

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 23 AUGUST 2017

Councillors Present: Jeff Beck, Paul Bryant, Hilary Cole (Vice-Chairman), Clive Hooker, Marigold Jaques (Substitute) (In place of Richard Crumly), Alan Law (Chairman), Tim Metcalfe (Substitute) (In place of Pamela Bale), Graham Pask, Anthony Pick and Garth Simpson

Also Present: Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Shiraz Sheikh (Principal Solicitor) and Linda Pye (Principal Policy Officer)

Apologies: Councillor Pamela Bale, Councillor Keith Chopping, Councillor Richard Crumly and Councillor Alan Macro

PART I

3. Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 15th December 2016 and 9th May 2017 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Jeff Beck, Hilary Cole, Clive Hooker, Anthony Pick and Garth Simpson declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(1), but reported that, as their interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

5. Schedule of Planning Applications

Councillor Alan Law introduced the Committee to the Officers present and advised that this was a quasi-judicial committee with formal set procedures and conduct. Firstly, the Planning Officer would introduce the application. Only those persons who had pre-registered would be allowed to speak and the time limit of five minutes for each category of speakers would be strictly adhered to. All speakers were requested to remain in their seats to answer any questions from Members of the Committee seeking clarification of what had already been said. It was not permissible for Members or speakers to introduce any new topics during this time. Following all presentations the Planning Committee Members would consider, question and seek clarification on the application in order to reach a decision which might or might not agree with the Planning Officers' recommendation.

The District Planning Committee considered recommendations deemed by the Development Control Manager and/or his representative to have:

- A possible conflict with a policy that would undermine the Local Plan or the Local Development Framework;
- A district-wide public interest; or
- The possibility for claims for significant costs against the Council.

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

(1) **Application No. and Parish: 17/01235/COMIND, Plantation Farmhouse, Beedon**

(Councillor Clive Hooker declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he had been lobbied. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

(Councillors Clive Hooker, Jeff Beck, Hilary Cole, Anthony Pick and Garth Simpson declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that they had been present at the Western Area Planning Committee when this item had first been discussed on 9th August 2017. They confirmed that they would listen to all evidence afresh prior to making a decision on the application. As their interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 17/01235/COMIND in respect of the erection of a free range egg laying unit.

The Western Area Planning Committee considered a report on 9th August 2017 regarding the application as identified above. This was an application for the erection of a free range egg laying unit as well as associated egg collection and packing facilities, two feed bins and external hard standings and concrete aprons. Planting was proposed around the building. It was proposed that the building would operate a multi-tier system and would accommodate 16,000 hens.

The application site was located in the countryside in the North Wessex Downs AONB. To the south of the site were two existing units, and a third, but mobile unit was also located on the farm.

The Western Area Planning Committee had been made aware that Officers considered the proposal to be contrary to the Development Plan and National Planning Policy due to the harm arising from the proposal on the NWD AONB, but Members at the Western Area Planning Committee had considered that the proposed landscaping would provide sufficient screening. There was also support from the Committee for the economic benefit that would result from the unit. The Development Control Manager under his delegated powers determined that approval of the scheme would comprise a departure from the Development Plan, and therefore the policy issues involved should be considered by the District Planning Committee.

Derek Carnegie, the Planning Officer, confirmed that the application sought outline planning permission for the erection of a free range egg laying unit, as well as associated egg collection and packing facilities, two feed bins and external hard standings and concrete aprons. It was proposed that the building would operate a multi-tier system and would accommodate 16,000 hens. The application site was located in open countryside outside of any defined settlement boundary, approximately 0.8km north of Chieveley and 1.3km south east of Peasemore. It was within the North Wessex Downs AONB, and was bordered on all sides by public rights of way. To the south of the site were two existing free range egg laying units which had been granted planning permission in 1999 and 2002, in addition to a mobile building. Combined these housed 20,700 hens, of which 1,900 were located in the mobile unit, which was to be removed as part of this scheme. A number of footpaths and bridleways traversed and surrounded the site.

The building would be 91 metres long, and 19.8 metres wide and would have a dual pitched roof, with the height to the ridge being approximately 5.7 metres, and to the eaves, approximately 3.05 metres. It was proposed that the building would be clad in

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

polyester coated profile sheeting in juniper green on the walls and dark grey on the roof, with black ventilation chimneys.

There had been a number of responses to the consultation on this application and in particular the following were specifically mentioned:

- It was noted that no comments had been submitted by Beedon Parish Council as two members of the Parish Council were associated with this business. Chieveley Parish Council had raised concerns in respect of the visual impact in the AONB.
- The Public Rights of Way Officer had raised no objection subject to condition and informatives.
- The Rambler's Association were supportive of the proposal but noted that the access road crossed footpath BEED/16/1 and it was felt that this could present a hazard to footpath users and therefore requested that suitable warning signs should be added for the benefit of HGV drivers and pedestrians.
- The Ecological Officer referred to comments made in relation to a previous application 16/02744/COMIND.
- The Tree Officer raised no objections subject to condition.
- Natural England advised that great weight should be given to the advice given by the AONB Board in guiding the decision. Their knowledge of the site and its wider landscape setting, together with the aims and objectives of the AONB's statutory management plan, should be considered as an extremely valuable contribution to the planning decision. The historic environment was recognised as one of the special qualities of the AONB, and consequently it was Natural England's opinion that it had not been given appropriate consideration. Users of the public right of way (PROW) footpaths surrounding the site, would experience sequential views of the development thus altering the scenic beauty of the area.
- North Wessex Downs AONB felt that the scale and type of development proposed amounted to an extended industrialisation of the open farmed landscape which typified the 'Brightwalton Downs' Landscape Character Area. The AONB Management Plan identified that a key issue for the 'Downland with Woodland' landscape, which included the Brightwalton Downs, was "... to maintain the remote, secluded and relatively undeveloped character of these wooded downs". The proposed development conflicted with this objective and was thus considered neither to conserve nor to enhance the natural beauty of the North Wessex Downs AONB. The North Wessex Downs AONB remained of the view that the proposed screening mitigation would appear incongruous in the landscape, out of character with the historic pattern and form of field boundaries and consequently it maintained its objection to the proposed development.
- One letter of support had been received which stated that demand for free range eggs was increasing and it was important that more egg production was developed in the region to utilise returning delivery vehicles.
- Eleven letters of objection had been received which cited the following grounds:

Impact on AONB and Landscape:

- Very large, would require additional space for access. Due to location would have a major impact on appearance of the valley and views from properties and PROW users;

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

- The Beedon Common area was relatively unspoiled and should be protected against such development;
- Large industrial scale out of keeping in a green field site and an AONB;

Impact on Neighbouring Properties:

- Increase in vermin infestations, rats. Thatched properties would be at risk;

Location:

- The simulated views showed what a “blot” on the landscape the development would be from a northern viewpoint. More sensitive site selection would avoid these issues and be hidden from all public rights of way;

Public Rights of Way:

- Would impact on views from footpaths and bridleway, in particular that running north to south to Beedon Common from the ridge above;

Ecology:

- Concerned about the effect on local wildlife from the extensive electric fencing to enclose the site. There should be measures in place to allow small mammals especially hedgehogs to pass through;

Traffic:

- Roads to Beedon Common were not built for large HGV lorries. HGVs already came down small tracks onto the Common and got stuck;

Other:

- “Thin end of the wedge” – concerns that this development would result in more along the valley - creeping industrialisation.

In terms of the principle of development the Core Strategy policy ADPP1 was clear that development should follow the existing settlement pattern. The policy went on to state that within open countryside, where the application site was located, only appropriate limited development would be allowed which was focused on addressing identified needs and maintaining a strong rural economy. The use of the land for an agricultural business was considered an acceptable use in principle on this site. This application however, was for a substantial building within a sensitive, designated landscape. There needed to be a balance between the requirements for physical developments within the site, the ability of the business to operate effectively and the protection of the NWD AONB and local amenities. The criteria contained within the policy stated that development should contribute positively to local distinctiveness and sense of place. Proposals were expected to make efficient use of land whilst respecting the density, and character of the area.

Natural England had been consulted and had commented, stating that the development of a significantly larger egg laying unit at this location would impact upon the rural, tranquil setting. They also commented that the proposed screening did not follow the present historic field patterns and hedge lines, and could therefore draw the viewer's eye to the egg laying unit rather than taking the focus away; consequently it would not be fulfilling its purpose. The NWD AONB remained of the view that the proposed screening mitigation would appear incongruous in the landscape, out of character with the historic pattern and form of field boundaries and, based on the 'Mitigation Planting' landscape visuals presented, rather similar in character to the block of plantation woodland adjacent to the existing egg laying units. The submitted landscape and visual impact assessment had been assessed and had been found to not fully represent the visual impact of the

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

development with further work required before the full extent of the visual effects could be considered.

There would be minimal changes in the number of highway movements as currently vehicles leaving the site were often only half full.

In terms of neighbouring amenity it was felt that the proposed development was sufficiently distant from nearby dwellings, such that it would not impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of sunlight, daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy.

In the Planning Officer's view the proposal had the potential for economic benefit. However this was outweighed by the impact that the unit would have on the environment in terms of adverse visual impact on the AONB and social aspects in terms of adverse impact on the public rights of way network. It was therefore concluded that having taken account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations referred to above, it was considered that the application was contrary to development plan policies in respect of the impact on the North Wessex Downs AONB and green infrastructure and the Officer recommendation was that planning permission should be refused.

The Update Sheet advised that an e-mail had been received from the agent confirming that the feed bins would be of a steel frame construction, with the bins themselves made of plastic, measuring 7m in height and 3m in diameter. The proposed dirty water storage tank would be under ground, measuring 3m (length) x 1m (width) x 1m (depth). The Update Sheet also contained the recommended conditions and informatives which covered all of the issues raised at the Western Area Planning Committee.

Councillor Alan Law clarified that the principle of development was acceptable on the site as stated in paragraph 6.1.3 but that the proposed building was too large within such a sensitive designated landscape.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr. Adrian Cubitt and Mr. Martin Griffiths, objectors, and Mr. Roger Gent and Mr. Sam Harrison, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr. Cubitt and Mr. Griffiths in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- It was necessary to defend the North Wessex Downs AONB which was an asset in the district and therefore the application was strongly opposed;
- The proposed development would be highly visible from the Public Rights of Way and adjacent properties;
- The first application submitted in 2016 had been refused and the same application made in 2017 had been referred to Committee by Councillor Clive Hooker. The Western Area Planning Committee had recommended approval against professional advice despite there being no exceptional circumstances and no economic justification;
- Agriculture contributes less than 1% of the UK economy and that figure was even less in this area where broadband had transformed the economy by assisting small businesses and allowing people to work from home;
- Whilst it was necessary to work with the farming community to find a way forward the arguments made at the Western Area Planning Committee did not stack up;
- The production of 500,000 eggs would not have much of an impact on the economy and would only benefit the family;

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

- Mr. Roger Gent was a neighbour and his friendship was valued, however, this development should not be allowed in this location;
- It would take Usain Bolt 8.71 seconds to run from one end of the proposed new building to the other;
- Views of the landscape would be lost to local residents if this development was permitted.

Councillor Jeff Beck asked where the objectors lived in relation to the application site. It was noted that the straight line distance was around 200m.

Mr. Roger Gent and Mr. Sam Harrison in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr. Gent confirmed that he had started egg production in 1999 following the outbreak of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) Production had been increased in 2001 following the Foot and Mouth outbreak. He stated that there was still some cows on the farm but it would only be a matter of time before they became infected with Tuberculosis (TB) and he therefore considered that free range egg production would now be the mainstay and was the safest way forward;
- Mr. Gent had taken care to protect the countryside and had invested in woodland schemes and environmental work;
- Mr. Gent could not afford to stand still and expansion was necessary in order to safeguard the business;
- The proposed development would offer employment opportunities and trees and hedgerows would be planted;
- The demand for free range eggs had risen by 7-8% and this was a large investment for the farm as regulations meant that all hens had to be free range by 2025. Consequently a robust plan would need to be put in place in order to safeguard the business;
- The application had received support at the Western Area Planning Committee and Officers were only recommending refusal because of the appearance in the AONB. It was in the gift of this Committee to determine whether the proposal was acceptable;
- At the site visit Members of the Committee would have seen that existing buildings on the site were well landscaped and that the colour scheme meant that they visually blended;
- The proposed development was an agricultural building and the farm was in the AONB along with the majority of West Berkshire. Whilst it was recognised that the AONB needed to be protected a balance needed to be met to ensure the viability of the business.

Councillor Graham Pask noted that most of the objections related to the position of the building and he asked if alternatives had been considered. Mr. Gent responded that there was around 10 miles of footpaths in the vicinity of the site and the visual impact would be the same if the building was relocated. When looking at the location of the building he had tried to find a dip in the valley so that it would not be so intrusive. The soil also needed to be self draining. Mr. Gent confirmed that other sites had been considered and dismissed as not being suitable.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe referred to the mobile unit which currently housed 1,900 hens and which would be removed as part of this scheme. He felt that mobile units would be

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

more effective in some ways as they could be moved around the site in order to prevent staleness of the ground. Why was the applicant moving to a fixed location. Mr. Gent stated that a large part of the site was sloped in one way or another and mobile units had to be located on level ground as they were not designed for undulating ground. Eight mobile units would be required in order to house 16,000 hens and double the amount of ground would be required so that one site could be rested each year.

Councillor Metcalfe referred to the other two units on the site and asked if there had been any objections raised to those. Mr. Gent recalled that the first application had raised some concerns and that both had been considered by the Planning Committee.

Councillor Marigold Jaques noted that the two units already on the site were well screened. However, trees took 10-12 years to mature and she queried whether it would be possible to plant trees which were more mature in order to speed that process up. Mr. Gent confirmed that he had indicated at the Western Area Planning Committee meeting that he would be prepared to plant clumps of more mature trees in order to screen the site and that clumps could be planted in front of the building in order to break up the initial impact. Mr. Sam Harrison confirmed that this was something which could be considered further as part of the conditions should the application be approved.

In response to a query on employment numbers it was noted that the expansion of the business would double the number of people currently employed.

Councillor Garth Simpson referred to the sustainability issue and whether it would be necessary to buy in additional manure. Mr. Gent responded that it would reduce the amount bought in. Indeed over the last 18 years a reduction had been seen and this would reduce the amount required even more.

Councillor Clive Hooker, as Ward Member, in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Councillor Hooker thanked the objectors and the applicant/agent for their presentations and he appreciated the views which had been expressed;
- The Officer recommendation was for refusal as it was in the AONB but the Committee had the power to overturn this recommendation for exceptional circumstances;
- This was a third generation family run business whose business model was free range egg production;
- A number of footpaths crossed the land but the people who farmed this site also needed to make a living;
- The AONB needed to be able to grow and develop to accommodate agricultural units as businesses needed to expand in order to ensure that they remained viable;
- Councillor Hooker felt that a precedent had already been set by approving the previous units which were both on a more elevated position. Due to careful screening there was little impact on the surrounding area. Once the tree line had been established the new building would also blend in;
- The expansion of the farm would provide an opportunity to employ an additional 1.5 people into the business;
- 78% of the district was in an agriculturally maintained AONB and was the Council saying that none of the businesses in that area could expand. The family had done

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

all it could to contribute to the AONB in their area and he therefore hoped that the Committee would support the application.

Councillor Paul Bryant queried why the two existing units had been given planning permission. The Planning Officer confirmed that permission had been granted some time ago and policy both nationally and locally had changed over that time to ensure that the AONB was protected. Members would need to make a judgement around the level of impact on the AONB when determining this application.

Councillor Bryant referred to other similar applications which had been approved in respect of the grain store at Eastbury and the development on the Showground at Chieveley, both of which had been prominent buildings. The Planning Officer stated that in regard to the Showground there was a distinct benefit to the local economy. Such decisions were difficult but policies to protect these areas were in place and Members would need to evaluate and weigh up protection of the AONB against protecting the local economy etc.

Councillor Garth Simpson noted that the Environment Officer had said that noise and odour was not an issue and he asked if there were any details around that. The Planning Officer confirmed that the Environment Officer had undertaken a detailed examination and had come to the conclusion that there would be no significant environmental damage to local residents.

Councillor Simpson referred to paragraph 6.2.15 where it stated that the submitted landscape and visual impact assessment had been assessed and had been found to not fully represent the visual impact of the development with further work required before the full extent of the visual effects could be considered. How significant was that? The Planning Officer stated that the report did analyse the visual impact and Officers were satisfied in that respect.

Councillor Simpson asked what the traffic was like on the footpaths. The Planning Officer confirmed that the Rights of Way Officer had not raised any objections and that it was more about the impact on the environment for one person rather than the amount of people who used them.

In considering the above application, Councillor Hilary Cole stated that she was the adjacent Ward Member and actually lived nearest to the application site. She had lived in the area for 31 years and was familiar with it. It was a wooded downs area in the AONB and was a working landscape which should not be treated with contempt. Generally she would endorse AONB policies but the AONB was not always helpful to West Berkshire. Farming had become industrialised which meant larger tractors which were not always able to negotiate the narrow country lanes. However, if the Council wanted to support farmers then it needed to accept that changes needed to be made. A mixed economy was vital in the area and farming needed to be embraced. There had been a considerable amount of discussion on the visual impact of the new building but not a lot of consideration for policy CS10 – the rural economy. This application was supporting farm diversification as it tried to move away from cattle farming which had suffered as a result of TB in a move to something more sustainable. She proposed that the decision made by the Western Area Planning Committee should be endorsed.

Councillor Anthony Pick stated that if the community wanted the AONB to remain idyllic then it and the numerous footpaths needed to be maintained by landowners. However, they would only be able to do this if their businesses were successful. Therefore the AONB could only be sustained by a strong rural economy.

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

Councillor Graham Pask cared deeply about the AONB and felt strongly that although the new building would be visually intrusive it would not be quite so bad once the screening had matured. The building would already be below the top of the existing tree line.

Councillor Jeff Beck stated that the AONB included vast tracks of farmland. Farming was a business that needed to change in order to be viable. The Rambler's Association had raised no objections and he felt that the new building would not be out of place against a backdrop of existing trees.

Councillor Garth Simpson was of the opinion that the market had moved ahead and that this would see more agricultural units popping up.

Councillor Paul Bryant felt that farming was an important industry. He remembered the debate on the grain store at Eastbury which was a large building which could be seen from a distance. The argument in that case was that the Council needed to change its approach to farming development in rural areas. Councillor Marigold Jaques agreed and said that although she lived in an urban area, 75% of West Berkshire was in the AONB but that it was also a working area.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe had a lot of sympathy with the objectors as it was a large structure. Farmers always tried to keep the farmstead in one area. Free range egg production was a country pursuit and the trees when they reached maturity would not seem out of place.

Councillor Clive Hooker stated that he was encouraged by the practical approach to this application which would be a lifeline to the community and a benefit to the local economy.

Councillor Alan Law asked if Members were happy with the condition in respect of the trees. The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant would work with the local authority to submit and agree a scheme of planting for the trees.

Councillor Hilary Cole proposed that planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions and informatives contained in the Update Sheet. This was seconded by Councillor Clive Hooker.

RESOLVED that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Time

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and other documents listed below, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority:

- Location Plan A1 received via email from the agent on 17/07/2017
- Site Plan A1 received via email from the agent on 28/06/2017
- Elevations A1 received via email from the agent on 02/08/2017
- Landscape Proposals IPA21032-11 received via email from the agent on 17/07/2017
- Soft Landscape Specification
- Topographical Survey and Sections IP/RG/04

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

- Design, Access and Planning Statement
- Email from agent confirming dimensions and material of feed bins received on 16/08/2017.

All received with the application on 28/04/2017 unless otherwise stated.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

3. **Materials**

The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be as specified on the application form and the design and access statement. The feed bins shall be as specified in the email from the agent confirming dimensions and material of feed bins received on 16/08/2017.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies ADPP5, CS 14 and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

4. **Hard surfacing**

No development shall take place until a schedule of the materials to be used in the construction of the hard surfaced areas hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to these matters which have been detailed in the current application. Samples of the materials shall be made available for inspection on site on request. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS 14 and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

5. **PROW - Warning Signage Required**

No development shall commence until details of warning signage for both drivers and pedestrians using Beedon Footpath 16/1 at the crossing point of the access to site have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved signage will subsequently be erected on site in accordance with the approved details, prior to work commencing on site. The warning signage will be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To protect the public using of the Public Right of Way. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS 18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

6. **Surface water**

No development shall commence until such time as a scheme to dispose of surface water has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The submitted details shall include the size of the silt traps, run-off volumes, soakaway capacities and infiltration rates, and all associated calculations. Prior to the building being brought into use the scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and the sustainable drainage measures shall be maintained in the approved condition thereafter.

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

Reason: Proposed operation could generate significant quantities of potentially contaminating material/waste. Soakaways associated with the proposed sheds should not be located in areas where excess chicken fouling are likely to be deposited.

To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner. To prevent the increased risk of flooding; to improve and protect water quality, habitat and amenity and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system can be, and is carried out in an appropriate and efficient manner. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design – Part 4 Sustainable Design Techniques (June 2006).

7. **Spoil**

Notwithstanding details received with the application, no development shall take place until full details of how all spoil arising from the development will be used or disposed of have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall:

- (a) Show where any spoil to remain on the site will be deposited;
- (b) Show the resultant ground levels for spoil deposited on the site (compared to existing ground levels);
- (c) Include measures to remove all spoil (not to be deposited) from the site;
- (d) Include timescales for the depositing/removal of spoil.

All spoil arising from the development shall be used or disposed of in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate disposal of spoil from the development and to ensure that ground levels are not raised in order to protect the character and amenity of the area. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

8. **External Lighting**

No development of the building shall commence until details of the external lighting to be attached to the building and used in the areas around the new building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the luminance, operation and timings of the external lighting proposed. The external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved scheme before the building hereby permitted is brought into use. No external lighting shall be installed except for that expressly authorised by the approval of details as part of this condition. The approved external lighting shall thereafter be retained and operated in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority wish to be satisfied that these details are satisfactory, having regard to the setting of the development within the AONB. Inappropriate external lighting would harm the special rural character of the locality and AONB. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

9. **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 statement shall include safeguards that shall be implemented during construction to minimise the risks of pollution and detrimental effects to the water interests in and around the site.

The Construction Method Statement shall cover:

- (a) the use of plant and machinery, oils/chemicals and materials;
- (b) the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles;
- (c) the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds;
- (d) the control and removal of spoil and wastes.

Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement.

Reason: To minimise the risks of pollution and detrimental effects to the water interests in and around the site. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

10. **Boundary Treatments**

No development shall take place until details, to include a plan, indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatments shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme before the building hereby permitted is brought into use. The approved boundary treatments shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: The boundary treatments are an essential element in the detailed design of this development and the application is not accompanied by sufficient details to enable the Local Planning Authority to give proper consideration to these matters. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies ADPP5, CS 14 and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

11. **Levels**

No development shall take place until details of the finished floor levels of the building hereby permitted in relation to existing and proposed ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the proposed development and the adjacent land. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies ADPP5, CS 14 and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

12. **Waste and dirty water**

Prior to the building hereby approved being brought into use, details of the collection, storage and spreading of waste and dirty water from the development must be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

waste and dirty water shall thereafter be dealt with in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The application site is located in a Source Protection Zone III (SP3) which required protection from pollution. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

13. **HIGH12 - Parking/turning in accord with plans (YHA24)**

Prior to the building being brought into use the vehicle parking and turning space shall be surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the approved plans. The parking and turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking at all times for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that 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).

14. **Trees**

All landscape works shall be completed in accordance with the submitted plans, schedule of planting and retention, programme of works and other supporting information including drawing numbers IPA21032-11 dated March 2017 during the first planting season after completion. Any trees, shrubs or hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme which are removed, die, or become diseased within five years from completion of this development shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedges of a similar size and species to that originally approved.

Notwithstanding the submitted details, 10% of trees planted must be semi-mature.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy July 2006-2026.

15. **Hours of Construction**

No demolition or construction works shall 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 amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy CS 14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and Policies OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

Recommended 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

DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23 AUGUST 2017 - MINUTES

secured and accepted what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

2. The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not in any way allow the Public Right of Way to be obstructed at any time during the course of the development.
3. Nothing connected with either the development or the construction must adversely affect or encroach upon the Public Right of Way, which must remain available for public use at all time. Information on the width of the PROW can be obtained from the PROW Officer.
4. The applicant is advised that the Rights of Way Officer must be informed prior to the laying of any services beneath the Public Right of Way.
5. No alteration of the surface of the Public Right of Way must take place without the prior written consent of the Rights of Way Officer.
6. 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.
7. 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.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 7.37 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature