

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 10 JANUARY 2024 FROM 7.00 PM TO 10.30 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: David Cornish (Chair), Andrew Mickleburgh (Vice-Chair), Alistair Neal, Wayne Smith, Michael Firmager, Stuart Munro, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Tony Skuse and Bill Soane

**Councillors Present and Speaking**

Councillors: Prue Bray

**Officers Present**

Gordon Adam, Principal Highways Development Control Officer  
Brian Conlon, Operational Lead - Development Management  
Madeleine Shopland, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist  
Rachel Lucas, Legal Services  
Liam Oliff, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist

**Case Officers Present**

Mark Croucher  
Stefan Fludger  
Benjamin Hindle  
Helen Maynard

**54. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence.

**55. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 December 2023 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**56. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

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 APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

There were no items withdrawn or deferred.

**58. APPLICATION NO 223691 "LEE SPRING", LATIMER ROAD, WOKINGHAM, RG41 2YD.**

**Proposal:** Full application for the proposed erection of 42 residential apartments in three blocks, including on-site parking, shared amenity spaces, enhanced green spaces to support biodiversity and waste storage facilities. Access for neighbouring garages to be provided by 3.7m wide through-route north of the site. Following demolition of the existing buildings.

**Applicant:** Burlington Developments

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 17 to 122.

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

- Parking Provision and Capacity.
- HGV Access.
- Clarification regarding Financial Contributions.

All members except Councillors Soane and Shepherd-Dubey had attended a site visit.

Keith Malvern, Wokingham Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. He referred to the lack of affordable housing as a major reason for objecting. He cited Homes England Fact sheet 9 that stated that affordable housing was key for the housing crisis, ending homelessness as well as helping people get onto the property ladder. He felt that the application ignored these points. Keith Malvern felt that a deferred payment for affordable housing at a late stage was insufficient

Grant Leggett, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. He mentioned that the officer's report had more than covered the reasons for the deferral and the site visit. He felt that the pictures the officer had shown in the presentation gave context to the scale of the development. He also referred to an objection from the Nisa Local near to the development. This had now been withdrawn. He summarised that the development provided delivery of housing on a highly sustainable brownfield site, replacing some tired buildings with a high-quality building, improvements to highway conditions, enhanced landscaping, and biodiversity as well as economic benefits like job creation.

Councillor Firmager asked about parking arrangements on the site and commented that there would be more people wanting to park than there were spaces. He asked officers for more detail on parking. Benjamin Hindle, case officer, indicated that a Parking Management Plan had been conditioned and that it would be strictly enforced, he added that if anyone was to be parked on the site that should not be, they would receive a ticket. The 7 car free units proposed, would have this detailed within their lease. He referred to data in the Supplementary Agenda which indicated that one fifth of parking spaces were available at council run car parks in Wokingham during peak times and that this would provide adequate parking for visitors, however, stated this was for information only and was not required to make the application acceptable in planning terms as Town Centre parking standards had been met. Councillor Firmager added the issue of vans parking for deliveries and asked where they would park safely and without blocking roads. The case officer stated that there should be no issue if they were only there for a short amount of time and added that it would be the same issue in a single access cul-de-sac.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey asked about the biodiversity of the site and how much there would be in comparison to other places. The case officer referred to the current site as a concrete jungle with very little vegetation on site. The applicant would provide semi-natural green space on the site with the retention of the TPO to the south of the site and amenity and green space to the north. Eco mosaic roofs would also be provided. Councillor Shepherd-Dubey asked about the animal wildlife on site and was informed that measures would be taken to protect bats on site. Greater opportunities would be provided for wildlife to thrive.

Councillor Smith commented that the site was a brownfield site and was where Wokingham Borough Council should be building. He added that the current site was a mess, and that the proposal would tidy it up.

Councillor Cornish mentioned that his previous issue with the application had related to the access for deliveries to the local shop and that the site visit had helped assuage those concerns. He was of the view that is the application was a very good example of a great brownfield development in a very sustainable location and that he fully supported the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Smith and seconded by Councillor Neal that the application be approved.

**RESOLVED:** That Application 223691 be approved subject to the

- a) completion of a legal agreement (S106) to secure the following head of terms-
  - My Journey or
  - Travel Plan
  - Car club contribution
  - Details of estate roads
  - Employment Skills Plan
  - Late-stage affordable housing deferred payment mechanism.

b) Subject to the conditions and informatives outlined in pages 66 to 77 of the agenda

c) Alternative recommendation: That the committee authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission in the event of an S106 agreement not being completed to secure appropriate contributions within six months of the date of the committee resolution (unless a longer period is agreed by the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee).

**59. APPLICATION NO 180711 AMEN CORNER (SOUTH) AMEN CORNER BINFIELD BRACKNELL RG12 8SZ**

**Proposal:** Hybrid planning application for a residential-led mixed-use development comprising outline planning application for commercial development (Use Classes A2 (financial and professional services), B1 (business), B8 (storage or distribution)) on 0.95ha (all matters reserved, except for access); and full planning application for 302 residential dwellings, public open space and spine road, estate roads, landscaping drainage, levels and car parking. The site spans the Wokingham Borough Council / Bracknell Forest Council administrative boundary: an area proposed as public open space to the far west of the application site falls within Wokingham Borough].

**Applicant:** Miss Emma Runeson

The Committee considered a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 123 to 148.

Stefan Fludger, case officer, presented to the committee and commented that an additional obligation that the applicant had agreed to provide a financial contribution to upgrade the surface of footpath 34.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey asked if Wokingham residents wanted to use the site, would they need to apply to Wokingham Borough Council or Bracknell Forest Council. The case officer explained that the application only referred to the change of use to public open space and that the question was an unrelated issue to this application.

Councillor Firmager questioned why it had taken so long for this application to come to committee when it had been 5 months since it had been approved by Bracknell Forest Council. The case officer said that the application needed to be dealt with correctly and that this could take time. Councillor Firmager then asked how much the financial contribution provided by the applicant would be and whether that could come to the committee. The case officer explained that the figure has not yet been agreed and that this would be part of the S106 agreement.

Councillor Smith asked whether Bracknell could still build the houses should the application be refused by Wokingham Borough Council Planning Committee. The case officer indicated they could not. Councillor Smith then queried how Wokingham Borough Council would benefit from the application, apart from the upgrading a cycle path. The case officer reminded Members that officers had to assess the application before them. No material harms related to the scheme had been found. There would not be a strong case to refuse given that Bracknell had approved the application.

Councillor Neal thanked the officers for the addition of the upgrade to footpath 34. He added that it is a key to make the route more coherent.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey asked who would be maintaining the land as it covered two local authorities. The case officer responded that a local management company for the estate was likely to be maintaining the land.

**RESOLVED:** That application 180711 be approved subject to conditions and informatives set out in pages 134 to 138, additional obligation to secure a financial contribution to upgrade WOK footpath 34 to a suitable surface, and S106 Agreement.

## **60. APPLICATION NO 230422 LAND WEST OF TROWES LANE AND NORTH OF CHARLTON LANE, SWALLOWFIELD**

**Proposal:** Full planning application for the proposed erection of 81 dwellings (including 40% affordable homes), open space, SuDS, landscaping, biodiversity enhancements, new vehicular access off Trowes Lane, pedestrian & cycle links, and associated infrastructure.

**Applicant:** Boyer Crowthorne House Nine Mile Ride, Wokingham RG40 3GZ

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 149 to 208.

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

- Education and Sustainable Location.
- Highways.
- The Local Plan Update.
- Additional representations from Councillors Pauline Jorgensen and Clive Jones expressing concern about the application.

All Members had attended a site visit except Councillors Soane, Smith, and Shepherd-Dubey.

Ian Fullerton, Swallowfield Parish Council, spoke in objection to this application. He commented that the application contravened a number of planning policies and would only make a very small contribution to the Council's 5 year land supply. Mr Fullerton was of the view that the application was unsustainable. He made reference to the lack of infrastructure within Swallowfield to serve the extra houses. He mentioned a lack of schools at pre-school level as well as primary and secondary schools, meaning all children would need to travel to school by car. He also stated that Swallowfield had limited to no employment opportunities, no supermarket, no leisure facilities, and no capacity at the medical centre. He questioned siting much needed affordable homes in an area with such limited facilities. Ian Fullerton disagreed with the figures in the report relating to car movements, and gave a figure of 300-400 movements per day as more realistic rather than 41-47 during peak hours detailed in the report. Increased traffic would negatively impact the village. He also made comments on the increased size of the village, which would be 42%, resulting in a loss of character and urbanise the village. He urged the Committee to respect CP9 and CP11 and to vote against the recommendations.

Jeremy Bayliss, resident, spoke in objection to the application. He commented that the Council had a good record at listening to its residents and that he hoped that they do for this application too. He believed that Swallowfield was unique in the Borough as all the other villages had been developed out. Residents of Swallowfield strongly believed the application would lead to irreversible damage to the village. Mr Bayliss mentioned that the proposal was contrary to the planning policies for Swallowfield which sought to restrict development within the boundaries of the settlement. He commented that local residents had engaged with the Council but the applicants had not engaged with the residents. He was also of the view that the 42% increase in size of the village would damage its character. The extent of harm far outweighed the benefits, and for all these reasons he asked for the application to be refused.

Chris Roberts, agent, spoke in support of the application. He mentioned three main points in regards to this application, these being the site sustainability, the proposed allocation of the site and the benefits of the site. In terms of sustainability the site lay immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of the village and was suitable for the number of homes proposed. Chris Roberts commented that Swallowfield was relatively well served for its size. There were employment opportunities at City Base and Wyvols Court Farm. In addition there was an hourly bus service to Reading. He then said that the application had not come from nowhere. The Council's Local Plan Update revised growth strategy had identified this as the only potential allocation in Swallowfield for residential development. The site did not flood, was not ecologically constrained, and Highways had endorsed the proposed access and car parking arrangements. It would help with the Council's housing need. He added that the main benefit of the scheme was the 33 affordable homes within the application, with 2419 people on the social housing waiting list in the Borough. He also mentioned other benefits such as the biodiversity net gain, wildlife enhancements and 2.8 hectares of public open space.

Councillor Cornish opened the discussion and commented that the application went against the intent of a number of local and national planning policies. He also commented that the site had been identified in the draft Local Plan Update for 2021, as a site which would be supported by the Council for housing. It could not easily be excluded from future

drafts without good planning reasons indicating a change of circumstance. Should the Committee be minded to refuse the application strong planning reasons would be required and there needed to be sufficient reasons to justify the site potentially being removed from future drafts of the Local Plan Update.

Councillor Mickleburgh asked whether previous similar applications which had gone to appeal, had their appeals upheld for the reason of access to schools. Mark Croucher, case officer, referenced a previous application on Lodge Road, Hurst which had been upheld at appeal on sustainability grounds. A small application in Hurst had also been recently refused to a lack of sustainability. He also mentioned an application north of Nine Mile Ride where the Council had been successful at appeal, based on access to local services. He added that Inspectors generally agreed on sustainability grounds. Councillor Mickleburgh then questioned whether the fact that academies had the power to choose their own admissions criteria, would impact school options available to parents, given that all but one of the listed local secondary schools are academies. The case officer stated that the list of schools in the Supplementary Agenda had been provided by Children's services and detailed schools where the development would be in the catchment area, which was not the same as a school being accessible. Councillor Mickleburgh then queried about Home to School Transport and the fact that the S106 funding was unlikely to cover the possible costs of this for the long term, he asked whether this is a material planning consideration. The case officer said that it was. He said that the Local Government Settlement and funding from CIL and Council Tax should generally cover the cost. There was a concern with S106 that there would be an element of double counting, and it would not be possible, as there were other existing funding streams.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey asked what would happen should the 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) go below the existing threshold of 3.9 years. The case officer stated that the application had to be considered in line with the current position of 3.95 years, and other relevant factors..

Councillor Smith commented that he was aware of sites having been removed from the Local Plan Update. He queried the assertion in the report that Oakbank school may be in walking distance. Councillor Smith stated that Swallowfield had a convenience store and a pub, but little else in terms of facilities. He was of the view that the site was not sustainable and commented that if there were on average 2.4 cars per household this would equate 194 cars and that would cause issues. The case officer responded that the officer position was not that the site was highly sustainable and therefore should be approved, more that the site was unsustainable and that weighed into the planning balance. He went on to state that in terms of the percentage to the village, Officers had calculated a 20% increase when taking land area into account as opposed to residential area.

Councillor Mickleburgh mentioned policy CP11 with the location of the site being within the countryside. He asked about exceptions and said that these were usually given against the policy for an application. The case officer indicated that the application would not fall into any exceptions in policy CP11. Councillor Mickleburgh asked whether the scale of the site was relevant in the evaluation when considering building in the countryside. The case officer stated that it was in terms of assessing against the policies in the Core Strategy, and when considering character and appearance and impact on the landscape, and also sustainability.

Councillor Soane commented that the additional Home to School Transport requirements would have a large financial impact to the Council, but would also impact on the child

because of the long commute to school, necessitated by the lack of education facilities within walking and cycling distance.

Councillor Neal asked why the proposal mentioned cycle links but then in paragraph 87 of the report it stated that there were no cycle links. The case officer stated that this related to the footpaths on the southern boundary. He added that was not something that was provided on the site but was relevant to the local cycle network. Councillor Neal then questioned the local bus service as it relied on various grants to keep it going. He also commented on the access to local supermarkets, with 5 miles being the closest one which is Sainsburys Winnersh. He then asked about a discrepancy between the Parish Council's traffic analysis and the Borough Council's traffic analysis and asked why. Gordon Adam, Principal Highways Development Control Officer, said that the traffic assessment was undertaken using the nationally accepted means of assessing a transport assessment, looking at peak movements. The case officer referred to the supermarket point made by Councillor Neal and indicated that there was potential for a new supermarket in Arborfield Garrison.

Councillor Cornish made the comment that the addition to the size of the village whilst hurtful to the village it did not close the settlement gap to another settlement. He reminded the Committee that the traffic levels were below the threshold that is set by planning policy. He was aware of one site which had been removed from the Local Plan. The landowner, the Council, had accepted that it be removed. Councillor Cornish then asked about the loss of high-quality agricultural land and where that sat in the balance of the decision. The case officer stated that it did weigh against it. However, the landowner had stated that the land was not suitable for modern farming operation and that the operation would not be harmed.

Councillor Smith asked whether the site had been considered suitable or unsuitable in the 2021 Local Plan Update. The case officer said had been regarded as potentially suitable but had been considered as unsuitable in the 2020 HELAA. Councillor Smith then mentioned an appeal for a previous application in Hurst and said the inspector agreed about Sustainability issues. The case officer made the comment that the site in question was double the size, and the landscape harm and the access was worse. He then said when looking at the balance of this application, the 5 years housing land supply and the 33 Affordable homes were given significant weight. Brian Conlon, Operational Lead - Development Management, clarified to the Committee that examples of successful appeals given had not focused specifically on education.

Councillor Mickleburgh mentioned Mr Fullerton's reference to local Swallowfield planning policy and asked whether they had a Neighbourhood Development Plan. The case officer confirmed they have no Neighbourhood Development Plan

Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that application 230422 be refused on the grounds of sustainability, specifically related to education access and access to local facilities, the harm to the countryside and the change of the size of the village due to the scale of the site. The site would not be suitable for housing as future occupiers would have a high dependency on private motor vehicles to access services and facilities. The proposal would not promote sustainable transport modes.

With regards to lack of sustainability as a reason for refusal, Brian Conlon sought clarification from Members whether the potential impact on the home to school transport fund and education was something which Members wished to specifically reference in a reason for refusal, or whether the issue formed part of a wider concern around access to

local facilities. Specific reference to education would prevent wider consideration of the site's location to a range of services and facilities. He clarified that the Committee had identified the principal issues of the application being its conflict with the spatial strategy, and inappropriate development in the countryside in conflict with policy CP11. This was separate to the physical scale and visual impact of the application itself on the village.

Councillor Mickleburgh's proposal was seconded by Councillor Smith.

**RESOLVED:** That application 230422 be refused on the grounds of

- 1) a lack of sustainability and access relating to education, transport and retail,
- 2) the loss of countryside contrary to policy,
- 3) the scale of the application being disproportionate to the size of the existing settlement for which it was adjoining and;
- 4) In the absence of a completed Legal Agreement, the proposed development fails to make adequate provision for affordable housing, contrary to policy CP5 of the Core Strategy and section 6 of the NPPF.
- 5) In the absence of a planning obligation to secure suitable avoidance and mitigation measures and access management monitoring arrangements, in terms that are satisfactory to the Local Planning Authority (LPA), the LPA is unable to satisfy itself that the proposals include adequate mitigation measures to prevent the proposed development from having an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, in line with the requirements of Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended and Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43/EEC. The proposal would be contrary to Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan, Policies CP8 and CP4 of the Core Strategy.
- 6) In the absence of a completed legal agreement, the proposed development fails to secure opportunities for training, apprenticeships and other vocational initiatives to develop local employability skills contrary to MDD policy Local Plan TB12.
- 7) In the absence of a completed Legal Agreement, the proposed development fails to make adequate contributions to sport and recreational facilities, contrary to MDD Local Plan policy TB08, Core Strategy policy CP4 and Sections 4 and 8 of the NPPF.
- 8) In the absence of a completed Legal Agreement, the development fails to secure a schedule off-site highway works to improve pedestrian & sustainable travel infrastructure and the management/adoption of internal estate roads and public open spaces, contrary to Core Strategy policy CP1, CP3, CP4 and CP6 and MDD Local Plan policy CC03 and TB08 and sections 4, 8, 9 and 12 of the NPPF



## **61. APPLICATION NO 231094 LAND AT 69 KING STREET LANE, WINNERSH RG41 5BA**

**Proposal:** Outline application for the proposed erection of up to 28 dwellings, associated landscaping and open space following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings. Only access to be considered, all other matters reserved.

**Applicant:** Mr David Vokes

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 209 to 254.

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

- Tree Protection Order's which are on 3 trees on this site.
- Hedgerows on the Southern and Eastern Boundary will be protected.
- Electricity pole will be relocated.
- Highways/Access
  - amended conditions 1, 2, 4, 12, 22, 24, additional condition relating to a swept path analysis,

All members except Councillors Soane, Smith and Shepherd-Dubey attended a site visit.

Paul Fishwick, Winnersh Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He noted the residents' objections from pages 211-216 of the report. He said that traffic around King Street Lane was a big issue between 7:45am to 9:15am which lead to traffic issues on Bearwood Road where a school was located and said that additional traffic would increase an already difficult situation and also create harmful emissions. He also mentioned that the walking distances from the site had been taken from the access and not from the centre, so there would be an extra 200m for some people living on the site to access shops. Paul Fishwick then referred to the mention of buses in the report and said there was no bus stop or regular bus service. He believed that the site was not sustainable. No reference had been made to the existing foul water and sewage issues.

Justine McDonald, resident, spoke in objection of this application. She stated that the main concerns amongst local residents were, the impact on traffic, increased pressure on an already struggling sewage network, increased pressure on local services, the detrimental impact on wildlife and the impact on the privacy and light on existing properties. She mentioned that 200 local residents had signed a petition against the application. She then raised the issue of the access onto the site and that the access crosses into the boundary of 73 King Street Lane. She said that at 61 King Street Lane people had to move out in March 2023 due to sewage and had only moved back in Nov/Dec 2023. She asked that the Committee reject the application with 38 objections and 200+ signatures from residents.

Adam Constantinou, agent, spoke in favour of the application. He started by mentioning the dialogue with officers and residents. He added that this plan was the exact type of high-quality development that was in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. The site was energy efficient, reused brownfield land, had 40% Affordable Housing, and offered the protection of the TPO trees and the planting of extra trees. He indicated that there had been no technical objections from the Council's statutory consultees on highways, drainage, ecological and tree and landscape matters. He concluded by saying

that the application was in an inherently sustainable location and resulted in a high-quality development. He emphasised that it was an outline application so the committee were only considering access.

Councillor Prue Bray, ward member, spoke in objection to this application. She mentioned that the site was in the Local Plan Update in early 2022 and that the application had increased from 25 to 28 dwellings. She said that a landscape buffer was needed between the housing and the countryside. She also commented that this application opened up the possibility of further development into the countryside. She referred to the revised conditions in the supplementary agenda and the fact that the indicative plans had been removed from condition 2. She was of the view that the Committee would no longer know what was likely to come back at the reserved matters stage. She commented that there were no drawings to show the distance between the access road and the neighbouring properties. She believed that the access road could cause harm to the neighbouring properties. She questioned whether if approved, a management company could be set up and they may not keep surrounding areas up to standard.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey said it took her 40 minutes in the afternoon to drive from the main road to King Street Lane. She also questioned where any children who may move into the proposed properties would go to school as all the local schools were full. Helen Maynard, case officer, emphasised that the application was for up to 28 dwellings.

Councillor Cornish asked about the sewage report from Thames Water for the site. The case officer indicated that Thames Water had not commented on the application. Brian Conlon clarified that Thames Water had an obligation to connect new homes up to the sewage system prior to habitation. Councillor Soane also asked about sewage, and said the photos provided by residents of raw sewage showed a different reality to what the drainage expert said. The case officer said the drainage expert had not given any objections on surface water drainage. Foul water drainage was outside of their remit and was a matter for Thames Water.

Councillor Mickleburgh asked whether it was possible for a condition to be added that development not begin until the sewage issue was resolved. Brian Conlon referred to a Grampian condition to accommodate additional demands to serve the particular development. Councillor Mickleburgh then questioned whether a proportion of the site was brownfield land. The case officer responded that the builder's yard on the site was brownfield, and the existing residential and residential gardens were not. Councillor Mickleburgh referred to the buffer between the site and the countryside and asked for more clarification on this buffer. The case officer said that the indicative plan showed planted on the boundary. Condition 29 specifically related to hedgerows and trees on the boundary and their retention. In terms of a buffer as there was still an indicative site, what was likely to come forwards was not yet known.

Councillor Firmager asked for some clarity from the Highways team on the traffic issues. Gordon Adam responded that as set out in the supplementary agenda the new site would add 17-50 two way movements in the peak hours, with there being 700-750 vehicle movements on King Street Lane in peak hours, he commented that this represented around 2% of vehicle movements and was not considered as a significant impact. Councillor Firmager asked about including this information and comments on applications in the main agenda rather than in supplementary agenda. Brian Conlon said including these reports in the main agenda would double the size of the report and that the

comments on the applications were available online. Councillor Firmager asked whether Members could be directed to this information in future.

Councillor Neal asked about access. He felt that it would be gridlock during the school rush hour, and also referred to drawing 21-029/004 which showed access to site, and was concerned that pedestrians would have reduced priority. Gordon Adam said there were many examples in the Borough where the stop line was sited at the edge of the carriageway. Councillor Neal believed that pedestrians would have to wait some time to cross.

Councillor Skuse referred to there being 700-750 cars on the road at peak times and asked what the maximum capacity of a road like this would be. Gordon Adam said that the capacity would be 700-1000 but that this road was limited by how the junction works.

Councillor Cornish was reassured by comments made about the buffer between the site and the countryside.

Councillor Neal asked if the whole site was proposed in the Local Plan Update or just the brownfield part of the site. The case officer said it was the whole site but just 25 dwellings as opposed to 28.

At this point in the meeting 10.25pm Councillor Cornish proposed that the committee extended by 30 minutes to ensure that all business be completed, this was seconded by Councillor Mickleburgh. Upon being put to the vote this was agreed.

Councillor Mickleburgh commented that that reserved matters applications can be delegated to officers or to come back to committee if required.

Councillor Mickleburgh proposed that the committee approve the proposal with 2 additional conditions being that the dwellings are not occupied until assured there will be no sewage issues and also as part of a landscaping plan, that there is robust buffer between the site and the conservation area.

Officers clarified the sewage condition, that no development would be occupied until confirmation had been provided that either foul water capacity existed offsite to serve the development or a development and infrastructure plan had been agreed with Thames Water or all upgrades needed had been undertaken.

Councillor Cornish asked the Committee was approving the specific design for the access. Gordon Adam confirmed that it was the principle of the access, the design would have to be submitted at a later stage. Councillor Cornish also made the point that he wanted the reserved matters to come back to committee.

Councillor Mickleburgh's proposal was seconded by Councillor Skuse.

**RESOLVED:** Approval subject to conditions and informatives on pages 240 to 250 at S106 legal agreement to be signed within 6 months, if it is not signed the committee authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission (unless a longer period is agreed by the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee), amended conditions 1, 2, 4, 12, 22, 24, additional condition relating to a swept path analysis, and two additional conditions that the dwellings are not occupied until Thames Water confirm the necessary sewage systems are in place

and as part of a landscaping plan, that there is robust buffer between the site and the conservation area.