

Date Published: 20 April 2018



PLANNING COMMITTEE

19 APRIL 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY PAPERS

TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

The following papers were circulated at the above meeting.

Alison Sanders
Director of Resources

Page No

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

(Head of Development Management)

**The conditions for public speaking have been met in the applications marked 'PS'.
For further information or to register for public speaking, please contact Customer
Services 01344 352000.**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Annex

BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
19th April 2018
SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

Correspondence received and matters arising following preparation of the agenda.

Item No: 5
17/01123/OUT
Beaufort Park South Road Wokingham Berkshire RG40 3GD

ISSUE DATE: 19.04.2018

Correction to Officer Report

Pg. 29 Paragraph 9.11 insert the word 'from' after evident.

Additional Information

Pg. 35 Paragraph 9.58, For clarification, after applying VBC and calculating the affordable housing, any agreed affordable provision will be secured as on site provision.

Further drainage details have been received. Whilst the scheme is acceptable further details will be required at the reserved matters stage and the final layout will need to ensure sufficient space is left for drainage attenuation. At present the layout does not allow for this.

Following the adoption of the revised SPA SPD at Executive Committee on the 10th April 2018 revised SPA observations have been received. There is now capacity at Ambarrow Hill/ Court SANG and this will be secured through the S106.

Additional information has been received from the Highways Officer regarding the status of South Road:

In relation to para 9.22 of the report some alterations are required as position in relation to South Road is slightly different to what has been reported in the main report. South Road whilst not defined as adopted highway is controlled by the Council and in that regard is still maintained by the Council just not the Highway Authority. In that regard its status is very similar to an adopted highway. With that in mind there would be an option for the roads serving Beaufort Park to be adopted. As this is an outline application I would advise that we should provide a flexible approach to the site requiring a detailed scheme via the S106 defining which roads would be adopted and which would remain private. This would provide flexibility once the layout is known and will also protect the council's position in relation to adequate access for refuse and any future restrictions that may be required to control parking for example.

Correspondence received

A further representation has been received from BIRSA, a company who have shown an interest in occupying the building and the Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce supporting them. The objections cover the following grounds:

- The application does not comply with Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 70 of the Town and Planning Act 1990, which state that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- Paragraph 22 of the NPPF states that planning policies should avoid protection of employment sites where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose. However, there is now an interested user of the site which would secure the continued employment use of the site. [Officer Note: the site is not a designated employment site within the BFBLP]
- The site is unsustainability located, and divorced from the settlement boundary, contrary to policies CS1 and CS2 of the CSDPD.
- Land around may be allocated within the draft Local plan, this still needs to go through examination and therefore may not happen. [Officer note: the application has been assessed on its own merits]
- The site is being brought forward by a speculator and therefore may not be delivered to contribute to the 5 year housing supply. [Officer note: The planning system cannot guarantee the delivery of any housing sites as other factors affect this].
- The site could be occupied by a company safeguarding 165 jobs within Bracknell Borough. [Officer comment: this is not a planning consideration].
- Beaufort Park is a building of low carbon and environmental performance and its demolition would be a waste of resources. [Officer comment: whilst the NPPF talks about prudent use of resources, it is not within the context of disused buildings].

A representation in response to the above has also been received by a party to the application. This confirms that whilst an offer has been received, no offer has been accepted by the board, and therefore the comments relating to the occupation are hypothetical.

Amendment to Recommendation

Pg. 38:

Following the completion of planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relating to:

1. SPA mitigation measures
2. Affordable Housing
3. Education
4. Travel Packs
5. Highways scheme to show what roads would be adopted and to secure that adoption, and securing the maintenance and management of the areas left private.

Amend condition 19 to read:

No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme (SWDS) for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The results of full BRE365 Compliant Infiltration Testing shall be submitted to support the design of the infiltration system. The hydrogeological setting of the site will also be confirmed via ground water monitoring they'll be incorporated into the design of the system. The drainage strategy shall demonstrate that surface water run-off generated up to and including the 1 in 100 years critical storm, with a suitable allowance for climate change and allowances for urban creep included, will not exceed the run-off rate or volume from the equivalent greenfield site and that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere. The SWDS shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

REASON: To ensure that the site is properly drained and does not increase the risk of flooding.

[Relevant Policies: CS1 of the Core Strategy.]

Additional conditions

20. No development shall commence until details of how the surface water drainage shall be maintained and managed after completion have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include confirmation of the required maintenance activities with expected frequency, with site specific assessments included to demonstrate that health and safety has been fully considered in the design and that access and egress for future residents will be maintained during any operations to repair or replace drainage features.

REASON: To ensure that the site is properly drained and does not increase the risk of flooding.

[Relevant Policies: CS1 of the Core Strategy.]

21. Development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing any on- and off-site drainage works, along with proposed points of connection, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed to ensure there is no increase in flood risk off site.

REASON: To ensure that the site is properly drained and does not increase the risk of flooding.

[Relevant Policies: CS1 of the Core Strategy.]

22. No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the sustainable urban drainage scheme for this site has been completed in accordance with the submitted details. The sustainable urban drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan. Written confirmation of agreements for the management and maintenance of the drainage scheme shall be submitted and approved by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure that the site is properly drained and does not increase the risk of flooding.

[Relevant Policies: CS1 of the Core Strategy.]

23. No gates shall be provided at the vehicular access to the site.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

[Relevant Policies: Core Strategy DPD CS23]

Recommendation

Pg. 43 In the event of the s106 planning obligation not being completed by 23.05.2018.

Item No: 6

18/00089/FUL

Land Adjacent To 3 Toonagh Winkfield Street Winkfield Windsor Berkshire

ISSUE DATE: 19.4.2018

Amendment to officer report

Para 9.15 should read

The proposed materials are therefore considered acceptable. It is therefore not considered that the proposed alterations to the previous approval would result in an adverse impact of the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore not be contrary to CSDPD Policy CS7, BFBLP 'Saved' Policy EN20 or the NPPF.

Item No: 7
18/00160/FUL
4-5 Keepers Coombe Bracknell Berkshire RG12 0TN

ISSUE DATE: 17.04.2018

Additional Information to Officer's Report

Paragraph 7, page 58

The Fire Service was consulted and made no comment. They advised that consultations to the Fire Service were only considered at the Building Control stage of a development.

Paragraph 9.21, page 61-62

Amended plans were provided on 17th April 2018. The front extension to 5 Keepers Coombe has been set in by approximately 0.73 metres at ground floor level. Space for 3 bins could therefore be accommodated to the rear of the parking space. Storage for 3 bins has been shown to the rear of the parking space at 4 Keepers Coombe.

Paragraph 9.22, page 62

The kerb to the front of both properties has been partially dropped. In order to implement the parking plan, the whole of the kerb would be required to be dropped. The parking spaces proposed which would require a dropped kerb would have a depth of at least 5.5 metres which would be considered sufficiently deep for a dropped kerb to be provided in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD.

ISSUE DATE: 19.04.2018

Amendment to Officer's Report

Paragraph 7.1, page 58

The Highways Authority was consulted and recommended that a revised parking layout, landscaping and dropped kerb proposal is provided.

Paragraph 9.22, page 62

The Parking Standards SPD recommends a depth of 5.5 metres for a driveway parking space in order to prevent overhang onto the footway. The existing driveway at 5 Keepers Coombe provides one parking space to meet this standard, and one parking space which measures 2.4 by 4.8 metres. This is due to the boundary vegetation and retaining walls present on this driveway.

The proposed development would decrease the depth of the driveway to 5 Keepers Coombe, and the revised scheme would provide one parking space to meet the 5.5 metre depth requirement. As the dwelling would increase from a 3 bedroom house to a 4 bedroom house, the Parking Standards require that an additional parking space be provided. Two parking spaces are provided on the parking plan for 5 Keepers Coombe, one with a minimum depth of 4.8 metres and maximum depth of 5 metres, and the other with a minimum depth of 5.1 metres and a maximum depth of 5.3 metres. It is considered that the deeper of the two spaces would be acceptable as it is unlikely to have an adverse impact on highway safety. It is also acknowledged that there is scope for on street demand, and that the applicant could park along the existing dropped kerb, as such the proposed development would not be considered to adversely impact on highway safety.

It has been recommended by the Highway Authority that the shallowest of the three parking spaces not be included on the parking plan in order to provide soft landscaping to mitigate the loss of soft landscaping to the sides. However, this

parking space meets the recommended depth of a standard parking space within the Parking Standards. It is therefore considered that the retention of this parking space could reduce the amount of on-street parking. Given the applicant could currently include hardstanding to the whole of their frontage, it is not considered reasonable to require soft landscaping.

Amendment to Recommendation

Paragraph 11.1, page 62

Condition 2:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following approved plans and other submitted details:

Site Plan and Location Plan - Drawing Number: 32 - Received 23rd February 2018

Ground and First Floor and Roof Plan As Proposed - Drawing Number: 33 F - Received 19th April 2018

Front and Side Elevations and Sections AA and BB As Proposed - Drawing Number: 34 F - Received 17th April 2018

Email confirming no encroachment - Received 19th March 2018

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Item No: 8

18/00132/FUL

58 Carnation Drive Winkfield Row Bracknell Berkshire RG42 7QT

ISSUE DATE: 19.04.2018

Additional Representations Received

An additional representation was received from the applicant. It is repeated below in full:

We feel compelled to observe that the objection from no. 30 does not address the subject of the planning application at all, but rather matters that were approved under permitted development. Without this "invalid" objection, the matter was likely to have been decided by delegated authority, and which the planning office has already advised they would grant approval.

We take on board their concerns about the overlooking that the door in the loft room provides into their garden. I am not sure if they have noticed but we have tried to be as respectful as possible & several months ago fitted a blind that covers the entire glass panel in the door. We have this tilted at an angle that allows light in but does not give a view of their house or garden. If we are not able to open the loft windows in the summer months, we will have to use this door as ventilation, which will unfortunately give us full view into their garden.

I think it is important to note that we already have a considerable view into their garden from our existing 1st floor windows, see below. I apologise for the nature of these photos, I wouldn't usually take photos of neighbours in their gardens but felt this was necessary to demonstrate the existing overlooking. Given that their garden is set on different levels, having them in the photo gives a clearer perspective of the view we have.



The objection from no. 31 asserts that we can view inside his property from these roof lights. This is not the case, as confirmed by the planning officer in her report.

There already exists significant overlooking from existing 1st floor windows from the rear of our house (see below photo), and as confirmed by the planning officer, this position is not materially worsened by these roof lights.



This page is intentionally left blank