

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 12 JUNE 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 10.59 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Simon Weeks (Chairman), Chris Bowring (Vice-Chairman), Stephen Conway, Gary Cowan, Carl Doran, Pauline Jorgensen, Abdul Loyes, Andrew Mickleburgh, Malcolm Richards and Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Charlotte Haitham Taylor

Councillors Present

Councillors: John Halsall, Adrian Mather, Imogen Shepherd-DuBey and Wayne Smith

Officers Present

Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – Strategic Development Locations, Planning Delivery
Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Case Officers Present

Stefan Fludger
Christopher Howard
Alex Thwaites

5. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Angus Ross.

6. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 May 2019 and the Minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Committee held on 22 May 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following typographical amendments:

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 May 2019:

Agenda page 6: “that the Winnersh areaa was in need...”

Agenda page 7: “that the surrounding roads were usually full with on street parking...”

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.

7. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

8. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

No applications were recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

9. APPLICATION NO. 181499 - LAND SOUTH OF CUTBUSH LANE, SHINFIELD, RG2 9AG

Proposal: Full planning application for the erection of 249 dwellings, new public open space, landscaping, surface water attenuation, access and associated works at land to the south of Cutbush Lane Shinfield.

Applicant: Bellway Homes and the University of Reading

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 15 to 110.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- An 37 updated list of head terms/alternative recommendation C on Pages 17 and 37;
- Replacement Table 1 on page 56;
- Removal of the work 'around' on page 60 paragraph 40;
- Typographical clarification on page 65 paragraph 73 stating that the total parking space allocation was 415 allocated spaces and 95 unallocated/visitor spaces;
- Clarification regarding the SANG capacity.

Jack Hatch, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Jack stated that he was surprised that this application had returned to the Planning Committee so quickly, considering the amount of details that had changed including the SANG provision. Jack was of the opinion that many of the objections raised by residents and interested parties had not been adequately addressed. Jack stated that many of the objections had highlighted that the proposed development site was not originally present in the SDL and was instead released via an Executive decision. Jack was of the opinion that the surrounding area of Shinfield was not coping with the existing levels of housing development and raised concerns relating to the lack of highways traffic concerns raised. Jack added that there was concern regarding access to the proposed development, citing that the access road was very limited with regards to space, especially on the west side of the road where the proposed development would be situated. Jack was of the opinion that the proposed access was therefore not safe. Jack concluded by querying whether the proposed development met Wokingham's needs effectively.

Mark Chatfield, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Mark stated that further consultation had not been carried out between the developer and the residents despite the significant changes to the application. Mark added that the report had noted that any archaeological findings on the proposed development site would be of little value, Mark felt that this was an opinion and he referenced that Shinfield had a longstanding history. Mark was of the opinion that there was no way to assess the impact to residents' wellbeing should the site be developed, and added that the proposed development could create additional pollution. Mark stated that traffic issues were already commonplace around the proposed development site and felt that this development would only exacerbate these existing problems. Mark added that there was poor pedestrian access to the proposed development and that this could lead to dangerous situations. Mark noted that the reptile survey was undertaken in December which was contrary to advice given by Natural England on how and when to undertake such surveys. Mark concluded by commenting that local residents would concur that there was no capacity within local services such as GP surgeries for additional local residents.

Nick Paterson Neild, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. Nick stated that the premise for housing on this land was established in 2010, and was included within the 2017 Shinfield neighbourhood plan. Nick added that Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) core strategy supported the SDL and a sustainable plan for present and future residents of Shinfield. Nick stated that a public consultation event had taken place with residents at the Shinfield Parish Hall, and added that the applicant had worked alongside a range of professional Officers to improve on various aspects of the application. Nick commented that there was an emergency access route to the proposed development along the north east side, and added that traffic surveys had been undertaken by the applicant. Nick stated that the applicant would provide S106 contributions, provide a T-junction, and landscaping enhancements to the eastern edge of the proposed site. Nick stated that the proposed development would provide 35% affordable housing, a new children's play area and sports pitch in addition to a new cycle and footpath. Nick confirmed that the proposed development would provide £6.5 million in CIL contributions which could provide for education and community facilities to benefit current and future residents. Nick concluded by stating that there were no technical objections to the application, and that the application fully accorded to the neighbourhood plan.

Jim Frewin, Ward Member, submitted a written statement which was in objection to the application. In his absence, Chris Bowring read out the statement. Jim outlined that his objections were in three main parts, namely pushing the date of development forward from 2026 to 2019 (and the need of doing so), the suitability of the SANG and residents wellbeing, and the previous character of the area. Jim stated that there were varying figures regarding WBC's land supply, ranging from 5.27 years to 11 years. Jim added that the local housing market had stagnated and was of the opinion that there was no demonstrable need for the proposed development, citing other major developments in the area. Jim added that the original proposed date of 2026 would have allowed time for appropriate infrastructure and community improvements to have been undertaken. Jim stated that a consequence of pushing the development date forward to 2019 would be a deteriorated level of wellbeing for residents. Jim was of the opinion that the calculation for the SANG allocation was questionable in addition to it being situated over 400m from the proposed development which would result in more people having to drive there. Jim stated that the development would create more pollution in the local area as a result of construction and increased car usage. Jim concluded by commenting that the prevailing character of an area was defined as being 50 to 60 metres from the application, with no 3 storey or linked terraces housing present within the prevailing area adjacent to the proposed development.

Charlotte Haitham Taylor, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. She raised concerns relating to the accompanying SANG, citing that the previous SANG was refused by Members and now no new SANG would be required for this application, thereby limiting the public open green space that local residents would be able to use. Charlotte stated that further development in Shinfield would lead to the village doubling in size, with roads already being at capacity and congested with traffic. Charlotte added that at the time when this land was released the land supply was close to 5 years, with the land supply currently being approximately 6.83 years, not taking in to account the South Wokingham SDL. Charlotte asked for assurances that planning permission would be refused in line with recommendation C should those circumstances occur. Charlotte concluded by stating that the proposed 3 storey buildings were a massive design element which were out of keeping with the prevailing area and commented that the proposed children's play area was toward the edge of the development, next to a bike path.

Pauline Jorgensen queried a number of aspects regarding traffic flow, traffic modelling and congestion in the area of the proposed development. Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that WBC use a strategic transport model which used an agreed study area to evaluate traffic flow both currently and in the future when a proposed development would be fully occupied and if the development would not be present. Judy stated that only one junction was identified to be a concern as a result of this modelling, and improvements could be made to alleviate these issues. Judy added that the strategic transport model also looked at the wider road network of the Borough as a whole, in addition to looking at the flow of traffic in and out of adjoining areas such as Reading and Bracknell. Judy stated that the circulatory carriageway could be increased to 4 lanes from 3 if required to ease congestion.

Stephen Conway asked for clarification regarding to the alternative recommendation C on agenda page 37. Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – Strategic Development Locations Planning Delivery, stated that it allowed Officers a ‘backup clause’ to refuse development if S106 obligations were not met within a reasonable timeframe. Connor added that the S106 agreement for this application was realistically a few days away from completion.

Stephen Conway queried whether the 3 storey buildings were out of keeping with the prevailing area, referring to the Officer comment on agenda page 44 which outlined 3 storey buildings in the area which Stephen felt were far from the proposed development and not in the prevailing area of the proposed development. Chris Howard, Case Officer, stated that the 3 storey buildings had already been consented in other developments locally and helped to provide a mix of housing types within the proposed development. Chris added that 3 storey buildings would be sited towards the centre of the development and would also be screened by the two storey housing which is located on the edge of the development.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey queried why the affordable homes were situated in one place on the proposed development site, and queried why solar panels were not included within the proposed development. Chris Howard stated that affordable homes were commonly situated in one area of a development site to allow for easier management of the properties. Chris added that solar panels required maintenance and were not a perfect solution, and clarified that the fabric first solution would secure carbon savings at the building stage of development.

Gary Cowan raised a number of concerns regarding this application, including the process of how the land was released via Executive decision, the precedent that recent appeal decisions had on this application, the calculation of the associated SANG including car parking provision and the long journey time to said SANG, the inclusion of 3 storey buildings when the prevailing area did not include these and the single access point to the development. Chris Howard clarified that the Ridge SANG had planning permission approved in 2014 and added that this included both parts of the SANG, as the SANG was previously partially fenced off. Chris confirmed that the SANG provision was acceptable in planning terms. Chris stated that a S106 agreement was in place to ensure that the SANG was developed and maintained to an acceptable standard.

Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor, clarified that the Executive decision only released the land into the housing land supply, and the Committee’s role was to take in to account all of the relevant planning policies and was not bound by the Executive decision.

Carl Doran queried the forecast number of houses for the SDL and how many homes were currently occupied, the tenure mix of affordable housing not meeting the 70:30 split of social rent to shared ownership, whether the lack of health care capacity was a material consideration, and how the application came forth. Chris Howard stated that there was no maximum limit to the SDL and that so long as an SDL was sustainable the Government was pressing for development to continue. Chris added that 2790 houses had been permitted within the SDL. Simon Weeks commented that the CCG Chief Executive had previously confirmed that the Shinfield GP surgery was running at half capacity and would need to employ more GPs to increase this. Chris Howard stated that the affordable housing working group had accepted the affordable housing proposals, including the commuted sum, and clarified that the affordable housing proposals reflected what was currently needed and in demand. Connor Corrigan clarified that approximately 1230 occupations had been verified within the SDL as of March 2019. Connor added that the University of Reading had instigated the application and pre-application advice.

Andrew Mickleburgh asked for clarification regarding the early release of the land into the housing land supply. Simon Weeks commented that the land was released by Executive decision as some developers had convinced the Planning Inspectorate that WBC had below a 5 year land supply, for example 4.96 years. Simon explained that this had led to other developers placing speculative applications in highly unsuitable and unsustainable development areas. By releasing the land, Simon explained that it put the housing land supply comfortably above 5 years which gave WBC back control to determine planning applications. Connor Corrigan stated that the site was always considered suitable, for that reason it was included as an adopted site in the Council's Core Strategy and had been assessed by modelling a full occupancy rate in 2026.

Malcolm Richards raised concerns relating to the site only having one main access point and an emergency access point. Chris Howard clarified that a previous appeal for a separate development was allowed, adding that this site also had one entrance.

Pauline Jorgensen stated that the Borough Design Guide stipulated that play areas should be situated towards the centre of developments, allowing the area to be overlooked by houses. Pauline reiterated concerns with regards to the traffic modelling.

Chris Bowring asked for clarification regarding the traffic modelling and the congestion levels of the relief road. Judy Kelly stated that traffic modelling had estimated that approximately 120 journeys would be made during the morning peak as a result of the proposed development. Judy added that the relief road had been included in the modelling at full occupancy rates in 2026 and the traffic flow was deemed to be acceptable.

Chris Bowring asked for clarification with regards to the emergency access to the proposed development, and whether the affordable housing provision complied with policy. Judy Kelly clarified that the emergency access would be through the east side and was covered by condition. Chris Howard stated that the affordable housing was compliant with policy, and added that it was common to have 3 storey buildings towards the centre of sites in order to allow for a greater diversity of housing mix.

A number of Members raised concerns that the development encroached on the countryside.

A number of Members raised concerns that the affordable housing mix and commuted sum was not appropriate and did not provide enough social renting dwellings. Connor

Corrigan stated that the proposals were policy compliant, and clarified that WBC allowed for off-site commuted sum contributions.

A number of Members surmised reasons for an alternative proposal to refuse the application, these being that the application:

- Was contrary to the character of the existing prevailing area due to the inclusion of 3 storey buildings;
- Had an inappropriate split of affordable housing, namely a lack of social rent properties;
- Encroached on the countryside and was contrary to CS 11;
- Had an inappropriately positioned play area situated towards the edge of the proposed development which lacked surveillance.

The proposal to refuse the application was moved by Stephen Conway and seconded by Carl Doran. Upon being put to a vote it was:

RESOLVED That application 181499 be refused, due to the application being contrary to the character of the existing prevailing area due to the inclusion of 3 storey buildings, had an inappropriate split of affordable housing - namely a lack of social rent properties, encroached on the countryside and was contrary to CS 11, and had an inappropriately positioned play area situated towards the edge of the proposed development which lacked surveillance.

10. APPLICATION NO. 190881 - ADDINGTON SEN SCHOOL, WOODLANDS AVENUE, WOODLEY, RG5 3EU

Proposal: Full planning application for the erection of a new teaching block, extended car parking and the reconfiguration of the existing MUGAs and sensory garden.

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council C/O DHA Planning Ltd

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 111 to 152.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification that agenda pages 127 to 142 were duplicated due to an administrative error;
- Additional comments received;
- Alteration to condition 6 to replace the word 'provided' with 'implemented';
- Altered condition 9.

Jenny Lissaman, on behalf of the residents' association, spoke in objection to the application. Jenny commented that the Committee had not undertaken a site visit for this application. Jenny was of the opinion that the application would allow a much loved open space to become lost and added that residents were becoming fatigued with a lack of consultation and compromise with developments in the area. Jenny queried why there was a need for the application to include a car park, when there was capacity at other local sites including the space owned by the University of Reading nearby. Jenny was of the opinion that the Officer report did not clarify how the new development would be screened, adding that a hedge would provide inadequate screening in the winter months. Jenny asked that the overall parking strategy for the area be evaluated in order to find a more amenable solution. Jenny added that Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) was ignoring its

own policies with regards to this application, and asked that the application be taken away and revised.

Jim Leivers, WBC Interim Director of Children's Services, spoke in support of the application. Jim stated that Addington was a brilliant school which had been rated as 'Outstanding' by Ofsted. Jim added that without the proposed development resource WBC would be required to provide alternate services for the children Addington served. Jim concluded by stating that the application had been carefully considered and assessed by himself, the Head teacher and Planning Officers, and was a resource which was very much needed.

A number of Members queried whether there was a need for new parking provision, when considering that there was available parking locally. In addition, Carl Doran commented that the Site of Urban Landscape Value (SULV) was being constantly eroded, and the proposed car parking would add to this. Alex Thwaites, Case Officer, stated that from a planning perspective an increase pupil and staff numbers resulted in an increase in parking provision, and this had been assessed by highways and was deemed acceptable. Alex added that there had to be a balanced approach to the SULV as the parking had to be positioned somewhere on site. Alex added that the proposed main teaching block was positioned outside of the SULV. Simon Weeks stated that if the application was approved, Jim Leivers could enter discussions with the University of Reading to explore alternative options for parking.

Stephen Conway asked for clarification regarding screening of the proposed development, and sought clarification regarding the emergency planning Officer's comments. Alex Thwaites stated that Woodlands Avenue would be screened from view, which would be secured by landscaping condition. Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – Strategic Development Locations Planning Delivery, stated that the emergency planning Officer had concerns about placing more development over a gas pipeline. Connor added that a Health and Safety Executive, gas pipeline operator, SGN and an independent consultant had been consulted and determined the risk to be minimal, for example a 1 in 1,000,000 chance of a minor event, such as a gas leak, to occur on the proposed development site.

Pauline Jorgensen queried why orange fencing was to be used at the proposed development. Alex Thwaites stated that this was a continuation of existing fencing and was required to stop access to the car park from other areas. Alex added that the fencing would be screened which was covered by condition.

Malcolm Richards queried when the construction work would take place and whether the proposed development would include sprinklers. Connor Corrigan stated that the construction work would be undertaken in a safe and considerate manner, with some of the construction taking place during term time. Connor confirmed that sprinklers would be included within the new teaching block.

Members of the Committee were unanimous in their opinion that Addington School was a brilliant resource that was in need of expansion and development in order to continue to provide excellent services to children across the Borough.

Simon Weeks proposed that the Officer recommendation be amended, to include a new informative that asked Addington School and its representatives to engage in conversation with the University of Reading to identify if an existing parking solution for the new development could be provided off site. This amendment was seconded by Chris Bowring

and upon being put to a vote it was resolved that the recommendation be amended to include the above informative.

RESOLVED That application 190881 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 112 to 117, altered condition 6 and 9 as set out in the Members' Update, and new informative 9 as resolved by the Committee.

11. APPLICATION NO. 190455 - ARBORFIELD GARRISON SDL AND ADJOINING LAND, PARCEL X, ARBORFIELD, RG2 9LN

Proposal: Application for the approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline planning consent O/2014/2280 for the construction of 70 dwellings together with access from the Primary School Access Road (PSAR), associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping and footpaths/cycleways relating to land at Parcel X.

Applicant: Bewley Homes Plc C/O Savills (Mr Stuart Garnett)

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 153 to 190.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification of condition 6(b);
- Alteration to condition 7.

Simon Weeks commented that this application was one of a series of reserved matters application for the wider Arborfield Garrison development site.

Gary Cowan commented that the 3 storey buildings towards the edge of the proposed development were not desirable, and sought clarification regarding parking restrictions. Alex Thwaites, Case Officer, clarified that parking restrictions would be enforced by condition.

Stephen Conway queried why there was a Highways objection to the application. Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – Strategic Development Locations Planning Delivery, clarified that the number of parking spaces were compliant and the Highways objection was related to the positioning of particular visitor spaces, and Highways suggested that trees be removed in order to reposition the spaces. Connor added that as the spaces were policy compliant, it was desirable from a planning and visual perspective to retain those trees.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey queried what the commuted sum would be used for in terms of affordable housing development. Simon Weeks stated that the commuted sum would be used to help redevelop the Gorse Ride estate, both renovating existing homes and creating brand new ones.

Carl Doran raised concerns over the split of affordable homes and the use of a commuted sum. Alex Thwaites confirmed that the proposed development conformed to the approved housing mix as stipulated at outline planning consent.

RESOLVED That application 190455 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 154 to 158, clarified condition 6(b) and amended condition 7 as set out in the Members' Update.

12. APPLICATION NO. 190618 - LIBERTY OF EARLEY HOUSE, STRAND WAY, EARLEY

Proposal: Full application for the change of use from Aged Care Facility to residential (all affordable), the creation of six new apartments (36no flats in total) through conversion of part of existing communal areas, provision of communal lounge, managers office and visitor room and the addition of 8no car park spaces

Applicant: Kate Bessant of Reading Almshouses Charity

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 191 to 222.

The Committee were advised that there were no Members' Updates. However, Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – Strategic Development Locations Planning Delivery, advised that the officer recommendation be updated to read:

- A. Completion of a **satisfactory** legal agreement to secure the provision of 100% affordable housing, the limitation of single occupancy for some units and the use of the visitor room

Peter Webb, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. Peter stated that the charity operated from two other locations and always aimed to build a community which worked in a harmonious way with the existing area. Peter added that the average age of residents was approximately 68, however key workers including nurses and police had been accommodated for in the past. Peter stated that a large proportion of tenants tended to be single occupants, and that the residents occupied the building under terms of licence which would allow for the property to remain as affordable rent indefinitely. Peter added that the dwelling would not offer care however individuals were welcome to bring in their own care. Peter commented that the previous owner of the property had concluded that the aged care facility was not viable to continue. Peter stated that the communal meeting room would be retained in addition to the existing management office and laundry room.

Simon Weeks commented that the living spaces were smaller in area than in many applications, however many residents could be transferring from temporary accommodation solutions such as Bed & Breakfast, in addition to many of the residents being single occupants. Simon added that the smaller living spaces were therefore acceptable in the circumstances, especially when considering the communal meeting room and garden area available to residents.

A number of Members raised concerns regarding the parking provision at the proposed development, including the possibility of increased on-street parking as a result of the proposed development. Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that the parking provision met Wokingham's parking standards. Judy added that Wokingham's parking standard was 0.5 unallocated spaces per 1-bedroom rental flat property, and as the development provided 24 spaces for 36 homes the provision exceeded standards. Judy added that a car parking management strategy was to be provided by condition.

Members of the Committee welcomed the provision of more affordable housing in the Borough.

RESOLVED That application number 190618 be approved subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 192 to 197.

CONTINUATION OF THE MEETING

At this point in the meeting 10.25pm, in accordance with Procedure Rule 8.2.9, the Committee considered a Motion to continue the meeting beyond 10.30pm, up to no later than 11pm, to enable further business on the Agenda to be transacted. This was proposed by Simon Weeks and seconded by Chris Bowring.

RESOLVED That the meeting be extended past 10.30pm, up to no later than 11pm, to enable further business on the Agenda to be transacted.

13. APPLICATION NO. 190673 - LUCKLEY HOUSE SCHOOL, LUCKLEY ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG40 3EU

Proposal: Full application for the proposed construction of a reduced size multi-use synthetic turf sports pitch with a 3m-4.5m high fence and 6no 12m column floodlights

Applicant: Mr Norman Patterson

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 223 to 292.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Correction to condition 12;
- Officer response to an additional letter of objection from neighbouring properties, represented by ET Planning Consultant.

Adrian Mather, Wokingham Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. Adrian stated that Wokingham Town Council Planning Committee had previously resolved this particular application and could therefore no reconsider it within a six month period. Adrian stated that since resolving this application, further information had come to the attention of the Town Council Planning Committee that was pertinent to the application. Adrian asked that the Committee consider all the relevant information and allow time for the Town Council to reconsider the application.

Emily Temple, Planning Consultant on behalf of local residents, spoke in objection to the application. Emily stated that she was representing 14 residents and commented that a formal stage 1 complaint had been submitted to Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) with regards to this planning application. Emily added that residents had commissioned an independent noise impact assessment which had taken into account noise sources including spectators, traffic noise, PA system(s), referee's whistle and background noise. Emily was of the opinion that many of these noise sources had not been fully assessed or modelled by the applicant's noise impact assessment. Emily was of the opinion that although condition 6 was intended to mitigate harm it did not meet the test to be an enforceable condition. Emily stated that light intrusion from the proposed floodlights would be harmful to residents, especially in the winter months and there was inadequate screening proposed between the residential properties and the proposed development site. Emily was of the opinion that the application had been returned to the Committee far too early, and urged the Committee to allow time for a further noise impact assessment to be commissioned.

Norman Patterson, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. Norman stated that a revised community involvement statement had been submitted for consideration. Norman confirmed that the application had no association with or funding supplied by Sports England and that the school's business plan was not dependant on the pitch producing any income from third party use. Norman stated that use of whistles would be restricted to Saturday mornings and added that this was easily enforceable by only allowing bookings which required use of a whistle to Saturday morning slots.

Maria Gee, Ward Member, submitted a written statement which was in objection to the application. In her absence, Chris Bowring read out the statement. Maria noted that the residents did not object to the Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) itself but instead the current plans for its design and use. Maria sought confirmation that a site visit had been carried out by Officers at dusk to assess the effects on residents and wildlife. Maria urged Officers to seek a revised noise impact assessment from Peak Acoustics, and consider the findings of the noise impact assessment commissioned by the residents of Denby Close. Maria sought clarification with regards to her previously submitted comments to confirm that an additional assessment of the effects of noise on bats both when foraging and in hibernation had been carried out. Maria sought confirmation that a risk assessment had been undertaken by the developers to assess the change of after school use from school use to substantial community use. Maria sought clarification that WBC would undertake an assessment to measure the light spillage to ensure that the development met the requirements of the planning permission, if granted. Maria was of the opinion that should the light spillage not conform to the planning permission requirements, that additional screening or hours of operation be implemented. Maria commented that a natural screen of 3m to 4m in height approximately 5m to 10m from the properties on Denby Close would provide screening from the lights. Maria noted that residents had complained that the distance measurements were incorrect and asked that they be revised prior to determination of this application.

Stephen Conway queried whether hockey would still be played on the sports pitch should the development be allowed. Stefan Fludger, Case Officer, stated that hockey would only be played during school hours and would not occur after 5pm.

Gary Cowan commented that he felt that the 12m high flood lights would intrude on neighbouring properties and that the load noises such as a whistle did not account for residents having their windows open.

Gary Cowan and Rachelle Shepherd DuBey raised concerns regarding the hours of operation for the proposed site, and suggested that these be reduced. Simon Weeks proposed that the hours of use be reduced to 8pm between the months of April through to August, with the other times for hours of use as contained in the Members' Update remaining unchanged. This proposal was seconded, carried, and subsequently amended condition 12 (as amended within the Members' Update).

RESOLVED That application 190673 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 227 to 233, and amended condition 12 as set out in the Members' Update and subsequently amended by the Committee.

**14. APPLICATION NO. 190747 - LAND REAR OF STANBURY HOUSE,
BASINGSTOKE ROAD, SPENCERS WOOD, RG7 1AJ**

Proposal: Full planning application for change of use of agricultural land to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and associated access, car park, footpaths and landscaping works (Renewal of planning permission 161920)

Applicant: Cooper Estates Strategic Land Limited

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 293 to 318.

The Committee were advised that there were no Members' Updates.

Carl Doran queried whether the 57 houses at Stanbury had been approved, Simon Weeks confirmed this to be correct.

RESOLVED That application 190747 be approved subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 294 to 298.