

PLEASE NOTE: An amendment was made to these minutes at the meeting held on 1 February 2017

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 7 DECEMBER 2016 FROM 7.00 PM TO 7.51 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), Chris Singleton (Vice-Chairman), Philip Houldsworth, John Kaiser, Malcolm Richards, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey and Wayne Smith

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: John Halsall

Officers Present

Lyndsay Jennings, Solicitor

Chris Easton, Service Manager, Highways Development Management

Justin Turvey, Operational Development Management Lead Officer, Development Management

Arabella Yandle, Democratic Services Officer

Case Officers Present

Daniel Ray

David Smith

Graham Vaughan

76. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Chris Bowring and Bill Soane

77. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 November 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

MEMBER'S UPDATE

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

78. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

79. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

There were no items deferred or withdrawn

80. APPLICATION NO - 162841 THAMES VALLEY SCIENCE PARK, SHINFIELD

Proposal: Application for approval of Reserved Matters in relation to the development of Phase 1b of the proposed Thames Valley Science Park (TVSP) for a new cancer treatment centre, all associated landscaping, access and ancillary works. Application made pursuant to Outline Planning Permission 152330.

Applicant: Proton Partners International (PPI) and University of Reading (UoR)

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 15 to 40.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included an update to the representations in favour of the proposed development.

Nick Paterson-Neild of Barton Wilmore spoke in favour of the application in favour of Proton and Reading University. He emphasised the ground breaking nature of the application, offering the first Proton Theme Therapy Centre in the South of England.

Resolved: That application No. 162841 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 15 to 40.

81. APPLICATION NO - 162818 THAMES VALLEY SCIENCE PARK, SHINFIELD

Proposal: Application for approval of Reserved Matters in relation to the construction of a permanent car park to serve phase 1 of the Thames Valley Science Park. Application made pursuant to Outline Planning Permission 152330 (Outline Permission for Phase 1 of a Science and Innovation Park).

Applicant: University of Reading (UoR)

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 41 to 52.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed additional condition indicating that the car park was not to be used until such time as screening had been put in place and approved by the Council.

In response to Member's questions, The Service Manager, Highways Development Management, referred to the use of the Science Park in Cambridge as an example that was used for comparison. He stated that, whilst the application was designated B1, the designated level of parking for B1 applications would not be required and that the affiliation with the university would give greater control. He further indicated that the location of the proposed Science Park on the Eastern Relief Road would offer no off-site parking so that parking would be controlled.

Officers clarified that information about charging points for electric cars would be outlined in the Parking Management Plan and that the main entrance to the building was located close to the disabled parking zone with a covered walkway linking the two.

Resolved: That application no. 162818 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the Agenda pages 41 to 52 and the additional condition as set out in the Member's Update.

82. APPLICATION NO - 162288 MALMESBURY, DAIRY LANE, REMENHAM

Proposal: Full application for the proposed creation of a polo facility for private use, comprising of a polo field, exercise track, stable block, all weather practice area, summer pavilion and widening of existing access onto A4130.

Applicant: Spink Property

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 53 to 80.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- An outline of a revision to the plan supporting the view that there would be no net loss of Local Wildlife Site Standard and/or Habitat of Principal Importance;
- Proposed additional condition that no development be taken place until a site specific great crested newt method statement of reasonable avoidance measures had been submitted;
- Proposed additional condition that a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) be submitted to, and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the development, to include details of the legal and funding mechanisms by which the long term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery;
- Clarification in relation to lighting, which would be restricted to the stable and approved prior to installation;
- Clarification that no klaxon would be used;
- Clarification as to the dimension of the floor space in the pavilion and the stable; and
- Clarification as to the dimensions of the stable housing the office and ridge heights.

Members had visited the site on Friday 2 December.

Mike Spink, of Spink Property, spoke in favour of the application to commend the Planning Department on their work.

John Halsall, Member for Remenham, Wargrave and Ruscombe, commented on the application. He stated that there had been a long and detailed consultation in the ward and that as a result the majority of issues had been addressed. He commended the Planning Officer on the application.

Resolved: That application No. 162288 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the Agenda pages 53 to 80 and the additional conditions and clarifications as set out in the Members' Update.

83. APPLICATION NO - 162736 UNITS 68 AND 69, SUTTONS BUSINESS PARK, SUTTONS PARK AVENUE, EARLEY

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 1no class B2/B8 industrial unit with ancillary office space and associated car parking, landscaping and recycling building, following demolition of existing buildings.

Applicant: Standard Life Assurance Ltd.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 81 to 110.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification in regards to the levels of job creation possible as part of the development;

- Agreement to provide additional parking;
- Proposed update to plans to reflect this change;
- Proposed additional condition relating to drainage requiring that development be implemented in full accordance with the approved plan to prevent an increased flood risk from surface water run-off.

Jenny Lissaman, representing the Association of Central Earley Residents (ACER), spoke in opposition to the application, citing the large size of the development and its proximity to the boundary of the site and stating that existing buildings had already been demolished. She commented on the selection of tree plantings and the need for them to be maintained. She questioned the colour choice of the roof and sought clarification as to whether run-off from the site would soak away as opposed to entering the local water system. She also requested that a noise condition be added to the plan.

The Officer clarified that demolition was part of the application. It was later confirmed that demolition had been approved in September 2016. In relation to landscaping and the dimensions of the building, he stated that the developer had changed the location of the building as far as possible to maximise the distance to the boundary. He outlined the measures that had been put in place to ensure a mix of planting. He stated that the area was a core employment area and that as such suitable for such a development. He indicated that the colour of the roof was illustrated on the elevations in the agenda.

In relation to noise levels, he outlined the distances between the development and residential properties and indicated that Environmental Health had no objection to the application. The Officer outlined the additional condition in the Members' Update as to how it related to drainage and commented that the concerns raised had been negated by this condition.

In response to Members' questions, the Service Manager, Highways and Development Management, stated that there would be a small increase in traffic but that the shift pattern used by the company would mean that this increase would not impact peak flow. The Officer stated that there was no traffic restriction on the existing building limiting night time movements but that an amendment to the conditions could require back-up sensors in lorries to be deactivated. He indicated the siting of the original building and clarified that the new building had a marginally higher roof line.

In relation to the colour of the roof, the Officer commented that the design was of a contemporary nature and that the Council had recently approved similar applications in the area. The Planning Department were happy with the materials chosen as indicated in the plan. He indicated that conditions in the plan specified planting during the appropriate season and that tree protection methods would be employed. He stated that the applicant had submitted an External Lighting Report as part of their application and that Planning and Environmental Health were happy with the findings of that report.

Resolved: That application No. 162736 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 81 to 110 and the updated plans and additional condition as set out in the Members' Update and an additional condition regarding the deactivation of reversing sensors.