ITEM NO: 6
Application No. 10/00281/FUL

Ward: Binfield With Warfield
Date Registered: 29 April 2010
Target Decision Date: 24 June 2010

Moss End Farm and Garden Centre Maidenhead
Road Warfield Bracknell Berkshire RG42 6EJ

Proposal:
Change of use of buildings 1, 8 and 9 from agricultural to small craft workshops / artist studios within Use Class B1 together with site office, site maintenance, site security uses and storage uses ancillary to the garden centre (areas 4 and 5 on drawing 145.09.02e).
Change of use of building 15 from agricultural to garden centre and of building 17 from agricultural to industrial use within Use Class B2 (part retrospective).

Applicant: Schyde Investment Ltd
Agent: Pegasus Planning Group
Case Officer: Trevor Yerworth, 01344 352000
evironment@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Site Location Plan (for identification purposes only, not to scale)
1 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (If Any)

01/01057/FUL Validation Date: 29.10.2001
Erection of single storey building forming toilet block with covered walkway following demolition of existing WC’s.
Approved

02/00838/FUL Validation Date: 15.08.2002
Section 73 application to allow for permanent use of Building 5 for the sale of pine furniture and craft goods without compliance with condition 2 of full planning permission 96/00725/FUL 621638
Refused

621639 Validation Date: 09.05.1996
Retrospective application for use of building 11 as woodwork and joinery workshop.
Approved With A Legal Agreement

621638 Validation Date: 09.05.1996
Retrospective change of use of part of building 5 to shop for sale of pine and craft goods.
Approved With A Legal Agreement

06/00223/FUL Validation Date: 09.03.2006
Change of use of buildings 17 and 18 to equestrian use and formation of new access road.
Withdrawn

06/00224/FUL Validation Date: 09.03.2006
Change of use of Building 16 to Class B1 and formation of new access road.
Refused Appeal allowed 5.2.2007

617742 Validation Date: 01.01.1992
Retrospective application for use of former agricultural buildings as garden centre with associated car parking including construction of a link between buildings 4 and 4a
Approved

619674 Validation Date: 01.01.1994
Change of use of existing store/workshop to antiques and craft centre with amenity blocks
Approved

620429 Validation Date: 01.01.1995
Change of use from workshop to steel fabrication
Approved

623547 Validation Date: 17.03.1998
Section 73 application to allow continued use of building 7 for steel fabrication and welding for a further 5 years without compliance with condition 1 of planning permission 620429
Withdrawn

09/00580/FUL Validation Date: 11.09.2009
Retention of various operational works comprising a covered way, new hardstanding for use as parking and storage, conversion of agricultural storage units to retail/workshop units 10a, b, c and d by the erection of new walls and roofs and
erected new retail/workshop unit (building 10e) and erection of a single storey front extension to building 4.
Retrospective change of use of buildings 1, 8, 9, 17 and 18 from agricultural to a variety of B1, B2 and B8 uses, units 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 from garden centre to a variety of unrestricted A1, B1, B2 and B8 uses and unit 16 from B1 to B2.
Retrospective change of use of agricultural hardstanding adjacent to buildings 11, 17 and 18 for external storage and vehicle parking.
Retrospective change of use of agricultural hardstanding north of Bowyers Lane to car parking and vehicle storage.
Stationing of a steel container on hardstanding adjacent to building 18.

Refused

10/00282/FUL Validation Date: 29.04.2010
Change of use of unit 17 to B2 (retrospective) and unit 18 to B1, B2 and/or B8 (part retrospective)
Withdrawn

10/00283/FUL Validation Date: 30.04.2010
Retention of covered walkway (southern element)
(No Decision – Application Currently Under Consideration)

10/00284/FUL Validation Date: 29.04.2010
Operational works comprising the erection of a covered way (retrospective), new shop front to units 6 and 11 (retrospective), the erection of an entrance gateway feature from the main car park (retrospective), the erection of a single storey front extension to building 4a (building 19) (part retrospective) and engineering works to define and protect the area of new grass in the south east corner of the site from over running by vehicles and to make a consequential re-alignment to the access track and parking area in this part of the site.
(No Decision – Application Currently Under Consideration)

10/00453/T Validation Date: 09.07.2010
Temporary use for a period of up to three years of units 16 and 18 for:
(a) storage of outdoor activities equipment by Leapfrog (retrospective);
(b) office accommodation and storage of surveying equipment by Geodrive (retrospective);
(c) storage of scaffolding equipment by RAM Scaffolding (retrospective);
(d) storage of ice cream vans and equipment by Southern Counties Ice Cream (retrospective);
(e) storage of roofing and other building materials by Moss End Roofing and Schyde (retrospective);
(f) motorcycle repairs and testing by CCM Racing (retrospective); and
(g) as a blacksmiths workshop by The Village Blacksmith.
(No Decision – Application Currently Under Consideration)

Appeal
Validation Date: 28.09.2009
Reference: 09/00039/ENF

Appeal against unauthorised use of Buildings
Appeal In Progress

Planning & Highways Committee 26th August 2010
Appeal
Validation Date: 02.02.2010
Reference: 10/00004/REF

Retention of various operational works comprising a covered way, new hardstanding for use as parking and storage, conversion of agricultural storage units to retail/workshop units 10a, b, c and d by the erection of new walls and roofs and erection of new retail/workshop unit (building 10e) and erection of a single storey front extension to building 4.
Retrospective change of use of buildings 1, 8, 9, 17 and 18 from agricultural to a variety of B1, B2 and B8 uses, units 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 from garden centre to a variety of unrestricted A1, B1, B2 and B8 uses and unit 16 from B1 to B2.
Retrospective change of use of agricultural hardstanding adjacent to buildings 11, 17 and 18 for external storage and vehicle parking.
Retrospective change of use of agricultural hardstanding north of Bowyers Lane to car parking and vehicle storage. Stationing of a steel container on hardstanding adjacent to building 18.

Appeal In Progress

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Key to abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description (May be abbreviated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFBLP</td>
<td>GB1</td>
<td>Building In The Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBLP</td>
<td>GB4</td>
<td>Reuse and COU Of Buildings Within GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBLP</td>
<td>E4L</td>
<td>Small Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBLP</td>
<td>EN20</td>
<td>Design Considerations In New Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBLP</td>
<td>EN25</td>
<td>Noise And Other Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBCS</td>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>Locational Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBCS</td>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>Limiting the Impact of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBCS</td>
<td>CS7</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBCS</td>
<td>CS9</td>
<td>Development on Land Outside Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBCS</td>
<td>CS19</td>
<td>Location of Employment Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBCS</td>
<td>CS23</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFBCS</td>
<td>CS24</td>
<td>Transport and New Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Warfield Parish Council

Letter received 26th May from Stuart Garnett of Savills Planning _ Regeneration on behalf of Warfield Parish Council

The proposed demolitions take some steps towards addressing the harmful impact on the Green Belt. However application 10/00284 still proposes the retention of some other unauthorised buildings and structures. The Parish Council remains unconvinced that these amount to appropriate development or that the applicant has put forward very special circumstances to justify an exception to PPG2.

The site remains in an area within which planning policies do not seek to encourage industrial or retail parks. The proposals involve a significant broadening of the range of products and land uses compared to those originally permitted.

The site continues to be in an unsustainable location and it is doubtful whether the proposed financial contribution satisfactorily mitigates this.

It is not considered that these applications have satisfactorily addressed the previous transport related reasons fro refusal.

The Parish Council remains concerned at the number of units on the site as a result of continual subdivision over recent years. The applications still include Schedule C which refers to a range of uses for individual units. It would be preferable if the applicant had sought to reduce the number of units on site and to control the land uses to make them more appropriate for this site.

It is not appropriate for the draft s106 to refer to live/work units as this should be discussed with the Council.

The main justification put forward by the applicant relates to the sites sources as a source of local employment. However if the applications are refused the site will still remain in use, principally as a garden centre and as an important local employer.

Warfield Parish Council
(Re-consulted on amended plans)
Warfield Parish Council considers that the proposal described in this amendment should be the subject of a new planning application. The proposal is for a material change of use of a building outside of the garden centre curtilage and should therefore be the subject of a separate application. Warfield Parish Council has no objection to the proposed change of use of building 17 to BS2 (retrospective) provided permission is restricted to the current tenant, Riddells only. Riddells have been legally operating within the site for many years however; their relocation to alternative premises should not set a precedent for the change of use of other buildings on site which would result in an intensification of B2 uses which represents inappropriate development within land designated as Green Belt and as such is contrary to Policy CS9 of Bracknell Forest Core Strategy and Policies GB1, GB2 and GB4 of Bracknell Forest Local Plan. No very special circumstances have been put forward by the applicant that would justify an exception to these policies.
Transportation Officer

No objection subject to conditions and s106 agreement.

Warfield Parish Council

Recommend refusal for the reasons set out below:

1. The use is harmful to the rural character of the area and as such represents an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt contrary to Core Strategy policy CS9.
2. The proposal represents an unacceptable re-use of existing buildings which results in inappropriate development to the detriment of the Green Belt.
3. Further development of the site for business purposes and intensification of this use as proposed would detract from the character and amenity of this Green Belt area.
4. The proposal represents an undesirable intensification of the use of the site for business purposes adjacent to a residential area. Such intensification would be likely to result in increased levels of noise and general disturbance detrimental to the amenities currently enjoyed by local residents.
5. The application relies on parking permitted under an earlier planning application and provides no dedicated parking for the additional development. The proposal therefore fails to meet the Highways Authority’s standards in respect of parking provision which would be detrimental to highway safety.
6. The proposal is a facility that is located in a part of the Green Belt that is not accessible by all modes of transport. As such, it represents a car-based development in the countryside contrary to the principles of sustainable development.

4 REPRESENTATIONS

4 letters of objection have been received raising the following issues:

- Increased litter and noise, particularly outside of normal business hours causing disturbance to residents and detracts from enjoyment of people using local paths for leisure. The motorbike workshop, blacksmith, scaffolders and taxi rank (not included as part of these applications) are singled out as causes of significant noise.
- Increased parking on Bowyers Lane making access to properties difficult
- Increased traffic using Bowyers Lane, which cause disturbance and damage to the road and sewage system.
- Harm to the character of the local rural area.
- Do not want Moss End turned into an industrial estate which would be an unreasonable and inappropriate use in the green belt

5 OFFICER REPORT

Site area (ha): 2.2
Proposed floor area for which a permanent change of use is sought: 900 sq metres
Proposed number of parking spaces:
Garden Centre: 116
Former agricultural land: 71

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This section of the officers’ report deals with three related applications for Moss End Farm and Garden Centre. These are applications 10/00281/FUL, 10/00284/FUL and
10/00453/T. They are being reported to committee in view of the planning history of this site and because more than three objections have been received.

These three applications vary in terms of relevant policies, consultation responses, representations and recommendations, and these matters are therefore reported separately for applications 10/00284/FUL and 10/00453/T elsewhere on the agenda. However because the three applications form a comprehensive package of proposals which raise similar planning issues, and would be linked together with the same s106 Agreement it is considered helpful to present them together within a single overarching report.

A decision will still have to be made on each application individually and, although the Officers' recommendation for each application is to approve subject to a s106 agreement, there is no restriction upon Members taking a different approach to each application, resolving to approve some and refuse others. However if Members are minded to take this approach the applicant may decline to enter into some or all of the obligations set out in this report. Should this be the case all the applications should be refused as it will become apparent from this report and the alternative recommendations set out for each application, that the proposed obligations contained within the draft s106 agreement are considered to be essential to the favourable outcome of all three applications.

In addition to the three applications referred to above a fourth application (10/00283/FUL) for the retention of the southern part of the covered walkway at this site is also before Members tonight. This application does not form part of the package of proposals that officers have discussed with the applicant and has been submitted as a stand alone application. This application is covered by this report and a full separate report is included elsewhere on this agenda.

Members will recall that an application for the retention of various operational works and material changes of use of buildings and land at this site was refused permission on the 21st January 2010. This is presently the subject of an appeal that is being held in abeyance pending the determination of the applications being reported tonight.

In response to comments made by several committee members at the 21st January 2010 meeting discussions have taken place with the applicant to try and establish whether sufficient common ground exists to enable agreement to be reached on a way forward for this site. These resulted in the submission of new applications at the end of April. Following further discussion one of these applications has been withdrawn and replaced by a new temporary application and an amendment has been made to 10/00281/FUL to include the change of use of building 17.

As stated above, applications 10/00281/FUL, 10/00284/FUL and 10/00453/T form part of a package together with a proposed s106 Agreement. Parts of the development being proposed are still considered to constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt for reasons set out in later in this report. However this element is substantially smaller than previously, and the obligations proposed in the s106 Agreement are material considerations that taken together are considered to constitute very special circumstances that outweigh any harm caused by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm.

Apart for Green Belt the main issues affecting these applications relate to impact on local residential amenity and transport. For reasons explained later in this report it is considered that the issues raised by neighbours can be most effectively dealt with through bringing the currently unauthorised uses within planning control through the
grant of a conditional approval. This would allow a more focussed and faster response to any future complaints from local residents.

As such the complete package as tied together by the s106 Agreement is being recommended for approval subject to completion of the s106 agreement in accordance with the terms set out in this report.

PROPOSAL

Application 10/00281/FUL

This application relates to the change of use of several of the traditional farm buildings outside the authorised garden centre. The present authorised use of all these buildings is for agriculture. It is also proposed that building 15 which lies adjacent to the garden centre be assimilated into the garden centre part of the site, with its uses controlled through the proposed s106 Agreement. The smaller traditional farmyard buildings on the north side of the site adjacent to Bowyers Lane are proposed to be converted into small craft workshops/artist studios falling within Use Class B1 (which by definition is a use which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit). In addition other uses associated with the running of the site such as a site office, site maintenance, site security and storage uses ancillary to the garden centre are proposed for this area.

Application 10/00281/FUL has been amended since its submission to also include building 17. This building, whose authorised use is also for agriculture, is presently occupied by A J Riddell Ltd. who operate a woodwork and joinery workshop from this unit. The amendment to the application seeks to authorise this retrospective change of use. A J Riddells previously operated with the benefit of a personal planning permission from unit 11.

Obligations in the s106 Agreement control the uses on the site, restrict the size of individual units and prevent their amalgamation to ensure that they remain available for small businesses.

The application does not propose any change to the use of the garden centre itself. This is presently permitted for retail use and this would not change as a result of the current application. The type of goods that may be sold within different parts of the site is presently controlled by way of a s106 agreement. Changes are proposed to these clauses to vary what goods can be sold where. These changes are described in detail later in this report.

Application 10/000284/FUL

This application relates to some smaller elements of the unauthorised operational development that has taken place at this site. These include the northern and western sections of covered way linking buildings 4, 6 and 11; the new shopfronts to buildings 6 and 11; the entrance gateway feature from the main car park; and the completion of the small toilet extension at the front of building 4. It also includes the engineering operations to the access road to the rear of the site, including works to improve its safety and to define and protect a new area of grass. The applicant has agreed to demolish/remove the larger, more harmful operational works such as building 10 and the area of hardstanding in the south east corner of the site. This application excludes the southern element of the covered walkway which is being pursued as a separate application 10/00283/FUL.
Application 10/00453/T

This application seeks a temporary permission of up to 3 years personal to the existing occupiers of buildings 16 and 18 to give them time to find alternative premises. The permanent use of these buildings would remain agricultural, however should there be no demand for agricultural use at the end of this period, in order avoid the buildings becoming vacant and derelict further temporary applications may be submitted for more acceptable, lower impact uses. The acceptability of any such application(s) would have to be assessed at that time.

The s106 Agreement

The main Heads of Terms that have been negotiated with the applicant are set out at this stage in the report in view of the importance of the s106 obligations in providing adequate control over the activities on this site and providing benefits that may constitute very special circumstances outweighing harm to the openness of the Green Belt and any other harm. These obligations form an integral part of the package of proposals before Members, and are a material consideration in the assessment of these applications.

The type of goods that can be sold from the garden centre are presently controlled by a s106 Agreement entered into in 1994. However this agreement did not include any restrictions on what could be sold from the main building (building 4/4a). As a garden centre falls within Use Class A1 (retail), in the absence of any controls over what can be sold, normally through s106 obligations or planning conditions, there is no planning control preventing a garden centre converting to any other type of retail use.

As these buildings contain over 900 sq m of floorspace this is considered to be a serious weakness in the 1994 Agreement. The proposed modifications to that Agreement which Members agreed in 2007 (but were not followed through in a modified Agreement) would have partially closed this loophole by limiting the unrestricted retail area to 500 sq m, while updating the list of goods that could be sold within the rest of the garden centre.

In the case of the latest s106 Agreement this loophole would be completely closed as building 4/4a would now be included within the restricted list of goods that could be sold from the garden centre. This is considered to be a major benefit of the current proposal.

Proposed Heads of Terms

Building 16

Rescind existing permanent planning permission 06/00224/FUL for B1 use of building 16.

Agricultural Land

Buildings 16 and 18 not to be disposed of separately from the agricultural land and vice versa.

Removal of permitted development rights for agricultural buildings.
These obligations will ensure that should any buildings be required in the future on the adjacent farmland these buildings will be available to meet this need, thereby avoiding the need for the erection of any new buildings that might otherwise be justified. Any permission granted for non agricultural use of these buildings will be restricted to short period temporary uses to ensure that these buildings remain permanently available to meet any future need for buildings on this land.

Units 1, 8 & 9

Maximum size of any single unit to be 65sq.m and no amalgamation of units. Use restricted to small craft workshops/ artist studios falling within Use Class B1.

Garden Centre

Other than the area currently used for fencing and paving the outside areas only to be used for the display of plants and garden sundries.
Restrictions on sales to specified goods. Garden Centre to be split into two separate areas. A broader range of garden, home and leisure goods will be permitted in units 2, 3, 6, 7, 11 and 15. Within this area a maximum of 20% of total floorspace of buildings to be in any one use.
New controls on goods that can be sold from units 4, 4a.
Café to be only in building 4a and ancillary to garden centre.

Hardstanding in South East Corner

This area to have hardstanding removed and replaced by grass in perpetuity.

Building 10

Remove

Bowyers Lane accesses

Eastern access only for agricultural and emergency use.
Western access only emergency access and access to Moss End Farmhouse.
Signs to be erected and retained informing of this.

Highway issues

Financial contribution and off-site works for pedestrian access to bus stops as advised by Highway Authority.

SITE

Moss End Farm and Garden Centre is located in the small hamlet of Moss End approximately three kilometres north of Bracknell town centre. The site lies within the Green Belt to the east of the main Bracknell to Maidenhead Road (A3095) and to the south of Bowyers Lane. Immediately adjacent to the south, west and east are open fields. To the north are various disused horticultural buildings in the appellant’s ownership and a number of residential properties on Bowyers Lane and Maidenhead Road beyond which lie open fields. The Shepherds House public house lies on the west side of Maidenhead Road just north of the site.
The site currently comprises a cluster of agricultural buildings of varying age and character that previously comprised Moss End Farm. The farm house has been sold as a private residence separately from the farm buildings, many of which were converted in the late 1980’s to a garden nursery and in the early 1990’s to a garden centre (Moss End Garden Centre).

The site contains retail businesses selling, amongst other things: plants, flowers, furniture, gardening sundries, gifts, pet care goods, stoves and fires, kitchens, baths and tiles, printed clothing, curtains and blinds, security equipment, antiques, books, fencing, stone, paving, aggregates and conservatories. In addition the following businesses operate from the site: lawn mower repair and sales, blacksmiths, fabric repair, costume design studio, hair and beauty salon, ladies gym, wood working, roofing supplies, campervan conversions, storage of ice cream vans, motorcycle racing premises, storage of outdoor adventure equipment, land surveying business as well as a café, offices used by Schyde Investments Ltd. and buildings used for site management and maintenance.

PLANNING HISTORY

The full relevant planning history is set out at the start of this report. However in view of the complexity of the history and its importance in approaching the current applications the main points are repeated below:

Planning permission 617742 was granted in 1994 for the use of former agricultural buildings as a garden centre with associated parking. This planning permission was subject to a s106 agreement dated 11 January 1994 that restricted the extent of the retail use and limited the nature of the goods sold to those garden products listed within the agreement (with the exception of building 4/4a which has unrestricted A1 use). It also allowed the continued use of one building each for lawnmower repairing and as a woodworking workshop ancillary to the garden centre use. At the time of the 1994 permission there were several other unauthorised uses on the site and the s106 agreement allowed them to remain for up to one year only. The s106 agreement also required the demolition of a number of buildings, including building 10.

The remaining buildings (1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17 and 18) were left as agricultural buildings under the 1994 legal agreement, not legally associated with the workings of the garden centre. Since the 1994 permission subsequent permissions have been granted for building 3 to be used as an antiques and craft centre (1994) and for building 16 to be used for B1 uses (allowed on appeal in 2007). Other temporary permissions have also been granted but these are now time expired and do not form part of the authorised uses on the site.

In 2007 the previous owner of the site sought to modify the 1994 s106 agreement by expanding the list of goods that could be sold from the garden centre. The purpose of this was to update the list of goods and provide greater clarity over what was considered appropriate within the definition of a garden centre. The proposed modifications would also have increased the restrictions on what could be sold in the main garden centre (building 4/4a) by limiting the amount of floorspace for unrestricted retail use in this building to 500 sq m. Although there was a resolution at the February 2007 meeting of this committee to agree these modifications the previous owner did not pursue the modification of the s106 agreement and subsequently sold the site to the current owner later that year.

A previous application 09/00580/FUL to regularise various operational developments and material changes of use of buildings and land at the site was submitted following
the serving of two enforcement notices on 28th August 2009. It sought the retention of various operational works including the construction of a new area of hardstanding, conversion of aggregate and sand storage bays to create new B1/B8 units, the erection of a new B2 unit, and the erection of new covered walkways. In addition it sought part retrospective permission for the material change of use of various buildings and land at the site. This application was refused permission by this Committee on 21st January 2010 and an appeal against this refusal is currently being held in abeyance pending the determination of the current applications.

PRINCIPAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

(1) Principle of the development

The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The starting point for assessing these proposals is to consider whether the proposal constitutes appropriate development within the Green Belt, and, if not, whether any very special circumstances exist that would outweigh any harm caused by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm. National Policy on Green Belts is set out in PPG2. Similar provisions are also contained within Policies GB1, GB2, and GB4 of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan.

The general policies controlling development in the countryside apply with equal force in Green Belts but there is, in addition, a general presumption against inappropriate development within them. National Policy sets out clearly that inappropriate development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances as it is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Where inappropriate development is proposed, it is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The construction of new buildings inside a Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for one of the purposes listed in paragraph 3.4 of PPG2. This list does not include retail, industrial or storage uses, and therefore by definition the extension of building 4/4a and the erection of the covered walkways, entrance gateway feature, and new shopfronts proposed in application 10/00284 constitute inappropriate development.

PPG2 states that the carrying out of engineering and other operations and the making of any material change in the use of land is inappropriate development unless it maintains openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Application 10/00281 includes engineering operations related to the access road. These are in relation to the requirements of the Highway Authority to provide a safe access and the removal of the unauthorised hardstanding and the grassing over of this land. It is considered that these relatively minor works would maintain openness and not conflict with the Green Belt purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This element of the operational development is therefore considered to constitute appropriate development.

PPG2 states that the re-use of buildings should not prejudice the openness of Green Belts since the building is already there. It can help to secure the continuing stewardship of land. The alternative to re-use may be a building that is left vacant and prone to vandalism and dereliction. PPG2 advises that the re-use of buildings is not inappropriate development providing four tests are met. These are:

a) that the development does not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it;
b) strict control is exercised over any extensions and over any associated uses of land surrounding the building which may conflict with the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it for example external storage or extensive hardstanding or car parking;

c) the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction and are capable of conversion without major reconstruction; and

d) the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings.

These tests are repeated in saved Local Plan Policy GB4 but in addition this policy includes the following additional tests:

e) changes of use to business, industrial, storage or distribution (BIDS) uses are restricted to a maximum of 500 sq metres within any individual building or complex of buildings within close proximity;

f) proposals must not cause significant environmental, road safety or traffic generation problems (considered later in this report); and

g) the proposed change of use must be small scale and appropriate to a rural area.

There no longer exists a farming enterprise at this site. The buildings are therefore presently redundant in terms of any agricultural need from the holding. It is therefore necessary to consider the future use of these former agricultural buildings that form the subject of applications 10/00281/FU and 10/00453/T, and how to reconcile the twin objectives of protecting the openness of the Green Belt while at the same time ensuring that these redundant agricultural buildings are put to a productive use and not forced to stand vacant, which as PPG2 states makes them "prone to vandalism and dereliction".

It is considered that the present occupation of the previous agricultural buildings fails to meet the above criteria. In particular it is considered that the introduction of business/industrial and storage uses on this scale has generated significantly greater levels of activity than the previous authorised use as agricultural and garden centre. Permission for small extensions and new shopfronts, covered ways and an entrance gateway feature is also sought, and new areas of staff parking required. The buildings are generally considered to be permanent and of substantial construction.

The main conflict with Policy GB4 is with respect to criteria e) and g). The existing uses have created over 3,500 sq metres of additional BIDS floorspace. This is clearly very significantly in excess of the 500 sq metres limit in Policy GB4. The supporting text to this policy at para. 4.61-4.63 explains that the re-use of existing buildings may assist in creating local employment opportunities. However the Council will seek to prevent the gradual expansion of existing or new employment uses within the Green Belt which over time could lead to a significant increase in development and alteration in the character and function of the Green Belt. When considering proposals for change of use regard will be had to incremental changes which might occur if other buildings exist in the immediate vicinity which could be proposed for similar change of use. Harm to the Green Belt could be significantly increased if change of use is allowed for a series of buildings in close proximity to one another. In these circumstances the Council may consider entering into an agreement with the applicant to ensure the change of use of one building is accompanied by demolition of others to improve the openness of the Green Belt.

This occurred in the 1994 agreement when it was agreed that several smaller buildings were to be demolished. In the present situation it is not considered sufficient to simply secure the demolition of building 10 and removal of the area of hardstanding in the south east corner as the demolition of building 10 was part of the 1994 package and
the hardstanding was unauthorised. The minimum considered to be acceptable (in addition to the above) is the revocation of the permanent B1 permission that was granted on appeal for building 16; the removal of permitted development rights for agricultural buildings on the surrounding agricultural land owned by the applicant; and the tying of buildings 16 and 18 to this land in perpetuity so if there was a need for buildings in association with this land in the future these buildings would be permanently available to meet this need.

All these elements are now being offered as part of the overall package by the applicant. However it is also considered that it would be unreasonable to require the applicant not to use buildings 16 and 18 at all pending the emergence of any need for buildings in association with the adjacent open farmland in the future. This would be contrary to the advice in PPG2 about allowing existing buildings to become vandalised and derelict. The buildings exist and are of sound and substantial construction and are capable of being put to productive use.

In order to move things forward the package being put before Members in this report proposes tightly controlled, short term temporary uses in buildings 16 and 18. Such uses would have to have a low impact in terms of both activity levels and in respect of any changes to the buildings or external areas around them so they could easily be made available if a need arose in connection with the adjacent farmland. Proposed uses should be appropriate within a rural area, generate little traffic, have a minimal visual impact externally and have no adverse environmental impacts. Examples could include certain types of equestrian use or low key storage uses where little traffic was generated. It is not considered that all of the present occupiers would meet these strict criteria, and these would be required to vacate over a reasonable period of time to allow them to find alternative premises (as proposed by application 10/00453/T). The applicant seeks a three year period for this vacation to take place, which your officers consider to represent an achievable and very generous timescale.

Following this, applications for further temporary uses would be considered on a case by case basis and would be likely to be subject to personal and short term temporary conditions to enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain strict control over the use of these buildings in the future. In order to ensure that only appropriate occupiers were permitted it is not considered that general applications for uses within a Use Class would be acceptable as these can cover quite a broad range of potential uses. Instead the LPA would seek to restrict any permission to very specific uses and would expect an applicant to demonstrate how the proposed occupier complied with the low impact requirement as set out above. Should Members be minded to approve these applications an informative to this effect is suggested.

If the package as outlined above is implemented the change of use of buildings 1, 8, 9 and 17 would represent an increase in commercial floorspace of approximately 1,420 sq m. This would be partially mitigated on a permanent basis by the revocation of B1 permission for building 16 (520 sq m). This would result in an overall increase in permanent B class floorspace of approximately 900 sq m. Although this still considerably exceeds the 500 sq m threshold in Policy GB4 it is considerably less than the 3,500 sq m currently in these uses.

The final criterion relates to small scale uses. Paragraph 4.64 states that it is not one of the purposes of the Green Belt to promote employment uses. Therefore the Council will seek to ensure that only small scale development proposals generating low levels of employment and traffic will be considered appropriate to the Green Belt. Consideration will be given to the effect on surrounding land uses and openness of the Green Belt and the cumulative impact of proposals. Additionally in the interests of
sustainability only uses which are appropriate to a rural area and which cannot be located in urban areas will be considered. Examples include small scale tourist and recreation uses, farm shops, small scale equestrian uses, craft manufacturing, small scale workshops and small scale storage facilities. The proposed development includes small craft workshops and studios which would be in accordance with this criterion. While the proposed change of use of unit 17 from agriculture to B2 uses, at 660 sq m cannot be considered to be small scale to some extent this is mitigated by the proposed revocation of the existing B1 permission on building 16. Overall it is considered that the package of measures proposed would in the longer term result in an increase in the proportion of small scale uses on this site and as such would be in accordance with this criterion.

PPG2 states at paragraph 3.9 that the LPA should consider whether imposing conditions would overcome any objections to the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt. Annex D2 states that when granting permission for the use of agricultural buildings for non agricultural purposes, LPAs should consider whether proliferation of farm buildings constructed under permitted development rights could have a seriously detrimental effect on the openness of the Green Belt. If so, they should consider whether it would be reasonable to attach a condition withdrawing these rights for new farm buildings in respect of that particular agricultural unit or holding. In the present case it is considered that it is appropriate to interpret this guidance as including any obligations agreed in a s106 Agreement. It is considered that when the proposed uses are taken as a complete package with the s106 Agreement and the suggested conditions, that as far as the long term, permanent position is concerned the obligations and conditions proposed would address any objections on Green Belt grounds to the reuse of the existing buildings as proposed.

In conclusion on Green Belt issues, the operational development, while being of a minor nature, is considered to be inappropriate development. It is also considered that the application for the temporary retention of the existing uses within buildings 16 and 18 represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. As such these elements are unacceptable unless very special circumstances are demonstrated to outweigh the harm caused by inappropriateness or any other harm. It is considered that the positive planning benefits that the applicant has agreed to in the s106 Agreement, for example the opportunity to close the loophole in the 1994 s106 Agreement that allowed unrestricted retail use within building 4/4a, the revocation of B1 use in building 16 or the removal of permitted development rights and the tying of buildings 16 and 18 to the surrounding agricultural land.

The refusal of these applications would put the fate of this site into the hands of an appeal inspector, obviating the opportunity to resolve the future of this site and to put in place effective controls at the local level. Furthermore should the appeal be dismissed this would still leave the future of this site unresolved and it is likely that further applications would be submitted for the re-use of these agricultural buildings, prolonging the process and creating further uncertainty for local residents as well as businesses operating from the site. It would also not resolve the problems that have been identified with the 1994 legal agreement. For these reasons it is acknowledged that the package being put before Members is to some extent a compromise in which both parties have had to make concessions in order to reach a position where this site can move forward. It is considered that taken together these considerations represent very special circumstances that would outweigh any harm caused by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm.
(2) Impact on character and appearance of the area

In addition to the Green Belt policies cited above, Local Plan Policy EN20 requires that development be in sympathy with the character and appearance of the local environment and appropriate in scale, mass, design, materials, layout and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

The retrospective operational development sought in application 10/00284 is not considered to be sympathetic to the rural character of the area. In particular the covered walkways and new shopfronts installed on buildings 6 and 11 are considered to be insensitive to the site’s rural location through the use of inappropriate materials and colours. The use of double glazed aluminium shopfronts, and steel framed walkway with green and cream PVC covering has resulted in an unattractive enclosed urban appearance more akin to an indoor shopping mall that is out of character with the traditional red brick farm buildings immediately to the north (buildings 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9).

However there are other material considerations that have to be taken into account. The operational development is considered inappropriate development within the Green Belt and of a poor design that does not respect its context. It is considered that taken independently a refusal of this operational development could be successfully defended at appeal. However this operational development forms part of an overall package of proposals being put forward by the applicant. It is considered that the benefits of this package outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area taking into account that it is relatively minor operational development which (apart from the entrance feature and front extension to building 4/4a) is contained between existing buildings and not readily visible from public viewpoints. This is not the case with the southern section of the covered way which does not form part of application 10/00284/FUL and is reported on separately elsewhere on the agenda.

(3) Effect on the amenity of neighbouring property

The nearest properties to this site are 1-5 Bingham Cottages, Bingham Lodge, 1 and 2 Moss End Cottages and Moss End Farmhouse on Bowyers Lane and Forge House on Maidenhead Road. A number of objections have been raised relating to the detrimental effect that the activities at the application site are having on the amenities of neighbouring properties. These principally relate to increased noise and disturbance, particularly outside of normal business hours, and increased parking and traffic on Bowyers Lane. The issues relating to noise nuisance have been forwarded to the Environmental Health section for further investigation.

In view of the close proximity of neighbouring residents on Bowyers Lane, and the nature of some of the existing businesses in terms of noise generating activities it is necessary to consider the location of any B2 uses on the site. B2 uses are industrial uses that would not be acceptable in a residential area by reason of loss of amenity caused by noise, dust and similar activities. The main problems appear to be in relation to the Blacksmiths, the Scaffolding Company and the Motorcycle racing team. The present proposals include the demolition of unit 10 which presently accommodates the Blacksmiths and the re-location of this business further away from residential properties in building 18 for a temporary period of up to three years.

The Scaffolding Company has moved from its previous outside location inside building 18 and the motorcycle team operates out of building 16. It appears that the main problem with these operations is the noise caused by activities taking place outside...
normal working hours. The present unauthorised activities are uncontrolled and subject to ongoing enforcement action. However approval of application 10/00453/T would enable conditions to be imposed controlling things like hours of operation and deliveries and restricting outside working or storage. Any breach of these conditions could be enforced through a Breach of Condition Notice (BCN). This provides a much faster and more focussed remedy than the present Enforcement Notices which are presently at appeal as there is no right of appeal against BCNs. It would also be easier to secure the vacation of these units at the end of the three year period as conditions are again suggested requiring this. Approval of application 10/00453/T with conditions would therefore not only help to secure the benefits from a new s106 Agreement but would also provide short term benefits to local residents through bringing much tighter control over these uses.

The other main concern raised by local residents is that of traffic, and in particular the large lorries that deliver to some of the units. The main vehicular access to the large units at the rear of the site as well as for deliveries to the garden centre is along a narrow access road along the southern boundary of the garden centre which is reached through the main garden centre car park. This route takes traffic away from any residential properties and does not require traffic to use Bowyers Lane. The 1994 s106 agreement prevented the Bowyers Lane access from being used in relation to the garden centre but did not prevent its use in connection with units 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17 and 18 which were then still in agricultural use. Following negotiations with the applicant the proposed s106 now includes obligations requiring this access only to be used for emergencies and to access the adjacent residential property, Moss End Farmhouse, which has a legal right of access. It would appear from the objections received that one of the greatest concerns relates to the increased use of Bowyers Lane from delivery and waste vehicles using this access. The proposed obligations would provide greater control over the use of the access and therefore would improve the amenity of neighbouring residents.

(4) Transport considerations

The site is located on the A3095 Maidenhead Road which is a primary distributor road subject to the national speed limit. Access to the site is via the main access to the garden centre which comprises of a ghost island junction and this appears to operate satisfactorily from observation. Visibility from the main access is acceptable in both directions.

There is a secondary access to the rear of the site via Bowyers Lane, which is a narrow country lane and not suitable for large vehicles. The use of this access should be for emergencies only and not for use at all by HGV vehicles. Visibility from Bowyers Lane onto the A3095 is adequate in both directions.

Access to the rear of the site is from the main car park at the front via an access road along the southern boundary of the site. This road is narrow and not suitable for the level or types of vehicles that use it and this will need to be altered to be acceptable. The applicant has indicated that the road will be widened to 5m wide and the road supported by a modified embankment that will be supported by structural soil. This is acceptable but details of the proposal should be sought through condition. The improved road width and the available visibility on approach to the road make it suitable for HGVs to pass each other while one is waiting at either end. The level of HGVs expected in a day is such that this proposed layout is acceptable.

In terms of access to the site by non car modes, the site is not located in a sustainable position with no footways or cycleways, along the main roads. However there are bus
stops located reasonably close to the site but pedestrian access to these stops is not
easy as there are no footways leading from the stops to the site. Furthermore the
frequency of the bus through the day is not really an attractive option. The applicant
has submitted a drawing showing a new footpath link to the nearest bus stop from the
site. The provision of this link would enhance access to the site by non car modes.
The design would lead to the loss of one parking space in the development but this is
unlikely to be a problem as the surveys submitted indicate that the front car park has
sufficient capacity. The detailed design and construction of this link will need to be
carried out under a S278 agreement with the Highway Authority and a condition is
suggested to secure this.

The applicant has provided an indication of the level of parking that could be required
and this indicates that 116 spaces would be retained at the front for the main garden
centre building with the various internal uses. At the rear of the site there would be at
least 71 spaces distributed around the various buildings with several spaces adjacent
to unit 16 and many opposite the units for the use of this block.

The applicant has indicated that turning for a HGV is available at the rear of the site
and this is considered suitable.

Cycle parking has also been indicated. Details of this can be covered by condition.

The applicant undertook traffic counts of local roads, all the accesses to the site,
including the Bowyers Lane access and the use of the access road serving the rear of
the site in November 2009 as part of the previous planning application (09/00580/FUL)
to establish the level of traffic generated by the different uses. This indicated that
approximately 260 vehicle movements took place on the access road serving the units
the subject of these applications. Further to this count another destination survey for
vehicles was undertaken on 20th April 2010 which supported the original findings.
Applications 10/00281/FUL and 10/00453/T propose the re-use of a number of former
agricultural buildings. Unit 16 already has permission for B1 use and thus the traffic
associated with this unit is deemed not to be affected by the proposal. The traffic
counts provided indicate that units 1,8,9,15,17 and 18 generate about 110 movements
per day, the TRICS analysis indicates that 118 movements would be anticipated.

In order to determine what the previous agricultural use could have generated the
applicant has provided limited information for a farm in Sussex and a site from TRICS.
There is no background information to substantiate the information for the Sussex site
but it seems more applicable to this site as it was a farm that had livestock and the size
of the original site compares well (220 acres) and thus the characteristics for this farm
have been used to determine the likely traffic impact. The buildings that are proposed to
change under these applications are only part of the former agricultural use of the site
and many of the units are small and thus would not have contained a lot of animals.
For this reason it is considered that the trips generated by the former agricultural use
may not have been as many as predicted by the applicant. It is likely that the majority
of the trips would have come from the fields that accommodated livestock and the
larger units (buildings 17 and 18) on the site which would have housed them. However
if the trip rate for the Sussex farm is accepted then units 1,8,9,15,17 and 18, as part of
a bigger farm holding may have generated in the region of 73 movements per day. The
uses for which permission is now being sought could generate approximately 118 trips,
an increase of about 45 trips per day.

The level of increase in traffic is unlikely to cause a capacity issue on the right turn lane
as peak garden centre use does not conflict with peak operating times of office and
storage/warehousing operations. However there will be a cumulative impact on the
wider road network with other developments in the area and thus mitigation through contributions should be sought.

The ability to reduce car trips to the site by using other modes is limited and thus this site does not represent the most suitable location for such employment uses. In considering the likely impact of this proposal compared to the previous use, the level of increase in traffic does not warrant the provision of a travel plan. However measures to increase non car travel such as cycle parking and the provision of the footway from the nearby bus stop will help facilitate travel by these modes in order to enhance the sustainability of the site.

(5) Section 106 matters

The principal Heads of Terms of the proposed s106 Agreement have been set out at the beginning of this report. As well as financial contributions towards highway and transport infrastructure, these obligations would secure extensive restrictions on the nature of the goods that could be sold from the garden centre, the revocation of an existing B1 permission on building 16, the removal of permitted development rights for agricultural buildings together with the tying of buildings 16 and 18 to the agricultural land, the demolition of building 10 and removal of hardstanding with its reinstatement to grass, and stricter controls on the use of the Bowyers Lane accesses.

The key issue is whether the obligations contained in the existing s106 agreements still serve a useful purpose and, if so, whether the proposed obligations would serve that purpose equally well instead. It is considered that the existing s106 agreements are now quite dated and do not contain adequate control of unrestricted retail uses within building 4/4a, have not prevented an appeal being allowed for the change of use of building 16 from agriculture to B1 use, contain inadequate controls over the use of the Bowyers Lane accesses and have not prevented the separate disposal of part of the former agricultural holding from the agricultural buildings.

6 RECOMMENDATION

Following the completion of planning obligation(s) under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relating to:-

Building 16
Rescind existing permanent planning permission 06/00224/FUL for B1 use of building 16.

Agricultural Land
Buildings 16 and 18 not to be disposed of separately from the agricultural land and vice versa.
Removal of permitted development rights for agricultural buildings.

Units 1, 8 & 9
Maximum size of any single unit to be 65 sq.m and no amalgamation of units. Use restricted to small craft workshops/ artist studios falling within Use Class B1.

Garden Centre
Other than the area currently used for fencing and paving the outside areas only to be used for the display of plants and garden sundries.
Restrictions on sales to specified goods. Garden Centre to be split into two separate areas. A broader range of garden, home and leisure goods will be permitted in units 2,
3, 6, 7, 11 and 15. Within this area a maximum of 20% of total floorspace of buildings to be in any one use.
New controls on goods that can be sold from units 4, 4a.
Café to be only in building 4a and ancillary to garden centre.

Hardstanding in South East Corner
This area to have hardstanding removed and replaced by grass.

Building 10
Remove

Bowyers Lane accesses
Eastern access only for agricultural and emergency use.
Western access only emergency access and access to Moss End Farmhouse.
Signs to be erected and retained informing of this.

Highway issues
Financial contribution and off-site works for pedestrian access to bus stops as advised by Highway Authority.

That the Head of Development Management be authorised to APPROVE the application subject to the following condition(s):

01. No machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site outside the following times 7:00am and 7:00pm Monday to Friday; 8:00am and 13.00pm on Saturday nor at any time on Sundays or public holidays.
REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential premises.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN25]

02. There shall be no vehicular access or egress from the site onto Bowyers Lane except for emergency access, access for Moss End Farm House and for agricultural use.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN20; Core Strategy DPD CS23]

03. No machinery shall be operated and no process shall be carried out anywhere on the application site except within buildings 1, 8, 9, 15 and 17.
REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential premises and the visual amenities of this rural area.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN25, Core Strategy CS7]

04. No goods, materials or equipment shall be stored or operated outside of any building on the application site.
REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential premises and the visual amenities of this rural area.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN25, Core Strategy CS7]

05. No individual unit within buildings 1, 8 and 9 shall exceed 65 sq metres gross floor area, nor shall any two units be amalgamated to create a larger unit.
REASON: To ensure that these units remain available to small businesses.
[Relevant Policies: BFBLP E4]
06. Buildings 1, 8 and 9 shall be not be used for any use other than as a craft workshop or artists studio falling within Use Class B1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) or as a site office, or use for site maintenance or site security or for storage uses ancillary to the garden centre (areas 4 and 5 on drawing 145.09.02e).

REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential premises, and to ensure that only small scale uses appropriate to a rural area are carried out.

[Relevant Policies: BFBLP EN25, GB4 and E4; Core Strategy CS9]

Summary Of Reason(s) For Decision:

The following development plan policies have been taken into account in determining this planning application:

a) Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (saved policies)

EN20 – as it would be acceptable in terms of its impact upon the character the area, and amenity of surrounding properties and adjoining area.
EN25 – which seeks to avoid development which would generate unacceptable levels of noise, smoke, gases, fumes, effluent, vibration, dust or other environment effects which would adversely added the amenities of occupiers or buildings, or users of outdoor space.
GB1 – which permits building in the Green Belt for agriculture, forestry, outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries, replacement, alteration or extension to existing dwellings and domestic outbuildings, provided there is no adverse harm to the character of the Green Belt and road safety.
GB4 – which permits re-use and change of use of buildings within the Green Belt where it would not impact upon the open, rural and undeveloped character of the Green Belt and not be materially greater than present use, they are of permanent construction, is in keeping with its surrounding, would not result in more than 500 sqm of business floor space, and would not cause significant environmental, road safety, traffic generation or other problems.
E4 – which seeks to permit development involving a variety and size of buildings for new and small businesses.

b) Core Strategy DPD

CS2 – which seeks to ensure that land will be allocated for development in the following order: Bracknell Town Centre; previously developed land and buildings in defined settlement; other land within defined settlements where there is no conflict with other policies; extensions to defined settlements with good public transport links.
CS6 – which seeks to ensure that development will mitigate adverse impacts upon communities, transport and the environment.
CS7 – which seeks to ensure that developments are of high quality design.
CS9 – which seeks to protect land outside of settlement for its own sake, particularly from development that would adversely affect the character, appearance or function of the land.
CS19 – which permits employment generating development within Bracknell Town Centre and defined employment areas.
CS23 – which seeks to ensure the Council will use its powers to reduce the need to travel, and promote alternative modes, increase safety of travel and maintain and improve the local road network.
CS24 – which seeks to ensure that development will mitigate any transport impacts which may arise from the development or cumulatively with other proposals.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Limiting the Impact of Development Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007), which provides guidance on planning obligations which may be required to satisfy planning policies, and aimed at making development more sustainable.
Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (July 2007), which sets out the parking standards for the Borough.

(Please note that this is not intended to be an exhaustive list).

The following material considerations have been taken into account:

The proposed development is inappropriate development within the Green Belt. However it is considered that the positive planning benefits that the applicant has agreed to in the s106 Agreement, including new restrictions on the types of goods that may be sold use within building 4/4a, the revocation of B1 use in building 16, greater restrictions on the use of the Bowyers Lane access, the removal of permitted development rights and the tying of buildings 16 and 18 to the surrounding agricultural land constitute very special circumstances that would outweigh any harm caused by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm.

The opportunity to provide a positive way forward for this site that will enable a greater degree of certainty over its future for local residents as well as the businesses operating from the site was also seen as a material consideration in approving this application.

On balance it is considered that any harm to the openness of the Green Belt, the siting of employment development in a relatively unsustainable location or any harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties or the character and appearance of the area is outweighed by the opportunity to secure a positive way forward for this site and the benefits that would be secured through the s106 Agreement. The application is therefore approved.

In the event of the S106 planning obligation(s) not being completed by 26.10.2010 the Head of Development Management be authorised to REFUSE the application on the grounds of:-

01. The proposed development constitutes inappropriate development within land designated as Green Belt and as such is contrary to Policy CS9 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policies GB1
and GB4 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan. No very special circumstances exist to justify inappropriate development that clearly outweigh the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm.

02. The application site is not identified in the Council’s Core Strategy DPD or the Local Plan as an area where employment generating development is to be located. The substantial increase in Business, Industrial, Distribution and Storage (BIDS) floorspace in this location would represent unsustainable development within the countryside, contrary to policies seeking to direct such development to more sustainable locations within defined settlements. As such the proposed development is contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS2, CS9 and CS19 and Local Plan Policy E4.

03. The proposed development would result in a material increase in traffic visiting the site. This would unacceptably increase the pressure on highways and transportation infrastructure. In the absence of a planning obligation in terms that are satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority, and which secure contributions towards integrated transport and highway safety measures, the proposal is contrary to Policies CS6 and CS24 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Core Strategy Development Plan Document and SC1 and M4 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan and to Supplementary Planning Document Limiting the Impact of Development.
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The application file to which this report relates can be viewed at the Council’s Time Square office during office hours or online at www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk