

Notice of Meeting



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday, 31st August, 2022 at 6.30 pm

**in the Council Chamber Council Offices
Market Street Newbury**

This meeting will be streamed live here: [Link to Western Area Planning Committee broadcasts](#)

You can view all streamed Council meetings here: [Link to West Berkshire Council - Public Meetings](#)

If members of the public wish to attend the meeting they can do so either remotely or in person. Members of the public who wish to attend must notify the Planning Team by no later than 4.00pm on 31 August 2022 by emailing planningcommittee@westberks.gov.uk.

Members Interests

Note: If you consider you may have an interest in any Planning Application included on this agenda then please seek early advice from the appropriate officers.

Date of despatch of Agenda: Monday, 22 August 2022

Further information for members of the public

Plans and photographs relating to the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting can be viewed by clicking on the link on the front page of the relevant report.

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact the Planning Team on (01635) 519148 or email planningcommittee@westberks.gov.uk.

Further information, Planning Applications and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at www.westberks.gov.uk



WestBerkshire
C O U N C I L

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 31 August 2022
(continued)

Any queries relating to the Committee should be directed to the Democratic Services Team by emailing executivecycle@westberks.gov.uk.



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 31 August 2022
(continued)

To: Councillors Clive Hooker (Chairman), Tony Vickers (Vice-Chairman),
Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Jeff Cant, Carolyne Culver,
Claire Rowles and Howard Woollaston

Substitutes: Councillors Jeff Beck, James Cole, Lynne Doherty, David Marsh,
Steve Masters, Andy Moore, Erik Pattenden and Martha Vickers

Agenda

Part I

Page No.

(4) Update Reports

5 - 12

Background Papers

- (a) The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
- (b) The West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire, the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire and relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents.
- (c) Any previous planning applications for the site, together with correspondence and report(s) on those applications.
- (d) The case file for the current application comprising plans, application forms, correspondence and case officer's notes.
- (e) The Human Rights Act.

Sarah Clarke.

Sarah Clarke
Service Director – Strategy & Governance
West Berkshire District Council

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact
Stephen Chard on (01635) 519462.



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

This page is intentionally left blank

**WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATED 31STAUGUST 2022**

UPDATE REPORT

This report sets out the running order for tonight's Committee meeting. It indicates the order in which the applications will be heard, the officer presenting and anyone who has registered to speak either in favour or against the application.

Those people attending to take part in the pre-arranged Public Speaking sections are reminded that speakers in each representation category are grouped and each group will have a maximum of 5 minutes to present its case.

Any additional information that has been received since the main agenda was printed will be contained in this report. It may for instance make reference to amended plans and further letters of support or objection. This report must therefore be read in conjunction with the main agenda.

The report is divided into four main parts:

Part 1 - relates to items not being considered at the meeting,
Part 2 - any applications that have been deferred for a site visit,
Part 3 - applications where members of the public wish to speak,
Part 4 - applications that have not attracted public speaking.

Part 1	Item (3) 21/03083/COMIND: Land Adjacent to M4, Membury Airfield	Pages 43-55
Part 2	N/A	
Part 3	Item (2) 22/01643/TELE56 Telecomms Mast at Junction Of Stoney Lane & Turnpike Rd	Pages 33-41
Part 4	Item (1) 2/01556/HOUSE 11 Valley Road, Newbury	Pages 25-32

This page is intentionally left blank

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
31ST AUGUST 2022

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 22/01556/HOUSE **Page No.** 25-32

Site: 11 Valley Road, Newbury RG14 6ET

Planning Officer Presenting: Patrick Haran

Member Presenting: N/A

Parish Representative speaking: Councillor Nigel Foot

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: N/A

Ward Member(s): Councillor Adrian Abbs
Councillor David Marsh
Councillor Tony Vickers

No Updates on this application

This page is intentionally left blank

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
31ST AUGUST 2022

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (2) **Application No:** 22/01643/TELE56 **Page No.** 33-41

Site: Junction of Stoney Lane and Turnpike Road, Newbury

Planning Officer Presenting: Sian Cutts

Member Presenting: N/A

Parish Representative speaking: Councillor Nigel Foot

Objector(s) speaking: John Soffley Attending In Person

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: N/A

Ward Member(s): Councillor Jeff Beck
Councillor Jeff Cant

1. Alternative Sites

The Supplementary Information Form submitted with the application, included the following assessment of alternative sites.

Site	Site Name and Address	National Grid Reference	Reason for not choosing
1	Gaywood Drive, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2PA	448512 167899	It was considered that this option did not provide a better town planning and environmental solution, when compared directly to the application site. It was considered that visual splay issues could be caused for oncoming motorists near the junction. As such, this option was discounted.

2.	Gaywood Drive, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2PA,	448608 167800	Narrow pavement at this location would hinder pedestrian access should the necessary equipment be installed. This option was therefore discounted. The proximity to a steep embankment posed design concerns and would prove problematic for equipment deployment.
3.	Eastern Chef, Gaywood Drive, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2PA	448771 167760	The proximity to existing overhead cable posed design concerns and would prove problematic for equipment deployment. As such, this option was discounted.
4.	Hopwood Close, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2PG	448767 167833	Narrow pavement at this location would hinder pedestrian access should the necessary equipment be installed. This option was therefore discounted.
5.	Avon Way, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2PF	448790 167956	It was considered that visual splay issues on the shared pavement for pedestrian and cyclists could be caused for oncoming motorists near the junction. As such, this option was discounted.
6.	Wyndham Road, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2NJ	448761 167997	The proximity to existing overhead cable posed design concerns and would prove problematic for equipment deployment. As such, this option was discounted.
7.	Turnpike Road, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2ND	448743 167985	The proximity to existing services posed design concerns and would prove problematic for equipment deployment. As such, this option was discounted. Visual splay issues also raised concerns for oncoming motorists near the junction.
8.	Kiln Road, Newbury, West Berkshire, RG14 2NH	448523 167988	It was considered that visual splay issues could be caused for oncoming motorists near the junction. As such, this option was discounted

2. Additional Consultation Responses

Environmental Health:	<p>My experience of their cabinets is that whilst they do make a mild hum, it is not particularly loud or intrusive and has never resulted in any complaints that I am aware of so I have not typically raised it as an issue. If there are concerns, we could recommend a noise condition to ensure that noise generated does not cause adverse impacts:</p> <p>All plant, machinery and equipment installed or operated in connection with the carrying out of this permission shall be so enclosed and/or attenuated that noise therefrom does not exceed at any time a level of 5dB[A] below the existing background noise level [or 10dB[A] if there is a particular tonal quality [or is intermittent in nature] when measured in accordance with BS4142:2014 at a point one metre external to the nearest residential or noise sensitive property</p> <p>Reason To protect the occupants of nearby residential properties from noise</p>
------------------------------	---

The equipment cabinets are permitted development in their own right. Whilst additional advice was sought from Environmental Health on the potential noise from the cabinets, imposing a condition as suggested would be beyond the remit of this application which refers to siting and appearance of the mast only.

3. Response to 3rd Party Comments From Agent

The agent has submitted comments' in response to the objections raised the points can be summarised as follows:

- The NPPF states that planning authorities must not set health guards different to those set out by the International Commission guidelines, and an ICNIRP certificate was submitted with this application
- The height of the mast has been kept to a minimum to provide the necessary service and remain operationally viable, 20m high monopoles are routinely deployed.
- The ground based equipment cabinets are permitted development, whether they are the subject of graffiti is beyond the application
- The site selection has been limited to a small area to fit the Operators network and cell pattern, alternative sites were identified, and this is the best town planning solution, if the area to be served is residential, the mast will be in a residential area.
- The site is a residential area, but also where there is other street furniture
- Aiming to provide 3G, 4G and 5G coverage to this a part of Newbury, moving further away from target area will reduce connectivity, capacity and coverage, refers to appeal cases where the best site does not have to be selected.
- The applicants consider that the least damaging site has been selected in this instance, making use of the natural environment, given the trees, pedestrian footway, and the context of the built environment
- The height is below the standard 20m monopole which is used many settings and were permitted in 2017, and the further relaxation of PD rights in 2022 to enable 5G roll-out.
- Mobile data use is at an all-time high following Covid and the need for base stations to provide coverage & connectivity
- Selection of appeals where 20m monopoles and ground based assessment were considered.
- Accept that the current poles will be visible, but given the benefits they should be acceptable, and say that while visible it will not be harmful.

- The use of a 15 m high slim line monopole reduces the visual impact of the scheme as much as practical, contrast with the bubble headframe of the 4G roll-out. The design is a higher quality than previously used.