

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 8 JUNE 2022 FROM 7.00 PM TO 10.25 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey (Chairman), Andrew Mickleburgh (Vice-Chairman), Chris Bowring, Stephen Conway, David Cornish, Gary Cowan, John Kaiser, Andrew Mickleburgh (Vice-Chairman) and Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey (Chairman)

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Sam Akhtar, Shirley Boyt, Stuart Munro and Rachel Bishop-Firth

Officers Present

Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Brian Conlon, Operational Lead - Development Management
Chris Easton, Head of Transport, Drainage, and Compliance
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor

Case Officers Present

Tariq Bailey-Biggs
Nick Chancellor
Mark Croucher
James Fuller
Simon Taylor
Graham Vaughan
Marcus Watts

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Stephen Conway proposed that Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey be elected Chairman for the 2022/23 municipal year. This was seconded by Andrew Mickleburgh.

RESOLVED That Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey be elected Chairman for the 2022/23 municipal year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

David Cornish proposed that Andrew Mickleburgh be appointed Vice-Chairman for the 2022/23 municipal year. This was seconded by Stephen Conway.

RESOLVED That Andrew Mickleburgh be appointed Vice-Chairman for the 2022/23 municipal year.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Rebecca Margetts and Wayne Smith.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11 May 2022 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey declared a personal interest in items 16 and 17, on the grounds that she had spoken with the member who had listed the application. Rachelle added that she would leave the room for the duration of both items.

6. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Items 11, 12, and 13 were withdrawn from the agenda.

7. APPLICATION NO.211508 - ROSA BUILDING MULBERRY BUSINESS PARK, FISHPONDS ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG41 2GY

Proposal: Full planning application for the proposed raising of existing roof of Rosa Building to create 11no. apartments to the second floor.

Applicant: Mr Schneck

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 25 to 50.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included confirmation that the applicant had agreed to enter into a S106 agreement with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC), including a clause known as a deferred payment mechanism.

Stephen Conway queried who would determine how much affordable housing could be delivered based on the profitability of the development. Mark Croucher, case officer, confirmed that an independent specialist party advised on this matter in consultation with WBC and the applicant.

Andrew Mickleburgh commented that whilst there was an overprovision of 8 spaces, an informative allocating a number of spaces to specific flats might be useful for future residents. Mark Croucher stated that condition 5 required parking details to comply with the approved plans, however an informative as outlined above would also be reasonable.

Gary Cowan queried how WBC space standards compared to the national space standards, commented that should each unit be delivered on green space then a contribution towards local facilities and provision of green space would ordinarily be required, and queried whether planning permission be given to applications that were not providing adequate levels of affordable housing. Mark Croucher stated that WBC space standards were slightly more generous than national standards, however planning inspectors always applied national standards. CIL payments would be required for each of the 11 units, whilst WBC had one of the highest CIL charges in the UK. In relation to affordable housing, Mark Croucher stated that the viability assessment was written into the policy.

John Kaiser queried what the total CIL amount payable would be, and queried whether sprinklers would be included as part of the development. Mark Croucher stated that he would circulate the CIL amount to John outside of the meeting after calculating the total figure. Mark stated that inclusion of sprinklers was not a material planning consideration as this was covered by building regulations.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey queried whether the Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service (RBFRS) had made any comments with regards to sprinkler provision. Mark Croucher clarified that that the RBFRS had not commented on this application, and added that they tended to comment on issues such as the siting of water hydrants.

Andrew Mickleburgh proposed an additional informative, encouraging the applicant to consider allocating a number of car parking spaces to individual units. This proposal was seconded by Stephen Conway, carried, and added to the list of informatives.

RESOLVED That application number 211508 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 26 to 29, additional informative encouraging the applicant to consider allocating a number of car parking spaces to individual units, and subject to legal agreement.

8. APPLICATION NO.213106 - HEADLEY ROAD PARK, HEADLEY ROAD EAST, WOODLEY

Proposal: Full planning application for the proposed erection of 5 no. buildings for commercial development to provide flexible light industrial, general industrial, and storage and distribution uses, with ancillary offices, associated car parking, formation of new accesses, and landscape planting, following demolition of existing buildings.

Applicant: HE2 Reading 1 GP Limited

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 51 to 134.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Correction to paragraph 11 to state that the scheme would produce 222 to 433 jobs;
- Clarification that Members had received an email from a resident at Lily May Court, located to the west of the site, however the concerns raised related to existing impacts which occurred outside of the red line boundary of the site. Therefore, it was not considered materially relevant to the scheme as the planning application was only required to resolve impacts caused by the proposed development;
- Confirmation that an increase of 3 HGV movements per hour was expected as a result of the proposals, which was considered a minor increase which would not result in harm in planning terms to the extent as a reason for refusal.

Keith Baker, Woodley Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. Keith stated that officers had often repeated that applications must focus on the red line boundary and could not be expected to rectify existing issues outside of this area, which was correct up to a point. Keith added that the cumulative effect of this application on the immediate area must be considered, and there had been no response from officers with regards to this. Keith stated that an additional 3 HGV movements per hour had been identified within the Supplementary Planning Agenda, however no justification had been provided for this, and Keith queried how many HGV movements were currently carried out on site. Keith stated that the access for HGVs was via a very narrow strip of land, which restricted the number of HGVs that could access the site currently, which gave an artificially low basepoint for the suggested increase of 3 HGVs per hour. Keith added that there was in practice one company operating on site, and the narrow access suggested that the nature of their work did not require many HGV movements, whilst the contrasting proposals included 10 new units each with their own HGV parking slots with many having 3 slots for HGVs. Keith stated that assumptions had been made in relation to the suggested increase of 3 HGV movements per hour, however this information had not been made public. Keith asked that the application be refused.

Kai Meade, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Kai stated that with regards to the letter received from Lily May Court, one of the core NPPF objectives was to ensure that planning decisions were made to provide appropriate development for its location including the cumulative effect of pollution on health. Kai felt that the Committee was being asked to consider this application under the caveat that the development was not new, when in reality the development would have a much larger industrial footprint than the existing development. Kai felt that the fact that Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) environmental health officers had not raised an objection to this application was beyond belief. Kai questioned how an additional 20 individual HGV loading bays had been calculated to increase HGV movements by only 3 per hour, whilst the previously requested thorough detailed assessment of additional HGV movements had not been provided. Planning and environmental health officers had stated that the applicant had agreed to only allow access to the site from Headley Road East except for a short section of Viscount Way required to access units 9 and 10, whilst the impact of the assessment report stated that there would be an adverse impact by day and a significant adverse impact by night on residents due to units 9 and 10. Kai questioned how this application could be approved when it was going to hurt people.

Julian Temple, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Julian stated that his comments were made on behalf of local residents and subject specific experts within Aviation Heritage UK and the wider Miles Aircraft community, whilst he had over 40 years of experience with historic aviation buildings. Having carried out consultancy works for Historic England, Julian felt that their own specialist knowledge of aviation was limited. Julian added that his own site visit last week found much more additional historic fabric surviving inside the main offices than was reported, suggesting that Historic England inspectors unfamiliarity with buildings of this type. As a non-designated heritage asset the offices were inherently locally important, and how far the later use and the loss of the airfield setting diminished their importance was debatable. Julian stated that the exterior of the building was relatively unaltered, and it was easy to imagine its former aviation use, especially within the context of local aviation related road names. Julian was disappointed to see nothing noticeably new in relation to heritage issues within the planning officers report, and he had also expected a longer deferral to properly address the issues previously raised.

Andy Ryley, agent, spoke in support of the application. Andy stated that the site was within a core employment area, with intensification of employment use required by policy. Andy added that the determination of any application must focus on the red line boundary, and the application could not be used to fix wider issues outside of this area beyond the applicant's control. Andy stated that the cumulative impact issue raised at the previous Committee could only be material if the scheme was for new employment development, and not redevelopment of previous employment development as proposed. With regards to air quality, Andy stated that the current uncontrolled heavy industrial use was more harmful than the proposed light industrial use, whilst the neighbouring residents would have been aware that they were moving next to an industrial site and HGV movements at the adjacent site moved within 3 metres of Lily May Court whereas there be no movements closer than 63 metres from the building at the proposed development. Andy stated that the proposals would not exacerbate the existing levels of particulates, which were at low levels as identified within the TRL report as commissioned by WBC. As such, Andy stated that there would be no decrease to the air quality and any noise impacts could be successfully mitigated. Andy added that the site had been fully assessed by Historic England and the Secretary of State, whilst the site was not locally or statutory listed or within a conservation area of an area of local character. Andy stated that it was recognised

that the site was of local interest due to its former use at Woodley airfield, and as such it was regarded as a non-heritage asset where a balanced judgement was required. In assessing this balance the significance and site context were important, however little historic fabric remained and there was no understanding or experience that aircraft manufacturing or repair occurred there. Andy stated that the airfield was long gone, and the buildings had been significantly altered and used for non-aviation commercial uses for a significant period of time. Andy stated that the benefits of the scheme included between 222 and 433 new jobs, both skilled and unskilled, in addition to the existing occupier remaining within Wokingham whilst relocating to the Suttons business park, whilst 20 vehicle movements would be removed from Viscount Way per day, in addition to around 2700m² of additional commercial floorspace within modern energy efficient buildings. Andy added that other benefits included increased separation distances to homes on the eastern side by at least 7.5m with enhanced landscaping, reduced noise from the current use due through improved design and orientation of buildings, 100 trees being planted, new wildlife habitats created, a contribution to WBC's employment skills plan, whilst the applicant was also willing to provide a small memorial or plaque at the front of the site to recognise the previous use of the site. Andy agreed with the planning officer's judgement that the balanced judgement weighed heavily in favour of the benefits of the scheme whilst according with national and local planning policy, and asked that the application be approved.

Shirley Boyt, ward member, spoke in objection to the application. Shirley stated that she was disappointed to see that whilst some of the concerns raised by members and residents at the last meeting had been listened to, others had been discounted or ignored. Shirley stated that nothing new had been presented by officers in terms of the heritage aspects of the building, and queried what steps had been taken to evaluate whether the façade of the building could be maintained, or whether alternative protections such as local listing had been explored. Shirley stated that existing HGV movements on the site were between 7 and 10 per day, whilst the additional information received showed an additional increase of 3 HGV movements per hour, or over 100 movements per week. Shirley noted that if one or more of the units were to become a distribution centre this number would significantly increase, and asked for modelling on this and the worst case scenario for HGV movements. Shirley felt that signage alone would not stop drivers using a navigation system from turning into Viscount Way using Miles Way. Shirley queried how vehicles turning onto Viscount Way in error would be prevented from using Gemini Road, a residential road, to access Headley Road East. Shirley felt that the splay would have to be redesigned so that no vehicles could turn right into that service road. Shirley raised concern that if enforcement of the access condition and implementation of the delivery and service plan was left to the site owner or the tenant, it would not be carried out. Shirley queried what power WBC would retain to ensure that good practice was maintained at all times. Shirley questioned why the cumulative impact of pollution was not material, as it was material to residents who were in despair at the prospect of additional noise and pollution. Shirley stated that unit 10 would be far too close to dwellings at Bakers Place and felt that the proposed mitigation was inadequate, and queried why an environmental impact assessment was not needed. Shirley stated that the cumulative impact of noise and airborne pollution from this development must be considered within the context of the wider area as per paragraph 185 of the NPPF. Shirley acknowledged that the new application could not be expected to resolve existing problems, but equally it should not be allowed to make things worse. Shirley stated that the health and wellbeing of residents should outweigh all other considerations, and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Stephen Conway stated that there were three main concerns with this application, being noise, air quality and the design and heritage aspect of the proposals. Stephen added that the expert professional advice presented in relation to highways including HGV movements and environmental health concerns including noise and air pollution would require the Committee to evidence convincing data to be able to challenge this advice, as otherwise this would be difficult to defend at appeal. Stephen stated that the air quality survey carried out at Lily May Court was undertaken during the winter months when air particulate levels were lower, and noted that a deferral could allow for a further survey to be undertaken over the summer to assess whether the situation was any different. Stephen noted that in the event of a further deferral, the applicant would be very likely to go straight to appeal on non-determination, which would be unfortunate as residents wanted to find a way to retain the heritage asset. Whilst Historic England did not feel the site was worth of listing, the NPPF stated that a balanced judgement was required when assessing non-designated heritage assets. The officer judgement was that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the significance of the building, whereas the alternate view of a significant amount of local residents was that the building was of significant historic value and should be preserved. Stephen was of the opinion that the only ground to refuse the application at present was as it failed to preserve the non-designated heritage asset, as the NPPF allowed for a balanced view to be taken on this particular ground, whereas issues such as highways and environmental health would require specific data and evidence to go against the expert professional advice given.

Gary Cowan stated that there was a balanced view to be taken with regards to the non-designated heritage asset. Gary added that paragraph nine of the report outlined benefits including reduced noise from the current use through improved design and orientation of the buildings, which could not be quantified as information had not been provided as to what would be present within the buildings, for example a distribution centre. With reference to not making existing problems outside of the red line worse, Gary stated that the red line could be seen as inconsequential as at the Arborfield Garrison SDL a portion of land outside of the red line was granted development due to the proximity to facilities within the red line boundary. Gary felt that until the specific details of vehicle movements and use of the site were provided, he could not support the application. Gary added that you could not stop drivers using the road with a sign unless there were barriers in place. Gary commented that the trees planted on the site should be monitored to ensure that they survived and grew. Graham Vaughan, case officer, stated that any reference to a distribution centre was incorrect as the scheme was not for a large scale warehouse but instead was an application for mixed use B2,B8 and E(g)iii, within relatively small units. The current site had no restrictions on the amount of hours worked or on delivery times, whilst proposed units 1 to 8 were deliberately placed to allow all activity to occur within two buildings. Graham stated that the officer recommendation, supported by technical consultees, was that the impacts in terms of noise and pollution would be no worse than at present, and it was important to understand the red line boundary and what development surrounded it. Graham noted that whilst it did fall to WBC to monitor tree planting, the resources required to monitor all trees relating to planning applications in the Borough was unrealistic. Graham stated that the delivery and service plan would assist in stopping HGV vehicles using the wrong roads, whilst signage would also be included and the applicant would write this into the lease of the units, though this specific aspect was not materially relevant to the scheme. Gary raised concerns that the site could be allowed to operate at all times, creating considerable issues for residents, whilst it was disappointing that trees were not surveyed during the 5-year plan which went against the declared climate emergency.

Chris Bowring stated that if the Committee were minded to refuse the application on highways or environmental health grounds, this would go against the professional technical advice given. Chris queried how members might consider the additional HGV movements as a reason for refusal when this was currently unrestricted. Graham Vaughan stated that determination needed to be made of the harm in planning terms of additional HGV movements as a result of the proposals whilst considering the existing situation. Chris Easton, Head of Transport, Drainage and Compliance, commented that the existing floorspace was approximately 14,000m², and the proposals did not show a significant increase, whilst officers had assessed the trip rates on the floorspace of the existing buildings and added the increase in floorspace, giving an additional 3 HGV movements per hour. The parking management plan was conditioned, and additional details could be worked up with the Parish Council and local members, whilst a lot of buildings would not facilitate HGVs due to their smaller size.

Chris Bowring commented that should the application be approved, environmental health officers could get involved with the site should the situation be worse than anticipated.

John Kaiser felt that very little information had been provided with regards to the future use of the site, whilst it was known that residents would be living next door to it 24/7. John stated that he could not support the application in the absence of these details. John felt that a residential and industrial mix was not the best use of the land.

Andrew Mickleburgh queried what the NPPF said in terms of cumulative impact, sought details as to what investigation had taken place to retain the façade of the building, queried what the main sources of noise and air pollution were currently on the site and the reasoning for an expected reduction based on the proposals, and queried whether the secretary of state had responded to Historic England's decision to not list the building. Graham Vaughan stated that no discussions had been undertaken in relation to the façade as this was not a requirement of the planning process, and the Committee were here to determine the planning application in front of them and officers had made a balanced judgement which was that the benefits of the proposals were deemed to outweigh the local impact. However, the Committee was perfectly at liberty to overturn this recommendation if they felt the balance went the other way. Historic England had visited the site and had considered local evidence and had decided not to list it, whilst the Secretary of State had confirmed this decision.

David Cornish stated that the site appeared in need of work during the recent site visit, and noted that if the site remained as industrial use, then this would attract additional HGV movements. Whilst highways officers could come up with measures to restrict vehicle movements, air pollution would not respect the red line boundary. David questioned whether the heritage concern was with the fabric of the building or with the historic use of the building, in which case a monument could represent the previous use. David added that there had been a significant amount of comments and concerns raised by residents, and felt that deferral would be an appropriate option to allow an updated proposal from the applicant, an updated air quality assessment carried out during the summer months, and additional details relating to vehicle movements. Graham Vaughan stated that deferral of the application would increase the risk of an appeal, and the application needed to be deferred or refused on the right grounds to avoid costs being awarded at an appeal. In addition, an inspector may not necessarily concur with the recommended conditions which may result in the same development with less conditions and costs being awarded.

Stephen Conway stated that the Committee was faced with a difficult decision, as a deferral would very likely result in an appeal, whilst the only solid ground for refusal was that the NPPF allowed local planning authorities to take a balanced view on non-designated heritage assets. Stephen stated that he placed very significant weight on the views of a vast number of local residents, who saw this building as a vital part of the built heritage of Woodley.

Chris Bowring commented that the petition of 4,500 residents in favour of retaining this building carried weight.

Gary Cowan felt that the report was flawed as it did not provide sufficient information regarding HGV movements, whilst he was disheartened to hear about costs being awarded as that was not a material consideration. Stephen Conway stated that a refusal based solely on failure to retain a non-designated heritage asset did not prejudice interested parties addressing a future planning inspector on issues such as air quality.

Stephen Conway proposed to refuse the application based on the failure to preserve the Miles Aircraft Factory Headquarters building or façade. Stephen sought officer guidance on this reason for refusal.

Brian Conlon, Operational Lead – Development Management, stated that this was a complex application with lots of competing issues, and the officer balance was not a binary decision with some aspects being more quantifiable and others, such as future occupancy, less so. If the Committee were minded to defer the application, clear reasons needed to be given as to what differences were present at this point compared to when the application was previously deferred. With regards to the proposed wording for a potential refusal motion, Brian stated that reference to the façade was not necessarily as strong as the proposal was to remove the building and therefore that removal was the harm in planning terms.

Stephen Conway proposed that the application be refused as it failed to preserve the Miles Aircraft Factory Headquarters building. This was seconded by John Kaiser, and upon being put to the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED That application number 213106 be refused as it failed to preserve the Miles Aircraft Factory Headquarters building.

9. APPLICATION NO.220654 - 14 CHILTERN DRIVE, CHARVIL

Proposal: Application to vary condition 2 of application 212989 for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension with 1 no. roof light following demolition of existing conservatory and existing rear extension (part retrospective). Condition 2 refers to the approved plans and the variation is to allow an increase in the height of the roof. (Retrospective).

Applicant: Mr Harguns

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 135 to 152.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Clarification that Councillor Sam Akhtar listed the item due to the potential impact on neighbours due to loss of privacy;
- Updated condition 5.

Danny Murphy, neighbour, spoke in objection to the application. Danny stated that the ward member for Charvil, Sam Akhtar, had previously addressed the Committee to advise that he had made comments on the application and had acted as a mediator between the local residents and the owner. Danny added that Sam had in fact not commented on the original retrospective application, nor did he comment on this application, and not even to have it listed. Danny commented that Sam had not acted as a mediator between the applicant and any residents, and the Supplementary Planning Agenda had noted the reason for listing as the application having a potential impact on the neighbours due to loss of privacy. Danny queried whether this was the only point that the Committee could base their decision on, or whether other issues that residents raised concerns about could be considered. Danny stated that he objected to the application based on persistent breaches and breaching on and over his boundary, resulting in the cumulative loss of light and amenity. Danny stated that whilst he was happy that so many members managed to attend the site visit, he was disappointed that residents were not allowed to engage in discussions, and members subsequently had to rely solely on the word of the planning officer, who Danny noted had knowingly accepted inaccurate drawings and had used them in decision making for the previous retrospective planning application. Danny added that the planning officer had used an image at the last Committee meeting from a Google Street view to prove that the extension could not be seen from the street, despite this image being from July 2019 and showing no recent extensions. Danny referenced a recent photograph which showed the recent extension from the street and the obtrusive angles which were also visible from the street. Danny stated that a photo was shown at the previous Committee meeting which was taken in November 2021, prior to the retrospective application being decided whilst being in contrast to the up to date photograph. Danny stated that the plans had since changed again, however no attempt had been made to correct the inaccurate details that had hidden the changes on the western boundary. Danny felt that these issues were indicative of his experience in dealing with the Council over the past 11 months, whereby anguish and stress had been caused through 3 sets of plans, 2 enforcement investigations, 2 retrospective planning applications, 2 Committee meetings and a site visit. Danny added that the reasons for this retrospective application, including the steel and additional height, were all known prior to the original retrospective application being decided however they were not dealt with at the time. Danny queried why the planning teams accepted and continued to accept inaccurate plans. Danny felt that it was clear to see why residents had lost faith in the planning process when their voices were constantly dismissed whilst the Council manipulated facts to support their decision. Danny asked that the Committee refuse the application, and consider the previous developments and breaches and cumulative effects on neighbours within the wider area.

Jeff Asemi, agent, spoke in support of the application. Jeff stated that the application was to vary condition 2 of application 212989, which was approved for a rear extension of number 14 Chiltern Drive. Jeff stated that the extension replaced the previous structure which was higher than the current extension, where there was a pitched room adjacent to number 12 Chiltern Drive which was higher than the current flat roof that replaced it. Jeff stated that the current extension was smaller in length than the original structure, whilst photos had been submitted to the planning officer showing no shadows being cast to the adjacent property at number 12. The properties on Pennine Way were unaffected by the development because of the walls at number 14, and Jeff felt that their objection should be

dismissed. Jeff stated that the small height increase was on the roof away from number 12, and it was an existing steel structure which replaced the previous extension. Jeff added that the skylights were in the centre of the extension away from the adjacent properties, resulting in no overlooking or loss of light impacts on the neighbouring properties. Jeff added that the applicant had never tried to hide the height increase, and had invited neighbours from number 12 round to discuss the changes. Jeff condoned some of the language used by objectors, and thanked the Committee for taking their time to visit the site for consideration of this application, whilst the applicant was refused a meeting with the parish Council to discuss the application.

Sam Akhtar, ward member, commented on the application. Sam thanked the Committee for their time and consideration of this application, and added that he was really keen for both parties to get a resolution matter with a view to move on in the future.

Andrew Mickleburgh sought clarity that the previous structure was a glass conservatory and not brick, and stated that the impression he got at the site visit was that the increased height was an issue and the building was overbearing, whilst querying whether an informative might be reasonable if the application was approved encouraging the applicant to install blinds in the skylight to shield neighbouring properties from light pollution. James Fuller, case officer, stated that the previous structure was a glass conservatory, and added that the size of the rooflight was not excessive. Brian Conlon, Operational Lead – Development Management, stated that there was no legal strength given to informatives, and should the extension have been 25cm lower there would have been no restrictions on how much light could be emitted, in the same way that planning policy could not restrict how much light an individual emitted from their bedroom window.

Stephen Conway stated that he had not been able to attend the site visit, which had not allowed him to fully appreciate any bulk and massing. Stephen stated his sympathy for Mr Murphy, who appeared to have persistent problems with multiple applications with several being retrospective, with differences in built form compared to what was approved, which had created tension. Stephen commented that he would rely on the impressions from members who attended the site visit as to whether the development was overbearing.

Gary Cowan stated that he felt sorry for the neighbours, and added that he would likely abstain as he had not been able to attend the site visit. Gary queried whether more than one retrospective planning application was allowed. Brian Conlon confirmed that an application could not be refused purely based on the fact that it was retrospective, and noted that the same substantive application could not be submitted twice.

David Cornish was of the opinion that officers had clearly felt that the original condition was proportional and necessary, and saw no reason to agree the condition was wrong in the first instance and should now be changed. Brian Conlon stated that the Committee needed to consider whether the change between the approved plans and the proposal was sufficiently harmful to refuse, and not the principle of the change.

John Kaiser queried whether this application would be approved as a whole if it was submitted now. Brian Conlon stated that as this application was being recommended for approval, considering it was built in its entirety, suggested that the Council supported the development, whilst noting that this application was not seeking permission for the whole development as all but 25cm of the structure was approved already.

Chris Bowring was of the opinion that such a small increase in height was not detrimental in planning terms, and questioned what impact a reduction of 25cm would have.

Andrew Mickleburgh stated that after considering all comments made in addition to the agenda paperwork, he wished to move a motion to approve the application.

RESOLVED That application number 220654 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 136 to 137, and updated condition 5 as set out within the Supplementary Planning Agenda.

10. APPLICATION NO.220391 - LAND AT ARBORFIELD GARRISON PARCEL P (WEST OF PRINCESS MARINA DRIVE, EAST OF SHEERLANDS ROAD, SOUTH OF ROWCROFT ROAD), BARKHAM, RG2 9ND

Proposal: Application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Consent O/2014/2280 dated 02/04/2015. The Reserved Matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) comprise details of 43 dwellings within Parcel P with access via Princess Marina Drive, associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping, open space, footpaths and drainage.

Applicant: Taylor Wimpey West London

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 153 to 188.

The Committee were advised that there were no updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda.

Ettore Poggi, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Ettore stated that residents of both new and existing dwellings had objected to the application due to the lack of anticipated infrastructure and facilities. There had been a lack of progress on the district centre, the linear parks, alternative green spaces, allotments and sporting facilities. Ettore stated that one of the conditions for approval was that nothing shall be deemed to effect or vary the original conditions imposed by the original planning permission. However, Ettore stated that the northern neighbourhood centre had not materialised and was now used as a Crest Nicholson sales office. Ettore stated that various conditions related to the green infrastructure with requirements to submit phasing plans had not been adhered to, whilst the linear area from the stables to the lake should have been landscaped years ago, and the park near the lake which should have opened this summer had not. Ettore stated that the lead developer should have refurbished the sports field and pavilion and made them available for use according to the triggers within the S106 agreement, whilst these triggers had passed and progress had not been realised. Ettore felt that commitments to the community were continuously broken and the community was repeatedly being misled. Ettore queried what confidence the community could have in the lead developer of the Council that the district centre would materialise, that the sports pitches and pavilion would be a reality, or that alternative green space and linear parks would be completed. Ettore stated that the application for the district centre was scheduled for later this year, with completion in phases between 2023 and 2024. Ettore asked what assurances could be given that the timelines would be followed and adhered to, and asked that the Committee defer this application until some of the significant outstanding infrastructures were undertaken. Should the application be approved, Ettore asked that this be subject to plans for the district centre being submitted for approval within specific time limits, linear parks and sports field being completed within specified time limits, a reasonable start and end

date for each project being agreed and non-compliance dealt with, and the current site allocated for the district centre being cleared of rubble. Ettore noted that the application felt within the village green character area, Parcel P, and hoped that the relevant planning history would be adhered to.

Michelle Quan, agent, spoke in support of the application. Michelle stated that the Arborfield Garrison site was granted outline planning permission in 2015 for a mixed-use development including 2,000 new homes and supporting infrastructure. Taylor Wimpey acquired Parcel P from Crest Nicholson in October 2021, while Crest Nicholson remained the primary development delivery partner for Arborfield Garrison, and are responsible for delivery of the wider site and surrounding infrastructure, whilst Taylor Wimpey were solely responsible for the delivery of Parcel P. Michelle stated that the application before the Committee sought reserved matters approval for 43 high quality new homes ranging in size and type from two-bedroom apartments to four-bedroom houses. Michelle added that the proposals included 9 affordable homes, ensuring that the provision of affordable housing complied with the S106 requirement for the development. The applicant had worked hard alongside planning officers to ensure that the scheme complied with local and national planning policies, and met the aspirations of the associated design code. The development incorporated a variety of house types, materials and architectural details to provide interest and variation, whilst all dwellings met or exceeded national space standards. Michelle stated that the application provided parking provision up to Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) adopted standards, and included both visitor and unallocated parking spaces. The proposals also incorporated capacity for electric vehicle charging points for each property in addition to communal charging points. Michelle stated that 55 new trees would be planted as part of this development, in addition to new hedgerows, whilst the scheme had been carefully designed to retain all of the existing trees on site. A number of ecological enhancements were included, including hedgehog highways, bat boxes and bee bricks distributed throughout the development. Michelle commented that the proposals would realise a ten percent reduction in carbon emissions via a range of methods including the installation of photovoltaic panels. Michelle urged the Committee to approve the application.

John Kaiser stated that he was disappointed that Crest Nicholson had not delivered the infrastructure required for the wider SDL, and whilst some slowdowns could be expected due to the pandemic WBC had managed to deliver a new school during this time. John added that he would like to see officers working harder to ensure Crest Nicholson delivered on their requirements, however he did not feel that WBC could use a Taylor Wimpey application to remedy the issues caused by Crest Nicholson.

Gary Cowan commented that refusing an application for 43 houses would not speed up the delivery of the district centre or other infrastructure. Gary added that a bus would serve this development, whilst the car parking provision was at a reasonable level, and it was good to see the inclusion of electric vehicle charging points and photovoltaic panels.

David Cornish stated that housing developments were required to fulfil the Borough's housing number requirements, however he did share the frustrations raised by residents in relation to the lack of infrastructure. David felt that WBC needed to do more to pressure Crest Nicholson to deliver on their requirements, whilst there were innovative approaches to be able to get retailers into the district centre. Nick Chancellor, case officer, stated that officers were in regular discussions with Crest Nicholson, and it was vitally important that the development was delivered correctly and stood the test of time whilst being a commercial success which involved a process of pre-application and engagement. Nick

stated that there had been issues in attracting a supermarket operator for the district centre however they did now have interest to take on a tenancy which was of vital importance and was now driving things forward.

Stephen Conway commented that the Committee needed to focus on this specific application, and in his view the appearance of the site was acceptable for a reserved matters application.

Chris Bowring queried that if Parcel P was reliant on the district centre, why a condition was not included requiring the district centre to be built prior to occupation of units. Nick Chancellor stated that there were conditions attached to the outline planning permission which discussed phasing to some extent, however this was a different developer and consideration of the phasing was a separate matter to consideration of whether the application itself was acceptable.

John Kaiser stated that community interest companies charged residents between £300 and £400 per year, which meant residents were paying both WBC and these companies rates whilst the developer was not holding up their end of the agreement and delivering infrastructure. WBC had delivered on their requirements by delivering the roads and a new school. John felt that pressure should be placed on developers wherever possible to stop them putting in community interest companies which were just a way of making money, which caused nothing but heartache for residents and ward members. John added that if S106 and CIL contributions were paid rather than these companies being set up then WBC would deliver the required infrastructure at such developments, which was more preferable all round.

RESOLVED That application number 220391 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 154 to 157.

11. APPLICATION NO.220359 - BRICK BARN, WHITE HILL, REMENHAM HILL, WOKINGHAM, RG9 3HN

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

12. APPLICATION NO.220321 - BRICK BARN, WHITE HILL, REMENHAM HILL, WOKINGHAM, RG9 3HN

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

13. APPLICATION NO.220332 - BRICK BARN, WHITE HILL, REMENHAM HILL, WOKINGHAM, RG9 3HN

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

14. APPLICATION NO.221007 - 302 LONDON ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG40 1RD

Proposal: Full application for the proposed conversion of existing integral dog kennel to an end of life/care room and erection of a single storey side/rear extension to form a replacement kennel.

Applicant: Mulberry House Vets

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 289 to 308.

The Committee were advised that there were no updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda.

Stephen Conway was of the opinion that this was a modest application and he could not see any material harm should it be approved.

Gary Cowan queried how long the vets had been in-situ. Simon Taylor, case officer, stated that the vets had been operating from the site since 2018 and no complaints had been received by the Council in relation to noise from dogs.

RESOLVED That application number 221007 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 290 to 292.

15. APPLICATION NO.220034 - LAMBS FARM BUSINESS PARK, BASINGSTOKE ROAD, SWALLOWFIELD

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 3No business units within the business park with additional vehicle parking and ancillary works.

Applicant: Winkworth

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 309 to 344.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included clarification that the application had been listed by Councillor Stuart Munro due to the impact of the development on the countryside and the increased level of activity on the site having further adverse effects on traffic levels and highway safety.

Ian Fullerton, Swallowfield Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. Ian stated that there had been an increase in intensity on the site over the past years, and whilst the Parish Council supports the applicants contribution to the rural economy and local employment, there comes a point when the growing intensity of this otherwise beneficial development became unsustainable for the local community whilst being a threat to the safety of neighbouring residents. The Parish Council's primary concern related to the proximity of the site to Lamb's Lane Primary School, which was situated a short distance from the entry to the site. The school felt that existing traffic levels were already excessive, and there was already anxiety amongst parents with regards to the risks to their children. Ian stated that the school operated from the morning till early evening, and the catchment area for the school meant that many pupils and parents used pavements immediately opposite the site entrance to walk children to and from school. In addition, there were two houses directly opposite the site entrance which had been misrepresented within the original application. With the risk of accident a real possibility, the Parish Council felt that traffic levels needed to be reduced on Back Lane, and not increased even marginally. Ian queried when incremental growth of the site would end, and stated that the Parish Council strongly opposed the application.

Roderic Vaughan, resident, spoke in objection to the application. Roderic stated that the business park was established in 1998, and 35 subsequent planning applications had since been submitted. Over this time, the site had expanded by eight-hundred percent from 0.5 hectares to 8 hectares, with the site operating 24/7 and 365 days per year. Roderic added that the entrance to the business park was situated just 50m from the junction on Back Lane and a similar distance to Lambs Lane primary school, with two

residential properties located directly opposite the site entrance which had been ignored in this planning application. The business park was located within the rural parish of Swallowfield and was not located within a designated area for major development. Roderic stated that expansion in this sensitive area had continued despite Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) stating in 2012 that there was only scope for limited further development. In 2016 it was stated that development was fully developed when a proposal to build towards Lambs Lane to the west was refused at appeal. Roderic was of the opinion that expansion under the pretext of limited further development had become deeply flawed, and the cumulative negative impacts on the environment, highway safety, the local amenity and on need for any development to be sustainable were now being ignored. Roderic added that the proposal conflicted with a number of WBC policies, including sustainable development as there was no contribution to net zero carbon. Roderic stated that residents had objected to this application on the grounds of high building density, whilst attempts to previously list the site as a core employment area had failed which would have allowed for planned future development. Roderic concluded by stating that any development needed to be sustainable and not negatively impact its surrounding area, and on this basis the application should be refused.

Chris Hough, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Chris stated that the applicant was a private family-owned business which had owned and managed the business park for over 20 years. Chris added that the site met the needs of a variety of small businesses through the provision of flexible space, whilst the site was predominantly occupied by local businesses. The site was meticulously managed and maintained and enjoyed a high level of security, with close access to the motorway and a spacious layout. Chris stated that there was a continued strong demand for space on the site which operated at a one-hundred percent occupancy level with any vacancies usually filled very quickly through local advertisement. The business park had grown incrementally over time in accordance with planning policies, whilst this proposal was for 3 additional small commercial units. The site was previously developed land and needed to be viewed in the context of the existing large adjacent buildings. Chris stated that no objections had been received from highways officers, and he urged the Committee to approve the application which was of small scale and was in accordance with planning policies and guidance.

Stuart Munro, ward member, spoke in objection to the application. Stuart stated that he had lived near the site for 36 years and had seen the site change from a small farm building to a very large site through incremental development. Stuart commented that he did not list applications lightly, however there was so much local resistance to this application and the previous inspectors decisions citing the lack of need for additional development needed to be considered. Stuart stated that there was so much concern in relation to the school that there was a project underway within the highways department to consider restricting traffic from the north to the builders' merchants only and from the south to the business park only, not allowing it to traverse to the schools. Stuart noted that this evidenced that the highways departments did have some concerns regarding this site. Stuart stated that the site had increased in size by eight-hundred percent, and urged the Committee to be consistent with previous appeal decisions and refuse further development within this countryside area.

Stephen Conway stated that a lot of concerns had been raised with regards to highways, and the Committee had been given professional advice from highways officers stating that this application had been assessed and no objection had been raised. With regards to further expansion within the countryside, the officer opinion was that this application constituted an appropriate rural enterprise within the countryside. Stephen queried why

this application did not represent excessive encroachment significantly away from the original buildings. Marcus Watts, case officer, stated that the three proposed units represented further limited development of the site within the constraints of the site. The planning history indicated that the east of the site was considered as being in close proximity to the original farm buildings, which was referenced in the appeal decision in 2016. Towards the west of the site was far more open than the southeast corner. The NPPF was clear that previously developed land needed to be considered, including the curtilage of the developed land, and the officer opinion was that the proposed development sat comfortably amongst the existing buildings and were within the curtilage of the site.

Stephen Conway queried whether there would come a point where further applications to expand the site to the western boundary and the open countryside would become unacceptable. Marcus Watts stated that any future application would need to be determined on its own merits, however the inspector had indicated that the west was moving towards open countryside whilst the east had already been identified as acceptable for these business units.

Gary Cowan stated that the site had grown over time and was located next to a local primary school. Gary felt that what was being proposed was in all likelihood a limit to the possible development on the site, and he would be comfortable to approve this application if further expansion to the west was deemed inappropriate.

John Kaiser queried whether this additional proposed development would force vehicles to park off-site and on the road. Marcus Watts stated that highways officers had assessed the scheme and were content that it was very unlikely for off-road parking to occur as a result of this application. Chris Easton, Head of Transport, Drainage and Compliance, stated that there was already a fair section of double yellow lines and zig-zag zones outside of the school and very near to the application site. Only one slight accident had been recorded on this road over the last 5 years involving only 1 vehicle, whilst the school had a good pick up and drop off zone which kept the road clear.

David Cornish queried whether the speed limit on Back Lane was 20mph already, and if not whether this could be a consideration, as many schools in the Borough had this arrangement. Chris Easton stated that physical measures were usually required to restrict an area to 20mph at all times, and required enforcement from the police. Marcus Watts confirmed that 20mph advisory flashing signs during school drop of and collection times were in place along Back Lane.

RESOLVED That application number 220034 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 310 to 313.

16. APPLICATION NO.220825 - 39 THE TERRACE, WOKINGHAM

Items 16 and 17 were debated together due to their associated nature, with separate votes having taken place. The substantive combined minutes are contained within minute item 16.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey declared an interest in this application and left the room for its duration. Andrew Mickleburgh became the Vice-Chair in the chair.

Proposal: Householder application for proposed single storey rear extension, installation of glazed turret spiral staircase, extension of existing first floor roof terrace with 2No.

rooflights, new terracing, lawns and stone pathing to the rear, and associated fenestration, following removal of integral spiral staircase.

Applicant: Mr and Miss Paul and Sarah Warn and Perkins

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 345 to 382.

The Committee were advised that there were no updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda.

Imogen Shepherd-DuBey, Wokingham Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. Imogen stated that this application involved a listed building within the conservation area of Wokingham and was the former home of William Martin who was the mayor of Wokingham Town Council. Martin's pool was an outdoor pool area which was built by Martin using his own money, and it included bridges, fountains, rockeries and caves within a grotto. Imogen recalled the outrage when the pool was sold and demolished by Wokingham District Council. Imogen raised concerns in relation to the rockery, which was constructed in the 1920's in the same style as Martin's pool whilst originally being open to the public. Imogen felt that the information contained within the third party heritage report did not fully acknowledge the full heritage of the site. Imogen understood that the current family wished to modernise their space, however felt that Wokingham would lose some of its heritage should the rockery be removed completely, which the Wokingham Society concurred with.

Paul Warn, applicant, spoke in support of the application. Paul stated they had purchased the property as they loved its history and they had previously owned a listed building in Barkham. On purchase, they had accepted that the property did require significant investment to move it towards its next stage and to futureproof it for future owners. The design brief was to preserve and blend with significant historical features whilst improving upon some of the functional aspects to be more in keeping with modern living. A lot of work and efforts had gone in to ensuring that guidelines and policies were followed, including working closely with architects, undertaking historical research, and commissioning a detailed heritage assessment. There was a desire to restore the prominent historical Italianate aspect of the garden, the cross pond and associated brick works and to bring this design into a new terrace to replace the current rockery transition from the back of the house and the existing Italianate aspect. Paul stated that it was a key to the redevelopment was to use reclaimed bricks and replicating wall and pillar design seen in the existing Italianate garden and within the former Martin's pool. The current circular design feature seen in the pond would also be replicated within the lawn terrace design. Paul added that it was neither the expectation or the intention for the new terrace design to be of lower maintenance than the rockery, however the garden as a whole did require a lot of maintenance without direct access from the rear as previously existed when the meadow and pool were present, nor from the side. A such, a functional aspect of the design was to create more direct access through the garage and house but not via the utility space. Paul stated that other functional aspects to the scheme included the repair of the porous roof and back wall to the utility room, increased kitchen size, and to create an occasional bedroom and study. The house designs were of modest scale and follow on from work carried out in the 1980 and 2000. Paul added that the design drew on original characteristics including landscaped steps in a contemporary manner whilst maintaining the narrative of the building. It was difficult to determine how much of the rockery was original, and the rockery did not feature within the historic plans. The paths had been augmented and materially redesigned in the 1980's, whilst the water features within the

rockery contained plastic piping within concrete and modern electrics. Paul noted that the bridge structure constituted of reinforced concrete and was in disrepair, which would require material amendment and repair in any case to improve its safety to a modern standard. Mature TPOd trees at the rear of the garden were to be retained, whilst some younger and poorer quality trees were due to be removed and replaced with a greater number of trees and a number of oak species. The staircase within the Victorian part of the house was not being removed, whilst the steel staircase installed in the 2000's was proposed for removal.

Kate Cooper, architect, spoke in support of the application. Kate stated that this had been a thorough and lengthy process which had taken into account a wide range of considerations. Kate felt that the application needed to be viewed in its current context and condition with no public access, whilst officers had not called for it to be retained. Kate asked that the Committee approve the application.

Rachel Bishop-Firth, ward member, spoke in objection to the application. Rachel stated that she was not opposed to the development overall, and understood the wishes of the family to extend and modernise their house and garden so that it was easier to maintain. Rachel hoped that in the process a piece of Wokingham's history was not lost. Rachel stated that properties on The Terrace were some of the most beautiful and distinct within Wokingham, whilst the Wokingham Society felt that the removal of the staircase would affect the layout of the listed building. The bridges, sunken pathways and rockery area were uniquely designed and are the last remnants of the unusual design found at Martin's pool before it was demolished. Rachel asked that trees were retained wherever possible. Should the application be approved, Rachel asked that as much of this unique garden as possible was retained.

Stephen Conway commented that there was no longer any public access to the garden, and noted that should the rockery be retained it would still not be publicly seen.

John Kaiser queried whether the garden area counted as part of the built heritage. Tariq Bailey-Biggs, case officer, confirmed that the gardens were listed.

Gary Cowan commented that he had lived in a Grade 2 listed building, and he had found in general that occupiers of these properties were people who go on with the very best of intentions, and he believed that this was the case for this application.

Stephen Conway was of the opinion that certain historical features, for example the Italianate style, were being retained which was central to the design.

Andrew Mickleburgh noted that the heritage statement included comment that the existing structure in that part of the garden were totally unsuited to domestic gardens.

RESOLVED That application number 220825 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 346 to 348.

17. APPLICATION NO.220826 - 39 THE TERRACE, WOKINGHAM

Items 16 and 17 were debated together due to their associated nature, with sperate votes having taken place. The substantive combined minutes are contained within minute item 16.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey declared an interest in this application and left the room for its duration. Andrew Mickleburgh became the Vice-Chair in the chair.

Proposal: Application for Listed Building Consent for the proposed single storey rear extension, installation of glazed turret spiral staircase, extension of existing first floor roof terrace with 2No. rooflights, new terracing, lawns and stone pathing to the rear, and associated fenestration, following removal of integral spiral staircase.

Applicant: Mr and Miss Paul and Sarah Warn and Perkins

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 383 to 418.

The Committee were advised that there were no updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda.

RESOLVED That application number 220826 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 383 to 386.

18. APPLICATION NO.221355 - 251 LONDON ROAD, WOKINGHAM

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey resumed the Chair.

Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension.

Applicant: Mrs Anita Walker

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 419 to 436.

The Committee were advised that there were no updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda.

Chris Bowring proposed that the meeting be extended by 30 minutes to a maximum finishing time of 11pm. This proposal was seconded by Stephen Conway and carried.

The Committee noted that this application was only before the Committee due to the applicant being a member of staff, and there appeared no material reason to go against the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED That application number 221355 be approved, subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 419 to 420.

This page is intentionally left blank