

Objector	Date objection received	Issue	Officer response
McClean (no address)	8/2/19	Despite what was said at last night planning committee meeting, the fact remains that the school contractor will not be able to fell any trees, erect fences or build a retaining wall at the rear of the proposed school, because the work will cause a disruption the Public Right of Way, Footpath 43. Furthermore, the Health and Safety at Work Act will not allow the contractor to carry out any works which could endanger the life of anyone who uses this footpath. Your comments at last night's meeting and the fact that a supplementary notice has been issued regarding this footpath and which remain open for comments until the 18th February 2019, now requires the proper procedure to be followed, for the Closure of this footpath, prior to the commencement of any works likely to cause potential danger to users of the footpath.. An Closure Order should be submitted to the Secretary of State, under the Town and Country Planning Act and therefore no work can be carried out adjacent to footpath 43 until this order is confirmed by the secretary of State. I should be grateful if you would confirm that no preparatory ground works will commence until a Footpath Closure Order has been confirmed.	The development will not disrupt FP43. FP43 is a short, circular walk which is unusual in that it encloses an area. The development is adjacent to the footpath, but does not affect it, nor does it affect its purpose, which is of a circular walk. If the purpose of using the footpath is to access the Playing Fields, then as set out in the officer report for planning application 171023/FUL, then that is still possible from access points nearby on Hewett Avenue. From the above, there is no requirement for a Diversion Order for this Public Right of Way, although due to an administrative error, the application has been re-advertised, as previously and as a precaution, to indicate that the footpath is 'affected' (inasmuch as the boundary of the application site abuts the footpath. Comments shall be accepted until 22 February 2019. Any requirements as may be necessary under other legislation, for instance Health and Safety requirements, are not relevant to this planning consideration. In any event, the applicant has advised that the site is to be protected by security fencing in preparation for the removal of trees on the adjacent site and this can take place without hindering the use or enjoyment of Footpath 43 by the public.

O'Neill	12/2/19	Please could I ask that no trees must be felled before the main Landscape Plan is approved and ALL Legal Agreements have been signed. Please could you respond to me and tell me if this is possible under your rules, regulations and possible delegated officer powers?	It is assumed that the objector is referring to the comprehensive masterplan for the wider Playing Fields. The provisions of the original planning permission 171023/FUL should be noted. By the Resolution of the Planning Applications Committee on 4 April 2018, that planning permission allows for development to commence with the Council to be paid a sum to undertake the landscaping, etc. works no later than 12 months of the transfer of the land to the applicant/developer. The present application adopts the same principle, with an adjusted contribution for delivery of the landscaping scheme. Signing of the s106 unilateral undertaking and the associated Deed of Variation is imminent and no tree felling is to be undertaken on either the application site or the wider Playing Fields until the relevant s106/uu/DoV are signed. The land is in Trust and separate approval of the Trust would be required, but officers understand that the approval of the Trust was given w/c 18 February 2019. However, it should be noted at the time of writing that a planning application has now been submitted for the landscaping, etc. works (ref. 190240/REG3) and validation of that application is imminent. The objector appears to be taking issue with the land which would be subject to the disposal/sale to the applicant and the red line of the planning application site. It is the wider plan, including the school site,
O'Neill	12/2/19	I wish to object to two further things: - The extension of the land to be controlled by the school as shown in the revised plan SiteBoundary00418011.pdf which now appears to enclose a further area beside the tennis courts. This, is	

	the original plan [inserted], [which] closely limits the school to reduce the impact that it will have on the remaining Trust land. Since community use agreements have not been finalised, there are possible implications that the school may not tolerate other Beneficiary access whilst they are busy and since this is the main and most accessible access route, it will seriously harm the rights of the Playing Fields during school hours. This is the widened boundary area now shown for the school influence [insert] I questioned one increase at the time of the Heads of Terms with Bruce Tindall but this seems to extend beyond the necessary access road which was in the first proposal. -I also wish to object to the inconclusive Surface Drainage (SUDS) report 00377391.pdf that leaves no final answers to permeability to the land in the area. It clearly states, 'surface water runoff from the development will infiltrate into the ground subject to confirmation that ground conditions are suitable for infiltration methods'. It is quite clear that the land is not very water absorbent -otherwise a wider landscape plan would not be needed to drain the football pitches. With no conclusion it would be expected that it either floods adjoining land or it requires impinging into land that it has not currently come within the curtilage/ boundary. A failure of this SUDS scheme will force water onto the proposed pitch drainage which in turn will considerably increase the penalty on the Trustees.	the access road and the MPF car park which was the subject of permission 171023/FUL and this variation application 182200/VARIAT. The planning assessment of application 171023/FUL in the officer report to the 4 April 2018 Planning Applications Committee assessed the impact on the MPF car park and other users and concluded that there was no objection from the Highway Authority, subject to the s106 (unilateral undertaking) and conditions, including a Construction Method Statement. This arrangement is very largely unchanged in the consideration of application 182200/VARIAT. The Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for the current application 182200/VARIAT is unchanged from the previous permission 171023/FUL, which was approved by the Council's SUDS Manager. The purpose of the SUDS plan is to ensure that in proposing the development, there is no additional run-off caused over the existing situation and this pertains to the application site. The principal change within the application site is the inclusion of a large, flat-roofed building and the SUDS report concludes that measures can be put in place sufficient to adhere to the levels required in the report. There is to be no building on the wider site, which is made up of a tarmac access road and a largely gravelled car park, although the soft and hard landscaping scheme, as previously, will need to provide permeability.
--	---	---

		I was told by the planning officer, Mr Eatough that this was the definitive document and conclusion of the SUDS report. I would ask why this scheme has been accepted without a published scientific study being done. I am fully aware of the intensity and cost of the much smaller scheme done in Lower Caversham by RBC just to permit the Amersham Road community centre and this in comparison seems to have been brushed over.	The applicant has confirmed that surface water drainage will be managed within the school site and the contractor is designing to that end. It is advised that infiltration rates on the northern part of the application site are lower than the southern part and there will be a degree of on-site attenuation to meet the required discharge levels as set out in the SWMP. The inference of the objection appears to be that there will be an issue as to the wider MPF works if the SUDS scheme for the red line application site fails. In response, the scheme must be in accordance with the approved SWMP and as with any condition, if the developer is not able to comply with the terms of the condition, then they will need to apply to have the condition modified, which would be considered on its individual planning merits. Regarding the wider Playing Fields, drainage of the pitches does indeed affect the pitches' carrying capacity/playability and the forthcoming planning application will seek to attend to this in as far as is necessary to meet the terms of the mitigation as required by permission 171023/FUL, as to be varied by 182200/VARIAT.
Watt	19/2/2019	The proposed location of Air Handling Units and Kitchen Plant Extract on the roof of the building will alter the profile, giving it a more industrial or "utilitarian" appearance and increase the height, making it incompatible with its environs. Whereas the original design met the requirements of the pre-application advice from RBC and conformed to the requirements of RBC Core Strategy Planning Policy, this altered design does not. {This is} contrary to the	The objector remains concerned for the eventual visual impact of the proposed air handling unit (AHU) proposed to be sited on the roof of the building. The concern is that such plant will alter the building significantly and no such plant was approved in the elevations of the original planning permission. The approved plans for permission 171023/FUL do not indicatively show the location/size of the AHU, but Condition 16 and also Condition 6 of that

	Officer's assurance to the Planning Application Committee the Architect's drawings show that the Air Handling Unit will protrude above the parapet by 2 metres, thereby changing the profile of the building to a more industrial or utilitarian appearance. The Officer's assurance to the Planning Application Committee included the following statement. "This Air Handling Unit does not project above by 2 metres. There is a parapet wall which is 1 metre high and therefore it won't project as much." However the Novium Architect's drawings of North, East, South and West elevations each show the extent of the plant by a dotted line. Reference to the scale of the drawings indicates that it will protrude above the parapet by at least 2 metres. RBC's pre-application advice included the following guidance <i>"You have been able to confirm that the building will have ... a flat roof ... Whilst I accept that flat roofs are an economical design solution, they are not generally an attractive design and in particular, when more than a single storey. Care must be taken not to harm the character of the area with what may inevitably be a rather utilitarian building."</i> This proposed variation will radically alter the profile of the building making it appear "utilitarian", contrary to RBC's pre-application advice RBC Planning Policy CS7 includes the following requirements "All development must be of high design quality that maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area of Reading in which it is located. The various components of development form, including:	permission require the submission and approval of such plant equipment. Application 182200/VARIAT has been submitted by the developer's contractor, having now worked through the more detailed design of the building. A more worked up roof plan is now submitted and this plan indicates the location of two large areas of biodiverse ('brown') roof, the required location of the PV solar array and the location of the kitchen plant extract and the AHU. The elevations show the indicative heights of the AHU. The applicant has advised that what is shown is a worst-case and the actual plant is likely to be lower than this and below the 2m as is the concern of the objector. It is usual for such plant to be conditioned in this way, largely because at the time of approval, the exact extent of the plant required is not clear. The dotted line on the approved plans is indicative and would not override the consideration of location/massing and external appearance considerations via condition submissions. In summary, the extent, location and appearance of plant/roof-mounted equipment was and would continue to be, subject to subsequent approval(s) by (a) separate application(s) to discharge planning conditions. There is not considered to be a variation in this aspect of the proposals and officers cannot refuse something which is to be considered subject to submission for a planning condition. Considerations such as design policy CS7 and the effect on the Playing Fields would indeed be relevant to the subsequent applications to discharge (a)
--	---	--

		• Layout: urban structure and urban grain; • Landscape; • Density and mix; • Scale: height and massing; and • Architectural detail and materials. Whereas the highest point of the original design was an architectural feature, a tympanum visible primarily from the car park and designed to enhance the appearance of the building, in the proposed revised design that will be completely overshadowed by the mass of the Air Handling Unit. This will be visible from all over Mapledurham Playing Fields, increasing the perceived height of the mass of the building by 25% and dwarfing immediately adjacent and surrounding bungalows. This proposed variation will make what was already a large building, relative to the environs, into a disproportionately massive building contrary to RBC Core Strategy Planning Policy CS7. This amendment radically alters the appearance and increases the adverse impact of the school and should be refused.	planning condition(s).
Watt	20/2/2019	I object to this application for a minor material variation to application 171023 for the erection of a 2FE primary school on Mapledurham Playing Fields. This application, submitted as a minor material amendment under Section 73 TCPA 1990 must be considered under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, and conditions attached to the existing permission. Local planning authorities should, in making their decisions, focus their attention on national and development plan policies, and other material considerations which may have changed significantly since the original grant of permission.	This is not entirely correct. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the adopted Development Plan and any other material planning considerations. In considering this s73 variation application, regard must be had to any significant changes in policy in the intervening period. Since consideration of the original planning application 171023/FUL there has been no significant change in the status of emerging local plan policies, although the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in July 2018. The report for

		The draft updated local plan, submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 29 March 2018, states: "EN7: LOCAL GREEN SPACE AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE The following Local Green Spaces (LGS) and Public Open Space (POS), as shown on the Proposals Map, will be protected from development. Proposals that would result in the loss of any of these areas of open space, erode their quality through insensitive adjacent development or jeopardise their use or enjoyment by the public, will not be permitted." Mapledurham Playing Fields is shown on the proposals map. If public examination of the local plan has been complete, as scheduled, the plan endorsed by the Secretary of State and adopted by Reading Borough Council then EN7 prohibits the development and, consequently, application 182200 must be rejected. If not, but the process of endorsement and adoption of the plan has progressed since 14th August 2018 (when application 171023 was approved) then committee cognisance should have been taken of this (as directed by July 2018 NPPF, which states: "From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: · The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); · The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the	application 182200/VARIAT discusses this at Section 5 covers these issues and clearly advises the weight which officers consider should be attached to the policies of the emerging local plan. See above. See above. Committee has been advised that the examination into the local plan has taken place. Again, Section 5 of the Committee Report covers this.
--	--	---	--

		greater the weight that may be given); and The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework ...") In this case the Committee's attention should have been drawn to this prerogative, which it was not, and therefore the application should be rejected. I requested the programme manager to advise me of the current state of progress of adoption of the local plan, but have had no response. If either the new local plan has been adopted or if the process of endorsement and adoption has progressed since 14th August 2018 this application should be rejected.	The Programme Manager has been on sick leave, but officers can confirm that there is no further update at this time. The new local plan has not been adopted. The LPA is currently awaiting the Inspector's Report, the date for this is not known. Upon receipt of the Inspector's Report, Modifications to the draft policies are likely and further public consultation will need to take place on these Modifications. Final adoption of the local plan is not expected before Summer 2019, therefore the current situation is as reported to the Committee.
Brommell, H	20/2/2019	I object to this planning application, in particular the amendment which includes the siting of air handling units and kitchen plant extractors on the roof of the building. I cannot see any evidence of noise, fumes and vibration tests completed for this equipment and if this is acceptable to local properties. This includes not only the properties but the gardens which are in close proximity to the boundary of the school.	See above. The amendments do not introduce air handling units, such were envisaged in application 171023/FUL. The response of the Council's Environmental Protection team on the original application as follows: <i>"RBC Environmental Protection advises that the noise assessment has shown that noise levels in the area will remain suitable. A noise control condition is required in relation to any mechanical plant. Impacts on air quality in the area are acceptable"</i>.

			The objector is advised that Condition 16 of the original planning permission 171023/FUL requires submission of full details of means of ventilation for the extraction and dispersal of cooking smells/fumes, including details of construction, odour control, noise, appearance and running specifications. Further, Condition 23 of the approval requires that no mechanical plant shall be installed until a noise assessment has been carried out and the relevant noise level to be adhered to is set out in the condition. Vibration is covered by this condition, because vibration is low-level noise. Therefore, subject to control by the conditions, impacts on residential amenity are considered to be suitable, subject to satisfactory adherence to the conditions above. These conditions are proposed to be carried over in this s73 variation application. Issues of height of AHU, noise in relation to neighbouring properties, impacts on air quality covered adequately above. See also officer reports. Issues of dominance, overbearing, and appearance also dealt with here and in the officer reports.
Hutt	22/2/2019	I am strongly Objecting to the purpose Major change to this planning application to fit Air & Kitchen Handling Extractors of some two meters high as Suggested by the Contractor over looking my property and garden . Can you send me the current evidence of the amount of noise pollution these Extractors will create in such close proximity to residential properties (ie) mine ?, and are predicted levels acceptable so close to my property . I can see no Statistics included to show the impact to Air and noise quality or what levels of pollution they will create and how this will impact on us in close proximity . In other words what are the current levels of air	

		pollution and what is this anticipated to increase to once the school is built . I think these could have a major impact to our health and local residents . Although this planning application has been passed to our disgust not only do we have to look forward to a great big white building over powering our home (bungalow) now we have the problem above ??. I look for would to your response ???	
--	--	--	--

Officer recommendation:

Please note the objections above and the responses proposed by your officers.

The consultation period re-advertising the Section 73 VARIAT application (by 22 February 2019) has expired and officers advise that no substantive new objection issues (relevant to the consideration of this application) have been received following your meeting.

HPDRS' response:

I agree the above as a correct record and agree that no new substantive objections/issues have been raised and accordingly planning permission 182200/VARIAT can be issued (subject to the prior execution of the required Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking and Deed of Variation).

Additionally I also hereby extend the time to complete the s106 unilateral and Deed of Variation and to issue the planning consent by Monday 25/2/2019.



..... G. F. Williams

25/2/19
Date.....

Signed: Head of Planning, Development and Regulatory Services

Acting Head of Dev