

The SMPC Planning Committee made some comments/raised questions with WBC on 5<sup>th</sup> February re 23/02548/FULMAJ: Land South of Tower Gardens, The Street, Mortimer.

“At its meeting on 11th January 2024, the Planning Committee of Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council considered planning application 23/02548/FULMAJ.

Whilst the Committee members have no objections in principle to this amendment, and consider that the revised wall and landscaping seem a better solution to that proposed in application 23/00297/RESMAJ, they do wish to raise the following issues:

1. The Block Plan - Planting and Seeding drawing (ref. 510 rev H) indicates a 'badger sett' (by a section of the proposed wall below plot no 56) which was not shown on previous layouts - can the applicant clarify the meaning of this and what are the implications of badgers being present for this application and the site generally?
2. What are the proposals for the maintenance of the retaining wall? (Previous applications have referred to details of maintenance issues (generally) being dealt with in information packs (etc) supplied to new occupants, but what are the arrangements and is this happening?)
3. What are the arrangements for maintenance of (a) the public open space, and (b) the SUDS ponds ' if there is/are s.106 agreements please supply copies/details (they do not appear to be available via the planning portal).
4. Finally, as raised in the Committee's comments on application 23/02498/NONMAT and subsequently confirmed by the applicant, we would like to see the link to the future footpath from the south-west corner of the public open space shown on the plans.”

Response from Michael Butler, case officer at WBC:-

1—The note on the block plan referring to the badger sett is incorrect and there is now no sett present. The pos block plan was updated via plan number 21-1099-056-A as approved under reference 23/02498/NMA.

2-There are no proposals for the maintenance of the retaining wall at present but please note condition 4 of the appeal permission dated the 26<sup>th</sup> of May relating to 23/00072/RESMAJ refused by the Council last year. This notes that no house should be occupied until a suitable maintenance regime is put in place. The applicant will accordingly need to submit a conditions discharge application to resolve this issue.

3—I understand that the future maintenance of the public open space and drainage ponds will be for the Council to resolve. Matthew Hart at the Council is the new officer responsible for the takeover of this space in the future, but this will not be done I believe until the development is completed.

4—As noted before the footpath link will be connected via the Developer and the Englefield Estate who owns the adjoining land. I understand this is in progress with the developer. It is possible of course that the Developer may not elect to build out the retaining wall as now approved under 23/00072 but revert to the fall-back permissions granted by the LPA earlier this year which has the smaller retaining structure.