



Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council
Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting
held on Thursday, 8th August 2019 in the Parish Council Office,
27 Victoria Road, Mortimer, at 7.30pm

Present:

Councillors:

Cllr. D. Morsley (Chairman), Cllr. M. Dennett, Cllr. S. Hill, Cllr. D. Ives, Cllr. L. Jones (*left meeting at 8.30pm*), Cllr. C. Lewis, Cllr. J. Wells, and Mr. T. Barber (co-opted) (*left meeting at 8.45pm*)

Clerk:

B. O'Reilly

Public/Press:

There was one member of the public present, Cllr. J. Bull and no members of the press.

Part I

19/37 To receive any apologies for absence

Apologies received from Cllr. S. Beard, Cllr. K. Johnson and Mr. N. Kiley.

19/38 Public Session

None.

19/39 To receive any declarations of interest

None.

19/40 To receive and approve the minutes for the Planning Committee meeting held on Thursday, 25th July 2019:

The Minutes were duly received and APPROVED to be signed by the Chairman as a true record of the meeting.

19/41 To receive any updates on the progress of the planning application for the Mortimer Station Car Park:

The Committee were advised that the purchase order for the landscape visual impact assessment had now been issued and the report would be due next month.

Further to the issue of the earlier proposals and concerns raised by Highways on the traffic control over the bridge by the station, it was agreed this would be discussed in more detail as a future agenda item for the Planning Committee.

19/42 To review any updates and progress of the Planning Application and receive any updates on the Biodiversity and Green Space project for MOR006 (17/03004/OUTMAJ):

Cllr. Morsley and Mr. Barber advised that the meeting with TA Fisher to discuss the Acorn Ecology report recommendations and the developer's biodiversity and green space plans across the development had been put forward to take place next week.

Cllr. Morsley advised the Committee that the Parish Council are not consultees to the developer's responses to conditions set in the granting of the outline planning permission on this development (discharge condition applications such as SUDS plans, integrated water supply and drainage strategy, arboricultural watching brief, construction method statement, details of electric car charging points, external lighting strategy, superfast broadband strategy). She advised that, further to a discussion with the Planning Officer, a letter has been signed from the Parish Council office to the Development Control Manager at WBC requesting the Parish Council be allowed to become consultees on all responses by the developer to such matters on this application as the NDP includes policies that will be addressed by them.

19/43 To consider the following planning applications:

19/01616/HOUSE: 10 Victoria Road, Mortimer Common, Reading RG7 3SE

Two new single storey additions: front porch and rear extension.

SMPC Comments:

No objections.

19/01824/HOUSE: 5 Asparagus Close, Mortimer Common, Reading, RG7 3WY

Alterations to existing conservatory to create sun room.

SMPC Comments:

No objections.

19/01715/RESMAJ: Land South of Tower Gardens, The Street, Mortimer Common, Reading, Berkshire

Reserved matters for details of the appearance, landscaping, and scale of the approved residential development for Phase 1 comprising 28 houses and apartments including affordable housing, public open space and associated landscaping.

SMPC Comments:

The Parish Council are aware that some of their comments and queries will be answered in the various discharges/conditions set by West Berkshire Council in the outline planning permission (17/03004/OUTMAJ).

The Parish Council would, however, like to outline its comments on 19/01715/RESMAJ as follows:

With consideration to the **Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Development Plan:**

Residential Site Allocation:

- **Policy RS4** (*The rural edge of any development will be carefully designed and landscaped to blend into the surrounding rural landscape rather than creating the effect of a hard edge*) As only a small part of the eastern side boundary is included in this application (Phase I), the Parish Council would like more information on the planting planned for further down the development.

Housing Mix and Density:

- **Policy HD1** (*Affordable homes will be integrated into developments in design, layout and location so as not to be distinguishable from other homes on the development*): Parish Council would like to query the statement from the developer that Sovereign insist on only one entrance to the affordable apartment block which will distinguish it from the marketed apartment block.

- **Policy HD2** (*Mix of housing types: 40% 1 or 2 bed dwellings split between apartments and houses, 20% 2 and 3 bedroom bungalows and the remainder being 3 and 4 bed houses*): although Phase I of the development clearly does not meet the indicated mix of home types, it is understood the overall site will meet this more closely.

- **Policy HD3** (*Starter homes*): The Planning Committee queried if there are any properties designated as 'starter homes' within this Phase I and, hence, will be available to purchase with any of the current government schemes as not indicated in plans.

General Design:

- **Policy GD1** (*General parameters*):

- There is no reference to how the 12 Building for Life principles have been implemented; in particular '**9. Streets for All**' design which enables pedestrians and motorists to safely use the same surfaces.
- As mentioned under RS4 above more information about the Eastern boundary is required to determine the effect on amenity of existing residents.

- **Policy GD2** (*Internal and external access and parking*):

- Is the pedestrian/cycle access onto The Street going to be made available with Phase 1? Application doesn't say.
- The Committee is unable to see whether the street layout design will be such that WBC could designate it a 20mph zone as per this policy.
- The Committee queried a statement received from the developer that WBC is not in favour of shared spaces. The case officer has now informed us that this is not the case, but shared spaces may only be used on roads serving less than 26 dwellings. In this phase, the only shared space indicated is into the front of plots 6 - 10. While accepting that full height kerbs are necessary on the main route to the possible school and surgery, the Parish Council would like to see more shared spaces in future phases of the development and a significant reduction in the number of full height, raised kerbs.

On safety grounds, Cllr. Lewis had reservations about this request to reduce the number of pavements on the development. Design features such as raised tables, other forms of level surface, pinch points etc could be introduced to reduce speeds and make the development safe for pedestrians and traffic and make the whole scheme able to be designated a 20mph zone.

- This NDP policy asks for use of asphalt surfacing to be limited. The current plans show largely asphalt roads and totally asphalt pavements. The Committee asks that where full height kerbs must be used, the pavement should be made of standard blocks and “countryside” (rather than standard urban style) kerbstones are used; we have been informed by WBC Highways that block pavements can be adopted as long as made of standard blocks.
- The Committee observed that there were not enough parking spaces allocated for the two one-bedroom apartments. Under the parking standards there should be 1.5 parking spaces per one-bedroom flat.

-Policy GD3 (*Flood management*): The Planning Committee is not confident that the plans allow for a ‘super storm’ situation and would appreciate WBC’s advice on how this is met on this application. It was also noted that there are no details in Phase I about SUDs which developer is obliged to meet nor the establishment of permanent owner of anti-flooding system.

-Policy GD4 (*Street lighting*): The Parish Council is pleased to see no mention of street lighting and seeks confirmation from WBC that this will not be introduced at a later stage.

-Policy GD5 (*Building Design and style*): The Planning Committee noted the application makes no mention of:

- Lifetime Homes Standard although the developer has told us this is at least partially included;
- Energy management technology;
- Car charging points.

-Policy GD6 (*Landscapes and environment*):

Boundaries onto highways: The illustrations and plans seem not to be totally consistent. Can it be confirmed that all railings will include hedges? The yew hedging (used by the developer in Tower Gardens) would be preferred to the privet shown as easier to maintain and will last longer.

Rear and side garden boundaries: This policy prefers brick or natural boundaries but if standard fencing is to be used, can it include hedgehog holes in all boundaries? The ecology survey commissioned by the Parish Council recommends open fencing on boundaries to woodlands for light and to create a better vista in both directions; can this be considered?

Referring to the planting list supplied, several non-native species have been included. The Parish Council requests these are replaced by native species and that **all** tree and shrubs should be native grown (biosecurity)

Site Design Brief:

-Policy SDB4 (*Landscape and Environment*): The layout plan still shows a zebra crossing which was to be removed from the drawing during the earlier outline planning submission. The Committee noted that tree species with more spring and autumn colouring could have been included.

Infrastructure Development:

-Policy IS1: The application does not contain a superfast broadband strategy statement.

-Policy IS6: The Parish Council is not aware of an agreed water supply and wastewater drainage strategy for this application

Other Issues:

The SMPC Planning Committee supports the comments made by Mr. C. Gower in his letter to WBC regarding the retaining of existing trees, establishing new plantings early, the measures to control disruption and noise on the site, and the suggestion that contractors' contact details should be displayed on site for the public.

Inconsistency:

It was noted there was an error on the Site Section – Street Scenes 18-1030-040-1st; the dashed line labelled B – B is indicated twice in different locations on the layout and the east-west section should in fact be labelled C - C.

As recommended at the last Planning Committee meeting on 25th July, a copy of the Acorn Ecology report would be provided to WBC when submitting the Committee's comments on this application.

19/44 Minor Matters for Information Only

- Further to an issue raised by Cllr. Hill, the Parish Council office will enquire with West Berkshire Council's Planning Officer if it would be possible to put in a restraint on the installation of artificial grass under permitted development on the new development behind Tower Gardens.
- The issue of constraints and conditions that can be put in place on developments within Mortimer was noted as an item to be included on a future agenda

Close

The meeting closed at 9.15pm