

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 26 APRIL 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.15 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), John Kaiser (Vice-Chairman), Chris Bowring, Michael Firmager, Philip Houldsworth, Malcolm Richards, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Wayne Smith and Bill Soane

**Other Councillors Present**

Councillors: Simon Weeks

**Officers Present**

Mark Cupit, Head of SDL Delivery  
Chris Easton, Service Manager, Highways Development Management  
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor  
Arabella Yandle, Democratic Service Officer

**Case Officers Present**

Emy Circuit, SDL Delivery Manager  
David Smith, SDL Delivery Manager  
Graham Vaughan, Senior Planning Officer

**117. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies

**118. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 29 March 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**MEMBERS' UPDATE**

There are a number of references to the Members' Update within these minutes. The Members' Update was circulated to all present prior to the meeting. It also contains details of properties to be visited prior to the next Planning Meeting. A copy is attached.

**119. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**120. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

There were no items that were deferred or withdrawn

**121. APPLICATION NO 163264 - MONTAGUE PARK PHASE 6, WILLIAM HEELAS WAY**

**Proposal:** Reserved matters pursuant to outline planning permission O/2010/1712 as varied by VAR/2015/0342 and 161963 for a development of up to 650 dwellings and associated infrastructure. The reserve matters comprise details of the neighbourhood centre incorporating retail and community use on ground floor, public parking, a public square, neighbourhood equipped area for play (NEAP) and 115 dwellings with associated internal access roads and footways, parking and landscaping. Details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be determined.

**Applicant:** David Wilson Homes

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 11 to 56.

The Committee was advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed change to Condition 2 listing revised plans;
- Clarifications to Conditions 4 and 5 regarding design for access and to mitigate congestion;
- Proposed additional Condition pertaining to the submission of details of roof design prior to construction, and
- Proposed additional informatives relating to landscaping details and larger vehicles.

Andrew Walters, Wokingham Town Council, spoke in objection to the application, stated that fundamental requirements of design had not been met. He stated that he also spoke on behalf of Julian McGhee-Sumner, Ward Member for Wescott. He suggested that the development would be of high density and low quality, especially Block C. Phase 6 would consist of 91% of the 1 and 2 bed flats. He went on to suggest that the design was out of keeping with the rest of the development and were of an inappropriate scale. He indicated that the increase of traffic on London Road would be an issue; the Southern Distributor Road was not complete, and cited CP4, which stated that suitable arrangements for the provision of infrastructure should be in place prior to granting of permission.

Ann Gillings, Agent, spoke on behalf of the applicant, David Wilson Homes, explaining how the application before the Committee fitted into the wider Strategic Development Location (SDL) and that the developer and planning officers at Wokingham Borough Council had worked to achieve a high quality design. She stated that the area of the application was designed to be the hub of the whole Montague Park development and therefore was of a different character to other areas within the development. She went on to state that the housing density across the site as a whole was 34 dph and the ratio of houses to flats was 60:40. She suggested that buildings on the edge of the central hub had been designed to merge with surrounding areas by the use of different styles and sizes of build.

In response, the Case Officer explained that the proposals were in line with the outline application, which had preceded the application in front of the Committee and had been designed to have a range of areas with distinct character. She stated that there had only been an indicative mix of dwelling types and sizes in the original outline and reiterated the reference made by Ann Gillings to the gradation of property styles around the hub. She also suggested that the inclusion of flats over garages offered a wider range of options to future homeowners.

The Service Manager, Highways Development Management, stated that the traffic assessment that had taken place as part of the outline application had allowed for 650 habitations and that this last phase Reserved Matters application resulted in an overall site total of 636 habitations. The junction at London Road, which formed the connection with the development spine road (Southern Distributor Road) had been delivered taking into account the cumulative effect of the whole of the South Wokingham SDL. This was to prevent multiple road works taking place as this junction as the SDL was progressed both north and south of the railway.

The Head of SDL Delivery spoke to the design overall and the intention in masterplanning and the outline planning permission was that it should include different character areas and densities as part of placemaking. He explained that large developments of a single nature often failed and that placemaking would aid in increasing footfall and vitality of neighbourhood centre and thereby the whole.

In response to Member questions regarding parking, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, stated that the parking allocated to be shared between the neighbourhood centre and Floreat Primary School exceeds the Council's parking guidance. Some of the properties would have tandem parking but this would all be allocated and is acceptable. He went on to state that parking would be managed.

In response to Member questions regarding access, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, stated that the Phase 6 development included a 15m loading bay for deliveries plus a turning head. The design had been tracked for refuse and delivery vehicles and had 6m access roads, and as it was a cul-de-sac there would be no problems with through traffic. The size of vehicles that could access the development was governed by a condition requiring a servicing strategy to be submitted for approval by the Council. The Coppid Beech roundabout and the London Road junction had been upgraded and signalised and the eventual completion of the SDR and NDR form part of the wider transport interventions as identified within the Core Strategy .

**RESOLVED:** That Application no 163264 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 11 to 56, the amendment to condition 2, the clarifications and additional condition as laid out in the Members' Update.

## **122. APPLICATION NO 161255 - NORTH OF HYDE END ROAD, SPENCERS WOOD**

**Proposal:** Full application for the proposed erection of 32no dwellings with associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping

**Applicant:** Bewley Homes

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 57 to 90.

The Committee was advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed additional plans to Condition 2;
- Proposed deletion of Condition 31 regarding capacity to deal with runoff, and
- A correction to the affordable housing.

It was noted that Members visited the site on 21 April 2017.

Nigel Boyer, Shinfield Parish Council, spoke to the application. He raised concerns about the changes in access, from heading north on to Croft Gardens Estate in the original SDL to heading south onto Hyde End Road. He indicated that there were a number of access roads letting on to Hyde End Road in the same stretch and that speeds were high. He went on to state that the Public Right of Way (PROW) footpath that runs through the site would need to be kept open and in good order throughout the development of the site.

Daniel Lampard, agent on behalf of Bewley Homes, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that Bewley Homes prided itself on building high quality properties in desirable

places. They had worked closely with council officers to make sure the design met council standards. As a result of comments, Fullbrook House would have a bigger separation from new properties; a veteran tree was being retained, and the footpath widened. He went on to indicate that there had been full discussion and assessment in relation to access and that the development offered a SANG and affordable housing.

The Case Officer reiterated the comments by Daniel Lampard regarding the changes to the plan and its effect on the relationship of the development to Fullbrook House. He stated that there was a legal requirement that the footpath be maintained. The Case Officer went on to list the figures that were subject to legal agreement and confirmed that, as they had agreed to the development, Thames Water would be responsible for any issues regarding capacity for runoff.

The Service Manager, Highways Development, stated that the roads in the plan were aligned to those in the South of the M4 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and that an independent road safety audit had been carried out as requested. He went on, in response to Member questions, to state that as part of the wider SDL pedestrian and cycle facilities and connections Hyde End Road is being looked at along with potential measures to assist in reducing the roads speed limit down to a 30mph speed restriction on that stretch of Hyde End Road.

In response to Speaker comments and Member queries, the following conditions were attached:

- The Construction Management Plan Condition amended to include details relating to the PROW footpath be kept open and in good order during the development and that any damage be made good, and
- The retention and amendment of Condition 31 to read: 'Development shall be carried out in accordance with the above details.'

**RESOLVED:** That Application no 161255 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 57 to 90; the additional conditions set out above, and the completion of legal agreements within 6 months

### **123. APPLICATION NO 163609 - THAMES VALLEY SCIENCE PARK, LAND NORTH OF CUTBUSH LANE**

**Proposal:** Outline planning application for Phase 2 of the Thames Valley Science Park comprising up to 57,110 sqm research and development and innovation floor space (with occupancy restricted by a Gateway policy) inclusive of up to 5,711 sqm of amenity and supporting uses and an energy centre (all matters reserved except access to the site).

**Applicant:** University of Reading

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 91 to 120.

The Committee was advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed wording for Condition 26 relating to the Ecological Strategy report;
- Proposed amendment to Condition 27, and
- Clarification regarding a Consultation Response from Reading Borough Council.

Nick Paterson-Neild, agent, spoke on behalf of Reading University, explaining that the application before the Committee was the second of a master plan that had been submitted in 2010, outlining how it fitted into the whole and the positive impact it would have on the University and Wokingham.

In response to a Member question, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, indicated that bus provision to the site would expand as the site was developed out alongside the South of the M4 SDL, which has an associated Public Transport Strategy which is secured and funded.

In response to Member questions, the Case Officer stated that a detailed landscaping plan would be part of an application relating to the carparks. He explained that there was allowance in the plan for cafes and crèches and similar enterprises that were an integral part of the site. He clarified that the decision on the application was in the purview of Wokingham Borough Council alone but that the views of Reading Borough Council had been taken into account in the report.

**RESOLVED:** that Application no 163609 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 91 to 120 and the amendments and clarifications as laid out in the Members' Update.

**124. APPLICATION NO 170570 - LAND WEST OF TWIN OAKS, LONGWATER LANE**  
**Applicant:** Mr G Lee

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 121 to 140.

The Committee was advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed change to conditions to read '...site, including the ditch';
- Additional consultee response, and
- Clarification relating to the five year supply of pitches.

It was noted that Members visited the site on 21 April 2017.

Gordon Veitch, Finchampstead Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application, stating that it represented an inappropriate development as it lay outside the settlement boundary and would have a detrimental effect on the ecology of the Thames Valley Basin Special Protection Area (SPA0).

Alan Dix, resident, spoke in opposition to the application, commenting on the current condition of the footpath and the likely impact of new residents on it. He stated that the application was inappropriate for a semi-rural area and would cause light pollution. He stated that the site had been subject to an appeal for two pitches on a previous occasion and had been rejected because of the sustainability of the site, and that this would still be the case for one pitch.

David Wood, Agent, spoke on behalf of the applicant, stating that the recommendation to approve indicated consideration of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA). He stated that the site was in the same area as other gypsy pitches and that the applicant had met the qualifying criteria. He suggested that other sites had installed similar drainage systems

that worked well; that the pitch was more than 50m away from other properties, and that the application included soft landscaping.

Simon Weeks, Ward Member for Finchampstead South, spoke on the application, stating that it was a question of balance. He referred to the appeal mentioned previously, citing comments about the harm a pitch would have on the character of the area and that the GTAA should not outweigh that.

In response to Member questions and Speaker comments about the five year supply of pitches and the deficit of 1, the Case Officer stated that the information was based on the 2015 report. He explained that Wokingham Borough Council's figures were updated on an annual basis at the end of March and that, when all the figures had been taken into account, there was a shortfall of one pitch. The Planning Department had taken this into account in regards to their recommendation as it had to be given weight.

The recommendation put to the Committee to approve the application was not supported. As a result, an alternative proposal was received from Councillor John Kaiser, seconded by Councillor Philip Houldsworth, to refuse the application for the reasons that:

- The application was outside of development limits,
- the application was contrary to policy GP11;
- the development would have a negative impact on the character of the countryside;
- the development would have a negative impact on the Thames Valley Basin SPA, and
- the shortfall of one pitch did not outweigh the impact of the pitch.

**RESOLVED:** That application no 170570 be refused for the reasons set out above with full wording to be agreed between the Case Officer and the Planning Chair and Vice-Chair.

## **125. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT MONITORING REPORT**

The Committee received and considered the Quarterly Enforcement Monitoring Report.

**RESOLVED:** That the Quarterly Enforcement Monitoring Report be noted.