

These Minutes have been amended. Please see Minutes of 5 April 2017 for amendments.

## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 15 MARCH 2017**

**Councillors Present:** Howard Bairstow, Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Paul Bryant (Vice-Chairman), Hilary Cole, Adrian Edwards, Paul Hewer, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson and Virginia von Celsing

**Also Present:** Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Jo Reeves (Principal Policy Officer) and Shiraz Sheikh (Principal Solicitor)

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor Billy Drummond

#### **PART I**

##### **51. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2017 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Page 6 Point 3, last sentence in the first paragraph, to be changed to read 'The plans were inaccurate and the agent had since confirmed there would be juliet balconies'.

A discussion was held regarding the juliet balconies, with some Members recalling that there would be no juliet balconies. Officers agreed to check the plans.

##### **52. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest received.

##### **53. Schedule of Planning Applications**

###### **(1) Application No. and Parish: 16/02529/OUTD - Land Adjacent To Summerfield, The Ridge, Cold Ash**

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 16/02529/OUTD in respect of an outline application for change of use of part of existing agricultural field to residential and the erection of 5 no. detached dwelling houses with ancillary garages, access, parking, landscaping and associated works. The matters to be considered were access and layout.
2. Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations. In addition, Derek Carnegie indicated the information in the update sheet regarding a recent High Court judgement regarding affordable housing and advised that the recommendation had been amended from the original report to include the requirement for a Section 106 contribution. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable and a conditional approval was justifiable. Officers recommended the Committee grant planning permission.
3. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mike Munro, Parish Council representative, Simon Vanstone, objector, and Kirstin Gray, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.
4. Mr Munro in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

- The Parish Council has opposed proposed development on the site ever since its inclusion in the Housing Sites Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD).
  - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that ridge lines and gaps needed to be protected.
  - The proposed development was for five homes and if refused would not have a significant impact on the Council's land supply as thousands of new homes were needed in the District.
  - The Cold Ash Village Design Statement set out a preference for smaller affordable dwellings as infill development. The proposed development was for five executive houses, of which Cold Ash had many.
  - Smaller dwellings were needed to attract and retain younger people to the village and also to offer downsizers suitable accommodation.
  - The development would be intrusive and interrupt views over the Kennet Valley.
  - The development would be unsightly.
  - The development was not in a sustainable location; there were no footpaths on the road and it was 0.75 miles to the nearest shops and there was no bus service.
  - The village already had an issue with the speed and volume of traffic at peak times.
  - Developers usually sought a rapid sale of new properties and in Mr Munro's experience larger properties took a long time to sell in Cold Ash.
5. Councillor Paul Bryant noted that Mr Munro had mentioned affordable housing and asked whether there was a bus service along the Ridge. Mr Munro replied that there was not.
  6. Councillor Virginia von Celsing noted that Mr Munro had advised that Cold Ash needed smaller properties and asked whether the Parish Council had conducted a housing needs survey; Mr Munro replied that they had not but the local housing market, with larger houses remaining on the market for long periods of time, indicated that there was a low demand for that type of property. He was aware of a number of residents in the village who would like to downsize but there was not a supply of smaller properties.
  7. Councillor Clive Hooker asked if the Parish Council had made Mr Munro's points in their response to the DPD consultations; Mr Munro confirmed they had, including the point regarding affordable housing.
  8. Mr Vanstone, in addressing the Committee, made the following points:
    - He was the owner of Ridge End Barn which would be adjacent to the fifth plot at the eastern side of the site and was speaking on behalf of nearly fifty residents who had signed a petition against the proposed development.
    - Residents were concerned about the level of ongoing development in and around the village and were of the view that the character of the village was being eroded.
    - Residents were concerned that the development would cause the loss of views.
    - The application should include the scale of the proposed development so that the appropriateness of the layout could be properly assessed.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

- Should the Committee be minded to accept officer's recommendations when there was not sufficient information regarding the scale of the development, it might prejudice the reserved matters application and lead to overdevelopment.
  - Any development on the site would be highly visible across the village.
  - The proposed layout indicated a frontage in a built form with insufficient gaps between dwellings. It would not allow views across the valley and did not accord with the Council's existing and proposed policies.
  - Policy HSA7 in the emerging DPD allowed for up to five 2 to 2.5 storey dwellings, however the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) had concluded that a ridge height of 5-6m would change the skyline of the village. Mr Vanstone questioned how a 2 to 2.5 storey building could be accommodated within 5m to 6m.
  - If the Committee approved the application the damage could not be undone at the reserved matters stage.
  - The objectors suggested that a single access point to the site would mitigate some of the potential traffic impact.
  - The site might have been allocated in the DPD but that did not mean that the development should be approved.
9. Councillor Pick enquired what type of property Ridge End Barn was, Mr Vanstone advised that it was a barn conversion with approximately 70% of the building being single storey and the remaining double storey part being the original barn. Councillor Pick asked what traffic incidents had occurred on the Ridge; Mr Vanstone advised that he did not know of any but it was only a matter of time.
10. Councillor Bryant recalled that at the site visit he had observed the stunning views but that they were only visible from the gateway. The hedgerow blocked the views elsewhere so they were not publically accessible. Councillor Bryant asked what type of development the objectors would find appropriate. Mr Vanstone advised that it was a partly deciduous hedge so the views were available for half of the year. He further suggested that low ridge houses would be appropriate for the site because larger homes had proved difficult to sell in the village.
11. Councillor Hilary Cole noted that Mr Vanstone was speaking on behalf of fifty residents and asked whether those residents had responded to the Council's DPD consultations; Mr Vanstone advised that he knew a number of them had.
12. Ms Gray, in addressing the Committee made the following points:
- The proposed site was one of two Cold Ash sites in the DPD and no objections had been raised by the Inspector when examining the DPD. The DPD now held substantial weight in supporting up to five houses to be built on the application site.
  - The development proposed five dwellings which would follow the established pattern of development along the Ridge of low density housing.
  - The development maintained the importance of the hedgerow whilst providing access with good visibility splays and turning space for vehicles so that they could enter the carriageway at full gear.
  - There would be ecological benefits informed by the LVIA including a strip outside the red line of the application to protect wildlife.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

- The application met the objectives of sustainable development.
  - There would be a contribution to local amenity and the development would be in-keeping with the village.
  - There had been no objections raised by the Council's statutory consultees.
13. Councillor Jeff Beck asked for more detail regarding the wildlife mitigation strip of land south of the site, including who would be responsible for maintaining it. Ms Gray responded that surveys had revealed that there were grass snakes and slow worms on the site and to mitigate any potential harm caused by the development an uninterrupted strip of land outside the curtilage of the dwellings would be introduced. It was likely that this land would be maintained by the current landowner who maintained ownership of the remaining part of the field. Further detail was available in the plans and conditions had been proposed by the officers.
14. Councillor Pick expressed concern regarding the impact of the development on the neighbouring dwellings Summerfield and Ridge End Barn and asked what the distance was between the proposed dwellings and the existing dwellings. Ms Gray advised that there would be 7.6m between Summerfield and the dwelling on plot one and 16m between the dwelling on plot 5 and Ridge End Barn, making the point that the scale of the development was still to be determined.
15. Councillor Garth Simpson noted that in paragraph 6.2.6 of the officer's report, the LVIA recommended new planting to the south of the site and queried how this would be done while mitigating any harmful impact on views. Ms Gray advised that the landscaping would be determined under a reserved matters application. Councillor Simpson further questioned whether mitigation of the harm of the development would be completed through its design in addition to vegetation. Ms Gray responded that it would.
16. Councillor Cole noted the amended recommendation as outlined in the update sheet and queried whether this was satisfactory to the applicant. Ms Gray responded that the information had been received at a late stage but the applicant would work with officers.
17. Councillor Hooker requested that Ms Gray feedback the concerns of residents and Members to the applicant and be mindful of their reservations, should the application progress to reserved matters.
18. Councillor Garth Simpson, speaking as Ward Member, in addressing the Committee made the following points:
- The site was proposed in the Council's DPD and in his opinion was the 'least worst' of the Cold Ash sites included in it.
  - Linear development was a curse in Cold Ash because one of the benefits of living in the village had been the views.
  - Public views were increasingly becoming private views.
  - The cumulative impact of development would be that there were eleven new properties to be built along the Ridge and the limits had been reached.
  - It was with a heavy heart that he accepted the principle of development as Policy HSA7 now held considerable weight.
  - Design mitigation would be required, including lower ridge heights.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

- The demand in the village was for smaller properties that older residents could downsize to rather than large executive houses which would have long lead times to being sold.
  - Smaller houses might be more profitable to the developer.
  - A section 106 contribution would be welcomed but it would not cover the cost of building one affordable home.
19. Councillor Adrian Edwards noted the concerns expressed in the letters of objection regarding the traffic impact and safety of school children and asked whether there had even been a footpath along the Ridge. Councillor Simpson responded that a footpath was inconsistent. Councillor Edwards asked what impact there might be on traffic in the area should the application be approved. Councillor Simpson advised that cars already tailed back along the Ridge when dropping off children at St Finian's primary school and the development would cause an incremental impact.
20. Councillor Bryant asked whether there was any scope to apply a condition at this stage the heights of the proposed dwellings and their proximity to neighbouring properties. Derek Carnegie advised that the Council could not make demands regarding the scale of the dwelling at this stage but was confident that the agent would report the committee's concerns to the applicant. Councillor Bryant asked whether an informative could be applied to prevent an unsatisfactory application being submitted at the reserved matters stage. Derek Carnegie advised that officers would not recommend approval of a reserved matters application if it was not satisfactory.
21. Councillor Pick further questioned why the Committee were not able to put in writing their strong wish that any reserved matters application was sensitive to the issues raised, particularly as this outline application would determine the framework for the development. Derek Carnegie advised that he would rely on the quality of the architecture and assessment of officers to ensure any reserved matters application was appropriate. Councillor Pick further expressed his wish to include some phraseology to protect the concerned residents as without it an unacceptable application might be made.
22. Councillor Beck supported the views of Councillors Bryant and Pick and recalled that there had been the situation in the past where an application at reserved matter stage was unsatisfactory. Councillor Beck queried who would maintain and pay for the mitigation strip. Derek Carnegie advised that Condition 15 would ensure that measures would be retained by the Local Planning Authority.
23. Councillor Simpson made the point that the existing hedgerow disrupted the roadside view of the valley and the ridge height of the proposed building might be an issue. Derek Carnegie advised that the Local Planning Authority had not control of the height of the hedge and he was confident that the architect would design a scheme to maintain uninterrupted views over the valley.
24. Councillor Edwards noted that there was no information in the officer's report regarding a potential risk to the safety of schoolchildren should the application be approved and asked Paul Goddard to comment. Paul Goddard advised that there would not be a sufficient level of impact to successfully defend refusal of the application at appeal. There would be three to four additional peak time movements and while the road could become busy at peak times the development would not cause an impact so harmful that Highways would recommend refusal of the application.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

25. Derek Carnegie made a commitment to bring the reserved matters application before the Committee, should they approve the outline application.
26. Councillor Simpson stated that he hoped the architect would reflect the concerns of the Committee in the design and accepted the principle of the development but was concerned about the loss of gaps. He expressed the view that the offer to bring the reserved matters application to the Committee was pragmatic and that wording in the decision notice would be helpful.
27. Councillor Cole expressed her frustration that the Committee was receiving outline applications for sites that were in the DPD, stating that applicants had ample time to put a proper application together. She stated that she had utter faith in officers to achieve a good outcome but wished to send out a strong message to applicants that she would like properly thought out applications.
28. Considering the application itself, Councillor Cole noted the concerns regarding school children but advised that St Finian's School had a wide catchment and children walking to school was not a big issue for that particular school. She noted the potential issues regarding the relationship between plot one and Summerfield, however hypothesised that Summerfield could submit an application to build an additional storey.
29. Councillor Edwards stated that he had listened carefully to the arguments on both sides of the debate and proposed that the Committee accept officers' recommendation to approve the application. Councillor Bryant seconded the proposal.
30. Councillor Pick asked why the Committee could not make a statement requiring sensitivity to the residents' concerns. Derek Carnegie explained that conditions had to be specific, reasonable and enforceable; the type of wording that Councillor Pick was requesting was too imprecise. He offered assurance that the applicant would still be required to comply with the reserved matters and officers would review the design to ensure it complied with the Committee's wishes.
31. Councillor Hooker invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor Edwards, as seconded by Councillor Bryant to accept the Officers' recommendation as outlined in the update sheet and including the conditions laid out in the report. At the vote this was carried.

**RESOLVED that** the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorized to GRANT Conditional Outline Planning Permission subject to the completion of a S106 planning obligation in respect of affordable housing provision in accordance with Policy CS6.

### Conditions

#### 1. Reserved Matters

Details of the appearance, landscaping, and scale (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission, and no building or other operations shall start on site until the Reserved Matters have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details and with the requirements of any conditions attached to any approved reserved matters application. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to the reserved matters which have been given in the application hereby approved.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). The

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

application is not accompanied by sufficient details of the reserved matters to enable the Local Planning Authority to give proper consideration to those matters and such consideration is required to ensure that the development is in accordance with the development plan.

### 2. Time limit

The development to which this permission relates shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the approved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

### 3. Plans approved

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with:

Site location plan 1686/P02

Block Plan 1686/P01 rev C

Visibility Splay Plan 1686/P03 rev B – received via email 3.11.2016

Site survey

Associated Documents

Planning, Design and Access Statement, Sept 2016

Phase I Ecological Assessment, PV Ecology, April 2016

Phase II Bat and Reptile Report, Issue 03, PV Ecology, Sept 2016 - received via email 6.10.2016

Landscape & visual impact assessment, April 2016

Flood Risk Assessment, Issue 3, Glanville, 6 Oct 2016, - received via email 6.10.2016

All received with the application 13.09.2016 unless otherwise specified.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policies ADPP1, ADPP5, CS 13, CS 14, and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007, Supplementary Planning Document: Quality Design 2006, and HSA DPD Policy HSA7.

### 4. Hours of work (construction)

Demolition or construction works shall not take place outside the following hours:

7:30am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays;

8:30am to 1:00pm Saturdays;

nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of adjacent occupiers in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

### 5. Unforeseen contamination

Should any unforeseen contamination be encountered during the development, the developer shall inform the Local Planning Authority immediately in writing via a condition discharge application. Any subsequent investigation/remedial/protective works deemed

## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES**

necessary by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out to agreed timescales and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing via a condition discharge application. If no contamination is encountered during the development, a letter confirming this fact shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority upon completion of the development via a condition discharge application.

This is in accordance with the NPPF, and Policies CS14 and CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 - 2026.

### **6. CONS1 - Construction method statement**

No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The statement shall provide for:

- (a) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- (b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials
- (c) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- (d) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing
- (e) Wheel washing facilities
- (f) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- (g) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

### **7. HIGH7 - Surfacing of access (YHA15)**

No development shall take place until details of the surfacing arrangements for the vehicular access(es) to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall ensure that bonded material is used across the entire width of the access(es) for a distance of 3 metres measured back from the carriageway edge. Thereafter the surfacing arrangements shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid migration of loose material onto the highway in the interest of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

### **8. HIGH9 - Visibility splays before development (YHA21)**

No development shall take place until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres have been provided at the access. The visibility splays shall, thereafter, be kept free of all obstructions to visibility above a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

### **9. HIGH11 - Vehicle parking provided to standards (YHA23)**



## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES**

No development shall take place until details of the vehicle parking and turning space/areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall show how the parking spaces are to be surfaced and marked out. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning spaces/areas have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The parking and/or turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

### **10.HIGH16 - Access construction (plans required)**

No development shall take place until details of all access(es) into the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the access has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

### **11.HIGH20 - Cycle storage (YHA41)**

No development shall take place until details of the cycle parking and storage space have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the cycle parking and storage space has been provided in accordance with the approved details and retained for this purpose at all times.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate and safe cycle storage space within the site. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

### **12.Storage of refuse**

No development shall take place until details of the provision for the storage of refuse and recycling materials for the dwellings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The dwellings shall not be occupied until the refuse and recycling facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained for this purpose thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate and safe refuse/recycling facilities within the site. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

### **13.External lighting**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the external lighting mitigation measures as set out in paragraph 6.1 of Phase II Bat and Reptile Report, PV Ecology, Sept 2016. Any proposed external lighting shall ensure that dark corridors for bats are retained and thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species, which are subject to statutory protection under European Legislation. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

### 14. Ecology - new boundary hedgerow

No development shall take place until details of a new boundary hedgerow along the southern boundary have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The new hedgerow shall be designed to create and enhance bat foraging and commuting habitat on site using native species and retained in accordance with the recommendations as set out in Appendix J of Phase II Bat and Reptile Report, PV Ecology, Sept 2016.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species, which are subject to statutory protection under European Legislation. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

### 15. Reptile mitigation strategy

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the reptile mitigation strategy as set out in paragraphs 6.4 to 6.12 and appendix K of Phase II Bat and Reptile Report, PV Ecology, Sept 2016 and shall be implemented in full and the measures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To ensure the protection of protected species, which are subject to statutory protection under European Legislation. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

### 16. Removal of permitted development rights.

Irrespective of the provisions of the current Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any subsequent revision), no additions or extensions to the dwellings shall be built or ancillary buildings or structures erected within the curtilages, unless permission in writing has been granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for the purpose.

Reason: To prevent the over-development of the site and to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies CS14, CS17, CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and HSA DPD Policy HSA7.

### **Informatives:**

1. This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to secure and accept what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

2. The development hereby approved results in a requirement to make payments to the Council as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) procedure. A Liability Notice setting out further details, and including the amount of CIL payable will be sent out separately from this Decision Notice. You are advised to read the Liability Notice and ensure that a Commencement Notice is submitted to the authority prior to the commencement of the development. Failure to submit the Commencement Notice will

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15 MARCH 2017 - MINUTES

result in the loss of any exemptions claimed, and the loss of any right to pay by instalments, and additional costs to you in the form of surcharges. For further details see the website at [www.westberks.gov.uk/cil](http://www.westberks.gov.uk/cil)

### 3. HI 1 Access construction

The Highways Manager, West Berkshire District Council, Highways & Transport, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury, RG14 5LD, telephone number 01635 – 519887, should be contacted to agree the access construction details and to grant a licence before any work is carried out within the highway. A formal application should be made, allowing at least four (4) weeks' notice, to obtain details of underground services on the applicant's behalf.

### 4. HI 3 Damage to footways, cycleways and verges

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Berkshire Act, 1986, Part II, Clause 9, which enables the Highway Authority to recover the costs of repairing damage to the footway, cycleway or grass verge, arising during building operations.

### 5. HI 4 Damage to the carriageway

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Highways Act, 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic.

### 6. HI 8 Excavation in close proximity to the highway

In order to protect the stability of the highway it is advised that no excavation be carried out within 15 metres of a public highway without the written approval of the Highway Authority.

### 7. H 100 Developer Coordination Requirements

"Any works/events carried out either by, or at the behest of, the developer, whether they are located on, or affecting a prospectively maintainable highway, as defined under Section 87 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, or on or affecting the public highway, shall be coordinated under the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic Management Act 2004 and licensed accordingly in order to secure the expeditious movement of traffic by minimising disruption to users of the highway network in West Berkshire.

Any such works or events commissioned by the developer and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site, shall be coordinated by them in liaison with West Berkshire Council's Street Works Section, (telephone 01635 519169/519234). This must take place at least one month in advance of the works and particularly to ensure that statutory undertaker connections/supplies to the site are coordinated to take place wherever possible at the same time.

Reason: In order to minimise disruption to road users, be they pedestrians or vehicular traffic, under the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic Management Act 2004. In order to satisfy the licensing requirements of the Highways Act 1980."

*(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.00 pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....