



## Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council

### Planning Committee Meeting

Meeting held on 11 December, 2017 in Mortimer Methodist Church, West End Road, Mortimer, RG7 3TB at 7.30pm

**Present:**

Councillors: Cllr. M. Dennett (Chairman), Cllr. J. Earl, Cllr. D. Ives, Cllr. N. Kiley, Cllr. C. Lewis, Cllr. P. Wingfield.

Clerk: H. Selwyn-Jones

Public/Press: 21 Members of the Public and 0 Members of the Press present.

17/58 **To receive Apologies**

Cllr. T. Reade

17/59 **Public Session**

17/03004/OUTMAJ

Peter Marsh:

- Expressed concern about the boundary on the car park with regards to its size and being a rough boundary. West side residents need to be aware of where the actual boundaries are as, at this moment, it is indicative only.
- Raised the question of where exactly the buffer of 20 metres is on the western boundary.
- Stated that the sewage pipe for the site as shown on the plans is running under his garden. This needs to be clarified.

Andrew Clark:

- Stated that it is unclear as to the exact location of the northern boundary.
- Raised the question as to whether an access impact analysis on The Street had been completed.
- Raised the question as to why the inspector reports are being ignored.

Martin Winter:

- Stated that the buffers are not shown on the western side of the eastern footpath.
- Stated that the strata of the site is gravel and London clay.

Martin Goodhill:

- Stated that the buses and cycling comments are incorrect: buses do not run on Sundays and trains do not run every half an hour on a Sunday.
- Disputed the claim that it is possible to get from the centre of Mortimer to the train station in 5 minutes by bike.

Tony Butcher:

- Expressed concern about the traffic inside the site as currently planned and how traffic will be further affected should the building of the school and surgery go ahead.

Mr Whittaker:

- Wanted to know when the development would be starting and how long it would take to complete.

Ann Kate:

- Stated that she thought the windfall infill would come off of the total of 110 houses required and therefore queried why the plans for the site were still for 110 houses.
- Raised the question of why two reports hadn't been considered and why the build line is now below what was recommended.

Mr Gowers:

- Expressed concern about the effect that the storm water of 17 houses would have in being fed into the same system.

Graham Bridgman:

- Explained that 110 houses are required for WBC needs and the whole of the NDP document excludes windfall sites.

Danusia Morsley:

- Confirmed that windfall infill had already been taken into account.

17/60 **To receive Declarations of Interest**

None

17/61 **To receive and approve the minutes for the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2017**

Cllr Lewis abstained. Received and **APPROVED** to be signed as a true record of the meeting

17/62 **To consider the following planning applications:**

<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/03004/OUTMAJ	Land South of St John's Church of England School, The Street, Mortimer	This outline application comprises two parts: Part a) The erection of 110 dwellings including affordable housing, public open space and associated landscaping with all matters reserved other than access and layout; Part b) The erection of a 3FE Infant School and 900sq m GP surgery (Use Class D1) with shared parking area with all matters reserved other than access.
<p><u>SMPC Comments</u> The Council supports this application with some reservations.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b> The developer has cooperated with SMPC in preparing, discussing and amending a Site Design Brief (SDB) before the submission of the present application. The committee welcomed this. It is noted that this application is for outline permission with all matters apart from access and layout being reserved. However, the submission documents contain many indicative statement, drawings and proposals. Rather than ignoring those elements at this stage, the committee decided to comment on them where it feels it is likely to object in the future, at the detailed design stage, if those elements are simply repeated. The committee comments on those areas where the application does not apparently meet the polices of the Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood</p>		

Development Plan (NDP) (such policies are referred to as in the NDP, e.g. GD1).

The committee also decided to draw attention to a few areas where the present application is silent on matters which are dealt with in the Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).

### **Specific comments**

1. The housing mix, density of housing and provision of affordable housing are all in line with the NDP (policies HD1, HD2, HD3, HD4, SDB3).

2. The proposed landscaping strategy does not meet NDP policies GD1 and SDB4. There is a gap in the landscaping which “should shield existing dwellings from the site but still allow open vistas”. This gap is on the western side of the public footpath which is on the eastern boundary of the site, particularly where houses 21 to 22 are situated. It is felt that the only way the policy can be achieved is by moving the houses further from the boundary of the site to allow for adequate landscaping.

3. The design of the internal roads does not meet policy GD2 in that there seems to be excessive use of kerbs and asphalt surfaces, whereas the ethos of the NDP is for alternative materials such as paviers. It is suggested that there should be greater use of paviers and non vertical kerbs, especially on straight sections of secondary road where the turning force of vehicles will be absolutely minimal.

4. There appear to be areas in which parking is not overlooked by habitable rooms (policy GD2), but it is appreciated that this will be clearer at the detailed design stage. However, as this could be considered a layout issue it is felt important to raise it at this time.

5. Policy GD3 concerns Flood Management. The council is not satisfied that the present proposal meets the requirement of the policy. In particular, the policy encourages the adoption of a worse case scenario where it is assumed that there is 100% run off from the whole of the area, as happened in 2007. The relevant application documentation does not make this assumption. Similarly, the calculations do not consider a 30 minute intense storm giving 21mm of rainfall. The details of the relevant storm, the third bullet point in GD3, can be found at:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wea.151/pdf>

As such we would wish to see the storm water provision enhanced to the standard given in policy GD3 before approval is given to this application.

6. Policy GD4 concerns street lighting. The council is not satisfied with the implication, contained in the ecology report, that there might be street lighting on the development. However, the Council have been assured by the developer, in an email, that no street lighting is intended other than where required by WBC. We would wish to make this a condition of approval of the application.

7. There seems to be a confusion over the use of standard fencing panels. Policy GD6 states a preference for them not to be used and this is supported by the diagrams in the application, but the text does make reference to them being used in back gardens. We would emphasise that the policy does not distinguish between particular areas but is intended to apply to all boundary treatments.

8. Policy GD6 also refers to the SUDS drainage strategy; the Council has concerns over this given the concerns over Flood Management (point 5 above).

9. The provision of environmentally friendly features, such as hedgehog gates, is specified as part of policies GD6 and B2, but the application's ecology report simply says they could be provided as opposed to will be provided. The Council requests WBC to make such provision a condition of planning permission.

10. While the application does make reference to a construction traffic management plan, as specified in policy SDB2. It is appreciated that this can only be developed in detail later in the design process, but the Council had great concerns over the adequacy of such a plan and request WBC to consider any such plan very carefully. There is substantial public concern at present over the construction traffic on the neighbouring Tower House/ Fairwinds site which has the same developers and uses the same access road. It is quite possible that construction for the current application may spread over at least three years and a comprehensive plan is required.

11. Policy IS1 requires 'A superfast broadband strategy statement will be expected with all planning applications. The statement shall outline how the developer will provide a development which provides the maximum broadband speed currently feasible in Mortimer, show how predicted future speeds will be obtained and explains what discussion have taken place with the operators in advance of submitting a formal planning application.' While a statement from BT is included in the application there is very little else to show how future speeds would be delivered etc.

12. A pedestrian crossing is shown on the layout plan, near the entrance to the school / surgery site. The council does not want this to be zebra crossing with the associated requirements for street lighting.

13. The provision of potable water and the disposal of wastewater is dependent on an agreement with Thames Water which is not in place at present (Policy IS6).

14. During the public session of the SMPC Planning Committee which discussed this application two points were raised by local residents and the committee passes them on for information:

- a) whether the main sewer crossing the site is correctly located on the plans
- b) whether the land forming pedestrian access at the north west of the site is part of the application site

# Cllr. Earl proposed an extension of 30 mins

17/02144/FULD

6 Victoria Road,  
Mortimer,  
RG7 3SE

Section 73A: Variation of Condition 2 – Approved Plans of planning permission 17/01919/FULD (Section 73: Variation of Condition 2: Approved plans and removal of Condition 4: Code For Sustainable Homes of approved application 14/02378/FULD).

Not discussed as already decided by West Berks

17/03098/FULD	52 Stephens Close, Mortimer, RG7 3TY	Erection of a new bungalow.
No Objections		
17/03120/HOUSE	42 Stephens Close, Mortimer, RG7 3TY	Single storey and two storey extensions with internal alterations
No Objections		
17/03147/HOUSE	Westwood, West End Road, Mortimer, RG7 3TP	Proposed single storey outbuilding.
<u>SMPC Comments:</u> No objections subject to a condition that it will not be used commercially in the future at any time.		
17/03273/PACOU	10A West End Road, Mortimer RG7 3SY	Application to determine if Prior Approval is required for the Change of Use of office accommodation into 4 no. 1 bed dwellings. Existing office car parking spaces allocated to new dwellings
<u>SMPC Comments</u> This is a technical matter for West Berks to decide but if it does require planning permission then SMPC would wish to comment.		

17/63 **Minor Matters for Information Only**  
None.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm