

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 11 OCTOBER 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.20 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), John Kaiser (Vice-Chairman), Philip Houldsworth, John Jarvis, Malcolm Richards, Angus Ross, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Wayne Smith and Bill Soane

Other Councillors Present - Speakers

Councillors: Prue Bray

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Imogen Shepherd-DuBey and Rob Stanton

Officers Present

Lyndsay Jennings, Legal Specialist
Justin Turvey, Operational Development Lead Officer
Arabella Yandle, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Chris Easton, Service Manager, Highways Development Management

Case Officers Present

Mark Croucher, Planning Officer
Pooja Kumar, Planning Officer
Dariusz Kusyk, Planning Officer

42. APOLOGIES

No apologies for absence were received.

43. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 September 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.

44. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Philip Houldsworth declared a personal interest in Item 47, application 171420 – 613 Reading Road, on the grounds that he had attended a meeting with the applicant/developer and case officer. He still had an open mind with regard to the decision.

Councillor Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey declared a personal interest in Item 47, application 171420 – 613 Reading Road, on the grounds that she had attended a meeting with the applicant/developer and case officer. She still had an open mind with regard to the decision.

Councillor John Jarvis declared a prejudicial interest in Item 49, application 172385 – 21-26 Tape Lane, Hurst on the grounds that he had been a Non-Executive Director for

Wokingham Housing Limited. (He left the meeting during consideration of the matter and did not take part in the vote.)

45. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

It was noted that: Item 48, 171903 – Units 62-67 Suttons Business Park, Sutton Park Avenue, Earley, RG6 1AZ was deferred at the request of the applicant to allow for discussions related to a revised parking layout.

46. APPLICATION NO 172013 - 2 BUDGES COTTAGES, KEEPHATCH ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG41 2YE

Proposal: proposed erection of single storey front extension to dwelling and covered porch

Applicant: Mr Fred Warren

The Committee originally heard this application on 13 September 2017, whereupon it was proposed that it be deferred until Members had been able to carry out a site visit. The Committee received and reviewed an addendum to the report about this application set out in Agenda pages 11 to 34.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included a proposed amendment to paragraph 2 to whitt that it is Condition 3 that is amended.

Members had visited the site on 6 October 2017.

Mrs Dance, resident, spoke against the application, stating that she and her family had lived in the neighbouring property for 55 years, and that the proposed development would spoil their outlook. The frontage of the properties was distinctive and this should be preserved as part of the history of the area.

Anthony Richardson, agent, spoke in favour of the application, suggesting that the purpose of the application was to provide a new entrance and circulation space, to minimise heat loss and to make the property more efficient and more modern. The extension was to the north and would therefore have less impact on light. He shared a time-lapse film that indicated sun movements around the property. The extension extended forward by 1.2m. The extension wall was approximately 1m away from the window. It was fundamental to the core brief to maintain the character of the cottage. The same materials or equivalents would be used. This would include soft clay brick tiles and patterns in blue brick. Material samples were to be provided as part of the conditions. The Conservation Officer had advised that the proposed extension would not lead to any loss of character. Flush fitting windows would be fitted as advised.

The Chair read a statement from David Lee, Ward Member, indicating that the cottages created their own unique contextual setting. He suggested that the building line for the property should be set in relation to the other cottages and not the terraced properties that had been built much later. He also stated that the loss of light would have a serious impact on the neighbouring property because of the small size of the windows.

In answer to Member queries regarding light, the Case Officer stated that the addendum report contained a correction to the calculations and that the 45° point had not been breached. The Lead Officer, Operational Development Management, went on to explain that the assessment of light followed a two-stage process. If the proposed development

did not breach the 45° rule, which was the first stage, the second stage was not required. The calculation point was the middle point of the roofline.

Members discussed the application at length. They acknowledged the visual impact of the proposed extension on the current properties and the fact that the neighbouring property had small windows and there would be a loss of light. Guidance was just that and should be used in relation to the circumstances at hand. However, the application met planning requirements and nationally used standards for assessing loss of light.

Resolved: That Application no 172013 be approved, subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 11 to 34 and the proposed amendment as laid out in the Members' Update.

47. APPLICATION NO 171420 - 613 READING ROAD, WINNERSH, RG41 5UA
(Councillor Philip Houldsworth and Councillor Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey declared a personal interest in this item)

Proposal: Full planning application for the demolition of existing building and erection of 102-bed Premier Inn hotel, with internal bar/restaurant area and Costa drive-thru, with associated parking and landscaping.

Applicant: Whitbread PLC

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 35 to 56

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Proposed deletion of Condition 13, and
- Proposed additional condition to secure lighting details.

Members had visited the site on 6 October 2017.

David Wetherill, Agent, spoke in favour of the application, explaining that the site had been vacant since 2012. It was in a major development location with bus and train connections so the application was acceptable on principle. The facility would offer mid-range accommodation not currently available in the area and would create up to 76 full time equivalent (FTE) positions. The scale, bulk mass and design of the development and the flood risk were acceptable and there were no other sites in the area that were suitable, viable and available. A flood response plan had been conditioned in the application. Site access and trip generation assessments indicated that there was sufficient parking and the impact on traffic would be minimal. There would be a peak demand of up to 28 vehicles during the morning for the drive-thru.

Prue Bray, Ward Member, spoke in favour of the application. She welcomed more facilities in Winnersh and the re-development of a vacant site. The new building would have better drainage system than the current building and there was sufficient landscaping. There would be an increase in traffic movements but this would be alleviated when the Winnersh Relief Road was in place.

In response to Member questions regarding flooding, the Case Officer stated that the new development had Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) and had been assessed for mitigation. The Service Manager, Highways Development Management, went on to

state that following the Environment Agency's change in climate change allowances the scheme had met this additional requirement and that the proposed scheme actually provided more storage than the amount required.

In response to Member queries regarding traffic, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, explained that a full assessment had been carried out with sensitivity testing to review the worst case, which included the scheme being considered as a completely new scheme. The results showed that there would be very little difference in the amount of traffic generated and was very comparable with the existing use. Junction assessments showed that the access operated well within capacity. In regards to the Costa drive-thru, similar sites had been assessed to determine the level of use; the results showed approximately 200 movements per day from 6am to 7pm with a peak time occurring between 8.30-8.45 am with 10 vehicles being recorded. The Costa Restaurant element was shown to generate approximately 370 vehicles to a site during the same 13 hour period, with its peak being between 8:15 – 8:30. As the site had been vacant for 5 years, to provide the committee with additional supporting information officers reviewed accident data over an extended period, the results highlighted one driver-fault accident at the site entrance in 2007 resulting from a u-turning vehicle. The current office building could be re-occupied at any time with full use and the vehicle movements it would entail.

Members asked that Highways look at the traffic on the road and to consider the use of a 'keep clear' marking. The officer acknowledge to that this request away to be considered but advised that it was not necessary to be linked to this planning permission and could be dealt with under a separate process.

In response to Member questions regarding foul water, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, indicated that drainage was being adopted by Thames Water and that systems were in place to prevent foul drainage escaping during a potential flooding event.

In response to Member questions regarding the environment, the Case Officer stated that the Ecology Officer was happy with the report. Ornamental planting associated with the existing car park would be removed and there would be some thinning of trees. A historic hedgerow was being retained and there was a large highway verge. The fine detail would be agreed with the landscaping team.

Resolved: That Application no 171240 be approved, subject to the conditions laid out in Agenda pages 35 to 56, and the proposed deleted condition and new condition as laid out in the Members' Update.

**48. APPLICATION NO 171903 - UNITS 62-67, SUTTONS BUSINESS PARK,
SUTTON PARK AVENUE, EARLEY, RG6 1AZ**

Proposal: Full planning application for the redevelopment of site to provide a new class B2/B8 industrial unit with ancillary office space and associated storage areas, car parking and landscaping

Applicant: Standard Life Assurance Ltd.

This item was deferred at the request of the applicant to allow for discussions related to a revised parking layout.

49. APPLICATION NO 172385 - 21-26 TAPE LANE, HURST, READING, RG10 0DP
(Councillor John Jarvis declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting before the item was addressed)

Proposal: Application to vary condition 2, 12, 15 and 17 of planning permission 162529 which approved the erection of 11 dwellings with associated access, car parking, landscaping and drainage following the demolition of existing dwellings. Condition 2 relates to approved plans, condition 12 relates to parking, condition 15 relates to Arboricultural Impact Assessment and condition 17 relates to first floor windows.

Applicant: Wokingham Housing Limited

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 83 to 118.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included further information regarding discharge conditions.

Members had visited the site in November 2016.

Derek Birtles, local resident, took Members through a presentation showing the types and numbers of vehicles that parked in appropriately. He stated that he had not objected to the original application, the 22 parking bays meeting Council standards. The application contained no restriction on the type of vehicles that could be parked on the development and he asked that covenants be applied to the application limiting this.

Darren Toes, Wokingham Housing Ltd, stated that the application before the Committee related to variations in conditions in an application that had already been approved. The additional parking space was for a disabled client who would be living in plot 1. The size of the properties had been increased to meet standards and landscaping would improve privacy.

In response to Member questions regarding the control and management of parking in the development, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, reiterated that the application had been consented and the application before the Committee was an amendment including the addition of one disabled parking space. As the proposed parking was not located within the public highway, it became a private management matter should parking spaces wished to be restricted, therefore restrictions could not be applied and Civil Parking Enforcement could not be used. One space per property had been allocated and there was approximately the same number of unallocated spaces, plus some additional visitor bays. As the spaces were provided along the length of the site fronting the road and with only one space allocated per dwelling the layout would aid in the reduction of additional vehicles parking along the road fronting these properties addressing some concerns that had been raised during the discussions.

The Committee asked the Chair to write a letter on their behalf to the housing department to ask what they were going to do to control parking.

Resolved: That Application no 172385 be approved, subject to the conditions laid out in Agenda pages 83 to 118, and the additional information as laid out in the Members' Update.

This page is intentionally left blank