

## UPDATE REPORT

BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC GROWTH & NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES READING BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE: 23 <sup>rd</sup> June 2021	ITEM NO. 9
---	------------

Ward: Whitley

App No.: 201853/FUL

Address: Brunel Retail Park, Rose Kiln Lane

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings. erection of 2no. buildings for use within Classes E(g)(iii), B2 and B8, along with access and servicing arrangements, car parking, landscaping and associated works.

Applicant: MCTGF Trustee 1 Ltd & MCTGF Trustee 2 Ltd

Date validated: 21<sup>st</sup> December 2020

Major Application: 13 week target decision: 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021

Extended Deadline: 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2021

26 week Planning Guarantee: 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021

Ward: Whitley

App No.: 201842/FUL

Address: Brunel Retail Park, Rose Kiln Lane

Proposal: Continued use of Units 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4, 5 and 6a within Class E providing a ground floor area of 11,329 square metres following consolidation of the Retail Park

Applicant: MCTGF Trustee 1 Ltd & MCTGF Trustee 2 Ltd

Date validated: 18<sup>th</sup> December 2020

Minor Application target decision: 12<sup>th</sup> February 2021

Extended Deadline: 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2021

26 week Planning Guarantee: 18<sup>th</sup> June 2021

### RECOMMENDATION:

201853/FUL: As on main report with an amended and additional condition as follows:

#### CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE:

##### Amended

- 36) DD65 - Visibility Splays as to be submitted and approved.

##### Additional

- 44) Should access into the site from Rose Kiln Lane, as indicated on the approved tracking plan, require the removal of the existing retained tree as shown on the approved landscaping plan, a plan to show the details of a replacement tree is to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved plan within timescales agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

## 1. AMENDED INFORMATION

### *Transport*

- 1.1 Amended plans have been received, which the Transport Development Control Manager has confirmed resolve the matters raised regarding:

- Visibility splays;

- Pedestrians and the proposed raised table;
  - Set back of gates from Gillette Way; and
  - Tracking for left hand turns from Rose Kiln Lane.
- 1.2 There is one visibility splay, which has not been shown for the dedicated access to the parking for Phase 2 (Unit B). This would be required at the junction/ access of 2.4m x 25m. The Transport Development Control Manager has confirmed, however, that having reviewed the plan it would appear that this would be achievable and is satisfied that this could be dealt with by way of a condition. An amended condition is therefore, included above, requiring the submission and approval of plans to show all the visibility splays.
- 1.3 It is possible that widening of the kerb line to achieve a safe left hand turn for HGVs from Rose Kiln Lane would not be possible without an effect on an existing retained tree. The Natural Environment (trees) officer requested that should the loss not be avoidable then replacement planting details should be provided. The applicant has confirmed that it would only be possible to confirm whether the tree could be retained, or not, once final detailed plans are drawn up for the S278 (associated works required within the Public Highway) agreement (condition 40 on the main report). Officers advise that the possible loss of a tree would be acceptable in this instance to achieve highway safety and with the proposed mitigation of a replacement tree.
- 1.4 The applicant has advised that the parking numbers set out in the main committee report (sourced from the Transport Statement) are incorrect. The actual numbers should be:
- Unit A - 31 car parking space; and
  - Retained retail - a total of 298 spaces comprising 233 customer spaces, and 65 staff spaces in the service yard.
- 1.5 The spaces for the retained retail unit would be higher than originally identified. In relation to Unit A this would be 2 spaces below maximum provision, but given that there are restrictions around the site, the Transport Development Control Manager is satisfied that this would be acceptable.

#### **Noise**

- 1.6 Following further clarification from the applicant the Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that there is evidence that Service Yard Management Plans (SYMP) have achieved up to 10db noise improvements, and subject to a suitably worded condition for the submission and approval of a SYMP, that the scheme would be acceptable.

#### **Sustainability**

- 1.7 The applicant has provided the following explanation for not including green/ brown roofs or and/ or green walls:

*“Green roofs are not compatible with roof forms that are at any form of pitch - such as the 4-6deg pitch utilised on the design of the proposed development. This is due to health and safety reasons and the maintenance issues that incorporating a green roof would require.*

*Whilst green walls can be installed on any form of development, they are rarely used for industrial sector developments such as that proposed. This is due to the increased maintenance requirements and the general context in which industrial development is being permitted.*

*The issue of viability refers to the financial viability of 'green' additions, including the ongoing maintenance requirements. Furthermore, there is no existing precedent at the retail park of the use of green walls or green roofs".*

- 1.8 As set out in the main report such measures form one of a possible range of measures to meet the requirements of Policy CC2. The cost of providing green walls/ roofs has been identified by the applicant as an issue affecting viability and this is a material consideration. The proposal would provide employment floorspace and would meet a policy compliant position of being BREEAM 'Excellent rating', and therefore there is no change to the recommendation as set out in the main report.

- 1.9 At the time of writing, the Sustainability Officer has not provided any further comments, but any subsequent response will be reported to your meeting.

#### **SuDS**

- 1.10 Further information was submitted by the applicant and the SuDS Manager has responded as follows:

*"I note that further discharge rates have been provided for the 1 in 1 year and 1 in 30 year events as requested and they both present a 50% reduction in discharge rate, which in principle is acceptable. However, as previously requested the drainage strategy must identify discharge rates for both the phase 1 and phase 2 proposals, this has not been provided.*

*Drawings have been submitted that illustrate a phase 1 and phase 2 proposal however the phase 1 proposal does not take into account the retention of the existing kerb line along the internal spine road. The road in question is closer to the Unit A as part of phase 1 but the road alignment is altered as part of phase 2 and as such this will alter the drainage scheme and therefore must be reflected within the proposals. I have provided images of the two phases below for reference.*

*Irrespective of the above the submitted drawings still identify a discharge rate of 212 litres/second which exceeds the proposed 1 in 1 year and 1 in 30 year events and also the existing discharge rate for the 1 in 1 year event. The discharge rate should therefore be reduced to ensure that a reduction occurs for all events.*

*Please ask the applicant's agent to submit suitably amended plans / information prior to determining this application."*

- 1.11 Following the submission of further clarification and amended details the SuDS Manager has confirmed that the updated information now covers the different phases proposed and allows for a 50% reduction in discharge rate for each event. A further detailed drawing is required, but this can satisfactorily be addressed by way of a condition. Conditions are recommended for the submission and approval of a sustainable drainage

scheme and the implementation of the approved scheme. These conditions are already included in the main report.

**Description**

- 1.12 It has been agreed with the applicant that the description for the application ref: 201842 be amended to remove reference to the overall floorspace for the retained retail units (shown as strikethrough above). This is because, the applicant wishes to retain as much flexibility going forward should small non-material adjustments to the retained retail floorspace be required in the future, which would not possible, as a result of the Finney ruling, if the total floorspace is contained within the description of development.

**Neighbour response**

- 1.13 A late neighbour consultation response, received on 18<sup>th</sup> June, since the publication of the main Agenda report, is as follows:

*“The current shops in the retail park provide needed types of commerce for the local community. Demolition of these stores and the building of logistics centres will increase the number of HGVs and also force local residents to travel further afield to get the same kind of service. I personally do not feel that this application is in the best interests of the community.”*

- 1.14 In response, officers advise that this area has a mix of uses and the proposal incorporates measures to address the increase in HGVs. There are other retail units within the area including supermarkets on Basingstoke Road and retail parks on the A33. Officers advise that the current Brunel Retail Park is not within a District Centre and its loss - whether partially or completely for retail uses - will not materially affect consumer retail opportunities or harm retail centres.
- 1.15 A written statement has also been provided by a resident in lieu of speaking at Committee as included within Appendix 1.
- 1.16 The matters they have raised were also included in their original comments on the application, summarised in the main committee report. With respect to bin storage this will be enclosed and lockable and there will be new fencing surrounding the site.
- 1.17 With respect to alarms the applicant has confirmed that the scheme would have modern alarms fitted and the specification would be determined during the detailed design stage.
- 1.18 In terms of HGVs, the Transport Development Control Manager states that *“There has been concern regarding the impact HGV’s would have on the surrounding Highway Network including Kennet Island where a resident has already identified HGV movements associated with the existing use utilising Kennet Island as a rat run and blocking access as they are unable to turn. ....the proposed use would not generate a significant increase in HGV movements within the peak periods and to counter this the proposal does result in significant reductions in overall car traffic. These reductions are therefore likely to result in improvements on the reliability of the main arterial routes surrounding the site that should reduce the need for drivers to use such routes. The Highway Authority are therefore satisfied that no mitigation is required as part of this application.”*

***Plans and other information***

1.19 Further amended plans were submitted as follows:

- Proposed Site Plan - Drawing no: 19032\_PL04 Rev D, received 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2021
- Proposed Phasing Plan - Drawing no: 19032\_PL05 Rev K, received 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021
- Proposed Site Sections (Boundaries) - Drawing no: 19032\_PL06 Rev C, received 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021
- Proposed Signage Locations - Drawing no: 19032\_PL07 Rev B, received 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021
- Proposed Typical Cycle Shelters - Drawing no: 19032\_PL31 Rev B, received 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021
- Proposed Waste Compound Enclosures - Drawing no: 19032\_PL32 Rev C received 15/6/21
- Proposed Landscaping Scheme - Drawing no: A4828 03 Rev G, received 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021

***Conclusion***

1.20 The recommendation remains as in the main report save for a further suggested and amended condition as included above.

Case Officer: Alison Amoah

## **APPENDIX 1: Written Statement for 'public' speaking**

Adam Boulding

*"As a resident and representative of the Kennet Island Reading Residents Management Company, for all residents in Kennet Island Reading, neighbouring the Brunel Business Park, I would like the following 3 questions and concerns to be answered and considered in the planning application and reflected in the final plan designs and conditions of approval;*

### **1) Confirmation of noise restriction from alarms at the site:**

*The existing site alarms for Fire / Security are too loud for a residential area, this had led to many noise complaints over the past 3 years since the Kennet Island residential area has completed, with alarms being able to be heard throughout Kennet Island, especially for the residents of Montagu, Osprey and Harlequin House' apartment blocks, please confirm that the new site will have modern new alarms fitted, not re-use of the old system, and with levels quieter for the residential areas surrounding so as not to cause nuisance.*

### **2) Waste storage at the new site:**

*Please confirm that the waste bins will be moved away from the riverside of the development, or will be LOCKED sheds.*

*The existing site bins are open 24 hours a day to children and homeless, and there is a constant littering and waste drift into the environment along the riverside and under the bridge by rose kiln lane (to the rear of Pets at Home, Next and Halfords), including; bike parts, car tyres, old signage and advertising, boxes pallets and plastic wrapping, old furniture and clothing, shopping carts and trolleys, and erection of cardboard box temporary dwellings. This has also led to multiple bonfires and waste fires from kids in the riverside and conservation space of this waste and cardboard.*

### **3) Local roads - HGV access in residential neighbouring areas:**

*Please confirm that Reading BC will ensure that the roads running through Kennet Island will be designated by Highways as NO HGV access / thoroughfare?*

*Today we have many HGVs for the site at Brunel business park trying to cut through from both sides off the A33 or to access the A33 through; Manor Farm Road, Drake Way, Gweal Avenue, Whale Avenue, Longships Way, Padworth Avenue, Woolhampton Way, Fair Isle Way, Rushley Way, Puffin Way, Greenham Avenue & Havergate Way. These HGVs are not able to turn or get out of the roads and block access, block emergency vehicle access and cause damage to property, cars and roads.*

*Please ensure that highways make these roads NO HGV access to co-inside with this development of the retail units in this planning."*