

LOCATION:	Erlwood Manor, London Road, Windlesham, Surrey, GU20 6PH,
PROPOSAL:	Alterations to existing buildings and landscape; demolition of Biology East; construction of a three storey collaboration hub and link building; landscaping; creation of footpaths; associated infrastructure and other works.
TYPE:	Full Planning Application
APPLICANT:	Catherine Nikolaou
OFFICER:	Michael Gavin

This application is being reported to Planning Applications Committee because it is a major development.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT, subject to conditions

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The site lies in the Green Belt and the proposal is to bring the vacant Eli Lilly site back into use as a medical research and development facility by UCB, a global biopharma company, focusing on neurology and immunology. The site would be the company's UK headquarters and be one of their three global centres. The proposal involves a very significant investment in a presently vacant site, with significant benefits for medical research and would provide associated benefits for the economy of Surrey Heath and the region.
- 1.2 UCB's occupation of the site does not represent a change of use. The development comprises additional floorspace of approximately 1, 500 square metres, including the principal building being a Collaboration Hub that would be sited in a central position in the overall collection of buildings and be enclosed and screened by them.
- 1.3 The proposal is considered to not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt because it would represent partial redevelopment that would not have a greater harm on openness than the existing development; and, represent an addition to a building that would not be disproportionate in size. The proposal would also respect the character and appearance of the area. The main building proposed is of a high quality, innovative design. Issues relating to trees, biodiversity, highways and parking, heritage and sustainability are considered to be adequately addressed, subject to appropriate conditions. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site comprises 11.26ha located on the north side of the A30 London Road, north of Windlesham's defined settlement boundary, bounded by Hollybush Ride to the west and Sunninghill Road (B3020) to the east. The complex of buildings within the larger, landscaped site includes a Victorian manor house and a number of research and development and ancillary buildings contained by a perimeter road. The buildings are 2-3 storeys in height. The settlement area of Windlesham lies to the south, directly across London Road. Access is from Sunninghill Road which leads to a gatehouse and central parking area. There is a former access to the Campus from the London Road, but this is gated and is not used. The existing campus buildings comprise a series of large scale,

elongated buildings, relatively modest 2-3 storeys in height, designed in a contemporary manner, with flat roofs and a strong horizontal emphasis. The complex of buildings is located broadly centrally within the site with extensive screening by surrounding belts of trees and vegetation.

- 2.2 The site is within the Green Belt. It is within Flood Zone 1, the lowest level of flood risk. It falls outside the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, it is not within a conservation area and there are no statutory or locally listed buildings nor Tree Preservation Orders.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 The site has an established research and development use (Class E(g)(iii)), dating from Eli Lilly's occupation of the site. The main consents over that period are as follows:

- 3.2 00/0883 Outline application for the erection of a part three part four storey research laboratory building with ancillary accommodation, a part three part two storey administration support building, a gatehouse together with rationalisation of existing car parking to include decked car parking following demolition of existing product development building, solvent store and other small ancillary building - Approved August 2002.
- 3.3 09/0275 Erection of a two-storey office building and single storey staff restaurant building - Approved August 2009.
- 3.4 16/0840 Erection of single storey building to provide restaurant and support services for existing business premises - Approved April 2017. This permission was not implemented and expired on 6 April 2020.

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The application seeks permission for demolition of the Biology East wing (building D), the building at the centre of the campus; and, excavation and development of a new central Collaboration Hub (building H). The proposed Hub is a three-storey building which will be partly set into the ground to provide three storeys and accessed via a new bridge from the existing perimeter road. Due to the construction of a new lower ground floor the overall height and roofline of the new Hub will be aligned with the roof level plant on the existing adjacent, surrounding campus buildings. The Hub is the principal element of the scheme, with the other main changes being the creation of a new terrace to the south west gable end of the Manor House (building E), facing onto new sculpted and landscaped landforms. Various façade alterations to existing buildings are proposed, and landscape changes including sculpted landscape areas across the site and replacement of existing tennis court with a Pollinator Garden. Some reconfiguration of internal access roads and the existing parking layout is also proposed.
- 4.2 Following demolition and construction works the net change in overall floorspace across the site would be an additional 1, 401 sqm (GEA). The following table provides a breakdown of the overall works:

<i>Building</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>GEA (sqm)</i>	<i>GIA (sqm)</i>
Collaboration Hub	Lower Ground	1,101	1,054
	Ground	934	841
	First	1,109	979
Link Building	Ground	72	65
NewBuild sub-total		3216	2939
Demolition (Biology East)		-1815	-1397
TOTAL		1401	1542

- 4.3 The applicant has submitted detailed background on the company and their requirement to relocate to the site. They explain that UCB is a global biopharmaceutical company and a world-leader in Life Sciences research. UCB is now established in 40 countries across the world with more than 8,300 employees serving 3.5 million patients. UCB plays a pivotal role in drug discovery and development, focused particularly on neurology and immunology involving cutting edge science, innovative drugs. UCB currently collaborates with 113 UK universities, charities and companies covering nearly 230 projects – totalling nearly £19 million of direct value. UCB is a top five investor in biopharmaceutical R&D in the UK. Many of UCB’s late-stage development compounds originated in the UK, and their commitment to innovation in the UK Life Sciences sector remains strong.
- 4.4 The proposed development would support UCB’s core Life Sciences mission, by facilitating the establishment of UCB in Windlesham as their new UK Headquarters. The proposal would perform a key role in UCB’s projected investment in the UK and supporting high value jobs in scientific research, translational medicine, clinical development, early manufacturing and commercial roles.
- 4.5 The proposal would support the relocation of UCB from their existing facility at Slough Industrial Estate, enabling the establishment of UCB’s core UK Early Discovery Facility (one of three global Discovery Research Centres) in Windlesham. The applicant’s intention is to commence works in January 2022 and occupy the site by the end of 2023.
- 4.6 In support of the application a need case has been presented and technical documents have been submitted. Reference will be made to these documents, where applicable, in section 7 of this report. This includes: Planning Statement; Design and Access and Landscape Statement; Transport Assessment; Preliminary Ecological Assessment and habitat surveys; Arboricultural Impact Assessment; Drainage Strategy; Air Quality Assessment; Acoustic Planning Statement; Environment Assessment; Sustainability and Energy Statement; Utilities Statement;

5.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 5.1 County Highway Authority No objection subject to conditions. *See Annex A for a copy of their consultation response.*
- 5.2 Council’s Urban Design Consultant No objection subject to condition
- 5.3 Council’s Tree Officer No objection subject to conditions
- 5.4 Surrey Wildlife Trust Further information is required including updates to relevant documents and conditions are requested
- 5.5 SCC Lead Local Flood Authority No objection subject to conditions
- 5.6 Surrey CC Archaeology Further information required and a condition is requested
- 5.7 Environment Agency Responded to say that no consultation was required.
- 5.8 Conservation Officer No comments received

- 5.9 Environmental Health Officer The appropriate land, acoustic and air quality reports have been submitted. No comments or objections to the proposed work.
- 5.10 Windlesham Parish Council No objection and fully supportive of the proposal.

6.0 REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 The proposal was advertised by press and site notices as a major development and as a departure (pursuant to the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021). In addition, the occupiers of 16 neighbouring properties were notified by letter. No representations have been received.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- 7.1 The proposal is assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 and its associated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG); policies CP1, CP2, CP11, CP14, DM7, DM9, DM11, DM13 and DM14 of the Surrey Heath Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012 (CSDMP); and the Surrey Heath Green Belt and Countryside Study 2017 (GBCS).
- 7.2 In principle, there is no objection to redevelopment of this vacant site for R&D purposes. The NPPF states at paragraph 81 that decisions should help create conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt, and that significant weight should be given to supporting economic growth and innovation. Paragraph 84 supports sustainable growth and expansion of businesses in rural areas, including provision of well-designed new buildings. Policy DM13 of the CSDMP 2012 supports redevelopment, extension, alteration or addition of existing buildings in employment use. In principle, there is therefore no objection to UCB's occupation of the site and the significant benefits that this global company can bring to the borough and the local and regional economy. For Surrey Heath the proposal constitutes hosting a global biopharmaceutical company and a world-leader in Life Sciences research which is now established in 40 countries across the world with more than 8,300 employees serving 3.5 million patients. These benefits to Surrey Heath, and regionally and nationally, are given significant weight.

On this basis the following main issues need to be considered:

- Principle of development within the Green Belt;
- Design, appearance and character of the area;
- Highways;
- Biodiversity and trees; and,
- Other matters (including heritage and archaeology; energy and sustainability; flooding, drainage and environmental health; and, residential amenity impacts).

7.3 Principle of development within the Green Belt

- 7.3.1 Paragraphs 147-149 of the NPPF state that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Paragraph 149 states that the

construction of new buildings is inappropriate in the Green Belt but lists exceptions to this, which includes c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; and, g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) provided that this does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

7.3.2 It is considered that the principal element of the proposal – the Collaboration Hub (with the link) - constitutes limited infilling and partial redevelopment of previously developed land which would have no greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. This is because whilst in spatial terms there would be an increase in built form, visually the development would not impact on Green Belt openness because the only new building proposed is contained within the existing surrounding buildings and would not spread development onto undeveloped land. Additionally, the proposal would not be seen from public view, or outside of the site, and this would lessen the perceived impact. The proposal also includes alterations to buildings – principally a terrace extension to the Manor House – which are not disproportionate in size. In the officer's opinion the proposal is therefore not inappropriate or harmful development in the Green Belt.

7.3.3 Landform changes are also proposed at various points across the site to enhance appearance and employee experience, including a reduction in level at the front of the building adjacent to the Manor House (Building E on the proposed layout plan), with raised areas framing this, to better connect employees to the rural setting and provide a high quality and attractive environment. There is no objection to these works which are considered modest and would not materially affect the topography of the site.

7.3.4 The proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, complying with the NPPF, which is consistent with the applicant's opinion. No special circumstances (VSC) are therefore required to be demonstrated, and no further Green Belt assessment is necessary. In the event that this opinion is wrong then the applicant has also presented a VSC case with 5 reasons listed and summarised below, which in the officer's opinion these benefits would amount to VSC:

1. The benefits of the proposal to research into immunological diseases supported by policy at national level. The significant direct contribution to the Government's Life Sciences Vision;
2. The strong need for the development in quantitative and qualitative terms;
3. The refurbishment and modernisation of the Windlesham Campus into beneficial use which is a vacant R&D campus;
4. The Campus is ideally suited to UCB's needs with the importance of developing the Collaboration Hub to create one campus.
5. Any Green Belt harm would be limited with no other harm identified.

7.4 Design, appearance and character of area

7.4.1 The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 requires high quality design that respects and enhances its setting, paying particular regard to scale, materials and massing.

7.4.2 The proposed Collaboration Hub building is enclosed within surrounding existing buildings and set down into the site to achieve a maximum height consistent with its setting. The design is innovative and considered high quality. It is a bespoke design approach in curved laminated timber taking its inspiration from the organic forms of nature, such as flower petals, to create interest and contrast to the surrounding discrete, but rectilinear concrete structures. The surrounding terraced garden space will provide daylight into the lower level of the Hub. The curved forms comprising the roof structure are of timber with aluminium framing elements. The warm, natural character of the wooden structure and the organic design cue are welcoming and well suited for a focal entrance and a dynamic

social/working/learning core and are supported by the Urban Design Consultant, subject to a condition to secure details.

- 7.4.3 The application also includes the refurbishment and alterations to the Manor house, mainly the introduction of new picture windows and French doors to the more recent extension, and the erection of a new terrace, which will wrap around the south west elevation, improving connectivity between the Manor House and the adjacent Chemistry East building. This is considered to represent an enhancement which would enable an attractive south west facing break out area and is supported from an urban design point of view. The creation of the new terrace involves lowering ground levels and details of the terrace base treatment should be secured by condition. Removal of windows from the northern elevation, due to the creation of a new catering kitchen beyond, would leave a section of blank elevation and treatment of this area should also be reserved by condition.
- 7.4.4 The regeneration project further proposes significant changes to the existing setting, including both hard and soft landscaping, such as the reconfiguration of the existing car parking area, the introduction of welcome and way-finding features, a new, terraced landscaped courtyard adjacent to the Collaboration Hub and permeable pathways across the site. Fire escape roads will be adjusted and paved by grass-crete to create a more natural impression. A distinct paved walk with a circular pattern between the Hub and the Manor House will reinforce this new, active focus of the site. All these improvements are supported from an urban design point of view and take into account pre-application advice.
- 7.4.5 New terraces and new landforms will be implemented in the Upper Meadows and at the Manor House, where raised, planted half circles will be created in patterns across the existing lawn and the Upper Meadows. This will have a minor visual impact on the existing open, natural character, although in the context of the overall site the landform changes are not considered significant, and it is noted that when the Manor House was created the landscaped gardens and parkland associated with it included a rich variation of different landscape elements, typical for an English manor at the time. The proposed landscaped landforms are considered acceptable, and in the context of the significant extent of the grounds would not materially affect how the wider site is perceived in terms of topography.
- 7.4.6 The existing complex of buildings is concentrated in a compact campus in the centre of the wider site, which is laid out with landscaped areas and substantial belts of trees and vegetation on all sides provides a screen which prevents views of the buildings from outside the site. Views into the site are available from the site entrance on Sunninghill Road but even here views are limited to the area immediately adjacent to the entrance due to flanking screening by trees and vegetation. The nature of the proposal is such that the new built form would be located within and at the edge of the existing building complex, such that no additional impact on the appearance and character of the area over and above the existing negligible impact would occur.
- 7.4.7 The proposed development is considered to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 and with relevant guidance in the NPPF, and is considered acceptable in terms of design and impact on rural character and appearance.

7.5 Highway and parking

- 7.5.1 Policy DM11 of the CSDMP 2012 seeks to ensure safe and efficient flow of traffic and consideration of all highway users including cyclists. Vehicle, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking for New Development (SCC November 2021) sets out parking guidelines.
- 7.5.2 The applicant explains that compared to the previous occupation of the site by Eli Lilly, the proposed occupation by UCB will result in a reduction in the number of on-site employees, which had up to 650 on-site employees. The applicant also advises that UCB operates a permanent remote working and flexible home-working arrangements, so it is expected that there would be a maximum of approximately 600 employees on-site at any one time. A Transport Assessment was submitted which states that the average traffic generation during the AM and PM peak hours would reduce from 320 total trips per peak hour for Eli Lilly's

previous occupation down to 291 total trips per peak hour for UCB's proposed occupation. This would equate to a reduction of 29 total trips per peak hour and potentially a reduction of 23 car trips based on the estimated mode share.

- 7.5.3 The County Highways Authority (CHA) has assessed the application on safety, capacity and policy grounds and accepts the conclusions of the Transport Assessment, that the trip rates associated with the previous occupiers were higher in both peak and daily periods than those of the proposed occupiers, and as such the development is anticipated to represent a reduced impact on the local highway network. The CHA raised no objection subject to conditions on parking, disabled parking, Construction Transport Management Plan, cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points (see Annex A).
- 7.5.4 There are currently a total of 511 car parking spaces for staff, six medical needs spaces and 25 visitor car parking spaces on site. The proposal would retain the 511 staff car parking spaces and would provide a total of 24 visitor car parking spaces, reduced from the 25 existing to provide eight disabled persons parking spaces. There are no disabled car parking spaces on the site at present. As a proportion of the total 535 spaces the SCC parking guidelines require 5% provision as disabled persons spaces, which would amount to 27 spaces. The applicant argues that the 8 spaces are representative of need experienced at its present Slough premises. The applicant has stated that if additional demand arises for disabled parking, this can be accommodated within the eastern section of the staff car park with standard bays being converted to provide for this. While the SCC guideline is not met at the outset, and particularly taking account of the absence of any disabled parking spaces at present, it is considered that a Car Parking Management Plan (CPMP) should be secured by condition, to set out a process whereby demand is monitored and conversion of spaces is undertaken as required over time. It is also noted that due to the distance and the unsuitability of the route from the car park to the various buildings, the site management team will provide a personal transport service by using electric buggies. While this is not ideal it arises from security issues at the site, and is a matter which would also be covered in the CPMP.
- 7.5.4 SCC guidelines requires 20% fast charge socket provision and 20% passive provision. The submission states electric vehicle charging will be provided for 68 for staff and three visitor spaces, a total of 71 car parking spaces (13% of the total), plus passive provision for an additional 15 spaces (3% of total). The application was submitted at the time the previous, now superseded guidance was in force, which required 10% active and 10% passive provision. Given this, the proposed 13% active provision and 3% passive provision is accepted, particularly as it is a significant improvement over the existing situation where no electric car charging facilities are present. A condition is proposed to secure the specified provision. The aforementioned Car Park Management Plan should address future additional provision to meet demand.
- 7.5.5 Existing cycle parking of 30 cycle spaces is provided in a structure located close to the gatehouse. This facility will be enlarged to accommodate an additional 54 spaces – 84 cycle parking spaces in total. Six additional spaces for visitors would be provided in the car park. A condition is proposed to secure the quantum and details of the storage facility. A condition is proposed to secure the specified provision. Subject to this cycle parking provision is considered acceptable.
- 7.5.6 Existing servicing arrangements for the site will generally be retained for deliveries, loading and waste management. Approximately 43 servicing and delivery trips are forecast per day. While some reconfiguration of internal access roads and service areas is proposed, the TA swept path analysis demonstrates that the largest vehicles expected to access the site would suitably and safely accommodated.

7.5.7 In response to the CHA request for a condition to secure a Construction Management Plan (CTMP), the applicant subsequently submitted a CMTP. This has been reviewed by the CHA who are satisfied with that it addresses their concerns. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted CTMP is therefore proposed.

7.5.8 The proposed development is considered acceptable in transport and parking terms, and complies with the requirements of Policy DM11 of the CSDMP 2012 and the NPPF.

7.6 Biodiversity and trees

7.6.1 Paragraph 174 of the NPPF requires that decisions contribute to and enhance the natural environment including by providing net gains for biodiversity. Paragraph 131 of the NPPF emphasises the important contribution of trees to the character and quality of environments and promotes tree retention and new tree planting as part of developments. Policy CP14A seeks to conserve and enhance biodiversity and requires that new development will, where appropriate, contribute to the protection, management and enhancement of biodiversity. Policy DM9 sets out that development will be acceptable where it protects trees and other vegetation worthy of retention and provides high quality landscaping. The Environment Act received Royal Assent on 9 November 2021. This requires 10% biodiversity net gain for development proposals, albeit secondary legislation is required and this will not be a mandatory requirement for circa 2 years.

7.6.2 The application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report and Biodiversity Metric 3 (July 2021) assessment. Biodiversity Metric 3 is a means of assessing changes in biodiversity value brought about by development. The applicant has assessed the scheme against this and an 8.5% increase in biodiversity value is calculated. Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) state that while this is short of the 10% target, it does provide evidence that the proposed development provides a measurable net gain, in line with NPPF guidance. SWT have however expressed some concern with apparent loss of Traditional Orchard, a Habitat of Principal Importance, and would prefer to see like-for-like replacement of this habitat. SWT also note apparent net losses in neutral grassland and modified grassland habitats, and in terms of potential impact on reptiles require further information on whether there is habitat connection between Lower Meadow and Upper Meadow. On this basis SWT request an updated Biodiversity Net Gain assessment and an updated Ecological and Environmental Management Plan (EEMP). A condition is proposed to secure these documents prior to commencement of landscaping works.

7.6.3 As works would take place within 30m of a badger sett, the EEMP should also be updated to include specific detail on the mitigation provided for badgers. Given the potential impact on badgers, SWT also request that three months prior to the start of development works, a survey of the main sett and site by an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist should be undertaken, and that the results of this survey should be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the start of the development works. Given the potential impact of works in close proximity to the sett, a pre-commencement condition is therefore required to secure appropriate assessment and mitigation. A condition is proposed.

7.6.4 A landscaping scheme and a Landscape Management Plan have been submitted and reviewed by the Arboricultural Officer (AO). The AO considers that the proposed planting is acceptable in the main, but queries use of some species on the basis of potential invasive consequences; suggests inclusion of species more adapted to future climate change; and proposes a greater mix of trees which provide seasonal colour and future proofing such as Quercus species. There are a few trees of average to low quality around the proposed site of construction, but their loss will not adversely affect the development and can be replaced with good quality landscaping post development along the front aspect of the new building, and the landscaping in the main part of the grounds incorporating raised areas is also generally acceptable. The AO considers the proposal to be acceptable subject to conditions, to require a detailed landscaping scheme, and to require a woodland management plan to

control and remove any invasive species currently within the existing woodland and ensure management of the woodland as part of efforts to improve the overall biodiversity of the site.

- 7.6.5 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of biodiversity and trees, and considered to comply with policies CP14A and DM9 of the CSDMP 2012 and guidance in the NPPF, subject to the specified conditions.

7.7 Other matters

Heritage and archaeology:

- 7.7.1 Policy DM17 of the CSDMP 2012 DM17 requires assessment of possible archaeological significance, including on development sites of 0.4ha or greater outside of Areas of High Archaeological Potential. Chapter 16 of the NPPF highlights the importance of conserving heritage assets according to their significance.
- 7.7.2 The property is not listed and is not a listed Park or Garden. The Manor House at the south west edge of the campus is an attractive building dating from c1810, surrounded by elements of historic gardens and parkland with mature ornamental trees, including a giant Cedar and traditional orchard, forming an attractive and historically interesting landscape setting. The building is not locally listed at present, but is considered of heritage value. The development would retain the Manor House with no demolition proposed, with minor façade works comprising the introduction of new picture windows and French doors, and the provision of an extended terrace at its south west elevation to provide an attractive break out space with an aspect over the grounds and towards the large, imposing Cedar tree. No objections are raised from a heritage point of view to the proposed works to the Manor House and surrounding grounds.
- 7.7.3 In terms of archaeology, a desk-based archaeological assessment accompanied the application which has been reviewed by SCC Archaeology. SCC recommend that further archaeological evaluation is needed and that a Written Scheme of Investigation (Method Statement) needs to be reviewed and approved before work commences. As it stands, without a submitted proposed scheme of work to approve, a standard pre-commencement condition is required. The applicant is seeking to address this matter and an update will be provided at committee, if required.
- 7.7.4 Subject to appropriate condition, the proposal would therefore comply with Policy DM17 of the CSDMP 2021 and the NPPF.

Energy and Sustainability:

- 7.7.5 Policy CP2 of the CSDMP 2012 requires development to contribute to a reduction in the Borough's carbon dioxide emissions and to include capacity for decentralised and low carbon energy. Policy DM7, Facilitating Zero Carbon Development, requires that all non-residential development will be expected to achieve a BREEAM 'very good' emissions rating. The application is accompanied by a Sustainability and Energy Statement which sets out that the scheme has been assessed as achieving BREEAM very good. The overall score targeted is 63.67% which is sufficient to achieve a Very Good rating with a reasonable margin for flexibility in the development of the design and between the individual assessments. A number of additional credits, worth a total of 22.46% have been identified as further potential uplifts, however this is to be reviewed as the design stage develops. The proposal is therefore compliant with Policy DM7 in achieving a BREEAM Very Good emissions rating.
- 7.7.6 The submission includes use of heat pumps at the Collaboration Hub but the applicant has indicated that additional photovoltaics (PVs) are not practical or feasible due to the extent of plant on the roofs of the buildings. There are however some existing PV on the buildings' roofs which would be retained and used to generate electricity for the site. The applicant

notes that there is no existing district heat or cool networks available in the vicinity to connect to, but states that the site has an existing cooling network with shared central plant benefits. While district heating/ cooling infrastructure is not feasible at the moment, the central plant is to be refurbished and the intention is that it will accommodate a future connection to a district heating / cooling system when this is available.

- 7.7.7 A total of 71 car parking spaces (13% of the total), plus passive provision for an additional 15 spaces (3% of total) is proposed, which is a significant improvement over the existing situation where no electric car charging facilities are present. An increase of 60 cycle parking spaces is proposed, to provide a total of 90 spaces, which is welcomed. Conditions are proposed to secure the EV and cycle space provision. A Car Park Management Plan would also be secured by condition to ensure additional EV charging points are provided over time as demand increases. A Travel Plan is also to be secured by condition to ensure that opportunities are taken to reduce reliance on private car journeys over time where feasible.
- 7.7.8 The proposal includes a central new build element but largely involves refurbishment and re-use of existing, vacant buildings, and as such constitutes an efficient and sustainable use of the site. Overall, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of energy infrastructure requirements and is considered to generally comply with policies CP2 and DM7 of the CSDMP 2012.

Flooding, drainage and environmental health:

- 7.7.9 The site is situated within Zone 1, the zone at least flood risk. NPPF paragraphs 167 and 169 expect that development will include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in order to reduce the volume and rate of surface water run-off. Policy DM10 of the CSDMP 2012 requires appropriately designed sustainable drainage management systems. A Drainage Strategy report accompanied the application which was reviewed by SCC as the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA). Further information was sought and a supplementary drainage statement submitted. The LLFA reviewed this and now confirm that the proposed drainage scheme is acceptable subject to conditions to ensure that the SuDS Scheme is properly implemented and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development. The requested conditions are imposed. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of flooding and drainage and complies with the requirements of policy DM10 of the CSDMP 2012 and relevant guidance in the NPPF.
- 7.7.10 The Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that potential contamination issues on the site have been addressed by the reports submitted and no further conditions are required. Acoustic and air quality assessments also accompanied the application. These are found to be acceptable by the EHO. Although the applicant indicated a lighting strategy was to be submitted, this was not received and a condition is proposed to secure a lighting scheme. This is necessary to protect wildlife at the site, prevent light pollution and ensure a high quality of development.

Residential amenity:

- 7.7.11 The site is isolated from nearby residential properties with the closest dwellings being those some distance to the south across London Road. It is not considered the proposal would adversely affect the living conditions of people in the area. The proposal would therefore comply with CSDMP Policy DM9.

Planning Obligations:

- 7.7.12 The applicant states that no obligations are required because the proposal would support the continued use of the site for Class E(g) employment purposes and would involve no change of use class. The number of employees on-site at any given time would not exceed the previous occupation. As such, there would be no material intensification of the site's use and no new or upgraded infrastructure would be required to support the application scheme. For this reasoning, in the officer's opinion requiring obligations would not meet the NPPF tests

i.e. an obligation must be: Necessary to make the development acceptable; Directly related to the development; and, Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Additionally, this development is not CIL liable.

8.0 POSITIVE/PROACTIVE WORKING AND PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

- 8.1 In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive, creative and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF. This included 1 or more of the following:-
- a) Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development.
 - b) Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered.
 - c) Have suggested/accepted/negotiated amendments to the scheme to resolve identified problems with the proposal and to seek to foster sustainable development.
 - d) Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.
- 8.2 Under the Equalities Act 2010, the Council must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation of persons by reason of age, disability, pregnancy, race, religion, sex and sexual orientation. This planning application has been processed and assessed with due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty. The proposal is not considered to conflict with this Duty.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposal represents sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF. It would principally meet an economic role by supporting UCB and their investment in the Government's Life Sciences in the UK. It would also make efficient use of a currently vacant site. The occupation and expansion by this global pharmaceutical company would bring significant benefits to the local and regional economy and is consistent with national policy to support economic growth and innovation. The proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, is a high-quality design and cause no harm to the highway, amenities, biodiversity or the environment. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

GRANT, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent an accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions and in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The proposed development shall be built in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

Drawings:

90001 LOCATION PLAN - EXISTING

90002 SITE WIDE MASTERPLAN - EXISTING

90003 SITE WIDE MASTERPLAN - PROPOSED

90011 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - LOWER GROUND FLOOR - EXISTING

90012 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - GROUND FLOOR - EXISTING
90013 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - ROOF LEVEL - EXISTING
90021 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - LOWER GROUND FLOOR - DEMOLITION
90022 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - GROUND FLOOR - DEMOLITION
90023 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - ROOF LEVEL - DEMOLITION
90031 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - LOWER GROUND FLOOR - PROPOSED
90032 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - GROUND FLOOR - PROPOSED
90033 BUILDING ABCD - PLAN - ROOF FLOOR - PROPOSED
90041 BUILDING ABCD - SECT - EXISTING 1
90042 BUILDING ABCD - SECT - EXISTING 2
90043 BUILDING ABCD - SECT - PROPOSED 1
90044 BUILDING ABCD - SECT - PROPOSED 2

01-ALTERATIONS

91001 BUILDING A - ELEV - SOUTH WEST - EXISTING & PROPOSED
91002 BUILDING A - ELEV - NORTH WEST - EXISTING & PROPOSED
91011 BUILDING B - ELEV - NORTH WEST - EXISTING & PROPOSED
91012 BUILDING B - ELEV - SOUTH EAST - EXISTING & PROPOSED
91021 BUILDING C - ELEV - SOUTH WEST & SOUTH EAST - EXISTING &
PROPOSED
91022 BUILDING C - ELEV - NORTH EAST - EXISTING & PROPOSED
91031 BUILDING D - ELEV - NORTH WEST & NORTH EAST - EXISTING &
PROPOSED
91032 BUILDING D - ELEV - SOUTH WEST & SOUTH EAST - EXISTING &
PROPOSED

02-COLLABORATION HUB

92001 BUILDING H - PLAN - LOWER GROUND FLOOR - PROPOSED
92002 BUILDING H - PLAN - GROUND FLOOR - PROPOSED
92003 BUILDING H - PLAN - UPPER GROUND FLOOR - PROPOSED
92004 BUILDING H - PLAN - ROOF LEVEL - PROPOSED
92011 BUILDING H - ELEV - EAST & WEST - PROPOSED
92012 BUILDING H - ELEV - NORTH & SOUTH - PROPOSED

03-MANOR HOUSE

95001 BUILDING E - PLAN - LOWER GROUND FLOOR - EXISTING
95002 BUILDING E - PLAN - GROUND FLOOR - EXISTING
95003 BUILDING E - PLAN - FIRST FLOOR - EXISTING
95004 BUILDING E - PLAN - ROOF - EXISTING
95111 BUILDING E - PLAN - LOWER GROUND FLOOR - PROPOSED
95112 BUILDING E - PLAN - GROUND FLOOR - PROPOSED
95113 BUILDING E - PLAN - FIRST FLOOR - PROPOSED
95114 BUILDING E - PLAN - ROOF - PROPOSED
95301 BUILDING E - ELEV - EXISTING
95311 BUILDING E - ELEV - PROPOSED

Documents:

Landscape Management Plan, Emily Irlam Studio, 24 November 2021
Sustainability and Energy Assessment, ARUP, 09 December 2021 -
APL-ARP-ZZ-ZZ-RP-J-74001
Transport Statement, ARUP, 8 October 2021
Badger Survey, ARUP, 01 October 2021
Combined Phase 1 and 11 Geo-Environmental Assessment and Detailed Quantitative
Risk Assessment Version 04, CBRE, 18 September 2020
Preliminary Ecological Assessment, ARUP, 01 October 2021
Design, Access and Landscape Statement, Heatherwick Studios/Veretec/Erlam
Studios, October 2021
Drainage Strategy, AKT II, October 2021
Drainage Strategy addendum, AKT II, December 2021
Bat Report, ARUP. 01 October 2021
Acoustic Planning Statement, ARUP, 7 October 2021
Air Quality assessment, ARUP, 08 October 2021
Archaeology Desk-Based assessment, Savills, December 2021

Ecological and Environmental Management Plan, ARUP, 26 November 2021
Biodiversity Net gain assessment Report, ARUP, 01 October 2021
Utilities Statement, ARUP, 8 October 2021
Construction Transport Management Plan, Rev00, December 2021
Outline Construction Management Plan, Rev01, 01 December 2021

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning

3. Prior to construction, alteration and extension of each building details and samples of materials to be used for the external surfaces of that building shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. In respect of the Manor House these details shall include detailed drawings at 1:100 and 1:20 and shall include details of treatment of the north elevation and terrace base. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality of construction and appearance and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

4. Prior to commencement of landscaping works a revised Biodiversity Net Gain assessment and a revised Ecological and Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved documents.

Reason: To ensure protection and enhancement of the ecological value of the site and to comply with policy CP14 A of the CSDMP 2012.

5. Three months prior to the start of development works, a survey of the main badger sett by an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist shall be undertaken. The results of this survey shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the start of the development works and demolition and construction works shall be undertaken in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure protection and enhancement of the ecological value of the site and to comply with policy CP14 A of the CSDMP 2012.

6. The development hereby permitted shall not commence, other than site clearance and demolition works. until details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority. The design must satisfy the SuDS Hierarchy and be compliant with the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS, NPPF and Ministerial Statement on SuDS. The required drainage details shall include:
 - a) The results of infiltration testing completed in accordance with BRE Digest: 365 and confirmation of groundwater levels.
 - b) Details of drainage management responsibilities and maintenance regimes for the drainage system, including details of maintenance to watercourse outfalls.
 - c) Details of how the drainage system will be protected during construction and how runoff (including any pollutants) from the development site will be managed before the drainage system is operational.

Reason: To ensure the design meets the national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the final drainage design does not increase flood risk on or off site and to comply with policy DM10 of the CSDMP 2012.

7. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations), provide the details of any management company and state the national grid reference of any key

drainage elements (surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls), and confirm any defects have been rectified.

Reason: To ensure the Drainage System is constructed to the National Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and to comply with policy DM10 of the CSDMP 2012.

8. No development shall commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: to ensure full assessment of the potential archaeological value of the site and to comply with policy DM17 of the CSDMP 2012.

9. Prior to the occupation of the development, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Plan shall be implemented in full for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To maximise use of sustainable modes of transport and to minimise the impacts of the development on the highway to comply with policies DM11 and DM7 of the CSDMP 2012.

10. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted 71 active and 15 passive rapid charging electric vehicle charging points shall be provided at the site. These spaces shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and to comply with policy DM7 of the CSDMP 2012.

11. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved 90 cycle parking spaces shall be provided, including 6 visitor spaces as shown on the submitted plans. Prior to occupation full detail of the location and design of a covered and secure cycle storage structure shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority to accommodate 84 employee cycle parking spaces. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and the cycle parking shall be available for use prior to occupation of the development, and shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To promote sustainable modes of travel and in the interests of visual amenity, and to comply with policies DM11 and DM7 of the CSDMP 2012.

12. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted 8 disabled persons parking spaces shall be provided at the site. These spaces shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of accessibility and to comply with policies DM11 and DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

13. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the submitted Construction Management Plan Rev00 December 2021.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and amenity and to comply with policy DM11 of the CSDMP 2012.

14. Prior to occupation of the development a Car Park Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Car Park Management Plan shall include details of how future demand and management relating to electric vehicle and disabled persons parking will be addressed. The development shall be operated in accordance with the approved Plan for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision of electric vehicle charging points and disabled parking provision across the lifetime of the development and to comply with policy DM11 of the CSDMP 2012.

15. No development shall commence other than demolition works until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) in accordance with BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the protective fencing is erected as required by the AMS/TPP.

The AMS and TPP shall include full details of the following:

- a) Timing and phasing of Arboricultural works in relation to the approved development.
- b) Detailed tree felling and pruning specification in accordance with BS3998:2010 Recommendations for Tree Works.
- c) Details of a tree protection scheme in accordance with BS5837:2012: which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent to the site which are shown to be retained on the approved plan and trees which are the subject of any Tree Preservation Order. A specification for protective fencing during both demolition and construction phases and a plan indicating the alignment of the protective fencing. Details to include a specification for ground protection within Root Protection Areas (RPA's).
- d) Details of any construction and demolition works required within the root protection area as defined by BS5837:2012 or otherwise protected in the approved Tree Protection Scheme.
- e) Details of the location of any underground services and methods of installation which make provision for protection and the long-term retention of the trees. No services shall be dug or laid into the ground other than in accordance with the approved details.
- f) Detailed levels and cross-sectional diagrams to show the construction of any roads, parking areas and driveways within Root Protection Areas as proposed, where the installation is to be constructed using a no-dig specification, demonstrating that they can be accommodated where they meet with any adjacent building damp proof courses and adjacent surfaces.
- g) Details of any changes in ground level, including existing and proposed spot levels required within the root protection area as defined by BS5837:2012 or otherwise protected in the approved Tree Protection Scheme.
- h) Details of the arrangements for the implementation, supervision, monitoring and reporting of works required to comply with the arboricultural method statement.
- i) Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
- j) No development or other operations shall take place except in complete accordance with the approved tree protection scheme and Arboricultural Method Statement.

Reason: To protect trees which contribute to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

16. No trees, shrubs or hedges within the site which are shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be felled, uprooted, wilfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees, shrubs or hedges removed without such consent, or which die or become severely damaged or seriously diseased with five years from the completion of the development or from the date of the occupation of the building hereby permitted shall be replaced with trees, shrubs or hedge plants of similar size and species and shall be planted in the immediate vicinity unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the continued wellbeing of the trees in the interests of the amenity and environmental quality of the locality and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

17. Prior to completion or first occupation of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner, full details of both hard and soft landscape works, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved within the first planting season (September - April) after completion or first occupation of the development, whichever is sooner and retained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

Details shall include:

- A. A scaled plan showing all existing vegetation and landscape features to be retained and trees and plants to be planted.
- B. Proposed hard standing and boundary treatment including, type, dimensions and means of installation:
- C. Location, type and materials to be used for hard landscaping including specifications, where applicable for:
 - a) Permeable paving
 - b) Tree pit design
 - c) Underground modular systems
 - d) Sustainable urban drainage integration (where applicable)
 - e) Use within tree Root Protection Areas (RPAs);
- D. a detailed written soft landscape specification detailing the quantity, density, size, species, position and the proposed time or program of planting of all trees, shrubs, plants, hedges, and grasses etc. and sufficient specification to ensure successful establishment and survival of new planting, including a landscape management plan and a comprehensive watering program, covering maintenance schedules for a minimum period of 5 years.
- E. Specifications for operations associated with plant establishment and maintenance that are compliant with best practise.

If within a period of five years from the date of planting of any tree or shrub shown on the approved landscaping plan, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the immediate vicinity, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation

Reason: To ensure a form of development that maintains, and contributes positively to, the character and appearance of the area and to comply with policy DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

18. Prior to completion or first occupation of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner; a woodland management plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The management plan should be prepared by a qualified and experienced forestry or arboricultural consultant and should include the following elements:

- a) A statement of the overall design vision for the woodland and for individual trees retained as part of the development
- b) Type and frequency of management operations to achieve and sustain canopy, understorey and ground cover, to remove invasive species and to provide reinstatement including planting where tree loss occurs.
- c) Frequency of safety inspections, which should be at least three yearly in areas of high risk, less often in lower risk areas
- d) Confirmation that the tree pruning work is carried out by suitably qualified and insured tree contractors to British Standard 3998 (2010).
- e) Special measures relating to Protected Species or habitats, e.g. intensive operations to avoid March -June nesting season or flowering period.
- f) Inspection for pests, vermin and diseases and proposed remedial measures.
- g) Recommendations relating to how trees within the immediate vicinity of properties or within private areas are to be protected, such that these are retained without the loss of their canopy or value as habitat.
- h) Confirmation of cyclical management plan assessments and revisions to evaluate the plan's success and identification of any proposed actions.

Reason: Required to ensure that woodland areas are satisfactorily safeguarded, managed and maintained in the long term /in perpetuity in the interest of nature conservation and the visual amenity of the area and to accord with policies DM9, CP14A and the NPPF.

19. Prior to commencement of development a lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details and retained as such for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: to protect biodiversity and to ensure a high quality of development and to comply with policies CP14A and DM9 of the CSDMP 2012.

Informative(s)

1. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water with regard to waste water, surface water and trade effluent infrastructure requirements.
2. The developer is advised that as part of the detailed design of the highway works required by the above condition(s), the County Highway Authority may require necessary accommodation works to street lights, road signs, road markings, highway drainage, surface covers, street trees, highway verges, highway surfaces, surface edge restraints and any other street furniture/equipment.
3. The developer is reminded that it is an offence to allow materials to be carried from the site and deposited on or damage the highway from uncleaned wheels or badly loaded vehicles. The Highway Authority will seek, wherever possible, to recover any expenses incurred in clearing, cleaning or repairing highway surfaces and prosecutes persistent offenders. (Highways Act 1980 Sections 131, 148, 149).
4. Section 59 of the Highways Act permits the Highway Authority to charge developers for damage caused by excessive weight and movements of vehicles to and from a site. The Highway Authority will pass on the cost of any excess repairs compared to normal maintenance costs to the applicant/organisation responsible for the damage.

5. The developer would be expected to agree a programme of implementation of all necessary statutory utility works associated with the development, including liaison between Surrey County Council Streetworks Team, the relevant Utility Companies and the Developer to ensure that where possible the works take the route of least disruption and occurs at least disruptive times to highway users.
6. The permission hereby granted shall not be construed as authority to carry out any works on the highway or any works that may affect a drainage channel/culvert or water course. The applicant is advised that a permit and, potentially, a Section 278 agreement must be obtained from the Highway Authority before any works are carried out on any footway, footpath, carriageway, verge or other land forming part of the highway. All works on the highway will require a permit and an application will need to be submitted to the County Council's Street Works Team up to 3 months in advance of the intended start date, depending on the scale of the works proposed and the classification of the road. Please see <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-permits-and-licences/the-traffic-management-permit-scheme> The applicant is also advised that Consent may be required under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Please see www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/emergency-planning-and-community-safety/flooding-advice
7. Notwithstanding any permission granted under the Planning Acts, no signs, devices or other apparatus may be erected within the limits of the highway without the express approval of the Highway Authority. It is not the policy of the Highway Authority to approve the erection of signs or other devices of a non-statutory nature within the limits of the highway.
8. It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the electricity supply is sufficient to meet future demands and that power balancing technology is in place if required. Installation must be carried out in accordance with the IET Code of Practice for Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment.
9. If the proposed site works affect an Ordinary Watercourse, Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority should be contacted to obtain prior written consent. If proposed works result in infiltration of surface water to ground within a Source Protection Zone the environment Agency will require proof of surface water treatment to achieve water quality standards. If there are any further queries, please contact the Flood Risk Asset, Planning and Programming team via suds@surreycc.gov.uk