

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT
NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	250242
Site Address:	Land North of Cutbush Lane, West of Upperwood Farm, Cutbush Lane, Shinfield, RG2 9LH
Expiry Date:	7 th March 2025
Proposal: Application for non-material amendment to planning consent 231561 to allow change of wording to condition 17.	

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
211841	Full planning permission for the Science Park Creative Media Hub comprising the erection of film stages and associated workshops and office space and ancillary uses including equipment stores, café. Formation of associated access, decked and surface parking, and landscaping at the Thames Valley Science Park (TVSP).	Approved – 13 December 2021
231561	Full application for the proposed re-location of workshop T4 (to become workshop G)	Approved – 12 November 2024

APPRAISAL

Proposal Description:

The proposed Non-Material Amendment application is in relation to development at Land North of Cutbush Lane, Shinfield as part of the wider Shinfield Studios development site. There is extensive planning history on this site but I have included the most relevant previous applications as stated above in the planning history section.

Proposed Amendment:

This proposed non-material amendment submission seeks permission to amend approved scheme (231561), by amending the wording of condition 17 to change the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM) status from 'Excellent' to 'Very Good' which was originally stipulated in planning permission (231561). The purpose of this report is to assess the impact of this amendment.

The original planning permission granted for the development at Land North of Cutbush Lane, Shinfield included a condition requiring the development to achieve a BREEAM rating of 'Excellent'. This condition was imposed to ensure the development met high

standards of sustainability, energy efficiency and environmental performance. The applicant has now submitted a request to downgrade the BREEAM status from 'Excellent' to 'Very Good' due to several limitations in Workshop G's design and systems, this includes:

- Lack of extensive mechanical and electrical systems that can be optimized for energy efficiency;
- Opportunities for advanced technologies like Building Management Systems (BMS) or integrated renewable energy solutions;
- Lack of diverse spaces that can incorporate features like natural ventilation strategies, intelligent lighting systems or innovative layouts to enhance performance.

These limitations mean fewer credits are available under BREEAM and achieving a higher rating can be extremely challenging. As a result, the applicant has sought a non-material amendment to reflect this change in the BREEAM status.

A non-material amendment application allows for minor changes to a planning permission that would not materially alter the original approval. The proposed amendment involves a reduction in the BREEAM rating from 'Excellent' to 'Very Good'.

The fundamental difference between the two ratings as per BREEAM is that an 'Excellent' rating represents a higher level of sustainability than 'Very Good' with an 'Excellent' rating requiring a project score at least 70% whereas a 'Very Good' rating only needs to achieve a score of 55%.

It seems that an 'Excellent' rating signifies best practice whilst 'Very Good' represents advanced good practice.

In terms of sustainability implications, a BREEAM rating of 'Very Good' still represents a high standard of sustainability and environmental performance. It demonstrates that the development will meet significant sustainability criteria, though it falls short of the more stringent 'Excellent' rating.

The applicant has provided documentation showing that the changes required to downgrade the BREEAM rating have not resulted in any significant changes to the overall environmental performance of the building. The development will still meet most of the key sustainability criteria originally planned.

The applicant goes on to state that despite lowering the target, the project will still incorporate impactful and relevant sustainability measures including the utilisation of efficient lighting systems, insulated building materials and is prioritising responsibly sourced and low-carbon materials.

In this instance, given the type of building being proposed, it is considered achieving a BREEAM target of 'Very Good' reflects a balanced approach that considers site constraints, financial realities and stakeholder priorities while still committing to significant sustainability performance. This adjustment ensures the project's successful delivery and long-term value without compromising its environmental and social objectives.

Conclusion:

The proposed non-material amendment to reduce the BREEAM rating from 'Excellent' to 'Very Good' is considered to be a minor change that does not materially alter the development's sustainability objectives or compliance with planning policies.

The amendment will not have any significant adverse impacts on the environmental performance of the development and the overall design remains aligned with the objectives of the original planning permission.

Given the above and the nature of the proposed amendment and its limited impact on the overall development, it is recommended that the non-material amendment be approved.

Is the proposed change non-material?

Yes	☒
No	☐

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010):

In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that persons with protected characteristics as identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation:	Approve – the change is non-material.
Date:	6 th March 2025

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	Connor Corrigan
Date:	13/03/25