

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 OCTOBER 2021 FROM 7.00 PM TO 10.10 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Rachel Bishop-Firth

Officers Present

Neil Allen, Senior Specialist; Legal Services
Connor Corrigan, Service Manager - Planning and Delivery
Chris Easton, Service Manager - Planning and Delivery
Justin Turvey, Operational Manager - Development Management
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Case Officers Present

Adriana Gonzalez
Christopher Howard
Simon Taylor

40. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Gary Cowan and Pauline Jorgensen.

41. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 September 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following minor amendment.

Agenda page 13: "...and additional informative relating to asking the applicant to work with the farm ~~owner~~ **tenant** regarding the possibility of dual use of the land for grazing purposes as resolved by the Committee."

42. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

43. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

No applications were recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

44. APPLICATION NO.211841 - LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF CUTBUSH LANE, SHINFIELD, RG2 9LH

Proposal: Full planning permission for the Science Park Creative Media Hub comprising the erection of film stages and associated workshops and office space; and ancillary uses including equipment stores, café. Formation of associated access, decked and surface parking, and landscaping at the Thames Valley Science Park (TVSP).

Applicant: Shinfield Studios

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 19 to 124.

The Committee were advised that the updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Updated resolution to recommend grant of planning permission subject to notification of the Secretary of State of a potential departure from policy in the development plan;
- Updated recommendation A;
- Clarification to the report with respect of biodiversity net gain of 10%;
- Insertion of plan numbers under condition 2;
- Insertion of the word 'ancillary' in front of the word 'offices' within condition 3;
- Insertion of the word 'out' after the word 'carried' within condition 7;
- Insertion of the words 'for monitoring purposes' after the word 'review' within condition 16;
- Insertion of the word 'the' after the word 'for' and insertion of the word 'thereafter' after the word 'maintained' within condition 17;
- Deletion of condition 34 and subsequent renumbering of later conditions;
- Insertion of plan reference for newly renumbered condition 38;
- Correction to report that the ditch had been approved on 12th October 2021;
- Insertion of letter of objection from Icenl on behalf of the residents of Cutbush Manor, Cutbush Barn and Badger Cottage and officer responses;
- Additional consultation responses received after publication of the report;
- Insertion of text in relation to the procedure of referring this application to the Secretary of State;
- Clarification that Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) has no set parking standards for studio use as this was not envisaged when the parking standards were set up, however five other comparable sites had been used for the parking calculations;
- Confirmation that the heritage assets cited in paragraph 113 were Grade 2 listed;
- Confirmation that landscaping details would be secured by condition 26 and evergreen planting could be secured if required.

Mark Cockram, neighbour, submitted a statement in objection to the application. In his absence, the statement was read out by Angus Ross. Mark stated that he supported the overall application for the Shinfield Studios and recognised the benefits that it would bring to the local area. Mark stated that he was however objecting to the positioning of the very large office A building which would be in close proximity to the Grade 2 listed buildings. Mark added that the office building would be approximately 50m from Cutbush Manor, and the office building would dwarf Cutbush Manor in a similar context to the Queen's Head pub and the Civic Offices in Wokingham. Mark stated that the buildings of Cutbush Barn, Badger Cottage and Cutbush Manor were all over 400 years old and constructed on timber frame and brick, built directly on to London Clay with no foundations. Mark was of the opinion that the potential structural impact to these buildings from the nearby building of Office A had not been adequately assessed under the current application by geotechnical investigation or by a specific and detailed engineering analysis. Mark was of the understanding that the land to be used was bequeathed to the University of Reading with the condition that it was only used for research. Mark added that Shinfield Studios had stated that office A would be sub-leased and that this would therefore be an entirely commercial part of the venture. Mark was not of the belief that it was in the public interest to use green space to build commercial real estate in a market that was already over saturated. Mark felt that the contractor at the current temporary site for the studios had

repeatedly failed to meet the requirements of their planning approval. Mark added that work had been conducted outside of approved hours and Cutbush Lane East continued to be used by site traffic, despite a design and access statement that stated that this road would be closed to all motor vehicles. Mark stated that near misses with pedestrians and cyclists were common, and should this continue, it was highly likely that a serious injury, or worse, would occur. Mark was of the opinion that due to poor schedule management, permission had now been given for work every Sunday, and the build time for the next phase is estimated at 27 months. Mark added that continued lack of schedule management would inevitably force more weekend work and disruption to nearby residents. Mark concluded by stating that it was his view that approval of the plans with office A remaining as proposed would result in the Local Planning Authority failing to meet its duty of having special regard to heritage assets as per Section 66 of the Planning Act of 1990.

Nick Smith, applicant, spoke in support of the application. Nick thanked Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) officers for their support throughout the planning process. Nick stated that content production was a fast growing industry, with £4bn worth of inwards investment, whilst the Government was targeting a figure of £6bn. Nick stated that this was a real opportunity to place Shinfield and Wokingham on the map as an area of production for high quality shows and movies. Nick added that this application would provide millions of pounds of inwards investment into the area, with an average production spending approximately £100m of which a significant proportion would be spent within the local area. Nick stated that approximately 500 crew would be employed for productions, which would create many local and high paid jobs. Nick stated that they had engaged with stakeholders, and the Parish Council were supportive of the proposals as were the Thames Valley LEP, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Department of International Trade. Two online sessions had been held which had attracted over 120 participants on both occasions. Nick stated that they were grateful for all of the support that had been given to this application. Nick added that the issue of sustainability had been taken very seriously for this application, with BREEAM excellent being targeted for this application, which would include the provision of solar panels, heat pumps and a fabric first approach. Nick concluded by stating that the cinema and post production area had been moved away from residential properties, and hoped that the Committee would approve the application.

Christopher Howard, case officer, responded to a number of points raised by public speakers. Christopher stated that the 50m separation gap to the listed building was the distance to the curtilage, which was a significant amount of space, whilst the distance to the dwelling was approximately 70m. Officers had looked at this in detail and had taken advice from the conservation officer, and the harm had been identified as less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF stated that such applications were required to be assessed against the public benefits, which had been set out within the report and had been deemed to outweigh any harm. With regards to concerns relating to piling and extended construction hours, any piling operations would be auger driven which would create substantially less noise than other operations, and the Government had asked Local Authorities to be flexible in terms of extended hours, and this facility needed to be opened in a time critical manner to meet production schedules. Christopher stated that times had moved on since the premise of the science park had been agreed, and options had to be explored to look at alternative use cases which could also be collaborative with other parts of the site. Christopher added that science companies tended to cluster together in areas such as Oxford and Cambridge in recent times.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried what impact the proposed office A might have on the listed buildings, and queried how many decks of the multi-storey car park were above ground and what their visual appearance would look like. Christopher Howard stated that the car park would consist of 11 split levels and the above ground portion would be lower than the stage building and would cut into the landscape of the science park, with the motorway side being open. The building would be cladded which would shield some lighting from the M4. With regards to the listed buildings, Christopher stated that the method of piling would reduce noise and vibrations when compared to other piling methods, and the construction team would have a duty of care to the listed buildings.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried whether anything could be put in place to restrict HGVs using Lower Earley Way rather than the M4 during the construction phase, as this was creating noise pollution and safety issues. Chris Easton, Head of Transport, Drainage and Compliance, stated that Lower Earley Way was a strategic route which was built to be capable of accommodating HGVs. Chris added that Lower Earley Way needed to remain as a secondary access route. Connor Corrigan, Service Manager - Planning and Delivery, stated that it would not be reasonable to state that vehicles could not use Lower Earley Way, as the direction of travel would depend on where the vehicles were coming from.

Angus Ross stated that the site visit had been useful for Members, and stated his hope that the right of way situation could be tidied up outside of this application. Angus queried whether the issue of manoeuvring of vehicles such as fire service vehicles had been addressed, and sought clarification that application 212936 had been agreed yesterday. Christopher Howard confirmed that the application for the drainage ditch had been approved yesterday, which would also help address some historic issues that had occurred on Cutbush Lane. Christopher stated that there was approximately 20m of space between each stage building which should allow for Fire Service vehicles to turn, and an additional condition was proposed to establish if fire hydrants were necessary for the development in consultation with the Royal Berks Fire and Rescue.

Sam Akhtar sought assurances that the cladding on the outside of the proposed building would be safe and fire resistant. Christopher Howard stated that the cladding was for aesthetic purposes, and building regulations would cover the safety aspects of the cladding.

Bill Soane queried what would be emitted from the proposed chimneys on site. Christopher Howard stated that these would likely be used to expel excess heat and may also be required to facilitate painting on site. Environmental Health would control any safety issues relating to the chimneys.

Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey queried how many photovoltaic panels would be installed on the site, queried whether additional vegetation could be added to the car park, and queried whether heat pumps would be installed on the site. Christopher Howard stated that twenty percent of required power would be generated from photovoltaic panels and a good generator would be installed to facilitate this. This figure was above the policy level of ten percent, which was commendable and above the policy threshold. Christopher confirmed that heat pumps would be installed and the development would be gas free. Christopher stated that landscaping had been incorporated where possible, and officers had secured a ten percent offsite biodiversity net gain and a comprehensive management plan for these spaces.

Stephen Conway felt that this was a well-balanced report with clear negatives and positives, and in his view the balance was in favour of the positive aspects of the proposed development. Stephen Conway proposed an informative indicating the Committee's wish that construction traffic be discouraged from using the Lower Earley Way. This was seconded by Andrew Mickleburgh, carried, and added to the list of informatives.

Carl Doran was of the opinion that this was not a clear cut decision, with local people feeling that the traffic in the area was already high and that future development would only add to this issue. Carl stated that he was pleased to see that drainage improvements for the area had been agreed. Carl queried whether (newly numbered) condition 37 relating to community engagement would still apply should the site be sold on in future, queried whether the proposed offices were solely related to the film studio, and queried whether the hours of development, particularly the 6am start on a Sunday, could be explained. Christopher Howard confirmed that condition 37 would still apply if ownership changed in future as this related to the planning permission, and any change would be subject to a change of use application. Christopher stated that the film studio needed to be set up at short notice, and the site was quite isolated and any disruption caused had to be considered with the backdrop of the M4 and Lower Earley Way both being in close proximity, and as such officers felt that the hours of construction would not cause significant harm.

At this point in the meeting, Sam Akhtar left the room and did not participate in the vote for this item.

Carl Doran sought assurances whether the landscape buffer near the footbridge over the M4 would remain, queried whether the height of the sound stages would be 22.6m total, queried whether the parking proposals were based off of parking models at similar facilities or actual use at other facilities, and queried which bus services would serve this facility. Christopher Howard stated that the landscaping was subject to condition and further details and strengthening could be included within condition discharge. Christopher confirmed that the stage would be 22.6m height in total including the concrete plinths. Chris Easton stated that other similar facilities such as Pinewood and Shepperton had been used to model a parking standard on a worst case assessment, and if anything there would be an overprovision of car parking on site. Chris added that the main public transport service was secured as part of the wider south of the M4 SDL.

Carl Doran commented that Shepperton had a free shuttle bus to local stations, and this might be worth considering for this site.

Angus Ross queried how much of a delay might arise from referring this case to the Secretary of State. Christopher Howard stated that this process would likely take around three weeks to complete.

RESOLVED That application number 211841 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 21 to 37, updated recommendation A and various updates and renumbering of conditions as set out in the Supplementary Planning Agenda, additional condition relating to assessment of whether fire hydrants were required on site, and additional informative dissuading construction traffic using the Lower Earley Way as resolved by the Committee.

45. APPLICATION NO.211530 - LAND AT SHINFIELD WEST, NORTH OF BEKE AVENUE

Proposal: Reserved Matters application pursuant to Outline planning permission VAR/2014/0624) (a variation of O/2010/1432) for the erection of 25 dwellings, 134.5m² of Class A1-A5 floorspace including access roads, parking spaces, open space and landscape treatment. (Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale to be considered)

Applicant: Bloor Homes Ltd., Bovis Homes Ltd. and Linden (Shinfield) LLP

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 125 to 200.

The Committee were advised that the updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- A further objection received from Shinfield Parish Council on 8 October 2021;
- Amendments to conditions 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. Conditions 10 and 14 had been deleted, and as such condition 11, 12 and 13 became conditions 10, 11, and 12, and conditions 15 and 16 became conditions 13 and 14.

Nick Paterson-Neild, planning consultant, spoke in support of the application. Nick stated he was speaking on behalf of the consortium, and they were delighted that this reserved matters application had been recommended for approval. Nick added that the application formed part of the local centre within the SDL in Shinfield, which was granted outline planning permission in 2012 for up to 1200 homes and supporting uses, and this application formed one of the final phases of this important development. Nick stated that the local centre was community focussed and had been positively shaped via pre-application and public consultation processes, and was in accordance with the approved local centre development brief. Nick added that the scale, type, and density of the development was appropriate and would provide for a vibrant and attractive local centre which complement the approved community building and care home. The consortium was working closely with a potential food store operator, Lidl, to deliver a food store. The proposals had been carefully planned and amended to ensure that the operator of the food store and its future delivery were not compromised. Nick stated that the proposals would deliver 25 homes, including 6 affordable units, which was an overprovision of affordable homes when considered across the allocation of the outline site as a whole. Nick added that the site would include flexible retail space to meet local needs, a public plaza which would prioritise pedestrians, high quality landscape and green infrastructure, energy demand reduction via a fabric first approach, 19 passive and 4 active electric charging points, and space to provide a food store in the future. Nick felt that this site was in an extremely sustainable location, and supported the officer's recommendation of approval.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey queried whether photovoltaic panels would be installed as part of this application, and queried whether the electric vehicle points would be upgradeable to any future standards. Connor Corrigan, Service Manager - Planning and Delivery, stated that the outline application was approved prior to the requirement for ten percent energy generation, and therefore the proposals were policy compliant. Connor added that building regulations would contain sustainability measures. Simon Taylor, case officer, stated that the electric vehicle charging infrastructure would consist of the latest infrastructure available.

Carl Doran queried why the bus gate had been removed, queried why there was only affordable flats rather than a mix of affordable flats and affordable houses, and queried where the amenity space was for the proposed flats. Chris Easton, Head of Transport, Drainage, and Compliance, stated that the bus gates were historic, and where the housing was located there would always be traffic in that location. Chris added that the model had been re-run, and had deemed that there was no significant benefit to the bus gate remaining and in any case it would be hard to police. Simon Taylor stated that the delivery of affordable houses had changed over time, and there was now a demand for affordable flats. Simon stated that the amenity space was located to the north of the site was intended to be used. Simon added that the flats would be dual aspect, with Juliet balconies and good south facing aspects which would reduce the necessity for ground level amenity space. Simon commented that this was not a departure from policy, as these were only guidelines.

Stephen Conway queried why the number of retail units had been reduced over time. Connor Corrigan stated that a considerable amount of work had gone in to planning this development, and part of the site had been safeguarded for a supermarket. Connor added that the retail market had changed substantially over the past ten years, and one retail unit and a supermarket was a much better fit in the current climate. Connor stated that whilst the supermarket would be slightly smaller than agreed, the operator had standard supermarket formats and would therefore meet the needs of the community.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried why the application for the food store had not been considered as part of this application, queried what officers envisaged the use of the retail unit might be, queried whether additional details should be provided in relation to condition 5 (public art strategy), queried what guarantees were in place to guarantee the accessibility of specific properties in perpetuity, queried whether the residents of the flats would have sufficient allocated car parking space, and sought additional details with regards to the shared section of the roadway within the local centre. Simon Taylor stated that the residential application was ready for consideration whilst the application for the food store was not, and officers could not compel the applicant to bring the applications together. Simon added that the retail unit would have A1 through A5 use classes. Simon stated that public art was considered as part of the SPD but not as part of the outline application. The applicant had agreed to its inclusion within this application, however the details would only come forward with the permission. Simon stated that the intention was to ensure that the dwellings were to M4(2) standards as adaptable dwellings in the future. Chris Easton confirmed that the application met the Council's car parking standards, including provision for the flats. Chris added that there was allocated provision for the flats within the parking court to the rear. Chris stated that the materials to be used within the local centre would indicate a change in character, with a footpath cycleway running through to create a hub area with four crossing locations. Chris added that the proposals would need to comply with road safety standards, and would be subject to various road safety audits, assessments and technical sign offs both prior to and during construction.

Angus Ross commented that, in his opinion, the proposals may not lead to a town square with only one retail unit. Angus sought additional details regarding the proposed refuse collection points on site. Chris Easton confirmed that the green dots within the provided plans indicated where each property would be served in terms of refuse collection.

RESOLVED That application number 211530 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 126 to 133, and various amendments to conditions and numbering thereof as set out in the Supplementary Planning Agenda.

46. APPLICATION NO.212228 - LAMBS LANE PRIMARY SCHOOL, LAMBS LANE, SPENCERS WOOD

Proposal: Full application for the retention of an existing single storey modular building for a temporary period of 7 years. (Retrospective)

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council (WBC)

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 201 to 220.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the supplementary planning agenda included clarification relating to the resource base and the seven year permission period.

Bill Soane queried how the site had managed to get three additional years of use without returning to the Planning Committee, and queried whether any permission granted should now be for 4 years rather than for seven. Adriana Gonzalez, case officer, stated that she did not know the details regarding why this application had not come forward until now, and confirmed that the permission as proposed would grant seven years of permission from the date of the decision. Adriana added that the seven year permission would allow further assessment of the structure and potential future options under the maintenance order. Justin Turvey, Operational Manager – Development Management, confirmed that the seven year permission would allow time to further assess future standards and needs of the site.

Stephen Conway wished for comments to be passed on regarding the Committee's concern over the time taken to bring this application forward for consideration.

Carl Doran commented that these buildings needed to be replaced properly, and he hoped that a permanent solution could be found in future.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey commented that these facilities were struggling to be replaced due to tight budgets for schools.

RESOLVED That application number 212228 be approved, subject to conditions and informative as set out on agenda page 202.

47. APPLICATION NO.212509 - 160 READING ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG41 1LH

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of a 2no.storey plus loft level dwelling with an integrated garage to include 12No roof lights following the demolition of existing bungalow including alterations to the vehicular/pedestrian entrance.

Applicant: G Lupton

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 221 to 244.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary planning Agenda included:

- Reference to three additional neighbour comments received after the report was submitted for the agenda;
- Amended condition 4.

Imogen Shepherd-Dubey, on behalf of Wokingham Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. Imogen stated that the proposals were for a large three-storey house including five bedrooms. Imogen added that the ridge height of the proposals would be 2.5m higher than that of the adjacent properties. Imogen stated that the other properties in the area were all two-storey family homes with no larger buildings in sight. Imogen stated that the proposals were downhill from neighbouring buildings, and the diagrams provided did not represent the street scene adequately. Imogen suggested that Members may wish to visit the street to get a true sense of the street scene and the character of the area. Imogen stated that the Town Council was grateful for the removal of the external garage and the rear dormer window proposals, however the third floor windows and the third floor useable space remained. Imogen was of the opinion that the height and massing of the proposal was not in keeping with the surrounding character of the area. Imogen was of the opinion that the proposals did not meet CP3a of the core strategy, and she did not want this application to set a precedent for larger properties of this nature outside of town centre settings.

Peter Mathers, neighbour, spoke in objection to the application. Peter stated that the existing bungalow at 160 Reading Road was not much smaller than the two-storey house situated at number 158 Reading Road. Peter stated that the proposal was for a property which was substantially higher than both numbers 158 and 162 Reading Road, and would have an overbearing nature that would disrupt the downward trajectory of the houses which followed the slope of the road. Peter stated that an officer report for a pre-application care home on the site address last year stated concerns relating to the centre section of the building being of three-storeys in height and being considerably higher than existing properties. Peter stated that this application would allow a building of a similar height, and therefore approval would be inconsistent with the approach taken last year. Peter stated that the proposals included eight roof lights and two small round windows in the roof which he felt was excessive. Peter raised concerns that the storage areas within the proposed third-storey may be used as bedrooms in future. Peter asked that the number of roof lights be reduced, and removed completely from side elevations, with the remaining roof lights to be obscured glass. Peter was of the opinion that the applicant had failed to provide examples of similar properties in the area in terms of height and the amount of glazing in the roof, and this was because these properties did not exist. Peter stated that the vast majority of properties in the area were of two-storey height. Peter welcomed redevelopment of the existing bungalow as it was in a state of disrepair, however the proposed application was overdevelopment in his view.

Peter Lindley Hughes, agent, spoke in support of the application. Peter stated that the proposal was for a sympathetic in-keeping scheme of high quality, to replace the 1960's existing dwelling which no longer served the needs of the existing family and was in desperate need of replacement. Peter stated that the applicant had collaborated with the local planning authority to ensure that the scheme was suitable in terms of material matters and local planning policy. Peter stated that the rear dormer windows had been removed via updated plans, which were the main issue for the massing and overlooking. Peter stated that in the absence of a garage, the parking proposals had been incorporated within the dwelling massing. Peter added that the proposals were for a three-storey dwelling with two-storey massing. Peter stated that following further consultation, no additional material matters were raised for consideration and the applicant was content

that the proposals were suitable for the location. Peter stated that the Environment Agency classified this as flood zone risk 1, which was the lowest classification of at risk areas, and a flood risk assessment had been carried out and had indicated that no level of mitigation solely on the applicant's property would not be able to remedy the wider issues within the area. Peter stated that during the detailed design phase, additional surface water flood mitigation measures were likely to be introduced which could also have benefits for neighbouring properties. Peter was of the opinion that the design was of high quality whilst fitting in with the character of the area, and would meet the needs of the applicant whilst providing surface water mitigation measures.

Rachel Bishop-Firth, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. Rachel stated that whilst she supported the redevelopment of this site to replace the existing bungalow, she was concerned that the current proposal was not in keeping with the surrounding area. Rachel stated that the buildings on this stretch of the Reading Road were all one and two storey homes, and whilst some properties have had a loft conversion this had mainly occurred where the existing property was a bungalow. Rachel stated that this was not an area where three storey homes were being built. Rachel stated that the proposals would be 2.5m higher than the neighbouring dwellings, which would be out of keeping with other homes and would set a dangerous precedent for the area. Rachel added that the blocky design of the house added to the bulk of the proposed development, which would be out of character with other properties in the area. Rachel urged the Committee to refuse this application.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey was of the opinion that the proposal was three-storeys and was out of keeping with the character of the area.

Stephen Conway commented that the proposals would be substantially higher than neighbouring properties, and felt that a site visit would be beneficial for Members to get a sense of the potential relationship. Simon Taylor, case officer, stated that he had visited the site and the dwellings were set back with a slope through the site, and the proposals were not felt to be excessive in terms of height relative to other properties.

Andrew Mickleburgh was of the opinion that there was no substitute for a site visit to get a better sense of the street scene and potential relationship between the dwellings. Andrew raised concerns that the proposed building works may create additional flood risk, queried whether there were any details regarding the increase in massing, and commented that the increase in glazing of the roof space would have an impact on the character of the area. Simon Taylor commented that the site sat in a one in 100 year surface flood risk zone, and sustainable drainage details would ensure that there was no adverse impact on surface flood risk compared to the current situation. Simon added that there would be some overshadowing, however this would not be sufficient to warrant refusal and the proposals met the 45 degree line test. Simon stated that the proposals would be higher than most properties on the street however this was not felt to be unacceptable. Simon stated that massing and volume were considerations within a countryside setting, and as this application was in an urban setting and it met the front, rear, and side guidelines the proposals were considered acceptable and policy compliant.

Carl Doran raised concerns relating to the height of the proposal, and worried that this would set a precedent for future applications if approved. Carl queried why this application was being considered so quickly after a small consultation period, and queried whether there was any way that the storage areas would remain as such in future as opposed to being used as a bedroom space. Simon Taylor stated that the application had been re-

consulted, which was not necessary however it allowed for neighbours to view and consider proposed changes to the application. Simon added that the consultation ended on the agenda publication date, and the applicant would have had to wait a further month prior to consideration of their application whilst no additional issues had been raised as part of the re-consultation. Simon stated that the 1.5m high windows were considered as acceptable and the extent of overlooking had been sufficiently minimised.

Angus Ross was of the opinion that the Committee were required to balance the inevitable redevelopment of the street scene to meet the current needs of residents against any potential harm.

Sam Akhtar stated his concerns in relation to surface water issues as a result of development, overlooking issues as a result of increased glazing, height of the proposed dwelling in comparison to neighbouring properties, and the change to the street scene that this application would cause.

Stephen Conway commented that the Committee may have differences of opinion to officers when subjective matters were being considered.

Stephen Conway proposed that the item be deferred to allow a site visit to be undertaken to consider the proposed development's relationship with neighbouring properties and the overall street scene. This proposal was seconded by Chris Bowring and upon being put to the vote the proposal was carried.

RESOLVED That application number 212509 be deferred, to allow a site visit to be undertaken to consider the proposed development's relationship with neighbouring properties and the overall street scene.