

Public Document Pack

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 1 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 7.00 - 9.45 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), Chris Bowring, John Kaiser, Malcolm Richards, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Wayne Smith and Bill Soane

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Bob Pitts, Ken Miall and Gary Cowan

Officers Present

Connor Corrigan, Chris Easton, Justin Turvey and Arabella Yandle

84. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor John Kaiser was duly elected as Vice Chair of the Planning Committee.

Councillor Tim Holton, Chair of the Planning Committee, extended his thanks to Former Councillor Chris Singleton, outgoing Vice Chair, for all his hard work on the Planning Committee

85. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Philip Houldsworth

86. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

An amendment was made to the Minutes of the Committee held on 7 December 2016, namely that Lyndsay Jennings, Solicitor, attended the meeting.

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 December 2016, together with the amendment as outlined above, were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

MEMBERS' UPDATE

There are a number of references to the Members' Update within these minutes.

The Members' Update was circulated to all present prior to the meeting. A copy is attached.

87. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor John Kaiser declared a personal interest in Item 92 on the agenda, Application number 163115, The Firs, Parkcorner Lane, on the grounds that he knew the applicant. He stayed in the room, but did not take part in the discussion or vote on this item.

88. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

There were no items deferred or withdrawn

89. APPLICATION NO - 162881 - ARBORFIELD GARRISON

Proposal: Full application for temporary planning permission for the use of land for filming, incorporating temporary change of use of existing former barracks buildings from Use Class Sui Generis to Use Class B1, and the use of the site and hard standing for parking and storage, with associated access

Applicant: Crest Nicholson Operations Limited C/O Savills

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 9 to 38.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification of responses from both Arborfield & Newland Parish Council and Barkham Parish Council;
- An additional neighbour comment;
- A re-wording of Condition 2 relating to the effect of the use of the site on surrounding properties, and
- A re-wording of Condition 9, to wit that no operation should commence until external lighting schemes had been submitted and approved in writing.

Ken Hann, a resident of the ward, stated that he was happy with the build proposed but had concerns in regards to: the speed of the access roads; the working hours of some of the stages, and the parking and access. In particular, he questioned the proposed design of the entrance to the site and whether it took account of current road use, and whether the 40 mph limit on Langley Common Road should be changed to 30 mph along the entire road. He asked for clarification on whether a proposed Traffic Order reducing the speed to 30 mph could be part of the application in front of the Committee as the Council had not identified it as suitable for a 30mph limit in its current form even though it was identified as a walking route to the Bohunt School.

Chris Tinker, Agent for Crest Nicholson, the developers, led Members through a presentation, comparing the site to an existing Film Studio at Longcross and outlining the benefits to the community in terms of employment and income. He stated that the site would be actively staffed and managed and that the traffic flow would be less than that of the previous military use.

The Service Manager for Highways Development Management stated that there had been no restriction in regards to access on the military base and that an independent Road safety audit had been carried out and found no issue with the proposal. He highlighted that the visibility was to be improved by some removal of vegetation and that that a 30 mph speed limit reduction would be considered for this section of the road alongside the detailed design work of the Langley Common Road and Biggs Lane roundabout improvements which formed part of the wider Arborfield SDL transport mitigation measures. He advised that the 30mph speed limit reduction was not necessary for this application currently being considered by committee. He also indicated that the anticipated number of vehicle movements would not be unusual for this type of road and that as the working day did not fit a standard pattern, there would not be an overall peak travel time issue.

In answer to Members' questions about the length of tenure and its impact on the Borough housing targets, the Case Officer stated that, if the company wanted to extend their length of tenure by even one year beyond the nine laid out in the application, they would need to submit a further application. The Strategic Delivery Manager went on to state that the site in question was currently due to be developed into housing in the final phase of the Arborfield development. He explained that there was always a degree of slippage in building projects but that any shortfall would be more than made up for by other developments in the Borough. The site has extant permission but this area would require, a new reserved matters application to be made prior to construction of housing.

In response to a Member's question about employment opportunities, Chris Tinker explained that, as a highly unionised industry, there were unlikely to be many career opportunities for local young people as actors but that there would be opportunities in the support sector and associated careers.

In response to a Member question regarding safe walking routes to Bohunt School, the Service Manager for Highways Development Management indicated that, the 30mph speed limit reduction would be reviewed under a separate scheme as mentioned earlier, and that as the only existing footpath was on the opposite side of the road to the site access junction, potential conflict between users was not consider to be an issue.

In response to a Member question about sound and its impact on neighbours, the Strategic Delivery Manager indicated that most of the activity on site would be indoors and that, outside, set-building would take place during normal working hours.

Resolved: That application No. 162881 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 9 to 38, and the amendments to conditions 2 and 9 as laid out in the Members' Update.

90. APPLICATION NO - 163444 - 52 READING ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG41 5NE

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of supported affordable housing consisting of 7no bedsitting rooms, 2no single person flats and supported ancillary accommodation, car parking, motor cycle parking, covered cycle storage and garden following demolition of existing building.

Applicant: Wokingham Housing Ltd

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 39 to 64.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed amendment to condition 3;
- Proposed additional condition regarding operating hours during building work;
- Comments from Councillor Mirfin in support of the application, and
- Additional comments from neighbouring residents in objection to the application.

Simon Price, Head of Housing, spoke in favour of the application, stating that the application would provide much needed affordable accommodation for young people, which was a priority for strategy in the Borough. Darren Toes, Wokingham Housing Ltd, went on to outline some of the features of the new build. He explained that the existing building would be demolished and that the new building, whilst being built in a different architectural style to other houses in the area because of its location, was being designed to fit in with the surrounding houses in choice of materials and gable ends. The new building would be a similar height to the existing building and would have a footprint only 5% larger.

Members indicated that they were in support of such a build and that a good effort had been made by the designers to fit in with the vernacular style, but were concerned about noise and parking. In response, the Service Manager for Highways Development Management stated that the condition relating to construction method covered noise. He

went on to explain that, as the application was classed Sui Generis, ie that its use did not fit into any other user class, that any future uses which might require an increase in parking levels would require a completely new planning application. Therefore the parking is deemed adequate for the current proposed scheme and has been design to enable on site turning for all vehicles as well as access to motorcycle and bicycle parking within the site.

Resolved: That application no 163444 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 39 to 64 with condition amended and the additional condition as set out in the Members' Update.

91. APPLICATION NO - 163369 - BEECHWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL, AMBLESIDE CLOSE, RG5 4JJ

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 3 single storey classroom extensions, extension to existing staffroom, erection of new security fencing and gates, new pathways, access door and alteration to parking layout.

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 65 to 88.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Amendment to paragraph 8, page 72, to whit that the increase in student numbers would be 15 per annum, not 30 as published;
- Summary table with current and proposed staffing levels;
- Proposed minor correction to condition 10, and
- Proposed additional condition regarding operating hours during building work.

Anju Sharma, Schools Programme Manager, spoke in favour of the application, explaining that the Council had a duty to ensure adequate school provision and that infill builds were part of the approved strategies. She stated that Woodley had been identified as requiring 45 extra places per year and that Beechwood had been chosen due to its current design, location, site area and the housing developments going on around it. She went on to explain that the expansion had been designed in partnership with the Council and that there were future plans to expand the school further to a two form entry (60 pupils per year) which would allow for efficient staffing and planning.

In response to a Member question, the Service Manager for Highways Development Management stated that there would be an increase of 4 additional staff, 3 full-time and one part-time, and that one extra parking space had been included in the design per full-time equivalent (FTE) staff member. He explained that this provision was in line with the Council's adopted parking standards and that the scheme also secured an updated travel plan, as well as improvements to both cycle parking and scooter parking.

In response to Member questions, the Case Officer indicated that construction work would commence in the summer to be ready for September and that a condition had been attached to the Construction Management Plan outlining hours of delivery. She stated that the school travel plan would be updated by September and that the parking and cycle/scooter places would be ready for then. Over the summer, construction traffic would be asked to park on site.

Resolved: That application no 163369 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 65 to 88 and the amendments and proposed condition as set out in the Members' Update.

92. APPLICATION NO - 163115 - THE FIRS, PARKCORNER LANE, CARTERS HILL, ARBORFIELD, RG2 9JJ

Proposal: Householder application for the proposed replacement of existing roof lights with dormer window extensions and the erection of a raised terrace to the south- west corner of the building at first floor level

Applicant: Mr & Mrs M Yardley

Councillor John Kaiser declared a personal interest and did not take part in the discussion or vote on this item.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 89 to 110.

Members had visited the site on Friday 27 January 2017.

Patrick Haran, Planning Agent, spoke in favour of the application, citing CP11 as the relevant policy, which supported small scale extensions to buildings in the countryside. He stated that the proposed extension would result in a 12.5% increase to the footprint but no increase in overall height, and that the current use for the 1st floor was as accommodation so that no change of use was involved. The expectation was that the flat would revert to an elderly relative and the installation of dormer windows and a terrace would increase manoeuvrability, with the impact limited by the substantial boundary screening. He stated that there was no objection from either the Parish Council or neighbours.

Councillor Gary Cowan, Ward Member, spoke in favour of the application, indicating that the property was on an un-adopted road and did not overlook anyone. He stated that alterations to other properties in the area had been approved. In relation to the citing of CP11, he suggested that the build would not cause harm and that the terrace sat comfortably within the Council's own guidelines. The Council recognised the need for families to support elderly relatives and this build would fit with that need.

The Case Officer cited CP11, stating that the proposal was an example of excessive encroachment, that it was inappropriate in scale and appearance and that, as such, it would cause significant harm. The information about the proposed occupancy by an elderly relative had not been cited in the application in justification.

In answer to Members' questions relating to the likelihood of an appeal if refused, the Case Officer pointed out that, as a detached outbuilding, the application site does not benefit from permitted development rights for further extensions and additions and therefore planning permission is required for the proposed alterations. Whilst there was some leniency for properties in the countryside, the proposed extension would in effect convert an outbuilding into a home. She also stated that a plan did not have to take into account who was living there.

The Committee were reminded that, just because a building could not be seen, there was still a need to be mindful of the impact of a building.

The recommendation put to the Committee to refuse the application, when put to the vote, was not supported. As a result, an alternative proposal was received from Councillor Wayne Smith to approve the application for the reason that the planned extension would not cause significant harm and that the increase in scale would not be inappropriate. This was seconded by Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

The following conditions were attached:

- The development should begin no later than three years from the date of the decision;
- The development would be carried out in accordance with the plans in Agenda pages 95 to 108;
- Materials used in the construction of the external surfaces would match those in the existing building, and
- The extended building would not be occupied at any time other than as ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as the Firs, Parkcorner Lane.

Resolved: That Application no 163115 be approved subject to the conditions set out above.

93. APPLICATION NO - 161845 - 134-146 LONDON ROAD, RUSCOMBE, RG10 9HA

Proposal: Full application for the erection of 31 two bedroom apartments with associated communal areas, landscaping and parking (C3 residential use)

Applicant: McCarthy & Stone

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 111 to 148.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed change to condition 3, whereby Community Liaison details would be implemented during the construction unless otherwise agreed;
- Proposed changes to condition 4 relating to the Approved Scheme for Tree Protection;
- Proposed changes to paragraph 44, page 131 regarding the value of the CIL amount psqm;
- Further information regarding the number of trips generated in peak hours, and
- A note referring to additional comments that had been received.

Members had visited the site in 2015.

Mike Evans, Planning Chair for the Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the application, citing that the development went against the Village Design Statement in its location in an open/semi-rural stretch of London Road and raising concerns about the amount of carparking being put forward. He referred to the difference in the design and the fact that the increase in area given to concrete would add to the flooding risk. He stated that the village needed an influx of families, not down-sizers, and that, due to the fact that there were no amenities in Ruscombe and there were no bus stops, residents would be forced to walk if they were not able to have a car.

Ian Hann, agent, spoke on behalf of the applicant, stating that the flats would allow older people to live in a setting where they have their own space. He suggested that the majority of tenants would be 65-75 years old and that the site would be carefully managed by the applicant. He went on to outline the rise in the older population in the country, stating that the number of older residents in Wokingham was set to rise by 23% by 2036, with an increase in the number of families being headed up by someone of 65 or more. He added that the proposal met council targets and that it would potentially free-up other accommodation in the area.

Councillor Bob Pitts, Ward Member, spoke in opposition to the application. He disagreed with the agent, stating that it was unlikely that accommodation would become accessible to young families because of the cost of housing. He suggested that most over 55s would still be working and that the parking would be insufficient in light of the lack of public transport and amenities. He finally asked what the management charges and costs to the residents would be and stated that some clearance had already taken place.

The Case Officer stated that, whilst they considered the Village Design Statement and the comments received, the proposal did not present great conflict with it. The frontage of the proposed design was reflected in other properties on the London Road and a flood risk assessment had taken place and been accepted. He suggested that the character of the properties around was mixed and that as such the proposed build would not be out of character, stating that the site had already been allocated to housing. He explained that site clearance work did not have to be approved, and that extant pegging out had been related to the movement of lizards.

In response to Members' questions, the Case Officer stated that only one person in the household needed to be over 55. The Service Manager for Highways Development Management went on to explain that the car-parking would not be allocated to individual properties, which complies with the Council's parking standards and is often the way parking is managed on private sites such as retirement developments. A condition has been applied to the scheme to ensure that the unallocated parking is retained and not allocated to individual occupiers. He felt that the intended age range of the residents was pertinent to the management condition.

In answer to a Member's question regarding parking, the Case Officer stated that the parking met Council policy and that there was an extant outline scheme for 16 dwellings.

In response to a Member question regarding the entry points of three properties onto the road, the Service Manager for Highways Development indicated that similar junction formations and numbers had been previously considered and consented with an earlier application on this site and that they each met the visibility splay requirement and were deemed acceptable for this scheme.

In response to Members' questions regarding density, the Case Officer confirmed that the property would have a much higher density than other properties in the locality, but that this was implicit in the nature of flats.

Councillor John Kaiser proposed that the application be deferred to permit a site visit. This was dropped. It was then proposed by Councillor Tim Holton that the application be refused for the reason that the proposed application was out of character due to bulk, scale and mass plus failure to complete the legal agreement. This was seconded by Councillor Wayne Smith.

Resolved: That Application no 161845 be refused for the reasons set out above.

94. JOULDINGS LANE, SWALLOWFIELD

Proposal: To give permission to Hampshire County Council to determine the Definitive Map Modification Application on behalf of Wokingham Borough Council

Applicant: Hugh Craddock

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 155 to 160.

Resolved: that Hampshire County Council be given permission to determine the Definitive Map modification

95. FOOTPATH EARLEY 15 - 660 WOKINGHAM ROAD, EARLEY

Proposal: To modify a Diversion Order on Footpath Earley 15

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 161 to 166.

Councillor Ken Miall, Ward Member, spoke in opposition to the application, asking why the original footpath plan was not being enforced and, if the Highway rules were not to change on this stretch of path, why the Diversion Order was being submitted. He stated that there were issues with erosion on the path and that two people had fallen down the bank.

The Public Rights of Way Manager stated that there had been an error in the original S106 agreement and that the proposed width of 2.5 m would mean that the footpath agreed with the agreement. She went on to state that funding had been assigned to improve the slope of the path and that fencing would be installed along the top of the embankment. The path was to become part of a long distance route.

In response to a Member question, the Public Rights of Way Manager stated that to pursue the original plan would result in a high cost to the Council with the likelihood that the diversion in front of the Committee would be agreed anyway. The Borough Solicitor stated that the diversion in front of the Committee would give a common-law path legal status with all the protections that includes.

Resolved: That the modification to the Diversion Order be agreed

96. FOOTPATH WOKINGHAM 23 - TAN HOUSE CROSSING, WOKINGHAM

Proposal: to put a Railway Crossing Diversion Order on Footpath Wokingham 23

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 167 to 168.

Damian Haynus, Network Rail, spoke in favour of the application, outlining the risks associated with the current crossing and the particular issues such crossings had with vulnerable users and unauthorised access, mostly children. He stated that if the crossing was reopened as is, the risk assessment gave that it would attract the third highest risk rating. He indicated that the temporary bridge had made a big difference to this rating.

In response to Member questions, Mr Haynus stated that that the temporary bridge currently in place was frequently vandalised and as a result was a high cost stream. The intention was to change to a permanent bridge by 2019. A bridge would reduce the risk rating to the lowest rating. He also indicated that, whilst disabled access had not been part of the original crossing, any future permanent bridge structure project would consider the ability to deliver disabled access where possible.

The Service Manager for Highways Development Management stated that discussions had taken place with Network Rail with the potential to extend any new bridge from Carnival Pool to cross both railway lines. The Public Rights of Way Manager added that funding for the bridge was on the CIL list and that progress would occur as soon as possible.

Resolved: That the Railway Crossing Diversion Order be authorised.

97. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT MONITORING REPORT

Proposal: to review the quarterly Enforcement Report

The Committee received and reviewed the quarterly Enforcement Report outlined in page 5 of the Members' Update.

Resolved: That the quarterly Enforcement Report be noted

98. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

There were no items that required exclusion of the public

This page is intentionally left blank

MEMBERS' UPDATE Planning Committee – 1 February 2017

Site Address: Arborfield Garrison
Application No: 162881, Pages 9-38.

Additional comments

Clarification of response from both Arborfield & Newland Parish Council and Barkham Parish Council following resubmission of plans below:

- *Arborfield Parish Council:* 'Most of the comments the Parish Council raised have been addressed however the final point regarding timing is to be reiterated'
- *Barkham Parish Council:* 'Our comments still stand. Our concerns lie with the speed limit along Langley Common Road, this to be reduced to 30 mph, and the entrance which is opposite to Staysure Tyres where large HGVs are frequently in and out.'

Additionally, please find attached in **APPENDIX ONE** applicant response to Barkham Parish Council.

Additional neighbour comment received 29/01/17:

'Dear Tim,

I email you in your guise of Chairman of the Planning Committee scheduled for 1 Feb. I am objecting to Planning Application 162881 regarding the former Hazebrouck Barracks, a place where I spent many happy years. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend this meeting and I spoke to Alex Thwaites last Thu and it was thought that this was the best way to get my thoughts across to the committee – email via the Chair.

At a time for the need of houses, houses and more houses, and at a time of talk about "Garden Villages, it would be at odds to approve this planning application. The developer should be ordered to carry on as previously planned and build these needed and affordable houses now on what is, after all, a brown-field site.

Indeed, the Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update as at 25 Jan states, "We know we have to plan for more housing, so we will need to identify and allocate sites for new homes."

There is a site, you have a site now so tell Crest to get on with it now and not wait the 9 years.

To approve this application would set the wrong precedence and open "Pandora's Box".

Please acknowledge this email and please read it out at the appropriate time for the benefit of the other committee members, thank you.

Regards,

John Edwards'

[Officer Note: the original Arborfield Garrison outline was for the approval of up to 2,000 units, clearly this is a large site and therefore the development is phased to allow an appropriate build rate. A condition within the outline secured the phasing scheme and the area where the proposed film studio is located is not expected to come forward until well after the first few phases have been delivered. The premise of the application is to make use of the existing facilities until the site is expected to be brought forward for its original intended use, residential parcels. The proposed Condition 2 secures the removal of the use so that the original outline application can continued to be implemented]

Conditions

Rewording of Condition 2 reason: *To allow the local planning authority an opportunity to restrict the effect of the use hereby permitted on the amenities of the surrounding properties. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1 and CP3.*

Rewording of Condition 9: No operation shall commence until details of any proposed external lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall set out the steps that will be taken to ensure that external lighting does not cause a nuisance to local residents including future residents of the site and shall include details of locations on site, on public roads, direction and level of illumination.

Site Address: 52 Reading Road, Wokingham, RG41 1EH
Application No: 163444, Pages 39-64.

Conditions

- Amendment to condition 3 (materials) to read- "Before any above ground works commence", instead of "Before the development hereby permitted is commenced".
- Additional Condition no.19: "No work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall take place other than between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays".

Additional comments

Councillor Mirfin emailed on 24th January 2017 to confirm his full support for the application.

The occupants of the neighbouring property have emailed their objections again to the Council on 01/02/2017. The issues raised are slightly more detailed than their original objections and have been responded to within the officer's report.

Site Address: Beechwood Primary school, Ambleside Close, Reading, RG5 4JJ
Application No: 163369, Pages 65-88.

Changes to the report

Paragraph 8, page 72 - The increase of student numbers would be 15 per school calendar year and not 30 per school calendar year.

Summary information table, page 70 -

Existing Staff	29 Full-time and 25 Part-time
Proposed Staff	32 Full-time and 26 Part-time

Conditions

Amendment to condition 10: Prior to occupation of the extensions, hereby approved, a scheme for a minimum of one log pyramid for stag beetles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The design of the scheme shall be in accordance with the design standards of People's Trust for Endangered Species fact sheet.

Additional Condition no.19: "No work relating to the development hereby approved, including works of demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall take place other than between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays".

Site Address: The Firs, Parkcorner Lane, Carters Hill, Arborfield, RG2 9JJ
Application No: 163115, Pages 89-110

No further update.

Site Address: 134 – 146 London Road, Ruscombe, RG10 9HA
Application No: 161845, Pages 111 - 148.

Conditions

Change condition 3 to:

The development hereby approved shall not be carried out unless in accordance with the Community Liaison details received by the Local Planning Authority on 31st January 2017 including:

- (i) letters to be sent to neighbours
- (ii) creation of 'construction website'
- (iii) erection of site notice boards with emergency contact details

The details shall be implemented during the time of construction unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Change condition 4 to:

a) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the tree protection details as agreed on plan number '9080/02 Rev A Tree Protection Plan' (referred to as the Approved Scheme). The tree protection measures approved shall be implemented in complete accordance with the Approved Scheme for the duration of the development (including, unless otherwise provided by the Approved Scheme) demolition, all site preparation work, tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery.

b) No development (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall commence until the local planning authority has been provided (by way of a written notice) with a period of no less than 7 working days to inspect the implementation of the measures identified in the Approved Scheme on-site.

c) No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the Approved Scheme.

d) The fencing or other works which are part of the Approved Scheme shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works including external works have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials removed from the site, unless the prior approval of the local planning authority has first been sought and obtained.

Reason: To secure the protection throughout the time that the development is being carried out of trees shrubs or hedges growing within or adjacent to the site which are of amenity value to the area, and to allow for verification by the local planning authority that the necessary measures are in place before development and other works commence
Relevant policy: Core Strategy policy CP3 and Managing Development Delivery Local Plan policies CC03 and TB21

Changes to report

Paragraph 44, page 131 – CIL amount should read £150 per square metre in accordance with adopted CIL charges for housing for the elderly.

Further Information

According to TRICS data for the proposal, 5 trips would be generated in the AM peak and 4 in the PM peak. No objection is raised with regards to this.

Additional letters have been sent to Councillors from residents and the applicant prior to the committee meeting. More specifically, the resident letters are copies of comments sent in on the application (with a covering letter stating an objection to the proposal) and the applicant letter promotes different aspects of the scheme and how it has been developed. Whilst these have been considered, they do not alter the recommendation of the report.

Site Address: Jouldings Lane, Swallowfield

Pages 149 - 154.

No further update.

Site Address: Footpath 15 – 660 Wokingham Road, Earley

Pages 155 - 160.

No further update.

Site Address: Footpath Wokingham 23 – Tan House Crossing, Wokingham

Pages 161 - 166.

No further update.

Pre-emptive site visits

Ref: 170031 - Aldrynton Primary School, Silverdale Road, Earley

Full application for the proposed demolition of external stores, swimming pool (including support facilities), temporary classrooms and part demolition of building followed by the

erection of a two storey teaching block with hall. Erection of a detached store adjacent to car park, provision of a MUGA in playing field and associated works to landscaping, and extension to car and cycle parking

Reason: - to assess the impact of the development on the character of the area

Ref: 163058 - Hewden Plant Hire, Old Forest Road, Wokingham

Full application for proposed erection of 45 dwellings (8 x 1 bedroom apartments, 12 x 2 bedroom apartments, 17 x 3 bedroom houses and 8 x 4 bedroom houses) together with associated access improvements, parking and refuse storage following the demolition of existing buildings.

Reason: - to assess the impact of the development on the character of the area

Non-householder appeal decisions

Period	Total number	Decisions	Main planning issues identified/addressed
December 2016 (full month)	2	1 Dismissed (153173)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Plan led system of SDLs and the location outside of settlement is contrary to this planned approach
		1 Allowed (160902)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is acceptable for development in character and sustainability terms despite being out of settlement and no harm could be found
January 2017 (up to 19/01/17)	1	1 Dismissed (160520)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character of area and neighbour amenity objection upheld No requirement for affordable housing on smaller sites contrary to Local Plan but in line with national Planning policy Guidance

Appendix 1:

6 December 2016



Judith Neuhofer
Clerk to Barkham Parish Council
Small Oaks
Doles Lane
Wokingham
RG41 4EB

By email only

Stuart Garnett
E: sgarnett@savills.com
DL: +44 (0) 23 8071 3923
F: +44 (0) 23 8071 3901

2 Charlotte Place
Southampton SO14 0TB
T: +44 (0) 238 071 3900
savills.com

Dear Judith

FULL APPLICATION - TEMPORARY PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE USE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS FOR FILMING, INCLUDING USE OF THE SITE AND HARD STANDING FOR PARKING AND STORAGE, WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS

FORMER HAZEBROUCK BARRACKS, ARBORFIELD

BY CREST NICHOLSON OPERATIONS AND DEFENCE INFRASTRUCTURE ORGANISATION

APPLICATION REFERENCE: 162881

Thank you for the Parish Council taking their time to meet with us on Wednesday 23 November 2016. Further to our meeting and in response to your letter of the 11 November 2016 to the above planning application, I thought it would be helpful to provide the following response to you and ahead of us preparing and submitting revised information to Wokingham Borough Council.

Time Period

We explained to you that this area of the site is not intended to be developed for residential for some time, and that this area provides an opportunity for Crest and the DIO to recoup some of the significant financial outlay they have already made, e.g. the early delivery of the secondary school, other Section 106 contributions and the sizeable upfront infrastructure investment in roads and utilities.

Crest have confirmed there is no intention to seek to make this use permanent, and at the end of the 9 year period, if Crest did seek to make it permanent the Borough Council would be able to refuse such an application. There is no provision to seek a further temporary consent for this use once the consent lapses.

Crest also explained that the film studio use will not delay the primary school coming forward on the adjacent phase, nor will it delay the delivery of new homes from the site.

Working Hours, Lighting and Noise

We have reviewed the comments received during the consultation process and in an effort to relieve these concerns, we will look to introduce restrictions to hours and activities as part of the application, and set out the changes we discussed at the meeting in this letter. We would propose that the operational hours for the use are amended to make the important distinction between hours of operation for filming, and hours of operation for associated activities, such as construction (i.e. set building). However, please note that the studio will have 24/7 on-site security presence.

Offices and associates throughout the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa and the Middle East.
Savills (UK) Limited, Chartered Surveyors, Regulated by RICS, A subsidiary of Savills plc. Registered in England No. 2926138.
Registered office: 33 Margaret Street, London, W1G 0JD





Filming - Hours of operation

	Original Application	Revised Hours
Monday to Friday	07.30 - 20.00	08.00 - 20.00
Saturday	10.00 - 17.00	08.00 - 13.00
Sunday and Public Holidays	10.00 - 17.00	Closed

Filming - Out of hours operation*

Late night (28 days per year)	20.00 - 00.00
Overnight (10 days per year)	00.00 - 08.00

* Proposed Restriction - No more than 3 days in consecution and excluding weekends and public holidays.

Associated activities (i.e. construction) - Hours of operation

	Original Application	Revised Hours
Monday to Friday	07.30 - 20.00	08.00 - 18.00
Saturday	10.00 - 17.00	08.00 - 13.00
Sunday and Public Holidays	10.00 - 17.00	Closed

There will be no out of hours operation for the associated activities, which comprises the construction of the film sets in the workshops and back lot areas.

We are confident that the revised operation times as set out above fully address noise concerns due to the restriction of construction hours in line with that permitted for the adjacent residential development.

The majority of filming activities will be located inside the stage facilities and the back lot areas. These are considered acceptable locations for filming to operate during the core operation hours and are sited well away from the nearest residential properties.

Whilst there will be security lighting and street lamps within the site, we anticipate that there will be limited additional light spill resulting from the studio use. Lighting associated with production filming is typically inward facing and set focussed, and usually external (back lot) sets will be surrounded by green screens or containers further limiting any potential light spill. Furthermore, the distances between these outdoor filming locations and the nearest residential properties will not result in any harmful light spill.

In the extremely rare event that there is the likelihood of 'extraordinary' filming taking place, a letter drop to properties in the vicinity advising them of the activity will take place.

Langley Common Road access and parking

The approval of the planning application will not grant a permanent consent for the use of the Langley Common Road access, and we are aware that this is an important point for the Parish Council. We can confirm that there is no future intention to look to seek consent for this to become a permanent access to the residential development, and the original Outline Consent does not include for an access in this location on the approved Movement and Access Parameter Plan. Such an attempt to do so would require a full planning application and, as explained by Phil Hamshaw of I-Transport, traffic flows from the future residential development would make this unacceptable. Crest have explained the importance of ensuring the film studio use is kept separate from the consented accesses from Biggs Lane into the new residential development and the new primary school. The Langley Common Road access provides suitable visibility for exiting vehicles and vegetation will be removed to ensure the visibility splays are maintained.

We confirmed with you during the meeting that a Road Safety Audit will be undertaken by an independent auditor, whose findings will be published and made available with this application once this is completed.



The use of this access should help to reduce or remove the current arrangement of vehicles parking in and around this access which has been a cause of concern to the Parish Council.

Further details on the parking arrangements within the site will be provided, along with how this compares with the film studio use at Longcross Studios.

The new roundabout at Langley Common Road and Biggs Lane is currently going through the design process, and as part of this, we will be looking to introduce speed remediation measures along this stretch of highway, which should assist in reducing vehicle speeds to make this road safer for users. We are aware that you are keen for this stretch of road to become 30mph, and we support this speed reduction. We will work with WBC in implementing the speed remediation measures such that the speed limit can be reduced along Langley Common Road in its entirety.

Langley Common Farmhouse

We discussed the future of Langley Common Farmhouse with you at our recent meeting and the various related conditions and obligations which are attached to the outline consent. Condition 71 relating to building protection has already been discharged and a maintenance regime has been agreed with WBC, which we are currently reviewing and is covered below.

A specific condition (no. 70) is attached to the Outline Consent regarding the future use of these buildings, and has been copied below for reference:

70. Notwithstanding the details shown on Demolition Plan PL15-Rev E, prior to the commencement of development in Parcel Z, a detailed assessment of the heritage significance and the suitability for re-use of Langley Common Farmhouse and the U-shaped range of stables to its immediate south-east, including details of reuse, should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development should be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of these locally significant buildings is respected in accordance with the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy TB3 and Policy TB26 of the Managing Development Delivery Document.

This condition imposes a restriction on bringing forward Parcel Z for development, until we have investigated whether it would be viable to integrate the farmhouse and stables into the scheme and bring them back into use. As we discussed, this part of the site is due to come forward in the later phases of development, and in order to progress with this part of the site, Condition 70 will need to be discharged in advance of commencement of development.

We discussed the need to prioritise works on site, and that there is a significant element of works that have already been delivered under the Section 106 at the early stages of the development of Arborfield Green, particularly the secondary school and infrastructure which was required in order for the school to open. We are not able to bring forward every element of the masterplan within the first couple of years, and as a result of the phasing, Langley Common Farmhouse is situated in an area which will be planned in detail in a number of years' time.

We agreed together that as the condition above is in place, we will not be investigating the future use of these buildings at this stage of the development, but, as suggested at our meeting, we have now reviewed the maintenance regime agreed with WBC under Condition 71. This regime includes for regular inspections and for any necessary maintenance of roofs and external building fabric repairs to ensure the buildings remain wind and weathertight and safe. To further enhance this, Crest will procure a high level Planned Maintenance Programme for Langley Common Farmhouse to schedule out any necessary preventative works over the coming years.



To avoid confusion with respect to the film studio proposals and the separate ongoing maintenance and management requirements for Langley Common Farmhouse we have decided to remove this building from the red line for the current planning application.

I trust that this letter is of assistance to you, however, should you have any further queries do please contact me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "SG", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Stuart Garnett
Savills Planning

Copy: Sammie Bryans, Crest Nicholson
Steve Carey, Curtin & Co

This page is intentionally left blank