

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 12 SEPTEMBER 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.00 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), Chris Bowring (Vice-Chairman), Carl Doran, John Jarvis, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey and Wayne Smith

**Councillors Present and Speaking**

Councillor: Pauline Jorgensen

**Councillors Present**

Councillor: Norman Jorgensen

**Officers Present**

Chris Easton, Service Manager, Highways Development

Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor

Justin Turvey, Operational Development Management Lead Officer (Interim)

Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

**Case Officers Present**

Katie Herrington

Christopher Howard

Omar Sharif

Simon Taylor

**26. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted by Angus Ross, Bill Soane and Malcolm Richards.

**27. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 July 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**28. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**29. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

No applications were recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

**30. APPLICATION NO 181366 LAND SOUTH OF CHURCH LANE, THREE MILE CROSS (SHINFIELD SOUTH)**

**Proposal:** Reserved Matters application Pursuant to Outline planning consent O/2013/0346 for the erection of 86 dwellings including internal access roads, garages, parking spaces, SuDs attenuation, open space, Play Area, Allotment and associated landscaping enhancements.

**Applicant:** Taylor Wimpey.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 13 to 52.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- The addition of various plans to condition 2;
- An amendment to condition 3 to include the word 'not';
- A clarification to condition 5 regarding the allowance of a fanlight window to allow for ventilation;
- An amendment to the reference number for the drainage statement for condition 8;
- An amendment to condition 9 to change the trigger from prior to commencement to prior the 50<sup>th</sup> occupation;
- A clarification that Highways comments were received and that the highways Officers were satisfied with the parking and access roads within the site;
- A typographical clarification to the neighbour comments;
- A clarification as to why allotments were still mentioned in the report;
- A clarification to the separation distance to the end of the rear garden boundary of houses;
- A clarification as to the garden depths;
- A correction to the parking numbers.

Nina Sharp, Agent for the application, spoke in favour of the application. She stated that the application would positively enhance the character of the surrounding area, including the Church Lane frontage area. She added that vehicles would have access to the site from Church Lane. Nina stated that all existing trees on the site would be preserved and supplemented with local species as part of the application.

Members queried the distance of the site to the allotments. In response Christopher Howard, Case Officer, stated that the allotments would be adjacent to the site with some additional allotments to the North of Church Lane.

Carl Doran asked about the provision of affordable housing at the proposed development. Christopher Howard stated that the overall provision of affordable housing across the wider development site was in accordance with the S106 agreement. He added that the majority of the affordable housing was in the north of the site, with a further 10% commuted off site.

**RESOLVED:** That application 181366 be approved subject to the conditions set out in agenda pages 14 to 17, and the amendments to conditions 3, 5 and 9 as set out in the Members' Update.

### **31. APPLICATION NO 181735 - LAND TO THE REAR OF 39 & 41 LOWTHER ROAD**

**Proposal:** Application to vary condition 2 following the grant of planning consent APP/X0360/W/17/188184 (for the proposed erection of 2no detached 4 bedroom, two storey dwellings and new access driveway) in order to amend: Plot 1 to adjust garage position, add additional floor to garage with dormer window and roof lights, add single storey rear extension, and rear ground floor fenestration changes; amend plot 2 to add garage to side of plot 2, and addition of solar panels.

**Applicant:** Mr Francis.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 53 to 80.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- An alteration to the description to include solar panels;
- An alteration to condition 7 so that the windows are obscure glazed and non-opening;
- An additional neighbour comment.

Derek Dawson, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that this application was to alter the original approved (at appeal) application. He added that these changes were not included in the original application as the owner of the site had decided not to sell plot 1 as they intended to live there. He stated that solar panels were included in the application, and that the main changes to the approved application was an increased garage size (to increase the 1<sup>st</sup> floor space). He stated that the closest neighbour had been consulted over the changes and that they had no objections. Derek clarified that there would be no change to the siting of the property within the boundaries.

Wayne Smith asked what the volume increase was between the approved application and this current application. Katie Herrington, Case Officer, stated that there would be a 1.5m ridge height increase.

Members asked for clarification on a previous version of an application which had a negative impact on the character and impact of the area. Katie Herrington clarified that the revised scheme had a far lower impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Tim Holton asked for clarification on the condition for a privacy level of 3. Katie Herrington clarified that there were 5 privacy levels for windows which were determined by their 'opaqueness'.

**RESOLVED:** That application 181735 be approved subject to the conditions set out in agenda pages 54 to 57, and the amendment to condition 7 as set out in the Members' Update.

### **32. APPLICATION NO 181642 - UNITS 31 - 33 SUTTONS BUSINESS PARK, RG6 1AZ**

**Proposal:** Full planning application for the demolition of existing building and erection of new building to provide new class B2/B8 industrial unit with ancillary office space plus associated storage areas, car parking, access and landscaping.

**Applicant:** Standard Life Assurance Limited.

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out in agenda pages 81 to 104.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- An additional comment from drainage;
- An additional drainage condition.

Members queried as to how the new application would reduce the traffic impact and the trip rate when compared to the existing site. Chris Easton, Service Manager - Highways Development, stated that the existing site had a mixture of B1, B2 and B8 units. The new development would have more B8, which tend to have a lower trip rate.

Wayne Smith asked as to why the variety of application on the larger site came to Committee separately, giving little opportunity for Members to see the 'bigger picture' for the wider site. In response Justin Turvey, Operational Development Management lead officer (Interim), stated that Officers would speak to the agent and pass on Member comments.

**RESOLVED:** That application 181642 be approved subject to the conditions set out in agenda pages 81 to 87, and the additional condition 18 as set out in the Members' Update.

**33. APPLICATION NO 180091 - HAMBRIDGE FARM, EASTHAMPSTEAD ROAD, WOKINGHAM**

**Proposal:** Full planning application for the siting of temporary rural worker's dwelling.

**Applicant:** Mr M Phillips.

The Committee received and reviewed a report on this application, set out in Agenda pages 105 to 136.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- A correction to condition 3 to not include the planting of yew trees;
- A correction to paragraph 32 to indicate that the application was not CIL liable and that Informative 5 be deleted.

Luke O'Brien, Resident, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the original barn on the site was built illegally, with a planning application submitted after construction had been completed. He added that since then the site had grown and been developed further. Luke was of the opinion that there were lots of farms in Wokingham Without with temporary dwellings for workers, which had sought to become permanent dwelling after three years via a planning application. He added that after permanent planning permission had been granted, the tendency was for the farming operations to close down and the occupants use the land solely as residential dwellings. Luke queried that a requirement of this planning application was that the applicant lived in Hurst and there was therefore a need for accommodation on the farm, but the applicant's son and his wife and dependant would be the main occupiers of the dwelling and it was not stated where they lived.

Emily Temple, on behalf of the Agent, spoke in favour of the application. Emily stated that there was an existing agricultural business on the site and that the enterprise had been successful to date. She added that the NPPF supported workers dwellings for rural workers where there was a need for accommodation. Emily stated that the applicant intended to increase the pigs on the farm to 50 or more, and to increase the calves on the farm to 100, which would be achieved by having the extra workers housed on site. Emily stated that having temporary accommodation on farm sites such as this was best practice, and that the structure in the application adhered to the legal definition of a caravan. Emily added that visual mitigation of the site and drainage facilities would be fulfilled as part of the application.

Tim Holton read out a written statement from the local ward Member Angus Ross, who was in objection to the application. He stated that access from the site had limited sight lines and was obscured in several areas. He added that the character of the proposed development was excessive when compared to the character and appearance of the surrounding areas. He urged Members to listen to the concerns of local residents who also

had concerns regarding the proposed application and its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

In response to Tim Holton's question regarding the viability report, Simon Taylor, Case Officer, stated that future projections supported the suggestion that the business would be profitable in the future.

Members queried the need for accommodation for the applicant's dependant. Simon Taylor stated the application was reviewed based on appropriate accommodation within 1 mile of the site and also based on the purchase and rental prices in the area. It was confirmed that the applicant's dependant lived with the applicant and would be working on the farm.

Members discussed their concerns regarding the landscaping of the site. Wayne Smith proposed an amendment to condition 3, whereby the landscaping plan be approved in conjunction with the Chair and the local ward Member. This was seconded by Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

**RESOLVED:** That application 180091 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 106 to 109, amendments as set out in the Members' Update, and the amended condition 3 as set out above.

**34. APPLICATION NO 181122 - RUSCOMBE WORKS, UNIT 12, RUSCOMBE PARK, RUSCOMBE RG10 9JW**

**Proposal:** Full planning application for the proposed storage and distribution warehouse facility following the demolition of the existing warehouse plus erection of cycle shelter.

**Applicant:** Mr S.K Rajput and Mrs U. Rajput.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 137 to 172.

Members discussed several features of the application, including its size and impact. Simon Taylor, Case Officer, confirmed that there would not be any substantial overshadowing to surrounding buildings as a result of the proposed development.

**RESOLVED:** That application 181122 be approved subject to the conditions set out in agenda pages 138 to 144.

**35. APPLICATION NO 180887 - 5 WESTCROFT CLOSE, SIBLEY PARK, EARLEY, RG6 5QW**

**Proposal:** Full application for the proposed change of use of land to residential.

**Applicant:** Alex Mackenzie.

The Committee received and reviewed a report on this application, set out in Agenda pages 173 to 188.

Bill Luck, on behalf of Earley Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the privacy of the property was deemed to be acceptable at the time of the

original application. He was of the opinion that the open space provided as part of the wider development was of poor quality and non-compliant with the conditions of the application. He stated that the application directly removes public open space and offered no replacement, which went against WBC's MPPF and could jeopardise the enforcement of conditions.

Pauline Jorgensen, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. She stated that the landscaping of the wider development was not complete and that all of the open space needed to be developed to standard. She asked that application be deferred until the various issues had been resolved and the open spaces had been transferred to the Borough Council (and subsequently the Town Council).

Justin Turvey, Operational Development Management Lead Officer (Interim), clarified that the adoption (of open space) plan could only be implemented once this application had been approved, should Members be minded to. He added that the impact of the loss of open space as a result of this application would be minimal as the developer had already provided approximately 5 times the conditioned amount.

Wayne Smith queried as to why this land was not part of the property originally. Justin Turvey clarified that this was likely due to a conveyancing issue.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey asked how much land was being transferred to the property as a result of the application. Justin Turvey stated that it was under 2 metres at its widest point. Omar Sharif, Case Officer, clarified that the land would provide privacy opportunities to the property by allowing a fence to be constructed which would obscure two windows from the view of the adjacent open space.

John Jarvis queried what would happen to the 'sliver' of land should the application not be approved. Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor, stated that the 'sliver' of land would remain as part of the original plan should the application not be approved, which would result in that land being transferred to the Borough Council once the developer had met its commitments.

Carl Doran stated that he had seen the children's play area which formed a part of the provided open space as part of the wider development. He was of the opinion that the children's area was dangerous and not fit for purpose. He felt that the Committee could refuse the application based on the loss of open space without a suitable replacement provided.

Justin Turvey reiterated to Members that the developer was only required to provide 0.99 hectares of open space as part of the wider development, and that they had provided approximately 5 times this amount. He added that the loss of open space as a result of this was minimal (0.004161 hectares of open space lost).

Chris Bowring stated that Members could only consider the impact and harm of the loss of this open space, and as far more open space had been provided than was required that the impact was minimal.

Mary Severin stated that although it was not relevant to this application, she could contact Officers responsible for enforcement and relay Member comments regarding the issues with the wider development at the site.

**RESLOVED:** That application 180887 be approved subject to the conditions set out on Agenda Page 174.