

**EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON 28 NOVEMBER 2018**

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 18/02121/OUTMAJ **Page No.** 37-115

Site: Lakeside, The Green, Theale, Berkshire

Planning Officer Presenting: Mr Simon Till

Member Presenting: N/A

Parish Council Representative speaking: N/A

Adjoining Parish Englefield: N/A

Adjoining Parish Sulhamstead: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mrs Liz Alexander

Ward Member(s): Councillor Alan Macro

1. Corrections to housing numbers

1.1 Your officer notes that the incorrect housing numbers have been given at several points in the Committee report. The following are the correct housing numbers proposed under the current application and previously approved under the appeal permission:

-The existing permission granted at appeal (ref. APP/W0340/W/16/3163215) is for up to 325 dwellings including 70 extra care units.

-The proposal under the current application is to remove the extra care element from the scheme and replace this with an additional 50 flats.

-The total number of dwellings proposed under the current application is up to 305.

-With 25% affordable housing this would equate to up to 76 affordable dwellings on the site.

-The affordable housing requirement under the approved scheme (ref. APP/W0340/W/16/3163215) with 12.5% affordable is up to 41 affordable dwellings plus any overage.

2. Adult Social Care response to variation to remove extra-care from the approval:

2.1 Following concerns raised by Councillor Macro that adult social care had not commented on the application, the acting head of adult social care commented (attached) that there is a lack of extra-care within the eastern part of the District. He was unable to provide robust figures on the level of demand, but felt that 70 units would be in line with his team's sense of the demand.

2.2 The policy officer has provided her comments on the adult social care response (attached). She states that there is a recognised level of need across the Housing Market Area for the period up to 2036 and that meeting this need is being looked at via the current Local Plan and within the Local Plan review. She further notes that the extra-care units were proposed by the applicant rather than being put forward by the Council, and were not something that the Council had identified a specific need to meet on this site. She would expect such need to be demonstrated by robust evidence before making a decision to seek extra-care provision on a site, in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy.

2.3 Taking note of the fact that the comments from adult social care indicate that the approved 70 units of extra-care accommodation may meet a need for provision of such units in the eastern area of the District, nevertheless the NPPF states that the development plan is the starting point for decision making, and supports a plan led approach where development needs, including housing needs, are met through the policies of the development plan, based on a robust assessment of the evidence of need.

2.4 While it is accepted by your officer in principle that there is likely to be a quantifiable need for extra-care provision in this part of the District, there is also an identified need for both market housing and affordable housing. The proposed alteration to the scheme would result in a significant uplift to affordable housing provision. It is also the contention of the agent that provision of the extra-care element of the site has proved problematic in negotiations for sale of the site to a developer, thereby delaying the development of the site and the resultant benefits to housing provision in the east of the District.

2.5 In light of these considerations, while the need for extra-care provision is noted, your officer does not consider this to outweigh the substantial benefits of the proposed alterations to the scheme in terms of significantly increasing the provision of affordable housing on the site and providing greater certainty in terms of the amount and delivery of housing on the site.

3. Traffic impacts

3.1 The highways officer has provided supplementary comments (attached) regarding the increase in levels of traffic due to the proposed alteration from 70 extra care units to 50 flats, which he notes would generate a higher level of associated traffic. However, the officer also notes that the traffic impact would be less than that of the extant consent for 350 units on the site, or the previously approved B1 office development referred to in the site history, and would not generate sufficient movements during peak travel periods to be considered such as to have a severe impact on the local highway network. Therefore highways raise no objections to the proposed alterations.

4. Revision to condition 6

- 4.1 The following alteration to the wording of condition 6 is proposed in the interests of clarity over the drawing referred to (amendment underlined below):

“6. The details of scale and layout to be submitted under Condition 2 shall accord with the parameters shown in the following submitted plans:

-Building Heights and layout Parameter Plan 30716 A-02-01 Revision P-00 dated November 2018, and;
-Indicative Site Layout – Substitution of 50 x flats for 70 x Extra Care units; Drawing number 30716 A-02-111 P-00 dated November.

Reason: These parameter plans fix the maximum extent and height of the development. Full compliance is necessary to ensure that the development would not have an unacceptable landscape and/or visual impact on the surrounding area, and to ensure that the development would safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring properties. This condition is recommended in accordance with the NPPF, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the Quality Design SPD.”

5. Amendment to condition 16

- 5.1 Condition 16 at section 8.1 of the report omits some of the text of the condition. It is recommended that the condition is updated to read:

“Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the approved development that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended and a risk assessment carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found remediation and verification schemes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These approved schemes shall be carried out before any work on the relevant phase of the development is resumed.”

6. Amendment to reason for condition 27

- 6.1 In the reason for condition 27 objections from nearby industry are noted. These refer to the previous appeal. It is recommended that the reason for condition 27 is updated to accurately reflect this:

“Reason: In order to protect the amenity of future occupants of the development from externally generated noise in the surrounding area. The noise assessment highlights high existing noise levels from traffic associated with the A4 and other road infrastructure, and the need for noise mitigation measures to protect residential amenity (internal and external areas) and communal open spaces. Nearby industry objected to the previous appeal (reference APP/W0340/W/16/3159722) unless noise mitigation is provided, and these objections are considered equally applicable to the permission hereby granted. It is suggested that relevant standards could be achieved by considering the orientation/location of buildings, as well as the installation of acoustic glazing and ventilation, and noise barriers (fences) where appropriate. Standards to be met and mitigation measures will need to be agreed with the LPA prior to commencement of the development. A ‘good’ standard for bedrooms and living areas (BS8233) is to be encouraged. This condition is recommended in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 to 2006 (Saved Policies 2007).”

7. Amendment to condition 28

7.1 The reason for condition 28 erroneously refers to “extra-care units” and it is therefore recommended that this reason is amended as follows:

“Reason: In the interests of protecting the local residents from unreasonable noise levels which would be detrimental to the residential character of the area. It is necessary to make sure that residents do not suffer excessive noise from, for example, ventilation systems associated with the apartments. This condition is recommended in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 to 2006 (Saved Policies 2007).”