
Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 7 July 2021

Site visit made on 8 July 2021

by J P Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/W/20/3265942

Land off Aldermaston Road, Tadley, RG26 3XJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Lidl Great Britain Ltd against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01063/COMIND, dated 5 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of Class A1 foodstore with associated car parking, access and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of Class A1 foodstore with associated car parking, access and landscaping at land off Aldermaston Road, Tadley, RG26 3XJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01063/COMIND, dated 5 April 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the annexe at the end of this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. During the hearing a revised landscaping plan was submitted showing various changes including a higher frontage hedge and additional trees within the site. The Council had time to consider the plan during the hearing. The plan indicates additional landscaping could be incorporated in the formal submission of a detailed scheme, as would be required by condition if permission was granted. I accepted the submission of the plan on this basis.
3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021 following the close of the hearing. Both parties were given the opportunity to make submissions in writing of any implications.
4. The appeal site lies within the remit of West Berkshire District Council, whereas Tadley, the adjacent town, is within Basingstoke and Deane Council's jurisdiction.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal in terms of the building, lighting, accesses, car parking, boundary fences and landscaping, on the character and appearance of the area;
- the effect of the proposal on Green Infrastructure and;
- the need for the foodstore.

Reasons

The effect on character and appearance: the site and surroundings as existing.

6. The appeal site lies on the edge of Tadley, a town with extensive residential areas. The site is close to the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) Aldermaston which occupies a substantial area surrounded by security fencing.
7. The site is not identified within any particular national or local landscape designations. It is within the National Character Area 129: Thames Basin Heaths, which is typically 25% woodland, low-grade agricultural land often rough pasture, with semi-natural habitats including wet and dry heathland and acid grassland as well as veteran trees. The West Berkshire Landscape Character Assessment identifies the site as within Burghfield Woodland and Heathland Mosaic, which notes a complex pattern of land use, including woodland, pasture and remnant heathland. The AWE and the expansion of nearby settlements are described as detracting from the landscape.
8. The appeal site fronts Silchester Road to the south and Aldermaston Road to the west, the latter of which is particularly busy as I observed at the mid-morning time of my site visit when there were few instances of no traffic. These roads cross at an extensive traffic junction by the south west corner of the site.
9. Opposite the appeal site, on the western side of the Aldermaston Road, there is an extensive residential area, including three storey flats under construction. Also, just off Aldermaston Road and close to the north of the appeal site, are Kestrel Meads and Falcon Fields, both of which are also modern developments. Similarly, to the south, the other side of Silchester Road, is a mix of residential and commercial uses, including Tadley Engineering, a partly metal clad building with a very functional appearance.
10. The appeal site's frontage along Aldermaston Road is defined by a tall and wide hedgerow. It was evident on my site visit that this is predominately hawthorn and much of the growth is at the sides and top. The hedge obscures the site from view so that the eye is drawn along the straight Aldermaston Road, particularly as the opposite side is lined with some large oak trees; these also soften the residential development behind.
11. The appeal site is more conspicuous from Silchester Road as the hedgerow here is sparse and not continuous, although this frontage is more notable for tall oak trees. The other appeal site boundaries are less defined to the east and north as the site appears part of larger fields.
12. To the north of the site off Falcon Fields, there is a bridleway where there are gaps in the intervening vegetation which allow visibility of the site.
13. The appeal site itself is part of a grass field, which is used for grazing. It adjoins several other fields. These fields are flat and featureless although they

do allow views to the edge of the town, surrounding residential buildings and the distinctive oaks and Tadley Engineering workshop on Silchester Road.

The effect on character and appearance from Aldermaston Road.

14. The proposed car park and building would lead to the loss of the grassland. The site itself is featureless, but it does allow a sense of openness and the perception of green space on the Aldermaston Road, on the approaches to the town centre. However, the appeal building would be set back into the site, and therefore to one side of the main view corridor, created by the boundary hedge and the line of trees on the western side of the road. Thus, the siting of the building would limit its visibility.
15. At the hearing the appellant stated that the boundary hedge would be maintained at 1.5m height which both parties agreed would partially screen the 7m high building and car parking. The hedge would be behind the visibility splay and so the height would be achievable. The top element of the building would be visible, particularly from the far side of Aldermaston Road. However, the multi-stock brick and timber effect walling would give a muted appearance. The roofing material and photovoltaic panels would be more discernible but due to the pitch of the roof, they would be a very small component of the view.
16. The service bay would be visible from Aldermaston Road but only from the point of the access. It would be set back into the site and therefore not prominent. The car parking would be largely screened by the boundary hedge. There would be potential for landscaping to break up its expanse which would soften the view through the access.
17. There would be some intrusion, but this viewpoint is not perceived as wholly countryside due to the residential development along the western side of Aldermaston Road.
18. The hedge would be reduced in width as detailed on the submitted landscape proposal. However, much would remain and indeed most of the growth is on the top and sides, and no evidence was produced to indicate it would not continue to flourish.
19. The proposed access on Aldermaston Road would involve the removal of the hedge to form a splay line. This would allow visibility of the building and car parking. The access would also undermine the continuity of the frontage hedge, which is a discernible feature. However, that view would be narrow being limited to the gap by the access. Additionally, being towards a corner of the site, only part of the development would be visible and largely from the north direction only, hence its impact would only be fleeting to a passing viewer.
20. The proposal would lead to traffic movements in/out of the site for much of the day. However, the tranquillity would not be impaired as Aldermaston Road is busy.
21. I therefore conclude that the proposal would lead to limited harm from this aspect.

The effect on character and appearance from Silchester Road

22. From the Silchester Road, the car parking and its hard surface would extend almost up to the edge of the site and close to the boundary of the road. The

two sides of the building would be visible. However, the hedge would be reinforced which would give some screening particularly to the cars, although this would take approximately 10-15 years to mature. The submitted landscaping plan shows potential new planting within the car park itself.

23. The proposed planting once mature would also obscure some of the building so that only the upper part of the wall and roof would be visible. The existing oak trees would filter some of the view, so that the eye would remain focussed along Silchester Road.
24. The proposal would result in the loss of the grass field, and the loss of its openness. However, Tadley Engineering and the built up road frontage and the extensive Silchester Road/Aldermaston Road junction, give the viewpoint an urban context and so the presence of development would be accepted.
25. An emergency access is proposed cutting through the hedgerow, but this would be narrow and being towards one corner would constrain the view of the car parking and the building. Therefore, this impact would be very limited.
26. The movement of cars around the car park would be perceptible, as well as pedestrian movements accessing the site. However, Silchester Road has a significant amount of traffic and as noted above the immediate environs are not a rural context. There is an emergency access on to Silchester Road but that would only be used for such an event. Consequently, tranquillity would not be impaired.
27. I therefore conclude that from this aspect the proposal would lead to limited harm which would become very limited once the landscaping matured.

The effect on character and appearance from the bridleway

28. From the bridleway, I noted on my site visit, that there would be several viewpoints where the building, lighting columns and boundary fence would be visible, but they would be reasonably distanced which would limit their impact. The proposal includes landscaping along the north and east boundaries. It was confirmed at the hearing that the depth of actual planting would be 4.8m and an allowance was made for a maintenance strip, which accounted for the annotation of 6m depth on the submitted plans. This planting would be substantial and includes trees for much of that length; it would obscure much of the building, although that would take 10-15 years. As discussed earlier, the walling would be muted and the roofing would be a very small component of the view.
29. The submitted LVIA includes photographs of the potential viewpoints during the winter. It is evident that the visibility of the store would be more apparent, but only appreciably so whilst the planting would be maturing. There would be a considerable depth of planting and the woody stems of the specimens would collectively merge to form screening. Moreover, there is potential for some evergreen species. The planting would also soften the visible element of the building.
30. A 2.1m high close boarded timber boundary fence is proposed along the north and east boundaries, facing towards the bridleway viewpoints. This would be set behind the 4.8m new planting and so would only be prominent in the initial years following planting. In any event, such a fence would weather and become

muted, whereupon it would merge with the shades of the planting and so would help the overall appearance and screening.

31. A 1.1m high post and wire fence is shown on the boundary treatment plan. This would be in front of the landscaping however from the bridleway such a structure would not be discernible once the hedge was well established.
32. The building would be perceptible from the bridleway and would look out of place. However, this impact would be localised and would ease as landscaping matures. Consequently, I find that the proposal would cause limited harm from this aspect.

The effect on character and appearance: historic wider landscape

33. The Council considered that the site is part of a landscape which is distinctive being subject to the Parliamentary Enclosures. They consider that the site is part of the wider landscape and as such is a 'valued landscape' as included in paragraph 174 of the Framework.
34. The appellant submitted maps of the historic field pattern. These show that the boundaries around the site itself and the adjoining fields have not changed over time. But beyond the bridleway, are the Falcon Fields and Kestrels Mead developments as well as the extensive new development on the west side of Aldermaston Road and the vast expanse of the AWE. There is no intervisibility with the pre-18th century field pattern around the neighbouring Ravenswing Farm and the north of the bridleway. Consequently, the site and the remaining fields are only a small fragment of the wider landscape and are disjointed.
35. The appeal site was the Poor's Allotment, and then enclosed and sub-divided. There is no evidence of an historic connection with the appeal site. Indeed, Tadley has grown considerably in the twentieth century, around and towards the appeal site. Visually the site and surroundings do not appear as any historic landscape in terms of the nature of the fields, the field boundaries or the surrounding trees. I therefore conclude that there is nothing which takes the appeal site out from the ordinary and it would not constitute a valued landscape.

The effect on character and appearance: lighting

36. The proposal includes various lights around the site to illuminate the access, parking areas, pedestrian walkways and provide security. The submitted lighting assessment plots the luminance contours and shows that light spillage would be very limited beyond the site boundaries. At Aldermaston Road and Silchester Road there are tall streetlights orientated along the roads, so the spillage would not be obtrusive. There would be some spillage onto the adjoining fields, but this would be very limited in terms of brightness and extent.
37. The luminance of the appeal site would be perceptible. From Aldermaston Road and Silchester Road, these are edge of the town contexts so that the lighting would not be perceived as out of keeping. From the bridleway the lighting would be perceptible, but in such dusk/dark conditions it would be only apparent to a few observers.

38. Lighting columns are distributed around the access and car park. These would be visible above the boundary landscaping. Both the adjacent roads have streetlights so that intrusion would be very limited.
39. I therefore find that in this regard the proposal would have very limited impact.

The effect on character and appearance: overview conclusion

40. The Council minutes indicate that councillors were concerned that the proposal could set a precedent. However, this proposal is self-contained and has a definitive application boundary which would be clearly demarcated by new landscaping. Moreover, the access would be orientated for the foodstore which would not leave space for its continuation into neighbouring land. Additionally, there is no evidence to assume that this would lead to other development, particularly as this is a foodstore aimed at local need.
41. In consideration of the various aspects of the development and its implications, I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful, but that impact would be limited.
42. Policies ADPP1 and ADPP6 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (CS) seek to contain growth and prevent urban growth in the countryside. Policy CS19 of the CS seeks to protect the diversity and local distinctiveness of landscape character and requires consideration of the sensitivity to change.
43. Paragraph 110 of the Framework highlights car parking should be sympathetic as reflected in the National Design Guide. Paragraph 126 states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. There is also a similar reference to beautiful and sustainable places in the preceding paragraph. Paragraph 130 requires developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Paragraph 174 of the Framework requires planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural beauty of the local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Reference is also made to valued landscapes but as I have found that is not applicable here. Paragraph 185 of the Framework seeks to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. The proposal would be in conflict with the above policies.
44. The Council did make reference to paragraph 134 in their final comments. This requires development to be well designed. However, the design of the building was amended during the application to be sensitive to the surroundings and I find that the above impact relates to the principle of the building.

The effect of the proposal on Green Infrastructure

45. The glossary of the revised Framework includes a wider explanation of Green Infrastructure (GI). There is some overlap with the proposed landscaping discussed in the preceding section.
46. The existing green field would be lost which would harm the Green Infrastructure (GI) of the area. However, the field's GI value as discussed above lies in its perception of providing a sense of openness. It has very limited contribution to the views and historic and social context of the town and the surrounding countryside. It is well grazed grassland and thus aside from

the boundaries limited in terms of species, habitat and foraging value to the wider ecosystem.

47. Whilst the proposed landscaping details have not been finalised, the basis has been detailed. The proposal would be likely to result in 38 new indigenous trees which in dedicated space and under a required maintenance regime should flourish. The landscaping plans also indicate a wide selection of 1,688 shrubs, which would diversify the vegetation. One tree would be removed but that is small and in poor condition.
48. The proposal does result in the loss of hedgerow for the Aldermaston Road access, a small emergency access and pedestrian gap on the Silchester Road. However, the hedgerow on the latter is very sparse and would be reinforced by the proposal. Moreover, the other side of the appeal site would be planted with 4.8m wide hedges, which would face the countryside, presenting new opportunity for wildlife in terms of habitat, foraging and movement.
49. Bat and bird boxes as well as reptile refugia are also envisaged in the appellant's ecology and biodiversity note. Provision for insects would also be possible and submission and approval of detailed management could be the subject of a condition, if the appeal was allowed.
50. The proposal would be an improvement in terms of the extent of new vegetation which would help biodiversity. Once fully established the tree and hedge planting would provide an attractive outlook for residents and visitors to the town. Whilst the loss of the grassland would be harmful but overall, I conclude that the proposal would be a marginal improvement in GI.
51. Policy CS18 of the CS requires the protection and enhancement of GI in terms of its extent and diversity. The proposal would not conflict with the policy in terms of the extent of GI because of the amount of new planting. The planting would also diversify the existing vegetation and thereby meet the other criterion in the policy. Paragraph 130 of the Framework states developments need appropriate and effective landscaping. Moreover, the newly added paragraph 131 emphasises that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Paragraph 174 emphasises the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystems including trees. The proposal would not be in conflict.

Need for the foodstore

52. Tadley is a town with most essential everyday facilities including banks, library, a Sainsbury's foodstore, smaller shops and health centre. The Sainsbury's supermarket appears adequate for a weekly shop and includes a café. It is broadly in the geographical centre of Tadley. There are Tesco and Co-op stores within more outlying residential areas but their limited size means they generally can only provide more everyday supplementary needs rather than wholesale shopping. The Council reasonably accepted the need for this proposed foodstore but did not find it outweighed the impact.
53. A 2017 retail study was undertaken by consultants GVA for the Council. Whilst this is slightly dated, after more population growth and now 2 Lidl stores at Newbury, it provides broad assessment of the patterns of retail demand. The findings show that Tadley and its environs only account for 35.3% of

- expenditure from its residents. Without doubt, there are substantial shopping trips outside Tadley by its residents. Indeed, many of the comments from the public on this appeal confirm their shopping elsewhere.
54. Such outward traveling for facilities will be degrading the vitality and viability of Tadley: it undermines the sense of a self-sustaining community. Indeed, I find that Tadley could become a backwater. The store would also give an opportunity for shoppers to meet other local people.
55. The traveling for foodshopping as evident from responses, takes time and creates difficult domestic arrangements, whereas this facility would be accessible to a wider section of the population including the elderly, those physically challenged and those who lack cars.
56. Moreover, the traveling to foodstores elsewhere is leading to carbon emissions from private cars. Whilst some trips may be connected with other activities such as traveling to work, many would be single purpose. Such a regular, routine activity as foodshopping will lead to carbon emissions on a frequent basis, and accumulatively will be significant for climate change and health.
57. A discount foodstore is intended which is a niche market and absent from the town. The store should also encourage shoppers into Tadley and use of other shops/services. Indeed, the proposed layout shows a pedestrian pavement in the nearest position to the town centre.
58. Policy CS13 of the CS seeks to reduce the need to travel. Similarly, the Framework in paragraphs 86-88 has an emphasis for the provision of facilities in the most accessible locations. Paragraph 152 of the Framework states the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate. The proposal would accord with the above policies.
59. Policy CS11 of the CS defines a list of hierarchy towns, for the focus of facilities, whilst that can only cover West Berkshire and Tadley is in the adjoining local authority area, nonetheless the foodstore's location accords with the aims of that strategy.

Other matters

60. If the foodstore was operated by Lidl, this would involve 40 jobs as suggested in the appellants' statement; it is reasonable to assume that another operator would not be wholly different. This would be significant and would help diversify the employment base which is likely to be otherwise dominated by AWE.
61. The submitted sustainability report and the application plans show that this would be an energy efficient store, including a substantial array of photovoltaic panels on the roof. An excellent BREEAM rating would be achievable. This would add to the merits of the proposal.
62. I note the objection from Aldermaston Parish Council about the traffic impact. However, such a store would be serviced by only 3 lorries a day, so the resulting increase would be minimal. In terms of car traffic, the proposal would save outward traveling to facilities elsewhere.

63. I note that some of the public responses were concerned about the adequacy of the parking. However, I find that the proposed 127 spaces would be proportionate for the 2,177sqm store, especially in such an accessible location.

Planning Balance

64. The site is not identified in a Local Plan settlement policy area boundary and the proposal is contrary to that accompanying policy. Nonetheless I have considered the accessibility of the site and the nature of the surroundings, and these material considerations indicate otherwise. The proposal would provide an appropriate local facility in a location which is accessible to a large number of people.
65. Paragraph 8 of the Framework sets out that achieving sustainable development involves three overarching objectives. The economic objective would be met by the construction benefits of the new store and the jobs, the social objective is met by the ability of local residents to use community facilities and the environmental objective would be satisfied by providing a necessary community facility in an accessible location (and thereby saving carbon emissions from substantial outward travelling) and the benefit to biodiversity.
66. I have found that the proposal would cause limited harm to the landscape, accordingly there is conflict with that Local Plan Policy. However, there is a need for the facility both for Tadley and the prevention of outward travelling to such stores elsewhere, which are supported by particular policies. Having considered the Development Plan as a whole and the Framework, the merits of the development materially outweigh the conflict with the Development Plan policy.

Conditions

67. Paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provide the tests for the imposition of conditions. The Council has suggested conditions and the appellants have confirmed their agreement. There was only one disagreement, whereby the Council sought to limit the Bank Holiday opening hours. However, as I have found above the area lacks tranquillity and I do not find the living standards would be so impaired.
68. Some of the conditions are pre-commencement and are agreed as such by the parties, because that is the necessity of their purpose.
69. The Council emphasised the importance of the conditions on the precise nature of the retail operation and the need to confirm its role as a discount store particularly as the planning system cannot guarantee that the operator would be Lidl. This is justified to complement and not duplicate the role of Sainsbury's and discourage outward travel to discount stores. The Council also emphasised the importance of the submission and updating of an emergency plan in the event of an incident at AWE. This is indeed justified bearing in mind its proximity.
70. Conditions on the timing and approved plans provide certainty. Conditions on the archaeology are necessary to ensure that any remains can be appreciated. The construction arrangements, water, drainage, refuse, parking and highway works conditions ensure that basic infrastructure is in place. The tree conditions ensure their retention which as I have found above is important. The landscaping, materials and external lighting details are similarly necessary to

aid the appearance. A condition on biodiversity improvements is imposed to ensure a net gain in ecology and together with the landscaping will provide green infrastructure. The BREEAM rating, travel plan, electric charging and cycle parking all help sustainability. The restrictions on store opening and deliveries would limit some illumination and I have added the timing of the lighting to the details to be approved.

Conclusion

71. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the conditions annexe below.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR

CONDITIONS ANNEXE

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents: • Site location plan ref. AD100 Revision E; • Proposed site layout plan ref. AD110 Revision N; • Proposed building plan ref. AD111 Revision A; • Proposed site finishes ref. AD114 Revision L; • Proposed boundary treatments ref. AD115 Revision L; • Proposed layout with topo overlay ref. AD117 Revision C; • Elevations plan ref. 18004-054 Revision A.

3) No development (including any demolition or other site works) shall take place until a written scheme of investigation for a programme of archaeological work has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not take place unless the programme of archaeological work has been undertaken and/or has been incorporated into the demolition/construction phase, in accordance with the approved details.

4) No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMS shall include measures for: (a) Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; (b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials; (c) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; (d) Erection and maintenance of security hoarding including any decorative displays and/or facilities for public viewing; (e) Temporary access arrangements to the site, and any temporary hardstanding; (f) Provision and use of wheel washing facilities; (g) Measures to control dust, dirt, noise, vibrations, odours, surface water run-off, and pests/vermin during construction; (h) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works; (i) Hours of construction and demolition work; (j) Hours of deliveries and preferred haulage routes; (k) An emergency plan providing policies and procedures for the preparedness and response to a radiation emergency at AWE Aldermaston during demolition and construction work. Thereafter the demolition and construction works shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement.

5) No development shall take place until information detailing how the developer intends to divert the water main (Thames Water asset) or align the development,

so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Thames Water). No construction shall take place within 5 metres of the water main. Any construction must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved information. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for the maintenance and repair of the asset during and after the construction works.

6) No development shall take place until details of existing and proposed ground levels, and finished floor levels of the buildings hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

7) No development shall take place until details of sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall: (a) Incorporate the implementation of Sustainable Drainage methods (SuDS) in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (March 2015), the SuDS Manual C753 (2015) and West Berkshire Council local standards; (b) Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site; (c) Include detailed run-off calculations, discharge rates, infiltration and storage capacity calculations for the proposed SuDS measures based on a 1 in 100 year storm +40% for climate change at a maximum rate of 4.4l/s; (d) Include a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. This plan shall incorporate arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a management company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime; (e) Written confirmation is required from Highways Authority of their acceptance of the discharge from the site into the existing ditch and confirmation that the downstream network has the capacity to take this flow. Thereafter the development shall not be first occupied until the approved measures have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The measures shall be retained, managed and maintained in their approved condition.

8) No development shall take place until a site-specific Emergency Plan, tailored to the first occupants of the premises, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Emergency Plan shall provide policies and procedures for the preparedness and response to an incident at AWE Aldermaston. Thereafter, the premises shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details. The premises shall not be operated without the implementation of the latest approved revision of the Emergency Plan. The plan shall be kept up-to-date, and relevant to the current occupant at all times, through regular reviews at intervals of no more than 2 years. An amended version of the plan may be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval pursuant to this condition. The Local Planning Authority may at any time require the amendment of the plan by giving notice pursuant to this condition; in which case the amended plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within 1 month of notice being given. The premises shall not be occupied for the first time by any new occupant until a site-specific Emergency Plan tailored to that specific occupant has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

9) No development (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) shall take place until an arboricultural watching brief has been secured for the development, in accordance with a written scheme of site monitoring, which has

been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Site monitoring shall thereafter take place in accordance with the approved details.

10) The development shall not be carried out without implementing in full the Arboricultural Method Statement and tree protection measures outlined within the Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment by RPS (Revision D dated March 2019, incorporating drawing 71D – rev B Jan 19). This includes no-dig surfaces detailed in RPS drawing 400 Jan 2019. No changes shall be made to the works unless amendments have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, whereby the submission shall include details of any changes to the implementation, supervision and monitoring of all temporary tree protection and any special construction works within any defined tree protection area.

11) No development above ground/slab level shall take place until a schedule of materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Samples shall be made available upon request. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

12) The development shall achieve an “Excellent” rating under BREEAM (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable building which replaces that scheme). No later than three months after the building is operational, a copy of the final certificate certifying that this rating has been achieved shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

13) The development shall not be first occupied until all vehicular, pedestrian and cycle accesses to the site have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.

14) The development shall not be first occupied until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43.0 metres have been provided at the new site access onto the A340. The visibility splays shall, thereafter, be kept free of all obstructions to visibility above a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level at all times. This condition shall also apply to the Silchester Road emergency access.

15) The development shall not be first occupied until a right-hand turn lane off the A340 into the site has been completed in accordance with the approved plans.

16) The development shall not be first occupied until the parking spaces, internal site circulation, and manoeuvring spaces have been provided (including surfacing and marking out) in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter these spaces shall be kept available for parking and internal vehicle circulation at all times.

17) No development above ground/slab level shall take place until details of electric vehicle charging points have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until the charging points have been installed and made operational in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter the charging points shall be retained and kept available for the use of electric vehicles.

18) No development above ground/slab level shall take place until details of cycle parking/storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until the cycle parking/storage facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter the facilities shall be maintained and kept available for that purpose at all times.

19) No development above ground/slab level shall take place until details of refuse storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until the refuse storage areas have been provided in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter the facilities shall be maintained and kept available for that purpose at all times.

20) The development shall not be first occupied until the hard landscaping of the site has been completed in accordance with a hard landscaping scheme that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping scheme shall include details of any boundary treatments and hard surfaced areas to be provided as part of the development.

21) Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted full details of all soft landscaping works shall have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. All soft landscaping works shall be completed in accordance with the approved soft landscaping scheme within the first planting season following completion of building operations / first occupation of the development (whichever occurs first). Any trees, shrubs, plants or hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme which are removed, die, or become diseased or become seriously damaged within five years of completion of this completion of the approved soft landscaping scheme shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedges of a similar size and species to that originally approved.

22) No development above ground/slab level shall take place until a schedule for biodiversity management and provision of habitats including but not limited to bat and bird boxes and reptile refugia have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until the measures have been provided in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter the agreed management and provisions shall be maintained for that purpose.

23) No external lighting shall be installed until a lighting strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the location, height, type and direction of any light sources and the intensity and timing of their illumination. Any lighting, which is so installed, shall not thereafter be altered without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority other than for routine maintenance that does not change its details.

24) The development shall not be first occupied until a Travel Plan for staff/employees at the premises has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall be implemented from the date that the development is first brought into use in accordance with timescales set out in the plan and any subsequent revisions. The Travel Plan shall include provisions for it to be reviewed, and if necessary updated within 6 months of first implementation, and annually thereafter.

25) The premises shall be used solely as a foodstore and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2020 (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification). This restriction shall apply notwithstanding any provisions in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

26) At no time shall more than 3500 individual lines of goods be sold at the retail premises hereby permitted. Only food and convenience goods sales shall be permitted in the store.

27) The premises shall not be open to customers outside of the following hours: Mondays to Saturdays: 07:00 to 22:00, Sundays: 10:00 to 16:00.

28) No deliveries shall be made to the site outside the following hours: Mondays to Fridays: 07:00 to 21:00 Saturdays: 08:00 to 20:00 Sundays and public holidays: 11:00 to 15:00.

END OF CONDITIONS ANNEXE

LIST OF APPEARENCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Chris Tookey BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI	Technical Director RPS
Corinna Demmar BA(Hons) Dip LA CMLI	RPS Senior Director
Rodri Price Lewis QC	Landmark Chambers
Dr Nikki Cook BA(Hons) PhD CIfA	RPS Technical Director
Mike Barker BSC MSC CIEEM	RPS Director Ecology
Richard Broad BSc MCIHT MILT	Mayer Brown
Oliver McGuinness	Lidl
James Mitchell	Lidl
Douglas Symington	Lidl

FOR THE COUNCIL

Michael Butler BSc(Hons) MPhil MRPI	Principal Planning Officer
Liz Allen CMLI	Consultant Landscape Architect

INTERESTED PARTIES

Councillor Ken Rhatigan	Leader Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
Emlyn Evans	Local Resident