

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 DECEMBER 2023 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.50 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: David Cornish (Chair), Andrew Mickleburgh (Vice-Chair), Alistair Neal, Wayne Smith, Michael Firmager, Stuart Munro, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Tony Skuse and Bill Soane

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Rachel Bishop-Firth and Rebecca Margetts

Officers Present

Gordon Adam, Principal Highways Development Control Officer
Neil Allen, Legal Services
Brian Conlon, Operational Lead - Development Management
Connor Corrigan, Head of Strategic Development
Madeleine Shopland, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist

Case Officers Present

Mark Croucher
Benjamin Hindle
Christopher Howard
Marcus Watts

45. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

46. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 November 2023 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

It was noted that Roger Marshallsay's name had been misspelt in one instance.

47. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor David Cornish declared a Personal and Prejudicial Interest in Item 49 Application 236143 206 Nine Mile Ride, Finchampstead, on the grounds that he knew one of the speakers who would be speaking against the application. He indicated that he would withdraw from the meeting for this item, and that Councillor Mickleburgh would chair this item.

48. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

There were no items to be withdrawn or deferred.

49. APPLICATION NO 231643 206 NINE MILE RIDE, FINCHAMPSTEAD

(Councillor Cornish left the meeting for this item, which was chaired by Councillor Mickleburgh)

Proposal: Full application for the erection of a detached dwelling and outbuilding following demolition of the existing property

Applicant: Mr C Lucanu

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 13 to 52.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- An additional representation from 11 Avery Close.
- Clarification regarding the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Plan.
- A plan demonstrating the 45-degree test for loss of light.

All Members excepting Councillors Cornish and Skuse had attended a site visit.

Roger Marshallsay, Finchampstead Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He referred to the validity and status of the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan and commented that it could be seen as the most up-to-date planning policy for the area. He commented that he could not find reference in the report to the use of the Neighbourhood Development Plan by the Officer in making their recommendation, despite its specific policy around three-storey buildings. Finchampstead Parish Council had made reference to the Plan in their submission and had indicated that the application was contrary to elements of it. Roger Marshallsay felt that due process had not been applied and that the application should be refused.

Pauline Grainger, resident, spoke in objection to the application. She felt that a building of the proposed mass, scale and design would be incongruous with the surrounding area of Nine Mile Ride and would not enhance the street scene which consisted of brick built bungalows and chalet bungalows. She noted that the roof line was approximately 1.79m higher than the existing bungalow, which was higher than the adjacent and other surrounding properties. Pauline Grainger highlighted the potential loss of shrubs and trees along the common boundary of 204 and 206 Nine Mile Ride, which she believed would be detrimental to the street scene. The proposed three-storey building would sit alongside a neighbouring single-storey building and would impact on the light of its eastern elevation. She stated that despite the 45-degree light test, the height change from one storey to three storeys would take light from the ground floor windows on the east side. The dormer windows on the rear, because of the increasing height, would lead to a loss of privacy in her garden. In addition, Pauline Grainger emphasised that the application contravened policies D1 and D2 of the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan. She indicated that she was not against redevelopment of the site, but had not anticipated an application of the scale, mass, height, and design, proposed. She suggested that a significant reduction in the height, replacing dormer windows with roof lights and installing obscure glazing in side elevation windows would make the proposal more acceptable and more in line with CP3.

Councillor Rebecca Margetts, ward member, spoke in objection to the application. She highlighted that a single-storey bungalow would be replaced by a three-storey dwelling. The surrounding properties were a maximum of two storeys or were chalet style bungalows. She emphasised that D1 of the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan stated that building heights should reflect the character and appearance of the parish, which this proposal did not. It also stated that the development of three-storey housing would generally only be supported within the area of the Strategic Development Location. Policy D2 outlined the need for the preservation of the rural character of the parish. She was of the opinion that the application would not deliver enhancements to the landscape character. Policy D3 stated that although innovation and design was encouraged, this

needed to be sympathetic with, and complement existing styles. Councillor Margetts reemphasised that the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan had been adopted and was the most up-to-date planning policy for the Finchampstead area.

Councillor Neal queried why there was not a condition around obscured glazing on the western and eastern elevations on the second floor windows. Marcus Watts, case officer, commented that there was one side-facing window on each elevation of the first floor and both of these served ensuite bathrooms. As it was not considered a habitable room but a service room, there was more flexibility as to whether obscured glazing was required or not. Officers had considered obscuring the windows by condition to be unnecessary. The Operational Lead – Development Management added that it was indicated as being obscured on the elevational drawings.

In response to a question from Councillor Neal regarding policy D1 of the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan, the case officer indicated that the officer report referred to two policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst D1 was not explicitly referenced, its objectives were outlined and D2 was explicitly referred to. The policies had both been taken into consideration. A balance had been undertaken between these policies and those of Wokingham Borough Council, namely CP3 of the Core Strategy, which indicated that the bulk and scale needed to be appropriate. Whilst technically the proposal could be viewed as three storeys of development, because it visually appeared as a two and a half storey dwelling with the third within the roof, similar to other examples in the area, and the height being considered appropriate, on balance it had been considered acceptable. Whilst the proposal did not meet D1 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, this conflict had been balanced with the merits of the scheme and how it complied with other policies.

Councillor Smith commented that he was sympathetic to the Finchampstead community who had spent some time developing the Neighbourhood Development Plan, and the fact that the application did not meet several of the policies within this Plan. He felt that the Committee was being asked to balance between D1 of the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan and CP3 of the WBC Planning Policy.

Councillor Sheperd-Dubey commented that it looked to be a two-storey building from the plan. She questioned whether the Neighbourhood Development Plan would not permit the installation of dormer windows in a loft. The Operational Lead – Development Management clarified that the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan detailed that three-storey dwellings were only normally acceptable in specific designated areas. Applications had to be considered in accordance with the Development Plan unless there were material considerations which indicated otherwise. When weighing up, officers would consider whether any harm was sufficient to warrant recommending refusal, or not. In order for a recommendation for refusal to be given, where any harm lay, for example, bulk, mass, scale, and impact on the character of the area, had to be identified.

Councillor Skuse asked whether an application for a two-storey property to build a loft conversion would be considered unacceptable. The Operational Lead – Development Management indicated that it would be a question of the level of harm. There were flexibilities in the Plan to accommodate acceptable proposals but also to resist unacceptable proposals.

With regards to policy D2 of the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan, Councillor Mickleburgh questioned whether maintaining the separation of settlements

applied for the proposal. He was informed that this did not apply, and that, that part of the policy referred to clusters of houses in the countryside and maintaining a separation between those and other smaller settlements. Councillor Mickleburgh questioned whether complementing the relevant landscape characteristics was the street scene and was informed that it was.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey referred to a nearby large two storey building (208 Nine Mile Ride). The case officer indicated that the proposal was 20-30cm above that building. In terms of potential overlooking the arrangement at the building identified by Councillor Shepherd-Dubey was not uncommon in a suburban area. This was another reason why the height of the proposed building including having the dormer at the rear, had been considered acceptable. It was thought that no adverse overlooking would be introduced, and it was not out of character. It was confirmed that 208 Nine Mile Ride was 8.1m in height and the maximum height of the proposed dwelling was 8.55m.

Councillor Mickleburgh asked how much the footprint of the site would change should the application be approved. The case officer explained that the increase in footprint had been deemed acceptable because the two to three storey element was just above the existing bungalow, and where it would be expanded to the side and rear, it would continue to be single storey only.

Councillor Smith questioned what the volume increase of the proposal would be against the existing bungalow. The Operational Lead – Development Management clarified that volume was not calculated for domestic extensions, replacements, alterations, or replacement dwellings within established settlements. Any increase in footprint or volume was considered not based on what was there, but on whether what was being proposed caused an unacceptable relationship. The plot was 52m and the replacement dwelling had a depth of 16m.

Councillor Smith recommended that application 231643 be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan and specifically policies D1 and D2, and the bulk, scale and mass of the application. This was seconded by Councillor Munro.

RESOLVED: That application 231643 be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to the Finchampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan and specifically policies D1 and D2, and the bulk, scale and mass of the application.

(At this point in the meeting, Councillor Cornish returned to the meeting).

50. APPLICATION NO 230099 LAND TO THE SOUTH OF GAZELLE CLOSE, WINNERSH, RG41 5HH

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of a foodstore with associated access, parking and servicing areas, landscaping, and other associated works to include solar panels to the roof.

Applicant: Aldi Stores Limited.

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 53 to 92.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Further information around flooding, the Environment Agency's objection and how it was being addressed.
- Further information regarding the impact on the highway network.
- Amended condition 25 to include an additional clause around voids underneath the building.
- Amended conditions 9, 12 and 26 to reflect an amended condition trigger.
- Amended condition 13.

Members were informed of an additional representation from Councillor Bray, ward member. In addition, the Committee was notified that should the application be approved, there would be a need to consult the Secretary of State and a period of 21 days from the date the Secretary of State was furnished with the information be allowed for in order to confirm that they did not intend to call in the application under Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

All Members had attended a site visit excepting Councillor Skuse.

Alan Williams, agent, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the proposal represented a large investment into the local economy and would deliver beneficial development on an undeveloped site. There was currently no discount food store in Winnersh, and the proposal would provide an improved retail offer, reducing the need for residents to travel further afield. He indicated that approximately 40 employment opportunities would be provided, at varying levels, a mixture of full and part time. Alan Williams stated that the application had addressed all the necessary issues and had been assessed in detail by officers and was considered acceptable. Planning permission for a new workshop, showroom and car park had been previously granted permission and implemented and was now extant. He emphasised that there were no sequentially preferable sites. Whilst it was appreciated that parts of the proposed car park were on a flood plain, the applicant had worked with officers to mitigate concerns. The Council's Drainage Officer had agreed that the proposal was acceptable and a betterment on the previous extant planning permission. A Flood Response Plan to outline procedures in the event of flooding, would be prepared. He acknowledged concerns raised about vehicle access, particularly from Reading Road, and indicated that Aldi had worked with officers, looking at a number of options to establish the best arrangements for access to the site. Following assessment and modelling, officers had agreed that maintaining existing arrangements was acceptable. Finally, Alan Williams referred to the programme of community engagement undertaken by Aldi, to which 428 responses had been received. 93% of responses had been supportive of the proposals for an Aldi store in this location.

Haran Singh, resident, representing the Reading and Wokingham Sikh community that had recently acquired Mizuno House on Reading Road, spoke in support of the application. He indicated that they supported the application and the economic development it would bring to the area. Whilst they had had concerns regarding traffic coming out of Gazelle Close and the impact this might have on their congregations using the area at weekends, these had been addressed.

Councillor Soane expressed concern around the highways arrangements and turning left out on to Reading Road. Many vehicles already turned left on to Reading Road and then turned right into the Premier Inn site, undertook a U turn, and then turned right, in order to

avoid the traffic lights at the Showcase roundabout. He went on to refer to the entrance to the site coming from the direction of the Showcase roundabout. There was a cycle lane on the inside of the road with a broken line, which allowed cars to move into the cycle lane if safe to do so. Many motorists did not appreciate that this was possible and backed up behind those waiting to turn right, creating queues. Councillor Soane was concerned that the proposal may worsen this situation.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey questioned whether a traffic signal would be appropriate.

Councillor Skuse questioned whether the creation of a traffic island to oblige people to turn left, would alleviate the issue of people turning right illegally on to Reading Road.

Councillor Neal questioned whether there should be further protection for the cycle lane. The Principal Highways Development Control Officer responded that if a vehicle had to cross a cycle lane, the cycle lane should have a broken line. Councillor Neal also queried whether dropping the speed limit in the area to 30mph would have a positive impact and was informed that any change to the speed limit would need to be approved by the Police.

Councillor Mickleburgh queried whether the safety of the junction was a material planning consideration and was informed that it was. Councillor Mickleburgh asked what alternative options had been considered around highways, and why.

Councillor Smith also expressed concern regarding the potential impact on the highway, the junction, and the capacity of the road. Whilst a supermarket would benefit the area, supermarkets were often busy and would contribute to traffic in the area.

Councillor Firmager noted that the Highways officers were of the opinion that the proposal would have minimal impact on the highways network and result in minimal queuing. Whilst he was supportive of the proposal for a store and believed that residents should have a choice, he was concerned about the possible impacts on the highway network.

Mark Croucher, case officer, highlighted paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework which stated that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impact on the road network would be severe. Although it was accepted that the highway network would be impacted, it was considered that these thresholds had not been met. Formal modelling had been undertaken. He emphasised that alternative options considered were not a material planning consideration but had been referenced to provide assurance that other options had been considered. All other options had projected worse queuing.

The Principal Highways Development Control Officer indicated that other options considered had been a right turn lane out onto Reading Road, a right hand turn lane on Reading Road, a mini roundabout on Reading Road and signalisation. For various reasons these options were not considered viable. A mini roundabout would be impractical due to the capacity of the road and buses accessing the road. A right hand turn lane would potentially cause issues with traffic waiting and trying to pass those waiting to turn. A right hand turn lane out of Gazelle Close would likely create issues with operational capacity. The Principal Highways Development Control Officer commented that it was likely that some of the increased traffic would already be part of the network e.g. people stopping at the store on their way home from work. There should be sufficient space for those travelling south from the Showcase roundabout and waiting to turn right

into Gazelle Close to be passed on the inside, as Reading Road was quite wide. The Principal Highways Development Control Officer referred to the possibility of adding signage indicating a 'no right turn.'

Some Members were of the opinion that the cycle lane was not wide enough for vehicles to enter if safe to do so, if cyclists were on the road.

Councillor Firmager commented that in the past the junction had been both a left and right turn, and asked this had been considered. It was confirmed that it had.

A number of Members commented that it would have been helpful to have had more information on other options considered around improving the junction and why they had not been taken forward, to assist the Committee in its decision making. The Committee requested that high level technical data be provided where appropriate in future Committee reports. The Operational Lead - Development Management emphasised the need for balance in the information provided.

Councillor Munro asked if there had been accidents in the past from cars turning into Premier Inn and then doing a U turn.

Councillor Cornish stated that the Committee had concerns around the highways situation. The Operational Lead - Development Management reminded the Committee that the application was not proposing any works to the highways and that no further highways works were considered necessary.

In response to a question from Councillor Mickleburgh around informatives, it was clarified that the purpose of an informative was to bring the applicant's attention to something which related to the specific application, not wider preexisting matters.

Councillor Cornish suggested that the Committee discuss with the relevant Executive Member and Leader of the Council, situations where the knock on effect on the highway network may be outside the consideration of an application could be taken forward and discussed within the Council, with a follow up meeting with the Director of Place and Growth, with a view to developing how a better understanding of how such concerns could be logged and potentially actioned.

Councillor Firmager questioned whether the applicant could be asked to withdraw and amend the applicant and was informed that this was not possible.

It was proposed by Councillor Neal and seconded by Councillor Soane that the application be approved.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) application 230099 be approved subject to the
 - a) Completion of a legal agreement relating to the following head of terms – Employment Skills Plan.
 - b) Conditions and informatives as set out in Appendix 1 on pages 134 to 145, (subject to any additions and updates agreed with the Assistant Director – Place and Growth between the date of the resolution and the issue of the decision) and amended conditions 9, 12, 13, 25 and 26 as outlined in the supplementary agenda.

- c) The expiration of 21 days beginning with the date with which the Secretary of State tells the authority in writing they received the material specified in paragraph 11 of the Town and Country Planning Act (Consultation) (England) Direction 2021, and have either notified the authority that they do not intend to call in the application under section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and may proceed to determine the application , or no comments are provided in 21 days.
- 2) the Committee discuss with the relevant Executive Member and Leader of the Council situations where the knock on effect on the highway network may be outside the consideration of an application could be taken forward and discussed within the Council, with a follow up meeting with the Director of Place and Growth, with a view to developing how a better understanding of how such concerns could be logged and potentially actioned.

51. APPLICATION NO 223691 "LEE SPRING", LATIMER ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG41 2YD

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 42 residential apartments in three blocks, including on-site parking, shared amenity spaces, enhanced green spaces to support biodiversity and waste storage facilities. Access for neighbouring garages to be provided by 3.7m wide through-route north of the site. Following demolition of the existing buildings.

Applicant: Burlington Developments

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 93 to 190.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Clarification of various points.
- Additional clarification regarding financial viability.
- Information on the height of the proposed building, and how this is approached by the Wokingham Borough Design Guide.

Sarika Odedra, resident, spoke in objection to the application on behalf of Nisa Local, Barkham Road, which would be impacted by the application. The business owned the land covering the loading bay and the garage next to the site. The business had previously made comments on how the application would impact its daily running. Sarika Odedra felt that these had not been sufficiently addressed. She commented that stock was delivered to the store on a weekly basis. Currently the delivery lorry was able to load in the loading bay at the rear of the property. The business had been informed that the vans could stop on Barkham Road. However, there was only a 30 minute limit for unloading which would be insufficient. The lorry would also impact traffic flow if loading from Barkham Road. Sarika Odedra was of the view that the path available to the loading bay at the rear would be inadequate and that parking spaces and the entry to the proposal site would be obstructed. In addition, the proposed location of the refuse bins would be close to the store which could have hygiene and odour implications.

Grant Leggett, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The application would replace existing poor quality buildings with 42 homes, close to the services and transport links of the town centre. The scheme would optimise the brownfield

site, relieving pressure on the greenfield development. It would be fully compliant with the Borough Design Guide. Grant Leggett indicated that the development had been designed to be no higher than Queen's Gate to the north, and also represented a step down in height to the residential properties to the south and the west. The application would be set back from neighbouring properties and met separation distances detailed in the Borough Design Guide. He indicated that the homes would be close to leisure provision, parks and recreation facilities. Members were informed that there would be 34 parking spaces for the 42 homes, which had been agreed with Highways as an appropriate level of parking for a location so close to the town centre and the train station. All the family units would have an allocated space. However, residents would be encouraged to use sustainable transport, and there would be access to a car club and cycle parking and a travel plan would be produced. Grant Leggett added that the application would not cause harm to the Borough's overall supply of employment land. He emphasised that it had been agreed with the Council's independent viability assessment that the scheme would not be viable and could not support any affordable housing. However, the applicant had agreed that there would be a late stage review mechanism secured through the S106 agreement.

Councillor Rachel Bishop-Firth, ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. She commented that homes were needed for residents and ideally on brownfield sites. However, she was of the view that the current proposal was too large for the site and referred to policy CP3. Councillor Bishop-Firth stated that the large four-storey building would be shoehorned in between smaller two storey Victorian houses on Barkham Road and two storey 1960's maisonettes on Latimer Road, which would change the character of the area. She felt that the application would also loom over houses on Station Road. Councillor Bishop-Firth questioned why houses on Elms Road and Outfield Crescent should be considered comparators as they were located some distance away from the site. The majority of buildings in the immediate vicinity were two storeys, except the Queen's Gate retirement home, which was three. She noted that the flats on Elms Road and Outfield Crescent had the top storeys of the buildings within a number of individual pitched roofs, which broke up the overall mass. The proposal would be the only four storey flat roofed development in the immediate area. Lastly, Councillor Bishop-Firth referred to CP6 and expressed concerns around access and parking. She felt that insufficient parking would be offered in an area where parking was already difficult. Turning out on to Barkham Road would potentially be challenging.

Councillor Mickleburgh noted the viability of the scheme and the measures agreed with the applicant for a late stage viability review. He asked about the concerns raised by Sarika Odedra around the potential impact on the loading bay of Nisa Local. The Principal Highways Development Control Officer explained that as part of any assessment, access of a vehicle turning into a site, whether it could manoeuvre safely on site, and leave safely in forward gear, would be looked at. As part of the assessment the developer had used the largest lorry (at 16.5m an arctic) as a test vehicle and it had been able to turn safely. The loading bay was slightly to the south and the stock lorry would be smaller than the test vehicle. He was satisfied that access would not be obstructed. Councillor Mickleburgh went on to ask about the scale and density of the development and how this would compare with similar developments in the town centre. Benjamin Hindle, case officer, referred to 19-21 Market Place. It was a town centre development and consequently density would be slightly higher. Nevertheless, it was 160 dwellings per hectare, which was greater than that of the site.

Councillor Firmager commented that the parking provision was inadequate for the number of homes and was concerned that existing issues with parking in the surrounding area

would be added to. He felt that a smaller development with affordable housing would be more appropriate. Councillor Firmager questioned why the independent viability assessment had not been carried out internally. The Operational Lead – Development Management stated that the assessment of any financial viability appraisal needed to be undertaken by a suitably qualified practitioner in valuations and the Council did not have such resource available internally. Therefore, a third-party valuer was appointed.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey echoed Councillor Firmager's concerns around the level of parking provision. She commented that Wokingham was one of the largest car owning areas in the country.

Councillor Skuse expressed concern around the late stage viability review. He questioned whether such reviews often led to the Council receiving funding. The case officer explained why this agreement had been proposed.

Councillor Cornish also asked about access to the Nisa Local Store. The case officer re-emphasised that it had been clearly identified that the largest lorry could access the site and manoeuvre safely, and that this had been considered sufficient to override the objection submitted regarding this. Whilst the proposed situation may be considered less convenient by the objector it did not constitute a highways safety concern.

In response to a Member question regarding whether there was a policy which defined apartments with no allocated parking spaces, the case officer explained that it was a case by case situation. Due to the very high sustainability of the site and the connection to public transport it had been considered that the site would benefit from more allocated parking spaces. In such a location not all residents would own a car. CP6 outlined that a modal shift away from the private motor car was being sought where possible. The unallocated parking spaces would create flexibility whilst fully allocated parking would not. The Principal Highways Development Control Officer added that there would be 7 car free units and that this would be part of their lease. Apart from the family units all other units would have unallocated parking. This was similar to other locations in the Borough. The scheme was located close to the train station and a bus route, and very close to the town centre.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey queried if the fourth floor balconies would be overlooking. The case officer responded that the scheme was in excess in every dimension of the Borough Design Guide recommendations, which were the minimum requirements. There was full compliance with the Guide with regards to overlooking.

Councillor Firmager reemphasised that he felt that the parking was insufficient and commented that some residents may have vans or motorbikes. He queried where visitors were expected to park.

Councillor Smith expressed concerns around the bulk, scale and mass of the development. He suggested that a site visit would be beneficial.

Councillor Cornish stated that whilst Members may dislike the situation it was established that the viability assessment had been carried out externally. He went on to state that some housing units in the town centre did not have parking arrangements, and that if it was explicit in the lease agreement then residents would be aware of the situation before they moved. Officers reiterated that the Local Plan promoted alternative transport and a shift away from private transport. The site was very sustainable and as such significant

attached parking would not be expected. There were various options for visitor parking within the town centre car parks. It was noted that there was a controlled parking zone out the front of the site and along Barkham Road, excepting loading bays for the Nisa Local.

Councillor Smith proposed that application 223691 be deferred for a site visit to enable Members to better understand the bulk, scale, mass, access and parking arrangements. This was seconded by Councillor Shepherd-Dubey.

RESOLVED: That application 223691 be deferred for a site visit to enable Members to better understand the bulk, scale, mass, access and parking arrangements.

52. APPLICATION NO 231524 HEATHLANDS FARM, HONEY HILL, WOKINGHAM, RG40 3BG

Proposal: Full application for the proposed installation of no. 1,762 Photovoltaic Panels, each panel mounted on no. 4 concrete footings.

Applicant: Hall Hunter Partnership

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 191 to 214.

Councillor Soane questioned who would be responsible for the removal of the panels when they had deteriorated, and if the site would be returned to agricultural use. Marcus Watts, case officer, indicated that condition 3 stated that once the panels were no longer operational, the applicant or any future landowner, would be responsible for the removal of the panels and the associated development, including the concrete footings. The site would be returned to agricultural use. Councillor Shepherd-Dubey suggested that further installation of panels should be encouraged once those detailed in the application were no longer operational.

RESOLVED: That application 231524 be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in pages 201 to 204.

53. APPLICATION NO 231561 LAND NORTH OF CUTBUSH LANE, WEST OF UPPERWOOD FARM, CUTBUSH LANE, SHINFIELD. RG2 9AA

Proposal: Full application for the proposed relocation of Workshop T4 (to become Workshop G).

Applicant: Shinfield Studios

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 215 to 246.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Revised plans which have slightly reduced the floor area of the proposed workshop.
- Amended resolution A to include the requirement to provide Employment Skills Plan contributions. Administrative clauses to be renumbered accordingly.
- Additional bullet point for reason for refusal 1.
- Add in MDD DPD policy TB12 for the reason for refusal.

Councillor Sheperd-Dubey felt that the site would be a good site for apprentices to be based.

RESOLVED: That application 231561 be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in pages 227 to 234 and S106 Agreement as set out in Appendix A of the report, and as amended in the Supplementary Agenda.