

LRM Planning
Owen Jones
22 Cathedral Road
Cardiff
Wales
CF11 9LJ

Applicant:
Bloor Homes and Sandleford
Farm Partnership

PART I - DETAILS OF APPLICATION

Date of Application

2nd June 2020

Application No.

20/01238/OUTMAJ

THE PROPOSAL AND LOCATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT:

Outline planning permission for up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 extra care housing units (Use Class C3) as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150 sq m, B1a up to 200 sq m) and D1 use (up to 500sq m); the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works. Matters to be considered: Access.

Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury

PART II - DECISION

In pursuance of its powers under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, West Berkshire District Council REFUSES OUTLINE planning permission for the development referred to in Part I in accordance with the submitted application form and plans, for the following reason(s):-

1. The proposed development fails to ensure the holistic comprehensive development of the Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation (SSSA), with a view to maximising its potential as a well-planned and sustainable urban extension. The submitted application documentation fails to provide adequate certainty and confidence that this proposal will deliver the required comprehensive development of the SSSA as a whole, along with the co-ordinated and timely delivery of the associated infrastructure, services and facilities necessary to mitigate its impact across the entirety of the SSSA and beyond. The unacceptability of the proposal is exacerbated by numerous inconsistencies in the contents of the various submitted plans and reports, as well as in relation to the proposals for the adjoining site.

The failure to secure the comprehensive development of the SSSA renders this proposal unacceptable and contrary to:- i) Policy GS1 of the West Berkshire

Housing Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017); ii) the Vision, the Strategic Objectives and the Development Principles, including S1, of the Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document (Sandleford Park SPD, adopted March 2015); and iii) Policy CS5, CS13, CS14, CS17, CS18 & CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012).

2. Policy CS3 requires infrastructure improvements to be delivered in accordance with the West Berkshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP, 2016). The IDP identifies the provision of green infrastructure to be necessary infrastructure. Development principle L1 of the Sandleford Park SPD requires a planning application to be accompanied by a clear Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan for the whole of the allocated site to integrate the development with the landscape and green infrastructure, and to incorporate the landscape, ecology/biodiversity, drainage and public open space / recreation development principles in the Sandleford Park SPD.

The development proposal fails to secure a consistent Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan for the whole of the allocated site.

The proposals for development are uncertain and contradictory, as a consequence of inconsistencies, omissions and unnecessary duplication within and between the relevant submitted drawings and associated reports. For example these include:- green links within the application site and also in relation to the remaining area of the Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation (SSSA); strategic drainage mitigation elements; the location, size and extent of the education land offered as the Park House School extension, in this case proposed to provide a sports pitch; and tree and hedge removals and retention. There is no certainty in the proposal in respect of:- the required mitigation regarding the removal of existing green infrastructure (trees and hedgerow) along Monks Lane frontage to provide the proposed accesses; the future of the important row of mature trees along the southern boundary of Park House School adjoining Warren Road in the context of the need to provide a satisfactory public transport / all vehicle access through to Andover Road.

The unacceptable proposal of piecemeal development of only part of the SSSA gives rise to the need for unnecessary mitigation, which itself would result in harmful impact arising from, for example the proposed emergency access proposals for Development Parcel Central (DPC), incorporated as part of the central valley crossing structure and also the widened cycleway through the country parkland.

The proposed development does not form part of a well-planned comprehensive and satisfactory proposal for the SSSA in accordance with the Sandleford Park SPD, nor does it secure the comprehensive delivery of the intended sustainable urban extension and fails to provide a holistic approach to the landscape, visual impact, green (and other) infrastructure for development of the whole of the SSSA.

For those reasons, this application for only part of the allocated site is considered to prejudice the successful delivery of the development of the SSSA and it is unacceptable and contrary to Policies CS3, CS5, CS14, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012), Policy GS1 of the West Berkshire Housing Sites Allocations

Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017), and the Development Principles, including L1 and F1 of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015).

3. The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is unsatisfactory and unacceptable in that it fails to adequately and appropriately assess the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development of the application site, which forms part of a valued landscape. The LVIA was not undertaken using the latest West Berkshire Landscape Character Assessment 2019. As a result, the more up-to-date key characteristics, value attributes, sensitivities have not been identified/updated using the most recent information and this has not informed or influenced the scheme's design. As a consequence, the assessment of effects does not assess the correct Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) (WH2: Greenham Woodland and Heathland Mosaic; or the important interaction with the narrow, but critical UV4: Enborne Upper Valley Floor).

In addition, the LVIA and associated information fail to adequately consider the landscape and visual impact of a number of proposed elements and on a number of existing features, including those listed below:-

- i) the embankment structure within the central valley;
- ii) the suite and extent of encroaching proposals within the northern valley;
- iii) the NEAP and LEAP locations;
- iv) the engineered nature of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) features, and their close proximity to ancient woodlands;
- v) ancient and other woodlands and their buffers;
- vi) ancient, veteran and category A trees;
- vii) the western access point at the boundary with Sandford Park West (SPW);
- viii) the Monks Lane accesses; and
- viii) the creation of emergency accesses and associated works to serve Development Park Central (DPC).

Notwithstanding the above, the submitted LVIA acknowledges that the proposal results in harm, at times significant, to the landscape and visual resources of the site. The proposals fail to take account of key characteristics and special features, which are sensitive and form highly valued components in this complex landscape and they will result in an unacceptable level of harm, with significant impact on the landscape character and visual resources. The application proposals fail to protect or enhance a valued landscape, as set out in NPPF paragraph 170, which also recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, including the benefits of trees and woodland.

The lack of an adequate LVIA for the proposed development, and the identified harm to the landscape character and visual resources without sufficient mitigation is contrary to Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012); Policy GS1 of the West Berkshire Housing Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017); and the Vision, Strategic Objectives and the Development Principles in category L of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015).

4. The Council's policy on affordable housing (CS6 of the Core Strategy) requires a 40% on-site provision for major developments on greenfield sites, 70% of which should be for social rented. Although the application satisfies the overall 40%

affordable housing requirement, it proposes that 70% of that provision to be for a mixture of affordable rented and social rented units. In this respect the proposal is unacceptable and unsatisfactory in that it fails to deliver the required proportion of units for social rent, for which there is the greatest need in the District.

In addition Schedule 8 of the accompanying draft Section 106 Legal Agreement submitted by the applicant proposes 80 extra care units (70x 1-bed & 10x 2-bed), which are all to be provided in one location within Development Parcel Central (DPC) and which form part of the affordable housing provision. Schedule 8 of the draft Section 106 stipulates that in the event that it was not feasible to progress the Extra Care Housing, the said units shall become General Affordable Housing Units. However, the unit mix and spatial distribution requirements of General Affordable Housing within the site are substantially different, to that of Extra Care Housing. Unless the proposal were to be considerably adjusted in good time, such a scenario would result in an unacceptable concentration of 80 units with an unacceptable unit mix. The development would fail to create a successful, sustainable, mixed and balanced community and to make satisfactory affordable housing provision.

Furthermore Schedule 8 of the draft Section 106 also provides that, under certain circumstances, the 30% intermediate housing would be allowed to switch to market housing, failing to make the required 40% affordable housing provision. Should the above occur, this would also result in a material change to the description of the development proposed, for which planning permission is hereby sought.

In all three of the above respects the application would be unacceptable and harmful to the community's need for affordable housing. The application therefore fails to make a policy compliant provision of affordable housing and it is contrary to Policies CS3, CS4 and CS6 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy adopted July 2012); the Vision, Strategic Objectives and the Development Principles in category F of the Sandleford Park SPD (adopted March 2015); and the affordable housing provisions of the West Berkshire Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (PO SPD, adopted December 2014).

5. This major development proposal, on the larger portion of the Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation (SSSA), fails to use this significant opportunity to fully exploit the specific potential of the SSSA's inclined south facing orientation, greenfield status and scale to deliver an exemplar development regarding carbon dioxide emissions reduction, in the form of renewable energy generation, and to deliver a zero carbon residential-led mixed use urban extension. In this respect the proposal fails to demonstrate a high quality and sustainable design or that it would be built to high environmental standards. It is considered to be an unsustainable and harmful development, failing to reduce carbon dioxide emissions through the extensive use of renewables on site and otherwise contributing to climate crisis.

In this respect the proposal is anachronistic, unacceptable, inappropriate, inadequate and unsatisfactory. It is contrary to Policies ADPP2, CS3, CS14 and CS15 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012); the Vision, Strategic Objectives and Development Principle R1 of the Sandleford Park SPD (adopted March 2015); the West Berkshire Corporate Environment Strategy (2019) and associated Declaration of

Climate Emergency and objective to achieve Carbon Neutrality in West Berkshire by 2030.

6. Development Parcel Central (DPC) would effectively comprise a substantial residential quarter, as well as a local centre which would serve the entire urban extension at Sandford and provide the necessary mix of uses required by the allocation of the site. The piecemeal nature of this development proposal for only the eastern part of the Sandford Strategic Site Allocation (SSSA), and the failure to put forward a well-planned, co-ordinated, comprehensive and holistic development for the SSSA, mean that the proposed development does not on its own provide and/or guarantee the necessary vehicular access through to Andover Road to the west. As a result, DPC would stand as an island with a single point of vehicular access being via the central valley crossing from the north east, forming a very large scale cul-de-sac. This is considered inadequate in urban design terms, in respect of permeability and connectivity.

The application includes two proposals for emergency access, one across the central valley and one along the cycle route within the country parkland. Both of these fail to provide satisfactory vehicular emergency access for DPC and its community. This is unacceptable, inappropriate and unsatisfactory in highways terms, for the necessary emergency and service vehicles, as well as for all the residents and users of DPC. The proposals would result in an unacceptable form of development, failing to provide a successfully integrated urban extension.

Access is not a reserved matter and it is considered that the detailed access proposals fail to provide satisfactory access to DPC and in this respect the proposed access details are inadequate and insufficient and therefore unacceptable.

In addition, the critical issue of access to DPC and the applicant's proposed design response have a number of harmful and unnecessary consequences for the development and the site as follows:-

i) in highways terms satisfactory emergency access could only be provided in this case in the form of two separate and independent access road structures across the entire width of the central valley. The applicant's illustrative solution is for a single substantial earthworks embankment bridge structure instead. This would result in unnecessary and unacceptable harm to:- a) the landscape character and visual quality of the valley; b) trees on the valley side; and c) the ecology of the riparian valley, including the priority habitat of rush pasture, with the area of purple moor grass of county importance. Similar concerns are also raised in respect of the potential adverse harmful impact of the proposed construction access across the central valley to DPC and also to PHS. The proposed central valley crossing embankment would also introduce an unacceptable and unnecessary obstacle to the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes running along the two sides of the central valley, which seek to connect the country parkland and the whole of the SSSA to the Rugby Club site to the north; and

ii) the other emergency access in the form of the Grasscrete widening of the proposed cycleway within the country parkland and its consequent diversion in part from running adjacent to the public right of way (PROW9), would introduce an unnecessary additional element of domestication within the country parkland, which results in unnecessary and unacceptable harm to the landscape character

and visual quality of the landscape, as well as to an ancient woodland (Waterleaze Copse) and associated riparian valley crossing, through which it would pass.

The proposal, by disregarding the importance to deliver a comprehensive and co-ordinated holistic development, is ill-thought out, will cause unnecessary substantial material harm to a whole range of interests of acknowledged importance, would fail to deliver a satisfactory form of development and is therefore unacceptable and inappropriate on a number of levels. In this respect it is contrary to Policies ADPP2, CS3, CS5, CS13, CS14, CS17, CS18, CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS DPD, adopted July 2012); Policy GS1 of the West Berkshire Housing Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017); and the Vision, the Strategic Objectives and the Development Principles including S1, L1, L2, L4, L6, L7, E1, E2, A1, A2, A6, F1, F2, U1, U4, U5, CA7 & CA9 of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015).

7. The application fails to provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the development proposed would not result in a severe impact requiring mitigation on the A34 Strategic Road Network, despite the IDP identifying the A34/A343 junction as critical infrastructure. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ADPP2, CS3, CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012).
8. The application site includes a network of six ancient woodlands and one other woodland with a number of ancient indicators. All the trees on the site are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 201/21/1016-W15-MIXED). In accordance with NPPF paragraph 175(c) ancient woodlands are irreplaceable habitats. Although the submitted documentation refers to the intended provision of 15m buffers to the ancient woodlands and 10m buffers to the other woodland, the proposals indicate that in certain instances works will encroach into the 15m buffers, as in the case of the sports pitch proposed to the south of Barns Copse, or the proximity of conveyancing channels and detention basins in relation to Dirty Ground Copse, Highwood and Slockett's, Copse, or the proposed cycle route and Grasscrete works in relation to Waterleaze Copse. The Planning Authority considers that notwithstanding the 15m buffers metric in Sandford Park SPD, 15m buffers should be a minimum in accordance with Natural England standing advice and the development should be providing appropriate and more generous buffers as appropriate, to ensure unnecessary deterioration and harm to these irreplaceable habitats. At the same time the existing connectivity of Crooks Copse with Highwood and Slockett's Copse, is seriously at risk from the encroachment of the development proposals into the area of the northern valley, significantly narrowing that corridor beyond what is envisaged by the SP SPD. Furthermore the proposed drainage strategy gives rise to concerns in respect of potential direct surface water drainage from Development Parcel Central (DPC) and Development Parcel North 2 (DPN2) into the adjacent Dirty Ground Copse and Slockett's Copse respectively.

The proposed development fails to provide acceptable indications, and therefore sufficient confidence and certainty, that the proposed development will not cause the avoidable deterioration of and harm to the ancient woodlands on site. The application proposal fails i) to adequately set out and explain any wholly exceptional reasons which apply in this case and justify any such harm; and ii) to

clearly set out the suitable compensation strategy that would be put in place to address this harm.

In this respect the application is unacceptable, inappropriate and contrary to Policies CS3, CS14, CS17, CS18, CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012); Policy GS1 of the West Berkshire Housing Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017); and the Strategic Objectives and Development Principle L4 of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015).

9. In addition to the woodlands the site contains many individual trees and also others forming part of hedgerows. All the trees on the site are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 201/21/1016-W15-MIXED).

The proposal will result in the loss of an ancient oak (T34) and the potential loss of a veteran oak (T127) to facilitate aspects of the development. In both cases the application has failed to explain why their loss cannot be avoided, as it appears that it could be, and to set out the wholly exceptional reasons and to provide details of the suitable compensation strategy that would justify their loss.

The proposal will also result in works within the root protection area of four other veteran trees and their potential deterioration, the loss of a category A tree within the central valley and the loss of a number of trees and hedgerow in relation to the extension land to PHS. All these works appear to be avoidable and the proposal does not demonstrate alternative approaches to avoid such harm to trees that are the subject of a TPO.

The proposal will also result in the extensive loss of trees and hedgerow along Monks Lane without satisfactory strategic mitigation, to the detriment of the amenity, visual quality and verdant character of this important thoroughfare street scene.

The proposed development will cause harm to a number of irreplaceable priority habitats comprising ancient and veteran trees and a number of other important trees that are the subject of a TPO, without satisfactory justification and compensation / mitigation. The proposal is therefore poor, unacceptable and inappropriate and contrary to Policies CS17 and CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012); and the Strategic Objectives and Development Principle L4 of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015).

10. The proposal seeks to set aside part of the site to form an extension to Park House School in order to mitigate the impact of the development proposed on secondary education provision, as required by Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy. The applicants have proposed that the expansion land to be provided is used to facilitate the identified need for an additional sports pitch. The proposal however will result in the loss of the ancient tree (T34), as well as a number of trees and hedgerow along its western boundary, while also encroaching onto the buffer of the Barns Copse ancient woodland. It is apparent that these impacts could be avoided by a small increase in the area of proposed expansion land to be secured, the size of which remains inadequate, or, through an alternative proposal for the alterations to the school.

The proposal is unacceptable as it stands and as a result the proposal would fail to make adequate provision in relation to secondary education, to mitigate the needs of the development and to also ensure the satisfactory provision of a sports pitch. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS3 and CS5 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012); policy GS1 of the West Berkshire Housing Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017); and the Vision, Strategic Objectives and design Principles S1 and F1 of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015).

11. It is considered that the proposed development gives insufficient regard to the post-construction adverse impacts on the existing retained habitats. The current proposals are expected to lead to:-
 - i) a gradual but significant decline in the quality of the habitats on site, such as:- ancient woodland, rush pasture (including Purple Moor Grass), ponds, riparian/fluviat habitats, secondary woodland / Lowland mixed deciduous woodland, hedgerows, and Woodpasture and Parkland BAP priority habitat; and
 - ii) an unacceptable reduction in the suitability of habitats for a number of protected species, such as:- bats, reptiles, skylarks, lapwings, dormice and badgers; and also notable species such as native amphibians and hedgehogs.These are caused by increased anthropogenic pressures on the site which have neither been adequately considered, nor mitigated for with appropriate compensation measures.

Furthermore, the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (ES Vol. 3 Appendix F2 1) is considered inadequate as it does not account for the degradation of the retained existing habitats.

In addition there are a large number of inconsistencies within the submitted documentation, and the considerations being made have the potential to also have an adverse impact of the local natural environment, with environmental impacts not adequately addressed / mitigated for.

The proposal is unacceptable on ecological and biodiversity grounds and it is contrary to Policies CS14, CS17 and CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012); Policy GS1 of the West Berkshire Housing Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017); and the Vision, Strategic Objectives and Design Principle L4 of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015).

12. The proposed development could have potential significant effects on European Designated Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), namely Kennet Valley Alderwoods SAC, Kennet and Lambourn Floodplain SAC and the River Lambourn SAC. With regard to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the proposal provides insufficient information regarding the likely impacts on air quality of the development proposed. The lack of provision prevents the necessary assessment of the potential significant effects on these SACs and any necessary mitigation required. The proposal does not include the information that is necessary to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation.

The lack of sufficient information is contrary to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Policies CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy

Development Plan Document (CS DPD, adopted July 2012) and Policy GS1 of the West Berkshire Housing Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) (HSA DPD, adopted May 2017)

13. The proposal does not provide sufficient information in respect of:-
- i) the interrelationship of surface water runoff between the application site and the remainder of the Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation;
 - ii) the impact of the proposed conveyance channels on ground water levels; and
 - iii) the impact of surface water runoff on ancient woodland.

In the absence of that information there is potential for adverse impact on ground water and the woodlands.

Furthermore, the proposed drainage strategy proposes detention basins within the country park (A, B and C) with approximately the same surface area in square metres as volume in cubic metres, resulting in basins approximately 1 metre in depth with near vertical sides. This would be unacceptable as basin side slopes should be constructed ideally with a 1 in 4 gradient in accordance with SuDS Manual C753. The use of conditions to address this concern would not be reasonable given the limited area around the basins and high potential to detrimentally impact on existing streams (which require an 8 metre buffer zone on both sides), proposed footpaths and ancient woodland.

In addition, the Drainage Strategy Plan submitted (ES Vol. 3 Appendix K1, drawing number 10309-DR-02) is incomplete, omitting a significant element of green infrastructure comprising the River Enborne, appears to show surface water flowing almost in line with the contours in several places, rather than angled to them as would be expected. Furthermore, surface water flow appears to be directed through the ancient woodlands of Dirty Ground Copse and Slockett's Copse which is unacceptable due to potential ecological damage that would cause. With regard to the status of those woodlands as irreplaceable habitats, the development proposal has failed to determine through modelling that new surface water flow will not detrimentally affect the ancient woodland.

The lack of sufficient information prevents a full consideration of the impact of the proposed development on ground water levels and ancient woodlands and the necessary mitigation required. Furthermore, the provision of acceptable and adequate detention basins are unlikely to be achievable whilst respecting the existing watercourses, proposed pedestrian infrastructure and ancient woodlands. As such the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to Policies CS3, CS14, CS16, CS17 and CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy, adopted July 2012); the Vision, Strategic Objectives and Development Principle H1 of the Sandleford Park SPD (adopted March 2015); and the West Berkshire Sustainable Drainage Systems SPD (adopted 2018).

14. The development fails to secure satisfactory Section 106 planning obligation/s to deliver the necessary infrastructure, mitigation and enabling works (on and off site), including in terms of: affordable housing, travel plan, highway works including pedestrian and cycle facilities (off-site), country parkland, public open space and play facilities, sports pitch provision, other green infrastructure, public transport, primary and secondary education, healthcare and local centre, including community and commercial uses.

The application is therefore contrary to Policies CS3, CS4, CS5, CS6, CS13, CS17, CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS DPD, adopted July 2012); the Vision, Strategic Objectives and the Development Principles of the Sandford Park SPD (adopted March 2015); and the West Berkshire Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (PO SPD, adopted December 2014).

If you require further information on this decision please contact the Council via the Customer Call Centre on 01635 519111.

INFORMATIVE:

1 In attempting to determine the application in a way that can foster the delivery of sustainable development, the local planning authority has approached this decision in a positive way having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to try to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has also been unable to find an acceptable solution to the problems with the development so that the development can be said to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

2 This decision to REFUSE the proposed development is based on the following plans and reports:

Location Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP01 RevB);
Land Use and Access Parameter Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP02 RevH1);
Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP03 RevG1);
Building Heights Parameter Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP04 RevG1);
Parcelisation Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP05 RevB);
Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan (drawing number 04627.00005.16.632.13);
Country Park Phasing Plan (drawing number 04627.00005.16.306.15);
Monks Lane Eastern Site Access (drawing number 172985/A/07.1);
Monks Lane Western Junction Access (drawing number 172985/A/08);
Illustrative Layout Plan (drawing number 171);
Access Road Plan (drawing number 14.273/928);
Combined Land Use and Access Parameter Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP02 RevI);
Combined Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP03 RevH);
Combined Building Heights Parameter Plan (drawing number 14.273/PP04 RevH);
Combined Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan (drawing number 04627.00005.16.633.14);
Planning Statement (May 2020, Issue A);
Affordable Housing Statement (May 2020, Issue A);
Transport Assessment (March 2020);
Environmental Statement (Non- Technical Summary, Vol. 1 - Main Report, Vol. 2 A3 Figures, Vol. 3a & 3b Appendices; March 2020);
Design and Access Statement (February 2020, Issue 8);
Energy and Sustainability Statement (December 2019, 2017.013.001b);
Draft S106 Agreement (6th May 2020, 2112295/AZT/SKA01);
Response to Reasons for Refusal To Application 16/03309/OUTMAJ (May 2020);
Draft Planning Conditions (May 2020, Issue A);
Memorandum of Understanding (6th May 2020);

Statement of Community Engagement (March 2018).

3 This application has been considered by West Berkshire Council, and REFUSED. Should the application be granted on appeal there will be a liability to pay Community Infrastructure Levy to West Berkshire Council on commencement of the development. This charge would be levied in accordance with the West Berkshire Council CIL Charging Schedule and Section 211 of the Planning Act 2008.

Decision Date :- 13th October 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gary Lugg', written in a cursive style.

Gary Lugg
Head of Development and Planning

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Notification to be sent to an applicant when a local planning authority refuse planning permission or grant it subject to conditions

Appeals to the Secretary of State

- If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- If you want to appeal against the local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice.
- Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN or online using the Planning Portal at www.planningportal.co.uk.
- The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.
- The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to him that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.
- In practice, the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because the local planning authority based their decision on a direction given by him.

Purchase Notices

- If either the local planning authority or the Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grants it subject to conditions, the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted.
- In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.