

MEMBERS' UPDATE
Planning Committee – 1st April 2015

Site Address: Former Allied Bakeries site, Viscount Way, Woodley, RG5 4BJ
Application No: F/2014/2105, Pages 17 - 84

The committee report commented that two of the adjoining road haulage businesses had objected. Similar concerns have now been raised in writing by a third business Delivered.

The applicant has submitted two further reports to provide reassurance on the issue of noise. Both have been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. The first has been undertaken by 24Acoustics who have undertaken 6 further days of monitoring, and this has verified the accuracy and reliability of their original noise modelling.

The adjoining business has raised the fact that they will be installing audible left turn warnings on vehicles over the next 2-3 months and this has not been accounted for.

24Acoustics has contacted a supplier of the audible warnings, and conclude that the system will create a dB L_{Amax} no higher than already assumed for the use i.e. no louder than the reversing beepers. It has been calculated that the additional audible warning will not increase the maximum noise levels (L_{Amax}) already recorded and that there is no need to upgrade the noise mitigation measures already proposed.

The adjoining business has also raised concerns about the 'bounce effect' created by the proposed acoustic barrier, however the modelling carried out already takes into account the nature of surfaces in the vicinity (e.g. soft ground/hard ground) so any reflections or reverberation has already been accounted for. There are no reflective surfaces in the vicinity that will cause any significant increase in noise. The proposed 3m high acoustic barrier will provide additional protection and will not increase the level of noise experienced by future residents.

The second report is a 'peer review' undertaken by AcousticAir in order to further demonstrate the robustness and appropriateness of the proposed mitigation measures. The second report confirms the proposed mitigation measures to be entirely appropriate.

Finally, prospective purchasers and tenants (including affordable housing tenants) will be made aware of the haulage yard and on-site mitigation measures (e.g. information placed on the deeds and plots sales contracts). A deed of variation on the original s106 agreement has been used to secure this (dated 01/04/15).

It is therefore considered that the chances of residents putting in complaints will be minimised as much as possible.

Site Address: Shinfield, C of E Junior School, Chestnut Crescent, Shinfield
Application No: F/2014/2633, Pages 85 - 110

No update with exception of plan numbers for condition 3.

Plan numbers for condition 3:

5458-1356 06, 5458-1600B, 5458-1601B, 5458-1710B, 5458-1711B, 5458-9000B, 5458-9001B, 5458-9022-B, 5458-9010-C, 5458-1000A, 5458-1001-B, 5458-1010B, 5458-1011B, 5458-1021A, 5458-1022A, 5458-1050C, 5458-1051A, 5458-110B, 5458-1101C, 5458-1200C, 5458-1201B, 5458-1202C, 5458-1203-C

Site Address: Willow Tree Works, Swallowfield Street, Swallowfield
Application No: F/2014/0940, Pages 111 - 158

Recommendation

Whilst it was anticipated that the Section 106 agreement would be complete by the date of the committee, a few minor changes have been made relating to technical details and the delivery of footpaths. Whilst these do not change the level of contributions, it is now anticipated that the Legal Agreement will be completed tomorrow morning. As such the recommendation remains as per the report.

Page 119 Conditions 20 and 21 are deleted as unnecessary as a contribution to children's play of £74,068.80 is proposed through the Section 106 Legal Agreement. Amended drawings have been received to reflect removal of the play area and replace drawings on page 114.

MCA114-03C
2521 -10M
2521 -15J
2521 – 16J
2521 – 24G
2521-25D

Additional highway conditions

VISIBILITY SPLAYS (APPROVED) (AMENDED)

Prior to the occupation of Plots 1 to 6 the proposed vehicular accesses shall have been formed and provided with visibility splays as shown on the approved drawing number [INSERT]. The land within the visibility splays shall be cleared of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height and maintained clear of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height at all times.

In the interests of highway safety and convenience. Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP3 & CP6.

VISIBILITY SPLAYS FOR PRIVATE DRIVES (AMENDED)

No part of any buildings hereby permitted shall be occupied until visibility splays of 2.0 metres by 2.0 metres, have been provided at the intersection of the driveways and the adjacent footway as shown on the approved drawing number [INSERT]. The visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility above a height of 0.6 metres.

Additional informatives

ON-SITE ENGINEERING WORKS (S.38 ADOPTION)

If it is the developer's intention to request the Council, as local highway authority, to adopt the proposed access roads etc. as highway maintainable at public expense, then full engineering details must be agreed with the Highway Authority at the Council Offices, Shute End, Wokingham. The developer is strongly advised not to commence development until such details have been approved in writing and a legal agreement is made with the Council under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980.

WORKS AFFECTING THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY

Any works/ events carried out by or on behalf of the developer affecting either a public highway or a prospectively maintainable highway (as defined under s.87 New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA)), shall be co-ordinated and licensed as required under NRSWA and the Traffic Management Act 2004 in order to minimise disruption to both pedestrian and vehicular users of the highway.

Any such works or events, and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site must be co-ordinated by the developer in liaison with the Borough's Street Works team (0118 974 6302). This must take place AT LEAST three months in advance of the intended works to ensure effective co-ordination with other works so as to minimise disruption.

Additional comments

Comments on the Herrington Consulting review prepared on behalf of Swallowfield Flood Resilience Group are attached as an appendix (Appendix 1) to this update.

WSP response - Letter 30th March 2015 (see end of update sheet) in response to issues raised by the Swallowfield Flood Resilience Group (FRG). Also the following comments made by email by WSP on 31st March 2015.

The Environment Agency has further commented by email dated 31/03/2015 (see end of update sheet)

Additional points made by Planning Director Bellway Homes (see end of update sheet)

Additional comments from Swallowfield Parish Council (see end of update sheet)

Additional comments from Thames Water (see end of update sheet)

Response to additional comments

WSP as the Councils consultant has reviewed all of the additional comments and representations from the above. In addition they have met with the Flood Resilience

Group (FRG) and have considered verbal concerns expressed at the meeting. Taking all this into consideration they have advised that the additional modelling and technical information supplied by the applicants is robust. The recommendation including conditions remain as per the report

Page 144 Section 106. The Legal Agreement includes the following clause:-.

“Affordable Housing Contribution” has been amended to state: “means a contribution of One Million Three Hundred and Fourteen Thousand Pounds (£1,314,000.00), or such lesser amount as deemed appropriate and agreed between the Council and the Owner once the Vacant Buildings Credit (as defined in National Planning Practice Guidance) is applied, Index-Linked towards the off-site provision or regeneration of Affordable Housing within the Council's administrative area in lieu of the provision of 25% of Affordable Housing Dwellings on the Application Site”

National policy provides an incentive for brownfield development on sites containing vacant buildings. Where a vacant building is brought back into any lawful use, or is demolished to be replaced by a new building, the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings when the local planning authority calculates any affordable housing contribution which will be sought. Affordable housing contributions may be required for any increase in floorspace. The site has become vacant since submission of the application.

Site Address: Bearwood Park (Former Bearwood Golf Course)
Application No: F/2014/2119, Pages 159 - 226

Removal of Recommendation

It is clear that the s106 will not be ready by 2nd April. Therefore recommendation A is removed and recommendation B becomes the recommendation to the committee.

The application will become CIL liable. The CIL liability will be calculated in full accordance with Wokingham's CIL schedule and the CIL regulations.

Height of the HQ building:

At the briefing members queried the height of the HQ building and why it needed to be as tall as it is.

The Building is 5m tall (6m over the section where the ground slopes down), 34m wide and 10.3m deep.

Officers raised this matter with the applicant who commented as follows:

“Further to our conversation earlier regarding the HQ building and the Members’ queries as to why the building is the height shown, the rationale is as follows:

- . The floor to ceiling height of the proposed building is circa 3m which is not overly generous for a board room of this nature.
- . The additional height is a result of the need to accommodate the plant and M & E equipment internally. While this does result in some additional height to the building, this approach is considered far preferable in design, heritage and visual impact terms and negates the need for introducing plant on to the roof of the proposed building.”

Environment Agency response:

The Environment Agency has formally withdrawn its technical objection to the proposal. Subject to the following condition:

Recommended condition 57:

57. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained within the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Project Ref: 28289/00//Rev B, dated September 2014 and the Technical Note detailing the Surface Water Drainage Scheme no. TN002 (Rev D-Feb 2015), prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP.

The scheme shall include:

- *Permeable paving, porous paving and pitches and oil separators as outlined in the technical note.*
- *Reduction in surface water run-off to:*

*- Outfall draining **Area 1** to discharge at a peak rate of **12.6 l/s** for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 chance in any year critical storm event*

*- Outfall draining **Area 2** to discharge at a peak rate of **17.2 l/s** for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 chance in any year critical storm event*

*- 2 x outfalls draining **Area 3 and 4** to discharge at a peak rate of **26.l/s and 42.5 l/s** for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 chance in any year critical storm event.*

The scheme shall be fully implemented prior to completion of the development and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity. This is sought in accordance with paragraph 103 of the NPPF to ensure that the proposed development does not increase flood

risk onsite or elsewhere and in accordance with Wokingham Borough Council's adopted Core Strategy Policy CP1 point 3 and 4. Furthermore, Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution and by recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services.

Helicopter Usage:

Members expressed concerns over risk of helicopter usage at the site causing loss of residential amenity to residents by noise and requested a condition to control this.

Recommended Condition 58:

No helicopters, with the exception of air ambulances attending emergencies, shall land at the site.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. To avoid excessive noise. Policy: NPPF, Core Strategy CP1 & CP3, MDD CC06

Correction to condition 46:

Working hours should be limited to concluding at 6pm, in line with the WBC standard wording.

Amendment to Condition 4:

Members have expressed concerns that the buildings could be let out causing intensity of traffic and loss of amenity to residents from parties or noisy events. Members have requested that condition 4 be amended to exclude letting/renting out of the training buildings.

Amended wording:

"With the exception of the residential development (which may be disposed of separately), the permission hereby granted shall be personal to Reading Football Club for the purposes outlined in the planning application only. The non-residential buildings shall not be let or rented out to third parties.

In granting this permission the local planning authority has had regard to the special circumstances of this case, being the special requirements of Reading Football Club within the Borough, and wishes to have the opportunity of exercising control over any subsequent alternative use in the interests of the amenities of the area which may be more harmful to the countryside.

Relevant policy: Core Strategy policies CP1, CP3, CP11."

Clarification of comments of The Mid and West Berkshire Local access forum

The Action Forum requested that the following comments be placed in the members update to fully detail their comments on the byway.

“It is clear that it is the intersection of Mole Road and Byway 4 that is of concern, and our submission outlined the reasons, on grounds of Public Safety, in addition to Access.

We strongly advise that part of the developer’s contributions for the adjacent Bearwood application are used to address the intersection of byway 4 with Mole Road in order to allow the existing public rights of way network to be used.”

Comments from the People’s Trust for Endangered Species

The People’s Trust for Endangered Species comments were erroneously missed from the original report. The Trust objected with regards the impact upon orchards tree species and considered the proposal would have an impact upon protected trees and valued habitats. The trust suggested alterations to the layout of the scheme. [Officer note the value of the trees and habitat has been considered by the Landscape architect, Conservation Architect and Ecologist who do not object to the loss of vegetation in these areas – it is not considered by officers that alterations to the scheme are merited].

Final Plan Numbers for condition 3:

Drawing Title	Drawing No.	Revision	Scale
Existing Park Lodge	P100	A	1:100@A3
Existing West Lodge	P101	A	1:100@A2
Existing Apple Store	P102	A	1:100@A3
Existing Riding Centre/Stables	P103	-	1:200@A2
Existing Mole Lodge	P104	A	1:100@A3
Existing Sawmill Site Plan	P110	A	1:500@A2
Existing Garden Cottages	P111	A	1:100@A1
Existing Farmhouse and Farm Cottage	P112	A	1:100@A1
Existing Residential Elevations	P120	A	1:100@A0
Existing Residential Elevations	P121	A	1:100@A0
Proposed Mole Lodge	P149	B	1:100@A3

Proposed Park Lodge	P150	A	1:100@A2
Proposed Visitor Changing	P151	A	1:100@A1
Proposed First Team Building Ground Floor	P152	A	1:100@A0
Proposed First Team Building First Floor	P153	A	1:100@A0
Proposed First Team Building Roof Plan	P154	A	1:100@A0
Proposed West Lodge	P155	B	1:100@A2
Proposed Academy and Lean-to Floor Plans	P156	A	1:200@A2
Proposed Academy and Lean-to Roof Plans	P157	A	1:200@A2
Proposed HQ Building Plan	P158	C	1:100@A2
Proposed Indoor Pitch Plans	P159	C	1:200@A0
Proposed Indoor Pitch Roof Plans	P160		1:200@A1
Proposed Residential Site Plan	P165	B	1:500@A2
Proposed Plans Units 1 – 7	P166	B	1:100@A1
Proposed Plans Units 8 – 10	P167	B	1:100@A1

Proposed Plans Units 14 – 17	P168	B	1:100@A1
Proposed Plans Units 18 – 26 and 11 – 13	P169	B	1:100@A1
Proposed Elevations	P170	B	1:100@A0
Proposed Elevations	P171	B	1:100@A0
Proposed Park Lodge (Security Building) Sections	P220	A	1:100@A3
Proposed Visitor Changing Building Sections	P221	A	1:100@A2
Proposed First Team Building Sections	P222	A	1:200@A2

Proposed West Lodge Sections	P223	A	1:200@A3
Proposed Academy Lean-to Sections	P225		1:200@A2
Proposed Academy Sections	P226	A	1:200@A2
Proposed HQ Building Sections	P230	B	1:100@A2
Proposed Indoor Pitch Sections	P231	c	1:100@A0
Existing Park Lodge (Golf Club) Elevations	P300	A	1:100@A2
Existing West Lodge Elevations	P301	A	1:100@A2
Existing Riding Centre/Stables Elevations	P303		1:200@A2
Existing Mole Lodge Elevations	P304	A	1:100@A2
Proposed Park Lodge (Security Building) Elevations	P320	A	1:100@A2
Proposed Visitor Changing Building Elevations	P321	A	1:100@A1
Proposed First Team Building Elevations	P322	A	1:100@A0
Proposed West Lodge Elevations	P323	A	1:100@A1
Proposed Academy Elevations	P326	A	1:200@A2
Proposed Mole Lodge Elevations	P327	B	1:100@A2
Proposed HQ Building Elevations	P330	C	1:200@A2
Proposed Indoor Pitch Elevations	P331	C	1:100@A0
Groundsman Compound	SK100-14		1:100@A1
Red Line Boundary Plan	RGLO1	B	1:2500@A1
Masterplan	RG-L-08-13	H	1:1000@A0
Detailed layout 1 of 12	RG-L-08-1	D	1:500@A1
Detailed layout 2 of 12	RG-L-08-2	E	1:500@A1

Detailed layout 3 of 12	RG-L-08-3	E	1:500@A1
Detailed layout 4 of 12	RG-L-08-4	E	1:500@A1
Detailed layout 5 of 12	RG-L-08-5	F	1:500@A1
Detailed layout 6 of 12	RG-L-08-6	E	1:250@A1
Detailed layout 7 of 12	RG-L-08-7	E	1:250@A1
Detailed layout 8 of 12	RG-L-08-8	F	1:250@A1
Detailed layout 9 of 12	RG-L-08-9	D	1:250@A1
Detailed layout 10 of 12	RG-L-08-10	F	1:250@A1
Detailed layout 11 of 12	RG-L-08-11	F	1:250@A1
Detailed layout 12 of 12	RG-L-08-12	D	1:250@A1
Planting Schedule	RG-L-08-14		A
Hard and soft details	RG-L-10-1		1:20@A1
Hard and soft details	RG-L-10-2		1:100@A1
Hard and soft details	RG-L-10-3		1:20@A1
Landscape Section 1 and 2	RG-L-09-1	A	1:250@A0
Landscape Section 3	RG-L-09-2	A	1:250@A0
Landscape Section 4	RG-L-09-3	A	1:250@A0
Landscape Section 5	RG-L-09-4	A	1:250@A0
Landscape Section 6	RG-L-09-5	A	1:250@A0
Landscape Section 7	RG-L-09-6	A	1:250@A0

Site Address: Land to rear of 58 Hurst Road, Twyford, RG10 0AN

Application No: F/2014/2353, Pages 227 - 274

Alteration to report

At paragraph 22 of the report, a reference is made to MDD submission policy CC09. This should read MDD policy CC09 as the MDD is a fully adopted document in the development plan.

Date to be inserted to informative 2: 20th March 2015, being the date of the signed section 106 agreement.

With regards to paragraph 15 the Highways Officer has the following comments: Although the overall carriageway width of Hurst Road will be reduced in this location, the width of the running lanes will be maintained by removing central hatching. The scheme refers to 3.0m wide running lanes however this will be amended (as part of the S278 Agreement) to ensure minimum running lanes of 3.05m. This will provide a total carriageway width of 6.1m which is consistent with Hurst Road north of the site access. This minor amendment will not have a significant impact on the visibility splays or footway width.

Clarification

The site is within a major development location and is a greenfield site. As per policy CP5, the requirement for affordable housing is 35% of the net increase. The net increase for the site is 11 and 35% of this equates to 3.85. Therefore, the provision of 4 affordable units exceeds the policy requirement for affordable housing provision.

Site Levels

Email from Agent:

The only height data we currently have is the site specific topographic survey. This shows that the ends of the gardens of existing properties in Hurst Road are located at 40.1m AODN (at the lowest point). The flood level quoted by the EA for the 1 in 1000 year (FZ2 level) is 36.43m AODN. This shows the back of the existing properties to be located approx. 3.5m above the 1 in 1000 year flood level.

The historic flood maps show the flood extent to exceed the 40.1m AODN contour and therefore this would suggest that if the historic flood maps are believed to be correct, then the 1991 flood level would have a return period significantly larger than the 1 in 1000 year event. Clearly this cannot be the case as it is extremely unlikely that we have seen an event that exceeds the 1 in 1000 year event (the EA should be able to confirm this). Consequently, the historic flood maps are considered to be inaccurate at this location.

I would anticipate that the DPC levels in Hurst Road would be somewhere in the region of 43m AODN (based on the spot height in the road and the topographic survey which stops at the gardens). Consequently, these buildings are located 6.5m above the 1 in 1000 year flood level (FZ2).

At this stage, we have not fixed the dpc's of the new houses. However, it is certain that they will be built well above the maximum flood risk level of 36.43m AOND. The exact slab levels and dpc's will be agreed with yourselves prior to the commencement of development, to ensure that the new householders are not at risk.

Please note that we do not have any information regarding dpc's in Orpington Close.

Further Correspondence

Additional correspondence from the office of Theresa May has been received regarding a constituent's concerns. This and the Council's response are attached although the concerns raised are considered to be addressed in the officer report.

Following the publication of the officer's report, further letters of objection have been received and are attached (Appendix 2). The comments relate to the impact on flood risk and therefore paragraphs 20 – 25 of the officer's report refer. Correspondence from the EA will also be clarified in the appendix.

An additional email from Mr Croskell has been received and is also attached for Members. In response to this:

When the site was originally chosen for allocation in preparing the MDD Local Plan, an FRA was submitted to inform the decision making process. This FRA concluded that the majority of the site was actually in Flood Zone 1 and therefore more accurate than the EA flood maps. The EA was also consulted at this time and did not raise any objection to this. As a result, it was considered the site was in an appropriate location as development could occur without significant risk.

Site Address: 29 Copse Mead

Application No: F/2015/0055, Pages 275 - 290

Following the publication of the officer's report, additional photographs showing the application property's relationship to its neighbours are included below.

Additionally, plans showing the proposed scheme overlaid on to the existing SE and SW elevations as well as the appeal scheme overlaid on to the proposed SE and SW elevations are included below.

A full copy of the Inspector's report is attached. The Inspector's decision is summarised in the officer's report in paragraphs 20 and 21. The relevant sections from the Inspector's report are considered to be as follows:

Para 12: "Given the step back and the distance from the common boundary with No 31 of the two-storey element of the rear extension, I am satisfied, having regard to the detail provided in the amended plan, that whilst No 31's residents would be aware of the rear extension it would not be perceived as visually oppressive. Nor would it cause harm by materially reducing the amount of sunlight or daylight currently enjoyed.

Para 13: "The same however could not be said about the perception of the rear extension from No 27. Whilst the Council's officers assessed the effects of the proposal on one of No 27's bedrooms, I do not share the conclusion reached. This bedroom relies on a single side window for light and outlook. The limited outlook currently available towards the appeal property's side elevation would be considerably and harmfully foreshortened by the mass of the proposed side

extension brought to within 5m or so. It would appear oppressive from this habitable room.

Para 14: "Sunlight to the bedroom would be affected in the early summer mornings, but not so much as to justify refusal of planning permission, in itself. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that daylight to the bedroom would be materially affected.

Para 15: "No assessment of the effects of the proposal from No 27's garden was made in the officer report. The side/rear extension would be seen at close quarters from the property's main side entrance well above the roofs of the shed and garage which currently stand close to the boundary, and from that part of the garden closest to the house which appears to be most enjoyed by No 27's residents. By reason of its mass, bulk, height and proximity, it would be perceived as overwhelmingly oppressive and overbearing in its effects from next door.

Para 18: "I conclude that the proposed development would prove harmfully unneighbourly in terms of its oppressive and overbearing effects on the living conditions of the residents of 27 Copse Mead, contrary to the provisions of CS policy CP 3(a). Moreover, one of the *National Planning Policy Framework's* core principles requires that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. That objective would be severely compromised were the appeal proposals to proceed.



Relationship between 29 and 31 from rear



Relationship between 29 and 31 from rear.



Front elevation of application dwelling



Relationship between application dwelling and 27



Relationship between application dwelling and 27 from rear.



Proposed scheme overlaid on existing SE and SW elevations



Refused scheme overlaid on proposed SE and SW elevations

Pre-emptive site visits

RM/2014/2561 Land to the north of Cutbush Lane, Shinfield

Reserved Matters application pursuant to Outline Planning Consent O/2013/0101 for a residential development comprising up to 126 dwellings public open space, children's play areas accesses to Cutbush Lane and the Shinfield Eastern Relief Road Landscaping Ecological Buffer Zone ground modelling sustainable drainage and associated infrastructure.

Reason - to view and understand the proposal within the context of the wider SDL

F/2015/0073 Land adjacent to 1 Anson Walk, Shinfield

Proposed erection of 2no two bed and 2no one bed flats with associated parking and landscaping.

Reason - To assess the impact on the character of the area.

F/2014/2784 Green Isle, Wargrave Road, Remenham

Proposed erection of dwelling and boathouse following the demolition of existing dwelling and boathouse. Plus alterations to existing footbridge.

Reason - To assess the impact on the character of the area and Green Belt (also needs to be viewed from Henley riverbank).

F/2014/1561 Land West of Old Wokingham Road (Pinewood), Crowthorne

Proposed erection of 116 dwellings with associated access, highway works, drainage works (SUDS), open space and landscaping including provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).

Reason - to assess the impact on the character of the area, relationships with adjacent land uses and highway impact