

## MEMBERS' UPDATE

### Planning Committee – 11 September 2019

---

Site Address: 24 Matthewsgreen Road  
Application No: 191972 Pages 17-30

No update

---

Site Address: The Bird Gardens at the Old House, Milley Lane, Hare Hatch  
RG10 9TH  
Application No: 191566 Pages 31-46

#### **Additional submissions**

A summary of submissions is provided in the officer report on pages 37-39. Since the compilation of the agenda, 20 additional submissions against the proposal (making a total of 35 against) have been received from the following properties:

- 1) Hill House, Milley Lane, Hare Hatch RG10 9TH (previously submitted)
- 2) The Squirrels, Milley Lane, Hare Hatch RG10 9TL
- 3) Little Acres, Milley Lane, Hare Hatch RG10 9TH
- 4) Milley Lane, Hare Hatch RG10 9TL (no number or house supplied)
- 5) A'bears Corner, Milley Lane, Hare Hatch RG10 9TL
- 6) Down Cottage, Tag Lane, Hare Hatch RG10 9SU
- 7) Scarletts Lodge, Scarletts Lane, Hare Hatch RG10 9XD
- 8) Scarletts Farm, Scarletts Lane RG10 9XE
- 9) Whistler Cottage, Castle End Road, Ruscombe RG10 9XH
- 10) Willow Vale, Castle End Road, Ruscombe RG10 9XG
- 11) Church Lane, Ruscombe RG10 9UA (no number or house supplied)
- 12) Church Lane, Ruscombe RG10 9UA no number or house supplied)
- 13) House #65533 Gallant, Halls Lane, Waltham St Lawrence RG10 0JD
- 14) The Sheiling, The Street, Waltham St Lawrence RG10 0JJ
- 15) 8 Cotterell Gardens, Twyford RG10 0XP
- 16) 75a Wargrave Road, Twyford RG10 9PD
- 17) Home, Byron Road, Twyford RG10 0AE
- 18) 1 Littlewick Place, Littlewick Green, Maidenhead SL6 3RA
- 19) 130 Pinkneys Road, Maidenhead SL6 5DN
- 20) Kings Lane, Cookham SL6 9AY
- 21) On behalf of residents of Milley Lane, Hare Hatch

The majority of the comments are already discussed in the officer report, with the exception of the following additional comments:

- Access should be relocated elsewhere

Officer comment: The proposed location is acceptable on planning grounds and a relocation is unnecessary.

- Access is excessively large for its purpose

Officer comment: The access measures 5.5m in width. This would allow for two vehicles to pass and is not excessive in width for its purpose. Given there are no adverse character, amenity or traffic issues, it does not form justification for the refusal of the application.

- People and animals use the road and they will be affected by increased speeds

Officer comment: The officer report explains that the proposal will improve sightlines on the road and it is not envisaged that it will compromise existing users of the roadway, including people and animals.

- Accidents have occurred along this stretch of road

Officer comment: A review of the accident data for Milley Lane indicates that there have been no reported traffic collisions in the past five years.

- A bend further along the road means cars accelerate into Milley Lane

Officer comment: A speed survey was submitted with the planning application that indicates existing speeds along Milley Lane. Acceleration of vehicles in the vicinity of the proposed access would not have any implication for the necessary visibility splays.

- Speed limit should be lowered

Officer comment: This is unrelated to the subject application.

- There are no special circumstances

Officer comment: Consideration of the proposal against Green Belt policy is detailed in the officer report under the heading 'Principle of Development'.

- No Great Crested Newt survey has been done

Officer comment: The proposed works lie outside the 100m Great Crested Newts consultation zone and further comment was considered unnecessary.

- No bat survey has been done

Officer comment: Given the scope of works and condition of the existing building, a bat report was unnecessary. This is detailed in 'Ecology' in the officer report.

- It has not been advertised or notified properly, including advertisement after the panel meeting

Officer comment: This is discussed in the officer report. It is clarified that submissions will be received up until 12 September and the recommendation reflects this.

- Not in a sustainable location

Officer comment: The proposal does not include provision for residential housing.

- It will impact on the Harding Brown issue nearby

Officer comment: The substance of this issue is unclear.

- The significance of Hill House is given little consideration

Officer comment: The Council's Conservation Officer has considered any impacts upon nearby listed buildings and the Area of Special Character and raises no objection, as noted in 'Heritage and Conservation' in the officer report.

- Overlooking/loss of privacy

Officer comment: The proposed access does not have result in an adverse increase in overlooking.

- Design appearance and materials

Officer comment: The proposed fencing materials and tarmac surface is satisfactory, including on streetscene grounds and within the Area of Special Character.

In addition, Ruscombe Parish Council (as an adjoining parish) have objected on the following grounds:

- Gates are excessively wide
- There are regular accidents at or near the site and the proposal will increase this risk
- Will impact upon the Grade II listed Hill House opposite
- The loss of trees is against Council's declaration of a climate emergency
- Loss of biodiversity (Great Crested Newts and other wildlife)
- Neighbours were not informed
- The consultation period ends after the committee meeting

Officer comment: These comments are addressed above or in the officer report.

- Ruscombe PC were not consulted

Officer comment: Ruscombe Parish is 305m to the south and consultation was not required.

One submission in support was received from Hurst Park Road, Twyford RG10 0EZ (no house number or name supplied. It indicated that safe access should be ensured. This submission makes a total of 10 in support.

## **Traffic data**

The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed traffic collision data from the past five years and there are no recorded accidents on Milley Lane, including at the intersection with Scarlett's Lane.

## **Materials**

The officer report does not specifically comment on the type of materials to be used within the fencing although paragraph 22 should be read in the context that the Council officer's raise no objection to the type of materials and colours and the style of fencing.

## **Loss of hedgerow**

Paragraph 28 notes that the loss of hedgerow is a key issue within this landscape. For the avoidance of doubt, the Council's Trees and Landscape Officer raises no objection in terms of the partial loss of some hedgerow as part of this development, subject to Condition 3, which requires details of enhanced landscaping along the frontage.

## **Corrections**

The last paragraph of the summary on page 31 should state that Council officers raise no objection, as distinct from the objection raised by the ward member.

Paragraph 26 on page 43 implies that a listed building consent is required. This is incorrect and Informative 1 is unnecessary.

---

Site Address: Manor Farm, Finchampstead RG40 3TL  
Application No: 191112 Pages 55-71

Adjourned

Pre-emptive site visits

None

---

