

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 1 August 2017

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/17/3170553
134-146 London Road, Ruscombe, RG10 9HJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 161845, dated 29 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 31 retirement two bedroom apartments with associated communal areas, landscaping and parking (C3 use).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 31 retirement two bedroom apartments with associated communal areas, landscaping and parking (C3 use) at 134-146 London Road, Ruscombe, RG10 9HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 161845, dated 29 June 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd against Wokingham Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant submitted a completed unilateral undertaking (UU) which would secure the payment of £150,000 towards off-site affordable housing. The Council has agreed through the Statement of Common Ground that the UU would overcome the second reason for refusal relating to the absence of provision for off-site affordable housing. I have framed the main issue accordingly. Nevertheless, I still need to be satisfied that the UU meets the tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regs).
 4. Whilst, the application form gives the site address as Twyford, I agree with the interested parties at the hearing who maintain that it is more properly described as Ruscombe. I have, therefore, used Ruscombe in the heading above.
-

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site falls within a triangular area of land defined by London Road, New Road and Northbury Avenue. The properties lining these roads are arranged in an essentially linear pattern. Within the triangle and behind the road frontages the, generally more recent, development is laid out in shorter, less formal culs de sac. The open land to the east of New Road is within the Green Belt, but there are no direct visual or functional links between it and the appeal site.
7. The appeal site comprises the former garden area of a now dilapidated dwelling. Generally rectangular in shape, it is surrounded by the side or rear boundaries of established residential development on three sides and has an extensive frontage onto London Road on the remaining side. Therefore, whilst the main parties accept that the site does not amount to previously developed land for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), it is within the built up area. Moreover, the site is allocated for 'around 15 dwellings' under Policy SAL02 of the Council's Managing Development Delivery Local Plan 2014 (MDD) and has an extant outline planning permission for 16 dwellings (application ref O/2104/1386).
8. The London Road frontage provides the site's most immediate publicly visible setting. Here the mainly two storey detached and semi-detached properties on both sides of the road are fairly evenly spaced, in regularly shaped plots, along consistent building lines. The dwellings are set back behind generous highway verges and front gardens. As well as providing vehicle access and parking, many of the gardens contain substantial planting.
9. This setting is, therefore, characterised by a spacious, linear pattern of well landscaped development with a rhythm of domestic scale buildings. It contributes positively to local distinctiveness and these characteristics are recognised in the Ruscombe Village Design Statement. Notwithstanding the linear pattern of development along London Road, in part due to the way in which the land rises from London Road to New Road, development in depth is also visible to the rear of the London Road frontage.
10. The appeal proposal for a single plan form building would distinguish it from the prevailing domestic scale of buildings in the area. However, the appeal site currently comprises a single parcel of land which is much larger than the surrounding residential plots. To that extent the proposal would not interrupt the surrounding pattern of plot sizes. The proposal would also follow the London Road building line and be set behind an area of grass and planting. This area would also accommodate three accesses and parking spaces, although similar features are also found at nearby properties. In terms of spaciousness, linearity and landscaping, the general arrangement would not be dissimilar to the adjoining sections of London Road.
11. The elevation onto London Road would be divided into four elements separated by fairly deep set-backs. The fronts of each of these two storey elements would be further articulated by projecting bays and would have its own pitched

roof. Their widths would be comparable with adjoining buildings. I recognise that, when viewed from directly opposite, it would be apparent that these elements form part of a larger building. Nevertheless, considered as part of the street scene, they would adequately break up the mass of the building and give it a domestic scale and rhythm reflective of the prevailing pattern of development along London Road.

12. The main access would be on the north-eastern side of the building and would allow views from London Road of the full depth of the development. However, I have already found that development in depth is apparent from the road. The element of the building closest to the corner of the main access and London Road would project forward of the remainder of the north-east elevation and its width and depth would be similar to nearby buildings. The rest of the elevation, whilst larger in scale, and including a narrow three storey section, would tend to regress behind the projecting corner element in views from London Road. Its mass would also be broken up by a recessed central entrance.
13. The height of the building would step up with the rising ground towards the south east corner of the site. However, the existing ground level would be reduced by around 2m towards the rear of the site and the ridge lines of the proposed building would be lower than those of the immediately adjoining buildings in Walnut Tree Close and Garraway Close. Even if the site were developed for a more traditional form of housing it would be reasonable to expect the heights of the buildings to step up in response to the changing ground level. In this case, the requirement for level internal access would lead to part of the building being three storeys in height. Nevertheless, the three storey element would not be prominent in external views and, as the Council, acknowledges, would not be readily visible from London Road.
14. Consequently, although the depth and height of the proposed building would reveal the difference in scales between it and existing properties in the area, I consider that the design incorporates sufficient features to prevent that difference from being harmful. I note that the scheme was reviewed by the South East Design Review Panel which, subject to detailed comments, also found that the scale and single plan form of the building would be acceptable.
15. Whilst the density of the scheme, measured in the number of units per hectare, would be significantly greater than the consented scheme or the development plan allocation, in large part that is a consequence of the flatted form of the proposed development as opposed to the density arising from, say, two storey housing. As the Borough Design Guide (BDG)¹ recognises for that reason, of itself, density does not help with an assessment of whether a proposal would fit into a place.
16. I deal below with the relationship between the proposed building and Walnut Tree Close in terms of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The south west wing of the building would be seen in the view from the end of Northbury Lane (Verified Visual Montage 3). A fairly large expanse of new roof would occupy the space between 16 Northbury Lane and the properties in Walnut Tree Close. However, built development, albeit more distantly located, can currently be seen in this view and the new building would sit behind a

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 2012

reasonably substantial belt of planting. Therefore, I consider that the change would not be harmful to this view.

17. There is no substantive evidence to show that the size of the spaces around the building would be out of keeping with neighbouring development. I also note that the spread of built form across the site would, if anything, be slightly less extensive than that shown the illustrative layout for the outline planning permission. Consequently, I consider that the proposed layout would not be cramped or have an unduly urban character. There is nothing to suggest that the detailing or external materials of the proposed building would be objectionable.
18. Overall therefore, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies CP1 or CP3 of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy 2010 (CS) insofar as they require proposals to maintain or enhance the high quality of the environment and be of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height and character to the area. Nor would the proposal be contrary to the BDG insofar as it has similar aims.
19. The Ruscombe Village Design Statement is appended to the BDG, although it was prepared in advance of the BDG and appears to have been the subject of informal consultation only. This limits the weight I can attach to it. In any event, for the reasons outlined above, I consider that the proposal would not offend the design aspirations of the Statement.
20. The Council could not identify any requirements in its Landscape Character Assessment which may be relevant to the proposal. It follows that the proposal would not be contrary to MDD Policy TB21 which requires proposals to demonstrate that they have addressed the requirements of that document.

Other Matters

21. The two storey detached properties in Walnut Tree Close adjoin the south east boundary of the site. No 6 is closest, but is set at an angle to the boundary such that its principle, rear facing first floor windows face towards part of the site which would not contain buildings. Moreover, at their nearest corners, the proposed building and No 6 would be separated by a distance of 12m. The wing of the building in the south west corner of the site would have a pitched roof that would extend part way along the boundary with No 6. The ridge level of that roof would be only slightly lower than the ridge level of No 6. It would, therefore, somewhat curtail views from the first floor bathroom, ground floor side windows and parts of the side garden of No 6. However, it would be seen above substantial boundary planting and the ridge of the shallowly pitched roof would be significantly more than 12m from the dwelling. As such, I consider that the roof would not have an overbearing effect on the outlook from No 6.
22. A condition could be used to require the openings in the part of the building facing No 6 to have obscured glazing to prevent overlooking. With these considerations in mind, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6. The other houses in Walnut Tree Close are further from the site and would be less affected.
23. The occupiers of No 6 were also concerned that the application plans do not accurately show the existing and proposed ground levels adjoining their

- property. I have some sympathy with the difficulty of interpreting three dimensional relationships using two dimensional drawings. However, the application plans are based on a topographical survey² and I am not convinced that they contain material inaccuracies.
24. Concern has been expressed locally that the proposal would not provide adequate car parking to meet the requirements of future occupiers, visitors and delivery vehicles. It is argued that the site is not well located for local services or public transport and, therefore, many occupiers would be likely to have more than one car per dwelling. London Road is a busy through route with a 40mph speed limit and any overspill parking would be harmful to highway safety.
25. The site is located just over 800m from a range of local facilities and services in Twyford village centre and around 250m from the nearest bus stops. The bus services provide connections to Reading, Twyford and Wokingham and the appellant's evidence indicates that they run at 30 minute or hourly frequencies, depending on the time of day, on week days and less frequently on Saturdays. Conditions could be used secure the provision of resident's and visitor cycle parking. Therefore, although the location is not particularly accessible, it would allow travel other than by private car for day to day needs. I am also mindful that the site is allocated, and has planning permission, for residential development.
26. The proposal is for older persons housing and one of the suggested conditions would require at least one of the occupiers of each dwelling to be 55 years of age or older. There was considerable discussion at the hearing about the likely age and mobility of potential occupiers. However, whilst the proposed condition would not prevent occupation by working age persons, I tend to agree with the appellant that, in practice, people would chose to move to this form of accommodation because it meets their needs. The appellant's Planning Statement indicates that 70-80% of residents of McCarthy and Stone developments are aged 78 or older and that 85-90% are widowed or single. I recognise that the company offers a range of types of accommodation with varying levels of on-site care provision. The appeal proposal would be at the lower end of this range and, therefore, the age profile of occupiers of this scheme may be somewhat younger than the overall average for the company's developments. Nevertheless, it would be reasonable to expect that the level of car ownership of future occupiers would be lower than that of the population in general.
27. The Council's car parking standards require one space per dwelling in 'town and fringe' locations and for the spaces to be unallocated in order to provide flexibility in their use. The 33 unallocated spaces proposed to serve 31 flats would, therefore, marginally exceed the standard. A drop-off lay-by is also proposed close to the main access which could be used by delivery vehicles. Having regard to the site's location and the nature of the proposal, I find that the amount of car parking proposed would be adequate to meet the needs of future occupiers and visitors. Not allocating the spaces to dwellings would allow for the likely variation in car ownership amongst households. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would not pose a risk to highway safety.

² Application Plan reference SE-2293-03-AC-PL1101

28. Concern has been expressed that the local GP Surgery is at capacity and that an influx of future occupiers from the proposed development would increase waiting times. However, pressure on GP services is widespread and I note that the NHS Wokingham Clinical Commissioning Group did not object when consulted on the proposal. The proposal would also generate a CIL payment which could be used to help support GP services among other things.
29. The question of precedent was raised at the hearing. However, each application or appeal must be determined on its individual merits and my conclusions on the main issue are based on the specific circumstances of the site, its surroundings and the proposal.
30. It was claimed at the hearing that some local people who expressed support for the proposal were unaware of that that support would be used in the planning application process. The expressions of support which I have taken into account were included with the questionnaire documents supplied by the Council. Most are written on a pro-forma card that includes the Council's application reference number and has the Council's address on the reverse side. Whilst I understand that McCarthy and Stone undertook a separate public consultation exercise prior to the submission of the application, I am satisfied that those who submitted the pro-forma cards knew that their responses were part of the planning application process.
31. It has been suggested that there is a greater need for family or affordable housing than for older persons' accommodation in the area. Whilst I have no reason to doubt the need for affordable housing in particular, such a scheme is not before me. My decision must be based on the planning merits of the appeal proposal and the appellant's evidence shows that there is a need for older persons housing nationally and locally. Moreover, the Framework seeks the provision of housing to meet the needs of different groups in the community (paragraph 50) and the Planning Practice Guidance advises that the need to provide housing for older people is critical. It can also free up houses that are currently under-occupied (paragraph reference ID: 2a-021-20160401). As such, I consider that the proposal would contribute to meeting the housing needs of the area. The proposal is, therefore, supported by paragraph 47 of the Framework which seeks to boost the supply of housing.
32. The appellant has drawn my attention to a range of other benefits of the proposal including CIL and New Homes Bonus payments and contributions to the local economy through construction activity and local spending by future occupiers. For the most part, the Council did not take issue with the claimed benefits and they provide further support for the appeal proposal.

Planning Obligation

33. Regulation 122 of the CIL Regs states that a planning obligation (in this case, the UU) may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission if it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
34. Policy CP5 of the CS requires the provision of affordable housing at a rate of up to 50% on all sites of 5 dwellings or more, subject to viability. There is nothing to suggest that the need for affordable housing has been met since the CS was adopted. Therefore, I consider that a contribution towards affordable housing provision is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

However, I recognise that the nature of the proposal would make on site provision inappropriate in this case. A financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing would, therefore, be directly related in kind to the proposal.

35. The appellant has submitted a Financial Viability Assessment³ which finds that any financial contribution to affordable housing would make the scheme unviable. The Council also commissioned a viability assessment. Whilst I have not been provided with a copy, I understand that it shows that the scheme would be viable with a contribution of £150,000. The appellant has accepted that figure and it would be secured through the submitted UU. Having regard to the size of the proposal, I consider that the amount would be reasonably related in scale to the development. I have, therefore, taken the UU into account in reaching my decision.

Conditions

36. The Statement of Common Ground indicates that the conditions set out in the officer's report to committee and member's update provide a useful starting point. They are reproduced in the Council's statement. At the hearing it was agreed that suggested conditions 3 (Construction Environmental Management Plan), 15 (Community Liaison) and 17 (Construction Method Statement) could be amalgamated into a single condition. Suggested condition 6 (boundary treatment) is unnecessary since that requirement is covered by condition 5 (hard and soft landscaping). With amendments, I find that the remaining conditions meet the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.
37. A condition specifying the approved drawings is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition to secure the approval of a Construction Method Statement (which incorporates the requirements of suggested conditions 3 and 15) is required to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and highway safety. Conditions controlling construction working hours, the use of obscured glazing in the south east elevation of the building, the withdrawal of permitted development rights for the insertion of additional openings and the details of external lighting are also required to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
38. Conditions requiring details of external materials, hard and soft landscaping and the protection and replacement, if necessary, of existing trees are all necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area. A condition to secure the implementation of bin storage facilities is necessary for that reason and the interests of public health.
39. A condition to secure the provision and implementation of an Employment and Skills Plan is required to ensure that the development supports the local economy in accordance with MDD Policy TB12. A written scheme of investigation for archaeological work was submitted with the application. However, it is not clear from the response from the Council's archaeological consultee whether the document has been reviewed. I will, therefore, impose a condition requiring the approval and implementation of a written scheme of investigation.
40. Conditions to secure the provision of visitor and resident cycle parking and the implementation of the submitted Sustainability Statement are necessary in the

³ Alder King dated 12 July 2016

interests of sustainable travel and energy use. A condition controlling surface and foul water drainage in accordance with a previously submitted strategy is necessary to prevent flooding. Conditions to ensure the provision of vehicular access, parking and turning, as well as an age restriction on the occupation of the proposed flats, are required in the interests of highway safety.

41. A condition to ensure the implementation of the submitted Reptile Protection Method Statement is necessary in the interests of bio-diversity and a condition stipulating the procedure in the event that ground contamination is encountered is required to safeguard public health.

Conclusion

42. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR

**Schedule of conditions attached to
Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/17/3170553
134-146 London Road, Ruscombe, RG10 9HJ**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1100, SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1101, SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1102, SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1110 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1112 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL1210 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1211 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1212 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL1213 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL1310 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL1311 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1312 Rev A, SE-2293-03-AC-PL1350 and SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1360.
- 3) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
 - the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays, site notice boards, emergency contact details and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - wheel washing facilities;
 - measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - a scheme of temporary lighting;
 - the creation of a 'construction website.'

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 4) No works related to the development hereby approved, including works of

demolition or preparation prior to building operations, shall take place outside of the hours of 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 to 1300 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank or National Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

- 5) The corridor windows in the south east elevation of the building hereby permitted shall be permanently obscure-glazed and fixed closed at all times.
- 6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning, (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or similar openings, other than those shown on the approved drawings, shall be constructed in the any of the elevations of the building hereby permitted.
- 7) Before any above ground work is commenced details of any proposed external lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall set out the steps that will be taken to ensure that external lighting does not cause a nuisance to neighbouring or future occupiers of the site and shall include details of the location, direction and level of illumination of the lighting.
- 8) Before any above ground work is commenced, samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) Before any above ground work is commenced full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include proposed finished floor levels or contours, means of enclosure, hard surfacing materials and minor artefacts and structure (e.g. furniture, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, and external services). Soft landscaping details shall include a planting plan and specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, and an implementation timetable. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a timetable approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved and shall be permanently retained.
- 10) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the tree protection details shown on plan number 9080102 Rev A Tree Protection Plan (referred to as the Approved Scheme in this condition). The tree protection measures approved shall be implemented in accordance with the Approved Scheme for the duration of the development including, unless otherwise provided by the Approved Scheme demolition, all site preparation work, tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery. No development (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary

access construction and or widening or any other operation involving use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) shall commence until the local planning authority has been provided (by way of a written notice) with a period of no less than 7 working days to inspect the implementation of the measures identified in the Approved Scheme on-site. No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within an area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the Approved Scheme. The fencing or other works which are part of the Approved Scheme shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works, including external works, have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials removed from the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

- 11) No trees, shrubs or hedges within the site which are shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be felled, uprooted wilfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed without previous written consent of the local planning authority. Any trees, shrubs or hedges removed without consent or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within 5 years from the completion of the development hereby permitted shall be replaced with trees, shrubs or hedge plants of similar size and species unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.
- 12) No building shall be occupied until the bin storage area/facilities have been provided in full accordance with the approved drawings. The bin storage area and facilities shall be permanently retained and used for no purpose other than the temporary storage of refuse and recyclable materials.
- 13) Prior to the commencement of development an Employment and Skills Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Employment and Skills Plan shall show how the development hereby permitted will provide opportunities for training, apprenticeship or other vocational initiatives to develop local employability skills. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 14) Prior to the commencement of development the applicant or their agents or successors in title shall secure and implement a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the planning authority.
- 15) No building shall be occupied until details of secure and covered bicycle storage/parking facilities for the visitors to the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The cycle storage/parking shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall be permanently retained in the approved form for the parking of bicycles and used for no other purpose.
- 16) No building shall be occupied until secure and covered parking for cycles for occupants of the proposed development has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings. The cycle parking/storage shall be permanently retained for the parking of bicycles and used for no other purpose.
- 17) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the

details in the Sustainability Statement by Focus Consultants, reference L1517, dated June 2016.

- 18) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment, Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy by WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff dated 23 June 2016. Before development commences full details of the following matters shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning authority:
 - the sizing of the basins to demonstrate that they can cater for flood volumes generated by the 1 in 100 year flood event with a 40% allowance for climate change;
 - level details of the proposed SuDS features;
 - a drainage strategy plan indicating the linkage of the permeable areas to the basins;
 - a SuDS maintenance strategy setting out who will be responsible for maintenance of the SuDS throughout the lifetime of the development;
 - finished floor levels of the proposed development.The submitted details shall be implemented as approved and thereafter maintained.
- 19) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the proposed accesses have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.
- 20) No part of any building hereby permitted shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning spaces shown on approved drawing SE-2293-03-AC-PL 1110 Rev A have been provided. The vehicle parking and turning spaces shall be retained for that purpose at all times. The vehicle parking spaces shall not be allocated to any particular apartment.
- 21) The apartments hereby approved shall only be occupied by persons over the age of 55 and by any wife, husband or partner of such a person.
- 22) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details in the Pre-commencement Reptile Protection Method Statement (Innovation Group Environmental Services, Ref: E-13195, December 2016)
- 23) Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the approved development 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 the development is resumed or continued.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Robert Walton	Of Counsel, instructed by Planning Bureau
Kenny Brown	Townscape Solutions
Matthew Shellum BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Planning Bureau
Andrew Telling	Accord Architecture

FOR THE COUNCIL

Graham Vaughan	Planning Officer, Wokingham Borough Council
Councillor John Kaiser	Wokingham Borough Council

INTERESTED PERSONS

Mike Evans	Chair, Ruscombe Parish Council
Sharon Moore	5 Walnut Tree Close
Linda Cassidy	6 Walnut Tree Close
Kevin Cassidy	6 Walnut Tree Close
Bridget King	7 Walnut Tree Close

DOCUMENT SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Completed Unilateral Understanding dated 1 August 2017
2. Email from Ian Hann dated 6 July 2017 regarding housing land supply
3. Appeal decision reference APP/W0530/W/16/3162178
4. Council's Cost Rebuttal
5. Extract from the Wokingham District Landscape Character Assessment.