
**Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning, Environment and Highways Committee
held on 12th January 2026 in Charvil Village Hall at 8pm**

Present Lee Cripps (Chair), Katrin Harding, Mark A' Bear, Stephen Lucas, Narinder Ryatt, and Pat Sutcliffe. Matt Walker attended due to a conflict of interest for the Chair of Planning and Jane Hartley attended the end of the meeting

Apologies

Absent

**26/342 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND ANY WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR
PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA TO BE CONSIDERED BY
THE CLERK**

Councillor Cripps reported that he backs onto the site of Application 253071, and because of that, will pass the Chairmanship for related agenda items to the Chair of Council and will not take part in the discussions on these points on the agenda.

26/343 OPEN FORUM

Four residents attended who were all concerned about Planning Application 253071, the reserved matters for land West of Park Lane. One resident asked several questions around whose responsibility is it to note the ongoing drift on the planning conditions relating to the land west of Park Lane, residents, the Parish Council or the planning officers themselves. The answer is to comment on anything seen as material, so that it does not get overlooked. The second point was around the conditions of the outline planning consent; these remain in place, even if they are not covered by these reserved matters application and can be dealt with in the future. The third question was around the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan, and that this was at the Examination stage, and it is hoped it will go to referendum in May. There were two residents who are concerned about the lack of a buffer zone between Canberra Lake Way and their property, because the angle of the proposed development to their rear will eat into their light and affect privacy, and they believe they are the most adversely affect home in Canberra Lake Way. The final resident was also concerned about the lack of a buffer, which he believed was in the original plans for Canberra Lake Way, and with the blend of housing types which is unsuitable for such a car-centric village. The residents left at 8.55, at the end of the discussions on the planning application.

26/344 To Approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on 1st December 2025

These were approved and signed

26/345 Highways

To note the Speed Indicator Device data

The data was consistent with previous readings, and there were concerns around the 61mph reading in Park Lane. Some concerns were raised about the accuracy of the data and whether it was giving correct readings. Councillor Harding reported that the new Borough Speed policy would be approved later in the week, and parishes will be able to influence where lower speed limits could be introduced.

26/346 Environment

**To consider and approve a date, time and location for the litter pick on
weekend of 21st or 22nd March 2026**

It was agreed that this will take place on Saturday 21st March at 2pm. Refreshments will be provided.

It was noted that the orchard planting went ahead as planned on 14th December, and there was a photo-shoot for the planting of the horse chestnut, which should be

planted properly by the end of January or early February. The hedging plants also need to be planted.

26/347

a)

253071

Planning

The following Planning Application for consideration

Application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to outline Planning consent 232704 comprising details of 75 homes, together with associated internal access roads, parking, public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). Details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be considered on land West of Park Lane, Charvil

Councillor Cripps passed the Chairmanship to Councillor Walker and took no part in the ensuing discussion and had no input into the agreed planning points.

After some discussion it was agreed that the clerk should comment as follows:

Charvil Parish Council has various concerns around the proposals in this application, which are set out below.

1. **Housing layout and size.** *There is much disquiet from existing residents of Canberra Lake Way about the proposed layout, and it does appear that this current plan is not in accordance with CP3, in that it will adversely impact on the amenity of the existing homes. This would be relatively easy to amend, by incorporating some landscaping between the existing and new developments and would also provide valuable green corridors for wildlife.*

A further concern is around affordable housing. The Parish Council welcomes the inclusion of 40% affordable housing, but feels the current layout is contrary to the S106 agreement signed in May 2025. The agreement states that there should be no clustering but instead the affordable homes should be spread around the site; these homes are largely all together, around the perimeter of the existing Canberra Lake Way, although there are small pockets elsewhere. It also states that these homes should be indistinguishable from market price homes, but it will be very clear in most cases, because the only homes that are not four or five-bedrooms are affordable in the current plan. The Parish Council would like to see some market value smaller homes as per its emerging Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2, Meeting Local Housing Needs. There also needs to be some three- bedroom homes rather than the current concentration of four and five-bedroom homes. This would then allow the developer to meet the terms of the S106 agreement. One further concern is the lack of commitment to solar panels – if these were included in tandem with the promised air-source heat pumps, then the properties would be the most sustainable in the village, and this is a missed opportunity as well as contrary to both the emerging Local Plan, and the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan.
2. **Active Travel and village integration.** *In the Design and Access statement, the developer states that they fully support walking and cycling infrastructure, but even within the development, the proposals are intermittent and will not encourage walking and cycling. from a wider village perspective, there is also no support; the footpath suggested in the indicative plan provided as part of the outline application into Canberra Lake Way has not been taken forward, and the design of the crossing of Park Lane is conspicuously absent from these reserved matters. This is contrary to AM02 of the Charvil Neighbourhood Plan that wishes to encourage walking and cycling permeability throughout the village. It is important to improve and maintain community cohesion and to allow a free flow of pedestrians and cyclists around the village in a safe and pleasant environment, and this development needs to support that in the limited ways it can.*
3. **Village Facilities.** *All but one or two of the substantial developments in the village since the 1960s have been allowed on appeal, and consequently there have been limited options for the Borough or Parish Council to influence what additional facilities are provided to support the growing population. It was hoped that this development would be different, providing two facilities currently lacking: some allotments, and a space for older children to enjoy. Initial conversations around the proposed development indicated both could be included but unfortunately this plan, if adopted,*

will be a missed opportunity to provide two facilities that the village sorely needs that could reasonably be provided alongside a development of this size.

4. **Concerns around the site geology report.** Perhaps the greatest concern the Parish Council has is around the results of the Geological survey that was commissioned as a condition of the outline planning permission being granted. This was to protect the health and safety of residents and others going forward. The conclusion of the report suggests that there needs to be quite a lot of further investigation before any safe development in various areas of the site, and that some areas will need very deep foundations to mitigate the effects of ground desiccation, while others will only need normal foundations. Another suggestion is that if soakaways are provided, they need to be a substantial distance from the houses and roads to mitigate any adverse effects. SUDS are to be at a depth of at least a metre above the flooding level of the wettest areas; this could be difficult as the ponds are very close to the flood zones 2 and 3. It is also a concern that when this site was assessed for its suitability after the call for sites in 2019, the whole field was categorised as Flood zone one, so there was no concern around flooding. There were still no concerns even when the site was given outline planning permission a year ago, but now the lowest-lying areas are flood zones 2 and 3. Does this re-classification have implications for the viability of the site for development, and have all the possible impacts been explored, particularly as to how it affects The Homestead to the south, and East Park Farm car park and sports facilities to the east? Moreover, although the report mentions the well-publicised sink hole in the East Park Farm car park, it glosses over the cause, even suggesting that it was down to poor workmanship, but fails to mention that there was one, and possibly two earlier sink holes on the sports pitches on the same line, and how these may be an effect of the chalk dissolution. Some local geologists have suggested that more research needs to be done on the effect of a narrow water channel travelling parallel with the existing stream, into which the overlying gravels are collapsing. This would have been too narrow to have been picked up using the survey methods applied and are likely to be the cause of the sink holes on the western side of Park Lane. This is to do with the feathering of the Lambeth group which overlaid the chalk essentially the rock thins and at the interface between the two a spring line sees water from the aquifer flow out across the chalk. These zones are long recognised and notorious for causing sinkhole problems. Although the report states that the responsibility of the stability of the site falls solely on the developer, will this be the case on land that is not part of the development and in different ownership, such as the East Park Farm car park and the sports facilities? There seems to be too much uncertainty and possible repercussions to determine this application at this stage, and as the leaseholder of the land east of Park Lane that could be most adversely affected, the Parish Council feels that there needs to be a cast-iron agreement that any further sink hole damage there is paid for by the developer, or steps taken to reduce the likelihood of such events to a minimum.

Councillor Cripps returned to chair the next items on the agenda

- 253115 Application for works to protected trees TPO 275/1984, T1, T2, Oak (T1 on TPO) – selective crown reduction of lateral limbs by 1m back to previous reduction points at 11, The Hawthorns (For information only) – no Parish Council comment

b) Planning Applications approved - the following approvals were noted

- 252701 APPLICATION FOR WORKS TO PROTECTED TREE(S) TPO 1852/2022, GROUP 3 T1, Lime – Reduce branches overhanging play area back to fence line, up to 4.8m above ground level, T2, Lime – Reduce branches overhanging play area back to fence line, up to 4.8m above ground level, T3, Lime – Reduce branches overhanging play area back to fence line, up to 4.8m above ground level at East Park Farm, Charvil

- 252726 Application for the proposed erection of a self-build dwelling with annexe, attached two bay carport and associated landscaping works following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuilding at Chilterns, Thames Drive
- 252382 Application for a certificate of lawfulness for the proposed loft conversion along with changes to fenestration including replacement of existing rooflight at 6, Old Bath Road
- 252434 Application for works to protected trees TPO 1611/2017, woodland T1, Ash – Fell, T2, Hazel – Fell, T3, Oak – remove deadwood, T4, Hazel – Fell, T5, Oak – Fell, T6, Ash – Fell, T7, Ash – Fell, G8, silver birch – Fell, T9, Sycamore – Fell, T10, Oak – Fell, T11, Sycamore – Fell, G12, Sycamore – Fell, T13, Elm – Fell, T14, Willow – Fell (partial tree consent) at land adjacent to Lands End House, Beggars Hill Road
- c) **Appeal lodged** – Permission in Principle application for the proposed erection of 1no. detached dwelling at land next to Lands End House
- d) **To consider whether to make a formal approach to Bellway Homes regarding the application 253071**

Councillor Walker returned to chair the final agenda item and Councillor Cripps did not take part in the following discussion

It was agreed that the clerk should make an approach to Bellway Homes for a meeting. Councillor Harding reported that she may make a similar approach, and it might be feasible for her and representatives of the Parish Council to attend the same meeting. The affected residents have also made an approach, but it was felt inappropriate for council representatives to attend that meeting if it is agreed.

Items for the next Full Council Meeting

The only possible item would be whether to appoint a planning consultant if Application 253071 were to go to the Planning Committee.

The meeting ended at 9.15pm