

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 11 MARCH 2020 FROM 7.00 PM TO 10.13 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Jenny Cheng and Lindsay Ferris

Officers Present

Lyndsay Jennings, Legal Specialist
Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager
Justin Turvey, Team Manager (Development & Regeneration)
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Case Officers Present

Nick Chancellor
Natalie Jarman
Brian O'Donovan
Baldeep Pulahi
Simon Taylor

91. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Simon Weeks.

92. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 February were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Vice Chairman in the Chair, subject to the following amendment:

Agenda page 6: "Gary Cowan queried *the cost of the development proposal.*"

MEMBERS' UPDATE

There are a number of references to the Members' Update within these minutes. The Members' Update was circulated to all present at the meeting. A copy is attached.

93. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Carl Doran declared a personal interest in Agenda item 95, land at 78 Reading Road, on the grounds that part of the application site was owned by BT, his employer. BT were not the applicants and they had no issue with the application. Carl added that he would still take part in the debate and the decision.

Stephen Conway declared a personal interest in agenda item 97, on the grounds that he had listed this item to allow for public debate. Stephen added that he would consider this application with an open mind, and would take account of the officer report, presentation, Committee debate and all other representations prior to making a judgement on this application.

94. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

No applications were recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

95. APPLICATION NO. 193059 - LAND AT 78 READING ROAD AND TO THE REAR OF 80 READING ROAD, EVERSLEY, RG40 4RA

Proposal: Full application for proposed change of use to provide light industrial (Use Class B1) and internal and external storage and distribution (Use Class B8) on the site with associated parking

Applicant: Palmarium Properties Limited

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 15 to 56.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification that the first sentence of paragraph 1 on page 33 should refer to there being three existing buildings on site;
- Further clarification relating to Policy CP15;
- Additional submissions received since the publication of the agenda, and associated officer comments.

Chris Bowring stated that the Committee had been on a site visit to the subject application site. Pauline Jorgensen stated that she had not been able to visit the site. Justin Turvey, Team Manager (Development & Regeneration), clarified that not attending the site visit did not preclude a Member from voting on an application.

Gareth Rees, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Gareth stated that he was speaking on behalf of a number of Reading Road residents. Gareth was of the opinion that the proposed development was contrary to Policy CP11 as it was an inappropriate increase in size. Gareth stated that the B usage of the site only extended to building 2, with the remainder of the site being classified for agricultural usage. Gareth was of the opinion that the proposals did not meet the requirements of Policy CP11, being neither diverse nor rural. Gareth stated that the site would have an inadequate turning circle for heavy goods vehicle (HGVs) and that it had not taken account of the provision for waste storage. Gareth added that the transport statement had inaccurate access vehicle tracking and the visibility splays were inadequate being 60m rather than 120m. Gareth asked that should this application be approved, additional conditions be added regarding enforcement action, hard fencing, limiting vehicle weight to 3.5 tonnes and limiting the on-site businesses to diverse and rural enterprises.

Robin Henderson, agent, spoke in favour of the application. Robin stated that the site was well contained and was currently in a neglected and redundant state, and was in need of meaningful use. Robin added that the applicant had engaged in consultation with officers throughout the planning process, and the applicant had received expressions of interest from businesses for usage of the site. Robin stated that B1 usage was suitable for a residential environment, and it was unlikely that there would be increased vehicle movements than would have resulted from previous planning approval on the site. Robin added that the proposals would improve the sight lines on Reading Road, and the requested planning permission would not facilitate a Collards Waste operation. Robin stated that the proposals were necessary to provide local employment, generate a much needed improvement to the site whilst having a low impact on the surrounding area.

Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that the site had been tracked for large HGVs, and an adequate and maintained turning space was conditioned. Visibility splays had been deemed acceptable after assessing data from the speed survey, and the proposals would result in an improvement to the current situation on Reading Road. Judy stated that the 'left in and left out' turns were the tightest manoeuvres and that was the reason why these had been assessed.

Simon Taylor, Case Officer, stated that Condition 4 required additional detail regarding boundary treatment, including additional fencing and landscaping.

Abdul Loyes asked for additional clarification regarding Policy CP11. Simon Taylor stated that although the proposals breached Policy CP11 as it referred to a rural enterprise, the existing lawful business use was a strong material consideration. The NPPF gave provision for expansion of an existing business within reason, and the proposals were deemed to be an appropriate expansion of the existing site.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried whether it could be conditioned to prevent a Collards operation on site, whether the visibility splays were impacted by the size of the vehicles, whether the shared pedestrian and vehicular access could be improved by condition, and asked for confirmation that the existing buildings would be retained with no new building construction planned. Simon Taylor stated that there was nothing to stop a Collards operation, however a skip hire business would require a *suis generis* use classification and would also be restricted by the limited Class B8 external storage given the required turning circle on site. In addition, it would unfairly restrict the applicant to not be allowed to operate on site. Simon stated that no new buildings would be constructed as part of this application, and the existing buildings would be reused. Judy Kelly stated that the visibility splays were based on the recorded speed of traffic, with a speed survey having been completed. Judy added that the visibility splays met standards, and the shared access was already existing and was not deemed to be a highways concern.

Stephen Conway queried why the trip rate was calculated to be lower than the existing vehicle movements, and whether a condition stating a reasonable vehicle weight was necessary to reassure residents. Judy Kelly stated that the trip rate was based on a national database, specifically looking at the standard trip rates for B use classes for the site. Simon Taylor stated that the access was proposed to be widened, and the previous restriction to 3.5 tonnes was related to a 17 person minibus, and not conditioning a weight limit was not deemed to cause significant harm to the road network or neighbour amenity.

Gary Cowan queried the fencing proposals, queried why not having a vehicle weight limit was deemed to not cause harm when a 3.5 tonne limit was previously imposed, queried why the northbound traffic exiting the access road was not covered within the transport statement, and requested that the hours should be limited to an 8am start as was standard for other sites. Simon Taylor stated that the fencing was conditioned, with fencing between building 2 and the northern boundary to be constructed with additional landscaping. The 7.30am start time was based on previous conditions. Judy Kelly stated that vehicle access was due to be widened, and the left turn was the tightest manoeuvre and was therefore tracked. It was confirmed that the northbound access was deemed acceptable in highways terms.

Carl Doran queried why the existing 3.5 tonne vehicle weight limit should not remain considering the whole access road was not due to be widened, and whether a gate would

be constructed to allow pedestrian access to the other site. Simon Taylor stated that beyond number 80A Reading Road the access was only for the subject application site and there would therefore be no other pedestrians on this stretch other than those entering the application site. Resultantly, there would be low conflict between vehicles and pedestrians on this stretch of road. Simon stated that a gate would be subject to details.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey queried what weight limit was imposed on vehicles associated with the sawmill. Simon Taylor stated that the mill was a historic usage, and had no planning permission. In addition, there were no traffic number datasets related to the mill, however the proposed widening of the access road would benefit any vehicles travelling to or from the mill.

Pauline Jorgensen queried what percentage of the road would be made into two-way access. Simon Taylor stated that approximately 60 percent of the road would be made into a two-way access, which would reduce the potential for traffic conflict on 60 percent of the road. Judy Kelly stated that a maximum of 19 vehicle movements per hour were expected, and the part of the road that was not due to be widened had good visibility to allow vehicles to wait for an oncoming vehicle. Two 2.6m wide vehicles could pass by side by side on the widened stretch of road.

Angus Ross was of the opinion that it would be unreasonable to impose a vehicle weight restriction for this site if there was no such restriction for the BT site or mill which both used the access road.

Angus Ross queried whether the site levels, as stated, were correct. Simon Taylor stated that there were no proposed changes to the site levels.

Malcolm Richards queried what would be the maximum weight of vehicle that could travel down this access road should the weight limit be unrestricted. Judy Kelly stated that a vehicle of 44 tonnes, the same permitted on other highways, could use this access road. The maximum vehicle length would be approximately 16.5m.

Pauline Jorgensen queried why a 3.5 tonne vehicle weight limit was felt acceptable to impose before, but not considered acceptable to impose now. Simon Taylor stated that the previous vehicle weight limit was due to the access road width, and to provide certainty on the types of buses (minibuses) accessing the site. Simon added that the proposals were acceptable on traffic access grounds with the proposed widening.

Gary Cowan was of the opinion that there needed to be conditions regarding vehicle weight restriction, a substantial boundary fence and, an 8am start time. Chris Bowring queried whether a vehicle weight restriction condition was necessary and reasonable. Justin Turvey stated that a restriction to this site would still allow unrestricted vehicle weights for the mill and the BT site.

Gary Cowan proposed an additional condition, delegating officers to assess a reasonable vehicle weight limit and condition it to the subject application site. This proposal was seconded by Pauline Jorgensen, passed, and added to the list of conditions as set out in the officer recommendation.

Gary Cowan proposed that a 2m boundary fence be conditioned, and an 8am opening time be conditioned. This was seconded, passed, and added to the list of conditions as set out in the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED That application number 193059 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 16 to 22, and additional three conditions as resolved by the Committee.

96. APPLICATION NO. 192018 - HARE HATCH SHEEPLANDS, BATH ROAD, HARE HATCH

Proposal: Full application for the change of use of three existing nursery glasshouses into events area relating to the existing nursery

Applicant: Hare Hatch Sheeplands

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 57 to 80.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- A request from the agent to review conditions 3 and 4, and associated officer responses in objection;
- Amendment to condition 3(f);
- Amendment to condition 4.

Frank Moore, resident, spoke in support of the application. Frank stated that he was a keen amateur gardener, and he fully supported this planning application to allow three existing nursery structures to host horticultural events. Frank added that this site was a benefit to the community, and the application was fully in line with Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) vision of enabling strong and vibrant communities to thrive.

Alyson Jones, agent, spoke in support of the application. Alyson stated that the enforcement notice associated with the site did not prohibit the events related to this application. Alyson added that a range of activities would be hosted on site, including flower shows, children's activities, community events and Tywford in Bloom. Alyson stated that the applicant had applied for permission to host events on weekends and school holidays, however they accepted the restricted hours.

Stephen Conway stated that he fully supported the proposals, and queried how the 24 day limit was calculated. Simon Taylor, Case Officer, stated that the Inspector had previously commented that 20% was an appropriate guide in establishing what constituted an ancillary use limit. Officers had calculated 20% of 52 weekends, which rounded to 12 weekends (or 24 days). 73 days, as requested by the applicant, was deemed as excessive when compared to the existing use.

Andrew Mickleburgh recognised the significant community benefit of the application, and queried whether there were any parking concerns associated with the proposals. Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that there were 85 parking spaces required for A1 use standards, which were available within the site, and therefore the parking provision was deemed satisfactory for the proposals.

Pauline Jorgensen queried what defined a community event. Simon Taylor stated that a list of events was contained on agenda page 59.

Malcolm Richards queried whether the hours of use should reflect bank holiday usage, as standard on applications. Simon Taylor stated that the hours needed to be corrected to reflect the existing conditions on site.

RESOLVED That application number 192018 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 58 to 60, amendments to condition 3(f) and 4 as set out in the Members' Update, and amendment to the restrictions of use to reflect the existing conditions relating to bank holidays.

97. APPLICATION NO. 192280 - LAND TO REAR OF 20 -22 STATION ROAD, TWYFORD

Proposal: Full application for the erection of a 1No bed two storey dwelling following demolition of the existing workshop.

Applicant: Mr Ray Cook

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out in agenda pages 81 to 112.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Omission of Condition 17;
- Minor amendment of Condition 20;
- Addition of Condition 21;
- Addition of Condition 22;
- Comment from Twyford Parish Council, objecting to the proposals and supporting the residents' viewpoints;
- Correction to paragraph 5.

Selena Durrant, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Selena stated that the application was of modern design, which was out of keeping with the rest of the properties within the conservation area. Selena stated that her home was built in 1901 and retained its original character. Selena added that the proposals did nothing to enhance the conservation area, and mixed-use parking was at a premium in the area. Selena was of the opinion that the designs were unsympathetic to the character of the street scene, and three vehicles regularly parked alongside the existing garages. As parking was already a daily issue, the proposals would only create more issues. Selena stated that the proposals would overlook into her property, in addition to creating additional noise to the rear of the property. Selena added that an elderly neighbour would be affected by additional noise and privacy concerns. Selena asked that the Committee conduct a site visit, in order to gain a better understanding of privacy concerns and develop a better picture of the character of the existing conservation area.

Thomas Rumble, agent, spoke in support of the application. Thomas stated that the existing site was in a dilapidated state and was in need of redevelopment. Thomas added that the proposals were for a new one bedroom dwelling which followed the design of a previous appeal decision. The Inspector had commented that the current site negatively affected the conservation area due to its dilapidated state. Thomas stated that the site was situated within a highly sustainable area, and the new property designs were more desirable than the existing property. Thomas added that the Inspector had refused the previous appeal on two grounds (timber cladding, and the 1st floor infringing on the adjacent dwelling), both of which had been remedied within the current application proposals. Thomas stated that the proposals furthered development on brownfield land.

Thomas added that the plans allowed for a positive active frontage, with a contemporary dwelling design situated within a sustainable area.

Lindsay Ferris, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. Lindsay stated that the proposals were totally out of character with the Twyford conservation area. Lindsay stated that the Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) conservation Officer had raised an objection to the proposals. Lindsay stated that the site was cramped and overlooked neighbouring properties. Lindsay stated that acceptance of the proposed structure could break down the character of the area. Lindsay saw no reason that WBC should accept the proposals in their current form. Lindsay stated that the Inspector's comment regarding that the proposals were better than the existing were unusual for an Inspector, as he was not commenting on a planning consideration. Lindsay asked that the Committee refused the proposals.

Stephen Conway commented that the issue with this application was that the Inspector had made some very clear conclusions regarding the designs, and had in essence invited the applicant to re-apply with suggested amendments. Stephen added that the WBC conservation officer had raised a very strong objection to the application, and the officers recommendation was very much 'on-balance'. Stephen commented that parking spaces were very limited in this area, and there would be significant overlook which would be contrary to the Borough Design Guide. Stephen queried whether the application was compatible with the conservation area status, and suggested the Committee conduct a site visit to assess the street scene.

Chris Bowring queried how the Committee should weigh up the conservation officer's objection against the Inspector's findings. Justin Turvey, Team Manager (Development & Regeneration), stated that officers had refused three similar designs, however the Inspector had made some very positive comments regarding the design of this application subject to amendments. As the Inspector gave the applicant clear guidance, which was followed, the Inspectors judgements should be viewed as the main consideration.

Pauline Jorgensen queried whether an inspector would overturn a previous Inspector's decision, and was of the opinion that the proposals were not acceptable. Justin Turvey stated that this was unlikely unless there had been a material change. Government guidance stated that it would be unreasonable behaviour to ignore the advice of an Inspector, which would result in costs being awarded against WBC.

Andrew Mickleburgh stated his support for a site visit, and was of the opinion that the large expanse of front facing glazing was out of character with the surrounding conservation area.

Gary Cowan was of the opinion that the designs were wholly out of character with the surrounding conservation area, and the proposals would destroy the character of the street scene. Gary was of the opinion that the 'on balance' decision should have been to refuse the application.

Angus Ross stated that a site visit would give WBC a stronger case, should the Committee be minded to refuse the application at a later date.

Malcolm Richards queried whether the 20th March expiry would present an issue should this item be deferred for a site visit. Justin Turvey stated that it would be reasonable to go beyond the expiry date should Members request a site visit.

Carl Doran asked for clarification of the purpose of a conservation area, and commented that the scheme was out of keeping with the character of the conservation area. Justin Turvey stated that a conservation area did not mean that there could be no further development, however there was a higher threshold when assessing planning applications. Justin added that the Inspector would have taken these considerations into account.

Carl Doran asked for clarification as to whether the amenity spaces were below standard. Natalie Jarman, case officer, confirmed the amenity spaces to be 27m², which were under standard.

Chris Bowring commented that the Inspector had made a very strong judgment, and it was likely that this would be allowed at appeal should the Committee be minded to refuse the application.

Stephen Conway commented that a site visit was very important, as it would allow Members an opportunity to assess the character of the conservation area. Stephen added that any new build within this area should seek to preserve or enhance the conservation area.

Angus Ross commented that a site visit would allow the Committee to be more informed about any potential reasons for refusal, should this be how the Committee was minded at a later date.

Stephen Conway proposed that this item be deferred, in order to allow for a Member site visit to be conducted to assess the relationship of the proposed dwelling to the existing dwellings, and assess whether the proposed dwelling was appropriate for a conservation area. This proposal was seconded and carried.

RESOLVED That application number 192280 be deferred, in order to allow for a Members site visit to be undertaken for the reasons listed above.

98. APPLICATION NO. 200089 - CARNIVAL POOL LEISURE HUB LAND AT WELLINGTON ROAD & FINCHAMPSTEAD ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG40 2AF

Proposal: Full planning application for the erection of 55 dwellings (flats) with associated landscaping, parking, access and drainage. Demolition of all existing buildings on site. The proposal is for an amended design to the dwellings previously approved under reference 172012, with replacement leisure centre to be constructed pursuant to planning permission 172012.

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council (WBC)

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 113 to 152.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification of paragraph 128;
- Insertion of plan numbers;
- Correction of condition 11 to state "visibility splays";
- Amendment to condition 14;

- Amendment to condition 21;
- Additional condition 35.

David Smith, WBC, spoke in support of the application. David stated that this application was an alteration to the residential phase of Carnival Pool redevelopment which had previously been approved. David added that this would be the 'last piece of the jigsaw' for the Wokingham town centre redevelopment. David stated that the updated proposals included amendments to the residential block, which were viewed as an improvement to the previously agreed scheme. David added that the application was conditioned to deliver 10% renewable energy, however officers were hoping to achieve a significantly higher level, with the goal being a carbon neutral building to be achieved by methods including a flat roof which would allow for additional coverage of photovoltaic panels.

Carl Doran queried why the viability assessment was not being made available for public and Member viewing, when the guidance stated that such viability assessments should be made publically available unless there were exceptional circumstances. Nick Chancellor, case officer, stated that the viability assessment was not available due to commercial sensitivity. However, the assessment deemed that affordable housing was not viable for this development.

Carl Doran queried whether by stating that occupants should use the parking at Carnival Pool car park could set a precedent for private developers to argue a similar proposal. Justin Turvey, Team Manager (Development and Regeneration) stated that the Committee was realistically looking at the amendments to the scheme which was previously approved. The details regarding car parking had been previously approved at Committee. Justin added that the fall back for the applicant could be to proceed with the previously approved scheme, which would not have the updated design elements.

Andrew Mickleburgh was of the opinion that WBC should set a high standard for issues such as affordable housing and renewable energy. Andrew queried why there was no immediate commitment from WBC to provide a carbon neutral development. Nick Chancellor stated that planning policy only required a 10 percent renewable energy source for such a development, however the applicant desired to exceed this considerably.

Gary Cowan commented that it was difficult for the Committee to make a decision on this application when it had not seen the viability assessment. Gary also queried how many trees would and had been cut down, where, and how many would be replaced. Nick Chancellor stated that the original site had 46 trees, some of which had already been felled. The proposals were to remove a total of 33 trees (including those previously removed), including a number of grouped small and low quality trees. Only 13 trees of quality were proposed to be removed, with 13 to be retained and 36 high quality trees to be planted which would result in a net gain of 3 trees and a gain in the quality of the trees. The landscaping officer had felt that this would be a significant improvement, and a proportion of the trees would be semi-mature specimens.

Chris Bowring commented that the previously approved application had approved various aspects of the scheme, such as parking and landscaping.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey stated that WBC should be setting a high threshold for developers when it came to affordable housing and combatting the climate emergency.

Abdul Loyes queried what the changes were to this application compared to the previously approved application. Nick Chancellor stated that some aspects of the design had changed including the elevations and a flat roof, which necessitated a new planning application.

Stephen Conway asked for confirmation that a new viability assessment had been undertaken, and had taken account of current figures. Nick Chancellor confirmed that a new viability assessment had been completed, which had taken into account all relevant data and had concluded that it was not viable to provide affordable housing on site.

Angus Ross stated that in future, a management plan for upkeep and preservation of planted and existing trees should be included within applications, to prevent situations where trees repeatedly died and had to be replaced. Nick Chancellor stated that a Landscape Management Plan was conditioned to manage the landscaping on site.

Stephen Conway suggested that an Informative be added, stating that the Committee was disappointed that no affordable housing would be provided, and reminding that applicant that in future WBC should be looking to set an example to provide affordable housing to meet WBC's own standards. This was seconded by Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, carried and added to the list of Informatives.

RESOLVED That application 200089 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 114 to 127, various amendments and corrections to conditions as set out in the Members' Update, additional condition 35 as set out in the Members' Update, and additional informative as resolved by the Committee.

99. APPLICATION NO. 200191 - 314 KINGFISHER DRIVE, WOODLEY, RG5 3LH

Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a two storey side extension, new driveway and dropped kerb.

Applicant: Mr and Mrs J Kalsi

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 153 to 168.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Comments from Woodley Town Council, recommending that the application be refused;
- Additional condition 9.

Carol Jewell, Woodley Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. Carol stated that Woodley Town Council had previously submitted objections to this application, however they did not come through. Carol added that there were poor sight lines at the application site, with a children's play area opposite the proposed driveway. Carol stated that any vehicle exiting the proposed driveway would have to come forward significantly due to a blind spot, which could cause accidents. Carol added that the estate was designed to have an open frontage with rear access to each property. Carol stated that none of the other corner properties had this type of access, with house number three not setting a precedent as it had a path which only served 4 houses. Carol raised a number of safety concerns that these proposals could cause, and was of the opinion that this application would be out of keeping with the character of the area in addition to setting a

precedent. Carol stated that the dropped kerb had not met any of the four criteria within Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) guidance, and asked that the application be refused.

Katrina Hearne, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Katrina stated that a front facing driveway was not in keeping with the character of the street scene, and the property was situated on a blind spot opposite a children's play area. Katrina added that this driveway would pose a hazard to Council staff who came to maintain the park, in addition to the park being used as a general cut through for train commuters. Katrina stated that a vehicle in the proposed driveway could have to reverse into oncoming traffic, and the proposal would reduce on-street parking for residents. Katrina added that the proposals would create access issues for emergency vehicles. Katrina stated that there were two local primary schools, a secondary and an SEN in the area which resulted in the footpaths being heavily used by children and parents. Katrina was of the opinion that the proposals would be a danger to all road users, pedestrians and cyclists. Katrina stated that the existing six foot fence hides the vehicle exiting the property, and the property had sufficient parking already.

Jenny Cheng, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. Jenny stated that she objected to the driveway proposals, as they did not accord to the original design of Kingfisher Drive which had service roads and garages. Jenny added that each house had rear access, and drivers would not be expecting a driveway when using this stretch of the road. Jenny stated that the development was designed to be open, and the proposals were not in keeping with the character of the street scene.

Carl Doran queried whether the height of the fence had been considered. Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that the Members' Update included a condition to ensure that the fence was lowered to allow for a suitable pedestrian visibility splay.

Andrew Mickleburgh asked for specific details on highways considerations. Judy Kelly stated that cars were parked on the road at the moment, and the driveway would only remove one on street parking space whilst creating two off street parking spaces. The visibility splays were secured by condition, and the proposals met all highways safety standards.

Pauline Jorgensen queried whether the dropped kerb required planning permission. Justin Turvey, Team Manager (Development and Regeneration), stated that a means of access came under permitted development rights, which would require highways approval but not planning permission.

Stephen Conway asked for clarification as to whether reversing out of the driveway was considered safe. Judy Kelly stated that both reversing and driving forwards from the proposed driveway had been assessed as adequately complying the conditioned visibility splays.

RESOLVED That application number 200191 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 153 to 155, and additional condition 9 as set out in the Members' Update.

100. APPLICATION NO. 193417 - SQUIRES GARDEN CENTRE, HEATHLANDS ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG40 3AS

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of a single storey structure to form a kitchen with associated fridge/freezer unit plus extension of existing café terrace, installation of an infill canopy over rear entrance and erection of a new 2 metre high metal mesh fence to the southwestern part of the site boundary

Applicant: Martin Breddy

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 169 to 190.

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

Martin Breddy, applicant, spoke in support of the application. Martin stated that the proposals represented a modest increase in the site footprint. Martin added that the proposal would allow for a larger kitchen which would improve staff conditions. A canopy would be moved to improve the customer experience, and the fence would be replaced in order to improve security. Martin added that the fencing would be sufficiently landscaped to shield it from view.

Angus Ross stated that the applicant had recently acquired the site and had done much to improve the existing structures.

RESOLVED That application number 193417 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 170 to 171.