

Note: These Minutes have been amended. Please see Minutes of 16 August 2017 for amendments.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 26 JULY 2017

Councillors Present: Pamela Bale, Graham Bridgman, Keith Chopping, Richard Crumly, Lee Dillon (Substitute) (In place of Alan Macro), Marigold Jaques, Alan Law (Vice-Chairman), Tony Linden (Substitute) (In place of Peter Argyle), Tim Metcalfe, Graham Pask (Chairman), Richard Somner and Quentin Webb (Substitute) (In place of Emma Webster)

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)), Gareth Dowding (Senior Engineer), Emma Nutchey (Principal Planning Officer) and David Pearson (Development Control Team Leader)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Peter Argyle, Councillor Alan Macro and Councillor Emma Webster

PART I

14. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2017 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of the following amendments:

Item 10 (1) Application 16/03528/FUL:

Page 5, second paragraph, second sentence: Councillor Graham Bridgman asked that the sentence be replaced with the following “He suggested in accordance with the Council’s Constitution, it was for the Chairman to exercise his discretion, if he so wished, to allow the material to be presented at the meeting.”

Pages 5 – 7: Phil Magnum to be replaced with Phil Magurn.

Page 7, penultimate bullet point: be deleted.

Page 11, first paragraph under condition 7: Councillor Richard Crumly suggested that the final sentence should read as follows “No operations shall be undertaken at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays”

Item 11: 17/00402/ULTEXT:

Page 17, seventh paragraph: Councillor Pamela Bale asked that the first sentence should be replaced with the following; “Councillor Pamela Bale stated the Committee should not focus on mitigating the developer’s actions to build something they did not have permission for however, should work towards reinforcing the previous conditions.”

15. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Richard Crumly and Lee Dillon declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(2), but reported that, as their interest was a personal or other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

16. Schedule of Planning Applications

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

(1) **Application No. & Parish: 17/00743/FUL - Land North of Englefield Road, Theale**

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 17/00743/FUL in respect of a proposal for the change of use of land from agricultural to outdoor recreational and leisure facilities with parking.

Emma Nutchey presented the report to Members of the Committee and confirmed that no overriding objections had been raised by Highways Officers and therefore the recommendation was to delegate to the Head of Development and Planning to grant planning permission, subject to the schedule of conditions.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Jan Richardson, Parish Council representative, a representative from the adjacent Parish, Ms Pamela Sergent and Ms Natalie Lowe, objectors, and Mr Richard Turner and Mr Greg Bowman, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Councillor Jan Richardson in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- There were currently four full sized sports pitches on the site plus parking.
- Two of the full sized pitches would be lost if the application was approved.
- If the application was approved, the suggested plans would not provide pitches to the current standard on the site.
- Youth teams that currently used the facilities on the site progressed through their ages. In two years time it was not known if there would be adequate facilities for under 15 year olds.
- The parking element of the application was not sufficient and an acceptable solution had not been offered. Cars would be parked two metres away from the run off line and there would be the risk of footballs colliding with vehicles.
- There would be vehicles parked directly behind the goals, which would not only cause a potential risk to vehicles but would also be a distraction for those playing football on the pitches.
- The layout of parking provision would prevent emergency vehicles from accessing the site. It was estimated that the emergency services were called to the site at least once every season.
- The new plans would cause spectators to park on the close by footpath in attempt to avoid damage to their vehicles if parked on the site.
- Englefield Parish Council needed to make a decision as to whether to relinquish the land. This was a very complex issue that needed to be considered.

Councillor Pamela Bale noted that the report stated that one undersized football pitch would be lost in the application was approved and queried whether this detail was incorrect. Councillor Richardson confirmed that all pitches currently on the site were full sized and two of these would be lost.

Councillor Keith Chopping was unsure if he had misunderstood and asked for clarification on whether Councillor Richardson had suggested that the application should be for full size pitches. Councillor Richardson confirmed that this was correct. It was felt that two acres was too small for spectator provision. Councillor Chopping further questioned what the Parish Council would like to see with regards to parking on the site. Councillor Richardson stated that the Parish Council did not have an issue with the amount of parking proposed for the site but with the layout of parking spaces, which were too close

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

to the pitch. Councillor Richardson added that there could potentially be 44 cars manoeuvring within the site and this would be dangerous when paired with children retrieving balls.

Councillor Chopping noted that a 1.8 metre fence was proposed for the site and asked Councillor Richardson if she felt this was adequate to deal with balls leaving the pitch. Councillor Richardson had attended many games on the site and was aware that balls often went much higher than this.

Councillor Graham Bridgman noted that the current site was to the south of the highway and asked when the four pitches were in use how many cars were on site. Councillor Richardson answered that there would be at least 40 cars on site when all pitches were in use however, alternate pitches were often used. Councillor Bridgman referred to Mrs Richardson's statement where she had mentioned that eight acres of land were required to accommodate the pitches and parking. Councillor Bridgman asked if the Parish Council had carried out any work with regards to the layout of the site. In response to the question Councillor Richardson reported that the manager of the site was very knowledgeable and had expressed the view that the proposed plans for the site would only accommodate two full size pitches and parking.

The representative from the adjacent Theale Parish Council confirmed that they had no further comments to add to that which was already included within the report.

Ms Pamela Sergent and Ms Natalie Lowe (Theale Golf Club) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Ms Lowe disagreed with the report that the proposal would compliment the area. She was concerned about the level of noise when football games were taking place. Golf was a quiet sport compared to football and therefore would be negatively impacted upon.
- A pitch had already been lost due to the new school that was proposed for the area.
- The parking proposed would accommodate three pitches and therefore there was fear that spectators would park on the road or in the golf course's car park, which would affect customers using the course.
- Theale Golf Course was responsible for the private drive leading to the course and there was concern that this would become used for parking by those using the football pitches. The golf course's toilet facilities were already being used by those using the pitches.
- Ms Sergent stated that there was no evidence that an under 15s football pitch was required and it was not large enough to meet the needs of the local teams.
- The proposed fencing was inadequate and would make it easy for travellers to enter the site.
- There was insufficient parking proposed for the site and there was an inadequate amount of room available for vehicle turning places. This would cause vehicles to breach the public right of way or encourage use of the golf course's parking.
- Changing facilities were too far away from the site. Young girls were becoming more involved in the sport and needed to be considered before deciding to rule out the need for toilet facilities.
- Once the new school was built the private road would be used to drop off and collect children from school.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

- Members of the Committee needed to be aware of a recent planning appeal for Lakeside.
- The site would be extremely difficult to access for emergency vehicles, which could cost lives.

Councillor Bridgman expressed his difficulty with the objections raised. There were currently four pitches on site and Officers were saying that four pitches would remain however, the Parish Council were of the view that there would only be three pitches. Councillor Bridgman did not understand how there would be more vehicles movements than what there was currently. In response to Councillor Bridgman's queries Ms Sergent reported that the existing car park would be lost and the new car park was not sufficient. If the school was to be built then the area would lose a further five acres. It was anticipated that the school would accommodate 315 to 320 pupils and because it was a new school there would be an increase in vehicle movements. Ms Sergent confirmed that the proposal was for two full sized pitches and one under 15's pitch.

Councillor Bridgman asked who owned the road leading to the golf course and it was confirmed by Mrs Sergent that this belonged to Englefield Estate who leased Theale Golf Course the land.

Councillor Alan Law agreed that the school would increase traffic to the area and asked whether the access to the school was from the golf course. Ms Sergent reported that there would be no access for collection from the school. There would be a kiss and drop gate but this would only be for use by certain pupils. There would be nowhere else for people to stop outside of the school.

Councillor Graham Pask reminded Members of the Committee that the school was not part of this planning application.

Mr Richard Turner and Mr Greg Bowman in addressing the Committee stated that they had no statement to make however, were happy to receive questions from Members of the Committee. Solicitor, Sharon Armour, stated that in accordance with the Constitution, Members of the Committee were able to ask questions to clarify a point made in a statement. The only other option was for Members to suspend standing orders.

Mr Turner in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He invited Members of the Committee to vote in favour of the application and declared that he was happy to receive any questions from Members regarding information contained within the report.
- Mr Turner confirmed that 12 cars would be able to use the kiss and drop facility at any one time.

Councillor Alan Law asked if Mr Turner would expect anyone to cross the pitches to access the school and in response to this question Mr Turner confirmed that he would not.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe highlighted to Members that the application before them had been submitted by West Berkshire Council (WBC) and therefore the conditions would need to be upheld by WBC. Councillor Metcalfe asked who would be responsible for operational functions such as locking the gate and Mr Turner confirmed that these kinds of functions would be managed by the leaseholder. Mr Turner confirmed that the leasehold would be offered to Theale Parish Council and WBC would not manage the site. Councillor Metcalfe asked how the site would be accessed for grass cutting and Mr Turner confirmed that there would be a gap in the fencing for this purpose.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

Councillor Metcalfe further questioned about the car parking spaces. He noted from the report that the spaces would be marked bays however, the plans suggested that the bays would be grassed over. Mr Turner confirmed that an artificial product was being used that would allow grass to grow through it.

Councillor Richard Crumly asked for a response from Mr Turner regarding comments raised about car parking including turning circles, risks to children and cars being parked closed to goal areas. Mr Turner confirmed that the distance between the goal and where cars would be parked was 4.7 metres, which according to guidance provided by the Football Association was sufficient.

Councillor Keith Chopping referred to concerns raised by the Parish Council with regards to overhead power lines and asked Mr Turner for comments on this subject. Mr Turner confirmed that power cables were not a planning consideration and therefore had been excluded from the report however, it had been agreed with the power provider that the lines would be rerouted underground away from the site.

Councillor Lee Dillon highlighted concerns raised by Theale Golf Club and asked Mr Turner if re-locating the site away from the Golf Course had been considered. Mr Turner reported that the piece of land in question was the only option offered by the free-holder.

Councillor Quentin Webb felt that the proposal for parking on the site was not clear. Mr Turner confirmed that how the parking was managed would be in the hands of the Parish Council. There would be eight acres remaining. There would be a gated access to the site once the school had been built, that would ensure parking available during competitions.

Councillor Bale expressed her confusion in the fact that the application had been submitted by WBC however, the pitches would be managed by the Parish Council and the surrounding area and therefore queried if there would need to be an agreement between WBC and the Parish Council. Mr Turner confirmed that there would need to be an agreement between the freeholder and the Parish Council.

Councillor Richard Somner referred to the point made by Councillor Metcalfe regarding the marking of parking spaces. He was aware of the reinforced mesh used at Holybrook however, queried if markings could be made on this material. Mr Turner was unaware if markings could be placed on the materials proposed.

Councillor Bridgman asked if it was correct that after the school was accounted for there would only be space for two full sized pitches and parking. According to aerial dimensions taken through GIS, Mr Turner believed that the space could accommodate more than this.

Councillor Marigold Jaques stated that the Parish Council were concerned that those dropping children at school would use the site as an access route to the school. Mr Turner confirmed that the school would have a traffic plan in place to help ensure this did not happen.

Councillor Dillon read a statement on behalf of the Ward Member, Councillor Alan Macro, who had raised the following points:

- He apologised for not being able to be present at the meeting.
- The decision on the application was of personal interest to him as he was a Member of the Parish Council and a Governor at the Primary School.
- The site in question had been the only one the freeholder had been prepared to lease.
- He felt that parking provision proposed for the site should be adequate.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

- He was of the view that the application should be approved and permission granted.

Councillor Metcalfe stated that the application Members were considering was within the red lines outlined on the plans for the application however, discussions kept referencing areas that fell outside of these redlines. Members needed to consider if the plot of land was suitable for what was proposed within the application.

Councillor Alan Law stated that according to the Football Associations website a standard football pitch could be a minimum of 90 by 45 metres and what was being proposed was 91 by 61 metres and therefore should be adequate. Councillor Law asked if Officers agreed with this. Planning Officer, David Pearson, expressed his view that an adult game of football could be played on the proposed pitches.

The Chairman asked the Highways Officer if he had any comments to add to the discussion regarding parking provision on the site. Highways Officer Gareth Dowding, stated that grass crete had been mentioned and this plastic system accommodated white markings, as long as the grass was kept short.

Councillor Dillon noted that there was a 1.8 metre mesh fence proposed for the eastern side of the site and asked Officers if they felt this was high enough and whether it might be sensible to increase the height. Emma Nutchey reported that the height of 1.8 metres had been suggested by the Public Rights of Way Officer as it had been felt that the scattered trees and hedge line together with the fence offered sufficient protection.

Councillor Metcalfe expressed that he was in favour of an application that encouraged sport and that health was a key aspect of work undertaken by WBC. Councillor Law concurred with Councillor Metcalfe and proposed that the application should be approved in line with Officers' recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Crumly and the motion was carried at the vote.

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

Conditions

1. Time Limit

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. Plans

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

- Proposed Site Plan drawing number PL301 rev. 9
- Hard and Soft Landscape GA drawing number LLD1063/01 rev. 10
- Detailed Plant Schedule and Planting Specification July 2017
- Landscape Specification July 2017
- Gate & Fence Details drawing number PL302 rev. 1
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report, Protected Species Assessment October 2016

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

3. Boundary treatment

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

No development shall commence until a plan to show the addition of a pedestrian gate within the post and rail fence along the southern boundary has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The pitch shall not be bought into use until the fencing has been constructed in accordance with the approved details and in accordance with the drawing titled Gate & Fence details drawing number PL302 rev. 1. The boundary treatment shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The boundary treatments are an important element in the design of the scheme. A pedestrian access at the eastern end of the pitch is considered desirable to allow for easy access onto footpath THEA/7/2 thus minimising the need for people to walk along the access road. This is in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 2006-2026.

4. Landscaping

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 LLD1063/01 REV 10 dated 13.10.2016 and supported by the Detailed plant schedule and planting specification ref LLD1063/KM/06.07.17. 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.

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.

5. External Lighting

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order with or without modification), no external lighting shall be installed across the site without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose.

Reason: To have regard to the setting of the development within the open countryside and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and wildlife. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

6. Signage for PROW and cars

The sports pitch hereby approved shall not be bought into use until details of the proposed signage to be erected at the vehicular entrance into the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details. The signage must warn vehicle drivers of the existence of the footpath, and footpath users of the fact that vehicles will be turning into and out of the site across the footpath. The submitted details shall include a plan to show where each sign will be positioned, what it will say and its appearance.

Reason: To ensure the safety of users of footpath THEA/13/1 in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and paragraph 75 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. Erection of a 1.8m high mesh fence parallel to the parking

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

No development shall commence until a plan is submitted to show the siting and details of a 1.8m high mesh fence running parallel to the western end of the pitch and the parking spaces. The pitch hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the approved 1.8m high fence has been erected in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect cars parked in proximity to the pitch from stray balls in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 2006-2026 with respect to good design.

8. Use restriction

The playing field shall be used for Outdoor Sport and for no other purpose (including without limitation any other purpose in Class D2 Use Classes Order 2005, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: To protect the playing field from loss and/or damage, to maintain the quality of and secure the safe use of sports pitch.

9. Construction and management plan for the pitch

No development shall commence until a construction and management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall provide for:

- (a) A detailed scheme which ensures that the playing field will be provided to an acceptable quality (in terms of soil structure, drainage, cultivation and other associated operations), informed by a detailed assessment of ground conditions (including drainage and topography) of the land proposed for the playing field;
- (b) Details of how the pitch will be maintained and managed
- (c) Details of community use arrangements;
- (d) A programme of implementation.

The land shall thereafter be provided and managed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure the quality of the pitches is satisfactory, in accordance with Policy CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Height restriction across car park is hinged and lockable

The height restriction barrier to be installed at the entrance to the car park shall be hinged and lockable to allow emergency vehicles into and out of the site. This type of barrier shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the site is accessible to emergency vehicles in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Informative:

No cars shall be parked on or within the legal width of the footpath.

- (2) **Application No. & Parish: 17/00472/FULMAJ - Land North of Travellers Friend, Crookham Common Road, Crookham Common.**

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

(Councillor Richard Crumly declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that the owner of the land in question was known to him. He was a Member of Thatcham Town Council and had been present during the discussion of this item, but had abstained from voting and would consider the application afresh. 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.)

(Councillor Lee Dillon declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Thatcham Town Council and had served with the applicant on the Town Council. 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.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 17/00742/FULMAJ in respect of the development of five live/work units on land north of the Travellers Friend.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mrs Jean Norman and Mrs Sheila Ellison, supporters, Mr Duncan Crook, applicant, and Councillor Dominic Boeck, adjacent Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.

The Chairman asked what the acronym CPHOA represented and it was confirmed that this stood for Crookham Park Home Owners Association.

Mrs Jean Norman and Mrs Sheila Ellison in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Sheila Ellison stated that she had lived close to the Crookham Park since 1982. The Traveller's Friend had always been an important part of Crookham Common.
- There were already houses near to the site including some nice bungalows. These were lived in by both young families and people who had lived in the area for many years.
- The area offered some excellent walks and a pub that was a great asset to the area.
- The bus that served the area would continue to run as it took local children to the Hurst Community School.
- Mrs Ellison could not see why Highways had raised an objection to the application as the site was easily accessible and offered good parking provision.
- Mrs Norman expressed that she and her husband were in support of the application
- The reduction to a two hourly bus service had adversely affected many within the community including disabled residents, meaning some were resorting to the use of taxi services.
- The application included the provision of a shared electric car, which would be available to local residents through a car club scheme and would help resolve the impact of fewer buses to the area.
- Crookham Common was a pleasant place to live and if approved plans would bring added security to the area. There would also be improvements made to the footpath close by, which had not been looked after adequately in the past.

Councillor Keith Chopping noted that Mrs Norman had said that there was a bus service that operated on a two hourly basis. Mrs Ellison reported that it was less frequent than this and felt that the car club aspect of the application would be extremely beneficial to other residents in the area, particularly those who were elderly.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

Mr Duncan Crook in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The strategy for development was within a sustainable location.
- The location was rural. He took a different view to the Planning Officers. The report referenced that the application was relevant to Core Strategy Policy C1 however, Mr Crook also felt that the application was relevant to ADPP6.
- Mr Crook felt that the site was within a sustainable location because it was in a countryside setting. All sites were assessed against the sustainable transport criteria.
- Policy C1 singled out Brimpton as a sustainable location. If Brimpton was considered to be sustainable then Mr Crook was of the view that the Traveller's Friend site was sustainable too.
- The electric car and Car Club scheme would provide a sustainable source of transport and there were already electric charging points across West Berkshire.
- The proposal sought to make improvements to the footpath that ran west from the sit along Crookham Common Road, linking it to a public footpath which ran along the western boundary of the mobile homes park.
- There were many differences between the application in question to that which had been brought before Members of the Committee in 2015 for the same site. It had not included a car club scheme or improvements to the close by footpath.
- Thatcham Town Council did not object to the proposal.

In considering the above application Councillor Richard Crumly referred to paragraph 6.6 of the Planning Officer's report on affordable housing, which stated that 20% of the units should be provided as affordable housing. Mr Crook stated that if the application was refused then the suggested affordable housing provision would be added to the proposal and if the application was approved then this would be secured via a Section 106 Agreement.

Councillor Alan Law noted that Mr Crook had referred to ADPP6 however, he disagreed that the application had any reference to this policy. Mr Crook reported that it was included within part of the Appeal Statement of Common Grounds and did not form part of the inspection report.

Councillor Graham Bridgman asked how important the live/work aspect of the application was. Mr Crook stated that this was very important. The site was in a good location and there was demand for such units. Superfast broad band was being rolled out across the district, which supported home working. Public consultation undertaken evidenced that that there were ample labour sources within the area. The site was within a sustainable location and the live/work element of the site would ensure fewer vehicle movements by residents.

Councillor Bridgman stated that he had not realised that he lived in a live/work unit. Before retirement Councillor Bridgman stated that he used to work from home however, now that he was retired he no longer used his home for this purpose. Councillor Bridgman asked what guarantee there was that the units would be used appropriately and that the working element would not cease to exist. In answering Councillor Bridgman's question Mr Crook stated that it was possible that the work space could become vacant however, the occupier would be required to pay business rates as an incentive to use it for work purposes. Mr Crook added that a live/work unit was not the same as using a home as an office, as a quarter of the unit would be equipped for work purposes.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

Councillor Lee Dillon asked if Mr Crook was aware of the longevity of a electric car club scheme. Mr Crook answered that the scheme would be secured by S106 money and he expected the scheme to continue for a long time. Mr Crook stated that the car share scheme had originated from public consultation. It was not economically viable for five dwellings however, the community would contribute on a hire basis.

Richard Crumly was of the view that the proposal would increase dependency on car usage as it would still generate movements for the family element of living. Mr Crook stated that although domestic car usage would not decrease, car usage in relation to work would do.

Councillor Dominic Boeck as adjacent Ward Member raised the following points:

- He had called the item in and had done so with the interest of Brimpton in mind.
- He was a Member for Aldermaston however, had lived in Brimpton in the past.
- Many of his residents struggled to access facilities and therefore he was in support of any developer who wanted to help sustain local amenities such as the village shop.
- He urged Members to approve the application.

The Chairman noted that part of Councillor Boeck's reason for calling the item in was that it would be making use of previously developed land however, the report suggested that this was not the case. Councillor Boeck accepted that he might have been mistaken on this point.

(Councillor Tony Linden joined the meeting at 8:16pm however, was not permitted to vote on the item)

Councillor Jason Collis in addressing the Committee, raise the following points:

- Both he and his fellow Ward Member, Councillor Rob Denton-Powell supported the application.
- The site in question was an odd part of the ward in that it was very rural.
- It was becoming increasingly difficult to support development within rural areas.
- If the site was considered as unsustainable then the whole community was as well.
- The shop acted as a hub within the community.
- He felt that the development acted as an infill.
- The additional element of a car club scheme was a real step forward and was an innovative solution.
- The live/work aspect of the development would help support the economy in the area.

The Chairman asked Planning Officer, David Pearson, to make a statement on sustainability. David Pearson explained that when Members identified settlements within settlements boundaries, they were identifying areas that they considered to be sustainable. Any areas outside of these boundaries were not considered to be sustainable. David Pearson added that Members needed to assess each application on its own merits. The Planning Officer's view was that the location was not sustainable and this had been upheld by an inspector.

Councillor Law asked David Pearson to comment on the application's relevance to Policy ADPP6. Planning Officer, Emma Nutchey, explained that the relevance of this policy was

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

reliant upon the location of the site as it applied to the East Kennet Valley. The application site was too far west for ADPP6 to be relevant.

Councillor Keith Chopping queried if the provision of a car club scheme would deal with the non sustainable element of the site and David Pearson stated that although it was a nice aspect to the proposal it was peripheral to Members' decision on the application.

Councillor Dillon raised a query about affordable housing and Emma Nutchey reiterated the fact that West Berkshire Planning Policy stated that this needed to apply to 20% of the site (the percentage of affordable housing depended on the number of units and ranged between 20% and 40%). Councillor Dillon queried if the application was delivered with affordable housing, if this would be a S106 Contribution rather than a plot on the site. Emma Nutchey stated that if a site was deemed to be unsustainable then a contribution would normally be agreed. Councillor Dillon asked if the application would be referenced up to the District Planning Committee if Members were minded to vote against Officer recommendation and David Pearson confirmed that this would be the case.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe had noted at the site visit that access to the pub would need to be completely altered. He queried if this would form part of the application. Emma Nutchey confirmed that this would involve negotiations between the developer and the pub. The entrance to the pub would not need to be closed however, the layout would need to be changed.

Councillor Metcalfe further queried when a site was not longer considered a Greenfield site, for example if it was covered in tarmac. Emma Nutchey reported that the criteria for a Greenfield site was not strictly about surface material.

Councillor Bridgman understood why Mr Crook had referenced ADPP6 and queried if its relevance should be considered by Members. David Pearson stated that Policy C1 was worded in a very strict manner. ADPP6 did not apply to site that was outside of a dwelling cluster and was set back from the road.

Councillor Bridgman recalled Members debating over a property in Padworth, where Members had also been confronted by Policy. These policies had been agreed as part of the Council's Development Planning Document. He did not see the proposal as an infill development. The application failed to adhere to Policy C1.

Councillor Crumly disagreed with Councillor Bridgman as he felt the proposed development could be considered as an infill, which he felt was neat in design. He accepted views that had been raised about the countryside location however, he expressed his view that the proposal was novel and therefore would like to see Members support the application.

Further to Councillor Crumly's comments, Councillor Law stated that the site was not considered to be an infill development by Planning Officers or the Planning Inspector. Councillor Law reiterated that it was not previously developed land or an in-fill development.

Councillor Law felt that a brave attempt at an application had been brought before Members. The developer had looked carefully at the site and consulted local people. Working from home was completely different to the concept of a live/work unit. Regarding sustainability, Councillor Law expressed the view that the site was not sustainable and this had been supported by the point raised by Ward Member Denton-Powell when he had stated that it was in a rural location.

Councillor Law added that he had been Portfolio Holder when the policies in question had been agreed and therefore he supported Officers' view that the application did not

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

comply with these policies. Councillor Law felt that if approved the decision would set a very dangerous precedent.

Councillor Quentin Webb recalled the Spire Ridge live/work unit along the A4 and concurred with Councillor Law and disagreed with the points made by Councillor Crumly. Councillor Webb proposed that Members refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Bridgman.

Councillor Metcalfe was concerned that there was a gap in the policy regarding live/work units. David Pearson confirmed that Officers had worked hard in seeking national guidance on live/work units and what was available was minimal. Historically applications had been for replacement dwellings and there were few examples of applications for empty Greenfield sites. The application was within the remit of what was deemed by Officers as acceptable.

Councillor Somner expressed his struggles with the application and concurred with Members comments regarding adhering to policy.

Councillor Dillon was sympathetic to the overall development. He respected that policies were in place however, felt that those policies were failing Members in this instance. He suggested that it was something the Planning Advisory Group (PAG) should look into. The Chairman suggested that Members' speak to the Chairman of PAG.

Councillor Law sympathised with the views of Councillor Dillon however, stressed that policy should be adhered to. If Members felt that there was a strong enough reason for an exception to the policy, then no precedent would be set. In his opinion the application in question did not warrant exception to the policy.

Councillor Marigold Jaques understood that the application was against policy however, Members had to take into consideration the 41 signatures of support.

The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal put forward by Councillor Webb, seconded by Councillor Bridgman. At the vote the Chairman used his casting vote and the motion to refuse planning permission was approved. Councillor Somner abstained from voting.

RESOLVED that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development conflicts with the up-to-date housing supply policies of the statutory development plan in terms of the location and scale of new housing. The proposed development of five live/work units would result in the siting of new residential development within the open countryside in a location that is poorly served by access to local services and amenities and would result in an increase in the use of the private motor vehicle. Accordingly, the application is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies ADPP1, ADPP3, CS1 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Policy C1 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026).
2. The development fails to provide a planning obligation to deliver affordable housing. The application is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance, Policy CS6 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and the Planning Obligations SPD.

17. Appeal Decisions relating to Eastern Area Planning

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26 JULY 2017 - MINUTES

Members noted the outcome of appeal decisions relating to the Eastern Area.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 8.53pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature