WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2022

Councillors Present: Dennis Benneyworth (Chairman), Tony Vickers (Vice-Chairman), Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Carolyne Culver, Claire Rowles and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Bryan Lyttle (Planning & Transport Policy Manager), Lydia Mather (Senior Planning Officer), Gordon Oliver (Principal Policy Officer) and Lizzie Reeves (Business Analyst (Digital Services))

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Jeff Cant and Councillor Clive Hooker

PART I

35. Minutes

None of the outstanding minutes were available for approval at the meeting. However, it was noted that draft minutes for the meetings on 3 November, 24 November and 15 December 2021 had been submitted to the planning officers for approval. The minutes for the meeting of 12 January had been delayed due to staff illness. It was confirmed that all outstanding minutes would be available for the next meeting.

36. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Adrian Abbs and Carolyne Culver 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.

37. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. and Parish: 20/01336/OUTMAJ, Institute for Animal Health, High Street, Compton.

(Councillor Carolyne Culver declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that she was the local Ward Member for the application site. As her interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

(Councillors Adrian Abbs and Carolyne Culver declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1))

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 20/01336/OUTMAJ in respect of the Institute for Animal Health, High Street, Compton. This was a hybrid planning application and approval was sought for: 1) Outline planning permission (all matters reserved with the exception of access), for development comprising of up to 160 residential units (Class C3), the provision of landscaping, construction of access and street lighting, car and cycle parking, other associated infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems, engineering works and mitigation measures including the construction of internal roads. The

proposal includes at least 1.75 hectares of employment land (Class B1) associated with the retention of the Intervet building and a playing field (Class D2) associated with the retention of the existing Cricket Pitch. 2) Full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings, structures and hardstanding along with preparatory works including earthworks, remediation, utility works and associated mitigation measures. The change of use of land including the creation of public open space and wildlife area.

- 2. Mr Simon Till, Team Leader (Western Area Planning) introduced the report to Members, which took account of all relevant policy considerations and other material planning considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms and officers recommended that the Service Director – Development and Regulation be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and the completion of a S106 legal agreement as outlined in the main and update reports.
- The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard, Team Leader (Highways Development 3. Control), if he had any observations relating to the application. Mr Goddard explained that this proposal was for access only, with the internal layout to be covered by a subsequent application. The main access would be onto High Street using the existing access. Although sight line details were outstanding, Mr Goddard was satisfied these would be adequate. An existing secondary access served the industrial site off Churn Road and a second emergency access would be provided off Churn Road. There would be pedestrian accesses onto Churn Road and Hockham Road. The transport assessment was originally based on 250 dwellings and subsequently reduced to 160 dwellings. Highways were satisfied that the proposal would not increase traffic relative to that associated with previous uses on this site. The Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) had allocated 140 dwellings for this site, but 20 more units would not make much difference to traffic, and the transport assessment had assumed 250 dwellings. All key junctions had been modelled, including accesses to the A34, using data from local traffic surveys. The modelling showed no peak hour traffic congestion in the area and Highways England had raised no objection. Proposed off-site highway works included improvements to pedestrian routes and crossings. A contribution of £5,000 would be secured for travel plan monitoring. Condition 19 set out the requirements for a Construction Management Plan. There would be 20 HGV movements in and out of the site per day.
- 4. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Alison Strong, Rebecca Pinfold and lan Tong, Compton Parish Council, and Mike Harris, Richard Green and Jim Strike, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Parish/Town Council Representation

- 5. Ms Alison Strong in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Compton Parish Council was encouraged by the Committee's previous decision, which had allowed for completion of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The referendum concluded with 98% in favour and the NDP would enable the sympathetic evolution of the parish for future generations.
 - The NDP must carry weight in decision making at least two High Court hearings had made it clear that where an application was in conflict with the NDP, planning permission should not normally be granted.

- While the Parish Council appreciated that Homes England had incorporated some revisions, development density remained unchanged. Officers had implied that the use of the word 'approximately' within the NDP enabled development density to be increased by 20 units, disregarding the calculations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), as well as the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the NDP, which referred to 20 houses per hectare. The proposal for 160 units would exceed the current house per hectare ratio of the village.
- Legal advice had highlighted contradictions in the reports as to whether or not the proposal constituted major development. By saying that it was not major development, it avoided the exceptional circumstances test in the NPPF. A decision based on these contradictions would be challengeable. The proposed increase alone represented major development within the definition of the NPPF and should be refused within the AONB.
- The proposal to retain previously used community buildings was appreciated, but should not be confused with offsetting against density. Community buildings were seen as an enabler to link the development to the existing community. These buildings would be unacceptable without development investment and a committed sum to cover future costs before they were handed over to the community.
- Some residents were already experiencing hazardous environments due to the crumbling Thames Water infrastructure. A family had been instructed to limit toilet use for 120 hours with no further escalation possible until sewage entered the house. New homes should not be occupied until Thames Water infrastructure had been secured to mitigate further detrimental environmental impact.
- Homes England had not yet disclosed the professional body that would endorse the decontamination management plan and which would be the accountable body for the safety of the village. This was considered an absolute requirement given local knowledge about infectious diseases experimentation conducted at the site. Lessons needed to be learned from the recent Covid pandemic where an airborne virus had been released from a single source.
- The site was being used for Police fire arms practice and had 24 hour security. Committee Members were concerned that the site could be broken into by children, but this was speculation by individuals who were not resident within the community, and did not correspond with planning principles. However, it did imply that Members were concerned about public safety, which should also relate to enforcement of a robust and legally binding contamination accountability plan.
- The Parish Council and local residents requested that the Committee act on their behalf, recalling that the Neighbourhood Planning regime was intended to shift away from top-down planning that excluded local people and communities as set out in the NPPF.

Member Questions to the Parish/Town Council

6. Councillor Tony Vickers sought clarification about the Parish Council's concerns in relation to major development, Thames Water's contributions, and decontamination. He asked if the Parish Council was confident that Homes England had access to all of the confidential information about previous work undertaken at the site.

- 7. Ms Strong explained that the site had been used for research on infectious diseases, with experimentation on animals over a long period. This work had been highly classified. The majority of employees had lived within the village, so there was a lot of local knowledge. Children had been encouraged to avoid particular locations that had been used for burial of animals. Elderly residents had been approached by Central Government departments to help identify contaminated areas and the Parish Council found it difficult to believe that Homes England had access to all of the information that they would need. Ms Becca Pinfold agreed and suggested that not everything would have been documented.
- 8. Ms Strong confirmed that it had been her property that had been affected by the 120 hour restriction by Thames Water. She noted that there had been significant underinvestment by Thames Water so the area's infrastructure was crumbling. Previously, there had been issues with drains collapsing and constant pumping during periods of flooding. Therefore, the Parish Council did not support any occupancy of the proposed development until Thames Water had improved their infrastructure.
- 9. Ms Strong explained that the Parish Council had engaged a planning solicitor, who had stressed that the site was within the AONB and the 20 additional houses would push it into major development. It was noted that officers' reports seemed contradictory on this matter. The word 'approximately' had been used to support the increase in density, but this was only a judgement call and Members did not have to support it. The planning solicitor had advised that contradictions in officers' reports would allow the Parish Council to challenge that the proposal was major development in the AONB. It was stressed that previous work on the SPD and NDP had been focused on securing the right density of development on this site, which was felt to be 140 units.
- 10. Councillor Carolyne Culver noted that Policy C13 of the NDP stated that the Piglets nursery and Pickled Pig complex should be retained, renovated and enhanced, but the current proposal suggested that these should be offered to the community to buy. She asked if the Parish Council would have sufficient funds to buy these buildings.
- 11. Ms Strong confirmed that the Parish Council's priority was to secure a new burial ground, which would require all of its funds.
- 12. Councillor Adrian Abbs noted that there had been mention of Anthrax in the background papers and asked if this was a concern.
- 13. Ms Strong indicated that the Parish Council expected the worst, because the experiments were so important and highly classified. It was known that work had related to BSE, foot and mouth, and other diseases.
- 14. Councillor Abbs asked how previous enquiries about where animals were buried had related to sampling on the site.
- 15. Ms Strong stated that sampling had been around the perimeter of some of the buildings, but the site had been extensively developed over many decades. Also, some of the original experimentation would not have had the same level of rules and regulations around waste disposal as would be expected today. She suggested that it was not possible to tell where issues may be found. Eye witnesses had reported that testing had only been to shallow depths. She did not believe that local residents had been consulted to inform the sampling works, but in any case, many of the residents who would have necessary information were dead, or were elderly and could not recall the details.
- 16. Councillor Phil Barnett asked which organisation would be appropriate to undertake the decontamination works.

- 17. Ms Strong did not know who this would be, but stressed that there had to be a named accountable individual or body who would have responsibility for the safety of village and that an evacuation plan was needed for the village and two schools. It was noted that the main contact at Homes England had already changed twice.
- 18. Councillor Howard Woollaston noted that the Parish Council would benefit from 25% of all Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions and asked if this could help pay for refurbishment of the community buildings.
- 19. Ms Strong did not think it was fair that all of the CIL funding from the site should be used this purpose and that investment was needed across the rest of the parish. It was noted that the hostel buildings could not be reused, because they were not in an acceptable condition. They had been built around the same time as the buildings being offered for community use, and had been unoccupied for the same amount of time. The Parish Council would need to pay for works required to make the buildings usable, which could take years.
- 20. Councillor Woollaston felt that the site was currently an eyesore and if anyone was to be responsible for decontaminating the site, then he would want to be a Government backed body rather than a speculative developer.
- 21. Ms Strong agreed, but stated that the aim of the NDP was sympathetic evolution of the village, which would not be achieved by cramming 160 homes onto the site. The Parish Council wished to see a good mix of housing at the right ratio and some employment opportunity. She stressed that the development had to be right for the parish.

Applicant/Agent Representation

- 22. Mr Mike Harris and Mr Richard Green in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Paragraphs 4.42 4.47 of the report were very clear on the matter of contaminated land, while Condition 18 referred to the Environment Agency and the Environmental Permitting Regulations, which supported the Environmental Protection Act 1990. These answered many of the previous questions on decontamination.
 - In the application pack, Homes England had made commitments to design and to working with the Parish Council and local community as good neighbours and to deliver a good project.
 - An overarching objective of the application was to deliver a green infrastructure led response that embedded principles of building for a healthy life with benefits for Compton, with re-use of brownfield land, including removal of redundant buildings and full remediation of contaminated land.
 - Remediation was supported by an intrusive survey that would be reviewed and tested throughout the demolition process.
 - The site must be fully remediated in order to respond to house-builder market requirements.
 - The application was for up to 160 homes with a mix that would meet local needs for a range of 2-5 bedroom properties.
 - Although there had been a 14% increase in homes, they would all be provided within the identified developable area and the increase was within the 1-25

additional houses identified by the majority of respondents in the 2018 NDP - this was only approximately beyond 140 and was therefore considered acceptable under policy.

- The would be benefits in terms of additional choice and a fully compliant affordable housing provision.
- Wider community benefits included the retention of the Pickled Pig and Piglets day nursery, cricket pitch and former gate house.
- Contributions would also be provided to social infrastructure and public transport and employment would be maintained on the site, with potential for more in future.
- A transport assessment (TA) had been submitted for the application, which included construction management plans for both demolition and construction phases. No objections had been raised to the proposals in the TA.
- No development would take place within the flood plain and the development would incorporate a sustainable drainage network. These aspects were informed by an extensive flood risk assessment and hydrology model of the River Pang.
- The visual impact on the AONB would be reduced relative to the existing development.
- There would be no development in the northernmost area, which would be given over to a managed wildlife and habitat zone, and would provide a protective buffer to open countryside. This had the support of the West Berkshire Landscape Officer.
- Wildlife and habitat areas would be enhanced and integrated with further opportunities for interpretation and community learning.
- There would be a net increase in managed green infrastructure and associated biodiversity net gain benefit of approximately 85%.
- Strong community links and healthy lifestyles would be encouraged through low speed streets, play space and pedestrian / cycle links.
- The removal of hard boundaries and reinstatement of public rights of way would significantly improve accessibility for existing and new residents.
- Overall, the development would make a positive contribution to the village and the long-term sustainability of Compton.

Member Questions to the Applicant/Agent

- 23. Councillor Culver noted that paragraph 4.43 of the report cited NPPF, which required the contaminated condition of the site to be understood. She asked if it was accepted that this was not fully understood. Also, she indicated that Members concerns about the lack of one-bed housing had not been acknowledged, despite the NDP identifying the need for affordable one-bed properties.
- 24. Mr Harris explained that it was an outline application and the housing mix was not being considered at this stage. Once a developer had been chosen, then a reserved matters application would be submitted. The housing mix and layout shown on the drawings were merely indicative. The previous application for 185 homes included some one-bed flats, but these had not been incorporated in the illustrative masterplan for the current proposal. It was noted that the current one-bed homes within the hostel building were only unsuitable due to the building's environmental

performance, which would not support the aspiration for a net zero carbon development. To retain the buildings would do a dis-service to future occupants and the applicant wanted no differentiation between market and affordable housing on the site. It was stressed that the Homes England project manager would be responsible for signing off the reserved matters application and they would not do so if they were unhappy with any aspect.

- 25. Regarding contamination of the site, Mr Harris confirmed that a site investigation had been completed. Also, Homes England had a significant package of information from previous occupiers of the site, which was not in the public domain. This informed the environmental permit that Homes England had with the Environment Agency. He indicated that the Environment Agency would be the body responsible for overseeing the decontamination as defined in legislation.
- 26. Councillor Claire Rowles asked why reference had been made to the 2018 NDP survey rather than the current version. Also, she asked what assets would be made available to the community and in what state these would be when handed over.
- 27. Mr Harris confirmed that the majority of people who responded to the NDP survey in 2018 felt that 1-25 homes could acceptably be accommodated on the site in addition to the 140 set out in the West Berkshire Site Allocations DPD. Richard Green indicated that this had been used test the term 'approximate' in the NPD.
- 28. Mr Harris acknowledged that the community facilities offered as part of the previous application had not been considered good enough. Various options had been considered and the Picked Pig / Piglets day nursery building was considered to be in a reasonably good state of repair and would not require much upgrading to be used by the community. He appreciated the comments made by the Parish Council, but stressed that Homes England was not a commercial developer and was in the business of levelling up, regenerating brownfield sites, and clearing up contaminated sites, but it was not in the business of paying for new community facilities. However, in this case, they were in a position to discuss how the existing buildings could be transferred to the community.
- 29. Councillor Rowles asked if Homes England was able to commit to refurbishing the building. Mr Harris confirmed that he was unable to make such a commitment at this stage, but they could enter into a discussion.
- 30. Councillor Barnett explained that his previous comments had related to the contractor that would carry out the decontamination works rather than the overseer. He noted that Homes England had information about contamination on the site and asked if / when this would be made available. He also asked about the depth to which decontamination works would extend.
- 31. Mr Harris noted that remediation specialists, Arcadis, had been appointed. They had devised the specification for the works, and were supporting the open tender process to procure a specialist and would project manage the works in due course. A preferred bidder had been identified to undertake the works, but had not yet been appointed. He stressed that all decontamination works would be done and in accordance with legislation. He confirmed that unless the site was fully decontaminated, Homes England would be unable to market it to developers.
- 32. Councillor Barnett stated that he had worked for demolition contractors specialising in decontamination works and sought clarification as to whether this was a pecuniary interest. Sharon Armour confirmed that unless Councillor Barnett was aware of which contractors had bid for the work, there was no conflict at this stage.

- 33. Councillor Vickers noted that there would be embedded carbon in the retained buildings, and Homes England would save money by not demolishing them. He asked if this had been factored into their calculations. Also, he asked if the hostel could be retained and therefore save money, and suggested there would be value in retaining some of the history of the site. In addition, he asked if the 18 month demolition plan was realistic and whether all necessary research had been undertaken to understand what had happened on the site and the associated contamination.
- 34. Mr Harris agreed that buildings should be reused wherever possible and the Pickled Pig / Piglets Day Nursery building had been chosen due to its location and relatively good state of repair. He was unable to commit at the meeting to handing the building over for £1, but highlighted that there would be S106 negotiations, which would include the community uses.
- 35. Mr Harris explained that the 18 month demolition timescale was the estimate from Arcadis. Some bids had proposed a shorter timescale, but the more robust bids were closer to the 18 month timescale.
- 36. Councillor Woollaston indicated that Homes England was a Government body that took contaminated sites and got them to a developable state before selling them to housebuilders who would in turn submit a detailed planning application, which may include a contribution to community facilities. He asked if the fact that it was a Government body meant that the cost of the works was irrelevant.
- 37. Mr Harris confirmed that Councillor Woollaston's understanding was correct.
- 38. Councillor Woollaston asked why Homes England had stuck with 160 units and if this was a viability issue.
- 39. Mr Harris noted that the original proposal was for 250 homes because that was what they thought could be provided on the site. It had been made clear that this was unacceptable so they removed proposed development from the northernmost section of the site, which reduced the number of units to 185. This was addressed planning and environmental impact issues, but it was not supported by the Landscape Officer. The proposal was then reduced to 160 units, which made best use of the Brownfield site, in accordance with the NPPF. It was also noted that every additional home had an additional percentage of affordable homes attached, and West Berkshire had an affordable housing shortage.
- 40. Councillor Abbs noted that it was not Homes England's role to make as much money as possible for a house developer, so questioned why they had consistently exceeded the 140 units that the local community felt to be appropriate for the site. He noted the aspiration to provide more affordable homes, but highlighted the lack of one-bedrrom homes proposed for the scheme. He asked if Homes England were seeking to minimise spend by maximising the number of homes on the site.
- 41. Mr Harris confirmed this was not the case. He felt the site could accommodate 160 homes and pointed out that Homes England's remit was to deliver homes, and particularly affordable homes. If they could sensitively deliver additional housing, then that was the right thing to do. He stressed that the policy was for 'approximately' 140 units.

Ward Member Representation

42. Councillor Carolyne Culver in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Since the Committee had last considered the application in January 2022, the residents of Compton had voted to approve the NDP. Turnout had been 48.9%, with 98% voting in favour. These figures were better than the national average for such referenda.
- The NDP now carried full weight in relation to the Committee's decision.
- The NDP and District Local Plan clearly referred to 140 homes, but this application was for 160 homes, and cited a four year-old survey to justify the additional units. In that informal survey, 191 people had indicated that additional homes would be acceptable, but a far higher figure of 588 people had voted for 140 homes in the recent referendum.
- There had been around 330 objections to the application, including Compton Parish Council.
- The proposed development would represent a 25% increase in the size of the village, so it was very significant.
- There were concerns about the impact on infrastructure, including local roads, schools and the GP surgery.
- She was concerned at the lack of consistency in advice given to Members about whether the proposal constituted major development. The previous application had indicated that it was not major development, but the cover sheet for the latest application indicated that it was.
- The NDP advocated retention of the hostel, which had not been incorporated into the proposal. This could provide much needed one and two bedroom accommodation.
- She accepted that the housing mix would be a reserved matter, but did not understand why the applicant had not amended their plans to demonstrate their commitment to providing affordable one and two bed homes.
- She felt that the proposal did not meet the strategic housing market assessment, nor the Council's Housing Strategy, nor the housing need survey cited in Policy C5 of the NDP.
- She welcomed the concession regarding the Pickled Pig and Piglets Day Nursery, but the building would not be in a fit state to use straight away. The cost to the parish council was unknown and they did not have funds for this project. The NDP referred to the retention, renovation and enhancement of the building.
- Local residents were concerned about employment and felt that there would be demand for an enterprise hub.
- Many people from the village used to work on the site and there was need for local employment. There were insufficient employment buildings in the village the School Road Industrial Site was full.
- It had previously been proposed to use the former gate house for public toilets, but the current application indicated it could be used for an employment hub if necessary, demonstrating a lack of clear thinking about the employment need on the site.
- If approved, the development would generate 100 vehicle movements per day during demolition and 280 per day during construction. This would create pressure on Compton, East Ilsley and potentially Hampstead Norreys. Traffic would have to

negotiate a tight blind pinch point in East IIsley and would pass the front of homes that had no front garden or pavement to act as a buffer zone.

• There was no confidence that Thames Water would deliver the infrastructure that was needed. The Committee had heard about issues with foul water backing up into residents' properties and it was clear that Thames Water needed to complete the works prior to first occupation.

Member Questions to the Ward Member

- 43. Councillor Vickers asked about the paragraphs that referred to the application as not being major development.
- 44. Councillor Culver confirmed that it was 5.16 of the January agenda pack and the cover of the latest update sheet.
- 45. Councillor Woollaston noted that the Development Plan accepted there should be development on the site, everyone accepted that the current development was an eyesore and that there was contamination on the site that needed to be dealt with. Whatever happened on the site, there would be traffic going through East Ilsley during decontamination and construction. He could understand the argument about 160 homes vs 140, but could not see any problems beyond this.
- 46. Councillor Culver accepted the point about traffic, but indicated that the proposal did not meet several policies in the NDP, which must be given full-weight. There were concerns about the number of houses, and the fact that policies were not met in relation to district heating, housing mix, retention of the hostel, housing size, the business hub, and renovation of the Pickled Pig / Piglets Day Nursery.

Member Questions to Officers

- 47. Councillor Abbs noted that the Secretary of State had been asked to call-in this application and asked if the call-in would take place in the event that the application was approved or rejected.
- 48. Mrs Lydia Mather reported that a third party had submitted a request for the Secretary of State to call-in the application for determination. This process would only start if the recommendation of the committee was for approval of the application.
- 49. Councillor Woollaston asked if conditions could be imposed regarding the inclusion of one-bedroom accommodation and a contribution towards the renovation of the Pickled Pig.
- 50. Mrs Mather noted that the housing mix was a reserved matter. The housing mix would be put forward as part of a future application Housing Strategy would be consulted to see if the proposal was compliant with their housing register and evidence of housing need in the area. Affordable housing would fall under the S106 agreement or would be part of the reserved matters. If the reserved matters application was not considered acceptable then it could be refused.
- 51. Councillor Woollaston asked if it could be dealt with under the S106 agreement.
- 52. Sharon Armour confirmed that it could, but noted that the Housing Officer was not present, so the requirement was unknown. She suggested that the wording could reflect the fact that Members would prefer to see one-bedroom units subject to the Housing Officer not having an objection.

- 53. Simon Till agreed that it would require the Housing Officer to make an assessment of housing need in the area. He suggested that an informative be imposed to direct the developer and officers to consider the provision of one-bedroom units in the affordable housing mix during discussions to negotiate the S106 agreement. He did not consider that it was a matter that could be conditioned, since provision of one-bedroom units may not meet local need. He also confirmed that if Members wished for a contribution to be negotiated for the Pickled Pig as part of the S106 agreement, then officers could take that as an instruction.
- 54. Councillor Culver noted that the applicant had indicated it was not possible to have a district heating system because the site was not big enough. However, NDP Policy C4 referred to thresholds of 10 dwellings or 0.5 hectares. Councillor Culver also noted that the occupation triggers for foul water and water supply infrastructure being upgraded were 20 and 49 units respectively and asked how these figures had been calculated. She suggested that the wording of Conditions 29 and 30 should be amended such that works must be completed prior to occupation of any units.
- 55. Mrs Mather noted that the occupation thresholds had been provided by Thames Water, based on what they felt could be accommodated, but the conditions could be amended to pre-occupation. On the district heating system, it was noted that the policy had been drafted as the proposal was being developed. The only sites where district heating was being sought in West Berkshire were at Sandleford and Newbury Racecourse, which represented 1,500 and 2,000 homes respectively. She noted that the Compton site could achieve net zero carbon in other ways.
- 56. Bryan Lyttle noted that there was a cut-off point beyond which sufficient renewable energy could not be generated during the day to meet peak demand. This could not be achieved at the Racecourse and a decision on Sandleford was awaited from the Secretary of State.
- 57. Councillor Rowles asked about the interpretation of 'approximate' in relation to the additional houses proposed for the site, also about whether the proposal constituted major development. She also noted that the transport modelling had been based on 2017 data and asked if this was sufficiently recent given changes that had taken place in the area.
- 58. Mr Goddard felt that traffic levels were still settling down following the pandemic. He indicated that traffic levels were still below 2019 levels. He was confident that traffic levels in the coming years would remain below those of 2017. While he acknowledged that there would have been development since 2017, traffic levels would have been growthed up to take account of proposals and this would be the most robust data.
- 59. Mrs Mather explained that the application was classed as 'major' for purposes of its application category because it consisted of more than 10 houses. However, within the AONB, the definition as to whether or not a proposal represented 'major development' was a matter for the decision maker. This would have been considered at the site allocation stage. The site had been allocated, so the question was whether the 20 additional units represented major development within the AONB. If the Committee was to consider it major development within the AONB, then it would normally be refused unless there were exceptional circumstances. The exceptional circumstances relating to this development were set out in the report.
- 60. Bryan Lyttle noted that the exceptional circumstances were considered as part of the Site Allocations DPD Examination in Public in 2017. The Planning Inspector had considered all arguments relating to the site and concluded that the site met the

exception tests and should be allocated. He also noted that allocations had an automatic 10% flexibility allowance for non-delivery of planning sites. He indicated that the proposed 14% uplift was within the accepted definition of 'approximate', with some Planning Inspectors deciding that a 20% uplift complied with policy at appeal.

- 61. Councillor Barnett asked about lorry movements associated with decontamination of the site. He suggested that removal of radioactive material would require special consideration in terms of routes, times and quantities to be carried.
- 62. Mr Goddard confirmed that not all matters had been agreed, so a condition had been proposed to allow for details to be finalised at a later date. It was noted that there would be 20 lorries per day entering and leaving the site, which was the same as predicted during construction, but the duration of the works was unknown. The route via East Ilsley was the quickest and most direct to the A34, but how traffic would be managed was still to be determined. It had been agreed that there would be no HGV movements at peak travel times in order to prevent congestion within East Ilsley.
- 63. Councillor Barnett hoped that movements of radioactive waste would avoid times when children would be travelling to and from school in Compton.
- 64. Councillor Culver noted that predicted vehicle movements were higher than 20 per day.
- 65. Mr Goddard indicated that he had only referred to HGV movements and additional movements would be associated with staff travel.
- 66. Councillor Vickers noted that if the report were to be called in by the Secretary of State, the Local Plan would be at the Regulation 19 stage. He asked what weight would be given to the policies in the emerging Local Plan.
- 67. Bryan Lyttle noted that the Secretary of State would determine the application in line with policy. At this stage it would be the Housing Allocations DPD, and even if the emerging plan were at the Regulation 19 stage, more weight would be given to the adopted policy.
- 68. Councillor Vickers asked if the matter would come back before the Committee it was confirmed that it would not.
- 69. Councillor Vickers asked if the community facility on the Pickled Pig site could be accessed directly from Churn Road.
- 70. Mr Goddard had not considered such an access, but suggested it could be considered as part of the reserved matters application.
- 71. Councillor Vickers noted that people living on the estate should be within walking and cycling distance.
- 72. Councillor Abbs noted that less than 30% of the buildings were in the correct orientation to make use of solar panels and asked how net zero carbon would be achieved.
- 73. Mrs Mather explained that the masterplan was indicative and the layout was a reserved matter. There was a condition for a zero carbon strategy, and so the layout would need to be reviewed in order to achieve this.
- 74. Councillor Abbs suggested that if the layout needed to change, then this would affect the internal road layout.
- 75. Mrs Mather confirmed that the point of an illustrative masterplan was to show how the number of houses could be accommodated within the site. She agreed that the internal road layout was not fixed at this stage.

Debate

- 76. Councillor Abbs opened the debate. He noted that the NDP was clear on the number of homes considered to be appropriate for the site. However, Homes England was seeking to maximise the number of homes on the site. He stressed the need to be mindful of the impact of decontamination works on the local area, which would be exacerbated by a larger development. He suggested that the application should not be approved in its current form.
- 77. Councillor Culver noted the discussion on the carbon benefits of retaining the Pickled Pig and suggested that this would also apply to the hostel. She recognised that housing mix was a reserved matter, but highlighted the lack of respect shown to local policies by the applicant. There was a clear need for one and two bedroom houses, and the housing needs survey had demonstrated the need for more affordable housing, but these issues had not been addressed by the applicant. She made the point that a key lesson from the Covid pandemic was for the need for additional smaller homes for young people and elderly residents who would like to downsize. She indicated that residents were leaving Compton because there was not suitable accommodation within the village. Councillor Culver also expressed concerns about the Environment Agency being under-funded. She suggested that a condition would be required to ensure that spoil retained on the site would be carefully checked for contamination. A former vet had made a representation on the previous planning application indicating that there was radioactive waste from Bikini Atoll present at the site, and radioactive waste had been left in barrels in the ground. Councillor Culver suggested that an evacuation plan was needed and should be included within the conditions. She concluded by noting that the application failed to meet NDP policies for: the number of houses on the site; district heating; housing mix; hostel retention; house size; the business hub; and the Pickled Pig.
- 78. Councillor Vickers noted that 14 recommendations from the Parish Council had been fully accommodated, with three others partially accepted. He suggested that there may be policies in the Local Plan that had not been given full weight and it was a question of balance. He indicated that even if the application were to be approved, it may not be implemented in full. He hoped that the developer could reconsider use of the hostel site for one bedroom flats due to concerns about embedded carbon in the building and the value in maintaining a record of the history of the site. Councillor Vickers had no issue with the definition of major development nor with the proposed additional housing. Providing a good Construction Management Plan could be secured, he did not consider that traffic was an issue, since an employment site would generate more traffic. He indicated that he was inclined to support the application subject to changes to the conditions.
- 79. Councillor Rowles noted that all parties were in agreement that the site needed to be redeveloped. She felt that any concerns could be addressed through conditions. She expressed disappointment about the applicant's response regarding community assets. The aspect where she had greatest concern was the increase from 140 to 160 units, which was more than the 10% standard increase.
- 80. Councillor Woollaston was reassured by the fact that Homes England was the applicant, since it was a Government body rather than a developer. He stressed that it was an eyesore and would be detrimental to the village as it continued to deteriorate. He proposed to support Officer's recommendation to approve the application subject to changes to conditions and informatives.
- 81. Councillor Barnett agreed that the site needed to be decontaminated and the area enhanced, but he had concerns about the impact of the lengthy demolition and

construction process. He also expressed concern about supporting infrastructure in the village, including the GP surgery, retail, and Thames Water's networks. Councillor Barnett indicated that he was a member of the Radiation Induced Diseases Register, and suggested that people who had worked on the site would also be on the Register, and therefore could be contacted for further details of contamination on the site. He expressed concern about what radioactive material would be found and how it would be transported from the site.

- 82. Councillor Tony Vickers seconded the motion to approve the application, subject to changes to conditions and informatives.
- 83. Councillor Culver proposed a number of changes to the conditions and informatives:
 - Condition 14 This should fully reflect the design code policy in the NDP, particularly in relation to consultation with the local community, the Building for Life Assessment Framework and energy supply.
 - Condition 18 There should be a requirement to test the water for contamination.
 - Condition 19 HGV movements should avoid school hours.
 - Condition 26 Any spoil remaining on the site must be tested to ensure that it is free from contamination.
 - Conditions 29 and 30 Reference to the 20th and 49th house, and the second part of both conditions to be removed to ensure that all improvements to Thames Water's supply and foul water drainage infrastructure were completed prior to any units being occupied.
 - An additional condition relating to an evacuation plan.
 - An additional informative about contributions towards the renovation and enhancement of the Picked Pig
- 84. Mr Till noted that Part B of Condition 18 would address Councillor Culver's concerns regarding contaminated spoil. He also suggested that a bullet point be added to Condition 18 requiring details to be submitted of any emergency or evacuation measures considered necessary to address contamination hazardous to human health identified during site investigation, demolition, remediation or development work. Regarding the Pickled Pig, he suggested that the matter should be investigated through discussions between officers and the applicant in respect of the S106 legal agreement, and that if no contribution was secured as a result of those discussions within three months of the resolution (or such appropriate time period to be agreed with the Service Director Development and Regulation in consultation with the Chairman of Western Area Planning Committee), then the application would be brought back before Members to consider at Committee.
- 85. Councillor Vickers suggested that any consultation should include the Ward Member and Chairman or Vice Chairman. Mr Till confirmed that this could be accommodated.
- 86. Councillor Vickers also asked what would happen if the change to the Thames Water condition could not be achieved. Mrs Armour confirmed that the applicant would need to submit a fresh application to amend the condition.
- 87. Councillor Vickers suggested that the wording of Condition 1 could be improved.
- 88. Councillor Woollaston asked for an informative to be included to reflect the aspiration for one-bedroom properties. Mr Till recommended that affordable housing be explored by officers during consideration of the S106 agreement. In respect of the

market housing, an informative would be included requesting that the applicant consider the prospect of including smaller properties within the housing mix.

89. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Howard Woollaston, seconded by Councillor Tony Vickers to grant planning permission subject to the proposed conditions and the completion of a S106 legal agreement. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED PROVIDED THAT a Section 106 Agreement has been completed by 31 May 2022 (or such longer period that may be authorised by the Service Director – Development & Regulation, in consultation with the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Western Area Planning Committee), to delegate to the Service Director – Development & Regulation to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the conditions listed below.

OR, if a Section 106 Agreement is not completed within the above timescale, to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the reasons listed below.

Conditions

1.	Commencement of development – full permission change of use
	The change of use to public open space and wildlife area hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. This relates to the land shown on parameters plan: green infrastructure 102G, except that shown as built development.
	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.	Phasing plan (full permission - demolition)
	The demolition hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing demolition plan 105B or 105C (subject to the terms of the S106) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
	Reason: To facilitate the phasing of the development in the interests of timely infrastructure delivery, phased CIL payments, self-build delivery and project delivery. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
3.	Phasing plan (outline)
	A phasing plan shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval before or alongside the first application for reserved matters approval. The phasing plan shall identify all phases of development by which the development shall be undertaken. No development shall take place until the phasing plan has been approved by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
	Reason: To facilitate the phasing of the development in the interests of timely infrastructure delivery, phased CIL payments, self-build delivery and project delivery. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because the phasing plan will need to be adhered to throughout the entire construction phase.

4.	Approval of reserved matters
	Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") for each phase of development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development in that phase takes place. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
	Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
5.	Time limit for reserved matters
	Applications for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
	Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
6.	Commencement of development (phased outline)
	The commencement of each phase hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved for that phase.
	Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
7.	Approved plans
	The development hereby permitted and the reserved matters shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:
	Location Plan 008B
	Parameter Plan: Land Use 101E
	Parameter Plan: Movement 103E
	Parameter Plan: Green Infrastructure 102G
	Bat house design 113
	Churn Road Intervet HVG access SK002A
	Churn Road Intervet car park access SK003A
	 With the exception of the visibility splay proposed access arrangements SK001
	Demolition plan 105C
	The following documents shall inform the reserved matters:
	 The Former Pirbright Institute Compton Environmental Statement, Appendices and Addendums
	Outline Construction Resource Management Plan
	Outline Operational Waste and Recycling Management Strategy
	Transport Assessment ref 60544578
	Framework Residential Travel Plan
	Revised Flood Risk Assessment

	Draina na Talahuinal Nata
	Drainage Technical Note
	Hydrology Review October 2021
	Non Real Time Hydraulic Model Review October 2021
	Biodiveristy Net Gain Calculation
	 Amended Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report Revision 003
	Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning. Outline planning permission is granted solely on the basis of the parameters within these approved details.
8.	Access construction before occupation
	Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority, no building shall be first occupied until the vehicular, cycle and pedestrian accesses (together with all associated engineering operations) have been provided and completed in accordance with the approved access plans SK002A and SK003A, and for the proposed access arrangements off the High Street the details including sight lines which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
	Reason: In the interest of highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026). Access arrangements for construction fall within the remit of the Construction Method Statement.
9.	Layout and Design Standards
	No development shall commence until drawings and details illustrating how the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority's standards in respect of road and footpath design, vehicle parking and turning provision will be met, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That submitted information shall include details of engineering work specifications; the methodology for the monitoring, and the staged evidencing of, the provision of the necessary works to an adoptable standard. This condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications to these matters which have been given in the current application.
	Reason: In the interest of future maintenance, road safety and flow of traffic and to ensure waste collection. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).
10.	Set back of gates
	Any gates to be provided at the vehicle accesses, shall open away from any adjoining highway and be set back a distance of at least 5 metres from the edge of the highway. No part of the development shall be brought into use until the gates have been provided.
	Reason: In the interest of road safety and to ensure that vehicles can be driven off the highway before the gates are opened. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

11.	Gradient of private drives
	The detailed layout of the site shall ensure the gradient of private drives does not exceed 1 in 12 to enable them to be occupied by all users including those with mobility impairments.
	Reason: To ensure that adequate access to parking spaces and garages is provided. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).
12.	Parking
	No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission shall take place until details of vehicle parking and turning spaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be first occupied until vehicle parking and turning spaces have been completed in accordance with the approved plans (including any surfacing arrangements and marking out). Thereafter the parking and turning spaces shall be kept available for parking and manoeuvring (of private cars and/or private 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 applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD 2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because the parking arrangements will need to be determined before any construction to ensure it can be accommodated within the space available.
13.	Dwelling height
	The detailed scale and appearance of the dwellings shall ensure no more than 5% of dwellings are 2.5 storeys in height, at least 5% of dwellings are single storey in height, and the remainder of dwellings shall be no greater than 2 storeys in height unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
	Reason: To ensure the detailed design of the housing development hereby approved responds to the local character and setting in the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The illustrative masterplan has been assessed on the basis of all dwellings being 2 storey. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy ADPP1, ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and policy HSA23 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD 2006-2026.
14.	Design Code
	No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission, or ground works associated with the change of use shall take place until a design code has been submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase of the development. The design code shall include addressing the following matters:
	 Avoid over dominance of car parking at the front of dwellings in particular onto the green street;
	Avoid long stretches of rear boundary fences/walls in particular fronting

	public open spaces;
	 Provide attractive facades where housing fronts the cricket pitch and
	conservation area;
	 Avoid locating LEAP and LAPS that involve crossing primary internal roads to reach them, and avoid being located in areas with no natural overlooking from dwellings;
	 Avoid strategic tree planting within the private gardens;
	 Public open spaces, particularly within the areas to be developed, to be based around the trees to be retained;
	 Be developed in consultation with the local community;
	 Use the Building for a Healthy Life assessment framework;
	 Identify opportunities to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems.
	Reason: To ensure the detailed design of the development responds to the character of the site and surrounding area in the AONB, and takes account of the natural constraints on site. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies ADPP5, CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, policy HSA23 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD 2006-2026, and policy C9 of the Compton Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2037.
15.	Tree Protection
	No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission, and no demolition, access construction, or ground works associated with the change of use, shall take place (including all preparatory work) until protective fencing and measures have been provided for the protection of the retained trees in accordance with the Arboricultural Assessment 60544578_DOC_005 for that phase of the development. The approved tree protection measures shall be implemented in full and maintained for the duration of the development works. Within the fenced areas there shall be no excavations, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles or fires.
	Reason: To ensure the trees to be retained will not be damaged during the development and to protect and enhance the appearance and character of the site and locality, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies ADPP1, CS14, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
16.	Archaeological supervision
	No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission, demolition, or ground works associated with the change of use, shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work (phased as appropriate) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement for each phase.
	Reason: To ensure that any significant archaeological remains that are found are adequately recorded. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy

	2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; archaeological deposits require investigation and supervision before and during the development works and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.	
17.	Building recording	
	No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission, or demolition, or ground works associated with the change of use, shall take place within the application area until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement for each phase.	
	Reason: To ensure that an adequate record is made of this site of historical interest. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; archaeological deposits require investigation and supervision before and during the development works and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.	
18.	Contaminated land (investigation and remediation)	
	No phase of the development* hereby granted outline planning permission, demolition, or ground works associated with the change of use, shall take place until a scheme to deal with contamination including water quality and ground/surface water infiltration at the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The above scheme shall take account of the suggested mitigation in the Environment statement and:	
	(a) Include an investigation and risk assessment. A report of the findings shall: identify the nature and extent of any contamination on the site (irrespective of its origin); include an assessment of the potential risks to human health, property, and the environment; and include an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of preferred option(s).	
	(b) Include a remediation scheme* which ensures that, after remediation, as a minimum, the land shall not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures.	
	(c) Include a monitoring and maintenance scheme* to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation, and the provision of reports on the same that shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.	
	(d) Be prepared by a competent person (a person with a recognised relevant qualification, sufficient experience in dealing with the type(s) of pollution or land instability, and membership of a relevant professional organisation), and conducted in accordance with current best practice.	
	(e) Include an evacuation plan.	
	Thereafter, any approved remediation scheme and/or monitoring and maintenance measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for that phase. Two weeks written notice shall be given to the LPA prior to	

the commencement of any remediation scheme.

If any previously unidentified land contamination is found during the carrying out of the development, it shall be reported immediately in writing to the LPA. Appropriate investigation and risk assessment shall be undertaken, and any necessary remediation measures shall be submitted and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter, any remediation measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

The development shall not be occupied* until all approved remediation measures have been completed and a verification report to demonstrate the effectiveness of the remediation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

(* Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA)

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies 2007).

A pre-commencement condition is required because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; land contamination mitigation measures may require work to be undertaken prior to and throughout the development works and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

19. **Construction method statement**

No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission, or ground works associated with the change of use to parkland, shall take place until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) (phased as appropriate) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the demolition and construction works for that phase shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved CMS. The CMS shall take account of the suggested mitigation in the Environmental Statement and include measures for:

- (a) A site set-up plan during the works;
- (b) Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- (c) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (d) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- (e) Erection and maintenance of security hoarding including any decorative displays and/or facilities for public viewing;
- (f) Temporary access arrangements to the site, and any temporary hardstanding;
- (g) Wheel washing facilities;
- (h) Measures to control dust, dirt, noise, vibrations, odours, surface water runoff, and pests/vermin during construction;
- (i) The proposed method of piling for foundations (if any);
- (j) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction

	works;
	(k) Hours of construction and demolition work;
	 (I) Hours of deliveries and preferred haulage routes including to avoid school hours for HGVs;
	(m)Ensuring public rights of way are kept open and unobstructed throughout the development
	(n) Lighting of areas and construction compounds
	Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers, and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS13, CS14, CS17 and CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policies OVS.5, OVS.6 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007). A pre-commencement condition is required because the CMS must be adhered to during all demolition and construction operations.
20.	Construction Environmental Management Plan (Biodiversity)
	No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission, demolition, or ground works associated with the change of use shall take place (including vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (phased as appropriate) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall take account of the suggested mitigation in the Environmental Statement and include the following:
	(a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
	(b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
	(c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working
	(d) practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be
	(e) provided as a set of method statements).
	(f) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity
	(g) features including protected species.
	(h) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be
	present on site to oversee works.
	(i) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
	(j) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works
	(ECoW) or similarly competent person.
	(k) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
	The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the development works or phase thereof strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
	Reason: To ensure biodiversity is protected during the development works. This condition is required in order to meet the policy objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 Policy CS17.
	A pre-commencement condition is required because insufficient detailed

information accompanies the application; environmental measures will be required prior to and during the development works and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.
Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Plan
No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission, demolition, or works associated with the change of use hereby permitted shall take place until an Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall take account of the suggested mitigation in the Environment Statement and include adequate details of the following:
(a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed and created.
(b) Aims and objectives of management.
(c) Appropriate management options to achieve aims and objectives.
(d) Prescriptions for management actions.
(e) Preparation of a costed schedule for securing biodiversity enhancements in perpetuity.
(f) Ongoing compliance reports, monitoring and remedial measures.
(g) How the habitat enhancements will be managed long term to ensure a net gain legacy.
(h) Measures to build biodiversity into the design of the new dwellings, providing details of location and design of features, e.g. bird and bat boxes integrated into buildings, bat lofts, fence holes for hedgehogs, access points for badgers, ponds for amphibians, banks for bees.
 (i) Description of how the developer expects to ensure no impact on protected species on site during construction and through scheme design.
(j) Sensitive Lighting Strategy during construction and once the site is in operation (to minimise adverse impacts on bat species present).
(k) A biodiversity net gain calculation demonstrating at least 10% net gain.
Proposed enhancements should be based on the recommendations of the ecological reports submitted in support of this application.
With the exception of ongoing measures after construction no part of the development shall be brought into use, or dwelling occupied, until the mitigation measures have been provided in accordance with approved details for each phase.
Reason: To ensure biodiversity is enhanced and maintained. This condition is required in order to meet the policy objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 Policy CS17, and to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements of relevant protected species legislation and the NERC Act 2006. A pre-commencement condition is required because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; ecological mitigation will be required prior to, during and subsequent to the development works and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

22.	Submission of a copy of the EPS licence
	No demolition works shall in any circumstances commence unless the Local Planning Authority has been provided with either:
	(a) A licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 53 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 authorising the specified activity/development to go ahead; or
	(b) A statement in writing from Natural England to the effect that it does not consider that the specified activity/development will require a licence.
	Reason: To ensure the adequate safeguarding of protected species in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026. This "strict protection" condition helps to ensure that a developer will apply for an EPS licence and, if they do not, can be prevented in advance from undertaking the activities that might jeopardize the protected species, before the species is harmed. The use of planning conditions for this purpose has been established through case law and is also recommended in government.
23.	Flood risk - finished floor levels and ground levels
	The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref 5th August 2021/60544578 R001/AECOM) and the following mitigation measures it details:
	1. Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 101.6 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD)
	2. There shall be no raising of existing ground levels on the site
	These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.
	Reasons
	1. To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.
	2. To prevent the increased risk of flooding due to impedance of flood flows and reduction of flood storage capacity.
	This condition is applied in accordance with policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
	No Infiltration Drainage
	No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. Any proposals for such systems must be supported by an assessment of the risks to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
	Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution caused by mobilised contaminants or flood risk to people and property. This condition is applied in accordance with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy

	2006-	2026.
24.	Susta	inable drainage
	works of sus to an appro	hase of the development hereby granted full planning permission, or ground associated with the change of use to parkland shall take place until details stainable drainage measures to manage surface water have been submitted approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (phased as priate). These details shall take into account the suggested mitigation in the pommental Statement and:
	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 the WBC SuDS Supplementary Planning Document December 2018 with particular emphasis on Green SuDS and water re-use;
	b)	If required include a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for developments located in areas at risk of flooding (in Flood Zone 2 and 3 or from surface water) or developments larger than 1 hectare;
	c)	Include flood water exceedance routes (low flow, overflow and exceedance routes), both on and off site;
	d)	Include full information of catchments and flows discharging into and across the site and how these flows will be managed and routed through the development and, where the flows exit the site, both pre-development and post-development information must be provided;
	e)	Demonstrate that proposed finished floor levels are set in accordance with Environment Agency requirements;
	f)	Include attenuation measures to retain rainfall run-off within the site and allow discharge from the site to an existing watercourse at no greater than 1 in 1 year Greenfield run-off rates;
	g)	Include and be informed by a ground investigation survey which establishes the soil characteristics, infiltration rate and groundwater levels. Soakage testing shall be undertaken in accordance with BRE365 methodology;
	h)	Include run-off calculations based on current rainfall data models, discharge rates (based on 1 in 1 year greenfield run-off rates), and if infiltration measures are proposed the infiltration and storage capacity calculations for the proposed SuDS measures based on a 1 in 100 year storm +40% for climate change;
	i)	Include with any design calculations an allowance for an additional 10% increase of paved areas (Urban Creep) over the lifetime of the development;
	j)	Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site;
	k)	Include pre-treatment methods to prevent any pollution or silt entering SuDS features or causing any contamination to the soil, groundwater, watercourse or drain;
	I)	Ensure permeable paved areas are designed and constructed in accordance with manufacturers guidelines if using a proprietary porous

paved block system; otherwise ensure any permeable areas are constructed on a permeable sub-base material, such as MoT/DoT Type 3; m) Show that attenuation storage measures have a 300mm freeboard above maximum design water level. Surface conveyance features must have a 150mm freeboard above maximum design water level: n) Include written confirmation from Thames Water of their acceptance of the discharge from the site into any surface water sewer and confirmation that the sewer network has the capacity to take this flow; o) Include a management and maintenance plan showing how the SuDS measures will be maintained and managed after completion for the lifetime of the development. This plan shall incorporate arrangements for adoption by the Council, Water and Sewage Undertaker, Maintenance or Management Company (private company or Trust) or individual property owners, or any other arrangements, including maintenance responsibilities resting with individual property owners, to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. These details shall be provided as part of a handover pack for subsequent purchasers and owners of the property/premises; p) Include a Contamination Risk Assessment for the soil and water environment (assessing the risk of contamination to groundwater, develop any control requirements and a remediation strategy); q) Include measures with reference to Environmental issues which protect or enhance the ground water quality and provide new habitats where possible; r) Include details of how surface water will be managed and contained within the site during construction works to prevent silt migration and pollution of watercourses, highway drainage and land either on or adjacent to the site; s) Include an Application for an Ordinary Watercourse Consent in case of surface water discharge into a watercourse (i.e stream, ditch etc). Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved measures for each phase. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall not be occupied until all approved remediation measures have been completed and a verification report a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. This Report shall include plans and details of all key drainage elements (surface water drainage network, attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls) and details of any management company managing the SuDS measures thereafter. 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 SuDS Supplementary Planning Document (Dec 2018). A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the

	application; sustainable drainage measures may require work to be undertaken throughout the development works and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.
25.	Ground levels and finished floor levels
	No phase of the development hereby granted full planning permission, or ground works associated with the change of use shall take place until details of existing and proposed ground levels, and finished floor levels of the dwellings (phased as appropriate), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for that phase, and the parkland shall not be brought into use until the ground levels have been provided in accordance with the approved details.
	Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the proposed development and the adjacent land. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the Quality Design SPD (June 2006). A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; ground levels will be an early development operation and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.
26.	Spoil
	No phase of the development hereby granted full planning permission, or ground works associated with the change of use shall take place until details of how all spoil arising from the development will be used and/or disposed have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (phased as appropriate). 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 from the site (that is not to be deposited);
	(d) Include timescales for the depositing/removal of spoil.
	All spoil arising from the development shall be used and/or disposed of in accordance with the approved details for that phase.
	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 applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is required because insufficient information accompanies the application and spoil may arise throughout the development works and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.
27.	Piling
	No piling shall take place unless and until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works)

	has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water. Thereafter any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement for that phase.
	Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
	Information: Please read the Thames Water guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. <u>https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your- development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</u> .
	Should you require further information please contact Thames Water Email:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk
28.	Works in proximity to water main
	No construction shall take place within 5m of the water main. No phase of the development hereby granted full planning permission, or ground works associated with the change of use shall take place until information detailing how the developer intends to divert the asset / align the development, so as to prevent the potential for damage to subsurface potable water infrastructure, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any construction must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved information. Unrestricted access must be available at all times for the maintenance and repair of the asset during and after the construction works.
	Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground strategic water main, utility infrastructure. The works has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. A pre-commencement condition is required to ensure damage does not occur during the construction phase.
	Information: Please read Thames Water's guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. <u>https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your- development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</u>
	Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: <u>developer.services@thameswater.co.uk</u>
29.	Foul water network upgrades
	No dwelling on any phase shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that All foul water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development of that phase have been completed.
	Reason: Network reinforcement works are likely to be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid sewage flooding and/or potential pollution incidents. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

30.	Water network upgrades
	No dwelling on any phase shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development of that phase have been completed.
	Reason: The development may low / no water pressures and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development. Any necessary reinforcement works will be necessary in order to avoid low / no water pressure issues. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
31.	Public footpaths
	No phase of the development hereby granted full planning permission, or ground works associated with the change of use shall take place until details of the public footpaths have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:
	(a) Alignment including width;
	(b) Surfacing materials/treatment;
	(c) If required measures to prevent cycles and/or motorcycles access;
	(d) Pedestrian safety measures if the footpaths are crossed by roads;
	(e) Any tree works necessary in proximity to footpaths to ensure public safety;
	(f) Signage for rights of way users/vehicle drivers;
	(g) Any means of enclosure;
	(h) A timetable for the implementation of all footpath infrastructure in conjunction with the phasing of development.
	The public footpaths shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and completed prior to the first occupation of the final dwelling.
	Reason: To protect and enhance public rights of way and green infrastructure. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, policies CS14 and CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006- 2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.
32.	Zero Carbon Strategy (addition)
	No phase of the development hereby granted outline planning permission shall take place until a strategy on the measures to be provided and calculations demonstrating that the residential development shall achieve zero carbon in line with policy CS15 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the measures have been provided in accordance with the approved strategy.
	Reason: To ensure the development provides a carbon reduction in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and policy CS15 of the West Berkshire District Core Strategy 2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application

	so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.
33.	Intervet noise assessment and mitigation
	No dwelling shall be first occupied until mitigation measures to protect its occupants from externally generated noise have been provided in accordance with a scheme of works that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of works shall be informed by an appropriately detailed investigation to address the noise impacts from the commercial use (Intervet) on site.
	Reason: To protect future occupiers of the development from excessive noise levels from the commercial use on site, to ensure a good standard of amenity. The approval of this information is required before occupation because insufficient information has been submitted with the application. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007), and Quality Design SPD.
34.	Hard landscaping of public open space/wildlife habitat areas
	A detailed scheme of hard landscaping for the open space and wildlife habitat areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping scheme shall include details of any boundary treatments (e.g. walls, fences), hard surfaced areas (e.g. paths, decking) and any other hard landscaping features to be provided as part of the development. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the change of use to parkland shall not take place until the hard landscaping of the site has been completed in accordance with the approved details or in accordance with an agreed schedule of phasing.
	Reason: Landscaping is an integral element of achieving high quality design. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the Quality Design SPD.
35.	Soft landscaping of open space/wildlife habitat areas
	The change of use to open space and wildlife habitat areas shall not take place until a detailed soft landscaping scheme for the parkland has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed plans, planting and retention schedule, programme of works, and any other supporting information. All soft landscaping works shall be completed in accordance with the approved soft landscaping scheme within the first planting season following completion of building operations / first use as open space and wildlife habitat (whichever occurs first) or in accordance with an agreed schedule of phasing. Any trees, shrubs, plants or hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme which are removed, die, or become diseased or become seriously damaged within five years of completion of the approved soft landscaping scheme or the timescale agreed as part of the Environmental Enhancement & Management Plan shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedges of a similar size and species to that originally approved.
	Reason: Landscaping is an integral element of achieving high quality design. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy

	Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the Quality Design SPD.
36.	Landscape management plan (for the open space and wildlife habitat)
	The change of use to open space and wildlife habitat shall not take place until a landscape management plan for the parkland including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for a minimum period of 5 years or the timescale agreed as part of the Environmental Enhancement & Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include any areas of existing landscaping including woodlands and also include any areas of proposed landscaping. Thereafter the development shall be managed in accordance with the approved details.
	Reason: To ensure the long term management of existing and proposed landscaping in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
37.	Public open space infrastructure
	The change of use to public open space and wildlife habitat areas shall not take place until benches, signage, children play equipment and any means of enclosure have been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
	Reason: To ensure there is adequate public parkland infrastructure for users in the interest of amenity. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).
38.	Lighting strategy (AONB/Ecology)
	No external lighting shall be installed until a lighting strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall:
	(a) Identify those areas on the site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance.
	(b) Show how and where external lighting will be installed so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species.
	(c) Include isolux contour diagram(s) of the proposed lighting.
	(d) Ensure all lighting levels are designed within the limitations of Environmental Lighting Zone 1, as described by the Institute of Lighting Engineers.
	No external lighting shall be installed on site except in accordance with the above strategy.
	Reason: To ensure the conservation and enhancement of the biodiversity assets of the site and to conserve the dark night skies of the North Wessex Downs AONB. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-24, and
	Policies CS17 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
39.	

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented with the first occupation of the residential development hereby permitted. Written notice of first occupation shall be given to the Local Planning Authority within one week of such occupation. The Travel Plan shall be reviewed (and updated if necessary) within 6 months of first implementation. After that the Travel Plan shall be annually reviewed and updated and all reasonable practicable steps made to achieve the agreed targets and measures within the timescales set out in the plan and any subsequent revisions.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and provides the appropriate level of vehicle parking. 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 TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies 2007), Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

40. **Refuse Storage (prior approval)**

No dwelling shall be first occupied until storage area(s) for refuse and recycling receptacles (and collection areas if necessary) for that dwelling has been provided for that dwelling in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate refuse and recycling storage facilities within the site, to ensure safe and adequate collection in the interests of highway safety and local amenity. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the West Berkshire Quality Design SPD (Part 1, Section 2.13).

41. Cycle storage (prior approval)

No dwelling shall be first occupied until cycle parking/storage facilities for that dwelling have been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the facilities shall be maintained and kept available for that purpose at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle parking/storage facilities in order to encourage the use of cycles and reduce reliance on private motor vehicles. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD 2006-2026, Quality Design SPD, and the Council's Cycle and Motorcycle Advice and Standards for New Development (November 2014).

42. Electric vehicle charging points (prior approval)

No dwelling shall be first occupied until an electric vehicle charging point has been provided for that dwelling in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the charging point shall be maintained, and kept available and operational for electric vehicles at all times.

Reason: To secure the provision of charging points to encourage the use of electric vehicles. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD 2006-2026.

43.	Emergency water supplies
	No dwelling shall be occupied until either:
	(a) Private fire hydrant(s), or other suitable emergency water supplies, have been provided in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; or
	(b) Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service confirm that such provision is not required (for example, because a public mains water supply for the development provides sufficient supply) and confirmation of the same has been given in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to this condition.
	Reason: At present there are no available public mains in this area to provide suitable water supply in order to effectively fight a fire. Suitable private fire hydrant(s), or other suitable emergency water supplies, are therefore required to meeting Royal Berkshire Fire and Rescue Service requirements, in the interests of public safety. The approval of this information is required before development commences because insufficient information accompanies the outline application and it will affect the servicing of the development. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CS5 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
44.	Use of community buildings
	The community buildings shown as the retained buildings on demolition plan 105C hereby permitted shall be used under Use Class E, Use Class F1, or Use Class F2 and for no other purpose under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification). This restriction shall apply notwithstanding any provisions in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking that Order with or without modification).
	Reason: As part of a wider residential development the building is to provide for the community. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies ADPP1, CS9, CS11 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Policies OVS.5, OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies 2007).
45.	Operating hours (use/activity – community buildings)
	The use of the community buildings shown as retained on demolition plan 105C hereby permitted shall not take place outside of the following hours:
	Mondays to Fridays: 07:00 to 22:00
	Saturdays: 07:00 to 23:00
	Sundays and public holidays: 09:00 to 18:00
	Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
	Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of surrounding occupiers. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies 2007).

46. **Music (community buildings)**

No amplified or other music shall be played on the premises of the community buildings shown as retained on demolition plan 105C outside of the following hours:

Mondays to Fridays: 08:00 to 22:00

Saturdays: 08:00 to 23:00

Sundays and public holidays: 09:00 to 18:00

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of surrounding occupiers. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies 2007).

Heads of Terms for S106 Agreement

1.	Affordable housing
	Provision arrangements to be agreed. 30% of the overall number of homes to be provided as affordable housing through a registered provider with triggers during construction. Except for any provided under the First Homes initiative. Investigate provision required for 1 bedroom units.
2.	Local Lettings Scheme
	Details of scheme to be agreed, with some of the housing to be made available first to those with a local connection (subject to this not affecting the ability of a registered provider to obtain funding).
2.	Housing to Part M4(2)
	Provision arrangements to be agreed. At least 15% of homes to be built to at least Part M4(2) Category 2 of Building Regulations as accessible and adaptable. A proportion of the affordable housing to be to this standard.
4.	Community Buildings
	Provision arrangements to be agreed for transfer as local community buildings. Should the building identified as C087 on the demolition plan 108C not find a party to take on the building within an agreed time scale it shall be released.
	Investigate provision of a commuted sum towards renovating building C087.
6.	Open Space and Wildlife Habitat Areas
	Provision and governance arrangements including the cricket pitch, one LEAP and 4 LAPS. A commuted sum for management and transfer to a long term owner or management company (based on calculation in Planning Obligations SPD, circa £200,000).
7.	Commuted sum for off-site footpath upgrades
	Provision arrangements to be agreed. Contribution for off-site footpath improvements for public rights of way ($\pounds 10,000$) and for pedestrian improvements including dropped kerbs to be paid prior to first occupation of the site.
8.	Travel Plan
	Contribution of £5,000 for monitoring, travel information packs for all new

	residents and other measures.
9.	Housing to 19% improvement on carbon emissions
	Housing to be built to 19% improvement on building regulations standards Part L with regard to carbon emissions.
10.	Highways
	Contribution towards dropped kerbs and tactile paving.
11.	Drainage Strategy
	Provision and maintenance to be agreed along with provisions for potential land transfer to a management company.

Refusal Reasons (if S106 legal agreement not completed)

1. **Planning obligation**

The application fails to provide an appropriate planning obligation to mitigate the impact of the development with regard to affordable housing, enhanced accessible and adaptable housing, community building, public open space, public rights of way, sustainable travel, climate change measures. The District has a high affordable housing need and an affordability ratio above the national average. Public open space and upgrades to the public rights of way and increase in sustainable travel options are all required from the development, and there is a statutory duty on climate change. Without these planning obligations the proposed development conflicts with policies CS5, CS6, CS13, CS15, and CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, the Planning Obligations SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives

At reserved matters the housing mix shall be expected to include 1 bedroom units.

(The meeting commenced at 6.31 pm and closed at 9.35 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature