

Wiltshire Council

Strategic Planning Committee

11 December 2013

Late Observations and Additional Information - Application 13/01593/FUL

In response to discussions the agent writes:

- The majority of the issues can be dealt with by way of pre-commencement conditions.
- Drainage- The surface water drainage will be attenuated to Greenfield run-off rates and will be infiltrated as part of the soakaway system. It is understood that soakaways will be sufficient, although this will be informed by further infiltration testing as part of a detailed drainage design. The foul drainage will be discharged to the private system on site.
- Traffic and ecology comments are noted.
- Lighting – The comments of the environmental health officer are noted. The scheme will contain limited external lighting to the proposed building and they are content that a condition is sufficient. The lighting will be low level car park lighting and some to the loading bays. It is not proposed to add further lighting along internal roads.
- Building 4 has received a total redesign as far as is practical as well as removal of a large building from the scheme.
- Much discussion has centred around the Heritage Asset of the site and the potential impact on them. However, they wish to stress the important role that Kemble plays in the local economy. The application is to secure the medium to long term future of the site and enable it to play an important role both locally and within Wiltshire. The proposed development will provide additional space for expansion of businesses and generate additional employment, as well as consolidating existing jobs on site which are currently under threat of being located elsewhere – please note the letter previously submitted from Rapid Racking. The proposal will also facilitate the ongoing use of the heritage assets on the site as part of a thriving business park and therefore their ongoing maintenance. There has already been substantial investment in the existing building stock (including heritage assets) to ensure they remain an important component of the offer on the site and in continued use, however this needs to be done in conjunction with new space in order to retain the existing and attract new users.
- There is local support for the proposal , which is evidenced by the Parish Council's continued support and the comments of the economic regeneration officer.

The architect for the scheme responds in addition to the comments more specifically of the conservation officer. These comments are summarised as:

1. The need has been recognised from the outset to limit development in order to protect the existing character of the historic and greenfield setting. Accordingly the application establishes a clear master-plan.

2. Open spaces – such as the baseball field - have been left open. The development does not occupy existing built spaces, other than the gatehouse, open ground has been retained between each development cluster.
3. Throughout the redesign, the scale and siting of each proposed building has been tailored to its own individual location.
4. Building 5a has been totally removed.
5. The structural landscaping through the use of bunds actively disguises the largest components of the development and mitigates the impact on the greenfield location. Bunding has been used in a way that references the lamella type hangars, which would have been finished in earth covered turf.
6. None of the proposals seek to remove, impede or cause material change to the existing listed structures. Additional material in the form of sections and images has been submitted for consideration to demonstrate how the proposed master plan acknowledges scale and disposition of existing buildings.
7. The drawings illustrate how landscaping and re-design protects the setting of the grade II listed hangars around building 4. The principles of the masterplan define the scope of re-development and through the extended period of consultation have defined the next generation of building at RAF Kemble.
8. The development is considered highly reflective of its location, is restrained in scale and composed in massing. It acknowledges the existing environment, setting and historical importance of the site.

The agent has confirmed that approval is sought for access and siting only for buildings 1, 2, 3 and 5 and that therefore the images are illustrative only.

ADM- The applicant has made reference to 2 appeals, one of which was previously considered in relation to 11/01531/FUL. That one was the appeal at Top Farm at Kemble, where the Inspector concluded that a residential site could come forward as Kemble was considered to be a sustainable location. The village of Kemble itself may well be considered to be sustainable having a train station to London, a shop and a school. However, the site in question is some 1.5km from the village along a busy A class road with no public transport facility. The sites are therefore not comparable.

The second appeal relates to a site in Berkshire within the North Wessex Downs AONB. There are some similarities with the existing site but also some key differences: The application was for one identified end user who was present in the locality and in need of premises to expand; There was evidence that this use could not be accommodated elsewhere within the district; There were no listed structures; substantial planting was proposed and in a woodland style setting this was considered to be appropriate (the application site here is very open); There was recognition that the location was unsustainable, but given its limited scale (circa 1000m²) in floor area and the identified need there was policy support (The current application is an increase of 21,000m² – not as stated in the report as 26000m²)

The Tree Officer states that From the information provided in relation to trees, I note that the content on the Illustrative Tree Protection, Retention and Removal Plan Drawing No. NPA 10347 P201 is a little confusing, in that there is so much information on one drawing. Generally, a plan should be submitted to show trees to

be retained and removed. The trees to be removed should be indicated with a dotted line and the ones to be retained should be shown by a solid line. A separate plan should then be submitted to show all retained trees with the Root Protection Areas and the position of the Protective Fencing on the new proposed layout. All trees should also be numbered to correspond with the Tree Survey so we can clearly see what category trees are marked for retention and removal. Without this information, I am unable to give a clear definitive response.

Charmian Burkey

Senior Planning Officer

Economic Development and Planning, North Hub

01249 706667