

DRAFT

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

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2019

Councillors Present: Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Jeff Cant, Hilary Cole, Carlyne Culver, Claire Rowles, Tony Vickers (Vice-Chair, in the Chair) and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Rachel Craggs (Principal Policy Officer (Equalities)), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control) and Shiraz Sheikh (Principal Solicitor)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Clive Hooker

PART I

25. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 August 2019 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Vice Chairman.

26. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Phil Barnett, Jeff Cant and Tony Vickers declared an interest in Agenda Items 1 and 2, 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.

27. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. and Parish: 19/01881/HOUSE - 89 Enborne Road, Newbury

(Councillors Phil Barnett, Jeff Cant and Tony Vickers declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 4(1) and (2) by virtue of the fact that they were members of Newbury Town Council Planning and Highways Committee. Councillor Howard Woollaston had also been lobbied on the matter. 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.)

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 19/01881/HOUSE in respect of a two storey side and single storey rear extension, with proposed loft to be connected into existing converted loft space at 89 Enborne Road, Newbury.
2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Simon Moffat, objector, and Councillor Andy Moore, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.
3. Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members, which had been called in by Councillor Moore due to the impact on the neighbour's privacy. The report took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations and in conclusion it detailed that the proposal was acceptable and a conditional approval was justifiable.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

4. Simon Moffat in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The planning application had been shown by his neighbour had originally only had two windows on the ground floor and one on the first floor.
 - However the door that had since been inserted at the side of the extension and was referred to in the officer's report had been removed, although the window on the first floor remained.
 - Following the construction of the outbuilding in 2018, they had had to install blinds at the back of their house as they were completely overlooked.
5. Councillor Adrian Abbs enquired as to when they had found out about the installation of the side door and Mr Moffat replied that they had returned from holiday to find the extension being built, which included a side door. They had raised this with the neighbour who had showed them the plans, but these were different from the original plans.
6. Councillor Andy Moore in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - He had called the planning application in and, as he was a Member of the Newbury Town Council Planning and Highways Committee, he had advised them then that he was likely to do so. This was why there had been no one from the Town Council to make representations on the item.
 - He had called the application in following representations from Mr Moffat about overlooking of his garden and property.
 - There was a history of overlooking from the earlier construction of an outbuilding and a review of enforcement action at the property had indicated the applicant was prepared to submit plans and then change them. Therefore he had considered that calling in the application would help discourage the applicant from doing this again.
 - He would urge the applicant to build the extension in accordance with the agreed plans and he accepted that it could now be approved.
7. Councillor Hilary Cole queried why the matter had been brought to Committee as it was a neighbour dispute and not a planning matter and as there were no issues with overlooking, she proposed the Committee should accept the officer's recommendation for approval.
8. Councillor Phil Barnett commented that he had originally thought this was a straight forward case involving the construction of an extension. However, when he visited the rear of the site and had seen the impact the au pair accommodation had had on the neighbouring property, he had appreciated the impact changes made during the construction process could have on neighbours. He recognised that if the extension had already been completed the Committee would not be discussing it and it would be difficult to refuse it from a planning perspective but he felt the Committee should be looking at this sort of planning application.
9. Councillor Jeff Cant noted he did not understand why the item had been called in and he supported the recommendation.
10. Councillor Abbs added that he was glad the application had been called in as it helped to highlight the fact that people needed to follow the planning process.
11. Councillor Tony Vickers confirmed that Ward Members have the right to call in planning applications and all that was required was the Chairman's permission to do so. Furthermore, if the Chairman had agreed to it being called in, there must have

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

been a good reason for doing so. He also agreed that it sent out a message to applicants that they should be following the planning processes even for small applications.

12. The Chairman invited members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Cole and seconded by Councillor Cant and at the vote the motion was carried unanimously.

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

Conditions

1. 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. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing number 16107/PLR002 received on 15 July 2019 and 16107/PLR001 Rev A received on 3 September 2019.

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

3. The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be as specified on the plans and/or the application forms. Where stated that materials shall match the existing, those materials shall match those on the existing development in colour, size and texture.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials respond to local character and appearance. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Quality Design SPD (Part 2, June 2006), and House Extensions SPG 04/2 (July 2004).

4. 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 windows/dormer windows or doors which would otherwise be permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and/or C of that Order shall be constructed on the western side elevation of the dwelling, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of adjacent properties/land, in the interests of safeguarding the privacy of the neighbouring occupants. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Quality Design SPD (2006) and House Extensions SPG (July 2004).

(2) Application No. and Parish: 19/01850/FULD - Land North of 4 and South of 8 Edgecombe Lane, Newbury

(Councillors Phil Barnett, Jeff Cant and Tony Vickers declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 4(2) by virtue of the fact that they were members of Newbury Town Council Planning and Highways Committee. Councillor Barnett had also been lobbied on the matter. 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.)

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 19/01850/FULD in respect of the demolition of an outbuilding and the construction of two semi-detached dwellings with highway improvements.
2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Gary Norman, Parish Council representative, Simon Middleton, objector, Gary Marshall, applicant and Kate Cooper, agent and Councillor Jeff Beck, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.
3. Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members, which had been called in by Councillor Beck and had received ten or more objections. The report took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations and in conclusion it detailed that the proposal was acceptable and a conditional approval was justifiable. Derek Carnegie also referred the Committee to the recommended additional condition included in the Update Report.
4. Gary Norman in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - He was the Vice Chair of the Newbury Town Council Planning and Highways Committee.
 - Concerns had been raised about the width of the lane and the fact that delivery vehicles would have to reverse onto Kiln Lane.
 - It was noted that Waste had not commented on the application and they were aware that the development would lead to an increase in the number of bins placed in Kiln Lane.
 - There would be an increase in the amount of traffic coming out of the lane and this was already very difficult.
 - The proposed removal of the hedges would constitute environmental damage.
 - A couple of items in the officer's report could be interpreted differently. For example, officers have suggested that insufficient garden space in the proposed gardens would be balanced by the provision of two houses, but this suggested that it was possible to ignore planning rules. Also, 6.2.2 stated that the site was currently used as garden space with a small outbuilding, resulting in it being considered as previously developed land. This was very concerning as it meant that previously developed land could be anything with a shed on it, which left Newbury in great danger.
 - He was concerned, from past experience that Committee Members often followed the officer's recommendation and therefore, this application was likely to be approved.
 - The Planning Inspector had rejected a planning application on this site in 1990 and the objections raised at the time had not been mitigated with this application.
 - It was not an urban street, but a semi-rural lane.
5. Councillor Adrian Abbs asked Mr Norman if he could explain why the width of the lane was an issue. Mr Norman replied that when he had driven down the lane, he had had to undertake a nine point turn in order to turn round and it would be even narrower following the development.
6. Councillor Hilary Cole asked Mr Norman if he was aware of the Local Plan, which defined the sites for new housing. She added that a new plan was currently being developed, which made it clear that the planning authority was plan-led and she asked if he accepted that this gave residents protection against inappropriate

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

development. Mr Norman said he was aware of the Local Plan but he still felt that if different interpretations could be given to previously developed land, it could lead to trouble.

7. Councillor Claire Rowles challenged Mr Norman's assertion that Members often followed the officer's recommendation as she said in her experience this was definitely not the case. Mr Norman acknowledged that his experience was limited to one case.
8. Simon Middleton in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - He was addressing the Committee as the owner of 6 Edgecombe Lane and he was also speaking on behalf of the owners of the properties on the eastern side of the lane.
 - There would be an inappropriate overdevelopment of the site. He was aware that the Council preferred there to be a maximum of five houses per adoptable access road but in this instance there would be eleven houses.
 - The lane had not been improved since the 1990s but the number of cars using it had increased from six to fifteen.
 - The lane was 70 metres in length with variations in width and no turning areas. Consequently it did not meet the required statutorily required width and there was no evidence that the fire service had been consulted.
 - The exit was very dangerous especially during the rush hour and 80% of the time visibility was blocked to the west by cars parked on the road.
 - Visibility was further blocked by the positioning of waste bins in readiness for the weekly waste collection and the residents whose houses the bins would be positioned outside, were unhappy about this.
 - Turning in the lane was very tight and did not allow for the scaffolding that would be required during construction.
 - The character of the lane would be ruined and numbers 1 to 4 would lose their gardens if the development went ahead, which would also compromise their privacy.
9. Councillor Abbs asked which part of the lane measured 2.1 metres in width. Mr Middleton said it was on the right outside of the proposed development site and between the entrances to Numbers 5 and 6.
10. Councillor Abbs further asked about the use of smaller delivery lorries and Mr Middleton advised that he had been in contact with various local building firms and none of them used these.
11. Gary Marshall and Kate Cooper in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - There was a presumption in favour of development for the site.
 - The design met the relevant standards and reflected the character of adjacent dwellings.
 - The separation from neighbouring gardens met the relevant standards.
 - They understood that change was difficult to come to terms with but they were hopeful that the Committee would find in favour of the application.
 - There were some errors in the report contained in the agenda pack.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

- They understood that parking in Kiln Road was an issue but the Council could reinstate the yellow lines.
 - The fence would be removed which would improve visibility.
 - The existing rights of way to cross the lane would not be impacted.
 - Consequently, the application provided improvements, whilst not taking away any existing rights and the Council could introduce no parking in Kiln Road to improve visibility.
12. Derek Carnegie asked Mr Marshall to elaborate on the errors in the report and he advised they were in section 4.2, which it was noted related to comments made by objectors and not officers.
13. Councillor Cole made reference to point 6.3.3 in the report, which stated that obscure glass would be installed to protect privacy for 4 and 6 Edgecombe Lane and she asked which window it related to. She was advised it was a window onto the staircase and Councillor Cole concluded there was no reason for obscure glass to be used as there would be no outlook from these windows.
14. Councillor Abbs asked whether the red line on the screen was the correct interpretation of the red lines and was advised that it was.
15. Councillor Jeff Beck in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
- He had been considerably lobbied on the application and he had called it in as there were a number of factors prevailing in Edgecombe Lane, which made him wonder if it was a good idea to increase the amount of housing in the area.
 - Although officers were recommending approval, the landowners could preclude the extension taking place to the width of the lane which would make access difficult for cars.
 - In 1998 Newbury Town Council had refused a planning application for two dwellings.
 - In 1990 the Planning Inspector in response to an appeal relating to a bungalow had said that no further traffic should be encouraged in the lane. However there had been a substantial increase in vehicle numbers since then.
 - He therefore asked the Committee to give careful consideration to his comments and those made by Newbury Town Council and the objectors before making a decision.
16. Councillor Jeff Cant referred to page 32, point 7, which stated no development would take place until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres had been provided at the access, but as one of the objectors referred to 27 metres, he asked which was correct. Paul Goddard stated that Highways officers had visited the site to check and rechecked the measurements and the current site lines were more than 43 metres as shown in the photograph. Furthermore, officers believed that sight lines of 43 metres could be achieved.
17. Councillor Cant noted that applications for this site had been to appeal twice and been rejected both times and he asked what had changed to make this application eligible for approval. Derek Carnegies responded that the visibility splays were satisfactory according to Highways and planning policy had been relaxed with developments in towns since the 1980s. This application ticked all the boxes and if the application was refused, in his view it would fail at appeal.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

18. Councillor Cole referred to the obscure glazing on the north and south elevations to protect the privacy of 4 and 8 Edgecombe Lane and questioned its purpose since it was on a staircase. Derek Carnegie said that as the applicants were content with the obscure glazing it was an added benefit for the current residents.
19. Councillor Cole further asked whether the planning application submitted in 1989 had been before Lawrence Place was built on the former site of the SCATS warehouse and she was given affirmation of this.
20. Councillor Rowles asked whether the root container that had been referred to was covered in the landscaping conditions at section 10 and she was told it was.
21. Councillor Rowles further enquired about access by the emergency services. Paul Goddard assured her that the existing dwellings along the lane could be accessed by the emergency services and although he was unsure whether they had been consulted, the proposals complied with government guidance and the Manual for Streets regarding emergency access.
22. Councillor Howard Woollaston enquired about turning at the top of the lane and Paul Goddard responded that there were already very limited turning facilities at present for the existing dwellings, but this would be improved with the proposed application.
23. Councillor Abbs asked whether the red lines shown on the plans had taken account of the information provided at the site meeting and Derek Carnegie assured him that he was satisfied the red lines were correct. However if any residents held information to the contrary, they would need to take it through the courts. Paul Goddard had written a very clear email to one of the local objectors which stated the whole width of the carriageway could be driven on and used to pass and repass. Consequently it would not be necessary to use the section that is 2.1 metres in width in order to turn.
24. Paul Goddard added that Edgecombe Lane was a private street with public highway rights that existed from boundary to boundary and therefore, it was irrelevant who owned the land as anyone could drive on it and pass and repass.
25. Councillor Tony Vickers enquired how it would be possible to stop people parking on the lane if the public highway rights did not include parking. Paul Goddard responded that since it was a public highway, he believed it would have the same powers of enforcement.
26. Councillor Abbs referred to the photographs showing the visibility splays and remarked that during the site visit there had been a van parked at the entrance to the lane which had reduced visibility considerably. Paul Goddard commented that the photograph had been taken on a Thursday afternoon and referred to point 6.4.3(g) from the Manual for Streets, which said that "although parking in visibility splays was quite common, it did not appear to create significant problems in practice". This made it difficult for him to object to the application on these grounds. He added that the Council did try to increase the yellow lines about six years ago but it failed to do so due to objections from residents, although he acknowledged it would be possible to look at it again. However he added that this was not something that the planning application could resolve.
27. Councillor Abbs remarked that as there would not be a turning circle, it would be necessary for large vehicles to reverse out of the lane. Paul Goddard referred him to the Construction Management Plan mentioned in the Update Report as he said information relating to this issue would be included here. He added that unless the Council was satisfied the development could be constructed without significant inconvenience, it would not go ahead.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

28. Councillor Carlyne Culver referred to the previous planning applications mentioned by Councillor Beck and asked why one had been invalid whilst the other had not been determined. Derek Carnegie replied that the first one had been declared invalid because the applicant had not mentioned that both he and his wife owned the land but he did not know the reason for the non determination of the second one.
29. Councillor Phil Barnett referred to the fact that at least one resident had put in a planning application to alter the alignment onto Kiln Road to allow parking off the highway and he said this should be encouraged. He also noted that no mention had been made of the obstructions going up to Lawrence Place as it was difficult to access it off Edgecombe Lane.
30. Paul Goddard pointed out that the increase would amount to six daily vehicle movements and this would be difficult to defend at an appeal if the application was refused on these grounds.
31. Councillor Cole reflected that since there were already eight properties in Edgecombe Lane that issued must already have been encountered with passing and she asked what impact a further two properties would have. Paul Goddard responded that adequate parking was provided on the site, which met the required standards and there would be a very small increase in vehicle movements.
32. Councillor Rowles noted concerns about waste storage had been raised by the objectors as the current storage area would be lost and she asked if storing the bins on the road would cause any difficulties. Derek Carnegie confirmed that it would obscure the visibility splays but it was not a strong enough reason to refuse the application as this would not stand up at an appeal. Councillor Cole added that it would be possible for residents to use waste sacks if this was a problem.
33. In considering the above application Councillor Barnett expressed concerns about the site. He said although it was an urban area, it provided a rural environment in north east Newbury and this had only recently started to change. Previous comments from the Planning Inspector had been made when there had been fewer vehicles than there were today and it was not easy to park in the area, which meant it was not an ideal place to increase car movements. In addition he did not like to see the loss of gardens and in his view the proposal was not acceptable because it would cause overdevelopment, it did not have proper access, existing residents would have difficulty turning out of the road and waste bins would be an issue.
34. Councillor Abbs added that as there would be less visibility he could not support the application because he did not want to put people's lives at risk reversing out from the lane. However if the visibility issue could be resolved he would support the application, but as this did not seem possible, he would second the motion to refuse it.
35. Councillor Vickers noted that conditions 7 and 15 attempted to deal with the visibility splays and asked whether they could be further amended. Paul Goddard confirmed that this would not be possible as any changes to parking restrictions were subject to a separate consultation process and as already advised, the visibility splays complied with the Manual for Streets.
36. Councillor Cant requested clarification of the planning ground for rejecting the application. Derek Carnegie advised it would be overdevelopment, the access and turning was poor, poor visibility and obstruction from waste bins. However the application did comply with the Manual for Streets on all these points and consequently it would be difficult to fight an appeal based on this.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

37. The Chairman invited members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Barnett, seconded by Councillor Abbs and at the vote the motion was defeated by four votes to three.
38. The Chairman therefore asked the Committee to propose another motion and Councillor Cole proposed that they accepted the officer's recommendation and approved the application. This was seconded by Councillor Woollaston.
39. The Chairman invited members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Cole, seconded by Councillor Woollaston and at the vote the motion was carried by four votes to three.

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

Conditions

1. 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. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:
 - (i) Drawing 127 P 001A (Location Plan) received on 31.07.2019;
 - (ii) Drawing 127 P 002 (Site Sections) received on 12.07.2019;
 - (iii) Drawing 127 P 004A (Block Plan) received on 31.07.2019;
 - (iv) Drawing 127 P 005A (Proposed Site Plan) received on 31.07.2019;
 - (v) Drawing 127 P 006 (Proposed Floor Plans) received on 12.07.2019;
 - (vi) Drawing 127 P 007 (Proposed Roof Plan) received on 12.07.2019;
 - (vii) Drawing 127 P 008 (Proposed Elevations) received on 12.07.2019;
 - (viii) Drawing 127 P 009 (Proposed Sections) received on 12.07.2019;
 - (ix) Drawing 127 P 012A (Construction Traffic Plan) received on 31.07.2019;
 - (x) Drawing 127 P 013 (Propose Site Plan- Entrance) received on 12.07.2019.

Associated documents:

- (i) Design and Access Statement (Rev.C 05.07.2019) received on 12.07.2019.

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

3. The finished floor levels in the approved dwellings shall match those shown in the approved plans.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

4. The proposed first floor windows in the north and south elevations (side elevations) of the hereby approved dwellings shall be fitted with obscure glass and non-openable 1 metre above the window cil. The windows shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of 4 Edgecombe Lane and 8 Edgecombe Lane in the interests of amenity. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (2006).

5. No development shall take place until a schedule of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings and areas of hard surfacing 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 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, Policies CS14, CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006) and Newbury Town Design Statement (July 2018). A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; materials are required to be agreed before the construction phase begins and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

6. No development shall commence until the applicant submits to the Local Planning Authority a scheme of works or such other steps as may be necessary to minimise the effects of dust from the development. Development shall not commence until written approval has been given by the Local Planning Authority to any such scheme of works.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007). A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; a scheme to minimise the effects of dust is required throughout the construction phase and therefore it is necessary to agree before development commences.

7. 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 and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

8. No development shall take place until details an electric vehicle charging point has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until an electric vehicle charging point has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings. The charging point shall thereafter be retained and kept available for the potential use of an electric car.

Reason: To promote the use of electric vehicle. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocation DPD and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

9. No development shall take place until details of a temporary parking and turning area to be provided and maintained concurrently with the development of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved parking and turning area shall be provided at the commencement of

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details until the development has been completed. During this time, the approved parking and turning area shall be kept available for parking and used by employees, contractors, operatives and other visitors during all periods that they are working at or visiting the site.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking and turning facilities during the construction period. This condition is imposed in order to minimise the incidences of off-site parking in the locality which could cause danger to other road users, and long terms inconvenience to local residents. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026). A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; temporary parking and turning is required throughout the construction phase and therefore it is necessary to agree before development commences.

10. No development shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the treatment of hard surfacing and materials to be used, a schedules of plants (noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities), an implementation programme, and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment. The scheme shall ensure:
- a) Completion of the approved landscaping within the first planting season following the completion of the development; and
 - b) Any trees, shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of the completion of the development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.

Thereafter the approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026). A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; landscaping measures may require work to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

11. No development shall take place until details of sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

These details shall:

- a) Incorporate the implementation of Sustainable Drainage methods (SuDS) in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (March 2015), the SuDS Manual C753 (2015) and West Berkshire Council local standards, particularly the WBC SuDS Supplementary Planning Document December 2018;
- b) Include and be informed by a ground investigation survey which establishes the soil characteristics, infiltration rate and groundwater levels;
- e) Include attenuation measures to retain rainfall run-off within the site, off site discharge will not be permitted;

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

- f) Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site;
- g) Include run-off calculations, discharge rates, infiltration and storage capacity calculations for the proposed SuDS measures based on a 1 in 100 year storm +40% for climate change;
- j) Include pre-treatment methods to prevent any pollution or silt entering SuDS features or causing any contamination to the soil or groundwater;
- m) Include details of how the SuDS measures will be maintained and managed after completion. These details shall be provided as part of a handover pack for subsequent purchasers and owners of the property/premises;

Reason: 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 applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Part 4 of Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006) and Sustainable Drainage Systems SPD (2018). A pre-condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; sustainable drainage measures may require work to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

12. No demolition or construction works shall take place outside the following hours unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing:

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, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS.5 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

13. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking has been surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the approved plans. The parking 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 that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

14. No dwelling shall be occupied until the improvements to the access have been provided and constructed in accordance with the approved drawing number 127 P 013 dated 12.07.2019.

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

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25 SEPTEMBER 2019 - MINUTES

15. No dwelling shall be occupied until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 2.4 metres have been provided at the junction of the driveway/access and the adjacent footway. Dimensions shall be measured along the edge of the driveway/access and the back of the footway from their point of intersection. The visibility splays shall, thereafter, be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.

Reason: To enable pedestrians to see emerging vehicles and to be seen by its driver. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

16. No dwelling shall be occupied until the cycle parking has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings and this area shall thereafter be kept available for the parking of cycles at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and assists with the parking, storage and security of cycles. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, 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).

17. 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 windows/dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) which would otherwise be permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and C of that Order shall be constructed at first floor level or above on the north and south elevations of the hereby permitted dwellings, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose.

Reason: To prevent overlooking of adjacent properties, in the interests of safeguarding the privacy of the neighbouring occupants. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Quality Design SPD (2006).

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.15 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature