

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	242665
Site Address:	Land west of Kingfisher Grove, Three Mile Cross
Expiry Date:	4 July 2025
Site Visit Date:	8 November 2024
Proposal: Application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline Planning Consent 201002 (approved under appeal ref. APP/X0360/W/22/3304042 dated 31/01/2023) for the erection of 49 no. affordable dwellings with associated drainage and attenuation, open space and landscaping. Details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be considered, plus details for discharge of conditions 11, 12, 13, 15 and 16 from the Outline permission.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Contaminated Land Consultation Zone
Affordable Housing Thresholds
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Scale and Location of Development Proposals – **Countryside (CP11)**
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone – **Green and Amber Risk Zone**
Ground Water Zones
Nuclear Consultation Zone – **Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) for AWE Burghfield**
Public Open Space
Landfill Gas Consultation Zone
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
Thames Basin Heaths SPA Mitigation Zones – **7km Linear Mitigation Zone**
PRoW Within WB Consultation Zone
Ordinary Watercourses Consultation Zone
Ordinary Watercourse

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) National Design Guide
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP2 – Inclusive Communities CP3 – General Principles for Development CP4 – Infrastructure Requirements CP5 – Housing Mix, Density and Affordability CP6 – Managing Travel Demand CP7 – Biodiversity CP8 – Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals

	CP11 – Proposals Outside Development Limits CP17 – Housing Delivery
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC04 – Sustainable Design and Construction CC05 – Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks CC06 – Noise CC07 – Parking CC09 – Development and Flood Risk CC10 – Sustainable Drainage TB04 – Development in vicinity of Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE), Burghfield TB05 – Housing Mix TB07 – Internal Space Standards TB08 – Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities Standards TB12 – Employment Skills Plan TB21 – Landscape Character TB23 – Biodiversity and Development TB25 – Archaeology
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document A Vision for Our Villages: Ryeish Green, Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (March 2015)

PLANNING HISTORY		
Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
F/1999/70608	Proposed Change of Use Of Agricultural Building To Storage Of Landscaping Material (B8 Use).	Refused 23/12/1999
TP/2003/8699	Application for temporary change of use of agricultural building to site office. Retrospective.	Refused 23/07/2003
201002	Outline planning application for the proposed erection of 49 affordable dwellings, with new publicly accessible open space and access (access to be considered)	Non-Determination Appeal – Allowed 31/01/2023

CONSULTATION RESPONSES
Internal
WBC Property Services – No comments received WBC Environmental Health – No comments received WBC Drainage – No objections WBC Highways – No objection subject to condition(s)

WBC Growth & Delivery (Planning Policy) – No comments received
WBC Economic Prosperity & Place (Community Infrastructure)
WBC Green Infrastructure – Commentary on LAP provision
WBC Landscape and Trees No objection subject to condition(s)
WBC Health and Wellbeing – No comments received
WBC Public Rights Of Way – No comments received
WBC Community Safety – No comments received
WBC Emergency Planning – No comments received
WBC Built Heritage Officer – No objections
WBC CIL – General CIL commentary
WBC Education (School Place Planning) – No comments received
WBC Cleaner and Greener – No comments received
WBC Ecology Newts – No objections
WBC Sustainability – No objection subject to condition(s)
WBC Sports Development (Places and Neighbourhoods) – No comments received

External

Office for Nuclear Regulation – No comments received
Binfield Badger Group – Advisory comments on pre-commencement check
Natural England – No comments received
Southern Gas Networks – Advisory commentary on works affecting gas lines
Thames Water Utilities Ltd – No comments received
The Environment Agency – No comments received
Berkshire Archaeology – Insufficient information to discharge condition 12
West Berks Emergency Planning Officer – No comments received
Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue – Advisory commentary for emergency vehicle access/road weight.
Active Travel England – No comment
NHS Wokingham CCG – No comments received
AWE Burghfield – No comments received
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust – No comments received
Crime Prevention Design Advisor – Advisory comments on rear access for Plots 1-8, gates for plots 42 and 45 and defensive planting for boundaries.
SSE Power Distribution – Advisory commentary on works affecting electricity lines

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Shinfield Parish Council (SPC) make the following comments: <u>Highways</u> SPC would stress that the current proposed signalisation of the Church Lane/Basingstoke Road junction does not currently include ANY improvement to the 'T-junction' of Grazeley Road/Basingstoke Road which remains as an uncontrolled Keep Clear Box. This junction must be supported by a yellow hatching box with CCTV monitoring of breaches of stopping within such a yellow hatched box. This would ensure that traffic entering/leaving Grazeley Road, be
---------------------	--

	it northbound (left turn) or southbound (right turn) is unimpeded. Otherwise, the Grazeley Road/Basingstoke Road junction must be brought into the signalised operation of the whole Basingstoke Road/Church Lane/Grazeley Road arrangement, (which has consistently been refused by the developers and WBC). <i>(Officer comment: Condition 7 requires full details of the construction of the access onto Grazeley Road to be approved by the Council prior to the commencement of development.)</i> <u>S106 Agreement</u> The Planning Inspector referred to the Woodcock Lane BOAT as in need of upgrading to allow full use by vehicles from the development. SPC would stress that Woodcock Lane was designated a BOAT in error, and that any improvement of the surface (very desirable) must be tied to its redesignation as a Byeway for horses, pedestrians and cyclists but NOT motorised vehicles other than permitted maintenance ones. This must include access restrictions through appropriate gates etc. The drawing in the application 200102 Appeal Transport Appendix is ITB15490-GA-016 and the developer cost contribution proposed in 65k. <i>(Officer comment: The re-classification of Woodcock Lane as a bridleway is not a planning matter and must be dealt with outside of the planning process.)</i> <u>Conditions</u> SPC would stress that conditions 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 18 must be met in their entirety. Note that condition 18 is based on Drawing ITB15490-GA-017 in the application 200102 Appeal Transport Appendix and refers to Tactile paving to designate pedestrian crossing points at Moorhen Court and Loxwood Close, given the increased pedestrian footfall arising from the development. Shinfield Parish Council made the following comments following the re-consultation period between 6th March 2025 and 3rd April 2024: - the garden layout for plots 24/25 look particularly badly designed and should be redrawn. Having a garden physically separate from the property is not a good design practice. Many of the other gardens are poorly shaped with numerous angles and corners; plots 32,33, 34 & 35 vary considerably in
--	---

	size for the same type of dwelling. The inadequate designs of the gardens do not make this development a nice place to live. - The one bedroom flats are only given one allocated parking space, whilst this may be inline with the very limited WBC policies it is wholly inadequate for this site, especially considering the distance to any form of public transport. This poor design will lead to on-road and verge parking by residents. Increasing the allocated spaces for the one bedroom flats from 1 to 2 would resolve this problem. - The access to Woodcock Lane (the BOAT) needs to be carefully considered. This pathway needs to be downgraded to a bridlepath to avoid it being destroyed by motorbikes and 4x4s. The plans do not give enough information on access to this path, both from the north of the site, and other places along the border. At a minimum, there should be additional accesses from the southern field and at the southern end of the houses. It is imperative that access should only be for pedestrians, bikes and pushchairs, and must limit access by cars or motorbikes. During construction of the site, Woodcock Lane must remain open to users with the northern entrance fully accessible. It must not be blocked by construction vehicles. It must also remain safe for users, including horses. - The installation of electric charging points and air source heat pumps is welcome but must be guaranteed. The installation of PV panels is also welcomed but it seems odd that many of them are on the north facing roofs, these should be realigned where possible to maximise efficiency. (Officer comment: EV Charging Points are now a Building Regulations requirement.) - The landscaping process seem acceptable. - The straight line road layout for the western side of the development should have clearer traffic calming measures installed otherwise it will become a racetrack for vehicles leaving the site. This could be achieved by using raised tables or pinch points. (Officer comment: The roads include traffic calming measures such as speed bumps and shared surfaces to mitigate this.) - We would like clearer information on the SUDs system that is proposed; mainly to do with the impact of flooding on Woodcock Lane. Will this SUDs system change the water runoff that appears on Woodcock Lane in any way? Could it reduce the amount of flooding on this lane, which would be
--	--

	welcome, or would it increase the water level to a point where the lane becomes impassable more often. - The play areas proposed are particularly uninspiring, especially considering the distance that this development is from the rest of the villages. More substantial play areas should be designed and incorporated into this development.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	33 representations received from local residents raising the following concerns: - Extra traffic impacting area. - Distance from settlement would result in residents using private vehicles instead of walking to access facilities and amenities. (Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.) - No provision for schooling, impact on already oversubscribed. - Roadworks will be excessive for the area. (Officer comment: Whilst it is acknowledged that works associated with the development may cause minor disturbances for adjacent properties, these impacts will be mitigated via a Construction Method Statement, secured via condition 9 of Outline Consent 201002.) - Impact on on-street parking. - Impact on local wildlife. - Devalue surrounding properties (Officer comment: This is not a material planning consideration.) - Destruction of public bridleway. (Officer comment: The S106 agreement associated with the 201002 Outline Consent includes an obligation to improve it.) - Loss of green space. - Lack of infrastructure to support dwellings. - Inadequate parking provision. - Impact on Highway safety. - Impact on local doctors' surgeries. - Lack of public transport links for the estate (Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.) - Development is outside of settlement limits and contrary to CP11 (Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.) - Development would close the gap between Three Mile Cross and Shinfield (Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.)

	- Impact on DEPZ and concerns for safety of residents (Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.) - Access from Grazeley Road inadequate/ Improvements needed to surrounding roads to facilitate development. (Officer comment: Condition 7 requires full details of the construction of the access onto Grazeley Road to be approved by the Council prior to the commencement of development.) - No children's play area (Officer comment: A play area is proposed to the southern end of the site.) - Impact on flood risk for surrounding properties. - Design of dwellings poor quality and not in-keeping with the area. - Disturbance to existing residents during construction. (Officer comment: Impacts on nearby residents will be mitigated via a Construction Method Statement, secured via condition 9 of Outline Consent 201002.) - Impact on existing sewage pump. - Pollution concerns related to additional traffic. - Alternative sites available. (Officer comment: Alternative sites are irrelevant to the determination of this application.) - Need to comply with the 201002 conditions. - Improvements to access and BOAT need to be secured via a S106 legal agreement. Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.) - Disagree with the Inspectorate's conclusions on DEPZ impact and need to provide further evacuation measures(Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent and does not require further documentation to be assessed under this application.) - Impact on dwellings by reason of noise from adjacent commercial workshop. 17 representations received following the re-consultation period between 6th March 2025 and 3rd April 2024 raising the following concerns: - Inadequate transport infrastructure - Traffic would be severely impacted - Local drainage inadequate - Lack of local amenities/infrastructure - Impact on wildlife - Grazeley Road not suitable for construction traffic
--	--

	- Impact on AWE Blue light plan (Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.) - Air quality issues due to increased traffic - Noise pollution detrimental to wildlife - Alternative sites available (Officer comment: The determination of this application cannot consider alternative sites.) - Application was previously refused (Officer comment: Outline Consent 201002 was allowed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.) - Flooding concerns - Unsustainable location (Officer comment: This matter was covered by the 201002 Outline Consent.) - Doctors/Schools do not have capacity - Loss of green infrastructure - Thames Water infrastructure inadequate (Officer comment: The applicant has confirmed capacity with Thames Water.) - Limited parking provision - Not in-keeping with area
--	--

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The application site is outside of any defined settlement limits and is within the countryside. The access to the north would abut the boundary of the Modest Development Location of Three Mile Cross.

The site is an undeveloped agricultural field(s). There is an agricultural barn located to the north of the site, which is excluded from the definition of development in the 1990 Act. To the north of the site is residential areas of Kingfisher Grove and Grazeley Road. To the east there is a public byway and the A33. To the south and west are fields and paddocks.

The site slopes upwards from west to east and forms part of a characteristic undulating ridgeline in the landscape. There are mature trees around the edge of the site and marking the field boundaries.

The site is also within the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) for the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) at Burghfield.

Proposal Description:

This is a Reserved Matters (RM) application, pursuant to outline consent 201002 (approved under appeal ref. APP/X0360/W/22/3304042 dated 31/01/2023) for the

erection of 49 no. affordable dwellings with associated drainage and attenuation, open space and landscaping.

This RM application addresses the consideration of the development's appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Further to this, the applicant wishes to discharge the following conditions imposed on the 201002 outline consent:

- Condition 11 (Sustainable Drainage System)
- Condition 12 (Written Scheme of Investigation – Archaeology)
- Condition 13 (Arboricultural Method Statement)
- Condition 15 (10% Biodiversity Net Gain)
- Condition 16 (Landscape Environmental Management Plan)

Principle of Development:

General:

The starting point for decision making is the development plan. Section 70[2] of the TCPA 1990 & 38[6] of the PCPA 2004 states that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The plan-led approach established in law is reinforced through the NPPF including paragraph 48:

'Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

The Development Plan includes the Core Strategy (adopted in January 2010) and the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (adopted in February 2014) (MDD Local Plan). The Core Strategy and MDD Local Plan sets out the vision for the borough and the policies to achieve those objectives. The core spatial strategy established by the Core Strategy was informed by engagement with the community.

The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The site lies within the Countryside as designated in the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy. Core Strategy policy CP11 states, in order to protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain the quality of the environment, proposals outside of development limits will not normally be permitted except in certain circumstances. These exceptions are:

- 1) It contributes to diverse and sustainable rural enterprises within the borough, or in the case of other countryside based enterprises and activities, it contributes and/or promotes recreation in, and enjoyment of, the countryside; and

- 2) It does not lead to excessive encroachment or expansion of development away from the original buildings; and
- 3) It is contained within suitably located buildings which are appropriate for conversion, or in the case of replacement buildings would bring about environmental improvement; or
- 4) In the case of residential extensions, does not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building;
- 5) In the case of replacement dwellings the proposal must:
 - i) Bring about environmental improvements;
 - or ii) Not result in inappropriate increases in the scale, form or footprint of the original building.
- 6) Essential community facilities cannot be accommodated within development limits or through the re-use/replacement of an existing building;
- 7) Affordable housing on rural exception sites in line with CP9.

Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy states ‘the scale of development proposals in the borough must reflect the existing or proposed levels of facilities and services at or in the location, together with their accessibility.’

Policy CP6 states of the Core Strategy states:

‘Planning permission will be granted for schemes that:

a) Provide for sustainable forms of transport to allow choice;

b) Are located where there are or will be at the time of development choices in the mode of transport available and which minimise the distance people need to travel;’

Policy TB04 of the MDD allows development in the vicinity of the Atomic Weapons Establishment at Burghfield but only where the increase in density can be safely accommodated. Policy TB04 states development will only be permitted where the applicant demonstrates that the increase in the number of people living, working, shopping and/or visiting the proposal can be safely accommodated having regard to the needs of “Blue light” services and the Off-site Emergency Plan (OSEP) for the Atomic Weapons Establishment site at Burghfield.

Local Plan Update (LPU):

The Council are also progressing with their Local Plan Update (LPU) which has progressed beyond the Proposed Submission Plan (Regulation 19) stage, with representations received on the plan’s legal compliance and soundness between 30 September and 13 November 2024.

The Proposed Submission Plan (Regulation 19) consultation has now closed and the Council have now analysed the representations received. The Regulation 22 plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in February 2025, and two Planning Inspectors have been appointed to examine (EiP) the plan. The examination of the local plan is ongoing, and the council responded to initial questions and requests from the Inspectors in May 2025.

As seen in High Court judgements, even when an emerging plan is at an advanced stage, it may still attract limited weight if further consultation and modifications are required, and the Inspector has yet to issue a final report. Wokingham's LPU has several stages yet to be completed, including and the examination hearings and main modifications stages, which restricts the weight that can currently be afforded to non-substantive.

LPU policies of particular relevance to the application are:

- SS1 (Sustainable development principles)
- SS2 (Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy)
- SS3 (Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements)
- SS5 (Development in the Countryside)
- SS7 (Development in the vicinity of Atomic Weapons Establishments)
- H3 (Affordable Housing)

The Council however acknowledge that there unresolved objections on substantive grounds pursuant of all of the conditions listed above, meaning weight attracted to these policies is limited. Notwithstanding this, as this application is at Reserved Matters stage, the Outline consent was deemed acceptable in principle when assessed against the relevant basket of policies (Core Strategy 2010) that the policies listed above would supersede.

Housing Supply:

Section 5 of the NPPF relates to delivering a sufficient supply of homes. Paragraph 61 states that to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. The overall aim should be to meet an area's identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community.

Policy CP17 of the Core Strategy refers to a requirement for at least 13,487 new dwellings with associated development and infrastructure between 2006 and 2026.

To achieve sustainable development, the NPPF requires LPAs to identify a five-year supply of specific deliverable sites to meet housing needs.

Following the publication of the new NPPF in December 2024, the Council released their Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (as of 31st March 2024) which concluded that the Council's housing land supply had been reduced to 1.7 years. Subsequently, Core Strategy Policies CP9 and CP11, as well as MDD Local Plan Policy CC02 identified above, which are most important for determining applications for new housing, are considered out-of-date in accordance with Paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 11 states that where policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless:

- the application of policies in the Framework that protect assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Outline Consent and Consented Parameters:

The 201002 Outline Consent established the acceptability of the proposed development in principle, notwithstanding the conflicts with Development Plan highlighted by the Council at appeal.

Matters resolved/approved via the Outline Consent consist of:

- Acceptability of the development in the Countryside (Core Strategy Policy CP11)
- Acceptability of the development in terms of its impact on the Blue Light Emergency Plan, due to its location within the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) for AWE Burghfield. (MDD Local Plan Policy TB04)
- The location of the site in terms of access to sustainable modes of transport (Core Strategy Policies CP6 & CP9 and MDD Local Plan Policy CC01).
- The dwelling density proposed (49no. dwellings).
- The development parameters.

The purpose of this RM application is not to re-consider these matters as they have already been established as acceptable. There has been no change in circumstances that would warrant a different conclusion on the principle of development from the allowed appeal decision.

Character of the Area:

Policy Context:

Policy CP11 supports development in the countryside only where it maintains the high quality of the rural environment. Policy CP1(1) similarly only supports development that maintains or enhances the high quality of the environment, with policy CP3 supporting development of an appropriate mass, layout, built form, height and character to the area CP3(a) and which makes a positive contribution to the sense of place contributes to the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings CP3(f).

The Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document provides further guidance for developers with general guidance that development should respond positively to its site and local context (G1) and respond positively to the local character of the area (G2).

Policy TB21 of the Managing Development Delivery Local Plan states that proposals must demonstrate how they have addressed the requirements of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment, including the landscape quality; landscape strategy; landscape sensitivity and key issues. Proposals should retain or enhance the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape.

Policy CC02 of the MDD Local Plan states that development at the edge of settlements is acceptable where it is demonstrated that it is within development limits and respects the transition between the built up area and the open countryside by taking account of the character of the adjacent countryside and landscape.

Policy CC03 of the MDD Local Plan states that new development should protect and enhance green infrastructure networks, promoting connectivity between different parts of the network and integrating with adjacent open space.

RD9 of the Borough Design Guide SPD requires that development on the settlement edge create an edge and incorporate soft landscaping to integrate to the rural setting.

The National Design Guide section B1, paragraph 67 also states that the built form of well-designed places should relate well to:

- the site, its context and the opportunities they present;
- the proposed identity and character for the development in the wider place;

Paragraph 68 follows on from this stating that houses and streets should establish an appropriate relationship with the pattern, sizes and proportions of existing houses in the local area.

With regards to well-designed places, paragraph 135 of the NPPF states planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; 39
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

Similarly, paragraph 139 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Layout

The proposed development consists of 49no. dwellings, accessed from Kingfisher Grove to the north. The access road into the site extends southwards with large amount

of grassland to either side, leading to the two main arterial roads through the estate that would loop round and connect at the southern end.

Upon travelling down the access road from Kingfisher Grove, the two arterial roads through the estate are visually divided by a large, triangular shaped area of amenity grassland; this area of amenity land would be characterised by a large tree at its apex, enforcing the verdant enclosure of the site's rural surroundings. Additional areas of planting are proposed further southwards and divided by a small footpath and an area for bench seating.

Plots 1-8 (semi-detached) would be sited adjacent to the site's north-eastern boundary, with parking consciously sited to the sides of each dwelling, allowing for the frontages of the dwellings to be characterised by areas of soft landscaping and planting, this is welcomed. Plots 1 and 8 would also be dual aspect and bookended, ensuring no blank frontages onto areas of public space.

The western arterial road is densely lined with tree planting and is generally straight in form. Visitor parking spaces also line the western edge of the road. Dwelling frontages along this road are varied, ranging from dual aspect semi-detached dwellings to several maisonettes and a four-dwelling terrace.

Similarly, the parking layout is also varied; Plots 29, 30, 31, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46 and 47 all have their parking sited to the side of the frontages but in comparison, the rest of the dwellings along this road, primarily including the maisonettes (Plots 32-35) and the four dwelling terrace (Plots 42-45) all have parking on their frontages. This inconsistency in the parking layout does appear relatively disjointed in places but by reason of the parameter plan's spatial constraints and the conscious efforts to soften the appearance of these frontages through additional planting provision, the visual impact of this would be negligible in the wider context of the estate.

The eastern arterial road is more curved than the western side and fronts the main areas of open space to the east. Like the western road, the edges of the road/footpaths are densely lined with additional tree planting, providing a sense of verdant enclosure for users and inhabitants of the estate.

The parking layout on the eastern road is similar to that of the western road, in that the location of parking in relation to the host dwellings either ranges between being to the side of dwellings or adjacent to the frontages. Soft landscaping provision has been agreed between the Applicant and Council to help break up and soften the visual impacts of the parking layout which are welcomed.

The centre of the estate would be characterised by a 8 dwelling cul-de-sac (Plots 13-20), accessed by vehicles via the eastern estate road, with pedestrian access available onto the western estate road. This area of the estate would be lined with generous areas of amenity grassland and tree planting, with the end plots all being dual-aspect/bookended to ensure no blank frontages and to ensure a sufficient level of passive surveillance. The layout is spacious and well landscaped and is acceptable to the Council.

The southern end of the estate is where the eastern and western estate roads connect. 4no. visitor spaces line the southern development boundary of the estate, adjacent to one of the designated Local Areas of Play (LAP). The eastern loop connection would be finished with a shared surface for both pedestrians and vehicles and lies adjacent to another large area of amenity grassland and tree planting, accompanied by street furniture such as bench seating. Three dwellings front this southern connection road (Plots 26-28) all of which have parking sited to the sides of the dwellings and thus allowing for small areas of soft landscaping on their frontages. Dense tree planting also lines the southern connection road, providing an appropriate and generally sensitive transition to the open Countryside further southwards.

The provision of both open spaces and LAPs throughout the estate are generous in both number and scale. The east of the site is characterised by a drastic change of levels that includes a large, grassed hill that would provide walking and recreational opportunities for local residents. There are three LAPs proposed, with the largest located to the southern end of the site and two smaller areas along the western road, adjacent to the Woodcock Lane BOAT. Their siting throughout the site is sensible and allows for sufficient levels of passive surveillance and their rural/natural designs are in-keeping with the site's context.

Overall, the proposed layout of the development is considered acceptable. Conscious efforts have been made to sensitively integrate the estate into its rural surroundings and the general layout of the estate is spacious, varied and ensures a consistent set of active frontages, softened by large areas of landscaping/tree planting.

Scale:

Condition 19 of the 201002 Outline Consent requires the dwellings proposed to not be more than two storeys in height, and no dwelling can exceed higher than 61.5m AOD.

The submitted sectional plans for the estate indicate that all of the dwellings proposed do not exceed more than two storeys in height and all of them are compliant with the maximum 61.5m AOD restriction. This is welcomed and acceptable, ensuring no conflicts with the drastic changes in topography heading eastwards.

The scale of development density on site has already been consented by 201002. Aside from their heights, the dimensions of the dwellings are all modest in scale and legibly spaced apart from each other, assisted by the large areas of soft landscaping and tree planting.

Overall, the scale of the proposed development, pursuant of Outline Consent 201002, is acceptable.

Appearance:

In terms of dwelling design, there are three main design types proposed:



All three of the design choices proposed all incorporate traditional gable roofs which is positively reflective of the surrounding built environment within Three Mile Cross. Similarly, the choice of either standard red brick or red-multi brick for the elevations is visually in-keeping with the surrounding area.

Further to the choice of red multi-brick for the elevations, the windows for the dwellings are characterised with vertical brick lintels. House type 1 also includes areas of raised brick patterns on their frontages, enhancing the textural appearance of the dwellings and ensuring a variety to the street scene.

All of the dwellings would include flat roofed, single storey porches on their frontages which would be primarily comprised of vertical black timber style cladding. The incorporation of this material choice is in-keeping with the rural character and generally, their modern forms are a welcome contrast to the appearance of the main dwelling elevations.

Mock chimneys have been incorporated on all of the key and gateway buildings within the estate, allowing for breaks in the roof form and further variety to the street scene, this is welcomed. The lack of breaks in the roof form for several of the semi-detached pairs and the four dwelling terrace is noted but the visual impact of their absence would be negligible on the wider context of the estate and generally lessened due to the increase in variety of other dwelling roof designs.

The roofs of the dwellings would be finished with two different types of roof tile; Red/Brown tiles or a Grey 'Slate-Style' tiles. Each roof tile design is distributed evenly throughout the estate to ensure a variety to the street scene and both tile choices are sufficiently in-keeping with the surrounding built environment.

The windows for the dwellings are proposed to be finished with a dark grey colour. The Council have requested that this is reverted to a black colour to remain in-keeping with the design of the porches and the guttering and drainage. As such, a condition will be imposed ensuring details of their final finishes are submitted prior to development commencing above slab level.

Overall, the appearance of the proposed dwellings would be acceptably in-keeping with the prevailing character of the area.

The LPA consider it necessary to impose a site-wide permitted development restriction on Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F (hard surfaces incidental to the enjoyment of a

dwellinghouse). Specifically, this restriction would limit the laying of hard surfaces forward of dwelling elevations that front the highway/access roads.

The reasoning behind this condition's imposition surrounds the already limited nature of front garden provision which varies across the estate. The green infrastructure throughout and surrounding the site would be central to the verdant character of the estate in this sensitive countryside location and therefore, in line with policies CC03 and TB21 of the MDD Local Plan, its retention would be necessary to preserve the site's character and that of the prevailing countryside.

Affordable Housing:

The Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) July 2013 provides guidance on the Council's approach to securing affordable housing in accordance with Policy CP5. It sets out, subject to viability, the minimum percentages of affordable housing sought on site by land type and location.

This application is for 100% affordable housing. The proposed split is below:

TENURE	AFFORDABLE HOUSING DWELLING SIZE	NUMBER OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING DWELLINGS
Social Rent	1-bed	2
	2-bed	15
	3-bed	10
	4-bed	7
Shared Ownership	1-bed	4
	2-bed	4
	3-bed	7
TOTAL		49

These figures vary slightly from those previously consented as part of the 201002 Outline application. However, it is important to note that S106 Legal Agreement associated with consent 201002 includes a mechanism that allows both the applicant and Council to agree a revised mix in writing, providing it is acceptable to the Council.

The above housing mix was proposed by the applicant and subsequently approved by the Council's Affordable Housing Officer in June 2024. The WBC Affordable Housing team have since responded to this application, re-affirming its acceptance.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking:

Figure 4.25 of R16 of the Borough Design Guide details the minimum separation distances between buildings to maintain privacy and limit sense of enclosure. This

application involves exclusively two storey properties. The minimum separation distances for properties of this size are as follows:

- Front to front – 10 metres
- Back to back – 22 metres
- Back to flank – 12 metres

All of the proposed dwellings comply with the minimum requirements above, with the exception of the back to back distance between plots 9 and 48 which is only 21 metres. Whilst two metres short of the recommended minimum, the arcs of outlook from each respective property would be naturally skewed due to the orientations of the houses.

It is considered that despite the shortfall proposed, the overlooking impacts would be negligible and would not adversely harm the amenities of either dwelling's occupiers.

The majority of the back to back separation distances proposed are approximately 25 metres and therefore, in the event of a dormer being constructed under permitted development, the amenities of neighbouring dwellings are unlikely to be adversely affected.

In terms of the wider context of the area, the estate is adequately sited away from any existing dwellinghouses in the area to ensure no adverse overlooking concerns.

Obscure glazing is proposed within all of the bathroom windows, ensuring all flank fenestration does not adversely harm the amenities of adjoining properties. A condition will be imposed restricting certain windows to obscurity to protect neighbouring amenities.

Overbearing:

By reason of the development's aforementioned compliance with the Borough Design Guide's separation distance recommendations, the proposed development would not result in any adverse overbearing impacts onto the occupiers of any of the dwellings proposed.

In terms of the wider context of the area, the estate is adequately sited away from any existing dwellinghouses in the area to ensure no adverse overbearing concerns.

Loss of Light:

R18 of the Borough Design Guide states that dwellings must be designed to provide appropriate levels of daylight and sunlight to new and existing properties.

All of the dwellings proposed are adequately spaced and sited to ensure no adverse loss of light impacts onto any of their occupiers.

On the other hand, it is acknowledged that Plots 15 and 16 would have exclusively north-facing rear elevations. Despite this, open spaces to the east and west would allow adequate sunlight to the rear gardens in the mornings and evenings.

Noise:

Neighbouring dwellinghouses:

The estate is adequately sited away from any existing dwellinghouses in the area; Plot 1 is the closest to Kingfisher Grove and retains a minimum separation distance of 17 metres away from no.12 Kingfisher Grove.

WBC Environmental Health raise no concerns on noise grounds and it is not anticipated that the additional residential activity would detrimentally impact the amenities of existing, neighbouring properties.

With regards to construction work, condition 10 of consent 201002 restricts work to 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays, and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays. Providing these hours are complied with, it is not anticipated that the construction works would detrimentally impact the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Occupier Amenity (Proposed dwellinghouses):

Condition 17 of Outline consent 201002 requires the implementation the noise mitigation measures set out in the submitted noise assessment report (CampbellReith, project no. 13390, April 2020) prior to the occupation of the development.

As the estate would lie adjacent to the A33, a busy 70mph dual carriageway, this document outlined the necessary internal and external insulation required to ensure the occupiers of the dwellinghouses are not adversely affected by noise pollution.

Providing these mitigation measures are complied with, no objections are raised with regards to occupier amenities.

Residential Amenities:

Internal Amenities:

The internal space standards for new dwellings are set out in the Borough Design Guide and supported by Policy TB07 of the MDD.

All 49no. dwellings proposed meet the minimum standards required for their occupancy levels and would provide adequate internal space to serve future occupiers.

External Amenities:

The Borough Design Guide specifies a minimum depth of 11 metres for rear gardens and a 1 metre set-back from the site boundary to allow access thereto.

All of the two storey dwellinghouses proposed meet the minimum 11 metre recommendations which is acceptable. All of the garden spaces are also large enough in general design to accommodate standard activities such as clothes drying and children's play.

On the other hand, rear garden space for the maisonettes (Plots 24, 25, 32, 33, 34, 35) is limited. Despite this, there are no minimum standards for this dwelling type and as such, any provision for these dwellings is welcomed by the Council.

In terms of sunlight, all of the properties proposed would receive adequate daylight to their rear gardens. It has already been acknowledged that Plots 15 and 16 would have exclusively north-facing rear elevations but despite this, open spaces to the east and west would allow adequate sunlight to the rear gardens in the mornings and evenings.

In terms of boundary treatments, all of the garden boundaries that face onto the public realm have been consciously designed to ensure they have solid brick walls which is welcomed by both the Council and Thames Valley Police. Further to this, revised plans now provide a lockable gate and fence limiting access to rear of plots 1-8, limiting the potential for anti-social behaviour.

The majority of the dwellings proposed would have independent, lockable gates to reach their rear gardens which is welcomed. Plots 42-45 would have a shared access and to address this, lockable gates have been provided for all of the rear gates into each respective gardens. This is welcomed by the Council and Thames Valley Police.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

Parking

- It is proposed that there are 92 allocated spaces and 16 visitor/unallocated spaces.
- Highways have used the borough's parking calculator and confirms that this proposed level of parking is above the borough standards which is welcome.
- This would result in a parking ration of 2.2 which is welcome.
- Highways have assessed the location of the visitor spaces, and consider these acceptable.
- The parking spaces have been assessed, and these are 5m x 2.5m which is welcome. The parallel spaces are 6m x 3m which is also welcome.
- Drawing 24009-DWC-SP008-01-DR-A-0010-E has been submitted showing the parking spaces which is welcome and acceptable.
- As requested by highways, a parking management plan has been submitted which has been reviewed and is acceptable.
- WBC Highways is therefore content with the proposed parking.

Cycle Parking

- It is proposed that cycle parking will be provided in line with borough standards in sheds in rear gardens with direct access which is welcome.

Electric Vehicle Charging

- It is welcome that electric vehicle charging spaces will be provided for each dwelling under Building Control Regulations Approved Document S.

Access

- The principle and location of the access was agreed under appeal decision APP/X0360/W/22/3304042.
- Concerns have been raised regarding the inadequacy of the The detailed design of this junction has been secured by condition 7 of the Appeal decision which is welcome

Site Roads

- As part of the outline application and the agreed s106 agreement, the site roads will be maintained as private in perpetuity.
- There are obligations within the s106 that are pre-commencement obligations.
- Even though the roads will be private, these will need to be built to Borough standards.
- The proposed widths of the site roads are in line with Borough design guidance.
- Details of the estate roads and footways will be secured via condition.

Visibility Splays

- Forward visibility splays have been provided, and these are outside the private gardens for the plots which is welcome.
- Pedestrian splays (2m x 2m) have been provided for every plot that has a private driveway which crosses a pavement which is welcome.
- It is welcome that the visibility splays for a 20mph speed limit for the access by plot 13 and the junction opposite plot 1 have been submitted, these are acceptable.
- The visibility splays have been illustrated on drawing ITB19902-GA-004 Rev D which is welcome.

Swept paths

- Swept paths for a car, fire tender and refuse vehicle with acceptable dimensions have been submitted which is welcome. These have been reviewed and together with the forward visibility splays illustrated on drawing ITB19902-GA-004 Rev D are acceptable.
- However, due to the turning area to the south of plot 13, highways would have expected swept paths of a refuse vehicle manoeuvring here to be included. An additional plan (drawing ITB19902-GA-009) has been submitted which shows this swept path which is acceptable.
- Swept paths of a large car entering and leaving a variety of spaces has been submitted which is welcome.

Lighting

- WBC Highways would have expected to see a lighting strategy for this development however, Highways are content for it to be included within Highway Construction Details condition mentioned above.

Service Margins

- A plan showing the service margins is still required to be submitted. Highways is content to include this in the Highway Construction Details condition mentioned above.

Servicing

- Highways would have expected to see a plan showing that all dwellings can be serviced within the carrying distances set out in MfS.
- That being said, highways have carried out an assessment and due to the layout of this development all dwellings are within these carrying distances which is welcome.

Construction Management Plan

- Highways would normally have expected a Construction Management Plan to have been submitted in support of this planning application. However, one has been secured under condition 9 of the appeal decision.

Flooding and Drainage:

Condition 11:

Policy CC09 of the MDD Local Plan requires consideration of flood risk from historic flooding. Policy CC10 of the MDD Local Plan requires sustainable drainage methods and the minimisation of surface water flow.

Condition 11 of Outline Consent 201002 requires the submission off a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) prior to the commencement of development. As a result, this

application is supported by a Sustainable Drainage Strategy in order to discharge this condition.

WBC Drainage have reviewed the submitted strategy and have no objections to the approach taken. Condition 11 will therefore be discharged and compliance with the strategy submitted will be secured via condition.

Concerns have been raised by residents regarding the impacts onto the existing sewer infrastructure in the area. The applicant has confirmed an agreement with Thames Water is in place who have confirmed adequate capacity can be provided to the development.

Ecology:

General:

The revised plans received on 27th February 2025 have addressed the concerns that WBC Ecology previously raised with the exception of ecological permeability and showing the detail of how mitigation measure MM10 of the Updated Ecological Appraisal will be installed.

WBC Ecology note that the Indicative Level Information plan refers to a separate planning condition to resolve the detail of levels and retaining walls. As these retaining walls are relevant to the ecological permeability detail, it is reasonable that the ecological permeability detail is resolved as part of the levels discharge condition. I recommend that the levels discharge condition reference the need for between plots ecological permeability measure to be detailed within the plan in order to accord with local plan policy TB23.

Condition 13 (Outline Consent 201002):

WBC Ecology note that the latest version of the Arboricultural Method Statement does include reference to the ecological mitigation measures from the Updated Ecological Appraisal that are relevant to the arboricultural work. WBC Ecology are satisfied that this at least highlights the mitigation measures that a responsible tree removal contractor needs to be aware of and seek direct advice from the developer's ecologist.

Aside from requirement e) of condition 13 that requires a Veteran Tree Management Plan prior to the occupation of the dwelling, WBC Ecology are satisfied that condition 13 can be partly discharged.

Condition 15 (Outline Consent 201002):

The full spreadsheet of the biodiversity net gain metric has now been submitted.

Aspect ecology have supplied a response to WBC Ecology's previous comments and provided a rebuttal to the concerns that they raised.

An explanation has been given as to why the site no longer achieves a net gain of 10% for river units. This highlights how the assessment at outline stage was overly optimistic

and not grounded in discussions with the other disciplines about what is possible. However, WBC Ecology accept that the wording of the condition is not as watertight as the mandatory process and there is wiggle room for this proposal to row back from its previous ambitions on the watercourse units.

In respect of individual trees, the idea that 140 individual trees will be retained on this site for the full thirty years is unrealistic. The idea that the term thinning refers to thinning of foliage is sophistry. The claim that some of the trees could achieve moderate size runs contrary to the user guide for the metric. However, WBC Ecology do accept, now that the spreadsheet has been submitted, it is possible to test what the implication is for half the individual trees failing within the next thirty years. Making this test, WBC Ecology accept that the development would still achieve at least a 10% biodiversity net gain.

WBC Ecology can therefore recommend discharge of this condition.

Condition 16 (Outline Consent 201002):

A revised Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) (Aspect Ecology, ref: 5796-04 LEMPvf2 AN/LP/CL, May 2025) has been submitted with changes made to address the concerns that WBC Ecology raised in their response dated 6th January 2025.

WBC Ecology are satisfied that the changes made are sufficient to discharge condition 16.

Landscape and Trees:

Landscaping:

Policy CC03 of the MDD Local Plan states that development proposals should demonstrate how they have considered and achieved the following criteria within scheme proposals:

- a) Provide new or protect and enhance the Borough's Green Infrastructure networks, including the need to mitigate potential impacts of new development
- b) Promote accessibility, linkages and permeability between and within existing green corridors including public rights of way such as footpaths, cycleways and bridleways
- c) Promote the integration of the scheme with any adjoining public open space or countryside
- d) Protect and retain existing trees, hedges and other landscape features
- e) Incorporate high quality, ideally, native planting and landscaping as an integral part of the scheme.

WBC Landscape and Trees have reviewed the hard and soft landscaping scheme submitted with this application. No objections are raised regarding the hard surfacing, boundary treatments and furniture proposals.

With regards to the planting scheme, WBC Landscape and Trees also raise no objection to this aspect of the proposals. The scheme includes a wide range of different styles of planting including:

- Retaining some existing meadow, and sowing new to create a mosaic of species rich grassland.
- Amenity grass areas and lawns
- New tree planting and enhanced native hedges and scrub
- Wetland planting to basins and to enhance existing water bodies
- Ornamental hedge species to front gardens and the side of plots, and at entrance
- Large areas of bulb planting

WBC Landscape and Trees are supportive of the planting scheme as includes a great range of native trees across the site including feature trees *Gleditsia triacanthos* to the site entrance and the Liquidamber nearby will create a visually pleasing entrance feature.

The hedging species are a good range and use of *Griselinia* with its apple coloured shiny leaves will be refreshing and attractive. *Escallonia* is also selected, another good evergreen plant that flowers.

Overall, no objections are raised by WBC Landscape and Trees to the overall landscaping masterplan for the estate, achieving compliance with CC03 of the MDD Local Plan.

Condition 13 (Outline Consent 201002):

WBC Landscape and Trees have reviewed the Arboricultural Method Statement and raise no objections to its contents. Similar to WBC Ecology, they note the lack of a Veteran Tree Management Plan (requirement e of condition 13) but acknowledge its submission is only required prior to the occupation of the development.

Therefore, WBC Landscape and Trees recommend the partial discharge of this condition.

Condition 16 (Outline Consent 201002):

A revised Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) (Aspect Ecology, ref: 5796-04 LEMPvf2 AN/LP/CL, May 2025) has been submitted with changes made to address the concerns that WBC Landscape and Trees raised in their response dated 16th December 2024 and 13th May 2025.

WBC Landscape and Trees are satisfied that the changes made are sufficient to discharge condition 16.

Sustainable Energy Generation:

Core Strategy Policy CP1 requires developments to Contribute towards the goal of reaching zero-carbon developments as soon as possible by:

- a) Including appropriate on-site renewable energy features; and
- b) Minimising energy and water consumption by measures including the use of appropriate layout and orientation, building form, design and construction, and design to take account of microclimate so as to minimise carbon dioxide emissions through giving careful consideration to how all aspects of development form.”

Policy CC04 of the MDD Local Plan states that planning permission will only be granted for proposals that seek to deliver high quality sustainably designed and constructed developments by:

- a) Seeking to achieve the requirements of the full Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4;
- b) Meet internal potable water consumption targets of 105 litres or less per person per day (as part of the requirement to meet full Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4).

All development, including conversions, alterations and extensions shall incorporate suitable waste management facilities, including on-site recycling.

Renewable energy and low carbon technology

The Energy & Sustainability Statement states that a 56.3% reduction in emissions is achieved through a combined strategy of reducing energy demand and provision of air-source heat-pumps (ASHP) to provide heating to all homes.

The ASHP strategy as shown in the Energy Resource Plan proposes one ASHP unit located at the rear of each home. The model proposed is not specified, and no comment is made on capability for reverse operation.

Baseline DER emissions rate for the site are stated as 46,068 kgCO₂ yearly. Modelled emissions based on the ASHP strategy are stated as 20,124 kgCO₂ per year – a difference of 56.3%.

The proposals for the use of ASHP in to supply domestic hot water are feasible and represent a very positive response to compliance with Policy CP1 12) a).

The revised Energy Resource plan submitted in February 2025 shows that photovoltaic panels are now proposed on all rooves, in addition to the previously specified ASHP. The addition of photovoltaic panels (PVPs) is viewed as contributing positively to operational decarbonisation and supporting the overall sustainability of the development.

Passive Design Measures - Glazing:

No CIBSE TM52 analysis is provided therefore the design will be appraised for potential overheating risk through Part O of the Building Regulations only. These regulations

provide limits on the amount of hours during which a space is permitted to exceed maximum temperatures for indoor thermal comfort. The comments on potential risks and mitigating factors for overheating provided in this note do not seek to anticipate the outcome of Part O analysis but rather to identify the degree to which passive design measures have been implemented as part of the overall approach to operational energy demand reduction.

No calculated glazing ratios are provided, however the Energy & Sustainability Statement describes a general approach to solar gain and natural lighting *“Glazing specification... has been considered to balance the requirements for useful solar gain with unwanted summer gain.”* No sun-path studies are provided therefore the following analysis is based on inspection of the drawings provided.

Houses are predominantly oriented either Southeast or Northwest. East-West orientation increases risk of unwanted solar gain in morning and evenings during the summer. It is noted that most first floor elevations include larger vertical glazing areas which can also increase overheating risk, however in general the proposals do not appear over-glazed.

Passive Ventilation

The Energy & Sustainability Statement states that *“All houses will be able to benefit from cross ventilation to effectively purge warm air from the properties during periods of hot weather. Window opening areas will be considered and guided by the Part O assessment, with increased opening areas being designed in as required.”* This is supported by the plans which show openings on multiple aspects in living areas and some bedrooms.

Passive Cooling

Dwellings are arranged in short streets with soft landscaping and gardens surrounding. The soft landscaping proposed will help to reduce the reflection of solar energy back into buildings.

Heat Loss Form Factor

In general, the homes are relatively simple in form. This is beneficial to the building performance and helps to mitigate the risk of an energy performance gap caused by heat loss through cold bridges in a complex architectural form. The need to minimise thermal bridging is noted in the Sustainability and Energy Statement.

Thermal Mass

The Sustainability and Energy Statement notes that traditional masonry construction will be used and will contribute to internal thermal regulation of the buildings due to its greater thermal mass than lighter equivalent construction types.

Thermal Performance of building elements (dwellings)

The proposed thermal performance of building elements is within the legal limits set in

Part L of the Building regulations. In the case of the roof, a best practice value is proposed. This is noted as positively contributing to the sustainability of the development.

Active Building Systems

As above, all homes will be supplied with air-source heat pumps. The Energy and Sustainability Statement notes that low energy lighting should be used wherever possible but no commitment is made, meaning this cannot be weighed as contributing to the sustainability of the proposed development.

Conclusion

The commitment to deliver a reduction in regulated operational GHG emissions of 56.3% for the development overall through the use of air-source heat-pumps and solar panels confers a significant benefit and is favourably viewed. The application of the standard condition ensuring that the provision for onsite renewable energy is delivered at the level described will be secured via condition.

A standard speculative water efficiency calculation for new dwellings is provided, demonstrating how the maximum domestic consumption rate of 105 L per capita per day required to comply with MDD Policy CC04 might be achieved.

In summary, the Sustainability and Energy Statement and its appendices show that an acceptable approach to sustainable development is taken. The level of operational energy displacement through the use of improved building fabric performance and on-site renewable and low carbon technologies is a particular benefit of this scheme.

Overall, the WBC Sustainability Officer raises no objections to the proposals subject to the conditions described above.

Contamination:

The application site lies within a contaminated land consultation zone. At Outline stage, a Phase 1 Geoenvironmental and Geotechnical Desk Study was carried out which concluded that the site had a very low environmental sensitivity.

As such, an unexpected contamination condition will be imposed on the decision notice as a precaution.

General Infrastructure Requirements:

Several concerns have been raised by residents regarding the lack of local infrastructure in place to serve the estate's residents, namely a lack of school provision and doctor's surgeries.

In allowing the appeal associated with Outline consent 201002, the principle of the development's impact on local infrastructure was deemed acceptable based on the provision of 49no. dwellings. This concern can therefore not warrant a reason to refuse this Reserved Matters scheme.

Archaeology:**Condition 12 (Outline Consent 201002):**

This application is supported by an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (Wessex Archaeology, April 2024).

Condition 12 of Outline consent 201002 requires the programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation. Berkshire Archaeology responded to this application concluding that the desk-based assessment is inadequate to discharge condition 12, insofar that it does not provide the correct level of assessment detail.

Condition 12 requires discharge prior to the commencement of development. The applicant has confirmed that they will pursue the discharge of this condition following the approval of this application.

S106 Obligations:

The S106 Legal Agreement and the obligations associated with Outline Consent 201002 will remain applicable to the consented development and enforceable.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

When planning permission is granted for a development that is CIL liable, the Council will issue a liability notice as soon as practicable after the day on which the planning permission first permits development. Completing the assumption of liability notice is a statutory requirement to be completed for all CIL liable applications.

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.

Conclusion:

To summarise, this Reserved Matters application is considered to comply with the development plan and the parameters set out by the 201002 Outline Consent. Subject to the conditions within the Draft Decision Notice, this application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Yes
Recommendation:	Approval
Date:	3 July 2025
Earliest date for decision:	22 November 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	<i>MC</i>
Date:	04.07.2025