

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES  
READING BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 7<sup>th</sup> November 2018

ITEM NO. 16

Ward: Whitley

App No: 181518

App Type: FUL

Address: Imperium, Imperial Way

Proposal: Change of use of 2nd floor (2658sqm GIA) to a flexible use comprising either: Office (Class B1a); or a mixed use consisting of office (B1a) and training and commercial conference facilities (Sui Generis) and physical works to replace high level glazing with louvres and install plant on the roof space. (amended)

Applicant: EEF

Date valid: 28<sup>th</sup> August 2018

Major Application: 13 week target decision date: 27<sup>th</sup> November 2018

Planning Guarantee: 26 week date: 25<sup>th</sup> February 2019

### RECOMMENDATIONS

**GRANT** Planning Permission subject to conditions and informatives as on the main report and the following additional condition:

8. Car Parking Management Plan - Prior to occupation of the development details of how the allocation of the car parking spaces for staff and visitors/delegates shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of the safety and convenience of all highway users.

### 1. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

#### *Transport*

- 1.1 Transport requested further information from the applicant regarding the overall floorspace of the application site and the maximum capacity for the conference and training facilities. This was submitted and Transport further commented as follows:
- 1.2 "The applicant has confirmed that the rooms could take from 8/10 people up to a maximum of around 250 people in any particular room. However, it is envisaged that the site would accommodate up to a maximum of around 420 delegates on site any one time attending different events [i.e. a number of rooms being used at the same time]. It is not planned for every meeting room to be used simultaneously and at maximum capacity, due to the on-site facilities (toilets and capacity of the catering) which will practically restrict the total number of people.
- 1.3 The Council's adopted Parking Standards and Design SPD, requires a parking provision of 1 space per 50sqm of B1(a) office use and 1 space per 7.5 seats for conference facilities. The applicant has set out an allocation of spaces for EEF staff leaving 110 car parking spaces. If we apply the 1 space per 7.5 seats for the proposed 420 delegates, the parking requirement would equate to 56 parking spaces i.e. 420/7.5. This would result in a total demand for car parking of 76 parking spaces based on the Council's Parking Standards, which can be met by the on-site parking provision.

- 1.4 In a 'worst case scenario', the availability of parking spaces on the site suggests that the proposed facility could accommodate a total of 825 delegates i.e. 110 car parking spaces x7.5 delegates (per car parking space) in addition to 20 staff parking spaces which is significantly in excess of the expected maximum occupation forecast by the applicant. In view of this, I am content that 130 spaces will satisfactorily meet their overall requirements for car parking at the site.
- 1.5 The applicant has confirmed that the allocation of parking spaces will change each day, with spaces being allocated to each particular event so that the organisers know in advance what parking provision is available. However, the applicant should be required by a planning condition to submit a car parking management plan to ensure the spaces are appropriately managed during conference/training events.
- 1.6 The existing servicing and refuse collection arrangements will be retained for the site. The undercroft parking area also provides for 36 cycle parking spaces which is in line with the Council's parking standards for B1(a) office use.
- 1.7 In view of the assessment above, there are no further transport objections to this application". The above condition was requested.

*SUDS*

- 1.8 The applicant has confirmed that the impermeable area would not increase as a result of the proposed development and therefore the run-off rate of discharge would not increase either. They therefore confirm that the proposed discharge rate would not exceed that prior to the proposed development, which is accepted.