

BARKHAM PARISH COUNCIL
Planning Committee

Page 17/298

Minutes of meeting of the Barkham Parish Council Planning Committee held on 24th January 2017 in Barkham Village Hall at 6.00 p.m.

Present: Mr. L. Heath (in the Chair), Mr. A. Scott, Mr G. Dexter, Mr K. Lane, Mr R. Rowe and the Clerk.

Apologies: Mr C. Heyliger (on holiday)

17/661 **Minutes** of meeting held on 10th January 2017 were approved and signed as a true record.

17/662 Planning

163547	Reading FC Training Ground, Park Lane Outline application (all matters reserved except access to the site) for up to 140 residential units (Use Class C3) and all associated parking, soft and hard landscaping within the site and ancillary works. (Means of access into the Site off Park Lane, demolition of existing buildings and 2.83 ha of SANG to be determined in full detail).	Proposed Opposed
--------	--	---------------------

Clerk to write to WBC opposing this application. This will come before the Planning Committee when BPC will speak against this. Clerk to speak to the neighbouring Parishes of Finchampstead and Arborfield to seek their support with a joint letter from the three Parishes. The points for opposing this application are listed below:

1. It is outside the settlement area and thus contrary to Core Strategy. Given that the Local Plan Update is in progress and the Neighbourhood Plan too, they should just wait, as is expected of everyone else.
2. It is a dangerous precedent for development of other sites outside the settlement boundary. If WBC give in on this, it is tantamount to scrapping the whole local plan process.
3. To argue that it is just an extension of the SDL is lazy thinking – though it is physically next door, the road access (off Park Lane) will be entirely via roads in the locality that are already overstretched, including congestion hotspots such as the Barkham Street/Barkham Road junction, Barkham Road/Bearwood Road junction, Biggs Lane/Langley Common Road, Commonfield Lane and California Crossroads.
4. Creating a direct link to the NME and thence to the Arborfield relief road should be a sine qua non for any possible development at this site. This could be achieved either by adapting byway 18 (which has a wide highway boundary) or possibly by creating a new route to the west of the existing Hogwood industrial area.
5. With access from Park Lane, the site is also remote in practical terms from many of the proposed SDL facilities.
6. The long term plan for the bus service will not pass along Park Lane as the intention is to serve the Merino area along the NME. This further erodes the sustainability argument.
7. They seem to have given up on the land swap concept to preserve the football pitches. This should not have been conceded so easily, just because it is difficult. (Interestingly the site outlined in the call for sites reflects the land swap.)
8. Have they bothered to explore other sports uses for at least part of the field?
9. This adds insult to injury considering the long term road works affecting local roads which are likely to continue for the foreseeable future in view of the amount of development in the area.

To argue against an application on the grounds of temporary traffic restrictions is not considered to be a valid planning argument. However WBC must recognize that many residents are already reaching boiling point about road closures: the latest works in Barkham Road were announced at very short notice and will last most of the year. It is a fair bet that other closures will occur in the same period on alternative roads, and this will continue for many years ahead as reckless overdevelopment will require further closures to install additional infrastructure, never mind emergency repairs and replacement of worn out pipe work. It seems that there are people in Shute end who are in denial about the impact of these problems.

162956	41A Sandy Lane Householder application for the proposed construction of an open fronted double car port.	Approved
--------	---	----------

BPC had opposed this application stating that the Wokingham Design Guide states that no garages should be positioned at the front of properties.

Officer Report

“The site is a detached chalet style bungalow sited on a good sized plot set back from the road. There is a staggered building line along the street with a variety of design of dwellings.

Following negotiations with applicant a revised plan has been submitted which reduces the bulk and mass of the roof of the proposed car port by lowering the pitch of the half hipped roof to a max height of 4m. The site is screened from the road by trees and vegetation which are to be retained and can be conditioned and as such it is considered that there would be limited views of the proposal from the highway. Examples of double pitched roof garages further along the street no’s 36, 38, 40 are sited forward of the main dwelling.

It is acknowledged that the proposal is contrary to advice in the BDG but this only guidance and each case must be assessed on its own merits. In this case the car port is a less bulky structure than a brick built garage, it uses naturel materials in keeping with the character of the area and will be well screened from public views by existing trees and vegetation, it is not considered detrimental to the character of the area.”

162821	52 Sandy Lane Householder application for the proposed erection of a part single storey rear extension and installation of PV panels on rear roof slope.	Approved
--------	---	----------

162881	Former Hazebrouck Barracks, Princess Marina Drive & Langley Common Road Full application for temporary planning permission for the use of land for filming, temporary change of use of former barracks and hard standing for parking and storage with access.	Proposed Opposed
--------	--	---------------------

BPC concerns remain the same as before, the speed limit on Langley Common Road needs to be reduced to 30 mph and the entrance on to the site from Langley Common Road needs to be addressed. The proposed access opposite Staysure Tyres is of concern as the tyre depot has large trucks entering and exiting on a regular basis. The proposed revised working times are an improvement but need to be controlled with suitable conditions should this be approved. This application to come to the Planning Committee on 1st February.

Meeting closed at 7.00 p.m.

Next meeting of full Council on 14th February 2017 at 8 p.m.

Next meeting of Planning Committee on 28th February 2017 at 7.30 p.m.