



**Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee**  
**held in the Mortimer Methodist Hall, 17 West End Road,**  
**Mortimer RG7 3TB on Thursday 13 June 2024**

**Present**

**Councillors**

Cllrs G Bridgman (Chairman), S Hill, H Kilshaw D Morsley, M Lock (arrived 19:20), A Richardson, J Wells

**Officers of the Council**

S Taylor

**Public/Press**

No members of the public or press attended.

**Part I**

**24/016 Public Questions**

No public present and none received.

**24/017 Apologies**

Apologies in anticipation for an expected late arrival were received from Cllr M Lock.

**24/018 To receive any declarations of interest**

None received.

**24/019 Minutes of last meeting**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Thursday 23 May 2024 were received with no amendments and approved unanimously for signature by the Chairman as a true record of the meeting.

**24/020 Chairman's remarks**

Cllr Bridgman said he attended the West Berkshire Local Plan examination meeting on 5 June at Shaw House. Cllr Bridgman had been concerned that, at an earlier session, it had been expressed (eg by agents for TA Fisher) that Mortimer ought to

take some housing as a rural service centre (possibly via a review of the plan if it passed the examination).

At the 5 June meeting the Inspector dismissed the concern on the basis that the current Plan does not require Mortimer to take on any more houses. (The session can be watched on YouTube.)

## **24/021 Items to be taken into private session**

None.

## **24/022 Policies**

No policies needed to be discussed.

## **24/023 Current Projects**

### **a Tower House Farm**

Cllr Bridgman reported that the appeal APP/W0340/W/23/3327705 for the Land South of Tower Gardens and in particular the retaining wall has been allowed and planning permission granted. The Inspector however refused the appellant's application for costs.

It was also noted that the houses, once built, cannot be occupied until TA Fisher puts an acceptable maintenance scheme in place for the open space and the SUDS ponds.

### **b Mortimer to Burghfield Footpath/Cycleway**

Cllr Morsley reported that SMPC is still waiting for a response from West Berkshire Highways in relation to design and implementation questions raised at an online meeting with SMPC, Ridge & Partners LLP and WBC on 19 April. Cllr Morsley has followed up with WBC Highways. Ridge & Partners LLP hope to setup another meeting soon with WBC Highways to discuss the questions raised.

## **24/024 Schedule of Applications for consideration**

### **24/00405/HOUSE: 14A Stephens Close Mortimer Common Reading RG7 3TX**

Two storey rear extension.

**SMPC Comments:** The planning Committee have no observations to make on this Planning application, however the committee note that a garden room is being built in the garden of the property and the planning officer may want to check this to ensure this comes under permitted development as the committee has not seen an application for this and also whether with the garden room there is sufficient amenity area for the house.

### **24/0933/HOUSE: 16 Windmill Road Mortimer Common RG7 3RN**

Demolish existing garage and construct new detached garage building.

**SMPC Comments:** The Planning Committee has no particular observations to make, but notes the previously refused application for a similar building (23/01332), also dismissed at appeal, and wonders precisely how different this is. If this application is

granted permission, the Committee seeks a condition that it can only be used for private, and not commercial, use.

**24/00957/HOUSE: 37 Victoria Road Mortimer Common RG7 3SH**

Proposed single storey rear extension to replace existing lean-to, proposed bay window on front elevation to replace existing porch, proposed timber frame open canopy and proposed 3.7m wide dropped kerb.

**SMPC Comments:** The planning committee wonder if the application succeeds, and the bay window is built whether it will allow enough space for parking in the front garden. There is also a concern that the appearance of the proposed bay window is not in keeping and in compliance with the design principles of the Neighbourhood Development Plan policy "9.2.5 - Building Design and Style" and is a stark difference to the rest of the terrace and will change the street scene.

# Cllr Lock arrived 19:20

**24/025 Schedule of Applications to note**

**24/00935/TPW: Ardenlea, Drury Lane Mortimer Common Reading RG7 2JL**

T1 -Oak: Remove storm damaged fork which looks to be decayed from ground level. Fork hangs over a footpath and road with a risk of fail.

**24/026 Applications for Future Consideration**

None at present.

**24/027 Items for information only**

**a Decisions received from West Berkshire Council**

**23/02038/HOUSE: 9 Windmill Road Mortimer Common RG7 3RN**

Erection of 4 no. 3 bed dwellings.

**APPROVED** subject to conditions – 29 May 2024

**SMPC Comments:** The recent comments of WBC Highways regarding what is said to be compliance with P1 are noted but the Committee wishes to point out what appears to be a lacuna in the policy relating to parking and thus a policy question, and also a specific question for Highways on their response.

If an existing property has the benefit of parking in accordance with P1, but then transfers that parking area to a developer to form part of a new adjacent development site - such that the new site has parking spaces in accordance with P1 but having lost its parking, the donor property no longer complies with P1 - how does WBC treat the loss of parking from the donor property?

In the instant case the applicant says: *"The new plans show 9 car parking spaces to the new development and also a space to No.9 Windmill road. By providing this additional space to No.9, in effect a tenth space is being provided so the net effect is the same as what is being asked for and a betterment is created given the existing dwelling has no parking at all. We believe that this is actually a better solution to just providing 10 spaces to the new development. Any future owner of No.9 in all likelihood is going to own a car and if we did not provide off street parking then*

*they would be parking on the street (as in all probability the previous owner was). We believe that this is actually a better balance overall because looking at census data only 8% of households locally have 3 cars or vans whereas statistically 38% of homes locally have only 1 car or van. So, this is more likely to provide a better balance to the scheme as a whole and the surrounding area."*

(First, of course, the applicant appears to be seeking to re-write P1 by reference to statistics. The Committee suggests that P1 should be strictly adhered to unless there are exceptional circumstances - as allowed for in the policy - which doesn't appear to be the case here. The applicant has chosen to put four houses on this site whereas they could easily put (eg) three and increase the space available for parking.)

The applicant can't have it both ways. Either the tenth space is for No 9, in which case the new development has nine spaces and fails to comply with P1, or the new development has ten spaces and complies, but No 9 has no parking (and if it does have parking it should have at least two spaces for compliance with P1). On this point, it is disingenuous when the applicant says that No 9 didn't have any parking – it benefitted from off-road parking on a field large enough for (now) four houses.

**24/00262/HOUSE: 16 The Crescent Mortimer Common Reading RG7 3RU**

Single storey rear extension, garage conversion and front extension to garage to provide covered car port with associated fenestration and new chimney flue.

**APPROVED** – subject to conditions - 23 May 2024

**SMPC Comments:** The planning committee does not understand the comments from Highways. According to the plans there appears to be a garage door at the front of property not set back within the car port space. Also, the car port together with the remaining drive does not appear to be long enough to accommodate two cars in a row. Other than this there are no further objections

**24/00455/HOUSE: 17 Damson Drive Mortimer Reading RG7 3WZ**

Retrospective: Application for the erection of 2 no. outbuildings in the rear garden of the house to be used for storage and chicken coop.

**APPROVED** – 6 June 2024

**SMPC Comments:** The planning committee do not see any objections to the sheds in planning terms. Any questions as to what they are being used for we do not consider a matter for planning but rather a matter for Environmental health.

**24/01040/NONMAT: 60 Stephens Firs Mortimer Reading RG7 3WZ**

Nonmaterial amendment to approved 22/01414/HOUSE - Erection of front porch, re-roof front elevation of garage, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation, minor internal alterations and erection of garden room. Amendment -change to false pitch roof.

**APPROVED** – 6 June 2024

**24/00762/TPW: 93 Victoria Road Mortimer Common RG7 3XD**

2x Oak: Reduce height and spread of trees by approx 25% (equal to 3-4m crown reduction), leaving cuts no greater than 50mm and finishing height of trees at 16m.

**APPROVED** – 7 June 2024

**b Minor matters for information.**

None.

**24/028 Communications**

No items for communicating identified.

**24/029 Future Agenda Items**

None.

**Part II (if needed)**

**24/030 Exclusion of Public and Press**

Not required.

**Close**

The meeting closed at 19:24.