

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 9 JULY 2025 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.00 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Martijn Andrea (Chair), Carol Jewell (Vice-Chair), Sam Akhtar, Greg Bello, Catherine Glover, Moses Iyengunmwena, Stuart Munro, Caroline Smith and Wayne Smith

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Joseph Barley and David Hare

Officers Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist

Neil Allen, Legal Officer

Alan Lewis, Highways Officer

Brian Conlon, Acting Head - Development Management

Connor Corrigan, Head of Strategic Development

Craig Hallett, Legal Officer

Case Officers Present

Joanna Carter

Nick Chancellor

Mark Croucher

Benjamin Hindle

8. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence received.

9. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11 June 2025 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

10. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Caroline Smith declared that prior to joining the Planning Committee she had sat on the Earley Town Council committee which had determined the consultation response to Item 13 Application No 250148 Liberty House, Strand Way, Earley, RG6 4EA and on this particular occasion it would not be appropriate for her to take part in that item. She did not participate in the debate or vote on the item and withdrew from the meeting room for the duration of that item (only).

11. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

There were no applications to be deferred or withdrawn.

12. APPLICATION NOS 242653, 242696, 242811 HOGWOOD FARM, SHEERLANDS ROAD, RG40 4QY

Proposal: Three planning applications –

(1) 242653. Full application for the proposed erection of 48 residential dwellings with associated access, internal roads, parking, landscaping, drainage and cycle storage.

(2) 242696. Application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Consent O/2014/2179 (as varied by 181194, dated 14/11/2018). The Reserved Matters comprise details of sports pitches, sports pavilion, allotments, car parking and play areas;

along with associated landscaping, highways and drainage infrastructure. Details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be considered (3) 242811. Application for non-material amendment to planning consent 181194 to amend the approved parameter plans to reflect revised land use arrangements.

Applicant: Cala Homes (Thames) Ltd

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 9 to 69.

John Richards, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the site had been granted outline planning permission in 2017 for a mix use development for 1,500 new homes alongside community facilities. Cala recognised the value of delivering infrastructure and community facilities at the earliest opportunity. The application sought the delivery of new pitch provision including a full-size grass football pitch, informal kick about area and 3G pitch, a pavilion building to be operated by the Council which would include changing facilities and a club room, play areas including a BMX track, car park, and 83 allotment pitches. John Richards emphasised that these facilities were originally intended to be directly delivered by the Council via CIL receipts, however this was not immediately available, and Cala had worked to fund their delivery through additional housing.

In response to a question from Councillor Iyengunmwena, Nick Chancellor, Case Officer, clarified that the houses would be heated via air source heat pump.

Councillor Caroline Smith asked whether there would be a lockable gate on the entrance to the allotments for security, and was informed that there would be.

Councillor Akhtar commented that much of the support for the application appeared to be based on the delivery of the community and sports facilities and questioned whether their delivery could be guaranteed. Nick Chancellor responded that were planning permission to be granted, it would be subject to a Section 106 agreement and a modification of the original Section 106 agreement for Finchwood Park. This would include triggers which meant that the sports facilities had to be delivered hand in hand with the residential development, and the residential development would not be able to be fully occupied until the sports facilities were in place.

Councillor Andrea summarised that the site would be outside of the area initially marked for potential development but was within the existing Strategic Development Location. Separation would be maintained with Barkham and Finchampstead, and shortfall around infrastructure would be partially mitigated through efficiencies and layout design quality. He highlighted that there were no objections around parking and that there would be a 10% Biodiversity Net gain through an offset SANG improvement. No objections had been raised around flooding and drainage. Whilst there was no affordable housing proposed, the scheme would enable the acceleration of the delivery of the sports and leisure facilities.

RESOLVED: That

Application 242653:

- 1) application 242653 be approved subject to conditions and informatives outlined in Appendix 1 of this report and the completion of a section 106 legal agreement between the Council and the applicant for the following Heads of Terms:

Administrative

- Payment of the Council's Professional and legal costs, whether or not the agreement completes;
- Payment of the Council's reasonable fees in monitoring and implementing the S106, payable at £538 per planning obligation trigger subject to indexation using the BCIS (Building Cost Information Service) index; payable on completion of the deed; and a commitment to cover the Council's additional costs;
- All payments of fees or contributions to be indexed from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of payment using the BCIS index.

Allotments

- Allotment site to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the allotment land specification approved by the council prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 35th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied with development parcels P4 and P5 of the Site Wide Development;
- Allotment site to be transferred to the council within 3 months of the council issuing a certificate of completion for the Allotment; Sports Hub (Pavilion, Astro turf 3G Pitch, Grass 11 a side Pitch and Kickabout Area and associated car parking)

Pavilion and associated car parking

- The pavilion to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the pavilion specification annexed to the deed prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 40th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied with development parcels P4 and P5 of the Site Wide Development;
- The pavilion to be transferred to the council within 3 months of the council issuing a certificate of completion for the pavilion; Astro turf Pitch 3G (Third Generation);
- The Astro turf Pitch 3G to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the Astro turf Pitch 3G specification approved by the council prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 40th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied with development parcels P4 and P5 of the Site Wide Development;
- The Astro turf Pitch 3G to be transferred to the council within 3 months of the council issuing a certificate of completion for the Astro turf Pitch 3G; Grass 11 a side Pitch and Kickabout Area (Pitch and Kickabout Area)
- The Pitch and Kickabout Area to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the Pitch and Kickabout Area 3G specification approved by the council prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 40th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied with development parcels P4 and P5 of the Site Wide Development;
- The developer to maintain the Pitch and Kickabout Area during the maintenance period from the issue by the council of the certificate of completion for the Pitch and Kickabout Area 10
- The Astro turf Pitch 3G to be transferred to the council within 5 Working Days of the council issuing the final certificate for the Astro turf Pitch 3G.

Contributions

- Bus contribution of £43,872 to be used towards improvements to bus services and related bus stops to be paid to the council prior to occupation of the 20th dwelling within the Full Development;
 - My Journey Travel Plan contribution of £29,376 (at £612 per dwelling) towards MY Journey initiatives to be paid to the council prior to occupation of the first dwelling within the Full Development;
 - Photovoltaic Panel (PV) contribution of £10,850 (for allotment site) PV Panel Contribution to be paid to the council prior to occupation of the 36th dwelling within the Full Development;
 - NHS contribution of £43,497 to be used towards the funding of an estate project to create additional health facilities to serve residents of the development; to be provided either within the Swallowfield Medical Practice or Finchampstead Practice or other facilities or services within the vicinity of the Full Development.
 - Strategic Access Management and Maintenance (SAMM) payment of £51,195 to the council for the Thames Basin Heath SPA prior to the occupation of the first dwelling to be occupied within the Full Development;
 - SANG (non-financial, utilising capacity reserved by the developer within the existing Finchwood Park SANG);
 - A late stage review of the financial viability of the scheme prior the sale of the 36 dwelling within the Full Development such review to be by an independent specialist in viability appraisal and to be paid for by the developer. The purpose of the late stage viability appraisal is to assess whether the viability of the proposed development may change and whether an affordable housing contribution is viable.
- 2) Or That the Committee authorises the Head of Development Management to REFUSE full planning permission if the legal agreement is not completed within six months of the date of this resolution (unless officers on behalf of the Head of Development Management agree to a later date for completion of the legal agreement).

Application 242696

- 3) that application 242696 be approved subject to 11 conditions and informatives outlined in Appendix 2 of this report and the completion of a section 106A Deed of Variation to the s.106 legal agreement (for 181194) between the Council and the applicant / site owners for the following Heads of Terms:

Administrative

- Payment of the Council's Professional and legal costs, whether or not the agreement completes;
- Payment of the Council's reasonable fees in monitoring and implementing the S106, payable at £538 per planning obligation trigger subject to indexation using the BCIS (Building Cost Information Service) index; payable on completion of the deed; and a commitment to cover the Council's additional costs.
- All payments of fees to be indexed from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of payment using the BCIS index.

Allotments

- New definitions of Allotment Land and Allotment Land Specification, definition of Allotment Land in the Principal Agreement to be deleted;

- Part 3 of Schedule 5 of the Principal Agreement to be deleted and a new Part 3 of Schedule 5 inserted in its place securing the following:-
 - Allotment site to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the allotment land specification approved by the council (prior to occupation of the first dwelling to be occupied within development parcels P4 and P5 of the Development (Planning reference 181194)) prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 35th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied within development parcels P4 and P5 of the Development;
 - Allotment site to be transferred to the council within 3 months of the council issuing a certificate of completion for the Allotment; Sports Hub (Pavilion, Astroturf 3G Pitch, Grass 11 a side Pitch and Kickabout Area and associated car parking)
- New definitions of Sports Hub, Sports Hub Land replacing deleted definitions of Sports Hub, Sports Hub Land in the Principal Agreement; New definition of Sports Hub Specification inserted.
- New definition of Pavilion and Pavilion Specification, Senior Football Turf Pitch and Informal Kick-About Area and Senior Football Turf Pitch and Informal Kick-About Area Specification, Astroturf Pitch 3G (third generation) and Astroturf Pitch 3G (third generation) Specification inserted in the Principal Agreement;
- New definitions of Full Planning Permission, Full Planning Application, Full Development, Land Use Parameter Plan, Landscape and Open Spaces Parameter Plan and all other associated definitions necessary to give effects to the deed of variation of the Principal Agreement to be inserted in the Principal Agreement;
- Part 4 of Schedule 5 of the Principal Agreement to be deleted and a new Part 4 of Schedule 5 inserted in its place securing the following:-

Pavilion and associated car parking

- The pavilion to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the pavilion specification annexed to the deed prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 40th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied with development parcels P4 and P5 of the Site Wide Development;
- The pavilion to be transferred to the council within 3 months of the council issuing a certificate of completion for the pavilion; Astroturf Pitch 3G (Third Generation)
- The Astroturf Pitch 3G to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the Astroturf Pitch 3G specification approved by the council prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 40th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied with development parcels P4 and P5 of the Site Wide Development;
- The Astroturf Pitch 3G to be transferred to the council within 3 months of the council issuing a certificate of completion for the Astroturf Pitch 3G; Grass 11 a side Pitch and Kickabout Area (Pitch and Kickabout Area)
- The Pitch and Kickabout Area to be constructed and delivered by developer in accordance with the Pitch and Kickabout Area 3G specification approved by the council prior to the earlier of occupation of either the 40th dwelling within the Full Development or 100th dwelling to be occupied with development parcels P4 and P5 of the Site Wide Development;

- The developer to maintain the Pitch and Kickabout Area during the maintenance period from the issue by the council of the certificate of completion for the Pitch and Kickabout Area;
- The Astroturf Pitch 3G to be transferred to the council within 5 Working Days of the council issuing the final certificate for the Astroturf Pitch 3G.

Children's Play Area

The table at Paragraph 12 of Part 2 of Schedule 5 in the Principal Agreement shall be deleted and replaced with the following updated table: Children's Play Area Table:

Updated Children's Play Areas	Children's Play Areas Completion payment triggers	Children's Play Areas Maintenance Sum
LEAP1 in combination with LAP	Prior to Occupation of the 25th Dwelling in aggregate across the combination of any of the following Development Parcels: P2, P6, P7, P8 and P9	£135,040 (LEAP) And £10,453 (LAP)
LLAP1	Prior to Occupation of the 25th Dwelling in aggregate across the combination of the following Development Parcels: P2, P3, P4, P5 and P6	£168,800
LEAP2	Prior to Occupation of the 25th Dwelling in aggregate across the combination of any of the following Development Parcels: P10, P11, P12a and P12b	£135,040 (LEAP)
LAP	Prior to Occupation of the 46th Dwelling on the Full Application Site	£10,453
NEAP in combination with LAP	Prior to Occupation of the 25th Dwelling in aggregate across the combination o the following Development Parcels: P6, P7, P10, P11 and NC	£384,000 (NEAP) and £10,454 (LAP)
LLAP2	Prior to Occupation of the 46th Dwelling on the Full Application Site	£168,800
BMX Facility	Prior to Occupation of the 46th Dwelling on the Full Application Site	£101,280

All other consequential amendments to the Principal Agreement necessary to give effect to the above.

- 4) OR That the committee authorise the Head of Development Management to REFUSE Reserved Matters if the legal agreement is not completed (varied) within six months of the date of this resolution (unless officers on behalf of the Head of Development Management agree to a later date for completion of the amendment to the legal agreement).

Application 242811

- 5) that condition 1 (development parameter plans) be approved.

13. APPLICATION NO 250148 LIBERTY HOUSE, STRAND WAY, EARLEY, WOKINGHAM, RG6 4EA

Councillor Caroline Smith declared that prior to joining the Planning Committee she had sat on the Earley Town Council committee which had determined the consultation response to Item 13 Application No 250148 Liberty House, Strand Way, Earley, RG6 4EA and on this particular occasion it would not be appropriate for her to take part in that item. She did not participate in the debate or vote on the item and withdrew from the meeting room for the duration of that item (only).

Proposal: Full planning permission for the erection of three 2No storey buildings each comprising of six apartments (18 in total), together with associated ancillary development, hardstanding, landscaping and footpaths.

Applicant: Mrs Annabel Nicol

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 89 to 113.

Councillor David Hare, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he welcomed affordable housing, however he had concerns regarding on street parking as Strand Way was a narrow, winding residential road. Parking outside the Liberty House flats was already an issue, making the road dangerous. There was limited visibility and increased traffic and on street parking would exacerbate safety issues. Planning Policy 3 indicated that local circumstances should be taken into consideration when setting standards and agreeing development. It was imperative that clear site lines were maintained for drivers whilst ensuring safety for other users. Councillor Hare went on to refer to the Council's Parking Guide and various statements of intent, including an appropriate level of parking for residents and visitors in new developments. However, there would not even be sufficient parking spaces for the residents. He felt that the statements of intent would not be met.

Councillor Wayne Smith asked about the difference between the lapsed planning application and the application before the Committee. Mark Croucher, Case Officer, indicated that they were the same.

Councillor Wayne Smith asked about any objections from highways. Alan Lewis, Highways Officer indicated that there were none. Mark Croucher stated that 0.5-0.7 parking spaces per household was anticipated as it would be unallocated parking. Strand Way was a cul-de-sac and vehicle speeds tended to be low. No objections had been received regarding site lines.

Councillor Iyengunmwena agreed that on street parking at Strand Way was difficult. Alan Lewis confirmed that the application complied with the parking standards. Whilst the

applicant could be asked to introduce parking controls to prevent on street parking in the worst locations, this may only move the issue.

Councillor Akhtar was pleased to note the proposed provision of 100% affordable housing.

Councillor Andrea summarised that the principle of development was acceptable, the application was the renewal of a previously approved, lapsed application, the application was compatible with the area and would bring 100% affordable housing, access was sufficient, and 18 parking spaces would be provided. He went on to state that there would be parking for cycles and that no objections to the application had been received from Highways or Landscapes. Concerns regarding drainage had been mitigated by Condition 7.

RESOLVED: That application 250148 be approved subject to the following: A. Completion of a legal agreement relating to the following head of terms: 1. Employment Skills Plan. 2. 100% on-site Affordable Housing (subject to such additional, updated obligations or conditions (if any) as agreed by officers on behalf of the Assistant Director – Place and Growth).

B. Alternative recommendation: That the Planning Committee authorises the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission in the event that: 1. A S106 legal agreement satisfactory to officers (on behalf of the Assistant Director – Place and Growth) is not completed within 6 months.

14. APPLICATION NO 250735 LAND TO THE NORTH OF SCHOOL ROAD ARBORFIELD CROSS

Proposal: Outline application for the proposed residential development of up to 70 dwellings together with associated access, landscaping, open space and associated works. (All matters reserved except for means of access.)

Applicant: Croudace Homes, Vortal Homes Limited and Falcon Developments (SE) Limited

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 135 to 217.

The Committee was advised of the following updates:

- Six additional representations had been received following the publication of the agenda.
- The Council had received reports of badger presence within the site. The Council was aware of locations of badger setts in the area and considered that the proposal would not result in fragmentation of their foraging habitats, in particular given the green infrastructure provision around the perimeter of the site, or impact on significant setts.
- The remaining five additional representations had covered a number of issues including impact on local wildlife and habitats, boundary treatment between the school and development, traffic generation and closure of School Road, and the safety of the children attending The Coombes.
- Arborfield and Newland Parish Council response to officer comments.
- Amendment to Condition 1 around Reserved Matters.

- Additional Condition 34 around Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Since the submission of the Agenda, the applicant had committed to the delivery of 20% of BNG on-site, which would be secured by condition.

Paul Stevens, Arborfield and Newland Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) tilted balance test required equal consideration of economic, social, and environmental factors. He believed that the proposal did not meet the environmental test, and as such was not sustainable development. The location was sub-optimal and walking distances to facilities were measured via Cole Lane, however, improvements to this route might be undeliverable due to environmental concerns. Paul Stevens noted that the travel plan was to be submitted after determination which meant that the measures detailed in the report were not guaranteed. He emphasised that developers often applied to vary conditions once permission had been granted, reducing motivation to honour initial commitments.

Paul Stevens went on to state that the benefits of the application had been overplayed and the disbenefits underplayed. Measures such as a car club and e-bike vouchers were insufficient to offset increased traffic from the proposed houses. In addition, three storey dwellings on rising land, abutting the countryside, were inappropriate and would create a negative visual impact for the residents of Cole Lane and Wood Lane. Paul Stevens added that reducing the scheme in size by 25 houses had not addressed earlier concerns that the site was unsuitable, and the density proposed exceeded the local housing density. He believed that no weight had been given to the decision to permanently close School Road to traffic and emphasised that the Committee was entitled to disagree with officers should it feel issues had been underweighted and material matters omitted, or if it disagreed with the planning judgement. Finally, Paul Stevens indicated that there was no medical facility at Arborfield Cross.

Iain Lingwood, resident, spoke in objection to the application. He commented that the NPPF stated that local authorities should ensure that planning decisions conserve and enhance biodiversity and must refuse permission if significant harm could not be avoided or adequately mitigated. Badgers, a protected species, had twice within the last week, been identified on the site, contrary to the ecological report in the planning application. Environmental harm would be caused by the proposed development. Iain Lingwood urged the Committee to request that a thorough reassessment of the site's ecological status and a review of whether the tilted balance was still valid, be undertaken. Iain Lingwood also raised the issue of safety outside The Coombes Primary School. School Road was already a dangerous bottleneck at school times and additional traffic from the development would exacerbate this. Councillors were reminded that the NPPF stated that developments must ensure safe and suitable access could be achieved for all users. Iain Lingwood stated that an onsite highways assessment during school hours was essential. He asked that the Committee defer the application until the points raised around highway safety and ecology were addressed.

Craig Pettit, agent, spoke in support of the application. The application had followed a previous refusal on a larger site area, and an appeal had been submitted with regards to this. He commented that there was a housing shortage and that this was chronic in the Borough. 40% of housing in the site would be affordable housing. Craig Pettit emphasised the importance of communities having the ability to thrive through choice. The Coombes School had been regularly undersubscribed, a trend which could continue unless Arborfield Cross was able to provide housing that kept pace with local population growth and change. The delivery of 28 affordable homes would help to address the

housing need within the Borough. Improvements which would be delivered by the applicant via 278 agreements were outlined.

Councillor Joseph Barley, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He commented that it had been previously ruled that an acceptable design for a major development could not be achieved on this site. A previous application of slightly greater scale had been found to constitute a coalescence of settlements. The application contradicted the Council's intention to divert traffic away from Arborfield Cross, and risked reintroducing unacceptable levels of traffic to School Road, putting school children at risk. Councillor Barley emphasised that measures such as car clubs and e bike vouchers relied on a suitable take up from residents to make a genuine difference and did not take possible behaviours into consideration. He referred to the proposed contributions to medical facilities in other areas through S106 agreements, highlighting the lack of local facilities. There would be an unacceptable loss of landscape in countryside land and contravention of existing and emerging Local Plan policies, and other S106 obligations which failed to meet an acceptable level of remediation. He was of the view that the disbenefits of the application considerably outweighed the benefits.

Councillor Wayne Smith asked about access and School Road. Alan Lewis, Highways Officer responded that the closure was further along School Road, close to Wood Lane. The resultant change on the relevant part of School Road would be the addition of the development and school traffic, so traffic would still be approximately 10-15% of what it was prior to the closure of School Road.

Councillor Wayne Smith asked why Highways had submitted an objection. Alan Lewis clarified that there had been concerns about the site location and sustainability. He referred to the tilted balance.

Councillor Glover queried whether consideration had been given to moving the bollards dividing School Road so that access was via the other end. Alan Lewis indicated that the application was as presented. Whilst traffic on that section of the road would increase, the accumulative residual effect and a degree of betterment had been established. The remaining traffic calming measures outside of the school were less effective because traffic flow was substantially lower and the proposals sought to modify this.

Councillor Caroline Smith noted that this site had not originally been included in the Local Plan and questioned why it was now suitable. Joanna Carter, Case Officer, stated that the site had been assessed as part of the Local Plan Update. Due to its proximity to services and facilities it had been considered unsustainable. It was a high-level assessment and since the HELAA had taken place there had been a number of changes such as improved bus service frequency, proposed additional improvements to access and safer pedestrian crossings for Eversley Road. Alan Lewis highlighted the impact of the Public Right of Way Plan, Bus Service Improvement Plan and the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. Councillor Caroline Smith sought clarification around the future long-term funding of the additional bus service.

Councillor Iyengunmwena queried the differences between the previously refused application and the present proposal. Joanna Carter highlighted some of the differences between the applications. For example, the issue of site coalescence between Arborfield Cross and Langley Common, and also Arborfield Cross and Barkham Hill, and the impact on heritage assets were no longer of concern following the removal of the eastern field from the application. Brian Conlon, Acting Head Development Management, reminded the

Committee that the previous scheme and the decision to refuse it had not at that time been tested at appeal.

In response to a question from Councillor Glover regarding Swallowfield Medical Practice, Joanna Carter stated that the Integrated Care Board would have to identify how the increase in floorspace could be achieved. Project work would need to take place, either at the Arborfield Cross Surgery or another branch operated by Swallowfield Medical Practice.

Councillor Andrea commented that the proposals conflicted with the Spatial Strategy policies as it was outside settlement boundaries and exceeded the scale of development for Arborfield Cross as a limited development location. The Spatial Strategy needed to be applied flexibly to enable sufficient land for housing to come forward.

Councillor Wayne Smith was of the view that the proposal was not sustainable and would not have been recommended for approval had the Council not had a 1.7-year land supply.

Councillor Andrea stated that 40% affordable housing was a positive.

The Committee discussed tilted balance.

RESOLVED: That application 250735 be approved subject to the (i) conditions and informatives as set out in Appendix 1, amended condition 1 and additional condition 34 as set out in the Update paper, and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure the following planning obligations:

- Affordable Housing – 40% secured on site
- Healthcare – contribution towards improvements of healthcare facilities at Swallowfield Medical Practice
- Employment and Skills – Employment and Skills Plan or financial contribution in lieu
- Thames Basing Heaths SPA – off-site mitigation secured via the Ridge SANG
- Travel Plan – submission of a travel plan
- Travel Plan – where required, fees for monitoring of a travel plan
- My Journey – contribution towards My Journey (to be agreed)
- Roads – management and maintenance responsibilities
- Management Company – details of establishment
- Public Open Space – policy compliant on-site provision
- Public Open Space – management and maintenance responsibilities
- Off-site Sports Facilities – financial contribution
- Public Transport Service Improvements – bus service contribution (Bus Route 3)
- Public Transport Infrastructure Improvements – contribution towards improvements of 2 no. bus stops (The Swan)
- Public Rights of Way – contribution towards upgrading of a section of a surface of Cole Lane
- Biodiversity Net Gain – submission of Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan
- Biodiversity Net Gain – fees towards monitoring
- Traffic Regulation Order – payment of fees

OR (ii) That the committee authorises the Head of Development Management to refuse full planning permission if the legal agreement is not completed within six months of the date of this resolution (unless officers on behalf of the Head of Development Management agree to a later date for completion of the legal agreement).

15. APPLICATION NO 241350 FLAT 42 STANLAKE HOUSE, RUSCOMBE PARK, RUSCOMBE

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 12no. residential apartments in two blocks, with associated servicing and landscaping.

Applicant: Mr H Schneck

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 227 to 269.

The Committee was advised of the following updates:

- Clarification around an existing small brick building.

Councillor Akhtar stated that the application was a positive and much needed type of development in the area.

Councillor Andrea asked about affordable housing. Benjamin Hindle, Case Officer responded that there would be a modest contribution.

Councillor Andrea sought clarification regarding trees on the site. Benjamin Hindle indicated that the site was part of a landscape character area and the proposal would result in the loss of two TPO trees, and also the partial encroachment of between 11-15% of five other separate trees.

RESOLVED: That application 241350 be approved subject to conditions, informatives and the following obligations:

- Affordable Housing Contribution – £26,065 My Journey/ Travel Plan - Contribution of £540 per dwelling towards MyJourney or Travel Plan to be provided.
- Employment and Skills Plan – Employment and Skills Plan or in lieu contribution to be provided
- Details of Estate Roads
- Details of Management Company Biodiversity Net Gain – Monitoring of the LEMP to ensure the BNG objectives are met over a 30 year period.

OR; That the committee authorise the Head of Development Management to REFUSE full planning permission if the legal agreement is not completed within six months of the date of this resolution (unless officers on behalf of the Head of Development Management agree to a later date for completion of the legal agreement).