable development is at the heart of the planning system and in this regard, locational considerations are key to achieving it.

NPPF paragraph 110 requires that the assessment of specific applications for development should ensure that:

- appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been
- taken up, given the type of development and its location;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an

acceptable degree.

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advises 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.

Paragraph 112 of the NPPF requires development to give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and within neighbouring areas; and second - so far as possible - to facilitating access to high quality public transport.

In terms of access, the site is within the settlement and there are already established pedestrian/cycling routes from the site to Hook railway station, the town centre and surrounding residential areas and towns/villages nearby. Also, the site is a 15/17-minute walk from Hook Railway Station and Hook Town Centre and the nearest bus stop is a 10-minute walk from the site. However, it has to be acknowledged that beyond the settlement boundary, the infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists is largely non-existent.

The development would be providing a new vehicular/pedestrian access into the site from Griffin Way South, as a result the proposal would also be undertaking improvements to the highway to accommodate the access proposed. This includes the provision of crossing points towards the southwestern portion of the site. The layout of the development would also provide pedestrian areas in front of the access to each of the units and pavements flanking the internal road so as to connect the proposed units with the public pavements adjacent to the site.

In terms to the additional access proposed and the internal road, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has not raised any objection in principle. They considered the visibility splays proposed along with swept path analysis provided and circulation within the site were adequate. Nevertheless, they initially requested that the proposed junction formed by the new access along Griffin Way South was subject to further modelling assessments and a Road Safety Audit undertaken for the access. The applicant provided the additional requested information which was satisfactory to the LHA.

Furthermore, the LHA also confirmed that their Engineering Team have not raised any concerns with the proposed road and intersection arrangement and that detailed drawings and reviews can take place in the detailed design stage within a Section 278 agreement under the Highways Act. The LHA, therefore, raised no objections in terms of access/accessibility to the site.

With regards to car parking provision, 2/3 of the site falls within 800m of Hook Railway Station with only a strip of the site to the eastern end falling outside the above distance. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider interim parking standards for Zone 1 (within 800m from the train station).

Table 1. - Council's Interim parking ratios.

Land Use	Zone 1 Car parking	Cycle parking
Former B1(a) – Office, currently E (g)(i)	1 space:45sqm	1 space:150 sqm
Former B1(b) or B1(c) – Research and Development or Light Industry currently E(g)(ii & iii)	1 space:60sqm	

B2 – General Industry		1 space:350 sqm
B8 – Warehousing	1 space:90sqm	1 space:500 sqm

To understand and compare how the above maximum car parking/floorspace ratios would translate into car parking spaces if the 14,122sqm of proposed floorspace were to be used in their entirety for each of the land uses contained in the table, the maximum car parking provision for each of the land uses would be as follows:

Table 2. – Council's interim parking ratios into car/cycle parking spaces

Land Use	Zone 1- Car parking	Cycle parking
Former B1(a) – Office, currently E (g)(i)	314 spaces	94 spaces
Former B1(b) or B1(c) – Research and Development or Light Industry currently E(g)(ii & iii)	235 spaces	
B2 – General Industry		41 spaces
B8 – Warehousing	156 spaces	28 spaces

It should be noted, however that the development proposed is seeking planning permission for flexible floorspace (14,122 sqm of floorspace for Flexible Use Class B2/B8/E(g)(i)-(iii)) without assigning, at this stage, which specific business/industrial uses would be operated in each of units. As such the car parking provision depicted above cannot be required from the development, however it provides an understanding of the level of on-site car/cycle provision that would be necessary for an industrial development of such size to be self- sufficient in this regard.

The development proposal would make provision of a total of 234 car parking spaces, of which 17 are to be to disabled standards and there are 12 parking spaces that would have a dual use (e.g., HGV parking /car parking). The proposal would also provide 94 cycle parking spaces (secured via 10 shelters adjacent to the industrial units proposed).

As it can be seen above the development for the flexible uses proposed when compared to the maximum car parking requirements depicted in Table 2 above, would provide a satisfactory amount of on-site car/cycle parking provision to sustain the uses proposed. Moreover, the car/cycle spaces would be suitably integrated into the proposal and have a suitable layout/arrangement/distribution within the site. Therefore, no objection is raised in terms of the level of parking provision proposed as it would not result in conflict with the objectives of policy INF3 of the HLP32, saved policy GEN1 of the HLP06 or policy HK10 of the HNP32.

Finally, highway safety is a material consideration and the LHA analysed traffic generation arising from the development (considering the trip rate that can be generated by the Office development formerly operating on the site). As a result, the LHA requested capacity modelling not only for the proposed access on the site but also for the roundabout at the A30/B3349 (north of the site). The LHA is satisfied that the current proposal (industrial units only) would result in a reduction of trips previously accepted (with retail use as part of the proposal) but note that the current industrial units would lead to an increase in HGV trips, however they

found the traffic generation acceptable and did not object to this or the junction capacity assessments submitted by the applicant.

It should be noted that Highways England was a formal consultee on this application, their interest was any potential impacts arising from the proposal on Junction 5 of the M3 and the M3 itself. They initially requested baseline traffic surveys and modelling, considering committed developments and future years traffic flows information to test junction capacity. The information was provided by the applicant and Highways England raised no objection to the proposal (this includes the current development without retail uses).

Therefore, the proposed development would meet the objectives of policy INF3 of the HLP32, saved policy GEN1 of the HLP06, policies HK9 and HK10 of the HKN32, and paragraphs 110, 111 and 112 of the NPPF 2021.

FLOODING/ DRAINAGE

Policy NBE5 (Managing Flood Risk) of the HLP32 sets out five criteria when development would be permitted, in this case the applicable criteria are:

- Over its lifetime it would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and will be safe from flooding;
- If located within an area at risk from any source of flooding, now and in the future, it is supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment and complies fully with national policy including the sequential and exceptions tests where necessary;

The application site features hardstanding almost in its entirety (with the exception of green pockets in car parking areas and along the perimeter). The proposed development would not be any different in this respect.

Flood risk and surface water management information was submitted with the planning application and was consulted with Thames Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

Thames Water advised that they did not have any objection to the proposal in terms of Foul Water Infrastructure. In terms of surface water, they indicated that approval should be sought from the LLFA.

The LLFA considered the information submitted and are satisfied that the surface water management and risk of local flooding would be dealt with appropriately as proposed (permeable paving, cellular storage tanks and discharge into 4 different connections to the surface water public sewer network). The LLFA recommended conditions be imposed if the application is supported by the Council to secure implementation of the flood risk/surface water management strategy and requested details of the long-term maintenance arrangement for the strategy.

As such the application is acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage in line with policy NBE5 of the HLP32 and the aims of the NPPF 2021 in this regard.

CLIMATE CHANGE & SUSTAINABILITY

On 29th April 2021 Hart District Council agreed a motion which declared a Climate Emergency in Hart District.

Policy NBE9 of the HLP32 requires at criteria (i) and (j) for proposals to demonstrate that they would:

- reduce energy consumption through sustainable approaches to building design and layout, such as through the use of low-impact materials and high energy efficiency; and
- they incorporate renewable or low carbon energy technologies, where appropriate.

The development would not raise concerns in terms of building design, as the units have been appropriately designed. It has been confirmed through the submitted documents that the development would comply with criterion 1-3 of part L2A of the Building Regulations (2013) and the development seeks to achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' and EPC 'A' ratings for energy efficiency through its construction and materials used.

In terms of renewable or low carbon energy, the submitted Energy Statement has undertaken a feasibility assessment of green technologies for the proposal. It is stated that the technologies that have been incorporated in the proposal are roof mounted Photovoltaic (PV) arrays to the industrial units and Air Source Heating/Cooling Pumps (ASHP) to the office areas within the industrial units.

The industrial units would have areas of PV arrays covering between 5-22 sqm of the roof area (it varies across the units), however the proposed amount of PV arrays, according to the energy report, could achieve as a whole carbon savings of 9,610.36 KgCO₂/year. Furthermore, with regards to the proposed ASHP the carbon savings across the 10 industrial units could achieve savings of 5,463 KgCO₂/year.

There would also be provision of 10 active and 10 passive electric vehicle charging points distributed in the car parking areas proposed.

As such, subject to securing the implementation and installation details of such technologies through planning conditions, the proposal would comply with adopted policy NBE9 of the HLP32, and the sustainability aims of the NPPF 2021.

EQUALITY

In terms of Equality, The Equality Act 2010 legally protects people from discrimination in society. It replaced previous anti-discrimination laws (Sex Discrimination Act 1975; Race Relations Act 1976 and Disability Discrimination Act 1995) with one single Act. The public sector Equality Duty came into force on 05.04.2011 In Section 149 of the Equality Act. It means that public bodies have to consider all individuals when carrying out their day-to-day work in shaping policy and delivering services.

Due regard is given to the aims of the general Equality Duty when considering applications and reaching planning decisions in particular the aims of eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This application would not raise any issue in this regard.

OTHER MATTERS

In terms of the public representations received in connection with the proposals, they have requested the Local Planning Authority to reject the use of the proposed units for general industrial uses (Land Use Class B2). Also, requests have been made to restrict the number of units that can be used for storage and distribution (Land Use Class B8).

However, the application site was designated on the HLP32 for Uses falling in the 'B' land use class (some of them now falling in land use class 'E'), in the knowledge of the residential uses

to the north of the railway line and also approval of conversions of office buildings in the immediate surroundings of the site since 2016. Therefore, given the designation of the site, it would be unreasonable to impose such restrictions on land uses on the site or to specific industrial units.

Other requests from public representations involve, hours of operation, which have been discussed earlier in this report. The Environmental Health Officer has requested a set of planning conditions in this regard, however only unit 9 would be required to be subject to restricted hours of operation given its proximity to the neighbouring residential building of Providence House.

Public requests to restrict parking along the whole of the Bartley Way or to prohibit HGV traffic to go north along the B3344 are beyond the scope of the planning powers conferred to the Local Planning Authority through Planning Legislation. Any parking restriction that surrounding residents would like to be imposed in specific public highways is a matter that has to be pursued directly with the Local Highway Authority under separate legislative and procedural frameworks.

Finally with regards to planning obligations, Policy INF1 of the HLP32 states that 'Where required to make otherwise unacceptable, development acceptable, development proposals must make appropriate provision for infrastructure, on and off-site, and/or through financial contributions to offsite provision.

However, none of the technical consultees have identified impacts arising from the proposal where improvement to local infrastructure is warranted and required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

It is noted the Hook Parish Council has requested the development provides two cycle ways, which are identified in table 9.1.1 of the HNP32 and run along Bartley Way. However, this request has to be considered in the context that the site had a lawful operation for office use (of 17, 296.5 sqm floorspace) which as a result of its nature when in full use would have posed a significantly larger impact on cycling/pedestrian infrastructure, when compared to the nature, character and size of the current proposal (14,122 sqm floorspace), despite that the proposed buildings could also be used for office uses. Also, it is noted that the LHA has not identified pedestrian/cycling infrastructure impacts such as to warrant a planning obligation from the proposal.

PLANNING BALANCE

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("TCPA 1990") provides that the decision-maker shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 is a recently adopted and up to date development plan document. In determining an application, the decision maker must also have due regard to the NPPF.

In terms of social benefits, the proposal would result in the creation of a variety of employment opportunities and potential for skills improvements during and post construction, not only for residents of Hook but the district as a whole. This is regarded as being a substantial benefit considering this employment site has been inactive for several years. No social harm is identified as part of this development proposal.

The environmental benefits arising from the scheme, relate to the regeneration of a brownfield site with a high-quality development that would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the locality and the fabric of the settlement. It is noted that minor environmental harm would arise as a result of the demolition of sound buildings and changes required to the current soft landscaping conditions of the site. However, this harm would be, in the long term, mitigated with the contribution of the proposal to reduce climate change from the sustainability measures incorporated in the proposal and the landscape strategy that is proposed, as such the minor harm would be reversed.

The economic benefits arising from the proposal relate to the positive impacts the development would have to the local economy as a result of the financial expenditure during the construction of the development and indirect effects through limited expenditure of wages of construction workers in the wider area. Also, there would be economic benefits to the regional and or national economy as a result of new companies, relocation or expansion of any existing company operating from outside/within the district that wishes to operate from the industrial units proposed. No economic harm would be anticipated as a result of the proposal.

The proposal is a welcomed regeneration of the site that would positively impact the three strands of sustainable development, as discussed above. NPPF 2021 paragraph 15 states that 'The planning system should be genuinely plan-led, and the proposal would comply with the objectives of the relevant policies of the adopted HLP32. The benefits identified would outweigh the limited harm arising from this development proposal, as previously discussed.

CONCLUSION

The application has been assessed against the development plan and all relevant material considerations. The proposal would accord with the spatial strategy and the employment designation of the site in the HLP32. The development, subject to planning conditions, would integrate satisfactorily to the locality and would not impact negatively on adjacent/ nearby neighbouring occupiers, local highways, the adjoining SSSI or on flooding/drainage conditions in the locality. There has been a minor harm identified but the substantial benefits arising from this proposal would far outweigh it, as detailed above.

As such this application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION - Grant

CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON:

To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in accordance with the following plans/documents (including any mitigation/recommendation/enhancement contained therein):

Plan:

108 (Planning Substitution Plan), 109 (Proposed Site Plan), 110 Rev. C (Proposed Floorplans Unit 1), 111 Rev. C (Proposed Floorplans Unit 2-4), 112 Rev. C (Proposed

Floor Plans Units 5-8), 113 Rev. C (Proposed Floor Plans Unit 9), 115 (2 Proposed Floor Plans Unit 10), 120 Rev. B (Proposed Elevations Unit 1), 121 Rev. B (Proposed Elevations Unit 2-4), 122 Rev. B (Proposed Elevations Unit 5-8), 123 Rev. B (Proposed Elevations Unit 9), 125 (Proposed Elevations Unit 10), 130 Rev. B (Proposed Roof Plan Units 1, 2-4), 131 Rev. B (Proposed Roof Plans Units 5-8, 9), 133 (Proposed Roof Plans Units 10), 140 Rev. E (Landscape GA Sheet 1 of 5), 141 Rev. E (Landscape GA Sheet 2 of 5), 142 Rev. C (Landscape GA Sheet 3 of 5), 143 Rev. C (Landscape GA Sheet 4 of 5), 144 Rev. D (Landscape GA Sheet 5 of 5), 145 Rev. B (Tree Canopy Cover), 146 Rev. B (Amenity Area), 150 Rev. A (Proposed Site Sections Sheet 1 of 2), 151 Rev. A (Proposed Site Sections Sheet 2 of 2).

Documents:

Planning Statement produced by Barton Willmore/Stantec (October 2021)
Covering Letter/Planning Justification produced by Barton Willmore/Stantec (October 2021)
Covering Letter/Planning Justification produced by Barton Willmore/Stantec (March 2022)
Covering Letter/Planning Justification produced by Barton Willmore/Stantec (April 2022)
Design and Access Statement produced by PRC (June 2021)
Design and Access Statement Addendum produced by PRC (April 2022)
BREEAM Pre-Assessment Industrial Shell and Core AES Sustainability (May 2021)
BREEAM Pre-Assessment Addendum produced by AES Sustainability (April 2022)
Energy Strategy produced by Shepherd Brombley (April 2022)
Land Quality Assessment produced by Baynham Meikle (June 2021)
Desk Study Report produced by Applied Geology (June 2021)
Site Investigation Summary produced by Baynham Meikle (October 2021)
Ground Investigation produced by Applied Geology (October 2021)
Air Quality Assessment produced by ACCON UK (June 2021)
Air Quality Technical Note produced by ACCON UK (September 2021)
Air Quality Technical Note produced by ACCON UK (March 2021)
Air Quality Technical Note produced by ACCON UK (April 2021)
Noise Impact Assessment produced by ACCON UK (June 2021)
Noise Technical Note produced by ACCON UK (April 2021)
Operational Noise Management Plan produced by ACCON UK (April 2021)
Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy produced by Baynham Meikle (June 2021)
Drainage Technical Note produced by Baynham Meikle (April 2022)
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal produced by Phlorum (May 2021)
Landscape and Trees Planning Response produced by PRC (October 2021)
Arboricultural Impact Assessment produced by SJ Stephens Associates (March 2022)
Transport Assessment produced by Motion (June 2021)
Transport Addendum for Hampshire County Council produced by Motion (September 2021)
Transport Addendum for National Highways produced by Motion (September 2021)
Transport Addendum produced by Motion (March 2022)
Transport Sustainability Report produced by Motion (September 2021)
Travel Plan produced by Motion (March 2022)
External Lighting Proposals produced by Shepherd Brombley (April 2022)

REASON:

To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interest of proper planning.

- 3 No development shall commence on site until details of a construction management plan are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include but not limited to the following:
- i) Construction worker and visitor parking;
 - ii) Anticipated number, frequency and size of construction vehicles;
 - iii) Dust and Noise/Vibration mitigation measures;
 - iv) Dust suppression measures;
 - v) Site security;
 - vi) Vehicle manoeuvring/ turning and measures to avoid conflicts along the site access track with vehicles not associated with the construction of the development;
 - vii) Locations for the loading/unloading and storage of plant, building materials and construction debris and contractors offices;
 - viii) Procedures for on-site contractors to deal with complaints from local residents;
 - ix) Measures to mitigate impacts on neighbouring highways; and
 - x) Details of wheel water spraying facilities;
 - xi) Protection of pedestrian routes during construction;

Once approved, the details shall be fully implemented and retained for the duration of the works.

REASON:

To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents and to ensure adequate highway and site safety in accordance with Policies NBE11 and INF3 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, saved policies GEN1 and CON8 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 (Saved Policies), the aims of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the NPPF 2021.

- 4 No development shall commence on site until details of a construction environmental management plan are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate how the construction of the development would be dealing with environmentally sensitive areas, their aftercare and maintenance together with a plan detailing the works to be carried out showing how the environment will be protected during the works.

This shall include how construction activities would be controlled /managed to avoid adverse impacts on the adjacent SSSI and trees/hedgerows within/adjacent the site. The details approved shall be fully implemented and retained for the duration of the works.

REASON:

To protect ecology and biodiversity of the locality in accordance with Policies NBE4 and NBE11 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, the aims of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the NPPF 2021.

- 5 No development above ground floor slab level shall commence until an external materials schedule including product brochures, online product links, or physical samples as appropriate, details and samples of all external materials for the buildings, boundary treatment details and hard surfacing on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the development shall proceed in accordance with the details as approved.

REASON:

To ensure a high-quality external appearance of the development and to satisfy Policy

NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 (Saved Policies), Policy HK12 of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the aims of the NPPF 2021.

- 6 Prior to the implementation of the landscape strategy hereby approved and notwithstanding any information submitted with this application, details of tree pits associated with the landscape strategy approved under condition 2 above and a detailed long-term Landscape Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The tree pit details shall be implemented as approved when undertaking the landscape strategy and the long-term landscape management shall be fully implemented as approved.

Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after completion of the approved landscape strategy, are removed, die or become, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of similar species, size and number as originally approved.

REASON:

To ensure the development is adequately landscaped and the landscaping is adequately managed in the interest of visual amenity and the character of the area as a whole in accordance with Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, saved policies GEN1 and CON8 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, the aims of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the NPPF 2021.

- 7 Prior to occupation of any of the commercial units hereby approved, details of the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation. The details shall include maintenance schedules for each drainage feature type and ownership; and protection measures.

The details approved shall be fully implemented before the development is firstly occupied and complied with for the lifetime of the development.

REASON:

To ensure that the proposed development would not increase the risk of flooding within the site and elsewhere, be safe from flooding and to satisfy policy NBE5 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2032 and the NPPF 2021.

- 8 Notwithstanding any information submitted with this application, details refuse storage, and a refuse management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of each of the units hereby approved.

The details approved for each of the units shall be fully implemented before the subject unit is firstly occupied and complied with thereafter.

REASON:

In the interest of neighbouring residential amenity and an adequate refuse storage/servicing, in accordance with policies NBE9 and NBE11 of the adopted Hart Local Plan and Sites 2016-203, saved policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 and the NPPF 2021.

- 9 Prior to first occupation of any of the industrial units hereby approved and notwithstanding any information submitted with this application, a night-time external lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority.

Any external lighting surrounding the approved industrial unit no. 9 should demonstrate it would not result in detrimental impacts to the residential premises at Providence House (light nuisance) and any external illumination along/near the eastern and southern perimeter of the site should minimise/avoid lighting spillage beyond the confines of the site. The information should include measures to prevent unnecessary night-time illumination of the external areas of site.

The night-time external lighting scheme shall be implemented in strict accordance with the details approved.

REASON:

To protect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, to minimise impacts on the adjacent Site of Special Scientific Interest and to satisfy Policies NBE4, NBE9 and NBE11 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2016-2032, saved local Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006, Policy HK8 of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the aims of the NPPF 2021

- 10 Prior to first occupation of any of the units hereby approved and following the installation of the night-time external lighting scheme approved under condition no.9, a post-installation testing report and a long-term maintenance scheme (including high level luminaires) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The post-installation testing report shall demonstrate the installation angles, lux values and associated fittings have been installed as intended with no inadvertent creation of light nuisance to surrounding residential properties.

REASON:

To protect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, to minimise impacts on the adjacent SSSI and to satisfy Policies NBE4, NBE9 and NBE11 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, saved local Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006, Policy HK8 of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the aims of the NPPF 2021

- 11 Notwithstanding any information submitted with this application, no external activities shall take place between 2300 hrs -0700 hrs for the industrial unit no.9, as labelled in the approved plans.

REASON:

To protect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers and to satisfy Policy NBE11 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, saved local Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006, Policy HK8 of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the aims of the NPPF 2021.

- 12 External areas to the buildings shall not be used for storage of any kind.

REASON:

In the interest of visual amenity of the site and the locality as a whole and to satisfy Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, saved local Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006, Policy HK12 of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the aims of the NPPF 2021.

- 13 No development, demolition work or delivery of materials shall take place at the site except between 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours on weekdays or 08:00 to 12:00 hours Saturdays. No development, demolition, construction work or deliveries of materials shall take place at any time on Sundays or Public Holidays.

REASON:

To protect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers and to satisfy Policies NBE9 and NBE11 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2016-2032, saved local policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006, Policy HK8 of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the aims of the NPPF 2021.

- 14 Prior to first occupation of any of the development hereby approved, the approved vehicular access, car parking facilities, loading bays and manoeuvring areas to serve the development as shown on Site Plan 109 shall be fully completed. These areas shall be retained in perpetuity for the purpose of vehicular access, parking, loading and manoeuvring and nothing shall be placed upon these areas to prohibit their use for these purposes. They shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved plan.

REASON:

To ensure that the development is provided with adequate access, parking and turning areas in the interest of public highway safety and to satisfy Policies NBE9 and INF3 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, saved policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, Policy HK10 of the Hook Neighbourhood Plan 2032 and the aims of the NPPF 2021.

- 15 Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2 - Class A; Part 3 - Classes G, MA, T; Part 7 - Classes A, E, H, I and J(a) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any subsequent order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modifications) no enlargement, improvement or other alteration to the industrial units permitted under these classes shall be carried out without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority, obtained through the submission of a planning application made for that purpose.

REASON:

In order to prevent over-development, retain suitable neighbouring relationships and ensure that the Planning Authority can properly consider the effect of any future proposals on the character of the locality and amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, saved local policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 and the aims of the NPPF 2021.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The Council works positively and proactively on development proposals to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF. In this instance: The applicant was advised of the necessary information needed to process the application and, once received, the application was acceptable and no further engagement with the applicant was required.
- 2 The applicant is advised to make sure that the works hereby approved are carried out with due care and consideration to the amenities of adjacent properties and users of any nearby public highway or other rights of way. It is good practice to ensure that works audible at the boundary of the site are limited to be carried out between 8am

and 6pm Monday to Friday, 8am and 12 noon on Saturdays with no working on Sunday and Bank Holidays. The storage of materials and parking of operatives vehicles should be normally arranged on site.

- 3 Works affecting the highway need consent from the Area Surveyor, please contact Hampshire Highways on 0845 850 4422.
- 4 There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near Thames Water's sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. Thames Water will need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services they provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read Thames Water's guide working near or diverting Thames Water's pipes.
- 5 A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Thames Water would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 3577 9483 or by emailing trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk
- 6 Should the applicant seek to vary planning condition no. 11 (night-time restrictions to unit no. 9), the Local Planning Authority should be provided with specific, robust and detailed mitigation measures for the loading bay which will have nearest distance and direct line of site with the residents of Providence House. Specific mitigation measures can include but not be limited to the design of the loading bay, loading dock curtains, screening, barriers, enclosures, sound insulation measures.