

Date: 25 February 2025
Application: 250415



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

WBC Highways

Development Management &
Compliance

P.O. Box 157

Shute End, Wokingham

Berkshire, RG40 1BN

Tel: (0118) 974 6000

Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991

Dear WBC Highways,

Full Planning Approval Consultation

Application Number: 250415

Applicant: Wrenbridge (FRELD Reading) LLP

Site Address: Shinfield Park, Whitley Wood Lane, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9FW

Parish: Shinfield

Grid Reference: Easting - 472865, Northing - 169083

Type of Development: Major Heavy industry/storage/warehouse

Proposal: Full application for the proposed redevelopment of site for flexible employment use (Use Class E(g)(ii)-(iii)/B2/B8) together with servicing areas, parking, landscaping and other associated works, including demolition.

Case Officer: Benjamin Hindle

Development Management has received the above application and we require your comments on the proposal using the recommended memorandum below. The documents associated with this are available to view in NEC DM using the application number 250415. Alternatively, public documents are available to view on the Council's planning application search page: [Wokingham Borough Council Online Planning](#).

Please index your response into NEC DM against the application. If you are recommending conditions, you should give a reason with reference to relevant policies. A list of standard conditions can be found on the Z Drive at: [Z:\Standard Planning Conditions](#).

Your observations are required in respect of this application within **10 working days** of the above date or **15 working days** if the development type is classed as a major development.

Yours sincerely,
Development Management & Compliance

MEMORANDUM

From:	(Name) (Job title)		
Service	WBC Highways	App No:	250415
Address:	Shinfield Park, Whitley Wood Lane, Shinfield, Wokingham, RG2 9FW.		
Proposal:	Full application for the proposed redevelopment of site for flexible employment use (Use Class E(g)(ii)-(iii)/B2/B8) together with servicing areas, parking, landscaping and other associated works, including demolition.		
Type of Development:	Major Heavy industry/storage/warehouse		
Site Visit Made:	Yes/No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No comment
☐ No objection
☐ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
☒ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
☐ Objection due to the reason(s) **stated below**

Comments On Proposal

General

- Highways understands that this application is to redevelop the former office site into flexible employment usage.
- It is welcome that pre-application discussions have taken place.
- This application is supported by a transport assessment and travel plan which is welcome.

Parking

- It is proposed that there will be 226 parking spaces allocated on site. With the inclusion of 24 overflow spaces this would increase to 250 spaces. The level of parking for each unit is set out below
- All spaces are 5m x 2.5m and there is ample space behind for safe manoeuvring.
-

Unit	Sqm	On Plot	Overflow	Total
1	8,030	19	65	84
2	3,799	45		45
3a	1,106	12		12
3b	1,106	15		15

4	2,593	37		37
5	3,368	14	19	33
Overflow			24	24
Total	20,102	142	108	250

7. Table 5.5 in the transport statement sets out a parking accumulation assessment is welcome. Highways have carried out the accumulation exercise using the trip rates in Appendix 5 and whilst there are differences, these are minimal, therefore the accumulation exercise is acceptable.
8. Highways concludes that there is ample parking on site for the proposed land uses.
9. All spaces are 5m x 2.5m and there is ample space behind for safe manoeuvring.
10. It is proposed that there would be 14 disabled spaces on site spread around the six units. This exceeds standards and is acceptable.
11. Highways is concerned with the 2 spaces at the end of the parking area for plot 1 as egress from these spaces would require a long reversing distance. See Below.



12. Car share bays were mentioned in the travel plan but have not been indicated on the parking plans.

HGV Parking

13. WBC have no standards for lorry parking for employment use.
14. Highways welcomes that the 14 loading bays can be used for HGV parking.
15. The transport statement states that there would be 26 loading doors proposed.
16. The transport statement states that where standards apply, a ratio of 1 space per 500sqm is required. For the proposed development this would require 40 spaces. Evidence of this standard would be required.
17. Based on this evidence a further 14 spaces would be required. Highways would need to see the areas that would be available for the parking of HGVs outside the loading areas to ensure that HGVs do not park on the site roads.

Cycle Parking

18. Based on Borough standards there would be a range of between 134 and 101 between office and the other employment land uses.
19. It is proposed that there would be 104 cycle parking spaces spread throughout the site.

20. This level of cycle parking spaces are spread throughout the site at each unit which is welcome.
21. The level of cycle parking is acceptable subject to a monitoring of the use of the cycle spaces within the Travel Plan and that if demand warrants it, more spaces are provided.
22. The cycle parking for plots 2, 3A, 3B and 5 are close to the main access into the buildings which is welcome. For plots 1 and 4 highways would recommend that these be moved closer to the respective accesses into the buildings.
23. Highways would also recommend that visitor parking for cyclists and electric cycle spaces are also provided.

Motor cycle parking

24. Under Borough standards for any employment use there would need to be provided 9 motorcycle spaces. Over the entire site, a total of 15 spaces are proposed which is welcome.
25. However, it is not clear on the Masterplan where these spaces are.

Electric Vehicle Charging

26. The Borough standards on electric vehicle charging have been replaced by Building Control Standards, Approved Document S.
27. Please note that in para 4.21 "BBC" should be "WBC".
28. It is proposed that there would be across the site 45 active and 205 passive spaces which is welcome

Access

29. It is proposed that the existing access from Lower Early Way and from Whitley Wood Lane would be used which is welcome.
30. The VISSIM modelling once completed and submitted would identify if there are any problems at this location.

Trip Rates

31. As there is an existing use on site, the trips to and from this office land use would need to be calculated.
32. This has been done and agreed which is welcome. Highways would have expected the approved borough trip rates to have been used, however the trips used here would give a worst case scenario.
33. Trip rates for an industrial estate have been calculated from TRICS database as this would likely be the category most suited for this development which is acceptable.
34. Based on this land use, the level of traffic would be less than that of the existing use of around 150 and 130 two-way trips in the am and PM peak hour respectively.
35. However, if this development becomes all office, the level of trip difference between existing and proposed but be a lot smaller.

36. The framework delivery and servicing plan included trip rates for HGV's. This has not been included in the Transport Statement and is required.

Traffic Assessment

37. The Borough's VISSIM model has been used to assess this application. The modelling output was not ready by the time the planning application was submitted.
38. Once the output has been submitted, then the Transport Statement would need to be re-submitted.

Walking and cycling

39. There appears to be a 2m wide pavement with crossing points which is welcome.
40. Highways would recommend that tactile paving and dropped kerbs are installed.
41. Between Unit 3b and 4 there is a walking route of around 2m wide. However as mentioned below, if this is going to be used for fire access this will need to be wider but could be design as 2m tarmac with the remaining width grass crete or similar.
42. There appears to be no mention of improving the public right of way to Railton Close. This would be required to improve walking and cycling access to the site or of improving pedestrian links to Shinfield Road.

Site Roads

43. The main route through the site appears to be over 7m in width until it passes the entrance to unit 5. The width reduces up to the overflow car park.
44. The secondary road which provides access to Units 2 to 4 and the service yard for Unit 1 is approximately 7m in width.
45. The secondary road meets the main site road at a priority junction.
46. Further comments may be forth coming once comments on the swept paths have been satisfactorily answered.
47. The site roads would need to be design to acceptable standards.
48. As the roads within the current site are private, highways have assumed that this will be the same for this development. This will need to be clarified.
49. If this is the case then, this would also need to be included in the s106 agreement, including details of the management company set up to look after the maintenance of the roads, the Borough's inspection fee and the APC Bond.

Swept paths

50. Swept paths for a variety of vehicles of different dimensions have been submitted which is welcome.
51. Highways is concerned that the swept path drawings do not show the full layout of the access and egress. This will be required.
52. Highways would also need to see the swept paths of an articulated lorry turning into the main site road from Whitley Wood Lane.

53. For plots 3a, 3b and 4 requires the articulated vehicle to reverse in from the site road. It looks as if the articulated lorry reversing into 3b would pass close to the gate for the yard for plot 1. This needs looking at.
54. Drawings 02.7 Rev E, 02.8 Rev E, 02.9 Rev C and 02.10 Rev C show the manoeuvring of a fire tender in land which highways have assumed to be between plot 3 and plot 2. This swept path does not appear to follow any footpath. If fire access is required, this would need to be 3.7m in width and cannot pass over landscaping. This needs looking at.
55. Drawings 02.10 Rev C and 02.11 Rev A show a panel van access the amenities space which is welcome though it appears that the manoeuvring of the van goes across grass, this will need looking at.

Visibility Splays

56. Highways would have expected visibility splays for the accesses into the service yards and for the internal junction to have been submitted. These have not and are required.

Sustainability Assessment

57. No sustainability assessment was carried out and included within the transport assessment as would have been expected.
58. The nearest bus stops to this site are on Shinfield Road some 500m from the site. These bus stops are served by Bus Route 3 with a frequency of 4 buses an hour during peak periods. This bus service is therefore classed as a good service under CP6.
59. Currently the bus stops have a flag and a paper timetable. Highways would recommend that a contribution of up to £25k per stop be sought to improve these bus stops to include shelters and real time information.
60. There are good walk links to these stops with a footpath from Shinfield Road to Whitley Wood Lane allowing pedestrian and cycle access to the site.
61. There appears to be a lack of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on Whitley Wood Lane and the footpath to Shinfield Road appears to be narrow and unattractive.
62. However, that being said due to the location of the site close to good bus services, the site is sustainable.

Delivery and Servicing Plan

63. A framework delivery and servicing plan has been submitted which is welcome.
64. It is welcome that each occupier of the site will produce their own version of the document, and this will be secured by planning condition.
65. Occupiers of each unit are responsible to ensure that all deliveries are only undertaken in their own servicing yard. No deliveries will be allowed on the site roads which is welcome.
66. It is welcome that all occupiers would need to adhere to the final version of this document.
67. It is welcome that contractors who are part of the Freight Operators Recognition scheme.

68. Highways is content with this framework document.

Travel Plan

- 69. A framework travel plan has been submitted which is welcome.
- 70. There is no mention in the document of WBC guidance.
- 71. Initial travel plan targets have been included which have been based on 2011 census data. This is acceptable as travel surveys would be undertaken once the site has been occupied.
- 72. It is welcome that a Travel Plan Co-ordinator has been included. This role would need to have sufficient time and budget. The funding of the co-ordinator and the travel plan would be the occupiers of the units.
- 73. An initial Action Plan has been submitted which is welcome.
- 74. An interim travel plan would need to be submitted, then a full travel plan will be required normally 3 months after surveys have been undertaken.
- 75. Once surveys have been undertaken a survey report would need to be produced and sent to WBC.
- 76. Please note a contribution of £4,500 would be required to enable WBC to monitor the travel plan.

Construction Method Statement

- 77. A framework construction environmental management plan has been submitted which is welcome.
- 78. It is proposed that the construction period would be 18 months.
- 79. It is welcome that the document will be monitored. If there are any major changes to the document, the document will then need to be submitted to WBC for approval.
- 80. The construction working hours are set out in para 3.7.4. However, due to its location highways would recommend an 8am start.
- 81. It is proposed that the existing access will be used for construction and that the route for construction traffic will be to and from the J11 M4 which is welcome. A route plan would need to be included in the final document.
- 82. It is welcome that a construction traffic management plan will be submitted at prior to commencement of construction which is welcome. Highways is content to secure this document through a planning condition.
- 83. Any deliveries will need to be managed, and highways would recommend that wherever possible deliveries avoid the AM and PM peak hours.
- 84. All construction traffic accessing and egressing the site would need to be managed through banksmen.
- 85. It is welcome that wheel washing will be in operation. Highways would also recommend that the highway would be monitored and if required street sweepers would be used.
- 86. The site will need to be secured and that gates would need to be setback from the highway the length of the longest vehicle.
- 87. Highways would recommend that a separate pedestrian and cycling access is provided.
- 88. All parking and cycle parking would need to be provided in the compound.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)			
Please use this section to detail any conditions that are required to make this development acceptable in planning terms. All conditions should be accompanied by reasons.			
Date:	27 th March 2025	Signed:	Gordon Adam