

Planning Rebuttal

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 78 appeal against the refusal of planning permission

Witness: Mr Matthew Shepherd BSc, MSc.

Subject of Evidence: Planning Development Management

Appeal: APP/W0340/W/22/3312261

Site: The Hollies Reading Road Burghfield Common Reading
RG7 3BH

Proposal: Erection of 32 dwellings including affordable housing,
parking, and landscaping. Access via Regis Manor Road.

Date: May 2023

Council Reference: 22/00244/FULEXT

Rebuttal

West Berkshire Council
Development and Planning
Market Street
Newbury
Berkshire
RG14 5LD

T: 01635 519111

E: appeals@westberks.gov.uk
www.westberks.gov.uk/planning

Rebuttal Points

- 1.1 **Referring to section 4.46 and 4.47** of the appellant's planning proof this refers to correspondence in CD5.15 noting that the principle of development was acceptable by the appellant's reading. The correspondence predates the submission of the application and the engagement with key consultees e.g. the ONR. It is also between a Principle Planning Policy Officer rather than a Development Management Officer. It also predates further development of the Council's emerging local plan where it was decided not to roll the allocation forwards. This correspondence is outdated and was prior to engagement in the development management process and consultation period that occurred during the course of the application and in my opinion cannot be relied upon.
- 1.2 It is accepted in Mr Cornwell's email of the 08 January 2021 that *"I have little doubt they will still object to any application for housing on the land."* This therefore shows that the agent in this email accepts that there may be issues to contend with through the future consultation period.
- 1.3 **In section 4.51** the appellant notes

"It is therefore clear that any conflict with Policy GS1 was addressed through the Council's approval of the Outline application for 28 dwellings on part of the allocation, and this established the principle of delivering the balance of the allocation (this Appeal Proposal) on the adjoining site, which the Council referred to in 2018 as Phase 2."
- 1.4 The appellant's argue that the Council's report in CD.5.8 establishes the principle of delivering the balance of the allocation. However, the appellant's have omitted the last paragraph of 1.3 of CD 5.8 which states the following

"The remainder of the site "Phase 2" is under separate ownership and is not included within the application site."
- 1.5 It is clear from this paragraph that the Council has not considered the site as "Phase 2" as it was beyond the scope of that planning application.
- 1.6 The use of the phrases 'Phase 1' and 'Phase 2' is how in correspondence between the Council and Planning agents of 16/01685/OUTMAJ referred to the sections of the site

and does not constitute agreement of a principle of development on this site that was not being considered as part of that application.

1.7 **In section 8.14** the appellants states

“.Therefore, in my opinion, very significant positive weight should be given to any proposal which delivers affordable housing in the District.”

1.8 The Council disagrees with the level of weight apportioned to the policy compliant level of affordable housing provided by this development by the appellants. The weight attached to affordable housing that is tempered by the aspect that there are many locations within the District which are not suitable for affordable housing such as floodplains and in this instance within the DEPZ. Therefore, in my opinion it is reasonable to give less weight to the provision of affordable housing in this case due to the sites inclusion within the DEPZ as per my proof of evidence.