

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	252185
Site Address:	Thames Wood House Care Home, School Hill, Wargrave, Wokingham, RG10 8DY
Expiry Date:	6 March 2026
Site Visit Date:	23 September 2025 and 20 January 2026
Proposal: Application to vary condition 2 of planning consent 222456 for the proposed erection of a new part two storey and part three storey care home building with associated communal spaces, back of house, and service areas, substation, parking and landscaping following demolition of the existing care home and associated ancillary buildings and a change of use of land at the eastern end of the site. Condition 2 refers to approved details and the variations include alterations to the height and roof forms of the building, details of ventilation locations, additional plant equipment and associated rooftop maintenance pathways (part-retrospective).	

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP2 – Inclusive Communities CP3 – General Principles for Development CP5 – Housing Mix, Density and Affordability CP6 – Managing Travel Demand CP7 – Biodiversity CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals CP15 – Employment Development CP17 – Housing Delivery
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC05 – Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB11 – Core Employment Areas TB12 – Employment Skills Plan TB20 – Service Arrangements and Deliveries for Employment and Retail Use TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development
Wokingham	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy

Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements SS4 – Development within or adjacent to minor settlements SS8 – Meeting our employment needs SS10 – Meeting our housing needs SS15 – Securing infrastructure CE1 – Design principles for efficient buildings CE3 – Environmental standards for residential development CE4 – Supporting a circular economy CE5 – Embodies carbon CE7 – Low carbon and renewable energy generation CE8 – Protecting renewable energy generation C1 – Active and sustainable transport and accessibility C2 – Mitigation of transport impacts and highway safety and design C3 – Active travel C4 – Green and blue infrastructure and public rights of way C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging C8 – Utilities ER1 – Core Employment Areas ER2 – Employment uses outside of Core Employment Areas ER4 – Employment and skills plans H1 – Housing mix, density and standards H2 – Presumption against residential losses H3 – Affordable housing H7 – Specialist accommodation FD1 – Development and flood risk (from all sources) FD2 – Sustainable drainage NE1 – Biodiversity and geodiversity NE2 – Biodiversity net gain NE4 – Trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows NE5 – Landscape and design DH1 – Place making and quality design DH2 – Safeguarding amenity HC1 – Promoting healthy communities HC2 – Community infrastructure HC5 – Environmental protection HC6 – Air pollution and air quality HC7 – Light pollution HC8 – Noise pollution HC9 – Contaminated land and water HC10 – Odor, fumes and dust
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document Wargrave Parish Design Statement

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
-----------------	-------------	-----------------

291-1953	Garage	Approved 27 April 1953
R/477/1970	Lounge extension	Approved 29 October 1970
21932	Change of use to elderly home	Approved 26 July 1984
26989	One and two storey rear extension	Approved 21 January 1987
32708	Additional accommodation and nurses' room	Refused 7 June 1989
35645	Extension accommodating 12 additional bedrooms, sitting room, dining room and bathrooms	Refused 30 May 1990
36582		Approved 14 November 1990
43069	Extension for lift shaft and bathrooms and enlargement of front dormer	Approved 19 August 1994
44681	Laundry shed (retrospective)	Approved 3 November 1995
F/1996/64538	Temporary cabin for staff accommodation	Approved 21 November 1996 (for one year)
F/1998/67706		Approved 18 August 1998 (for one year)
F/1999/8364	Internal alterations	Approved 1 March 1999
F/2000/0646	Single storey nurses' office extension	Approved 1 July 2000
TP/2000/1985	Temporary cabin for staff accommodation	Refused 11 October 2000
F/2001/3972	Enlarged dormers and windows	Approved 2 July 2001
222456	Full application for the proposed erection of a new part two storey and part three storey care home building with associated communal spaces, back of house, and service areas, substation, parking, and landscaping following demolition of the existing care home and associated ancillary buildings and a change of use of land at the eastern end of the site.	Approved 14 June 2023
240018	Application for submission of details to comply	Approved 18

	with the following conditions of planning consent 222456 dated 14/06/2023. Condition 4 relates to landscaping; 5 to landscape management; 6 to tree protection; 7 to electric vehicle charging; 8 to a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan; 9 to soakaway infiltration; 11 to drainage maintenance and 12 to an exceedance flow plan.	March 2024
241169	Application for submission of details to comply with the following condition of planning permission 222456 dated 14/06/2023: Condition 10 Contamination risk assessment.	Approved 17 June 2024
241837	Application for submission of details to comply with the following condition of planning consent 222456 dated 14/06/2023. Condition 3 relates to submission of a bat licence.	Approved 22 July 2024
250566	Application for submission of details to comply with the following condition of planning permission 222456 dated 14.06.2023. Condition 7 relates to electric vehicle charging; 13 to ventilation.	Approved 20 May 2025
251017	Application for submission of details to comply with the following conditions of planning consent 222456 dated 14.06.2023. Condition 14 relates to cycle parking, 15 to parking management strategy, 16 to delivery servicing plan, 17 to travel plan, 18 to bin store.	Approved 24 April 2025

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Environmental Health – No objections
WBC Drainage – No objections
WBC Highways – No objections
WBC Landscape and Trees – No objections
WBC Energy Manager – No comments received
WBC Ecology Newts – No comments received
WBC Ecology – No objections/comments

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Wargrave Parish Council had no objection to the application.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	Nineteen representations received from local residents raising the following concerns:

	- Increase in height of building is inappropriate and is visually intrusive. - Query as to when the Committee date to consider this application is <i>(Officer Comment: The LPA has not received any listing requests from local councillors. Furthermore, as per the scheme of delegation, this application type does not automatically qualify for a committee appearance. As such, the application will be determined under delegated powers.)</i> - Neighbouring properties not consulted appropriately <i>(Officer comment: See report below.)</i> - 24 hour noise levels from HVAC inadequately assessed. - Assumption that not all plant will operate at one is incorrect, must assess worst case scenario. - Works have already been carried out. - Additional plant equipment would adversely harm local residents/properties by reason of noise pollution. - Wildlife negatively impacted by additional noise emissions. - Request that the plant equipment is relocated to opposite elevation. - Additional plant equipment would increase height of building and cause additional visual harm and impact neighbouring properties. - The submitted noise impact assessment includes an improper background noise level measurement, and measurement location. - Question whether height increases apply to other areas of building <i>(Officer comment: The other areas of roof form are unaffected in terms of height.)</i> - Impact of acoustic fencing not adequately assessed. - Statement addressing the ridge height increases submitted after consultation period finished <i>(Officer</i>
--	---

	<i>comment: The statement was uploaded on the same day a further, 21 day reconsultation was actioned.)</i> - The HVAC equipment is a major change to the approved proposals, question the use of S73 application process <i>(Officer comment: HVAC equipment is a form of ancillary plant, and its inclusion does not affect the original description of development. As such, it can be considered as part of this S73 application.)</i> - Impact on views from neighbouring properties <i>(Officer comment: Impacts on views is not a material planning consideration.)</i> - Query when Council Officers last visited the site. <i>(Officer comment: The Case Officer last visited the application site on 21st January 2026.)</i> - Concern whether the plant equipment will exceed originally permitted height. <i>(Officer comment: A maximum height was never conditioned as part of the original 222456 consent. If this application were to be approved, the variation can reasonably approve variations in height where acceptable.)</i> - Current construction has damaged a neighbouring property's fence line. <i>(Officer comment: This is a civil matter separate from the planning process.)</i> - Request that the Beech Hedge adjacent to nos.6-8 Silverdale Road is retained. <i>(Officer comment: Discharge of Conditions application 240018 approved the retention of this hedge.)</i> - Builders on site have been disruptive to the local community <i>(Officer comment: This is a civil matter separate from the planning process.)</i> - Dust and noise from construction impacting local residents <i>(Officer comment: Such measures are covered by the Construction Method Statement, approved by Discharge of Conditions application 240018. Nuisances on these grounds will have to be reported to the Council's Environmental Health Team to investigate further.)</i>
--	---

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The site measures approximately 0.5 hectares and lies on the eastern side of School Hill, rising from the roadway to a relatively level site. Prior to the commencement of the development initially approved by application 222456, the site consisted of a two-storey dwelling, converted to care home in the 1980s, concentrated along much of the southern boundary. Land to the very rear of the site is overgrown and separated by hedgerow.

School Hill is characterised by large, detached dwellings many that reflect the Arts and Crafts style from the late 19C- early 20C that is a feature of Wargrave. Two schools are in the immediate vicinity and a school owned pathway running along the southern side boundary, which is also heavily vegetated.

Proposal Description:

This application seeks approval to vary condition 2 of consent 222456 (Approved Details). The variations consist of the following:

- A increase in the ridge height is sought, namely an increase in the tallest sections of the building from 10.2 metres to 10.6 metres (excluding the plant).
- Additional plant (Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning, HVAC) equipment to the roof of the building, plus associated acoustic screening.
- Rooftop maintenance pathways to facilitate access to the plant equipment.
- Variations to ventilation locations around the building.

Changes to the scheme and associated consultations:

It is important to clarify, in light of the several neighbour objections received, why this application has undergone three separate consultations.

The first consultation for this application ran between 22nd September 2025 and 13th October 2025; a site notice was posted, and all adjoining landowners (plus others within close proximity to the site) were all automatically consulted with a physical postcard via the Council's Digital Solutions Team.

As a result of the LPA's assessment of the scheme, a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) was requested from the applicant due to the inclusion of the roof-mounted HVAC equipment and its proximity to neighbouring properties. Upon receipt of the NIA on 17th December 2025, a further reconsultation was actioned until 12th January 2026 to allow residents and other consultees to comment on the submitted report. The LPA have been notified by neighbours that not all residents received the physical postcard for this reconsultation and as such, were not aware of the changes. The Case Officer has since invited further comments from the affected residents on the NIA post-expiry of the consultation period.

Upon further assessment of the scheme by the LPA, the Case Officer noted that when comparing the building heights of the original consent (222456) and those currently proposed under this application, the tallest sections of the building had increased from 10.2 to 10.6 metres, a change not referred to within the original description of development. The applicant's agent clarified that this change in building height had already been implemented on site. As a result of this, a further consultation was actioned on 20th January 2026 until 10th February 2026, with the

description updated to refer to the changes in building heights and the now part-retrospective nature of the development. A site notice was posted and consultations sent to all previous consultees on the application. Several residents again reported a lack of physical notification despite such consultations being actioned; the Case Officer has since entertained further comments from the impacted resident's post-expiry of the consultation period.

As such, the LPA are of the view that, despite the aforementioned issues with consultations not reaching several residents, they have sufficiently carried out their consultation duty in line with Section 15 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Principle of Development:

The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The principle of development was already found acceptable under previous planning consent 222456. Nothing herein contained within the current application is deemed to affect this conclusion, therefore no objections are raised on the principle of development.

Notwithstanding the principle of development, this application is subject to further assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the character of the area, street scene, neighbouring amenity as well as compliance with other local and national planning policies. These are addressed in turn below.

Character of the Area:

Policy Context:

Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment. Policy CP3 states that proposals should be of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area together with a high quality of design without detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life.

The Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document provides further guidance for developers with general guidance that development should respond positively to its site and local context (G1) and respond positively to the local character of the area (G2).

Policy TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan states that proposals must demonstrate how they have addressed the requirements of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment, including the landscape quality; landscape strategy; landscape sensitivity and key issues. Proposals should retain or enhance the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape.

The National Design Guide section B1, paragraph 67 also states that the built form of well-designed places should relate well to:

- the site, its context and the opportunities they present;
- the proposed identity and character for the development in the wider place;

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this. So too is effective engagement between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interests throughout the process.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Assessment:

Whilst several residents have raised concerns about the overall scale/footprint of the building itself, it is important to focus the assessment of this application on the variations sought by the applicant, those being the increases in ridge heights, roof alterations and the HVAC equipment proposed on the roof.

Firstly, and most notably, the applicant retrospectively proposes to increase the ridge height of sections of the building's roofs from the originally consented 10.2 metres to 10.6 metres, excluding the HVAC equipment. The ridge height of the other, shorter 'wings' are not affected.

Whilst a legible increase in height, the increases are concentrated centrally within the site and would still be 0.1 metres shorter than the ridge height of the care home

building that originally stood in this location prior to its demolition. The site itself is very well screened from the south by dense, tall vegetation, meaning views of the building are largely restricted to users of the road (School Hill) and dwellings within close proximity to its location, aided by the sloping topography. Furthermore, the building is set back approximately 20 metres from the frontage.

The increase in massing, whilst a notable increase on that previously approved, the changes are limited to certain areas of the building that are well offset from neighbouring boundaries and the site frontage, with the ridge height commensurate with that of the original building that existed prior to its replacement. Assisted by its densely vegetated boundaries and the local topography, the increase in height would have a limited, localised impact on the visual amenities of the area. In the context of its surroundings, the change is considered acceptable.

Attention now turns to the HVAC equipment proposed on the roof form, accompanied by the associated acoustic screen fencing recommended within the submitted Noise Impact Assessment. The plant is proposed to be spread across the flat crown roof forms of the building's wings, protruding between 0.15 and 0.8 metres from the roof forms.

Like the increases in ridge height already assessed, the protrusions from the HVAC on the building's roof form initially appear significant. However, it is important to note that all of the taller plant would be well set back from the edges of the roof; assisted by the building's hipped roof, the visual perception of its massing would be largely offset by that of the building itself. For example, due to the topography of the site, road users of School Hill are unlikely to see the equipment due to the viewpoint angles.

Similar to the height increases, the visual impact of the HVAC would be localised and would cause limited harm to the character of the area, by reason of an increase in vertical massing. However, in the context of its surroundings as outlined above, the impact would be acceptable.

The proposed walkways do not involve any increases in vertical massing, as they are largely limited to markings on the existing roof forms. As such, their impact on the character of the area would be acceptable. Similarly, the relocation of ventilation has a negligible effect on the massing of the building and is acceptable.

With regards to the PV panels, their minimal protrusion from the roof form raises no visual concerns, particularly as this location was approved for such panels as part of consent 222456.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking:

The nature of the changes proposed raise no concerns on these grounds.

Loss of Light and Overbearing:

Attention first turns to the impact on Beechwood House, which adjoins the site to the north. The main perceived impact on this property would be a result of the increases in the ridge height of the building proposed.

To begin with, the separation distances initially approved under consent 222456 are not impacted by the proposed variations. This means that the areas of the building that have increased in height from 10.2 to 10.6 metres (the main, eastern wing) maintain separation distances between 12.5 and 18.5 metres from the boundary shared with Beechwood House.

From an overbearing perspective, the consented separation distances are more than adequate to mitigate any adverse impacts on the amenities of the neighbouring property, despite the increases in height. The HVAC equipment does not involve consistent massing across the roof form and is well set back from the neighbouring property, ensuring no impacts on their amenities.

From a loss of light perspective, BRE 25 degree lines applied to the elevational plans indicate that the increases in height proposed would have no notable impact on the loss of light to the neighbouring property's southern side elevation, with the line falling onto the hedgerow that lines the shared side boundary.

To the south is the Wyatt Close cul-de-sac, which is separated from the application site by the site's densely vegetated boundary and a footpath that leads to Robert Piggott Church of England Infant School. Loss of light and overbearing impacts onto these properties would be unaffected by the changes in height and HVAC proposed, aided by the unaffected separation distances, existing screening and the path of the sun.

In terms of nos. 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 29, 31 and 31 Silverdale Road to the east and north-east of the application site, they would be largely unaffected by the proposed height changes, as they are concentrated to the far west of the application site. Similarly, the HVAC is sufficiently distanced away from these properties to avoid any adverse impacts on loss of light or overbearing grounds.

Noise:

MDD Local Plan TB20 states that planning permission will only be granted for commercial development proposals throughout the Borough that demonstrate:

- a) There is no harmful impact on the amenity of adjoining land uses in terms of noise, fumes and disturbance
- b) There is no significant impact on highway safety
- c) There is no significant adverse visual impact
- d) There is no significant adverse environmental impact

Policy CC06 of the MDDL P relates to noise. It states that proposals must demonstrate how they have addressed noise impacts to protect noise sensitive receptors (both existing and proposed) from noise impacts in line with Appendix 1 of the MDD.

The noise impact of the development must be assessed. Where there is no adverse impact (No Observed Effect Level) then noise will not be a material consideration. Where there is an adverse effect (Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level to Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level), then:

- a) The development layout must be reviewed. Where this results in there no longer being an adverse impact then design and mitigation measures should be incorporated accordingly.
- b) Where there is still an adverse impact then internal layout must be reviewed. Where this results in there no longer being an adverse impact then design and measures should be incorporated accordingly.
- c) Where there is still an adverse impact then physical mitigation measures such as barriers/mechanical ventilation must be reviewed. Where this results in there no longer being an adverse impact then design and mitigation measures should be incorporated accordingly.
- d) Where there is still an adverse impact and the development falls within the significant observed adverse effect level then planning permission will normally be refused.

This application is supported by a Noise Impact Assessment (Auditive Limited, 15th December 2025).

The initial assessment described in BS 4142 to determine whether an adverse impact is likely is based on establishing the difference between the rating level and the background noise level outside the residential property of interest. The British Standard states that the following points should be considered:

- Typically, the greater this difference, the greater the magnitude of the impact.
- A difference of around +10 dB or more is likely to be an indication of a significant adverse impact, depending on the context
- A difference of around +5 dB is likely to be an indication of an adverse impact, depending on the context.
- The lower the rating level is relative to the measured background sound level, the less likely it is that the specific sound source will have an adverse impact or a significant adverse impact. Where the rating level does not exceed the background sound level, this is an indication of the specific sound source having a low impact, depending on the context.

The World Health Organisation (WHO) recognises that the time base for daytime hours is 07:00-23:00, with the hours between 23:00-7:00 being defined as nighttime hours.

Table 3.2: Summary of Noise Criteria: WHO

Residential Environment	Critical Health Effect	L _{Aeq}	L _{AFmax}	Time Base
Outdoor living area	Serious annoyance, daytime and evening	55	-	07:00-23:00
	Moderate annoyance, daytime and evening	50	-	07:00-23:00
Dwelling, indoors	Speech intelligibility and moderate annoyance, daytime and evening	35	-	07:00-23:00
Inside bedrooms	Sleep disturbance, night-time	30	45	23:00-07:00
Outside bedrooms	Sleep disturbance, window open (outdoor values)	45	60	23:00-07:00

With regards to measuring background noise levels, the noise measurement position chosen was to the far south-eastern corner of the site. The NIA outlines that this location was chosen to minimise the influence of daytime construction activities on the measurements, including movements from vehicles along School Hill. The measurement position is also considered to be representative of the lowest background noise levels outside the adjoining dwellings due to its distance from School Hill. WBC Environmental Health have raised no objections to the measurement location as the chosen location would judge a 'worst case scenario' in terms of impact, since the background levels are at their lowest here and as such nearby receptors are more susceptible to changes in noise levels (compared to those properties closer to School Hill).

The microphone set up was set to continuously log measured noise levels over 15 minute intervals and simultaneously record audio. Whilst several objections have been raised by local residents outlining that measuring noise levels during construction activities inappropriately skews the background noise levels, the NIA outlines that such extraneous noise events were identified and excluded from the analysis during post-processing of the survey results using specialist software. WBC Environmental Health have raised no objections to this approach.

Figure 5 of the NIA concludes the representative sound levels of the measurement location during daytime and nighttime; the representative background level during daytime was 37db and 29db during nighttime. Based on the measurement approach taken, WBC Environmental Health have no reason to disagree with these conclusions.

A noise propagation model was produced in order to facilitate the calculation of plant noise levels impacting upon the nearest sensitive premises to the development site (see excerpt of Figure 6 below).



Figure 6 General Arrangement of Noise Propagation Model

Concerns have been raised by residents that the assessment has not considered a situation where all of the HVAC equipment is operating at once. Paragraph 5.6 of the NIA outlines that whilst it is unlikely all plant equipment will operating at once, the noise level calculations have been based on a 'worst case scenario' when all of the equipment is running at one time. Night-time noise levels were predicted with plant items assumed to be operating in their 'night' or 'silent' modes'.

In terms of impacts on nearby residential receptors during daytime, the nearest houses to the north and south (Beechwood House, Silverdale Road properties to the north and east, Wyatt Close properties) would be subject to noise levels of up to 37db and 33db respectively. Plant noise levels calculated outside dwellings lying to the east and west will reach up to 28db. Each of these measurements either matches the existing background noise levels of the area or are below it, indicating little to no additional impacts.

In terms of the Robert Piggott C of E Infant School during daytime, the school would be subject to noise levels reaching up to 25db. The resultant noise levels within the school building, assuming windows are open for ventilation or colling, are expected to reach no higher than 15db which is comfortable below the design limit of 35db recommended by Building Bulletin 93 for intrusive noise within general teaching spaces.

In terms of impacts on the nearest residential receptors during nighttime, the nearest houses to the north and south (Beechwood House, Silverdale Road properties to the north and east, Wyatt Close properties) would be subject to noise levels between 30 and 31db respectively. These measurements slightly exceed the nighttime background noise level of 29db, indicating a small impact on the nearest receptors.

As a result of the plant noise levels marginally exceeding the background levels during nighttime, mitigation measures are proposed within the NIA, namely the

inclusion of acoustic fencing around the HVAC equipment. Indicative details of the fencing has been included on revised plans.

With the acoustic fencing installed, the NIA outlines that the nearby residential properties would be subject to noise levels between 32-34db during daytime, a reduction from 33-37db without the fencing and a noise level that falls below the average background noise levels.

Similarly, with the acoustic fencing installed, the NIA outlines that the nearby residential properties would be subject to noise levels of 27d during nighttime, a reduction from 30-31db without the fencing and a noise level that falls below the average background noise levels.

For this assessment, the roof mounted air conditioning units and heat pumps will operate intermittently depending on load and will therefore incur a +3db correction for intermittency in order to convert their noise levels into BS4142 Rating levels. However, this correction is likely to be reduced or cancelled by correcting for the proportion of time during the assessment period when the plant is not operating or at 100% capacity (which will vary hourly and seasonably). Given these considerations, the NIA concluded that it is likely that the predicted noise levels will give rise to BS4142 Rating Levels that do not exceed the representative background sound levels during daytime and at night.

Overall, with the mitigation measures secured, WBC Environmental Health are satisfied that noise levels associated with the HVAC equipment would be adequately mitigated, and the impacts on nearby receptors would be acceptable. However, it will be important to secure specific details of the acoustic fencing via condition, as limited details (apart from their indicative locations on the roof forms) have been provided.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

Due to the nature of the proposals, there are no concerns on these grounds.

Amenity Space:

Due to the nature of the proposals, there are no concerns on these grounds.

Flooding and Drainage:

Due to the nature of the proposals, there are no concerns on these grounds.

Landscape and Trees:

Due to the nature of the proposals, there are no concerns on these grounds.

Ecology:

Due to the nature of the proposals, there are no concerns on these grounds. Noise emissions from plant equipment would be sufficiently muffled as to have no adverse impact on protected species.

Building Sustainability:

There are no proposed changes to the renewable energy/building sustainability strategy provided and approved as part of consent 222456. Condition 26 of the consent, which secures compliance with the energy statement, is still applicable and

unaffected by the proposed changes.

Conclusion:

Overall, the proposed development complies with the development plan. Subject to conditions, this application is recommended for approval.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

When planning permission is granted for a development that is CIL liable, the Council will issue a liability notice as soon as practicable after the day on which the planning permission first permits development. Completing the assumption of liability notice is a statutory requirement to be completed for all CIL liable applications.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010): In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that persons with protected characteristics as identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

RECOMMENDATION	
Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Approval
Date:	4 March 2026
Earliest date for decision:	16 January 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	5 March 2026