

# Public Document Pack



**WOKINGHAM  
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Civic Offices  
Shute End  
Wokingham  
RG40 1BN

E-mail: [democratic.services@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@wokingham.gov.uk)

To:- All Committee Members

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 2024**

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the next Wednesday, 14th February, 2024 meeting of the Planning Committee, the following reports that were marked as 'to follow' on the agenda sent out recently.

<b>Agenda No</b>	<b>Item</b>
------------------	-------------

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 63. | <b><u>Minutes of Previous Meeting (Pages 3 - 16)</u></b> |
|-----|--|

To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 January 2024

Yours sincerely

Susan Parsonage  
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

## SUPPLEMENTARY UPDATE AGENDA Planning Committee – 14 FEB 2024

### Planning Applications

**Agenda Item: 66**

**Site Address: 19-21 Market Place, Wokingham, RG40 1AP**

**Application No: 230881**

**Pages: 17-89**

**Omission:** representations from Wokingham Town Council and ward members, mentioned as being appended to the report are attached here.

**Clarification:** the summary of the consultation response from the council's Estates team (page 21) mentions that part of the application site is owned by the council. This is referring to the site access, through the Cockpit Path Car Park, which must be included in the application site boundary in order to achieve access to the adopted highway. No development is proposed on the council owned land.

#### Wokingham Town Council Comments:

PLANNING REF : 230881  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 11 Howard Road  
: Wokingham, Berkshire  
: RG40 2BX  
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Jane Ainslie  
DATE SUBMITTED : 12/12/2023  
COMMENTS:

I would refer the planning team to my previous comments - whilst amendments have been made to access through Howard Road all my previous objections remain.

In particular I am concerned that there is no affordable housing included in the plans.

PLANNING REF : 230881  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : 11 Howard Road  
: Wokingham, Berkshire  
: RG40 2BX  
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Jane Ainslie  
DATE SUBMITTED : 10/05/2023  
COMMENTS:

I am writing to raise the following objections:

#### 1. Safety

a. Howard Road is a single lane, Victorian Road with minimal pavement and limited parking - no consideration has been given to the vulnerability of young children and the elderly (Sale Garden cottages) on shared space - of Howard Road doesn't have a pavement and there is a pedestrian walkway at the top of Howard Road that is heavily utilised especially at school pick up and drop off (171 89 adults and 82 children a.m. and 131 60 adults and 71 children p.m. in latest survey)

- b. Survey of Howard Road residents suggests an average of 3 deliveries per property per week. The likely demographic of flat owners using online retailers/eating apps suggests the developer estimate of an additional 6-8 deliveries per week to be a vast underestimate. The additional traffic on Howard Road increases safety concerns.
- c. Assumption that vans requiring a longer dwelling time will park within the nearby parking spaces throughout the town centre - in reality this is likely to be Cockpit car park- pedestrian access through this car park is already difficult and potentially unsafe as the pavement is often blocked by parked vans.
- d. Ambulance access could be affected by increase in commercial vans at the top of the road - there are frequent call outs to Sale Garden Cottages.
- e. Risk of increased damage to resident walls and fences in Howard Road due to increased number of commercial vehicles - 1 neighbour has had her wall damaged 3 times in 5 years and another neighbour suffering at least annual damage to his fence.
- f. Construction traffic -
  - i. assumption that Denton Road will be used as an access road doesn't take into account the 2 blind spots.
  - ii. Alternative via Denmark Street not possible due to width citions on Langborough/Murdoch Road
- 2. Utilities impact - Howard Road's main sewer runs down the right-hand side of the road and undulation is visible where it runs - increased traffic will increase the deterioration of the road.
- 3. Lack of affordable housing
- 4. 4 storey building is imposing and will overlook both Sale Garden Cottages and lower end of Howard Road.
- 5. Impact on community garden and the wildlife it is designed to attract given the proposed huge building and extra traffic and pedestrians.
- 6. Parking
  - a. Insufficient parking at 0.6 per dwelling means an increase of on street parking around the local area.
  - b. Assumption that 19-21 Marketplace residents will have access to Howard Road permit places - these should be 24/7 available to Howard Road
  - c. Change to parking spaces will:
    - i. Compromise access to the 2 Green BT boxes
    - ii. Overwrite the space reserved for emergency vehicles by Sale Garden Cottages.
  - d. Poor provision for disability parking.
  - e. The proposal for a car club is innovative but where is there evidence that this has been successful in other developments.
  - f. Deliveries to the commercial premises - will no longer have rear access so will cause delays in town by parking.
  - g. Insufficient electric charging points.

7. Lack of community consultation at pre-planning stage.

8. Likelihood of anti-social behaviour in Denmark Place.

9. Reduction in commercial space.

a. Loss of Robert Dyas - a well-used commercial premises

b. Loss of Lloyds bank and the impact this has on both residents and business owners.

10. Infrastructure to support the new residents e.g., Wokingham Medical Centre already struggles.

PLANNING REF : 230881

PROPERTY ADDRESS : maria.gee@wokingham.gov.uk

:

:

SUBMITTED BY : Councillor Maria Gee

DATE SUBMITTED : 08/05/2023

COMMENTS:

General comment

The back lot behind the current 19/21 Market Place is unloved car parking in need of a complete redesign. I therefore welcome a more attractive use of this space; the proposal generally shows a lot of promise in this regard, and I would like to see it come back again with the objections by the town council, the advice of Borough Council planning officers, and objections by residents and local councillors taken into account.

External design

Generally

speaking, I like the building design; others hold different views. I think it reflects the design used in Elms Field very well. I would have gone further and got rid of the modern pastiche façade in front of what is currently number 19 (what's the point in keeping a fake?). I also think that the replacement of the newer red brick buildings makes Market Place more coherent.

As I mentioned in the

consultation, 21 Market Place appears to be an appropriate height to fit in with the roof lines toward Market Place. 19/20 Market Place, however, dwarfs the building at 2 Denmark Street.

I note the concerns of residents in Swift House regarding reduced access to light from the proposed building and ask that the planning committee consider this very carefully.

I welcome more outside squares; Peach Place has been very successful.

Internal design

During the consultation I said I would reserve my right to comment on the space standards in the individual apartments. These are my comments:

There is no plan for

floor 2 included (MPW AI ZZ 02 DR A 00 102 P9 GA Plan - Level 02 is missing as far as I can see).

Most of the apartments are spacious (at least by RIBA minimum space standards).

Some examples of apartments that do not appear to be well designed for comfortable living:

1 bed, 2 person apartments

b.01.01

51.9m<sup>2</sup> This is barely above minimum space standards and the kitchen, diner, living room has only one north east facing window and the kitchen will be very dark, especially as this is a floor with a balcony above the window.

b.03.01

51.9 m<sup>2</sup> This is barely above minimum space standards and the kitchen, diner, living room has only one north east facing window and the kitchen will be very dark.

2 bed, 3 person apartments

a.01.05

61.4 m<sup>2</sup> This is barely above minimum space standards and the kitchen, diner, living room has only one south east facing window and the kitchen will be dark, especially as this is a floor with a balcony above the window.

2 bed, 4 person apartments

b.01.05

70.7 m<sup>2</sup> This is barely above minimum space standards and the kitchen, diner, living room has only one south east facing window and the kitchen will be dark, especially as this is a floor with a balcony above the window (assumed as there is no floor 2 plan).

There may be others, but I leave it to professionals to spot all the issues and would like to see the floor plan for floor 2 included before the planning committee considers the proposal.

Affordable housing

There is no affordable housing provided in breach of Policy CP5 and Policy TB05. The town centre is an optimal place for the provision of affordable housing.

Parking

The outline

parking management plan refers to resident parking places available on Howard Road with a certain proprietary air, and it notes the restriction to residents is only operational from 8am to 8pm; I have checked, this is indeed the case. To protect current resident amenity a consultation for a change in the TRO should be carried out with residents of Howard Road to see if a 24-hour restriction is more appropriate (balancing the need for visitor parking against availability of spaces overnight can be tricky). The TRO should restrict resident parking permits to Howard Road residents only (not Howard Close).

I would like a condition attached to the development that residents of 19/21 Market Place will not be permitted to apply to use these car parking spaces as residents; they need to be kept as an amenity for Howard Road.

Parking and shared use along Howard Close

I welcome the additional link between Market Place and Cockpit Path and would like to see this work well and be safe for pedestrians.

The planning committee should note the presence of Sale Garden Cottages with many elderly and/or disabled residents. Proximity to the Cottages means that pedestrian safety is of paramount importance.

I am therefore baffled by the inclusion of the electric vehicle car parking spaces on Howard Close. When I mentioned this at the consultation, I believe that the explanation was that these spaces were required to meet WBC policy on parking; as this is a sustainable town centre location this constraint might usefully be reconsidered. The EV spaces should be accommodated within the site, and the additional space given over to a pedestrian only area on Howard Close, for safety reasons.

Re-siting the EV points would also result in a better amenity for those

apartments facing onto Howard Close, who otherwise have a car park one side and a drive in and drop off the other side for Howard Close.

I welcome the facilities for cyclists and non-motorised transport including cargo bikes. If we are to make our towns more pedestrian-friendly and reduce human effect on climate change, we need to change our expectations about car ownership and use. Furthermore, the ownership of cars is decreasing among younger members of society who would be attracted to this development - car ownership in the UK is highest among over 60s and lowest among under 30s - not having to have a car space if they don't need one may be an attractive proposition. Needless to say, car ownership is also lower among those on lower incomes (see need for affordable housing).

Drop off  
space

The drop off point for personal deliveries on Howard Close is at the furthest end toward Market Place. It should be sited (if at all) at the end closest to Cockpit Path car park to improve amenity for apartments facing on to Howard Close (I think this is far enough away from Howard Road for noise to be minimised, but I am prepared for residents to disagree with this view, they are closer to this development than I am).

I can attest to vehicles leaving engines running during drop offs throughout the town centre and I cannot see why that behaviour should change in this development. Traffic will no doubt also be generated along Howard Close by pick-ups that are not destined for 19/21 Market Place, for example pick up from town centre restaurants; protecting resident amenity at the outset is very important in any new proposal.

In any case, I question the use of a shared highway space for drop offs (e.g. Amazon, Ocado, Tesco, and so on). I would like to see a drop off point in Cockpit Path car park instead, purchased or leased from the Council. This is the most sensible area for drop offs and pick-ups, especially given my point below about use of Howard Road for personal deliveries.

Provision for disabled parking

I am not happy with the proposed arrangements for disabled car parking spaces (none provided unless required). This is a barrier for disabled people to purchase an apartment in an otherwise very accessible location. It is also a barrier for disabled visitors to the apartments. Redevelopment at The Forge included disabled parking and this proposal should too.

Using Howard Close as the  
delivery route for personal deliveries

I have concerns about

deliveries to apartments using Howard Road; this road is a shared vehicle/pedestrian space as it has no pavements for most of its length. The new traffic using Howard Road has been estimated - this is challengeable; it is likely, in my opinion, that Howard Road/Close will be used for pick-ups not related to the apartments. Many delivery drivers currently use, for example, the cut through between the former M&Co and Subway. Howard Close is just as convenient.

The delivery and servicing plan 4.9.3 states that "these types of servicing trips have likely previously taken place at the existing commercial uses and therefore the marginal increase likely as a result of the proposed redevelopment will result in a negligible impact." This ignores that the routes taken by personal services is proposed along Howard Road.

The mitigations at 5.8.2 in the delivery and servicing plan are

largely just wishful thinking. More certain mitigation would be to use Cockpit Path car park for personal servicing deliveries.

Construction traffic

I have major concerns about the routes to and from the site.

Going to the site

From London Road traffic will approach down Peach Street, Easthampstead Road, Denton Road then crossing Sturges Road. The issue with Peach Street is the overhanging buildings which mean that lorries must pull out into the centre of the road before turning left into Easthampstead Road; this is very worrying for traffic flow and these historic buildings. Denton Road has two blind bends and room only for one way traffic along some of the road.

From Wiltshire Road traffic will turn onto Peach Street and then follow the above route. This has all the same problems plus a very tight turn near The Ship Inn. Traffic often has near misses here, and there is no safe pedestrian crossing at this corner.

Exiting from the site

The exit route is also via Denton Road; this is clearly not acceptable. Traffic coming both ways is unable to see to the end of the road in either direction; there are no suitable passing places for large vehicles.

Once on Denton Road, the route is via Peach Street, Broad Street then to Reading or back to London Road. I would suggest that the A329M is a better route to Reading without having lorries thundering through the town centre along Broad Street.

Alternative proposal

The alternative proposed access via Denmark Street cannot disrupt the amenity of the area, must take into account the effect on the historic town hall and Market Place, the effect on trade of the commercial premises, and pedestrian safety. The planning committee should note the presence of disabled car parking spaces and loading bays in this area, the narrow pavements on Denmark Street, and the very narrow width of Denmark Street.

The alternative proposed exit via Denmark Street is not possible because of the traffic width

restrictors on Langborough Road/Murdoch Road. Langborough Road in particular is completely unsuitable for construction traffic and Murdoch Road is in a sensitive conservation area.

Cockpit Path car park and construction traffic

Crossing Luckley Path and using the access and exit across Cockpit Path car park is a risk to pedestrian safety. Lorries will be in conflict with pedestrians trying to gain access to or leave their cars; drivers using payment machines; and pedestrians using both paths. Specifically, there is no pavement on Luckley Path and I have seen several near misses of pedestrians on Luckley Path/Sturges Road by vehicles exiting Cockpit Path Car Park at speed.

Construction hours

"In accordance with WBC, all works will be conducted between 08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday and on Saturdays between 08:00-13:00, with no noisy works taking place on Sundays and Public Holidays." This should read 'no works on Saturday afternoons, Sundays and Bank Holidays'.

Commercial space

I am very ambivalent about commercial space loss, in line with resident comments.

I

regret the loss of Robert Dyas and the bank; banking facilities are becoming few and far between in Wokingham Town and will affect traders and residents, as noted in the most recent edition of



Wokingham Today. Robert Dyas is very well used and I hope to see it relocate within Wokingham Town. Edinburgh Woollen Mill is used by many residents and they will feel its loss. However, I know that loss of individual traders is not a relevant planning consideration, although loss of commercial space overall is. However, some residents have noted some empty retail properties around town and have argued that the commercial space is not required. Taking these perspectives into account, somewhere in the middle is what is needed in my view; well considered retail space that will meet the needs of residents. The long spaces, with front windows only, that house EWM, Robert Dyas and Lloyds Bank make for quite gloomy retail spaces; it could be argued that shallower, and flexible, ground floor retail spaces are what the town needs.

Summary

The proposal has potential but there are too many objections for it to proceed in this form.

PLANNING REF : 230881

PROPERTY ADDRESS : Town Hall Market Place

: Wokingham

: RG40 1AS

SUBMITTED BY : The Wokingham Town Council P&T Committee

DATE SUBMITTED : 19/04/2023

COMMENTS:

The Committee thought that the height of the building was an issue as it was four storeys and not in keeping with character of area.

The other main issue was Inappropriate access through Howard Road as this has safety issues as a shared surface with pedestrians.

There are concerns that this will cause an impact on the Community Garden and residents of sale garden cottages.

There is no affordable housing in the development.

Therefore, the Committee object as follows;

CP1 - Sustainable development

10) attractive, safe, secure

CP3 - General Principles for development

a) Mass

b) functional, accessible, safe, secure

CP5 - Housing mix, density and affordability

CP6 - Managing Travel Demand f) Enhance road safety

**Agenda Item: 67**

**Site Address: 'The Evendons Centre', 171 Evendons Lane, Wokingham, RG40**

**Application No: 231351**

**Pages: 110-173**

**Access:**

Members requested clarity on the justification behind a new access at Blagrove Lane, combined with the stopping up of an access at Evendons Lane.

The location of the proposed access at Blagrove Lane was considered acceptable in Highway safety terms by WBC Highways and the Planning Inspector within APP/X0360/A/13/2198994 in 2013.

Further, as evidenced on Member site visit, the existing access is located circa 10 metres from the increase in speed limit from 30-60 miles per hour. Given access of the proposed C2 use is afforded from Blagrove Lane, which is further back from the junction and will feature a pedestrian crossing (traffic calming), this in Highway safety terms is more suitable for the proposed use.

Concerning the anticipated built form, whilst all matters bar access are reserved, the parameter plans suggested for approval show a well contained footprint, in the vast majority within the confines of previously developed land, which by its very nature poses notably less visual and amenity value than the greenfield site to the north. This prevents 'excessive' encroachment into the countryside as per Core Strategy Policy CP11.

Retaining the existing access would require notable widening to facilitate deliveries by reason of ensuring adequate swept paths and visibility splay provision (particularly for larger delivery vehicles). This would decrease valuable landscape provision (of which the magnitude of change will be higher) and would subsequently force development to move further north, encroaching into the countryside which the current land use parameters seek to avoid, addressing previous concerns on layout outlined by the Inspector within APP/X0360/A/13/2198994. Members should note that through proactive discussions between the LPA and applicant that WBC Trees and Landscape do not object to the application, and find the proposal complimentary to the site's landscape character subject to enhancement conditions.

As above, the proposed access allows the development to be relatively contained in land use terms, which will pose lesser character impacts upon the submission of a future reserved matters application (should the application be approved).

The stopping up of the existing access and replacement with an enhanced native hedgerow (as secured by planning condition) also provides an opportunity to benefit the countryside appearance of Evendons Lane.

**Revised Growth Strategy:**

The site was submitted under reference 5WK023 for C3 residential use however, the site was not put forward for Revised Growth Strategy consultation. To date, a C2 use has not been promoted on site, nor strategically considered by the Council within the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).

### **Future C3 Provision:**

Clarity is provided on any future C3 residential development that may come forward on site, utilising the outline permission for C2 Specialist Care.

C3 and C2 uses are materially different uses, and previously under appeal APP/X0360/A/13/2198994, a proposed C3 residential use on site has been dismissed principally on unsustainable development location and character reasons arising from excessive encroachment of built form. The provision of sustainability enhancements and shared travel solutions (minibus service secured via S106) combined with concentrated form outline that C2 use would be acceptable in this location, where C3 would not. Accordingly, via Condition 34, Officers have secured that the use recommended for approval is solely for Specialist Care (including Dementia Care).

With regard to the imposition of a condition on the outline permission restricting future C3 applications, this would fail the 6 tests established within the Planning Practice Guidance. Furthermore, as such condition is likely to prejudice any future applications that may come forward in this location, notwithstanding the fact that all applications should be considered on their own merits. As discussed above, condition 34 adequately secures that the use hereby recommended for approval will be retained for the life of the permission.

Whilst not strictly material to the consideration of the application, Members should note that there are no permitted development rights within the General Permitted Development Order (as amended) which permit a flexible C2/C3 use. The only permitted development right that exists for Class C2, is to Class T (state funded school).

### **Wokingham Town Council Comments:**

Wokingham Town Council responded to a consultation request on 07/02/2024 with the following:

PLANNING REF : 231351  
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Town Hall Market Place  
: Wokingham  
: RG40 1AS  
SUBMITTED BY : The Wokingham Town Council P&T Committee  
DATE SUBMITTED : 07/02/2024

COMMENTS:

The Committee still strongly object as follows

Although the Committee acknowledge the requirement for dementia care and affordable care homes in Wokingham this was not seen as the appropriate location and development.

There is concern that the minibus service will use Section 106 funding.

The Committee object as follows.

CP4 - Infrastructure requirements

The local Bus service is inadequate for both patients and staff.

Blagrove Lane is not adequate to take extra traffic and travelling along that road particularly for cyclists and pedestrians is hazardous.

There will also be extra deliveries to the care home which will put extra pressure on an already inadequate road.

CP6 - Manage Travel Demand

- a) sustainable forms of transport
- e) adverse effects on transport network

- f) Enhance road safety

CP11 - Proposals outside Development Limits (Including countryside)

This development is in a countryside area and was not included as a potential development site on the Local Plan.

These matters have been considered within the Officer's Committee Report, however, for the ease of doubt:

***Concern that the proposed minibus service will use S106 funding*** – This is secured by S106 and will be funded by the developer. Full details will be secured via a Framework Travel Plan.

***Inadequate Bus Service and Transport Infrastructure*** – Sustainability enhancements, for example the proposed minibus service and improved pedestrian permeability on and off-site will provide access to work/ care from sustainable transport models such as train stations, bus stops etc. This detail is to be secured via S106 within a Framework Travel Plan.

***Blagrove Lane Access Inadequate*** – Both Evendons Lane and Blagrove Lane are single track in places, and as proven by TRICS data, the C2 use proposed will result in a lesser trip generation to and from the site than the existing sui-generis uses.

***Deliveries*** – Details of deliveries including their intended route, safe manoeuvring and access to site have been secured by condition.

***Location Outside of Settlement Limits (CP11)*** – As detailed within the Officers Committee report, the proposal does not accord with the criteria within CP11, however does achieve its aims. The site is in the vast majority previously developed

land, host to significant development of low architectural quality. The proposed C2 care home would maintain and enhance the quality of the environment and do not encroach further into the countryside, mitigating settlement coalescence.

*Site not contained within the LPU* – Whilst growth can be successfully strategically designed, there is nothing to prevent organic and logical development applications outside of the realms of strategic planning to come forward.

### **Other Matters:**

Officers note that Bewley Homes (the applicant) prepared a Briefing Note which was shared to Members on 12/02/2024.

Page 119 of the Agenda, bullet point 4 states *“Notwithstanding, on balance, the minor incursion into greenfield land does outweigh the benefits the proposal presents.”* this should read *“Notwithstanding, on balance, the minor incursion into greenfield land does **not** outweigh the benefits the proposal presents.”*

### **Agenda Item: 68**

**Site Address: Land Adjacent to School Road, Hurst**

**Application No: 230074**

**Pages: 215 - 255**

### Planning Policy

The Planning Policy Team advise that the site is outside of settlement limits and therefore conflicts with the spatial strategy in the development plan. They however further advise that though there is a conflict in terms of its location outside development limits, development on this site would not fundamentally undermine the objectives of the development plan, notably in terms of its scale, and its relationship to the settlement. The last published HELAA (2021), assessed the site as ‘potentially suitable’, albeit not one which was included as a proposed allocation in the Revised Growth Strategy.

### School Places

The School Place Planning Manager has advised that children from the development will have priority through the normal main admissions round. Based on Department for Education data, the proposal would generate a need for 1.2 school primary school places for each year group. This level of need would have a *‘short term impact of “very little” and a long term impact of “negligible” ... ‘we have more than enough capacity in the north planning area to meet this need.’*

Whilst, the school serves the village, it also draws pupils from the surrounding area and there are places in Twyford at Colleton Primary School. There are 22 1<sup>st</sup> preference applications for the 20 places at the school, for September 2024. However, only 15 of these children live in Hurst Ward. Hurst ward itself has 23 children, 8 of

whom have 1<sup>st</sup> preference applications for other schools. The School Place Planning Manager has advised that the developer would pay CIL and this would be the route to create additional capacity, if that was appropriate in the future.

### Sustainable Location

In addition to the facilities set out on page 71, The Martineau Lane designated Open Space is approximately 100m from the middle of the site and the associated Play Area is 140m from the middle of the site. There are allotments on Tape Lane that are approximately 190m from the middle of the site – there is however no footpath along the southern section of Tape Lane. The list of facilities within an acceptable walkable distance on page 71 is therefore amended as follows:

- Martineau Lane Play Area 140m
- Allotments 190m
- St Nicholas CoE Primary School 250m
- St Nicholas PreSchool 180m
- Broadwater Lane Play Area and playing field 600m
- Hurst Post Office and Village Store 670m
- Hurst Village Hall 150m
- Scout Hut 200m
- Green Man Public House 875m
- Bakery 720m (limited open hours)
- Hurst Gospel Hall 1,200m (via School Road)

### Highways Information

The Committee Report refers to the following issues, which can be found in either the published original Transport Statement or the Transport Statement Addendum:

- Peak hour trip rates - Transport Statement
- On street parking survey - Transport Addendum
- Traffic counts - Transport Statement
- Visibility splays - Transport Statement Addendum
- Swept path - Transport Statement Addendum
- Principle of new accesses in relation with the Tape Lane Junction and Road Safety Audit - Transport Statement

In summary, the supporting information referred to in the Committee Report has been published and available to view by interested parties. Whilst the June Transport Statement with an accompanying Road Safety Audit (RSA) was not published, the RSA raises no new conclusions to those contained within the originally submitted RSA regarding the impact on School Road and makes no additional substantive observations or recommendations. Members of the public are welcome to view the June document and appendices upon request, but to confirm it was not published as it was superseded by the Transport Statement Addendum, the recommendation did not rely upon it, and nor would it be an approved document.

### Re-consultation.

A set of amended plans were consulted on which included removing the southern access onto Orchard Road, reducing the quantum of development to 23 units and changing the internal parameters of the development. All those that were consulted originally and all respondents were consulted. The consultation took place on 15.12.2023 and lasted 28 days and this is in excess of the normal period of 21 days for consultations.

### Public Rights of Way

WBC Public Rights of Way officer raises no objection. They have stated 'the indicative layout shows that the Right of Way across the east of the site will be maintained, although views across the field would be lost to the proposed houses. *The parameters show that the Right of Way will not be impacted and the access from School Road does not affect the Right of Way.*'

### **Agenda Item: 69**

**Site Address: Tob1, Earley Gate, University of Reading, Reading. RG6 6EQ**

**Application No: 232475**

**Pages: 319 - 344**

Additional condition to be added to the recommendations in Appendix 1 as set out below:

23. The development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out in accordance with the principles and recommendations of the following reports:

- Geotechnical and Geo environmental Factual & Interpretive Report ref: ECMWF-MAC-XX-XX-RP-G-000002, dated September 2023
- ECMWF, University of Reading, Air Quality Assessment ref: ECMWF-ATK-XX-XX-RP-Y-000000, dated 13<sup>th</sup> of June 2023
- European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF), Noise Statement for Planning, ref: ECMWF-BDP-XX-XX-RP-Y-000000, dated 29<sup>th</sup> of September 2023

*Reason: In the interests of site safety and residential amenity in accordance with policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.*

## **Pre-emptive site visits**

None

## **Non-Householder Appeal Decisions**

Non-Householder Appeal Decisions will be reported quarterly prior to the following meetings as part of the Supplementary Planning Agenda:

- January 2024
- April 2024
- July 2024