

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.45 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), Chris Bowring (Vice-Chairman), Carl Doran, John Jarvis, Malcolm Richards, Angus Ross and Wayne Smith

Officers Present

Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Connor Corrigan, Lead Specialist, Planning Delivery & Compliance
Judy Kelly, Principal Highways Development Control Officer
Neil Allen, Senior Lawyer & Team Leader

Case Officers Present

Laura Callan
Nick Chancellor
Stefan Fludger
Christopher Howard
Alex Thwaites

45. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey and Bill Soane.

46. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 October 2018 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.

47. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Chris Bowring declared that he had listed application number 182236 (item 53) should it be recommended for approval. He stated that he wanted the opportunity for the application to be discussed in detail by Members and was interested in hearing the views of the other Committee Members. He added that he went in to the meeting with an open mind and would listen to all evidence and viewpoints before making a decision.

48. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

There were no applications recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

**49. APPLICATION NO 182059 LAND TO THE SOUTH OF CUTBUSH LANE,
SHINFIELD (ADJACENT TO THAMES VALLEY SCIENCE PARK)**

Proposal: Hybrid planning application in respect to:

- 1) Full planning application for a 15,628sqm research and storage facility (Sui Generis Use for the British Museum); 80 parking spaces; landscaping and surface water drainage.
- 2) Outline planning application for up to 15,000sqm research and storage facility (Sui Generis Use for the British Museum) all matters reserved.
- 3) Demolition of two existing residential dwellings.

Applicant: British Museum

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application as set out in agenda pages 13 to 76.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Various additions to approved plans and documents with regards to condition 3;
- An alteration to the wording of recommendation A;
- A replacement of condition 6;
- A replacement of condition 8;
- An update to the text of condition 14;
- An amended timeframe for reviewing the community engagement with regards to condition 6;
- Additional Ecology conditions;
- An additional condition for Thames Water;
- Additional informatives to the set;
- Amendments to the alternative recommendation for refusal.

Jonathan Williams, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that the 'Ark' was a new partnership in conjunction with the University of Reading. He added that the primary function of the proposed facility would be to store artefacts and exhibits that were not currently on display at the British Museum. Jonathan stated that the proposed facility would open up the opportunity for research projects within the University of Reading. He added that the site was ideally placed with good motorway access routes and close proximity to Heathrow Airport which would allow for the transportation of artefacts around the world. Jonathan explained that the proposed facility would allow local school and communities to have access to view the artefacts by appointment.

Nick Paterson-Neild, agent, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that a globally significant collection of artefacts would be stored at the proposed facility, and that it would provide an essential site to that would allow for safe storage of the irreplaceable set of collections. Nick emphasised that the proposed site would open up various research opportunities in conjunction with the University of Reading and that it would allow for community engagement by appointment. Nick added that the proposed development would be adjacent to the Thames Valley Science Park and would raise the profile of the Borough and would help contribute to the Borough's economic development.

Carl Doran queried whether there would be any changes to the usage of Cutbush Lane as a result of the proposed application, and whether the proposed site would have any road access to Cutbush Lane. Judy Kelly, Principal Highways Development Control Officer, stated that there would be a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) with regards to works on Cutbush Lane. She added that the main access route to the proposed development would be via the adjacent Thames Valley Science Park (TVSP). Judy stated that the TVSP already had an emergency access route via Cutbush Lane and that the proposed plans included an emergency access route for the British Museum storage facility. Judy added that the goal would be encourage all traffic to go via the TVSP.

Angus Ross asked whether the public right of way would be maintained on Cutbush Lane. Christopher Howard, Case Officer, confirmed that the public right of way would be maintained for pedestrian usage and cyclists.

Malcolm Richards asked what types and volumes of traffic could be expected at the proposed new development. Christopher Howard stated that due to the nature of the facility (which was primarily as a storage facility) there would be a low volume of traffic to and from the site. He added that there would be the occasional coach from school trips and large vehicles conducting deliveries and pickups from the site.

A number of Members commented on what a prestigious and great asset to the Borough and the community that the proposed development would be.

Tim Holton queried whether the sites' rights would be specific to the British Museum. Christopher Howard stated that the rights would be specific and tied to the British Museum via a Section 106 agreement.

Wayne Smith stated that although he recognised that the proposed development would be a great asset to the Borough, his concern was how the proposed development site would impact the already congested roads and highways in the area. In response, Judy Kelly stated that it was estimated that the site would have 41 vehicle related journeys at peak hour, and that this was not a significant amount compared to the whole Borough. Judy added that not all infrastructure in the area was currently developed.

Wayne Smith queried when would the described infrastructure be delivered, and stated that residents had asked for highways infrastructure to be delivered before major projects in the past. Judy Kelly stated that the 10 major highways project schemes within the Borough were scheduled to be completed by 2021.

Carl Doran reiterated that the proposed development would be prestigious for the Borough, but stated that the application was not compliant with CP11. He added that he felt in this instance that the benefits would outweigh the negatives. Tim Holton stated that he had similar concerns and that an amendment within the Members' Update regarding community involvement had been added as a result.

RESOLVED: That application 182059 be approved subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 15 to 23, and various amendments and replacements to conditions and informatives as set out in the Members' Update.

50. APPLICATION NO 181422 - HOGWOOD FARM, SHEERLANDS ROAD, FINCHAMPSTEAD

Proposal: Application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Consent O/2014/2179, as varied by application 181194. The Reserved Matters comprise details of 178 dwellings with access from Sheerlands Road and the proposed Nine Mile Extension (NMRE), associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping, open space, footpaths/cycleways and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs). Details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be determined.

Applicant: Legal and General Homes.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application as set out in agenda pages 77 to 114.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- A decision date for the application;
- Inserting of approved plans;
- Amendment of wording to condition 8;
- Amendment of wording to condition 10;
- Insertion of new condition 13;
- Insertion of new informative 14;
- A correction and clarification to paragraph 34 of the report;
- Appended plans which superseded the original plans contained in the report.

Ruth Hopkins, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. She thanked Officers for their professional manner in dealing with the application. Ruth stated that Legal General Homes (the applicant) had welcomed and taken on board all comments from Finchampstead Parish Council and had made amendments to the scheme based on these comments. Ruth continued by thanking every member of the public who attended the open events related to this application. Ruth stated that Legal and General Homes would be on site for at least 10 years and would deliver a high quality scheme that met Wokingham Borough's high standards.

Malcolm Richards asked whether all roads within the proposed developments would be the same width. Judy Kelly, Principal Highways Development Control Officer, stated that the main roads through the site would be approximately 6 metres wide, with some of the smaller cul-de-sacs being slightly thinner in places.

Malcolm Richards asked what the plan was with regards to electric vehicle charging point layout on the proposed site. Nick Chancellor, Case Officer, stated that there was a condition for an electric vehicle charging strategy to be considered prior to development of the site.

Carl Doran commented that he was delighted that the proposed development would meet its 35% affordable housing completely on site and added that the spread of the housing tenure was also very good. He queried why 6 gardens on the proposed site would be 1 metre below the recommended garden depth. Nick Chancellor clarified that as all gardens had rear access this had resulted in 6 properties losing out on 1 meter of garden due to the space requirements of the rear garden access.

Angus Ross queried whether there would be a loss of trees due to SUD installation, whether the SUDs would be managed by the Council and whether it had been considered that the power supply would need to be upgraded to sustain a high uptake of electric vehicle charging. Connor Corrigan, Lead Specialist Planning Delivery & Compliance, stated that underground SUDs required a lot of land to operate and Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC) policy states that the Council will not take management responsibility of underground drainage crates. Nick Chancellor stated that there would be some tree loss on the site, but these would be replaced by a large number of new trees due to be planted across the site. Nick clarified that the electric vehicle charging strategy would take in to account issues such as power requirements. Connor Corrigan added that the issue of power supply for electric vehicle charging was a national issue and the WBC had been consulting on this issue.

John Jarvis stated that the electric board had no current plans to increase the power supply to accommodate for a vastly increased demand in electric vehicle charging. Connor Corrigan stated that it was unlikely that there would be a 100% uptake of electric vehicles

in the foreseeable future, and reiterated that the power supply issue was a nationally recognised issue.

RESOLVED: That application 181422 be approved subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 78 to 83, and amendments to conditions 8 and 10, insertion of new condition 13 and new informative 14 as set out in the Members' Update.

**51. APPLICATION NO 181982 - PARCEL M, PRINCESS MARINA DRIVE
ARBORFIELD**

Proposal: Reserved Matters application for Parcel M only following Outline Planning Permission O/2014/2280 for the erection of 37 dwellings. Matters seeking approval: Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale (Parcel M).

Applicant: Millgate Homes C/O Savills.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application as set out in agenda pages 115 to 142.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- A revised comment from Finchampstead Parish Council;
- An alteration to condition 2;
- An alteration to the wording of condition 6.

Eleanor Kind, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. She stated that this application was from Millgate Homes, who were part of the Countryside Group. She added that the group were excited to bring a high quality development to the Borough and were hopeful that Members would support the application.

Tim Holton raised a point from Barkham Parish Council querying what would be done to shield and protect the Ancient Stables from the proposed development. Alex Thwaites, Case Officer, stated that a range of landscaping and 'double planting' of hedges would be completed to obscure the site from the view of the Ancient Stables.

Carl Doran commented that not all of the 35% affordable housing would be delivered on site, with part of it being a commuted sum. He felt that the site could have provided more affordable housing rather than as a commuted sum.

Angus Ross asked whether the overall character of the SDL area would be consistent as different developers were responsible for different developments within the area. Alex Thwaites stated that developers had to make sure that the design of their development was compliant with the overall character of the area, and that each developer was required to submit a design guide brief with links to the design and access statement which referenced the design brief agreed at outline.

RESOLVED: That application 181982 be approved subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 116 to 119, and alterations to conditions 2 and 6 as set out in the Members' Update.

52. APPLICATION NO 181694 - LAND OFF BLAGROVE LANE

Proposal: Application for the variation of condition 1 (names of residents) and condition 2 (number of pitches) of appeal reference 3085493 dated 15/1/18.

Applicant: Mr B and CM Maughan.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application as set out in agenda pages 143 to 166.

Neil Allen, Senior Lawyer & Team Leader, clarified to the Committee that this item was before the Committee under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act. He added that the Committee was there to correct a mistake made by the planning inspector at appeal. Neil stated that only the material issues regarding the name of the occupant and the number of pitches could be considered by Members.

Chris Bowering felt that this was a matter of natural justice and that it was the Committee's job to implement what the inspector intended to do.

Wayne Smith commented on the inspector's errors, stating that they had made a fundamental error and it was now the responsibility of the local planning authority to remedy it.

Malcolm Richards queried when the occupants would have to restore and vacate the site by. Laura Callan, Case Officer, stated that the occupants needed to comply with the condition that the site would be restored to its original setting (by removing the structure on the site) by the end of the 2 year occupancy.

Carl Doran queried whether there would be a designated area for the occupants to go in 2020, when they must vacate this site. Connor Corrigan, Lead Specialist Planning Delivery & Compliance, stated that the housing land supply accounted for Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Resolved: That application 181694 be approved subject to the conditions and informative as set out in agenda pages 144 to 145.

53. APPLICATION NO 182236 - 8 MEDWAY CLOSE, WOKINGHAM

Proposal: Householder application for proposed erection single storey front extension, first floor front and side extensions, conversion of existing garage to provide habitable accommodation and internal alterations.

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Hira.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application as set out in agenda pages 167 to 180.

Richard Kind, neighbour, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the current design of the proposed 1st floor extension would make the property overly dominant when compared with its neighbouring dwelling. He added that the extension would be build right up to the boundary line of the property. Richard stated that there would be a loss of soft landscaping due the creating of a new car parking space at the front of the proposed extension. Richard stated that the quantity and quality of the daylight received by his property would be reduced as a result of the proposed development. Richard explained that due to the proposed extensions' 75° angle to his property this would cause an approximate 50% light loss compared with the current situation. Richard stated that the front extension was out of keeping and not of a similar design with other properties on the

estate. Richard added that there were 2 windows included in the proposed extension and that these would create a loss of privacy for his property. Richard felt that the proposed extension would be dominant compared to its' host dwelling.

Pauljit Hira, applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that he, his wife and 3 children resided in the property. He added that his family had grown from 3 persons to 5 over the years and the family needed to maximise the space potential from their home. Pauljit described how he and his family liked the neighbourhood and felt safe there, stating that it was a great community and Borough to live in. Pauljit felt that the application was in current keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Tim Holton noted key points raised by Mr Kind, which included the dominant nature of the extension (compared to its host and neighbouring dwelling), the reduction of soft landscaping, the loss of daylight to the neighbouring property and the proposed side windows. Stefan Fludger, Case Officer, responded to the raised points. He stated that there was a varied and mixed design on the street and therefore the front extension would not be out of keeping with the local scene. He stated that there would be a loss of soft landscaping as a consequence of creating a new parking space, but clarified that this would not be a significant change to the character of the area. Stefan stated that as the side rooms of the neighbouring dwelling were not habitable (bar 1 side room which had another source of natural light through arches in the conservatory) and the natural light to these rooms were already heavily impacted by the neighbouring property, the impact of the loss of light as a result of the proposed extension was not significant. Stefan clarified the proposed 1st floor en suite window was restricted to being obscured glass. Stefan stated that the only planning concern was with regards to the habitable room of the neighbouring property which had another natural light source.

Chris Bowring stated that having reviewed the photographs of the property and listening to the evidence presented, he was of the view that the impact on the neighbouring property was minimal when considering the impact of the current dwelling.

A number of Members commented that they felt a site visit to the property would have been very useful to make a better judgement on all issues raised by the objector. These Members felt that that they did not have enough information to make a judgement on the application at the meeting.

Wayne Smith proposed that the application be deferred and a site visit organised to assess the impact on the street scene and the impact on neighbouring boundaries that the proposed development would have. This was seconded by Malcolm Richards and upon being put to a vote it was:

RESOLVED: That application 182236 be deferred and a site visit organised to assess the impact on the street scene and the impact on neighbouring boundaries that the proposed development would have.