

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

6a PLAN/2023/0875

WARD: St Johns

LOCATION: Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate, Woking, Surrey, GU21 6LY

PROPOSAL: Demolition of all existing buildings and structures and construction of a new commercial/industrial estate of 12 units together with parking, hard and soft landscaping and associated ancillary works. Units 5, 11 and 12 within Use Class E(g) (Commercial, Business and Service) only, Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10 within Use Class E(g) (Commercial, Business and Service) or Use Class B8 (Storage or distribution) and Units 7, 8 and 9 within Use Class E(g) (Commercial, Business and Service) use Class B2 (General Industry) or Use Class B8 (Storage or distribution)

APPLICANT: Woking Borough Council

OFFICER: Brooke Bougnague

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The applicant is Woking Borough Council. Also, this is an application for planning permission, where the recommendation is for approval, for the provision of buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more. For both of these reasons the application falls outside of the Development Manager - Scheme of Delegation.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Site Area: 0.6 hectare (6,000 sq.m)
 Existing Floorspace (GIA) (approx.): 2,546 sq.m
 Proposed Floorspace (GIA): 2,754 sq.m (+ 208 sq.m)

Unit	Use Classes	Proposed GIA (sq.m) (incl. Mezz)	Any Mezzanine Level?	Eaves Height (metres) (approx.)	Maximum Height (metres) (approx.)
Goldsworth Road					
1	E(g) or B8	200.70	Yes	5.75m	7.2m
2		174.60	Yes		
3		234.00	Yes	7.0m	8.8m
4		203.40	Yes		
5	E(g) only	98.10	No	6.0m	6.4m
6	E(g) or B8	244.80	Yes	8.8m	9.4m
7	E(g) or B8 or B2	284.40	Yes		
8		305.10	Yes		
9		300.60	Yes		
10	E(g) or B8	308.70	Yes		
Total 1-10		2,354.40			
Mabel Street					
11	E(g) only	308.70	Yes	8.7m (s/s 4.0m)	9.4m (s/s 4.0m)
12		90.90	No	7.0m	7.4m
Total 11-12		399.60			

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

PLANNING STATUS

- Urban Area
- Employment Area (Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate)
- Surface Water Flood Risk (Medium / High / Very High - to areas)
- Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA) Zone B (400m-5km)
- Adjacent to Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area (to north)
- Adjacent to Basingstoke Canal Corridor (to north)
- Adjacent to Urban Open Space (to north, Basingstoke Canal)
- Adjacent to High Density Residential Area (to east)
- Proximate to Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) (to north, water channel of Basingstoke Canal)

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site constitutes the Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate, which is principally accessed from Goldsworth Road, with access to units within the north-west of the site taken from Mabel Street. The site contains a number of commercial/industrial buildings which vary in height between single and two storeys; the majority of which are constructed from cement with pebble-dash external render and flat roofing and date from the 1960s. Concrete surfacing is present in all areas of the site, outside of the buildings and the verge which fronts Goldsworth Road. The activities currently occurring on the site include automation production, a ceramic tile warehouse, laser engraving and several vehicle repair centres. To the immediate north of the site there is an area of bankside terrestrial habitat/vegetation which leads up to the water channel of the Basingstoke Canal. The topography of the site gently falls from the east towards the west with ground levels ranging between 29.40m AOD and 28.40m AOD.

PLANNING HISTORY

Whole Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate site:

PLAN/2023/0440 - Demolition of all existing buildings and structures and construction of a new commercial/industrial estate of 12 units together with parking, hard and soft landscaping and associated ancillary works. Units 1, 4 and 5 within Use Class E(g) (Commercial, Business and Service) only, Units 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 within Use Class E(g) (Commercial, Business and Service) or Use Class B8 (Storage or distribution) (description amended 18.07.2023 to remove Use Class B2 from Units 11 and 12 and amended plans recd 08.08.2023 and 17.08.2023). Refused 08.09.2023

Refusal reason:

01. The proposed development would fail to cater for flexibility to (re)accommodate existing motor vehicle repair occupiers (which fall within Use Class B2 ('General Industrial')) which are based on the site, and thus fails to take into account local business needs, to provide a range of types of premises and to ensure a sustainable employment development pattern contrary to Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (most notably paragraph 81).

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

83/0931 - Permanent retention of 20,200 sq.ft. of light industrial space, 4,400 sq.ft. of ancillary office space and 3,000 sq.ft. of storage space.
Granted subject to conditions (27.03.1984)

Condition 1 of ref: 83/0931 reads: "*The industrial development hereby approved shall be restricted to Class III of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1972*". Class III of the 1972 Order (since superseded by the 1987 Order) states "*Use as a light industrial building for any purpose*". There are no planning conditions attached to ref: 83/0931 which restrict hours of operation or use within the Industrial Estate.

Previous to the above planning permission was granted on a temporary basis (ref: 24093) in July 1969 for the erection of buildings and the use of the site for light industrial purposes. Permission was renewed (ref: 76/1427) in March 1977 until 31st December 1987. The Officer Report for application ref: 83/0931 provides some further context in respect of the initial establishment of the Industrial Estate, setting out that:

"The site was originally a Local Authority Depot and was granted a temporary consent for light industrial purposes to accommodate firms requiring temporary relocation from the Town Centre in connection with the Central Area Redevelopment pending permanent relocation elsewhere... The estate has become established and is fully occupied by small firms, many of which are involved in motor repairs".

In addition, some of the existing units within the Industrial Estate have relevant planning history as follows (references are to existing unit numbers/addresses):

Units 1, 2 & 3:

PLAN/1990/0238 - Change of use of existing building from Class B1 (Light Industry) to Class B8 (Warehouse and Distribution).
Granted subject to conditions (15.05.1990)

Unit 4:

PLAN/1990/0713 - Erection of spray paint and drying booth to rear of existing industrial unit.
Granted subject to conditions (23.10.1990)

Units 15, 16 & 17:

29454 - The use of existing premises for repairing, sale and servicing motor vehicles at Units 15, 16 and 17 Goldsworth Industrial Estate, Goldsworth Road, Woking.
Granted subject to conditions (01.09.1972)

Miles Accident Repairs, No.11 Mabel Street:

75/0098 - Use of premises at Mabel Street for body & crash repairs in motor vehicles and for spraying and light engineering purposes.
Granted subject to conditions (25.02.1975)

24252 - The change of use of a building of 2,860 sq.ft. from use as part of a Local Authority depot to commercial use as a vehicle repair workshop and change of use of certain adjoining land to form ancillary off-street car parking space and erection of 2 petrol pumps and installation of 2 underground storage tanks on land at former Highways Depot, Mabel Street, Woking.
Granted subject to conditions (12.09.1969) (temporary planning permission until 31st May 1983).

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

CONSULTATIONS

County Highway Authority (CHA) (Surrey County Council): No objection subject to conditions

Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (Surrey County Council): No objection subject to conditions

County Archaeological Officer (Surrey County Council): No objection subject to condition

Contaminated Land Officer (CLO) (WBC): No objection subject to conditions

Senior Environmental Health Officer (WBC): No objection subject to conditions

Senior Arboricultural Officer (WBC): No objection subject to conditions

Surrey Wildlife Trust Ecology Planning Advice Service: No comments over and above those provided on planning application PLAN/2023/0440. Surrey Wildlife Trust did not raise any objection to PLAN/2023/0440 subject to conditions.

UK Power Networks (UKPN): No comments received.

Basingstoke Canal Society: No comments received.

Basingstoke Canal Authority: No comments received.

Thames Water Development Planning: No objection, recommend an informative

Affinity Water: No objection, recommend informatives

Southern Gas Networks: No comments received.

National Grid Asset Protection Team: No objection

REPRESENTATIONS

26 letters of representation (1x individual has submitted 2x letters of objection) have been received raising the following points:

Highways and parking:

- Disappointed that access for units 11 and 12 is still off Mabel Street
- Mabel Street is a residential area and the school and hotel have caused more traffic which should be taken into account
- The entrance on Goldsworth Road should be used as access
- Pedestrian safety issues with having an access from Mabel Street due to the high number of pedestrians and cyclists
- Considering the road geometry, number of parked cars and regular occurrence of the school run it is not suitable to encourage industrial traffic
- The Class E(g) use will have an increased number of comings and goings
- The reinstatement of the pavement around the bend will further narrow an already dangerous section of the road
- A simple solution would be to move the planned buildings by a few metres to back onto Mabel Street not front it which would enable access from Goldsworth Road

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- The problems with parking have got worse since Surrey took over
- My property has been damaged numerous times by vehicles mounting and crossing the pavement whilst navigating the blind bend.
- The layout should be amended so units 11 and 12 can be 'inward facing'
- The current volume of traffic due to the roads current usage is already an accident waiting to happen
- The access onto Mabel Street will increase the risk of an accident
- Mabel street access should be removed
- There is an perfectly adequate entrance from Goldsworth Road
- Increase in HGVs along Mabel Street
- Increase parking problems in the area
- Why would the layout shown in the planning statement not work

Design, character and appearance:

- The design and visual impact from Mabel Street is obtrusive
- Industrial appearance of the units in a residential area
- Thought should be given to render that is more in keeping with the residential street
- Change in site levels is not shown on the proposed plans

Neighbouring amenity, including noise:

- Increased traffic will cause more noise
- Decreased light
- Loss of privacy
- Overshadowing as the proposed building exceed the height of the current ones
- Increase in noise to Mabel Street
- Noise from people coming to work before 7am is unreasonable
- Noise and omissions from units
- Overbearing increase in height
- Increase in congestion and pollution
- The proposal should include a 6ft high acoustic fence on all boundaries including adjacent to units 11 and 12
- I would ask that the planning committee impose a condition that units should not be allowed to be occupied until the acoustic fence (and gate across Mabel Street) are installed
- The acoustic fence will not work when the gates are open to provide access to occupiers and customers
- Noise from demolition and during construction will be disruptive
- Depending on occupiers the units are likely to be open 7am to 7pm creating noise for 12 hours a day for nearest residents
- Noise form opening and closing of gates onto Mabel Street
- To build units of that height using material unsuitable for a residential area would affect the residents lives and wellbeing
- Who will monitor the opening and closing of the gates
- I do not believe it retains our amenity from Stepbridge Path
- Creation of dust during demolition works will impede our residential amenity and potentially health
- Concerned that the acoustic fence will have limited impact on noise levels

Need for proposed development and other comments:

- The restricted hours cannot be enforced and who will monitor the situation
- Restricting deliveries is not enforceable or workable
- Concerns over lack of consultation with local residents

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- A simple solution would be to move the planned buildings by a few metres to back onto Mabel Street not front it which would enable access from Goldworth Road
- Opening hours conditions should exclude bank and public holidays
- The proposal should include a 6ft high acoustic fence on all boundaries including adjacent to units 11 and 12
- Do we really need industrial units close to the town centre
- The demolition of the outbuilding
- Contrary to development plan
- The whole site is an eyesore *23/0875* and affect the value of our properties

BACKGROUND

Planning application ref: PLAN/2023/0440 was refused on 08.09.2023 for the following reason:

01. The proposed development would fail to cater for flexibility to (re)accommodate existing motor vehicle repair occupiers (which fall within Use Class B2 ('General Industrial')) which are based on the site, and thus fails to take into account local business needs, to provide a range of types of premises and to ensure a sustainable employment development pattern contrary to Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (most notably paragraph 81).

This application includes the following changes to overcome the reason for refusal:

- Units 11 and 12 have changed from a flexible E(g)/B8 use to only Class E(g)
- Units 1 and 4 have changed from Class E(g) to a flexible Class E(g)/B8 use
- Units 7, 8 and 9 changed from flexible Class E(g)/B8 to flexible Use Class E(g)/B8/B2

The below table summarises the uses of the proposed units.

Unit	Use Classes PLAN/2023/0440	Use Classes PLAN/2023/0875
Goldsworth Road		
1	E(g) only	E(g) or B8
2	E(g) or B8	
3		
4	E(g) only	
5		E(g) only
6	E(g) or B8	E(g) or B8
7		E(g), B8 or B2
8		
9		
10		E(g) or B8
Mabel Street		
11	E(g) or B8	E(g) only
12		

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 - Decision-making

Section 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
Section 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Woking Core Strategy (2012)

CS1 - A spatial strategy for Woking Borough
CS7 - Biodiversity and nature conservation
CS9 - Flooding and water management
CS15 - Sustainable economic development
CS17 - Open space, green infrastructure, sport and recreation
CS18 - Transport and accessibility
CS20 - Heritage and conservation
CS21 - Design
CS22 - Sustainable construction
CS23 - Renewable and low carbon energy generation
CS24 - Woking's landscape and townscape
CS25 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DM Policies DPD) (2016)

DM2 - Trees and landscaping
DM4 - Development in the vicinity of Basingstoke Canal
DM7 - Noise and light pollution
DM8 - Land contamination and hazards
DM16 - Servicing development
DM20 - Heritage assets and their settings

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

Woking Design (2015)
Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022)
Parking Standards (2018)
Climate Change (2013)

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG):

Heritage of Woking (2000)

Other Material Considerations

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (online resource)
Woking Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (November 2015)
Employment Land Review (ELR) - Market Appraisal (April 2010)

PLANNING ISSUES

1. The main planning issues to consider in determining this planning application are:
 - Principle of development;
 - Design, character and appearance;
 - Adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area, Corridor & Urban Open Space;
 - Neighbouring amenity (excluding noise);
 - Noise;
 - Highways and parking;
 - Arboriculture;

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- Biodiversity and protected species;
- Flooding and water management;
- Archaeology (below-ground heritage);
- Contamination;
- Sustainable construction; and
- Local finance considerations

having regard to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, other relevant material planning considerations and national planning policy and guidance.

Principle of development

2. Planning application PLAN/2023/0440 was refused for the following reason:
 01. The proposed development would fail to cater for flexibility to (re)accommodate existing motor vehicle repair occupiers (which fall within Use Class B2 ('General Industrial')) which are based on the site, and thus fails to take into account local business needs, to provide a range of types of premises and to ensure a sustainable employment development pattern contrary to Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (most notably paragraph 81).
3. The current planning application has been amended since Planning application PLAN/2023/0440 and now incorporates a Class B2 use and units 7, 8 and 9 would have a flexible Class B2, E(g) and B8 use. Three of the units (5, 11 and 12) are proposed to be used for purposes falling within Use Class E(g) and the remaining 6 units (1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10) are proposed to be used for purposes falling within Use Class E(g) or B8.
4. Both the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF) and Policy CS25 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) promote a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The proposed development would constitute the redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL) within the Urban Area. In this regard it would accord in principle with the spatial strategy for the Borough, set out in Policy CS1 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012).
5. Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy) of the NPPF states that:

'Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation⁴⁴, and in areas with high levels of productivity, which should be able to capitalise on their performance and potential' (paragraph 85).
6. The red lined application site boundary matches that of an Employment Area designation (in this case that of Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate), as shown on the Council's Proposals Map (October 2012). Policy CS15 (Sustainable economic development) of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) is therefore of key importance in this instance and states that:

"To accommodate the predicted future growth in economic development required for

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Woking's economy to grow, ensure sustainable employment development patterns, promote smart growth and business competitiveness, and allow for flexibility to cater for the changing needs of the economy the Council will:

- *permit redevelopment of outmoded employment floorspace to cater for modern business needs*
- *support small and medium sized enterprise (SME) formation and development by encouraging a range of types and sizes of premises including provision for incubator units, managed workspace and serviced office accommodation*
- *encourage improved ICT infrastructure in refurbished and redeveloped sites*
- *encourage workspace and ICT infrastructure as an integral part of residential development, where appropriate to support home working*
- *support childcare facilities close to places of employment*

The Council's policy with respect to specific types of employment use is as follows:

B Class Uses

Safeguard land within the employment areas for B uses, except in:

- *The Butts Road/Poole Road employment area where redevelopment for mixed office and residential use will be supported if it does not result in an overall loss of employment floorspace.*

The Forsyth Road employment area where redevelopment of vacant sites will be encouraged for B uses, unless redevelopment is for an alternative employment generating use which contributes to the aims of policy CS5 (priority places) and would not jeopardise the B use led nature of the employment area.

- [2. is irrelevant in this case]
 - *Permit the redevelopment of B use sites elsewhere in the Borough for alternative uses that accord with other policies in the Core Strategy where (i) the existing use of the site causes harm to amenity and/or (ii) it can be demonstrated that the location is unsuitable for the needs of modern business."*
7. The reasoned justification text to Policy CS15 states (at para 5.125) that "*The existing employment areas require safeguarding to meet projected need and are capable of accommodating future requirements for industrial/warehousing space. Sufficient land also exists in the Borough to accommodate potential spin off growth in high technology manufacturing*". The reasoned justification text also states (at para 5.126) that "*The need to renew and refurbish employment floorspace, especially office space in Woking Town Centre, is imperative if the Borough is to retain existing occupiers and compete effectively for new occupiers looking to locate in the area*".
 8. The designation of the application site as an Employment Area, and the clear wording of Policy CS15 in respect of safeguarding land within Employment Areas (other than the Butts Road/Poole Road and Forsyth Road Employment Areas, which are not relevant in this instance) for B Class uses makes it very clear that the retention of the application site for such B Class uses is required by the Development Plan.
 9. The Employment Land Review (ELR) - Market Appraisal (April 2010) states (at paras 5.43, 5.44 and 5.45) that Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate "*is a Woking Borough Council owned estate comprising mostly motor trade "bad neighbour" type uses. The*

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

estate is nearing the end of its economically useful life and is likely to require significant upgrading, refurbishment or redevelopment going forward. A redevelopment comprising more modern and visually acceptable units would be more in keeping with this location on the town periphery. Overall, the estate does serve a useful purpose in the local economy and vacancy rate is low (in common with virtually all the Borough's industrial estates)."

10. The ELR - Market Appraisal (April 2010) site survey sheets identified that the Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate is within 'Mixed industrial/warehouse' use, that the buildings are "1960s style industrial units with relatively low eaves. Fairly low grade image including a number of B2 motor vehicle repair 'bad neighbour' occupiers. Owned by Woking Borough Council". The ELR site survey sheets also noted that the estate was in a "Reasonable location overall. Plenty of amenities nearby such as a Morrisons supermarket".
11. The Planning Statement (page 12) states 'currently accommodates 2,546 sqm (Gross Internal Area) of existing industrial units which are nearing the end of their life. There are major issues with the existing buildings, including poor energy efficiency, dated facilities and mechanical & electrical systems which need upgrading. These issues make them difficult to let and will lead to substantial capital expenditures in the near future to comply with the Government's Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards, which will come into effect in 2026. It will no longer be legal to let these buildings, from 2026, if the necessary works are not done to improve their energy efficiency to meet the new Standards'.
12. Since the Woking Core Strategy (2012) was adopted (including Policy CS15) in 2012 Government has issued amendments to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, with substantive changes coming into force on 1 September 2020. The changes that the Government introduced are intended to give businesses greater freedom so that they can adjust more quickly, and with more planning certainty, to changing demands and circumstances. Uses which were formerly listed in Use Class B1 (Business) [including former sub-classes B1(a), B1(b) and B1(c)] are now purposes specified within Use Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) and are comparable to the uses listed under Class E(g) which is the applicant is proposing to the limit the Class E use to.
13. The proposed flexible uses which includes Class B2, E(g) and B8 would safeguard an existing designated Employment Area for B Class uses (Use Class E(g) being readily comparable to former Use Class B1) would take into account local business needs, provide a range of types of premises to ensure a sustainable employment development pattern and provide employment floorspace to cater for modern business needs in accordance with Policy CS15. The proposed Class B2 use would provide flexibility to reaccommodate the existing motor vehicle repair occupiers (which fall within Use Class B2 ('General Industrial')) which are based on the site.
14. It is considered that the introduction of the B2 use within 3 of the units has overcome refusal reason 01 of Planning application PLAN/2023/0440.
15. The proposed development would help to meet a requirement for industrial/warehousing space and would support small and medium sized enterprise (SME) formation and development by providing a range of unit sizes. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Design, character and appearance

16. The design, character and appearance of the development was fully assessed under planning application PLAN/2023/0440. The current planning application has the same design and appearance as planning application PLAN/2023/0440. A revised NPPF was published in December 2023, this has not resulted in significant changes to section 12 of the NPPF (Achieving well-designed and beautiful places).
17. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires proposals for new development to “*Create buildings and places that are attractive with their own distinct identity; they should respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which they are situated, paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land... Incorporate landscaping to enhance the setting of the development, including the retention of any trees of amenity value, and other significant landscape features of merit*”.
18. Policy CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that “*All development proposals will provide a positive benefit in terms of landscape and townscape character*”.
19. Section 12 of the NPPF relates to design, stating, inter alia, that “*The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities*” (para 131). Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that “*Planning...decisions should ensure that developments...b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping*”.
20. The site comprises the existing Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate which has an appearance and character typical of an industrial estate of its size. The existing commercial/industrial buildings are laid out in two ‘tiers’ within the main part of the site. One tier is sited close to Goldsworth Road and a second set back into the site and backing onto the Basingstoke Canal. The buildings vary in height between single and two storeys; with the lower buildings positioned close to Goldsworth Road and the taller buildings set back into the site and backing onto the Basingstoke Canal. There is also an ‘L-shaped’ two storey building which presents a (west) elevation to part of Mabel Street, together with a smaller building to the north of this (within the very north-west corner of the site) which is accessed from Mabel Street via an existing vehicular access. The majority of the existing buildings are constructed from cement with pebble-dash external render and flat roofing and date from the 1960s and are not of townscape or architectural merit.
21. There is a grassed verge along the Goldsworth Road frontage, which contains some shrub and tree planting, with no other soft landscaping or planting of any significance within the site which (other than building footprints) is laid mainly to concrete surfacing, this ground surfacing being fairly typical of such commercial/industrial estates. As such, there is no objection to the proposed demolition of the existing buildings and structures, subject to suitable replacements.
22. The proposed development would have the same layout as planning application PLAN/2023/0440 which was considered acceptable. The proposal would retain the two tiers of development to the main part of the site with buildings within the north-west of the site (Units 11 and 12) also reinstating a street frontage to part of Mabel Street. The

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

main entrance to the site from Goldsworth Road would be maintained as existing whilst there would be some modifications to the most northerly entrance on Mabel Street with that entrance which is more southerly on Mabel Street closed-off. The proposed commercial/industrial units would be generally rectangular in form with their own 'service' area towards the front, much like the existing site layout. Units 1 & 2 and Units 3 & 4 would be positioned on each side of the main entrance from Goldsworth Road, with their south elevations fronting Goldsworth Road.

23. The units fronting Goldsworth Road (except unit 4) would be sited closer to Goldsworth Road than the existing buildings. The remaining verge fronting Goldsworth Road would be sufficient to retain a suitably soft landscaped appearance to Goldsworth Road. There is also no prevailing building line on the northern side of this section of Goldsworth Road and, in any event, the south elevations of Units 1 and 4, which would adjoin the two storey houses either side would remain consistent with the front building lines of those houses.
24. The height of all the units and proposed materials are the same as those proposed under planning application PLAN/2023/0440 which were considered acceptable.
25. The proposed buildings along Goldsworth Road (units 1-4) would be taller than the existing buildings within this part of the site which are the only single storey buildings along this section of Goldsworth Road, in which predominant building heights are between two and three storeys.
26. Units 1-4 would have monopitched roof forms which would reduce in height towards the east and west sides and would have a maximum height of approximately 8.8m either side of the main entrance into the site from Goldsworth Road, which is considered appropriate in townscape terms. The appearance along the Goldsworth Road frontage would be slightly asymmetrical as the height of unit 1 is lower than unit 4 to minimise the impact on neighbouring property No.169 Goldsworth Road. However, these units would all have monopitched roof forms and be finished in the same materials.
27. Units 1-4 would be finished in full height timber panels to the south elevation of units 2 and 3 which would 'turn the corner' into the main entrance to the site, with lighter cladding with a horizontal emphasis (at lower level) and a darker cladding with a vertical emphasis (at higher level). All other elevations would be finished in a lighter cladding with a horizontal emphasis (at lower level) and a darker cladding with a vertical emphasis (at higher level) with vertical timber panels to key areas (including around the pedestrian and vehicular entrance) and feature flashing. It is considered that the proposed materials, horizontally emphasised glazing (at mezzanine level) and the stepped building lines, would successfully break-up the south elevations of Units 1-4 and provide an improved visual appearance to the Goldsworth Road frontage which would be appropriate in terms of form and scale whilst remaining legible as commercial/industrial buildings.
28. Unit 5 would be a detached building within the north-east corner of the site located in a very similar position to an existing detached building to be demolished. The unit would be sited further in from the east boundary than the existing building and the height of the building has been designed to improve the relationship with houses as Step Bridge Path. The unit would have a monopitched form and lighter cladding with a horizontal emphasis (at lower level) and a darker cladding with a vertical emphasis (at higher level) together with vertical timber panels to key areas (including around the pedestrian and vehicular entrance) and feature flashing.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

29. Units 6-10 would effectively form a 'terrace' of units towards the rear of the site. These units would be visible from Goldsworth Road but are set back within the site (and beyond intervening Units 1-4), in a similar position to existing northern buildings. Units 6-10 would have monopitched roof forms which slope from front (south) to the rear (north). These units would be approximately 1.9m higher than the existing building within this part of the site to be demolished. It is considered that the proposed heights would remain appropriate in this context in townscape terms. The proposed external materials and detailing would match the other proposed units.
30. Units 11 and 12 would be accessed from Mabel Street. Whilst these two units would form part of the street scene of Mabel Street the existing industrial buildings within the north-west part of the site already form part of this street scene and therefore the proposed development must be considered in this 'baseline' context. The west elevations of Units 11 and 12 would predominantly be set further back from Mabel Street than the existing buildings to be demolished.
31. Whilst Unit 11 would be taller than the existing building in this position it would be sited further away (compared to the existing building) from the site boundary with the ends of the rear gardens of Nos.169, 171, 173 & 175 Goldsworth Road and thus would appear less cramped within this part of the site.
32. Unit 12 would be attached to the north elevation of Unit 11 and have a reduced height. This unit would be positioned 'opposite' the side (east) elevation of the house at No.13 Mabel Street (as is the existing single storey building to be demolished) but would be set further back from the boundary than the existing building.
33. Units 11 and 12 would be finished in the same materials as the other proposed units. It is considered that proposed materials and the stepped building heights, would successfully break-up the west elevations of Units 11 and 12 and thus provide an appropriate spatial and visual appearance whilst remaining legible as commercial/industrial buildings, which already exist within this part of Mabel Street.
34. The height and position of units 11 and 12 were considered unacceptable under planning application PLAN/2023/0440.
35. There is currently very limited planting and soft landscaping within the existing site, which is dominated by concrete surfacing and the verge which fronts Goldsworth Road. A landscaping plan has been submitted which shows that the depth of the remaining verge along Goldsworth Road (which would be planted/landscaped) would be sufficient to retain a suitably soft landscaped appearance along this street scene. Modest new areas of planting and soft landscaping would also be introduced close to the modified entrance with Mabel Street.
36. The proposed landscaping would be the same as that proposed under planning application PLAN/2023/0440 which was considered acceptable. A condition is recommended to secure further details of landscaping.
37. Overall, the proposed development is considered a visually and spatially acceptable form of development which would have an acceptable impact on the character, grain and pattern of development within the area. The proposed development would comply with Policies CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the provisions of SPD Design (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in respect of design and character.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area, Corridor & Urban Open Space

38. The application site is located adjacent to the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset.
39. Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that “*New development must respect and enhance the character and appearance of the area in which it is proposed whilst making the best use of the land available. New development should also make a positive contribution to the character, distinctiveness and significance of the historic environment, including heritage assets at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. The heritage assets of the Borough will be protected and enhanced in accordance with relevant legislation and national guidance as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework*”. SPD Design (2015) provides supplementary guidance on the design of new development affecting heritage assets.
40. Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) provides more detail on the design of development proposals which affect a heritage asset and/or their setting. In respect of the adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention must be paid to the desirability of “*preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area*”.
41. Chapter 16 of the NPPF (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) sets out that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (para 200) and that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal (para 201).
42. In terms of heritage impacts it is the degree of harm, rather than the scale of development, which must be assessed. Harm may arise from works to a heritage asset itself or from development within its setting. Planning application PLAN/2023/0440 considered that as the proposal included no works to heritage assets and therefore the only heritage harm (archaeology is considered separately) which may potentially arise would be as a consequence of development within the setting of the adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area.
43. The site is also adjacent to the Basingstoke Canal Corridor and Urban Open Space, designations which are broadly contiguous with that of the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area. Policy DM4 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) states, inter alia, that “*Development proposals which would conserve and enhance the landscape, heritage, architectural or ecological character, setting or enjoyment of the Basingstoke Canal and would not result in the loss of important views in the vicinity of the Canal will be permitted, if all other relevant Development Plan policies are met.*”
44. The towpath serving this section of the canal is only on the northern side of the canal (across the water channel). Public views towards the site, from the canal, only take place from the northern side and from Step Bridge (which crosses over the canal to the east). Whilst there are numerous trees and undergrowth along the immediate banks and towpath of the canal, development along the southern side is relatively dense, predominantly in residential uses although with commercial/industrial uses already in-situ on the site.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

45. The arboricultural report submitted states that it is proposed for two trees (T15 and T16) to be removed due to their poor condition and hazard they represent. All other trees within the canal corridor would be retained.
46. The existing buildings within the site northern part of the site have some visibility from the towpath on the northern bank of the canal, through the intervening tree canopies and undergrowth which is present on the southern bank of the canal.
47. The proposed buildings to the northern part of the site would be taller than the existing buildings to be demolished. Units 5, 6, 7 and 8 would be sited no closer to the canal than the existing buildings. Unit 9 would be sited in between an existing 'break' between two existing buildings and set further into the south of the site than units 5, 6, 7 and 8 and would be readily visible from the towpath of Step Bridge due to existing trees and undergrowth. Units 10 and 11 would be sited no closer to the canal than the existing building and unit 12 would be sited further away from the canal than the existing building to be demolished in this north-west corner of the site.
48. The rear (north) elevation of units 5-11 and side and rear (east and north) elevations of unit 12 would back onto the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area / Corridor / Urban Open Space and would only have a door and no windows at ground or mezzanine level reducing the visibility of lighting from the canal.
49. Planning application PLAN/2023/0440 considered that the proposal would preserve the setting of the adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area / and thus would not harm the significance of that Conservation Area. Furthermore it was considered that the proposed development would conserve the landscape, heritage, ecological character, setting and enjoyment of the Basingstoke Canal and would not result in the loss of important views in the vicinity of the canal.
50. The height, position and materials of the units are the same as those proposed under Planning application PLAN/2023/0440.
51. It is considered that the proposed development would preserve the setting of the adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area and therefore would not harm the significance of that Conservation Area. It is also considered that the proposed development would conserve the landscape, heritage, ecological character, setting and enjoyment of the Basingstoke Canal and would not result in the loss of important views in the vicinity of the canal. The proposed development would therefore accord with Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM20 and DM4 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), SPD Design (2015), SPG Heritage of Woking (2000), the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in these respects.

Neighbouring amenity (excluding noise)

52. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that "*Proposals for new development should...Achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, avoiding significant harmful impact in terms of loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, or an overbearing effect due to bulk, proximity or outlook*" and "*Be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity, resulting from noise, dust, vibrations, light or other releases*". More detailed guidance is provided within SPDs Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) and Design (2015).

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

53. With regards to outlook paragraph 2.5 of SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) states that “*Outlook from a principal window will generally become adversely affected when the height of any vertical facing structure exceeds the separation distance from the window. When a structure is placed too close to a window so that it completely dominates the outlook it will have an overbearing impact*”. It must also be noted that Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) refers to “*significant harmful impact*”, this is the threshold which must be reached to form any potentially robust, and defensible, reason for refusal on neighbouring amenity grounds.
54. Appendix 1 of SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) sets out minimum separation distances for achieving privacy, most relevant are shown below:

Number of storeys	Measured Dimension	Distance (metres)
Two	Front to front elevation	10
	Rear to rear elevation	20
	Front or rear to boundary/flank	10
	Side to boundary	1

55. In respect of daylight, and where existing habitable room windows/openings are orientated at 90° in relation to a proposed development, SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) states (at para 5.10) that “*they may affect the daylighting of an adjoining dwelling if they project beyond 3 metres of the building elevation, particularly if positioned close to a common boundary. Significant loss of daylight will occur if the centre of the affected window (or a point 1.6m in height above the ground for floor to ceiling windows/patio doors) lies within a zone measured at 45° in both plan and elevation*”. Where existing habitable room windows/openings are located directly opposite a proposed development the SPD (at para 5.9) identifies that suitable daylight is achieved where an unobstructed vertical angle of 25° can be drawn from a point taken from the middle of each of the existing window openings.
56. The key neighbouring amenity impacts to consider in this instance are (noise is considered separately):

No.163 Goldsworth Road:

57. No.163 Goldsworth Road is a two storey detached dwelling sited to the south west of the application site. The dwelling fronts Goldsworth Road and the application site borders the north and west of the application site.
58. A single storey element of an existing building is angled along part of the boundary with No.163 Goldsworth Road and projects beyond the rear elevation of No.163 Goldsworth Road. This element would be removed and Unit 4 which would be sited closest to the application site would be sited no closer to No.163 Goldsworth Road than the existing buildings. No windows are proposed in the east elevation orientated towards No.163 Goldsworth Road.
59. Unit 4 would be approximately 2.8m higher than the main element of the existing building in this location. The existing single storey element adjacent to the boundary with No.163 Goldsworth Road would be removed. There is an attached garage at No.163 Goldsworth Road providing a separation between the application site and main dwelling at No.163 Goldsworth Road. There are no windows in the side elevation of No.163 Goldsworth Road orientated towards the application site. The 45 degree test has been applied to windows in the front and rear elevation and passed. It is

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

considered that there would not be a significant loss of daylight to No.163 Goldsworth Road.

60. Unit 5 would be sited approximately 9m to the north of the rear garden of No.163 Goldsworth Road. Due to the approximate 6.4m maximum height of Unit 5, absence of mezzanine windows in the south elevation of unit 5 and separation distance to the rear garden of No.163 Goldsworth Road it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing or loss of light impact to No.163 Goldsworth Road.
61. Unit 6 would be positioned around 15.5m north-west of the north west boundary of No.163 Goldsworth Road and approximately 27.5m away from the rear elevation of No.163. Due to the approximate 9.4m maximum height and separation distance to the boundary of No.163 Goldsworth Road it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing or loss of light impact to No.163 Goldsworth Road. Whilst Unit 6 would have mezzanine level windows within its south elevation the distance between these windows and the boundary and rear elevation of No.163 would exceed the distances set out within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) such that no significant harmful loss of privacy would arise to No.163.

Stepbridge House, No.161 Goldsworth Road:

62. Stepbridge House is located to the south-east of the site (east of intervening No.163 Goldsworth Road) and provides flats across three storeys, it fronts Goldsworth Road and has a surface car park to its rear which is accessed via an undercroft from Goldsworth Road. Whilst Stepbridge House doesn't directly adjoin the site it is only a short distance away from it (at its north-west site corner).
63. Unit 5 would be positioned around 9.5m away from the north-west corner of the rear surface car park and in excess of 20m away from the rear elevation of Stepbridge House. Due to the approximate 6.4m maximum height of Unit 5, absence of mezzanine windows in the south elevation of unit 5 and separation distance to the block of flats it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing or loss of light impact or loss of privacy to Stepbridge House.
64. Units 6 would be positioned approximately 22m north-west from the rear surface car park and 32m away from its rear elevation. Due to the approximate 9.4m maximum height and separation distance to the boundary of Stepbridge House it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing or loss of light impact to Stepbridge House.

Redcliffe and Nos.1 & 2 Highbridge Villas, Stepbridge Path:

65. Redcliffe is a detached house, and Nos.1 & 2 Highbridge Villas a semi-detached pair. These three houses all front Stepbridge Path and have rear gardens to their west, which adjoin the site. The impacts on all three properties would be similar thus they are taken together. The levels of the rear gardens, and houses, of all three of these Stepbridge Path properties are around 1.2m below the ground level of the site. No.1 Highbridge Villas has an outbuilding close to the common boundary with floor-to-ceiling windows within it facing east (i.e., back towards the rear of the house) and No.2 Highbridge Villas has a shed close to the common boundary. The rear garden of Redcliffe measures around 6.4m in depth at its shallowest point although it is deeper than this towards both sides.
66. The existing building in the north-east corner of the site measures around 4.1m (to its flat roofed height) and is positioned seemingly on/immediately adjacent to the common

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

boundaries with Nos.1 & 2 Highbridge Villas and spans across the width of both of these rear gardens as existing.

67. Unit 5 would be positioned further away from the common boundaries with Stepbridge Path properties and so would be positioned a minimum of approximately 1.9m from the rear boundary of No.2 Highbridge Villas and a minimum of approximately 2.2m from the rear boundary of No.1 Highbridge Villas.
68. Unit 5 would have a mono pitch roof with an eaves height of approximately 6m along the east elevation increasing in height to approximately 6.4m to the west elevation. The height of the Unit along the east elevation would be approximately 1.9m higher than the building to be demolished. However, this increase in height would be offset by the positioning of Unit 5 a minimum of 1.9m away from the common boundaries with Nos.1 & 2 Highbridge Villas (in most places the distance from the common boundary would be greater than 1.9m).
69. It is considered that Unit 5 would not result in an overbearing or daylight and sunlight impact that is worse than the current situation which must form the 'baseline' for assessment.
70. However, this conclusion is subject to some form of visual screening being provided between the east elevation of Unit 5 and the common boundaries with Stepbridge Path properties, to, over time, seek to replicate the existing 'greenery' which is apparent on the east elevation of the existing building in this location. The applicant has suggested a form of 'vertical climber planting' be provided, a condition is recommended to secure further details (and implementation, maintenance etc.) of this.
71. Unit 5 would be positioned a minimum of approximately 1.3m from the common boundary with Redcliffe and would span approximately 2.5m across the common boundary and therefore would leave the remainder of the common boundary with Redcliffe free of built form. The 25 degree test has been applied to the part of the rear elevation that would be closest to Unit 5 and has passed. It is considered that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of daylight to the windows in the rear elevation of Redcliffe. Due to the height and position of Unit 5 and condition to secure details of a 'vertical climber planting', it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing or loss of daylight impact to Redcliffe. Unit 5 would contain no windows/openings within its east elevation and therefore would cause no harmful overlooking of Stepbridge Path properties.
72. Unit 6 would be sited approximately 19m from the common boundaries of the Stepbridge Path properties. Given the separation distances, maximum height of Unit 6 (around 9.4m) and the absence of mezzanine level windows within its east (side) elevation it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing, overlooking and loss of daylight and sunlight effects upon Stepbridge Path properties.

No.169 Goldsworth Road:

73. No.169 Goldsworth Road is a two storey end-of-terrace house to the south-west of the site. It fronts Goldsworth Road and has a rear garden which has the site to its east/north-east and north/north-west. The area between the side (east) of No.169 and the common boundary with the site is used for car parking provision. No.169 has a ground floor level window within its side (east) elevation which serves a single aspect dining room (a habitable room). There is also a first floor window within this side (east) elevation.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

74. The existing building adjacent to No.169 has a flat roof height of around 4.1m and is positioned around 4.7m away from the side of the house of No.169, and almost immediately adjacent to the common boundary. The adjoining existing building breaches the 25 degree angle test for daylight, such that it causes a harmful loss of daylight to the ground floor side-facing window within No.169. The existing building within this south-west part of the site exerts some harmful overbearing to No.169.
75. The west side elevation of Unit 1 would be sited approximately 6m away from the side elevation of No.169, which is further away from the common boundary than the existing building. Unit 1 would be approximately 1.6m higher on its western side than the existing building to be demolished. This increase in height would be offset through the increased separation between Unit 1 and the common boundary, and side (east) elevation of the house of No.169.
76. Because the separation distance would exceed the vertical height of the west elevation of Unit 1 no significant harmful overbearing effect and loss of outlook would arise to the ground floor level side-facing window within No.169, particularly taking into account the existing relationship between this window and the adjacent existing building on the site.
77. Whilst the proposal would result in an increased extent of breach of the 25° angle daylight test in respect of this side-facing ground floor window, which would result in some harmful (additional) loss of daylight, given that there is an existing breach of the 25° angle test, and that the increased extent of breach would not be significant compared to the existing situation, it is considered that the harm which would arise to the daylighting of the ground floor side-facing (east) window within No.169 would not reach the threshold of 'significant' harmful impact so as to conflict with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012). It should also be noted that height of the building and relationship with No.169 is the same as that proposed under planning application PLAN/2023/0440 which was considered acceptable.
78. Unit 1 would be sited approximately 1.3m southwards towards Goldsworth Road then the existing building (where closest to No.169). It is considered that the projection beyond the front elevation of No.169 would be very modest and set away from the common boundary such that this projection would not give rise to significant harmful overbearing effect or loss of daylight and sunlight to windows within the front elevation of No.169. The side (west) elevation of Unit 1 would contain no windows or other openings and thus would not give rise to significant harmful loss of privacy to No.169.
79. Unit 10 and Unit 11 would be sited a minimum of approximately 1.7m and 1.5m from the rear boundary with No.169 Goldsworth Road.
80. Both Units 10 and 11 would be approximately 1.7m higher than the existing buildings, however this increase would be offset, in terms of overbearing effect, by the increased separation between the south elevation of these units and the rear boundary of No.169. In overbearing effect terms the proposed situation would be no more harmful to No.169 than the existing situation, which must form the 'baseline' for assessment. It must also be noted that the south elevations of Units 10 and 11 would remain approximately 24m away from the rear elevation of the house of No.169, and at a slightly oblique angle.
81. Unit 10 would have windows at mezzanine level in the south elevation, however these would be no closer to the rear boundary with No.169 than the first floor level windows within the south elevation of the existing two storey building in this position. A condition is recommended to secure the obscure-glazing and non-opening of these windows in order to preclude actual overlooking of No.169 and its rear garden area. Whilst it is

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

acknowledged that a perception of overlooking of No.169 and its rear garden area would remain this would be less harmful to the privacy of No.169 than the existing situation. The south elevation of Unit 11 would contain no mezzanine level windows. Units 10 and 11 pass the 25° angle test for daylight, in respect of windows/openings within the rear elevation of No.169, such that no significant harmful loss of daylight would be sustained to rear-facing openings within No.169. Given the positioning of Units 10 and 11 to the north/north-west of the house and rear garden of No.169 there would be no significant harmful loss of sunlight to No.169.

Nos.171, 173 & 175 Goldsworth Road:

82. Nos.171, 173 & 175 Goldsworth Road form the rest of a terrace of two storey houses on the south-west side of the site with No.175 sited on the corner with Mabel Street.
83. These three houses all address Goldsworth Road with the application site boarding the rear gardens. Their rear gardens vary in depth between approximately 17m (No.175) to 21m (No.171) although it should be noted that the preceding measurements exclude the pedestrian access at their ends such that the separation distances to the site are slightly greater. The existing building within this part of the site is two storeys in scale, demonstrates first floor level windows (facing south, east & west), is located very close to the rear boundaries and measures approximately 7.7m in height.
84. Unit 11 would be positioned a minimum of approximately 2.1m from the rear boundary with No.171 Goldsworth Road, at an oblique angle, with a height of around 9.4m. Whilst the south elevation of Unit 11 would represent an increase of approximately 1.7m in height in comparison to the existing situation this increase would be offset, in terms of overbearing effect, by the increased separation which would be provided between the south elevation and the rear boundary with No.171. In overbearing effect terms the proposed situation would be no more harmful to No.171 than the existing situation, which must form the 'baseline' for assessment. It must also be noted that the south elevation of Unit 11 would remain approximately 25m away from the rear elevation of the house of No.171, and at an oblique angle.
85. The proposed development would result in a notable improvement in the privacy of the rear garden and rear elevation of No.171 because Unit 11 would have no windows/openings within its south elevation, in comparison to the high levels of glazing which are apparent, including at first floor level, within the south elevation of the existing building. Unit 11 passes the 25 degree test for daylight, in respect of windows/openings within the rear elevation of No.171, there would not be a significant loss of daylight to No.171. Given the positioning of Unit 11 to the north/north-west of the house and rear garden of No.171 there would be no significant harmful loss of sunlight to No.171.
86. Unit 11 would be positioned a minimum of approximately 3.7m to 4.7m away from the rear boundary with No.173 Goldsworth Road, at an oblique angle, with a height of around 9.4m. Again, the increased height of Unit 11 would be offset, in terms of overbearing effect, by the increased separation which would be provided between the elevation and the rear boundary with No.173. In overbearing effect terms the proposed situation would be no more harmful to No.173 than the existing situation, which must form the 'baseline' for assessment. It must also be noted that the south elevation of Unit 11 would remain approximately 27m away from the rear elevation of the house of No.173, and at an oblique angle.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

87. The proposed development would result in a notable improvement in the privacy of the rear garden and rear elevation of No.173 because Unit 11 would have no windows/openings within its south elevation, in comparison to the high levels of glazing which are apparent, including at first floor level, within the south elevation of the existing building. Unit 11 passes the 25 degree test for daylight, in respect of windows/openings within the rear elevation of No.173, there would not be a significant loss of daylight to No.173. Given the positioning of Unit 11 to the north/north-west of the house and rear garden of No.173 there would not be a significant harmful loss of sunlight to No.173. The single storey element of Unit 11 would be positioned a minimum of approximately 2.5m from the common boundary with No.173. Given the approximate 4m height of this single storey element, together with the levels of separation and positioning to the north/north-west of No.173 and its rear garden area, this single storey element would not result in a significant harmful impact to No.173.
88. Whilst Unit 10 would have mezzanine level windows within its south elevation these would be no closer to the common boundaries with Nos.171 and 173 than the first floor level windows within the south elevation of the existing two storey building in this position. A condition is recommended to secure the obscure-glazing and non-opening of these windows in order to preclude actual overlooking of Nos.171 and 173 and their rear garden areas. Whilst it is acknowledged that a perception of overlooking of Nos.171 and 173 and their rear garden areas would remain this would be less harmful to the privacy of these properties than the existing situation.
89. The 'main' building of Unit 11 would be positioned largely offset from the rear boundary with No.175 Goldsworth Road, at an oblique angle, although would be positioned around 9.7m away from the rear boundary at its closest point. Whilst the single storey element of Unit 11 would be closer to the common boundary this element would nonetheless remain over 5m away from the common boundary. It is considered that there would not be a significant impact on the rear garden of No.175. It must also be noted that the south elevation of the 'main' building of Unit 11 would remain approximately 27m away from the rear elevation of the house of No.175, (and at an oblique angle) and that the single storey element of Unit 11 would remain approximately 24m away from the rear elevation of the house of No.175.
90. The proposed development would result in a notable improvement in the privacy of the rear garden and rear elevation of No.175 because Unit 11 would have no windows/openings within its south elevation, in comparison to the high levels of glazing which are apparent, including at first floor level, within the south elevation of the existing building. Unit 11 passes the 25 degree test for daylight, in respect of windows/openings within the rear elevation of No.175, there would not be a significant loss of daylight to No.175. Given the positioning of Unit 11 to the north/north-west of the house and rear garden of No.175 there would be no significant harmful loss of sunlight to No.175.

No.2 Mabel Street:

91. No.2 Mabel Street is a two storey semi-detached house which is sited to the west of the application site. Its front elevation faces north, and its rear garden is to the south. Unit 11 would address Mabel Street and have an 'across the street' relationship with No.2.
92. Unit 11 would be orientated towards Mabel Street and be positioned opposite the side (east) elevation of No.2, which seemingly contains no habitable room windows/openings. The 'main' building of Unit 11 would be positioned approximately 18.5m away from the boundary of the curtilage of No.2 with the single storey element

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

of Unit 11 around 15m away. Due to the separation distance and height of Unit 11 it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing impact, loss of daylight or loss of sunlight to No.2 Mabel Street.

93. Whilst Unit 11 would have mezzanine level windows within its west elevation the distance between these and the boundary of the curtilage of No.2 would exceed the distances set out within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) such that no significant loss of privacy to No.2 Mabel Street.

No.13 Mabel Street:

94. No.13 Mabel Street is a two storey semi-detached house to the west of the site. Its front elevation faces south, and its rear garden is to the north. There are windows at both ground and first floor levels within its side (east) elevation.
95. Unit 11 would be orientated towards Mabel Street although part of the building would be sited opposite the east boundary of No.13. Unit 11 would not be positioned opposite the part of the dwelling where there are windows in the side-facing (east) elevation. Unit 11 would be positioned a minimum of approximately 19m away from the east boundary with No.13. Due to the separation distance and height of Unit 11 it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing impact, loss of daylight or loss of sunlight to No.13 Mabel Street.
96. Whilst Unit 11 would have mezzanine level windows within its west elevation the distance between these and the east boundary of No.13 would exceed the distance set out within SPD Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022), there would not be a significant loss of privacy to No.13. The high levels of glazing which are apparent within the west elevation of the existing two storey building in this location, including at first floor level, must also be noted in this respect.
97. Unit 12 would be positioned to the east of No.13 Mabel Street and would be sited further away from the boundary than the existing building to be demolished. Whilst Unit 12 would be positioned opposite the side (east) elevation of the house at No.13, which contains ground and first floor windows, and opposite part of the rear garden boundary of No.13, Unit 12 would be sited a minimum of approximately 17.5m from the east boundary of No.13. Due to the separation distance it is considered that there would not be a significant overbearing impact or loss of daylight to No.13 Mabel Street, including to its rear garden. Ground floor windows are proposed in Unit 12, due to the separation distance it is considered that these would not result in significant loss of privacy to No.13.

Other properties:

98. Having regard to the nature, scale, siting and form of the proposed development no material neighbouring amenity impacts would arise to nearby properties other than those assessed previously.
99. Overall, subject to recommended conditions, and taking into account the 'baseline' for assessment, which is formed by the existing site, the proposed development would avoid significant harmful neighbouring amenity impacts. Noise will be considered separately below.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Noise

100. The NPPF sets out (at para 180e) that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (among other things) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of, inter alia, noise pollution. Paragraph 191 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should, inter alia, "*mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life*".
101. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) requires proposals for new development to "*be designed to avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity, resulting from noise*". For noise generating forms of development, or proposals that would affect noise-sensitive uses, Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) requires a statement detailing potential noise generation levels and any mitigation measures proposed to ensure that all noise is reduced to an acceptable level, stating that development will only be permitted where mitigation can be provided to an appropriate standard with an acceptable design, particularly in proximity to sensitive existing uses or sites.
102. In respect of noise it is stressed that the site constitutes an existing Employment Area which is protected for B Class Uses by the Development Plan (Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012)). It must also be noted that there is no evidence of any planning conditions (being attached to previous planning permissions on the site) restricting hours of use or operation within the existing Goldsworth Road Industrial Estate. The site is currently occupied by car repair businesses that fall under Class B2 and have unrestricted opening hours. The existing 'baseline' scenario must include that units within the site could be used for a B2 use with no restrictions on hours of operation.
103. Planning application PLAN/2023/0440 which included Class E(g) and B8 was considered to have an acceptable noise impact subject to conditions requiring that at least 30dB in noise reduction is provided by the cladding/structure of the units, that the units are only used during specified (daytime) hours, deliveries are restricted to specified hours and to secure the provision of acoustic fences. The current application includes a Class B2 use in three of the proposed units.
104. The application has been submitted with an Acoustic Assessment Report on the basis of the development being "*a total of twelve industrial units with the classification of Class E(g) flexible use or B8, with the exception of a few units which could be E(g) flexible use, B8 or B2 use. Unit 11 & 12 will be E(g) use only.*"
105. Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10 would be used for Class E(g) or B8, Units 11 and 12 which would be accessed off Mabel Street would be used for Class E(g) and Units 7, 8 and 9 would be used for Class E(g), B8 or B2. Units 1, 4 and 5 which are sited closest to neighbouring properties would be in either Class E(g) or B8 use or only Class E(g). Only 3 units (units 7, 8 and 9) are proposed for Class B2 use and would have a flexible Class B2, B8 and E(g), this would result in a reduction in the number of Class B2 units within the site compared to the existing situation. These units would be sited in the centre of the development furthest away from residential properties, the nearest residential property to the Class B2 use is No.169 Goldsworth Road.
106. The submitted acoustic report states that '*The units themselves will provide mitigation, but there should be at least 30dB in noise reduction via cladding/structure*'. The report

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

also states *"It is assumed that none of the industrial units will be occupied during the evening (7pm till 11pm) and night time periods (11pm till 7am)"* and (at para 4.1) that *"It is assumed all units will only operate during day-time periods (7am till 7pm)"*.

107. In line with the Acoustic Assessment Report recommendations a condition can require that at least 30dB in noise reduction is provided by the cladding/structure of the units (i.e., at detailed design / construction stages) and further conditions can secure that use(s) of the twelve units must not operate other than between the following hours, and also that no deliveries must be taken at or dispatched from the site except between the following hours:
- 07:00 and 19:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) (excluding Bank and Public Holidays);
 - 08:00 and 18:00 hours on Saturdays; and
 - 10:00 and 16:00 hours on Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays.
108. The submitted Acoustic Assessment report states *'Predicted noise levels are shown to be low and below the current background level at the nearest neighbouring residential properties, if an acoustic fence of at least 6ft is installed and roller shutters are kept closed. If Units 7, 8 & 9 are classified as B2 use, the predicted noise is approx. 6dB above the existing background level. All units should have sufficient insulation of at least Rw 30dB'*.
109. Environmental Health has been consulted advised the following *'With roller shutters open, the calculations show a noise level at 169 Goldsworth Road in excess of 55dB which exceeds the existing background noise level by 6dB. This indicates a likelihood of complaint, in accordance with BS4142 for the assessment of industrial and commercial noise. This noise measurement is taken from the nearest window of 169 Goldsworth Road.*
- The rear garden of 169 Goldsworth Road extends back into the industrial site. Noise levels here also exceed the WHO standard for external noise; the noise contour maps show noise levels in areas of the garden closest to the boundary with the industrial estate in excess of 60dBA.... It also impacts on the adjoining property in that terrace; number 171, and a property in Stepbridge Path (not numbered in the noise report) as shown in the noise contour maps'.*
110. The applicant has advised that a taller acoustic fence can be installed *'along the boundary with No 169. The Noise Consultant, PC Environmental, has done a calculation of the impact of this, "by using the average UK person height (5ft 10) for the noise level grid height. An 8ft [2.43m] close boarded heavy duty fence, provides enough mitigation to give a max of 55dB (which is the WHO amenity space limit) in the garden [of No 169]. With this 8ft fence, "the overall noise levels at the properties in the area will be lower than it is at the moment". The attached map shows the effect of increasing the fence height, as this limits noise in the garden of No 169 to a max of 55db'.*
111. With regards to the proposed taller fence Environmental Health have advised *'The proposed increase in height of acoustic fencing to the boundary with 169 Goldsworth Road to 8ft [2.43m] will improve the position and limit noise in the garden to a max of 55db which satisfies the WHO standard for external areas. The attached noise*

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

prediction map also shows noise levels at the rear of the houses and in all gardens to be 55dB or below.'

112. It is considered that the proposed Class E(g) and B8 uses would not have a significant impact on neighbouring properties subject to conditions requiring that at least 30dB in noise reduction is provided by the cladding/structure of the units, that the units are only used during specified (daytime) hours, deliveries are restricted to specified hours and to secure the provision of acoustic fences.
113. Environmental Health have raised concerns over noise levels if Units 7, 8 and 9 are used in Class B2 use. These units have a flexible Class E(g), B8 and B2 use and therefore may not be occupied by a use that falls under Class B2. The applicant has advised that the existing buildings within the site can be occupied by business that fall under Class B2 use and that units are currently used for car repairs which falls under a Class B2 use and there are no conditions restricting the hours of use. It is recommended that the B2 use of the Unit 7, 8 and 9 is restricted to car repairs only to control the use of the units. A further condition is also recommended for details of acoustic mitigation along the east boundary of No.169 Goldsworth Road to be submitted and approved prior to Units 7, 8 and 9 being used for Class B2 use.
115. Considering the 'baseline' for assessment which is formed by the existing site the proposed development would result in a reduction in the number of Class B2 units on the site, restrict opening and delivery hours and secure acoustic mitigation which would result in a betterment on the existing use of the site. In terms of noise the proposed situation would be no more harmful to neighbouring than the existing situation, which must form the 'baseline' for assessment.
116. Overall, subject to recommended conditions, the proposed development would be no more harmful to neighbouring properties in terms of noise pollution and would avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity, resulting from noise particularly having regard to the existing lawful use of the site. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Highways and parking

117. Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that "*The Council is committed to developing a well-integrated community connected by a sustainable transport system which connects people to jobs, services and community facilities, and minimises impacts on biodiversity and that this will be achieved by taking the following steps [inter alia]:*
 - ***“Locating most new development in the main urban areas, served by a range of sustainable transport modes, such as public transport, walking and cycling to minimise the need to travel and distance travelled.***
 - *Ensuring development proposals provide appropriate infrastructure measures to mitigate the adverse effects of development traffic and other environmental and safety impacts (direct or cumulative). Transport Assessments will be required for development proposals, where relevant, to fully assess the impacts of development and identify appropriate mitigation measures. Developer contributions will be secured to implement transport mitigation schemes.*

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- *Requiring development proposals that generate significant traffic or have significant impact on the Strategic Road Network to be accompanied by a travel plan, clearly setting out how the travel needs of occupiers and visitors will be managed in a sustainable manner.*
- ***Implementing maximum car parking standards for all types of non-residential development, including consideration of zero parking in Woking Town Centre, providing it does not create new or exacerbate existing on-street car parking problems. Minimum standards will be set for residential development. However, in applying these standards, the Council will seek to ensure that this will not undermine the overall sustainability objectives of the Core Strategy, including the effects on highway safety. If necessary, the Council will consider managing the demand and supply of parking in order to control congestion and encourage use of sustainable transport.***

118. Policy DM16 of the DM Policies DPD (2016) states that:

“The Council will require servicing facilities to be well designed, built to accommodate the demands of new development and sensitively integrated into the development and the surrounding townscape and streetscape. In particular, servicing activities should not give rise to traffic congestion, conflict with pedestrians, or other road users, or be detrimental to residential amenity”.

119. Section 9 of the NPPF (Promoting sustainable transport) states, at paragraph 111, that *“If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:*

- a) the accessibility of the development;*
- b) the type, mix and use of development;*
- c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;*
- d) local car ownership levels; and*
- e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.”*

120. Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that *“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*

- f) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- g) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- h) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and*
- i) 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.”*

121. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states 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.”*

122. The application has been submitted with a Transport Statement which identifies that the existing site access from Goldsworth Road will be maintained, with the existing access on Mabel Street to be modified.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Parking (incl. accessible & cycle)

123. Supplementary Planning Document Parking Standards (2018) states (at para 4.3) that “As set out in the Core Strategy, maximum parking standards will be implemented for all types of non-residential parking standards, including consideration of zero parking in Woking town centre”.
124. In respect of B Use Classes Supplementary Planning Document Parking Standards (2018) sets out a maximum parking standard of 1 car space per 30 sq.m for Use Class B1 (Business - Offices, research & development, light industry appropriate in a residential area) and Class B2 (General industrial use). As set out previously following substantive changes to the Use Classes Order (which came into force on 1 September 2020) Use Class B1 no longer exists although Use Class E(g) includes uses for the same purposes as fell within the former Use Class B1 (hence the requirement for Class B1 has been used for Class E(g) in this officer assessment). Supplementary Planning Document Parking Standards (2018) also sets out maximum parking standards for Use Class B8 (Storage/distribution) these being 1 car space per 100 sq.m for warehouse - storage and 1 car space per 70 sq.m for warehouse – distribution with a maximum of 1 lorry space per 200 sq.m for both types of warehouse.
125. As can be seen from the table below on the basis of the SPD Parking Standards (2018) maximum standards the proposed development would have a total maximum parking requirement of 91.3 spaces on the basis of all floorspace being in use for purposes within Use Class E(g) (i.e., equivalent to former Use Class B1) or Use Class B2.
126. The proposed development would have a total maximum parking requirement of 43.3 spaces on the basis of all floorspace, other than that within Units 5, 11 and 12 (which would be restricted to purposes falling within Class E(g)), being in use for purposes falling within Use Class B8. It must be stressed that these non-residential parking standards are expressed within the SPD as being maximum parking standards. A swept path analysis within the Transport Statement demonstrates that a large family car would be able to enter and exit the site accesses from Goldsworth Road and Mabel Street and would be able to manoeuvre into/out of parking spaces.
127. The proposed development would provide a total of 56 on-site parking spaces (including loading bay spaces), 46 of which would be accessed via Goldsworth Road (serving Units 1-10) and 10 of which would be accessed via Mabel Street (serving Units 11 & 12).

Unit	Use Classes	Proposed GIA (sq.m) (incl. Mezzanine)	‘Worst case’ SPD Maximum parking standard	‘Best case’ SPD Maximum parking standard	Proposed parking spaces (incl. loading bay space)
Goldsworth Road					
1	E(g) or B8	200.70	6.6	2	4
2		174.60	5.8	1.7	4
3		234.00	7.8	2.3	5
4		203.40	6.7	6.7	5
5	E(g) only	98.10	3.2	3.2 (Class E(g))	3
6	E(g) or B8	244.80	8.1	2.4	5

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

7	E(g), B8 or B2	284.40	9.4	2.8	5
8		305.10	10.1	3.0	5
9		300.60	10.2	3.0	5
10	E(g) or B8	308.70	10.2	3.0	5
Total 1-10		2,354.40	78.1	30.1	46
Mabel Street					
11	E(g) only	308.70	10.2	10.2 (Class E(g))	5
12		90.90	3	3 (Class E(g))	5
Total 11-12		399.60	13.2	13.2	10
Grand Totals		2,754.00	91.3	43.3	56

128. Supplementary Planning Document Parking Standards (2018) states (at para 4.4) that *“For non-residential development it is the responsibility of site occupiers to ensure adequate exclusive provision is made for the needs of people with disabilities to provide access in a socially inclusive way, under the Equalities Act 2010”* and that where a car park is used for ‘Employees and visitors to business premises’ (up to 200 bays) that *“Individual bays for each disabled employee plus 2 bays, or 5% of total capacity, whichever is greater”* should be provided. A total of 12 accessible parking spaces would be provided on-site, 1 space to each proposed unit. This level of accessible space provision represents 21% of total parking spaces across the site (i.e., 12 of 56 spaces) and would provide between 33% and 20% accessible parking to each unit. This level of accessible parking provision is considered appropriate given that it is not known how many disabled employees will work on-site post-development.
129. Supplementary Planning Document Parking Standards (2018) states (at para 4.6) that *“The provision of good quality cycle parking supports cycling as a means of transport and is therefore critical to increasing the use of cycles”* and sets out minimum cycle parking standards as follows (only relevant uses shown):

B1 Business (Now Class E(g))	
Offices - Class E(g)(i)	1 space per 125 sq.m (min. 2 spaces)
Research & development / light industry - Class E(g)(ii) & (iii)	1 space per 250 sq.m (min. 2 spaces)
B2 General Industry and B8 Storage or distribution	
B2 and B8	1 space per 500 sq.m (min. 2 spaces)

130. The Transport Statement states (at para 5.11) that *“Each individual unit will be provided with a dedicated cycle parking area. A locker room will be provided in each unit to allow for staff/visitors to change into and out of cyclist equipment. The locker room will be large enough to store cyclist equipment”*. Cycle parking is proposed to be provided internally within each unit and further details in this respect can be secured through a condition.

Public transport and cycle & pedestrian accessibility

131. The Transport Statement sets out that a number of bus routes serve the site, including bus services 28, 34 and 35, that the closest bus stops to the site are on Goldsworth Road immediately to the west and therefore future employees and visitors would be able to access the site via bus. Woking railway station is situated within Woking Town

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Centre approximately 1 kilometre to the east of the site and accessed via pedestrian footways.

132. The Transport Statement acknowledges the site is outside of what can be conceived as a reasonable walking distance to Woking railway station although local bus services run directly between the site and Woking Town Centre. As such, the site is therefore well served by Woking railway station as part of linked trips with local bus services for future employees and visitors of the proposed development.
133. There are high quality pedestrian facilities within the vicinity of the site and cycle routes within the local area provide good connections to facilities and amenities that are located throughout Woking Town Centre and the surrounding area.

Trip generation & impact

134. The Transport Statement identifies (at para 4.3) that *“The existing industrial floorspace is 2706.26 sqm GIA. The proposed scheme is similar in scale to the current site, so little or no net increase in floor space under the proposals. The proposed site has a floorspace of 2754 sqm GIA.”*
135. The Transport Statement uses TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) data to determine the total number of vehicle trips the existing site likely generates, stating that the existing use as an ‘Industrial Estate’ (the use of the existing units accessed from Goldsworth Road falls under Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g), these being grouped together as ‘Industrial Estate’ within the TRICS database) could reasonably be expected to generate is in the order of 116 total two-way vehicle trips from/to Goldsworth Road over the course of a typical weekday and that the existing use as ‘General Industrial’ (the use of the existing units accessed from Mabel Street as vehicle repair garages falls within Use Class B2 ‘General industrial’) could reasonably be expected to generate is in the order of 22 total two-way vehicle trips over the course of a typical weekday via the Mabel Street access. Whilst one of the existing units accessed from Mabel Street appears to be presently vacant, and appears to have been vacant for some time, the planning position is that use of this vacant unit could recommence at any time and therefore the existing ‘baseline’ scenario must include that unit being within active use.
136. The Transport Statement, using TRICS, states that the proposed development could reasonably be expected to generate in the order of 143 total two-way vehicle trips from/to Goldsworth Road over the course of a typical weekday and that the proposed development could reasonably be expected to generate in the order of 24 total two way vehicle trips via the Mabel Street access over the course of a typical weekday. The following table summarises the preceding:

Trip Generation from/to	Existing Trips	Proposed Trips	Net Trips
Goldsworth Road	116	143	+27
Mabel Street	22	24	+2
Total	138	167	+29

137. As such, the proposed development is expected to generate 29 more vehicle trips spread over the course of a typical weekday when compared against the sites extant use, only two additional vehicle trips via Mabel Street (across a typical weekday) are expected to be generated when compared against the extant use. The Transport

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Statement also advises that the Class B8 use has been removed from units 11 and 12 which are accessed off Mabel Street to address residents' concerns over heavy good vehicles access to the site from Mabel Street which is common for B8 users.

138. The Transport Statement therefore concludes that the traffic impact of the proposed development is therefore projected to result in a minimal and insignificant traffic impact on the adjoining highway in terms of traffic capacity, safety, and neighbouring amenity and that it has not been deemed necessary to carry out any further detailed traffic impact assessment or junction capacity testing.

Servicing

139. Servicing of the proposed units will comprise refuse collection as well as site specific deliveries.
140. The Transport Statement includes swept path analyses which demonstrate that the largest of goods vehicles (16.5 metre articulated lorry), and a 7.5 tonne panel van, can access and egress the site in forward gears. A swept path analysis has also been submitted to demonstrate that a refuse vehicle can access and exit the site in forward gear from Goldsworth Road, refuse collection for Units 11 and 12 will take place from the kerbside as per the existing arrangement on Mabel Street.
141. The proposed development has been considered by the County Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) who, having assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds, raises no objection subject to conditions to secure: (i) space laid out within the site for vehicles to park and turn, (ii) the proposed access to Mabel Street is modified and provided with pedestrian visibility zones and adequate pedestrian crossing facilities with tactile paving either side of the access (iii) provision for bicycle parking and cyclist changing/shower facilities and facilities for cyclists to store cyclist equipment. The CHA has stated that they consider the level of parking provision for the proposed development to be acceptable.

Mabel Street access

142. The application has been supported by a Feasibility Report in relation to the proposed Mabel Street access alterations. The report identifies that the two existing Mabel Street vehicular accesses give access to Woking Community Transport's existing bus repair garage (marked as Site Access 2), and to a car repair garage located to the north of the bus repair garage (marked as Site Access 1). The applicant proposes that the kerb line and footway will be reinstated at Site Access 2 (because this access will become redundant) and that Site Access 1 will be modified to provide a single access point from Mabel Street to serve Units 11 and 12 of the proposed development.
143. The applicant proposes to extend the footway on the corner of Mabel Street to achieve a 2m wide footway between the telegraph pole and the carriageway. A plan has been submitted which demonstrates that the narrowest width in the carriageway (after footway widening) would be 5.4m and a swept path analysis demonstrates that two cars will remain able to safely pass each other around this corner. Tactile paving would be installed on the footway where the modified vehicular access would cross the footway. The County highway Authority have been consulted and raised no objections to the work to Mabel Street. These works would need to be brought forward through a S278 agreement between the applicant and the County Highway Authority. The extension of the footway around this corner of Mabel Street would improve the safety of pedestrians because the current layout of the Mabel Street access pushes pedestrians onto the carriageway.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

144. Whilst it is acknowledged that numerous letters of representation raise concern in respect of the impact of increased traffic on Mabel Street, in the absence of objection being raised by the County Highway Authority on highway safety, capacity and policy grounds, any such potential refusal on this basis would not be robust and would very likely not be defensible.
145. Overall therefore, subject to recommended conditions, the impact upon highways and parking is acceptable and the proposed development complies with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM16 of the DM Policies DPD (2016), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Arboriculture

146. Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states, inter alia, that "*Proposals for new development should...incorporate landscaping to enhance the setting of the development, including the retention of any trees of amenity value, and other significant landscape features of merit, and provide for suitable boundary treatment/s*". Policy CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that development will be expected to, inter alia, "*Protect and encourage the planting of new trees where it is relevant to do so*".
147. Policy DM2 of the DM Policies DPD (2016) states that "*Trees, hedgerows and other vegetation of amenity and/or environmental significance or which form part of the intrinsic character of an area must be considered holistically as part of the landscaping treatment of new development. When considering development proposals, the Council will...require landscape proposals for new development to retain existing trees and other important landscape features where practicable...require any trees which are to be retained to be adequately protected to avoid damage during construction...require adequate space to be provided between any trees to be retained and the proposed development (including impervious surfaces)*".
148. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states that "*Trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments, and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change...that [developments should ensure that] appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible*".
149. The application has been submitted with an arboricultural report and arboricultural impact assessment, and a tree constraints and tree protection plan. There are trees adjacent to the application site which make a positive visual contribution to the appearance of the local area more generally and particularly to the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area / Corridor / Urban Open Space to the north.
150. The submitted arboricultural report states that it is proposed for two trees (T15 and T16) within the G21 group area to the north of the site to be removed due to their poor condition and hazard they represent. All other trees within the canal corridor would be retained. It is not anticipated that the proposed development will increase pressure for future tree pruning or removal as a result of overshadowing.
151. Whilst there would be incursions into some Root Protection Areas (RPAs), due to the footprints of the proposed buildings and the hardstanding of parking bays, these incursions would be small (up to around 10% of RPA) or would be no greater than existing incursions. Where RPA incursions would take place, this would be achieved

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

either be through a no-dig solution, hand-digging or no further incursion than already exists.

152. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has been consulted and raised no objection subject to the submission of a method statement and tree protection plan that considered demolition.
153. Subject to a condition to secure the submission and approval of additional information and ensure compliance with the submitted information, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on trees.

Biodiversity and protected species

154. The NPPF states that "*planning...decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity*" (paragraph 180). Circular 06/05 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system and requires the impact of a development on protected species to be established before planning permission is granted. These provisions are reflected within Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012). Paragraph 186 of the NPPF sets out the principles that local planning authorities should apply when determining planning applications.
155. The application has been submitted with a Preliminary Ecological Assessment which identifies that the nearest Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) is the Basingstoke Canal, directly to the north of the site, which is recognised for its aquatic plants and invertebrates including nationally rare species.
156. Surrey Wildlife Trust have been consulted and advised that the Preliminary Ecological Assessment states '*If the works have not been undertaken within eighteen months of the surveys outlined in this report, the risk of impact to bats should be re-assessed. Given the location of the site and its surrounding habitats, the risk of impact on other species would only need to be re-assessed if the proposed development plan was altered such that changes to habitats would be expected occur in the vicinity of the site*'. As the consultation is within the 18 month period the comments from planning application PLAN/2023/0440 can be referred to.

Bats

157. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment considers there to be a negligible likelihood of bat roosts being present within all existing buildings. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment also identifies that the small area of grassland and individual trees and shrubs to the south of the site (on the verge) were considered to provide negligible value to foraging bats and as such the risk to foraging and commuting bats in this area was considered negligible.
158. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment identifies that significantly increased lighting could render the trees less attractive for roosting bats and thereby risk disturbing bats or obstructing bat roosts. A condition is recommended to secure the submission and approval of permanent external lighting prior to installation.

Nesting birds

159. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment identifies that trees adjacent to site's northern

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

and eastern boundaries, and the two trees and several shrubs at the southern boundary of the site, were considered suitable for common nesting birds and therefore that the removal of or cutting back of trees and shrubs or dense scrub, if undertaken between March and end August (i.e., during the bird nesting season) would pose a high risk of harm to likely no more than low numbers of nesting birds on the site.

160. A condition is recommended to ensure that works on site are carried out in line with the following methods of working / impact avoidance precautions as set out within the submitted Preliminary Ecological Assessment and that the removal of trees must be completed under a 'soft fell' precautionary approach.
161. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment also considers that no further surveys were considered necessary for other species as their likelihood of occurring and being impacted by the proposed development was considered to be negligible.
162. Surrey Wildlife Trust comments on planning application PLAN/2023/0440 stated *"Despite the presence of crevices on all the buildings, in their professional opinion, Adonis Ecology has concluded that these buildings have negligible suitability to support a bat roost. If the application is granted by the LPA, then we would advise that they require the Applicant to proceed under a precautionary method. We would advise that if evidence of a bat roost is found, then works cease and an ecologist is contacted for advice on how to proceed. We would advise that the recommendations for trees with low suitability to support bat roosts provided in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment are followed if the application is granted"*.
163. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment includes outline recommendations for ecological enhancements (at section 5.3), which include planting recommendations and bat and bird box provision and states (at para 6.1.1) that *"with the biodiversity enhancements undertaken, there would be an increase in biodiversity that would be significant at the site level"*. A Landscape Strategy has been submitted with the application.
164. Under planning application PLAN/2023/0440 Surrey Wildlife Trust advised that if the application is granted, the applicant should be required to submit an Ecological Enhancement Plan (EMP). However, given the very modest existing planting and soft landscaping which is present within the application site, combined with the fact that limited planting and soft landscaping is proposed within the proposed site, it is not considered to meet the 'six tests' for planning conditions (NPPF, para 56) to require an Ecological Enhancement Plan (EMP) *per se* in this case although a condition is recommended to secure that measures for the enhancement of biodiversity on the site be submitted, and thereafter implemented.
165. Overall, subject to recommended conditions and informatives, the impact on biodiversity and protected species is acceptable and accords with Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Circular 06/05 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation and the provisions of the National planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Flooding and water management

166. Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that *"The Council will determine planning applications in accordance with the guidance contained within the NPPF. The SFRA will inform the application of the Sequential and Exceptional Test set out in the NPPF"*. Policy CS9 also states that *"The Council expects development to be in Flood Zone 1 as defined in the SFRA"*. Paragraph 165 of the NPPF states that *"Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development*

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future)”.

- 167. A Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy report has been submitted with the planning application which identifies that the site is in Flood Zone 1 and therefore no fluvial flooding issues, but there is a risk of surface water flooding within the application site.
- 168. The Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy states *that ‘the natural flow paths through the site will be maintained as the new buildings will be located in the positions of the existing ones’ and that ‘All buildings are proposed to be located outside of areas at a high risk of surface water flooding and therefore not displacing flood water, negating the requirement for flood compensation.’*
- 169. The Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy also sets out that, based on a review of the topographic survey and lidar data, the surface water flood extent appears to follow the 28.50m AOD contour and therefore, the finished floor levels (FFL) of the buildings will be set at least 300mm above the modelled surface water flood level, meaning the minimum FFL will be 28.80m AOD.
- 170. The Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy provides a flood risk summary table (at Tables 4.1 and 6.1) which is replicated below:

Flood Mechanism	Source	Flood Risk to the Development	Mitigation Required?
Fluvial	N/A	Low	No
Tidal	N/A	Low	No
Groundwater	Underlying geology and groundwater levels	Medium	No basement development proposed and FFL's to be set no lower than existing ground levels.
Surface Water / Overland Flow	Runoff from surrounding elevated land	Low-High	Natural flow paths to be maintained, no buildings proposed in high risk area, preventing displacement of flood water & FFL's set at least 300mm above modelled flood depth.
Infrastructure failure	Surface water systems and Water mains	Low	No
Reservoir Flooding	Local Reservoirs	Low	No

- 171. With regards to surface water disposal it is proposed to continue to discharge the surface water runoff from the site to the existing Thames Water public surface water sewer at greenfield run-off rates.
- 172. The proposed SuDS features will reduce the rate of surface water discharge into the

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thames Water network by providing on-site storage during heavy rainfall events, reducing the risk of surface water flooding. A petrol interceptor is also proposed to remove oil or hydrocarbons before the water is discharged from the site.

173. The Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy sets out that the proposed SuDS features will ensure that surface water run-off from the proposed development would be contained on-site for up to and including the worst case 1 in 100 year storm event, plus an additional 45% increase in peak rainfall intensity for climate change.
174. Thames Water have confirmed (to the applicant, this letter is on the application case file) that their surface water network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the surface water from the proposed development.
175. Whilst the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (November 2015) identifies parts of the site to be at risk of surface water flooding the site is designated as an Employment Area within the Development Plan. The proposed development would re-provide employment floorspace within the site and would not introduce higher vulnerability uses (i.e., such as residential uses), retaining the existing 'less vulnerable' commercial/industrial uses on the site. For these combined reasons, it is not considered necessary to apply the sequential test (due to surface water flood risk) in this instance. In addition, as set out within the FRA, the natural (surface water) flow paths would be maintained, no buildings are proposed in the high risk (surface water) area and FFL's are to be set at least 300mm above modelled (surface water) flood depth.
176. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) (Surrey County Council) have reviewed the surface water drainage strategy for the proposed development and raised no objection subject to conditions requiring the submission and approval of a surface water drainage scheme and a verification report.
177. Thames Water have commented that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water (which the submitted sustainable drainage proposal does) they would have no objection. Thames Water have advised that, with regard to waste water network and sewage treatment works infrastructure capacity, they do not have any objection.
178. Thames Water have also commented that the proposed development is located within 20m of a Thames Water Sewage Pumping Station (Officer Note: this falls within the existing site between Units 5 and 6) and that given the nature of the function of the pumping station and the close proximity of the proposed development to the pumping station Thames Water consider that any occupied premises should be located at least 20m away from the pumping station. Thames Water comment that the amenity of those that will occupy the new development must be a consideration in determining the application and that given the close proximity of the proposed development to the pumping station Thames Water consider that it is likely that amenity will be impacted and therefore object.
179. Whilst the preceding comments from Thames Water are noted the proposed development would provide industrial/commercial units within Use Classes E(g), B2 and B8. The proposed development would provide no residential accommodation and the industrial/commercial floorspace provided within the site would not be particularly vulnerable to periodic impacts from the pumping station in the form of odour, light, vibration and/or noise (as would new residential accommodation for example). Furthermore, Units 4, 5, and 6 which would be closest to the pumping station, which is

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

to be retained as existing would be no closer to the pumping station than the existing buildings on the site which are to be demolished. Moreover, the new buildings would have a facade construction which would achieve a minimum of the 30 dB Rw criterion, as specified within the Acoustic Assessment Report. Whilst this facade construction is principally for the containment of internally generated noise it would also have some benefit in reducing the impact of externally generated noise (i.e., such as that from the pumping station) within the proposed buildings. For these combined reasons the objection of Thames Water in this respect is considered without sufficient reasoned justification.

180. Overall, subject to recommended conditions, the impact upon flooding and water management is acceptable and complies with Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the SFRA (November 2015), the NPPF, the PPG and the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for sustainable drainage systems.

Archaeology (below-ground heritage)

181. Section 16 of the NPPF places the conservation of archaeological interest as a material planning consideration. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that *“Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation”*.
182. Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) states that *“On all development sites over 0.4 hectares an archaeological evaluation and investigation will be necessary if, in the opinion of the County Archaeologist, an archaeological assessment demonstrates that the site has archaeological potential.”*
183. Whilst the site does not fall within an Area of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP) the site area exceeds 0.4 hectares. An archaeological desk-based assessment report has been submitted with the application and assesses the archaeological potential of the site and the likely impact of the proposed development on archaeological remains. The principal conclusions of the assessment are that the Historic Environment Record (HER) shows a limited number of archaeological discoveries from within the 1km search radius, suggesting the archaeological potential for the site is low, or perhaps more accurately in view of the very limited amount of archaeological work that has occurred in the area, uncertain. The assessment identifies that the underlying sandy geology is likely to have a bearing on the presence of archaeological remains, with Mesolithic and Bronze Age material being most likely, whilst the presence of the Basingstoke Canal could be a factor in the presence of medieval and post medieval remains.
184. The County Archaeological Officer comments that the submitted desk-based assessment report is of good quality, and assesses all resources reasonably available, but draws conclusions that whilst the site may have had archaeological potential, this potential will have been significantly reduced by past development impacts, to the point where any archaeological remains that have survived will be of negligible significance. The County Archaeological Officer further comments that no evidence has, at this time, been submitted to indicate that the past development impacts are indeed as deep as has been assumed by the assessment and it is therefore reasonable to undertake a scheme of limited test pitting to demonstrate past depths of impacts across the site to confirm the assertions made by the desk-based assessment that supports this application.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

185. The County Archaeological Officer raises no objection subject to a condition to secure the submission and approval of an implementation of a programme of archaeological work, to be conducted in accordance with a written scheme of investigation.
186. Overall, subject to recommended condition, the proposed development complies with Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM20 of the DM Policies DPD (2016) and the relevant provisions of the NPPF in respect of archaeology.

Contamination

187. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that "*planning...decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate*". Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that "*planning...decisions should ensure that: a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination...after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990; and...adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is available to inform these assessments.*" Paragraph 190 of the NPPF states that "*Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.*"
188. Policy DM8 of the DM Policies DPD (2016) states that "*Adequate site investigation information should be provided with development proposals, including the site's history, potential contamination sources, pathways and receptors, and where appropriate, physical investigation, chemical testing, and a risk assessment to cover ground gas and groundwater.*"
189. The application has been submitted with an Environmental Desk Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment. The report identifies that the site and some of the adjoining land to the east appears to have seen commercial and/or industrial use spanning a period of at least 60 years, prior to which the site was largely undeveloped and that currently there are a number of vehicle repair facilities on the site along with other light engineering works.
190. The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has reviewed the submitted report and raised no objection subject to conditions to secure investigation and risk assessment, remediation method statement, remediation validation report, unexpected ground contamination and evidence that the buildings were built post 2000 or the submission of an asbestos survey.
191. Overall, subject to recommended conditions, the proposed development complies with Policy DM8 of the DM Policies DPD (2016) and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in respect of land contamination.

Sustainable construction

192. The Council has adopted BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) standards in Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) in order to deliver more sustainable non-residential development across the Borough:

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

“New non-residential development of over 1,000 sq,m or more (gross) floorspace is required to comply with the BREEAM very good standards (or any future national equivalent).”

193. To encourage renewable and low carbon energy generation in the Borough, Policy CS23 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) sets out the following:

“Applicants should take appropriate steps to mitigate any adverse impacts of proposed development through careful consideration of location, scale, design and other measures. All reasonable steps to minimise noise impacts should be taken”.

“Applicants should provide sound evidence of the availability of the resource which will be harnessed or the fuel to be used, including details of the adequacy of transport networks where applicable and detailed studies to assess potential impacts such as noise nuisance, flood risk, shadow flicker and interference with telecommunications”.

194. The application has been submitted with a sustainable construction statement which sets out (at para 5.2) that *“the proposal has undergone BREEAM pre-assessment exercises to assess the potential BREEAM score and rating for the proposed 12 industrial units...The pre-assessment is based upon the BREEAM New Construction 2018 Shell Only non-domestic methodology (SD5078:3.0-2018) with the appropriate measures applied under the BREEAM ‘Industrial, Shell Only’ methodology. This represents the most appropriate and most recent methodology for the development...The credits targeted result in a potential score of 61.60%, equivalent to a BREEAM ‘Very Good’ rating.”*
195. The sustainable construction statement sets out that new fabric elements (i.e., external walls, roofs, glazing, doors etc.) will reduce emissions and energy demand and that the renewable and/or low carbon technologies considered to be most feasible for the proposed development, and subject to further detailed review (and tenant requirements/ fit out specification), are Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) and Solar Photovoltaic (PV) systems.
196. The application has also been submitted with a BREEAM New Construction 2018 Pre-Assessment Report which states that *“the proposed development could provisionally achieve a maximum BREEAM ‘Very Good’ rating of 61.60% (all reasonable measures targeted). This ensures an adequate sustainability rating and maximum improvement in energy efficiency is achieved, which reflects the proposed building type and function”.* It should be noted that BREEAM ‘Very Good’ standard is awarded where the overall BREEAM score/rating is between 55% - 69%. Whilst the stated 61.60% BREEAM score/rating is provisional, and stated to be a maximum, at this pre-construction phase, the evidence suggests that achieving a (lower) BREEAM score/rating of 55% is realistic, which would result in a BREEAM ‘Very Good’ score/rating, in line with the requirement of Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012). Recommended condition 31 refers in respect of BREEAM.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

197. The proposed development would not be Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable because it would contain no residential or retail floorspace.

CONCLUSION

198. In conclusion, the proposed development would safeguard an existing designated Employment Area for B Class uses whilst achieving the redevelopment of outmoded

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

employment floorspace to cater for modern business needs, thus improving the quality of the commercial/industrial employment floorspace which is available within the Borough and helping Woking's economy to grow. The proposed development would help to meet a requirement for industrial/warehousing space (which would also be appropriate for potential high technology manufacturing) and would support small and medium sized enterprise (SME) formation and development by providing a range of unit sizes. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

199. Taking into account the appearance of the existing site, as well as the protection afforded to it (as a designated Employment Area) by Policy CS15 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the proposed development is considered to be a visually and spatially acceptable form of development which would have an acceptable impact on the character, grain and pattern of development within the area. Furthermore, the proposed development would preserve the setting of the adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area, and thus would not harm the significance of that Conservation Area, it would conserve the landscape, heritage, ecological character, setting and enjoyment of the Basingstoke Canal and would not result in the loss of important views in the vicinity of the canal. Considering the 'baseline' for assessment which is formed by the existing site the proposed development would avoid significant harmful neighbouring amenity impacts and, subject to recommended conditions, would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise pollution and would avoid significant harm to the environment and general amenity, resulting from noise.
200. Subject to recommended conditions, the impacts in respect of highways and parking, arboriculture, biodiversity and protected species, flooding and water management, archaeology, contamination and sustainable construction are acceptable. The application therefore complies with relevant Development Plan policies, and other material considerations, and is therefore recommended for approval subject to recommended conditions.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Site visit photographs
2. Consultation responses
3. Representations
4. Site Notices

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

01. The development hereby permitted must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

02. The development hereby permitted must be carried out only in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below, unless where required or allowed by other conditions attached to this planning permission:

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-1000 Rev P02 (Location Plan), dated 21/04/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2100 Rev P08 (Site Plan As Proposed), dated 17/08/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2101 Rev P01 (Roof Site Plan As Proposed), dated 21/04/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2140 Rev P01 (Site plan as proposed, Use Classes), dated 21/04/23 (rec'd by LPA 19.10.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2200 Rev P02 (Proposed Floor Plans Units 1 to 5), dated 21/04/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2201 Rev P02 (Proposed Floor Plans Units 6 to 12), dated 21/04/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2300 Rev P04 (Proposed Elevations Units 1 to 4), dated 17/08/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2301 Rev P04 (Proposed Elevations Units 5 to 10), dated 07/08/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2302 Rev P02 (Proposed Elevations Units 11-12), dated 21/04/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2305 Rev P03 (Proposed and Existing Street Scenes), dated 17/08/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2306 Rev P01 (Proposed and Existing Street Scenes 2), dated 17/07/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2310 Rev P03 (Typical Sections), dated 17/08/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

22045-HNW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2900 Rev P03 (Landscape Strategy As Proposed), dated 17/08/23 (rec'd by LPA 01.11.2023)

Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy, prepared by Mayer Brown Limited, dated May 2023.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Levels

03. ++ Notwithstanding any information shown on the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice no development must take place pursuant to this planning permission (with the exception of site preparation works and the demolition of existing building(s) down to ground level) until full details of the finished floor levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor(s) of the proposed building(s), and of the finished ground levels of

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

hard and soft landscaped areas within the site, all in relation to existing ground levels within the site, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development must thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved finished levels.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement (other than site preparation works and demolition) in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

Materials

04. ++ Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application (including any shown and/or annotated on the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice) prior to the application/installation of external materials/finishes to a building hereby permitted, full details of all external facing materials of that building must first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details must include details of all facing / cladding materials / panels (including timber and timber effect panels), roof covering materials, downpipes/gutters/verges (including colour and material) and RAL colour(s) and material for window(s), loading doors and personnel door frames.

The submitted details must generally accord with the type and quality of materials indicated within the application. The building(s) must thereafter be carried out and permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details unless the Local Planning Authority first agrees in writing to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the development respects and makes a positive contribution to the street scenes and the character of the area in which it is situated in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Use(s) & Mezzanine floors

05. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (and/or any Order(s) revoking and/or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification(s)), the following units hereby permitted must not be used other than for the following purposes as defined within The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification(s)) with any change between the uses permitted within Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 (inclusive) for up to 10 years following first occupation of any relevant unit:

Units 5, 11 and 12 (inclusive):

- For purposes falling within Class E(g) only of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose(s) within Class E of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification(s) and for no other purpose(s) whatsoever

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 & 10 (inclusive):

- For purposes falling within Class E(g) only of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose(s) in Class E of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification(s) or;
- For purposes falling within Class B8 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and for no other purpose(s) whatsoever without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Units 7, 8 & 9 (inclusive):

- For purposes falling within Class E(g) only of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose(s) in Class E of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification(s) or;
- For purposes falling within Class B8 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or;
- For the purpose falling within Class B2 (motor vehicle repair) only of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and for no other purpose (including any other purpose(s) in Class B2 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification(s)

and for no other purpose(s) whatsoever without express planning permission from the Local Planning Authority first being obtained.

Furthermore, the uses hereby permitted must occur only within the buildings hereby permitted and must not take place externally to the buildings.

Reason: To protect the status of the site as an Employment Area (designated by the Development Plan) and to protect the amenity of the surrounding area in respect of noise and disturbance, vehicle movements and highway impacts and parking provision in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

06. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (and/or any equivalent Order(s), replacing, amending and/or re-enacting that Order(s) with or without modification(s)) no additional floors, including mezzanine floors, other than as shown and detailed on the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice shall be erected within any of the twelve units hereby permitted.

Reason: To avoid potential over-intensification of use of the site and subsequent adverse implications for car parking, noise and neighbouring amenity in accordance

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

with Policies CS18 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Demolition & Construction Method Statement

07. ++ Development pursuant to this planning permission must not commence (including any site preparation and / or demolition works), until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Demolition and Construction Method Statement must provide the following details:
- a) the parking of vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
 - b) loading/unloading and storage of plant and materials;
 - c) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
 - d) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway;
 - e) measures to minimise dust levels during demolition and construction;
 - f) hours of demolition and construction work, deliveries and removal of materials as well as measures to minimise noise and vibration levels during demolition and construction works;
 - g) full details of any piling technique(s) to be employed, if relevant;
 - h) location of any temporary buildings and associated generators, compounds, structures and enclosures.

The approved Demolition and Construction Method Statement must be adhered to throughout the site preparation, demolition and construction period of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area in accordance with Policies CS18 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

Highways

08. The development hereby permitted must not be first opened for trading unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice for vehicles to be parked and for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear. Thereafter the vehicle parking and turning areas must be permanently retained and maintained for their designated purpose(s).

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

09. Units 11 and/or 12 of the development hereby permitted must not be first opened for trading unless and until the vehicular access to Mabel Street has been modified and provided with pedestrian visibility zones and adequate pedestrian crossing facilities with tactile paving either side of the access in accordance with the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this decision notice (and with the following plans prepared by Paul Mews Associates Traffic Consultants, both dated 01/August/2023; P2772/TN/1 (Existing and Proposed Footway on Mabel Street) and P2772/TN/2 (Proposed Extension to the

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Footpath on Mabel Street by 2.0m)). Thereafter the visibility zones must be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 1.05m high.

Reason: In order that the development should not prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

10. ++ A unit within the development hereby permitted must not be first opened for trading unless and until the following facilities have been provided to that unit in accordance with the following details which must first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- (a) The secure, covered and lit parking of bicycles (providing a minimum of 2 bicycle spaces to serve each unit hereby permitted);
 - (b) Facilities within each unit hereby permitted for cyclists to change into and out of cyclist equipment / shower; and
 - (c) Facilities within each unit hereby permitted for cyclists to store cyclist equipment.

Thereafter the approved cycle parking and cyclist facilities must be permanently retained and maintained for the lifetime of that unit.

Reason: To promote modes of travel other than via the private vehicle through ensuring that cycle parking and cyclist equipment is available within the development in accordance with Policy CS18 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Sustainable drainage (SuDS)

11. ++ The development hereby permitted must not commence (including any site clearance, preparation or demolition works) until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details must include:
- a) Evidence that the proposed final solution will effectively manage the 1 in 30 (+35% allowance for climate change) & 1 in 100 (+45% allowance for climate change) storm events during all stages of the development. The final solution must follow the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy (Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy, prepared by Mayer Brown Limited, dated May 2023). Associated discharge rates and storage volumes must be provided using a maximum discharge rate equivalent to the pre-development Greenfield run-off.
 - b) Detailed drainage design drawings and calculations to include: a finalised drainage layout detailing the location of drainage elements, pipe diameters, levels, and long and cross sections of each element including details of any flow restrictions and maintenance/risk reducing features (silt traps, inspection chambers etc.);
 - c) A plan showing exceedance flows (i.e., during rainfall greater than design events or during blockage) and how property on and off site will be protected from increased flood risk;
 - d) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system; and

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- e) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site in accordance with Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

12. ++ Prior to the first occupation / first use of the development hereby permitted, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage verification report must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.

Reason: To ensure the constructed surface water drainage system meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS in accordance with Policy CS9 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Ministerial Statement on SuDS.

Archaeology

13. ++ Development pursuant to this planning permission must not commence (including any site clearance, preparation or demolition works) until the applicant (or their agents or successors in title) has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work to be conducted in accordance with an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (AWSI) which must first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For land that is included within the AWSI, no development must take place other than in accordance with the agreed AWSI, the programme and methodology of site investigation and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works. The AWSI must accord with the appropriate Historic England guidelines and include:
- (a) a statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works; and
 - (b) a programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material.

The AWSI must be prepared and implemented by a suitably qualified professionally accredited archaeological person(s) or organisation.

Reason: To ensure that the potential for archaeological remains is properly addressed in accordance with Policy CS20 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM20 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Contamination

14. ++ Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted (including any on-site contaminated land site investigations) and in follow-up to the environmental desktop study report a contaminated land site investigation proposal must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (including any additional requirements that the Local Planning Authority may specify). The contaminated land site investigation proposal must provide details of the extent and methodologies of sampling, analyses and proposed assessment criteria required to enable the characterisation of the plausible pollutant linkages identified in the preliminary conceptual model. Following approval of the contaminated land site investigation proposal, the Local Planning Authority must be given a minimum of two weeks written prior notice of the commencement of on-site investigation works. The site investigation works must then be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby permitted without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement of development in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

15. ++ Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a contaminated land site investigation and risk assessment, undertaken in accordance with the approved site investigation proposal, that determines the extent and nature of contamination on site and reported in accordance with the current best practice and guidance such as Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) and British Standard BS 10175, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (including any additional requirements that the Local Planning Authority may specify). If applicable, ground gas risk assessments must be completed in line with CIRIA C665 guidance.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby permitted without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement of development in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

16. ++ Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a detailed remediation method statement must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (including any additional requirements that the Local Planning Authority may specify). The remediation method statement must detail the extent and method(s) by which the site is to be remediated, to ensure that unacceptable risks are not posed to identified receptors at the site and must detail the information to be included in a validation report. The remediation method statement must also provide information on a suitable discovery strategy to be utilised on site should contamination manifest itself during site works that was not anticipated. The Local Planning Authority must be given a minimum of two weeks written prior notice of the commencement of the remediation works on site. The development must then be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby permitted without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement of development in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

17. ++ Prior to the first occupation / first use of the development hereby permitted, a remediation validation report for the site must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation validation report must detail evidence of the remediation, the effectiveness of the remediation carried out and the results of post remediation works, in accordance with the approved remediation method statement and any addenda thereto, so as to enable future interested parties, including regulators, to have a single record of the remediation undertaken at the site. Should specific ground gas mitigation measures be required to be incorporated into the development the testing and verification of such systems must have regard to current best practice and guidance for the design of protective measures for methane and carbon dioxide ground gases for new buildings.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby permitted without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

18. Contamination not previously identified by the site investigation, but subsequently found to be present at the site must be reported to the Local Planning Authority as soon as is practicable. If deemed necessary development must cease on site until an addendum to the remediation method statement, detailing how the unsuspected contamination is to be dealt with, has been submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority (including any additional requirements that the Local Planning Authority may specify). The development must then be undertaken in accordance with the approved details. Should no further contamination be identified then a brief comment to this effect must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation / first use of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory strategy is put in place for addressing contaminated land, making the land suitable for the development hereby permitted without resulting in risk to construction workers, future users of the land, occupiers of nearby land and the environment in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

19. Prior to the commencement of development evidence that the building was built post 2000 or an intrusive pre-demolition asbestos survey in accordance with HSG264 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The survey shall be undertaken and a report produced by a suitably qualified person and shall include any recommendations deemed necessary. The development shall then be undertaken in accordance with the approved details. Upon completion of demolition works, the applicant shall provide in writing to the Local Planning Authority suitably detailed confirmation that demolition works were carried out with regard to the

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

aforementioned pre-demolition asbestos survey and recommendations contained therein.

Reason: To order to safeguard the environment, the surrounding areas and prospective occupiers of the site in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Hours of use and Noise

20. The use(s) of the twelve units hereby permitted must not operate other than between the following hours:

- 07:00 and 19:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) (excluding Bank and Public Holidays);
- 08:00 and 18:00 hours on Saturdays; and
- 10:00 and 16:00 hours on Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of existing adjoining and nearby residential occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

21. No deliveries must be taken at or dispatched from the site except between the following hours:

- 07:00 and 19:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays (inclusive) (excluding Bank and Public Holidays);
- 08:00 and 18:00 hours on Saturdays; and
- 10:00 and 16:00 hours on Sundays, Bank and Public Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of existing adjoining and nearby residential occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

22. ++ (a) Prior to the commencement of above ground development (with the exception of site preparation and demolition works) to construct a building hereby permitted details of facade construction for that building must first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details must confirm that the facade construction for that building will meet the minimum 30 dB Rw criterion specified within the Acoustic Assessment Report, prepared by PC Environmental Ltd (dated 16th March 2023).

(b) Prior to the first use / first occupation of a building hereby permitted a verification report (appended with substantiating evidence), prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced acoustic/noise consultant, demonstrating that the facade construction for that building has achieved the minimum 30 dB Rw criterion specified within the Acoustic Assessment Report, prepared by PC Environmental Ltd (dated 16th March 2023) (for the containment of internally generated noise) must be submitted to and approved in

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

writing by the Local Planning Authority. The building must thereafter be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of that building.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of existing adjoining and nearby residential occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies PDPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement (other than site preparation works and demolition) in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

23. ++ (a) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted details of the acoustic fence(s) to be installed must first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details must include:

- plan(s) (at 1:50 scale) showing the position and extent of the acoustic fence; and manufacturers' specification; and
- the selected acoustic fence must be 2.0 metres in height and possess a minimum surface density of 15 kg/m².

(b) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted the approved acoustic fence(s) must be installed in the approved location(s) and to the manufacturers' specification. The acoustic fence(s) must be permanently maintained for the lifetime of the development to ensure no gaps. Where gaps develop in the fence, the affected panels must be replaced within 21 days unless a longer timeframe is otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of existing adjoining and nearby residential occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies PDPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

24. ++ Prior to the first use of units 7, 8 and 9 in Class B2 (motor vehicle repair) details of acoustic mitigation along the west boundary of the site adjacent to No.169 Goldsworth Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development and shall be retained in perpetuity thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of existing adjoining and nearby residential occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies PDPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

25. ++ Fixed plant and / or equipment associated with air moving equipment, compressors, generators or plant or similar equipment must not be installed within the development site until full details, including acoustic specifications and measures to attenuate noise and vibration from such plant and / or equipment, have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any fixed plant and/or equipment associated with air moving equipment, compressors, generators or plant or similar equipment must thereafter be permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of existing adjoining and nearby residential occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

(2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies PDPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

26. No panel beating, paint spraying or other uses which give rise to noxious smells or fumes shall take place on the land without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the environment and amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies PDPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

27. No above ground development associated with the development hereby permitted shall begin until hereby permitted, a scheme for the installation of equipment to control the emission of fumes and smell from the premises shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and the approved scheme shall be fully implemented. All equipment installed as part of the approved scheme shall thereafter be operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect the environment and amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties and prevent nuisance arising from fumes and smell in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies PDPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Trees

28. ++ Notwithstanding the BS5837 Arboricultural Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Constraints Plan and Tree Protection Plan submitted with the application (both prepared by Arbor Cultural Ltd.) development pursuant to this planning permission must not commence (including any site clearance, preparation or demolition works) until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees, in accordance with BS 5837:2012 (or any future equivalent(s)), including a revised Tree Protection Plan(s) (TPP) and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The following specific issues must be addressed within the TPP and AMS:

- a) Details (including a method statement) for the demolition of existing building(s) within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees;
- b) Details and locations of all below ground services / utilities / drainage runs (including SuDS features), demonstrating that they do not encroach within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees;
- c) Details of special engineering of foundations and specialist methods of construction (including a method statement which must include details of the no-dig construction and extent of the areas to be constructed using a no-dig specification where applicable) for building construction within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees;
- d) Details (including a method statement) for the construction and/or replacement of hard surfaces (including parking bays) within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees;
- e) A specification for protective fencing and ground protection (where work access is required) to safeguard retained trees during both demolition and construction phases;

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

- f) Tree protection during demolition and construction indicated on a Tree Protection Plan and demolition and construction activities clearly identified as prohibited in these area(s);
- g) Details of any new and / or replacement boundary treatments within Root Protection Areas of retained trees and methods of installation;
- h) Details of contractor's parking, welfare facilities and storage areas demonstrating that these areas will not be located within the Root Protection Areas of retained trees or, if they will, that adequate ground protection will be provided;
- i) Provision for the convening of a pre-commencement site meeting attended by the developers appointed arboricultural consultant, the site manager/foreman and a representative from the Local Planning Authority to discuss details of the working procedures and agree either the precise position of the approved tree protection measures to be installed or that all tree protection measures have been installed in accordance with the approved tree protection plan;
- j) Provision for arboricultural supervision and inspection(s) by suitably qualified and experienced arboricultural consultant(s) where required, including for works within Root Protection Areas of retained trees; and
- k) Reporting of arboricultural inspection and supervision.

Demolition, site clearance or building operations must not commence until tree and ground protection has been installed in accordance with BS 5837: 2012 (or any future equivalent(s)) and as detailed within the approved TPP and AMS. The development must thereafter only be carried out only in accordance with the approved details, or any variation as may subsequently be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All tree protection measures must be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing must be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition. Any deviation from the works prescribed or methods agreed will require prior written approval from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the retention and protection of trees in the interests of the visual amenities of the area (including of the adjacent Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area / Corridor) and the appearance of the development in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This condition is required to be addressed prior to commencement in order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that the trees to be retained will not be damaged during development works (including site preparation and demolition works).

Ecology / Biodiversity and external lighting

29. Works on the application site pursuant to the planning permission hereby granted must proceed strictly in line with the following methods of working / impact avoidance precautions as set out within the Preliminary Ecological Assessment, prepared by Adonis Ecology (Project Ref: 1722):

- Paragraphs 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 (Potential Bat Roosts in Trees);
- Paragraphs 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 (Nesting Birds);
- Paragraph 5.2.5 (General Precautions); and
- Paragraph 5.3.7 (Expiry of Report).

In addition, the removal of trees must be completed under a 'soft fell' precautionary approach, whereby suitably qualified tree surgeons will cut and lower any substantial limbs to the ground to be left overnight to allow bats (if present) to make their way out.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reason: To prevent animals (including bats and nesting birds) being injured or killed during site works and to comply with Policy CS7 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Circular 06/05 Biodiversity and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

30. ++ The overall layout, extent and type of hard and soft landscaping for the development hereby permitted must generally accord with the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice. The development hereby permitted must not be first occupied / first brought into use until hard and soft landscaping has been implemented in accordance with details which have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details must include:
- a) details of soft planting, grassed/turfed areas, shrubs and herbaceous areas detailing species, sizes and numbers/densities;
 - b) specifications for operations associated with plant establishment and maintenance that are compliant with best practice;
 - c) hard landscaping, including specifications of all ground surface materials, kerbs, edges, steps and any synthetic surfaces; and
 - d) details of vertical climber planting to the east of Unit 5 and west of Unit 1;
 - e) a wayfinding and signage strategy.

All landscaping must be completed/planting must be completed in accordance with the approved details during the first planting season following practical completion of the development hereby permitted or in accordance with a programme otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any new planting which dies, is removed, becomes severely damaged or diseased within five years of planting must be replaced during the following planting season. Unless further specific written permission has first been given by the Local Planning Authority replacement planting must be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality development in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM2 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

31. ++ The development hereby permitted must not be first occupied / first brought into use until measures for the enhancement of biodiversity on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority together with a timetable for the implementation of such measures. Biodiversity enhancements must include, albeit not be limited to, the measures set out within Section 5.3 (Biodiversity Enhancement Recommendations) of the Preliminary Ecological Assessment, prepared by Adonis Ecology (Project Ref: 1722).

The measures as are approved must be implemented in full accordance with the agreed details prior to the first occupation / first use of the development hereby permitted and thereafter be permanently retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that there is a net gain in biodiversity on the site in accordance with Policies CS7 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

32. ++ External lighting must not be installed within the red line of the development hereby permitted (with the exception of any temporary demolition/construction required external lighting) until full details (to include a layout plan with beam orientation and a schedule

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

of equipment in the design (luminaire type, mounting height, aiming angles and luminaire profiles)) and demonstrating compliance with both the recommendations of the Bat Conservation Trusts' document entitled "Bats and Lighting in the UK - Bats and The Built Environment Series" (or any future equivalent) and the recommendations of the Institute of Lighting Professionals Guidance Note GN01/21 for The Reduction of Obtrusive Light (2021) (or any future equivalent) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting scheme must thereafter be installed and permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

External lighting (other than security lighting) within the development hereby permitted must be switched off at the latest 1 hour after the hours of use set out within condition 20 of this planning permission and switched on at the earliest 1 hour before the hours of use set out within condition 20 of this planning permission.

Reason: To protect the general environment, the amenities of the area, the residential amenities of neighbouring and nearby existing properties and the adjacent Canal Corridor habitat for bats and other nocturnal animals. Nocturnal animals, including bats, are sensitive to any increase in artificial lighting of their roosting and foraging places and commuting routes. To accord with Policies CS7 and CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Circular 06/05 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

Bin storage areas

33. The refuse and recycling bin storage areas shown on the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice must be provided prior to the first use / first occupation of the development hereby permitted and thereafter made permanently available for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage and recycling of refuse and to protect the general amenity of the area in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPD Design (2015) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

BREEAM

34. ++ Prior to the commencement of superstructure works for the development hereby permitted evidence that the development is registered with a BREEAM certification body and a pre-assessment report (or design stage certificate with interim rating if available) demonstrating that the development can achieve not less than BREEAM 'Very Good' in accordance with the relevant BRE standards (or the equivalent standard in such measure of sustainability for non-residential building design which may replace that scheme) must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 3 months of first occupation of the development hereby permitted a final Certificate must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority certifying that not less than BREEAM 'Very Good' in accordance with the relevant BRE standards (or the equivalent standard in such measure of sustainability for non-residential building design which may replace that scheme) has been achieved for the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) and SPD Climate Change (2014). This condition is required to be

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

addressed prior to commencement in order that the ability to discharge its requirement is not prejudiced by the carrying out of building works or other operations on the site.

35. Notwithstanding any indication otherwise shown on the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice at first installation all South Elevation mezzanine floor window(s) within Unit 10 of the development hereby permitted must be glazed entirely with obscure glass and non-opening unless the parts of the window(s) which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the finished mezzanine floor. Once installed the window(s) of Unit 10 must be permanently retained in that condition.

Reason: To protect the privacy of adjoining Nos.169 and 171 Goldsworth Road in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), SPDs Design (2015) and Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

36. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (and/or any equivalent Order(s), replacing, amending and/or re-enacting that Order(s) with or without modification(s)) windows, doors or glazed areas (other than as shown on the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice) must not be inserted/installed within any elevation of any of the twelve units hereby permitted.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of existing adjoining and nearby residential occupiers in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM7 of the Development Management Policies DPD (2016) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Informatives

01. The Council confirms that in assessing this planning application it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
02. The applicant is advised that Council officers may undertake inspections without prior warning to check compliance with approved plans and to establish that all planning conditions are being complied with in full. Inspections may be undertaken both during and after construction.
03. The applicant's attention is specifically drawn to the conditions above marked ++. These conditions require the submission of details, information, drawings, etc. to the Local Planning Authority PRIOR TO THE RELEVANT TRIGGER POINT(S). Failure to observe this requirement will result in a contravention of the terms of the permission and the Local Planning Authority may serve Breach of Condition Notices (BCNs) to secure compliance. The applicant is advised that sufficient time needs to be given when submitting details in response to conditions, to allow the Local Planning Authority to consider the details and discharge the condition(s). A period of between five and eight weeks should be allowed for.
04. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

05. Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage.
06. The applicant is expected to ensure the safe operation of all construction traffic to prevent unnecessary disturbance obstruction and inconvenience to other highway users. Care should be taken to ensure that the waiting, parking, loading and unloading of construction vehicles does not hinder the free flow of any carriageway, footway, bridleway, footpath, cycle route, right of way or private driveway or entrance. The developer is also expected to require their contractors to sign up to the "Considerate Constructors Scheme" Code of Practice, (www.ccscheme.org.uk) and to follow this throughout the period of construction within the site, and within adjacent areas such as on the adjoining public highway and other areas of public realm.
08. The applicant is advised that if proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), should be contacted to obtain prior written Consent. More details are available on the Surrey County Council website. If the proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the Environment Agency (EA) will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards. Sub ground structures should be designed so they do not have an adverse effect on groundwater.
09. In respect of the above archaeological condition the applicant is advised that , in view of the nature and scale of the development and the low likelihood of the potential archaeology, should it exist, meriting preservation in-situ, a scheme of archaeological test pitting would represent an appropriate initial phase of work in order to determine the archaeological potential and levels of previous truncation and the need for any further phases of work.

It is possible that observations by a suitably qualified archaeologist over any proposed geotechnical window samples, or examination by suitably qualified archaeologist of geotechnical boreholes would represent a suitable scheme to demonstrate the depth of past impacts and reduced archaeological potential, and therefore the County Archaeological Officer would highly encourage the applicant to discuss any proposed geotechnical works with their archaeological consultant at the earliest opportunity. The County Archaeological Officer would be pleased to discuss the approach with the applicant or their archaeological consultant following the grant of planning permission.

10. In respect of the above contamination conditions the Council is aware that there was leakage of fuel at the former garage at No.161 Goldsworth Road and risk to nearby residents from vapour was identified. Whilst there is no information to indicate the current users of Goldsworth Industrial Estate are at risk this needs investigating prior to the development hereby permitted. The proposed site investigation - figure 5 - only covers the proposed soft landscape areas. In submitting details pursuant to the above contamination conditions the applicant is advised that a more site-wide approach is required to ensure previous uses of the site have not impacted the underlying ground to a degree that significant risk is posed to receptors and to determine if any off site migration of fuels has taken place.
11. The applicant is advised that, in accordance with the Town Improvement Clause Act 1987 Sections 64 & 65 and the Public Health Act 1925 Section 17, Woking Borough Council is the authority responsible for the numbering and naming of properties and new streets. You should make a formal application electronically to Woking Borough Council

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

using the following link: www.woking.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/street-naming-and-numbering/about-street-naming-and-numbering before addressing any property or installing or displaying any property name or number or street name in connection with any development the subject of this Planning Permission.

12. The permission hereby granted must not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is advised that prior approval must be obtained from the Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, or verge to form a vehicle crossover to install dropped kerbs. Please see: www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/permits-and-licences/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs
13. The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above conditions, the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.
14. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to the Thames Water website. <https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers/larger-scale-developments/planning-your-development/working-near-our-pipes>
15. The proposed development is located within 20m of a Thames Water Sewage Pumping Station, and this is contrary to best practice set out in Codes for Adoption (<https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers/larger-scale-developments/sewers-and-wastewater/adopting-a-sewer>). Future occupiers of the development should be made aware that they could periodically experience adverse amenity impacts from the pumping station in the form of odour; light; vibration and/or noise.
16. There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near Thames Water 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 Thames Water provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read the Thames Water guide working near or diverting pipes. <https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers/larger-scale-developments/planning-your-development/working-near-our-pipes>
17. With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.
18. In respect of the demolition of the existing buildings and structures the applicant should proceed under a precautionary method. If evidence of a bat roost is found, then works should cease and a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist be immediately contacted for advice on how to proceed.
19. The applicant is reminded that the planning permission hereby granted is granted solely on the basis of the approved plans as listed within condition 02 of this notice, including those listed amended plans which were submitted during the application process. Any deviation from the approved plans listed within condition 02 of this notice would represent a breach of planning control and thus be liable to planning enforcement action.

22 FEBRUARY 2024 PLANNING COMMITTEE

20. The provisions of the Party Wall etc. Act 1996 may be applicable and relates to work on an existing wall shared with another property; building on the boundary with a neighbouring property; or excavating near a neighbouring building. Please refer to the following address for further information: <https://www.gov.uk/party-walls-building-works>