

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 9 JUNE 2021 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.38 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Chris Bowring (Chairman), Angus Ross (Vice-Chairman), Sam Akhtar, Stephen Conway, Carl Doran, Pauline Jorgensen, Rebecca Margetts, Andrew Mickleburgh, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey and Bill Soane

**Councillors Present and Speaking**

Councillors: Sarah Kerr and Shirley Boyt

**Councillors in Attendance**

Councillors: Gary Cowan

**Officers Present**

Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager  
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor  
Justin Turvey, Operational Manager – Development Management  
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

**Case Officers Present**

Stefan Fludger  
Benjamin Hindle  
Baldeep Pulahi  
Graham Vaughan  
Adriana Gonzalez

**1. APOLOGIES**

Gary Cowan attended the meeting virtually, and was therefore marked as in attendance, and was not able to propose, second, or vote on items.

**2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 March 2021, and the minutes of the extraordinary meetings of the Committee held on 24 March 2021 and 18 May 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Members wished to share their thanks to the outgoing Chairman, Simon Weeks, for his service and dedication to the Committee.

**3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Angus Ross declared a personal interest in agenda item 5, on the grounds that he had worked as the liaison between Wokingham Borough Council and the Friends of Foxhill. Angus added that he had not been involved in this application and had not formed a view regarding it. Angus stated that he would take part in both the discussion and voting related to this item.

Andrew Mickleburgh declared a prejudicial interest in agenda item 9, on the grounds that he was a member of the Earley Town Council Planning Committee which had made a recommendation of refusal. Andrew added that he had formed a view relating to this application, and would therefore take no part in the discussion or voting related to this item.

#### **4. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

No applications were recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

#### **5. APPLICATION NO 203539 LAND OFF BEARWOOD ROAD, WOKINGHAM**

**Proposal:** Full planning application for the change of use of 14.77ha from existing private woodland to informal recreational land and associated infrastructure including pedestrian and vehicle access, car parking and footpath network and landscaping.

**Applicant:** Mr and Mrs Pike

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 39 to 88.

The Committee were advised that there were updates within the supplementary planning agenda. However, the Committee were advised verbally on the night that the comments from Wokingham Town Council, contained on agenda page 46, were incorrect and related to a previous application at the site. Page 87 contained the correct response from Wokingham Town Council.

Tony Delliston, resident, commented on the application. Tony stated that the current footpath on the northern boundary was 0.6m wide, and a lot of removal of vegetation would have to occur to facilitate the path being made 2m wide. An alternative path was suggested in Tony's comments on the application, which would not have required the removal of trees. Tony was of the opinion that his suggestion should have been progressed and used. Tony felt that as this was not an application for a SANG, fencing may not be needed at all on site. Tony stated that barbeques should not be permitted on site, as the Fire Service were often required to attend fires as a result of barbeques. Tony commented that the applicant was a Wokingham Borough Council supplier, which could arise to a conflict of interest. As such, Tony felt that the comments made by the environmental health officer should be disregarded, and instead an independent noise assessment report should be commissioned.

Nicola Greenwood, BHS Access and Bridleways Officer, commented on the application. Nicola stated that the RG40, RG41, RG2 and RG6 postcodes covered the area in and the around Barkham and Wokingham parishes.

Nicola added that the new postcode figures provided by DEFRA dated April 2021 showed a 25% increase in horse ownership in these postcodes with a new total of 1,548 horses. These horses brought in excess of £8.5million per annum to the local economy, almost £3 million more than 9 years ago. Nicola attributed this increase in horse ownership to the large number of new houses that have been built in this area of Borough. Nicola stated that Foxhill had been enjoyed by horse riders for over 50 years. Nicola was of the opinion that in order to retain and increase rural job and business opportunities, off road horse rider access, close to where these people lived, needed to be increased and not decreased. Nicola asked that should this application be approved, access between Bearwood Road and Limmerhill Road be retained for horse rider use to ensure that riders who kept their horses in Limmerhill Road were not forced onto Barkham Road to get to the Coombes. Nicola concluded by asking that a circular bridleway be placed around the outside of the proposed site for recreational horse rider and cyclist use.

Emily Ford, agent, spoke in support of the application. Emily stated that the proposals sought full planning permission for 14.7 hectares of woodland to become informal

recreational land. Emily added that the proposal would regularise public use of the land whilst including new accessible recreational routes of up to 2.3km for use throughout the year. Emily stated that trees and protected species had been considered carefully throughout the preparation of this application. Emily added that the site would have five access points with kissing gates, and the site would have eighteen car parking spaces including three disabled spaces. The car park would be well screened and would also include cycle parking facilities. Emily concluded by stating that invasive vegetative species would be removed from the site, the overall proposals would increase the biodiversity on site, and if approved the proposals would allow public access to the site in a formal manner.

Tim Lloyd, Friends of Foxhill, spoke in support of the application. Tim stated that the residents of Woosehill had used this site for decades as a recreation space, many of whom had not realised that the site was privately owned. Tim added that the guarantee of public access was appreciated, as the site was well used. Tim asked that conditions be amended to facilitate meaningful consultation with the local community when detailed plans were being prepared, to alleviate concerns including potential flooding, wildlife conservation, and footpath layout.

Sarah Kerr, Ward Member, commented on the application. Sarah stated that the site was privately owned and had been enjoyed by the community for many years as a recreation space. Sarah asked that it be conditioned that the Friends of Foxhill be consulted on the detailed design stage, as a previous alternative footpath was suggested by the group and subsequently rejected for this scheme. Sarah asked that conditions regarding access to the site be updated to reflect that construction of the car park would facilitate new users, and existing users should not be denied access during construction of the car park. Sarah asked that a condition be added that dealt with the public right of way officer's request for a larger version of the kissing gates being added to allow for all sizes of motorised wheelchairs. Sarah asked that the Committee add a condition that removed the need for fencing on the northern boundary where residential fencing was already in situ, and access had been available for a considerable time. Sarah asked that the Committee add a condition which required suitable and safe walking and cycling infrastructure along Bearwood Road from Sindlesham to ensure the sustainability of the proposals. Sarah stated that there had already been a number of issues regarding woodland fires as a result of barbecues, and asked that a condition be added which banned their use on site. Sarah noted that the applicant owned the adjacent scrapyards, and asked that a condition be added which would require the applicant to install noise mitigation measures at the adjacent scrapyards site. Sarah was of the opinion that cyclists should not be prohibited to use the space, and asked that the Committee condition cycling to be allowed on site. Sarah asked that clarification regarding secure cycle storage be provided, as it was currently suggested to be situated solely in the proposed car parking. As many cyclists would access the site from a variety of entrances, Sarah asked that cycle storage be provided at all of the entrances to allow cyclists to store their bicycle safely if they then chose to walk the site.

Stefan Fludger, case officer, clarified a number of the points mentioned by the speakers. Stefan stated that the footpath along the northern boundary had been assessed largely in relation to Kent Close. This footpath was close to the existing footpath and there was not much of a level difference. Stefan confirmed that the closest path to a residential property was 12m away. Stefan commented that there would be removal of rhododendron on site, and there would be a considerable amount of vegetative screening on the edge of the site, and officers were content that there would be no significant overlooking from the pathways.

Stefan stated that the majority of the site would include post and rail type fencing, and the only substantive fencing would be adjacent to the WBC owned land which adjoined the open space, which went around the whole site apart from between it and the adjacent WBC owned land. Officers felt that the inclusion of these fencing proposals were not seen as harmful. Stefan confirmed that there had been no objection raised by Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service. Stefan stated that the noise related to the adjacent scrapyards was not considered to prevent the use of the site as an open space, and the environmental health officer had raised no objections. Relating to use of the site by horse riders and cyclists, Stefan stated that the increase of accessibility of the site via hard surfaces outweighed the negatives of not allowing access for horse riders or cyclists. Stefan stated that a number of issues would be resolved via conditions, including tree surveys, the final routing of the footpaths, and ecology surveys. Justin Turvey, Operational Manager – Development Management, stated that the Chairman could request that some conditions were agreed in consultation with the Chair and another nominated Member. Stefan Fludger commented that the proposed kissing gates met British standards and allowed all but the largest motorised mobility vehicles access. Regarding the access to the site by neighbours on the northern boundary, Stefan stated that neighbours had built up direct access from their gardens directly in to the site over time, and in planning terms these neighbours had no rights to this access and officers felt there were no grounds to refuse this application based on loss of access from these properties. Stefan stated that there were no footpaths to Sindlesham, but this mirrored the current situation, and the fact that the highway was outside of the application meant that officers felt that this lack of access would not warrant a reason for refusal as there was good access from other areas including the Woosehill area. Stefan confirmed that this application could not be used to mitigate the noise at the adjacent scrapyards. Stefan added that no officers had objected to the proposed bicycle storage in the car park as users would need to get off of their bicycles to move through the kissing gates.

Chris Bowring queried whether amending elements of the scheme, such as larger kissing gates, would be a permissible amendment. Justin Turvey stated that Members could make a change such as this, and Members would need to consider whether the changes would be necessary and whether they would meet the planning conditions tests.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey queried whether there would be sufficient access for emergency vehicles such as fire engines in and out of the site, queried whether the access from Simon's Lane would be made permanent, queried whether any electric vehicle charging bays would be provided on site, queried whether this could be a precursor for a future housing application, queried why horse riders were now considered an issue whereas in the past they were not, and queried who would be responsible for maintenance of the site. Stefan Fludger clarified that the car park gate would be large enough to accommodate emergency vehicle access. Stefan clarified that Simon's Lane did not provide access to this part of Foxhill. Relating to electric vehicle charging, Stefan stated that there was no provision on site, and Highways officers had not recommended that any be provided. Stefan clarified that this was not an application for a SANG, and it was not related to any current housing application. Stefan stated that whilst horse riders would lose access to the site, the improvements in terms of making the site accessible to disabled users, or users using pushchairs, outweighed these negatives. In addition, some of the footpaths were relatively narrow and could create a conflict between horse riders and pedestrians. Stefan confirmed that the maintenance of the site would be the responsibility of the applicant, although this could change in the future.

Carl Doran queried what changes had been made to the car parking compared to the previously refused application, queried whether the Bearwood Road's 40MPH section could be extended as it could be quite dangerous, queried how the driving of the 20m wide pathways be managed and monitored, and queried how any future SANG assessment would be considered. Stefan Fludger stated that the car park was proposed to be in the same location, however the previous application lacked details relating to the strategy for removal of vegetation and trees, which was much more detailed within this application. Highways officers had not raised any objections related to the speed limit on the Bearwood Road, and it did not warrant a reason for refusal. Stefan commented that half of the site was classed as ancient woodland, and there was conflicting advice received. Natural England had not objected to the proposals, however the Woodland Trust had. Tree and ecology officers felt that the surfacing of the pathways would mitigate many of the issues involving people straying from pathways. Stefan stated that should the site be considered for a SANG at some point in the future, his understanding was that the current footfall of the site at that time would be assessed to ensure suitable capacity of the site.

Chris Bowring queried whether the removal of trees would be considerable, or un-substantial. Stefan Fludger confirmed that only a small number of trees were proposed to be removed. The number of trees to be removed would be determined after the removal of rhododendron, to allow the footpaths to be routed around the trees thereby minimising the amount which would be required to be removed.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried what would happen should the site not be finished or maintained, queried whether any modelling had been carried out relating to increased footfall on site in terms of additional noise or litter which could affect neighbouring amenity, queried whether there was any parking standard for this type of use as there was a concern that should on-site parking spaces not be sufficient this could cause issues on the already busy Bearwood Road, and queried whether there would be adequate conditions and safeguards to ensure a high standard on maintenance on site. Stefan Fludger stated that the site was privately owned, and the applicant could decide not to finish the development and close the site to public use. Stefan confirmed that there had been no modelling related to increased footfall, however environmental health officers had raised no objections, and the site had been informally used as an open space for some time with pathways in a similar layout to what was proposed. Stefan stated that the highways officer had considered 18 car parking spaces to be acceptable for this site to be used as an informal recreational space. Relating to maintenance of the site, as the site was privately owned no maintenance plan relating to maintenance of the footpaths or car park surfacing had been submitted, however a long term maintenance plan relating to biodiversity and creating a biodiversity net-gain would be submitted.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried whether a maintenance plan for the upkeep of the site could be conditioned. Justin Turvey stated that this would be a reasonable condition.

Pauline Jorgensen queried whether making a decision to restrict cyclist and horse rider access for this application could prejudice a decision to allow those use types if a future application was submitted, for example for SANG use. Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor, confirmed that a decision relating to this tonight would not prejudice allowing the use in a future application.

Stephen Conway stated that Members had to assess the application as presented. Stephen added that neighbours may be able to challenge the loss of access to the site from their gardens outside of the planning process, should they wish. Stephen queried

whether the proposed kissing gates would allow all wheelchair and mobility vehicles access to the site, and suggested that the routing of the paths be agreed in consultation with the Chairman and a local Ward Member. Stefan Fludger stated that the kissing gates would allow access for all but the largest mobility vehicle users, which complied with British standards. Stefan added that Members could condition larger kissing gates to be installed, if they felt that this met the planning tests. Justin Turvey stated that pathway routing could be agreed in consultation with the Chairman, and another Member.

Angus Ross welcomed the principle of the proposals. Angus stated that the Royal Borough Fire and Rescue Service had not submitted a no-objection comments, but instead had issued no comment.

Andrew Mickleburgh proposed that a maintenance plan for the site be conditioned. This was seconded by Stephen Conway, carried, and added to the list of conditions.

Stephen Conway asked that it be minuted that the path routing condition be determined via the Chairman, in consultation with the Committee and a local Ward Member.

Angus Ross proposed an informative, asking that WBC continue to search for safe pedestrian access from Sindlesham to the proposed car park. This was seconded by Chris Bowring, carried, and added to the list of informatives.

Stephen Conway proposed that the condition relating to the kissing gates be revised, to allow use of the gates by all mobility vehicles, including the largest sizes of these vehicles. This was seconded by Andrew Mickleburgh, carried, and the condition subsequently revised.

Pauline Jorgensen took no part in the vote, as she had missed part of the officer's presentation.

**RESOLVED** That application number 203539 be approved, subject to conditions as set out in agenda pages 40 to 44, additional condition related to the requirement of a maintenance plan as resolved by the Committee, additional informative related to the continued search for safe access to the car park from Sindlesham as resolved by the Committee, and revised condition related to wider kissing gates to allow mobility vehicles of all sizes access to the site as resolved by the Committee.

## **6. APPLICATION NO 202065 - 54 - 58 READING ROAD. WOKINGHAM**

**Proposal:** Full application for the proposed erection of 34 no. retirement living apartments including communal facilities and associated car parking and landscaping, following demolition of existing 3 no. dwellings.

**Applicant:** McCarthy & Stone

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 89 to 170.

The Committee were advised that the updates within the supplementary planning agenda included context and clarification regarding condition 18.

Ian Hann, agent, spoke in support of the application. Ian stated that this application would support people in living healthy and happy lives within the Wokingham Borough. Ian added

that the NPPF was clear that it was critical for this type of housing to be provided and prioritised. Ian stated that the Wokingham Borough was seeing growth of elderly persons, which was predicted to rise above the national average going forwards. Ian added that no objections had been received from residents or the Town Council, and English Heritage and highways officers had also raised no objections. Ian commented that the site was well located within a sustainable area, within easy walking distance to shops and amenity facilities, with good transport links including buses and trains. Ian stated that the proposals would generate around £500,000 per year in increased spending for the local economy, in addition to affordable housing contributions and CIL payments. Ian concluded by stating that the proposals would combat loneliness and isolation within the elderly community by releasing under-used family houses which would be replaced by high quality retirement living accommodation.

Bill Soane commented that the application only provided 32 car parking spaces for 34 units. Bill stated that whilst this was marketed as a retirement facility, many of the residents would still be of working age when living in this accommodation. Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that this type of accommodation typically had a lower provision of parking spaces than regular market flats, due to the restricted age of potential occupants. Judy added that the site was in a sustainable location, and there was precedent for completely car free developments within the area. Judy stated that, on balance and within the age restricted context, the proposals were considered acceptable given that parking space provision was only 6 spaces lower than for a market development and a travel plan was conditioned which could be reviewed when required.

Graham Vaughan, case officer, commented that the average age of occupancy for developments such as this was typically above the age of 55.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried whether there was a specific car parking standard which applied to this type of accommodation, queried what the realistic age of occupants could be at this development, queried whether affordable housing could have instead been provided on site, and sought clarification that vehicles going along the reading road towards Wokingham could not turn right in to the proposed development. Judy Kelly confirmed that the requirement for this development was to provide 15 resident car parking spaces and 3 visitor spaces, whereas this site would provide 32 spaces total. Regarding the turning query, Judy confirmed that there would only be provision for a left hand turn into the site, and there would be curbing to prevent a right hand turn in to the site which was picked up at the stage one road safety audit. Graham Vaughan stated that the average age of occupancy would realistically be in the middle of the 70 to 80 year old age bracket. Regarding the affordable housing, officers had negotiated a much higher off-site contribution than was originally offered, and on-site provision was not a priority as these units were for retired persons.

Gary Cowan commented that planning permission had previously been granted to a similar development with limited parking, and the site could not get enough occupants within the age bracket. When the applicant then requested to market the flats as regular market properties, there was no option to expand the parking allocation. Judy Kelly stated that the site mentioned had been taken into account when considering this application, and there was a precedent for car free accommodation within the area. Gary Cowan requested a condition for this development to return to the Committee should they wish to offer the units on the open market with an unrestricted age profile. Graham Vaughan stated that a future application could not be prevented, however should such an application be submitted officers would assess the proposals and could send the item to Committee.

Stephen Conway commented that it would be useful to find space for additional car parking provision on site, to avoid complications in future. Stephen raised some concerns in relation to the listed building adjacent to the proposed development site, and asked whether any additional soft landscaping could be provided to soften the impact of the development. Graham Vaughan stated that the proposals were of a single footprint to provide step free access to the entire site. The conservation officer had not objected to the proposals, but had highlighted some harm which was deemed less than substantial. The NPPF stated that the level of harm and the significance of a historic asset had to be balanced against the benefits and suitability of proposed development. Graham added that condition 16 provided assurances that soft landscaping and tree planting would be carried out along the site boundary to protect the character of the adjacent heritage asset.

Carl Doran commented that officers had worked hard to achieve a much larger affordable housing contribution than originally offered.

**RESOLVED** That application number 202065 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 90 to 99.

## **7. APPLICATION NO 203460 - FROG HALL, FROG HALL DRIVE, WOKINGHAM**

**Proposal:** Full application for the erection of fencing and hardstanding to form a bin store to serve the existing flats (Retrospective).

**Applicant:** Ms Sarah Cleaver

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 171 to 188.

The Committee were advised that the updates within the supplementary planning agenda included:

- Amending the word impending with impeding on agenda page 171;
- A consultation response had been received from the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service (RBFRS) advising that the Fire Authority had no issues regarding access to the houses along the road that followed the boundary of Frog Hall.

David Rowland, neighbour, spoke in objection to the application. David stated that this was a retrospective application which restricted the access for neighbouring properties, as had been happening over decades. The restricted access caused issues with delivery vehicles, and David felt that the concerns of residents should have been considered prior to construction. David stated that the storage area did not have any drainage, and was in a full sun position which led to smells and odours. David was of the opinion that the storage was an eyesore, but not for the residents of the flats. David felt that a private company had built the storage in the cheapest and most convenient location with no planning consent or consultation. David commented that there was a suitable storage area on the other side of the car park area which was near drainage, in a shaded area, and on a site with previous planning permission for garages. David was of the understanding that this application would not have been allowed should it have gone through the planning permission process, and it should not be allowed retrospectively.

Carole Allam, resident, spoke in support of the application. Carole clarified that the alternative site proposed by neighbours was not owned by the applicant. Carole stated that



residents believed that permitted development allowed for the application to progress, but once it was clarified that planning permission was required the applicant progressed with a retrospective planning application as soon as possible. Carole added that the access to neighbouring properties by emergency vehicles and delivery drivers had been clarified within the officer report, and the Fire Authority had confirmed that they had no issues regarding access to neighbouring properties.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey read out a statement on behalf of Ward Member Maria Gee. Maria stated that the approval of this planning application rested on the arguments about access and safety for residents at the lower end of Froghall Drive. Maria drew the Committee's attention to the arguments presented by residents objecting to the application regarding restricted access to their homes, and the accessibility for emergency vehicles. Maria asked that the Committee satisfy itself that access was not impeded, particularly from a fire safety perspective.

Adriana Gonzales, case officer, stated that the RBFRS had confirmed that they had no objection to the application, and clarified that they had access towards the properties at the end of the carriageway.

Angus Ross stated that he had seen the site, and saw no reason to refuse the application.

Stephen Conway stated that Wokingham Borough Council's waste guidelines required a gate or door around refuse storage, and queried whether this was possible on this site. Adriana Gonzalez stated the development on site had to be considered as presented, which did not have an access door. The waste guidelines were only guidelines, and placing a door could result in highways and access issues for properties at the end of the carriageway.

Chris Bowring queried whether there was any evidence of bad smells or odours. Adriana Gonzalez stated that on her site visit, there was no evidence of bad smells or odours and all of the bins had lids on them.

Bill Soane queried why this bin storage area did not have a wash down and drainage area. Adriana Gonzalez stated that a pipe for washing the bin store had been installed to the rear of the fencing. Justin Turvey stated that there was no planning requirement for a drain to be present. In essence, the Committee was considering an application for a hard standing surface and fencing. Storage of the bins on site did not require planning permission.

**RESOLVED** That application number 203460 be approved, subject to condition and informative as set out on agenda page 172.

**8. APPLICATION NO 210805 - "DOLPHIN SCHOOL", WALTHAM ROAD, HURST, WOKINGHAM, RG10 0FR**

**Proposal:** Full application for the proposed erection of a two storey building to create additional classrooms, toilets and library facilities, with associated roof terrace.

**Applicant:** Mr Adam Hurst

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 189 to 214.

The Committee were advised that the updates within the supplementary planning agenda included additional details from the applicant which would result in fewer pre-commencement conditions. As such, conditions 2 through 7 had been slightly amended.

Stephen Conway stated that there was the issue of the listed building setting and historic wall, however the proposals were very effectively screened.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey sought confirmation that an informative had been added which asked that sprinklers be installed on site. Adriana Gonzalez, case officer, confirmed that informative 4 sought the inclusion of sprinklers.

**RESOLVED** That application number 210805 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 190 to 193, and amended conditions 2 through 7 as set out in the supplementary planning agenda.

**9. APPLICATION NO 210448 - 57 CHILTERN CRESCENT, EARLEY, WOKINGHAM**  
*Andrew Mickelburgh declared a prejudicial interest in this item and took no part in the discussion or vote.*

**Proposal:** Householder application for the proposed loft conversion to create habitable accommodation with rear dormer extension, hip to gable conversion and the installation of 2no. roof lights.

**Applicant:** Mr M Mand

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 215 to 228.

The Committee were advised that there were no updates within the supplementary planning agenda.

Tim Marsh, ACER Residents' Association, spoke in objection to the application. Tim stated that large dormers were appearing frequently in the locality, and all such dormers would have been refused if they were required to go for planning permission instead of permitted development. Tim stated that there was still a clear character in the area of having semi-detached hip-ended properties. Tim added that once a third storey was placed on top of the property with windows in this manner overlooking became an issue, as a traditional smaller dormer had its windows set much further back. Tim stated that the concern from residents was that overlooking would occur from looking directly down from the third floor of the property. Tim stated that CP3 made it clear that development should be appropriate for the area where it is located. The principles of the Borough Design Guide referred to CP3, stating that developments should respond appropriately to the existing character of the area and relate well to neighbours. Tim felt that these proposals did not comply with CP3 or the Borough Design Guide, and the application should be refused.

Shirley Boyt, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. Shirley stated that Chiltern Crescent was characterised by semi-detached properties with hip-ended roofs. The Borough Design Guide stated that developments should maintain the rhythm of the street scene, which these proposals would not in Shirley's opinion. Shirley added that there were only two examples similar to the proposals in the area, which did nothing to enhance the street scene. Shirley felt that officers should look for exemplary examples of extensions rather than referring to poorly designed outliers. Shirley felt that a small partial

hip joint would not impinge on the floor area and would only have a minor impact on the dormer, and should have been considered instead of the proposals.

Carl Doran queried what measurements were taken when assessing the dormer as subservient, queried how much of the development could be carried out under permitted development, and queried why examples of poorer design which were carried out under permitted development were being used as examples to promote this application. Benjamin Hindle, case officer, stated that the gross volume of the proposals were in keeping with permitted development and followed the Borough Design Guide advice. This application could have been carried out under permitted development, if not for a previously agreed planning application of which this application relied on part of that roof structure. Justin Turvey, Operational Manager – Development Management, stated that the Borough Design Guide was a guide, and there were legitimate circumstances to permit more than the guide allowed for. Justin added that if not for the previous side extension, this application could have been carried out under permitted development. Carl Doran felt that the views of the Town Council, local residents, and local Ward Members should be carefully considered when determining such applications.

Stephen Conway commented that there was a gradual erosion of the character of the area, and permitted development made it difficult to refuse planning applications which were of similar design to works carried out under permitted development rights.

**RESOLVED** That application number 210448 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 216 to 217.

#### **10. APPLICATION 210378 - BUILDINGS 4 AND 5 MICROSOFT CAMPUS, THAMES VALLEY BUSINESS PARK**

**Proposal:** Full application for proposed alterations to external areas to provide improved landscaping, outdoor gym, amenity and presentation areas, plus erection of refuse store and reconfiguration of car parking.

**Applicant:** BREO TVP4 LTD & BREO TVP5 LTD

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 229 to 248.

The Committee were advised that the updates within the supplementary planning agenda included amendment to condition 4.

Carl Doran commented that this application would be an upgrade to the existing business park, which would hopefully lead to the creation of additional jobs in the local area.

**RESOLVED** That application number 210378 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 230 to 233, and amended condition 4 as set out in the supplementary planning agenda.