

DELEGATED APPLICATION REPORT

Application No. 220964

Address: 577 Basingstoke Road, Reading

Proposal: Full Planning Application for a proposed extension to the existing Lidl foodstore to accommodate a new entranceway, Deposit Return Scheme (DRS), minor car park reconfiguration and other associated works at Lidl, 577 Basingstoke Road, Reading RG2 0SJ.

Target Date: 27/01/2023 (ext.)

Case Officer: Marcie Rejwerska

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

The application site comprises a commercial unit on the east side of Basingstoke Road in Whitley Wood. The site is set back from the road by way of a green buffer and has an existing car park with a total of 82 spaces. The existing trolley shelter is located by the entrance to the store.



1 577 Basingstoke Road. Image taken from Google Maps on 11/01/2023

Planning permission is sought for a new entranceway created by infilling the existing trolley storage area and a minor roof extension. Car park reconfiguration is proposed to relocate the existing trolley shelter to the middle of the car park resulting in a total loss of 6 car parking spaces.

The proposal has been amended by the applicant in response to the consultation responses received from Transport and Trees.

Plans Considered:

22159-AD100, Location plan, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022
22159-AD101 Rev.A, Existing site plan, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022
22159-AD103 Rev.A, Existing building plan, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022
22159-AD104, Existing roof plan, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022
22159-AD105, Existing elevations, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022
22159-AD110 Rev.B, Proposed site plan, dated May 2022, received 11 January 2023
22159-AD111 Rev.A, Proposed building plan, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022
22159-AD112, Proposed roof plan, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022
22159-AD113 Rev.A, Proposed elevations, dated May 2022, received 1 July 2022

Relevant Planning History:

091316 - 1 advertisement billboard - Application permitted on 30/04/2009
130291 - Extension to provide additional warehousing space without complying with condition 2 of planning permission 13/00011/FUL - Application permitted on 07/03/2013
130551 - Increase size of existing extension - Agree (13/06/2013)
160747 - Application for removal or variation of a condition 17 (Refuse collection hours and delivery hours) following grant of planning permission 06/00325/FUL/BP). - Application permitted on 05/07/2016
160843 - Internally Illuminated Freestanding Totem sign. - Application permitted on 18/11/2016

Public Consultation:

The following addresses were consulted via letter on 08/07/2022:

Flat 1-7, 563 Basingstoke Road
575 Basingstoke Road
579 Basingstoke Road

No comments received. received.

In addition, a site notice was displayed on site by the applicant.

Consultation Responses:

Transport - The site is located to the east of B3031, (Basingstoke Rd), access to the store is directly from Basingstoke Rd. The application seeks to extend the existing food store and reconfigure the existing car park. The site currently has 82 car parking spaces, comprising 75 standard spaces, three accessible spaces, two EV spaces and two parent and child spaces. The proposed GIA is 1,896 sqm, which is an increase of 86sqm,

The proposed development will result in the net loss of 3 car parking spaces resulting in an overall provision of 79 spaces. In accordance with the Councils current Parking Standards and Design SPD 1 space per 30 sqm would be required this would equate to 63 spaces, therefore the proposed provision is acceptable.

Trees - The site is subject to TPO 24/10 which includes 20 individual trees.

The site is also within a low canopy cover ward, on a treed corridor (both ref to our Tree Strategy) and within the AQMA. The retention of trees / vegetation and inclusion of appropriate greening of any development is therefore important.

When Lidl was first built the approved, landscaping included tree planting on the central car park area which ultimately could not be implemented and planters were subsequently introduced (in 2009) on the frontage of the building as mitigation, but these were never maintained, and I note are no longer in place. Ensuring Lidl also correctly implemented the remaining landscaping and maintained trees on site was very challenging. From photos and Google Street view, it does not appear that maintenance has improved.

The building extension does not extend into adjacent soft landscaping so offers no concerns. However, it does infill the canopy, leaving no prospect of the reintroduction of planters and results in one large flat frontage with no relief - I'll leave you to consider this latter point.

The application form states that there are no trees on site and that answers 'no' to the question: Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character? Neither response is correct given the protected trees on site and no consideration of these trees has therefore been given.

When comparing the above plans, it can be seen that the car park changes result in the paving over of the soft bed on the north boundary, in which TPO T18 (Sorbus) is located, i.e., results in its removal. No comment on this is provided or mitigation offered hence it is not acceptable. Development in sites with the natural environment constraints detailed above must result in a net gain in greening, not a net loss.

I also note that an additional parking space on the same (north) boundary results in blocking up the walkway from the store through to the development next door. On the assumption that this access still operates (I assume it must have formed part of the development of both sites), then the acceptability of this should be assessed. If it's already been blocked - is this acceptable?

In conclusion, I object due to the loss of a TPO tree with no justification or mitigation offered, contrary to EN14 and aims of our adopted Tree Strategy.

Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. However the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.

In this regard, the NPPF states that due weight should be given to the adopted policies of the Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy and Sites and Detailed Policies Document) according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

Accordingly, the National Planning Policy Framework and the following development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance are relevant:

CC7	Design and the public realm
CC8	Safeguarding amenity
TR3	Access, traffic and highway related matters
EN14	Trees, hedges and woodland

Appraisal

Design and the public realm

Policy CC7 states that: *“All development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located.”*

The proposed new entrance is a modest extension and is proportionate to the existing building. The proposed design of the new entrance is modern and sympathetic of the existing structure. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale and design. The proposal is set back from the road and is therefore not considered to impact the character of the area.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy CC7 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Safeguarding amenity

Policy CC8 states that: *Development will not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties, in terms of:*

- *Privacy and overlooking;*
- *Access to sunlight and daylight;*
- *Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development;*
- *Harm to outlook;*
- *Noise and disturbance;*
- *Artificial lighting;*
- *Vibration;*

- *Dust and fumes;*
- *Smell;*
- *Crime and safety; or*
- *Wind, where the proposals involve new development of more than 8 storeys.*

It is not considered that the proposal will have a negative visual impact on the character of Basingstoke Road, nor cause harm to the neighbouring properties. There is no proposed new outdoor lighting. The proposal is not considered to pose risk of harm to local air quality.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy CC8 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Access, traffic and highway related matters

The proposed development will result in the net loss of 6 car parking spaces resulting in an overall provision of 76 spaces. In accordance with the Councils current Parking Standards and Design SPD 1 space per 30 sqm would be required this would equate to 63 spaces, therefore the proposed provision is acceptable.

The proposed new trolley shelter is not considered to obstruct the car park.
Existing pedestrian access routes and crossings are unaffected.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy TR3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan (2019).

Trees

It is noted that planters were previously present at the entrance to the store, which were not maintained and subsequently removed. This is not considered a concern in the context of this application. The applicant initially proposed removal of one TPO Tree on the north side of the car park; the car park layout has since been amended to maintain this tree.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION

Conditions

TL1
AP1
M3
DC1

Informatives

IF1
IF5
IF6
IF7
IF8
I15
I24