

DRAFT

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

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 7 DECEMBER 2011

Councillors Present: Peter Argyle, Pamela Bale, Brian Bedwell (Vice-Chairman), Richard Crumly, Alan Law, Royce Longton, Alan Macro, Geoff Mayes, Tim Metcalfe, Irene Neill, Graham Pask (Chairman) and Quentin Webb

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Gareth Dowding (Senior Engineer), Hazel Evans (Senior Planning Officer), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Cheryl Willett (Senior Planning Officer) and Stephen Chard (Policy Officer)

PART I

34. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2011 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

35. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Geoff Mayes declared an interest in Agenda Items 1 and 2, but reported that, as his interest was personal and not prejudicial, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

36. Schedule of Planning Applications

36(1) Application No. & Parish: 11/00984/LBC, Pangbourne

(Councillor Geoff Mayes declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a member of English Heritage. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

The Committee considered the reports (Agenda Items 4(1) and 4(2)) concerning Planning Applications 11/00984/LBC and 11/00985/FUL in respect of the reconstruction of Whitchurch Bridge involving partial demolition of a Listed Building; construction of a temporary contractors compound and access; and construction of a temporary footbridge. It was agreed that it would be sensible to consider the two applications as part of a single debate with the recording of two separate proposals and decisions.

Councillor Graham Pask advised Members that four parish councils had registered to address the Committee. He felt it would be reasonable, in accordance with paragraph 7.6.2 (Motions which may be moved without notice) of the Council's Constitution, to allow additional speaking rights for what was a unique application, but asked that efforts be made by the speakers to avoid a repetition of points. It was therefore proposed by Councillor Brian Bedwell to suspend Standing Orders and allow additional speaking rights for all those registered to address the Committee for these two applications. This was seconded by Councillor Alan Law and agreed by the Committee.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mrs Elisabeth White, Mr Butterworth, Mr Brian Baldwin and Mr Kevin Bulmer, Parish Council representatives, and Mr Geoff Weir/Mr David Simpson, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Mrs White (Pangbourne Parish Council) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- She thanked Members for attending the site visit.
- The Parish Council owned the access land and Pangbourne Meadow was privately owned.
- The Parish Council had held discussions with the Whitchurch Bridge Company and had reached an agreement in principle for the reconstruction of the bridge to proceed. They did however have several comments to make.
- It was disturbing that the recommendations of English Heritage, which were supported by West Berkshire Council's Conservation Officer, were being rejected by the Whitchurch Bridge Company.
- Of greatest concern was pedestrian safety, particularly when considering that the weight limit of the bridge was to be increased to allow for 44 tonne vehicles. It was also necessary when larger vehicles were passing one another for one of them to mount the pavement to cross the bridge. The application should be rejected unless the carriageway and footpath width were adequately increased as part of the replacement bridge. West Berkshire Council's Rights of Way Officer had commented that this was an ideal opportunity to address a very unsatisfactory situation with the Thames footpath and this could be resolved by relocating it to the eastern side of the bridge and widening it. This was in line with the recommended improvements from Highways Officers.
- The predicted noise levels during construction were felt to be very high in comparison to existing levels. It was unclear how the Boathouse Surgery, Dolphin Centre and Thames Avenue would be affected during this period of time. If the applications were to be approved, then a robust noise related condition would be required.
- The Parish Council was concerned by the limited access available to construction vehicles using the temporary access track to the compound due to its narrow width and the fact that aspects of the land concerned were private and needed to remain so. In addition, the main sewer line ran below this track and engineering work was required for protection purposes in advance of heavy vehicles using the track.
- At six metres wide the proposed track to Pangbourne Meadow would in fact be wider than the proposed carriageway, but a concern was the absence of any turning space for large vehicles on the compound or the meadow.
- The proposed works would mean that a large part of the meadow would be out of use for some time. A condition to return the meadow to its current state post construction work was vital, subject to approval, and the Covenant held with the National Trust should not be infringed. The applicant would also need to prevent any pollution of the meadow and the river.

(Councillor Richard Crumly joined the meeting at 6.19pm).

- In terms of the temporary footbridge, adequate fencing was a requirement to ensure pedestrian safety and this needed to be conditioned.
- Car parking provision needed greater consideration as this was not currently sufficient for the period of construction. Use of the Parish Council owned recreation car park should not be made available to construction related vehicles and it was requested that this be a condition if Members were minded to approve the application.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor Pamela Bale questioned the length of time before the meadow was returned to its current condition and the impact this would have. Mrs White expected that it would be unavailable during the summer of 2013 meaning that the summer fete would be cancelled as would some Dolphin Centre activities.

Councillor Bale then asked whether the conditions in relation to noise levels were adequate. Mrs White responded by saying that this was of the greatest concern to the Dolphin Centre, but added that the conditions would need to be of an adequate strength. Strong conditions were also important to prevent pollution.

Councillor Law requested clarification on the conflicting information he had received from the Whitchurch Bridge Company and English Heritage with regard to the reconstruction of the bridge. Hazel Evans explained that the application had been approved by the South Oxfordshire District Council Planning Committee based on an independently produced engineering report and structural survey. These documents confirmed that European standards in relation to the bridge weight limit needed to be adhered to and South Oxfordshire District Council Officers felt this was sufficient to reject the views of English Heritage.

Mr Butterworth (Whitchurch Parish Council) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Whitchurch Parish Council was alarmed about the proposal for the following reason. The narrow width of the existing and proposed footpath made it a danger for pedestrians, in particular parents with young children/pushchairs, and some minor accidents had occurred on the bridge which was designed prior to the existence of cars.
- The Whitchurch Bridge Company's comment on this concern was that the replacement bridge would not exacerbate the situation and was not a material planning consideration. Mr Butterworth felt that improvements to pedestrian safety should be a condition of approval.
- The only other concern of the Parish Council was in relation to an increased length of disruption should works take longer than planned.
- The proposed high weight limit was sensible and would make it suitable for all vehicles.

Mr Baldwin (Streatley Parish Council) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- A finding of the Origin and Destination (O & D) Survey was that approximately 6,000 vehicles would be diverted via Reading, Goring and Streatley. The highest percentage was identified as going through Goring and Streatley and this amounted to an estimate of an additional 4,000 vehicle movements per day which was clearly a massive increase. It was the view of Streatley Parish Council that a full O & D Survey needed to be undertaken, as these figures were purely an estimate, to ensure that any mitigation measures took into account the most accurate traffic impact, should approval be granted.
- The introduction of a temporary Traffic Regulation Order to remove on street car parking along Streatley High Street during the day on weekdays was sensible to keep it as clear as possible. However, it would be difficult to enforce due to the limited amount of parking available in Streatley and would create a difficulty for the many elderly residents and those with young families in finding alternative parking. The Parish Council considered that usage of The Swan Public House car park would be an ideal solution, but an approach had yet to be made.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

- Streatley already had experience of being gridlocked as a result of previous road works and the difficulties this created on only a short term basis. The traffic impact created by the proposed works would be significant, of a lengthy time period and would have an impact on both residents and local businesses.
- It was not felt that the proposed alteration to the traffic light settings would have any benefit and existing sequences worked well.
- The Parish Council found it hard to believe that South Oxfordshire District Council had granted permission and hoped that the Committee would give consideration to their concerns in determining the applications.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe made the point that if the bridge was not rebuilt it would need to close and the traffic problems would still occur. He then queried whether the Parish had been consulted to try and resolve their concerns. Mr Baldwin advised that the positive impacts of the rebuilt bridge had been noted and, should approval be granted, the Parish Council wanted the significant adverse impact on both Streatley and Goring to be recognised and managed as sympathetically as possible.

Councillor Law then asked if the Parish Council would want to be actively involved in the traffic management schemes being proposed by West Berkshire Council and South Oxfordshire District Council. Mr Baldwin responded by saying that the Parish Council would be willing to work closely with the developer and other interested parties, and added that they needed to be consulted.

Councillor Brian Bedwell, in noting the concerns in relation to car parking, asked whether there were any other potential sites for a temporary car park aside from The Swan Public House. Mr Baldwin explained that this had been discussed by the Parish at length and the only other possibility, aside from The Swan, was use of Streatley Meadows, but this was protected and would be a significant concern for villagers. The only viable alternative was therefore identified as the car park to The Swan Public House and even this would create difficulties for elderly residents and young families due to the distance they would have to walk to the village amenities.

In response to a question from Councillor Bale, Mr Baldwin confirmed that the greatest concern in relation to an increase in traffic was during morning and evening rush hours, however an impact during other times throughout the week would still be felt. He also added that the new traffic lights and crossing lights were a benefit.

Mr Bulmer (Goring Parish Council) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- A significant concern of the Parish Council was the lack of communication between highway agencies and the Local Authority Highway Services. It was vital that they worked more closely together.
- The surveys produced by Oxfordshire County Council were not sufficient and a full detailed survey was required.
- A more robust traffic management plan was required for the closure of the bridge before approval was granted, as beyond approval, nothing would be altered until roads became gridlocked due to the considerable traffic increases.
- The impact of the works on local businesses was a concern particularly in a time of economic difficulty.
- Alternative parking arrangements were required for Goring due to the increased parking that was expected at the railway station.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

- While it was accepted that the bridge work was necessary, it was felt that the opportunity to improve safety should be taken and work needed to go beyond avoiding a deteriorating situation.
- The level of signage proposed by Oxfordshire County Council regarding road closures was not sufficient.
- Recent road works created significant issues for Goring and this was for only a two day period.

Mr Simpson in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Discussions in relation to the future of the bridge had been ongoing for approximately five years and reconstruction was essential.
- A Public Inquiry had been held regarding an increase to the toll on the bridge and as part of that the Inspector concluded that the bridge had reached the end of its useful life and rebuilding was necessary.
- A 44 tonne weight limit was necessary to meet European Union regulations and the bridge would need to be rebuilt to this standard. It was the intention that elements of the existing bridge would be retained wherever possible.
- A meeting had been held with English Heritage and there was surprise at their view that a 44 tonne weight limit was not necessary.
- The Officer report made it clear that there was limited scope to redesign the bridge and alter the weight limit. It would also be difficult to widen the bridge without having a greater impact on the listed building. However, proposals were in place in relation to traffic diversions, pedestrian access and S106 contributions.

Mr Weir in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The Whitchurch Bridge Company took safety very seriously and, while they were a business and finances were a consideration, they would do all they could to remove safety concerns. A meeting had been held with all related parishes, but there had been no mention of concerns with regard to pedestrian safety.
- A feasibility study would be conducted with a view to improving the bridge footpath and this included the possibility of relocating it. It was hoped that options could be discussed with the parishes to find a way forward that would alleviate concerns. However, this was a separate matter from the application before the Committee.
- Traffic concerns were understood and once the application was approved, discussions would commence with Local Authority Highway Officers on a Traffic Management Plan that would aim to keep traffic disruption to a minimum and give consideration to car parking concerns. The advice of Highway Officers would be relied upon.
- S106 contributions had been provisionally agreed to help fund bus diversions and there would be a willingness to consider further contributions to help minimise traffic disruption.
- Concerns in relation to the impact on the meadow were also understood and the Whitchurch Bridge Company wanted to protect it as much as possible. They were content to accept the conditions regarding its reinstatement.
- Conditions to prevent pollution and potential flooding of the meadow were also acceptable and there was a willingness to meet with the parishes to discuss ways to alleviate their concerns.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Councillor Law referred to the request of both Streatley and Goring Parish Councils for a more detailed O & D Survey and asked whether the Whitchurch Bridge Company would be agreeable to this. Mr Weir responded by saying that this decision would need to be taken based on independent advice as this would be an expensive process and Mr Weir questioned its value.

Councillor Bale added her support for a more detailed survey that would give greater consideration to the wider traffic implications. In addition, arrangements needed to be made for diverted bus routes. South Oxfordshire District Council had agreed a condition for this purpose and this needed to be replicated by West Berkshire Council.

Councillor Bale then asked a number of questions in relation to the concerns raised by the Parishes and, in response, Mr Weir made the following points:

- The proposed design and weight limit of the bridge had to be able to accommodate Heavy Goods Vehicles. However, the existing 7.5 tonne weight limit would be retained for environmental reasons.
- The confirmed timetable for the bridge closure would be included in the Construction Management Plan, but was expected to be between November 2012 and April 2013.
- The track to the compound would be dug out to protect the meadow whereas the compound itself would be built up as protection from flooding.
- Construction workers would be able to assist people wishing to access the Thames Path and the access track would be fenced.

Councillor Royce Longton referred to paragraph 6.2.18 of the report which sought listed building consent. This stated that European Structural Design Codes needed to be followed, which included weight limits, unless otherwise agreed with the Technical Approval Authority (TAA). Mr Weir confirmed that the TAA had been consulted and it was confirmed that the 44 tonne weight limit was required. This would remove the risk of the bridge being accessed by a vehicle in excess of 7.5 tonnes when it was not manned. There was also no capacity to measure a vehicles weight in the roads which linked to the bridge.

Councillor Metcalfe asked for clarity on the decision to retain the existing carriageway width. Mr Simpson explained that it was the intention to rebuild the bridge based on the existing fittings and foundations, and unless a decision was taken to rebuild the bridge in its entirety the width could not be increased. Mr Weir added that it was established at an early stage of discussions with Local Authority Conservation Officers that the bridge should remain the same size and the plans took this into account.

Councillor Geoff Mayes queried whether girder works would be conducted in situ. Mr Weir advised that the girders would be removed and worked on in a tented enclosure. This was detailed within the Construction Management Plan.

Councillor Mayes then queried what alternatives had been considered for the works. Mr Weir explained that a number of options had been considered and it was the view of the Whitchurch Bridge Company that this was the only viable option. He also added that their insurers insisted that engineering advice be followed. Derek Carnegie commented on this point by saying that Members only consideration was the application before them and not potential alternatives.

Councillor Bale was thankful for the suggestion to conduct a feasibility study before the bridge footway was replaced. She then referred to proposed condition 17 which stated that the reinstatement of the bridge should not commence until details of the new footway and carriageway had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Authority. Mr Weir advised that this was similar to a condition of South Oxfordshire District Council and the Whitchurch Bridge Company were willing to comply with this.

Standing Orders were then reinstated.

Councillor Bale, speaking as Ward Member, made the following points:

- There was no doubt of the need for a safe working bridge for vehicles and pedestrians. Councillor Bale felt that the proposal met this requirement and was in accordance with technical advice. She was pleased to note that the change to the river scene would be minimal.
- While there was a basis for approval, there were a number of impacts to be considered from the development as well as a need for the strengthening of some conditions.
- There was concern with regard to the affect this could have on the vibrancy of Pangbourne and to local businesses/retailers. A degree of certainty was needed over closure periods.
- The noise impact from piling works was a concern for the Boathouse Surgery when conducting patient consultations. A condition was therefore necessary that would require the Whitchurch Bridge Company to provide detail on noise levels and mitigation measures.
- Car parking for residents and non-residents needed to be addressed within the Traffic Management Plan. This would also need to include construction related parking.
- The impact on local traffic was another concern and liaison with parishes with regard to diversion signage needed to be a condition of approval. Some controls with respect to construction traffic were also needed where possible.
- Pangbourne Meadow needed to be reinstated to its original state on completion of the construction and the condition in relation to this needed to be tightened.
- The development would likely have an impact on the business of the Dolphin Centre, this was a particular concern following the disruption already experienced as part of its substantial refurbishment.
- The condition regarding the footway needed to be strengthened.

Councillor Law, speaking as Ward Member for Streatley, made the following points:

- It was recognised that work was necessary on the bridge and as such there was some acceptance of the associated disruption, which would most particularly be felt by Goring and Streatley. Having said that there was some experience of the impact temporary bridge closures and other traffic incidents could have, and this would become a daily occurrence during the period of construction.
- Alternative car parking arrangements on Streatley High Street was an important factor and it was necessary to make efforts to come to a commercial arrangement with The Swan Public House for the use of their car park.
- The need for a signage strategy was a condition of approval, but this needed to be strengthened as signage was only one aspect of the requirement for a robust Traffic Management Plan.
- The lack of collaborative working between the Highways Officers of West Berkshire Council and Oxfordshire County Council was a concern as this did not bode well for the management of the construction work. Reading Borough Council

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

also needed to be involved as some traffic would be diverted onto their roads. All three local authorities needed to work together to manage the traffic impact.

- A more robust data set was a requirement in the form of a more detailed O & D Survey as the current level of data gained from a more basic traffic survey was not sufficient and could only offer assumptions. Councillor Law felt that this should be a condition of approval.

Paul Goddard responded to the point made about survey data by advising that the detailed maps provided in the update report were produced as a result of a number plate recognition survey conducted in July 2011. This exercise covered the traffic movements on all four of the main entrances/exits to and from Pangbourne and the B471/B4526 crossroads and therefore Highways Officers made informed assumptions about where traffic was likely to divert to. It was predicted that approximately 73% of vehicles would divert via Streatley.

On the particular request for a more detailed O & D Survey, the advice from Highways was that the existing data was sufficient and fit for purpose. Paul Goddard questioned the need for an O & D Survey and whether it would provide any great benefit or additional information.

Councillor Law remained of the view that an O & D Survey was needed. A reason for this was the fact that the results of the traffic survey did not consider diversions other than via Streatley and Caversham. More robust data was required to back up the assumptions that had been made. He did not feel in a position, at present, to tell the residents of Streatley that all the potential implications of reconstructing the bridge had been fully considered.

Paul Goddard commented that little traffic would divert via other bridges particularly Sonning, but he would be happy for comments to be provided relating to improvements to the traffic management plan, which included signage. He added that signage was proposed to be extensive, but consultation was planned with parishes and Members to ensure this was adequate.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe referred to works on a railway bridge in Purley, a condition of which, agreed by Network Rail, was to increase the size of the footpath. He therefore felt there should be some scope for a similar outcome with this proposed development. On the subject of the O & D Survey, Councillor Metcalfe questioned if this was necessary in addition to the data already collated.

Councillor Alan Macro raised a need to ensure that the timing of the bridge closure did not conflict with separate bridge closures on diversionary routes. Paul Goddard agreed to address this point with Highways Officers in Reading Borough Council.

Councillor Macro then requested that condition eight be enhanced to mitigate against the noise impact in relation to the piling works.

Councillor Bale referred to the approval given on the applications by South Oxfordshire District Council, which they said was subject to notifying the Secretary of State and there was potential for the decision to be called-in based on the views given by English Heritage. Hazel Evans confirmed that South Oxfordshire District Council had taken this step, but English Heritage had said this was unnecessary. However, West Berkshire Council would also notify the Secretary of State for completeness.

Councillor Bale then proposed to accept Officers' Recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the amendments already discussed to the conditions which included Pangbourne Meadow and traffic/surveys. Prior to seconding the proposal, Councillor Law wished to confirm that an O & D Survey would be included within condition 15 and suggested that the wording be amended to include 'No development

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

shall commence until a signage strategy and traffic management plan, based on a more detailed O & D Survey, had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority working in co-operation with Oxfordshire County Council and Reading Borough Council.' He also requested that the relevant Parish Councils and Ward Members be consulted as part of the traffic management scheme and temporary Traffic Regulation Orders.

Paul Goddard reiterated his point that he was content for consultation to take place, but he remained of the view that an O & D Survey was unnecessary.

Derek Carnegie commented that the proposed addition to condition 15 was acceptable from a planning perspective.

Councillor Pask reminded Members that two separate proposals and votes were needed.

Councillor Bale proposed to accept Officers' Recommendation for listed building consent (application 11/00984/LBC). This was seconded by Councillor Law. The requirement for an O & D Survey was not part of this application.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant listed building consent subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this consent

Reason: To allow the Local Planning Authority to reconsider the desirability of the proposal if it is not carried out within that time and to accord with PPS5 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing title numbers B0852600/WHT/ARCH/004 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/203 Rev P0; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/002 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/501 Rev P0; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/401 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/302 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCG/102 Rev P1; and B0852600/WHT/ARCH/202 Rev P1 received on 27th May 2011, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details assessed against National, Regional and Local Planning Policy.

3. Any new facing brickwork or mortar including works of making good, shall match the existing brickwork in terms of bricks (size, colour and texture); mortar (mix, colour and texture) ; joint profile; and bond unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and preserve the special character of the Listed Building(s) and to accord with PPS5 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

4. No development shall take place within the application area until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording in relation to the bridge and its structure in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The building recording shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Reason: To ensure that an adequate record is made of the bridge in accordance with PPS5.

Councillor Bale then reiterated her proposal to accept Officers' Recommendation and grant planning permission for application 11/00985/FUL subject to the amendments already discussed to the conditions which included Pangbourne Meadow and the need to conduct a more detailed O & D Survey as part of the traffic management scheme. This was seconded by Councillor Law who commented that much of the preparatory work required for the O & D Survey had been conducted already and what remained was the need to process the information in more detail. The vote before Committee was clarified by Councillor Pask who confirmed that if this proposal was not approved, an alternative vote would be taken which omitted the requirement for an O & D Survey.

Councillor Bale made a request for a further condition in relation to the use of and access to the track and the fact that elements of it were in private ownership. Derek Carnegie agreed that an informative could be added if the application was approved. Hazel Evans added that access might not be restricted under permitted development rights, but controls could be exerted as much as possible.

Councillor Law made a final comment prior to the vote in urging Members to consider what their view would be around the need for an O & D Survey if the development was in their Ward.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within three months of this decision, to secure funding for the upgrading or reprogramming and monitoring of the A329/B4009 traffic signal junction in Sreatley and the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development shall be started within three years from the date of this permission and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development against Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 - 2006 Saved Policies 2007 should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing title numbers B0852600/WHT/ARCH/004 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/203 Rev P0; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/002 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/501 Rev P0; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/401 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCH/302 Rev P1; B0852600/WHT/ARCG/102 Rev P1; and B0852600/WHT/ARCH/202 Rev P1 received on 27th May 2011, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details assessed against National, Regional and Local Planning Policy.

3. Protective fencing shall be implemented and retained intact for the duration of the development in accordance with the tree and landscape protection scheme identified on approved drawing numbered 217/001.1,2,3 Rev A and dated Nov 10, supported by Arboricultural Report by SJ Stephens project No 217 dated 8th December 2010. Within the fenced areas, there shall be no excavations, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles or fires.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site in accordance with the objectives of policy OVS2 (b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

4. No site works, demolition or development shall take place within the application area until the applicant has secured the implementation of an Arboricultural watching brief in accordance with a written scheme of site monitoring, which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site in accordance with the objectives of Policy OVS 2 of West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

5. No development shall take place within the application area until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter all works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that any archaeological features or finds identified are adequately investigated, recorded, analysed and published in accordance with PPS5.

6. The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) ref. BPP 04 F8 dated 17 February 2011 and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:
 - The support compound buildings be raised on stilts and securely anchored at ground level.
 - Production of a flood risk management action plan
 - Registration to the Environment Agency Floodline Warnings Direct service

Reason: The site is in a location of high flood risk which needs to be managed in order to minimise the risk of flooding on site and the surrounding area in accordance with PPS25 Development and Flood Risk

7. Within 3 weeks of completion of the temporary works within the construction compound, all structures within the temporary compound shall be removed and the site shall be restored to its previous state to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the site is restored following completion of the works to prevent any increased risk of flooding in accordance with PPS25 Development and Flood Risk

8. No development shall take place before a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise, vibration and dust/ pollution emanating from the site. Thereafter, the development shall not commence until the approved scheme has been fully implemented for the duration of the works.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Reason: To protect the occupants of nearby residential properties from noise disturbance in accordance with policies OVS5 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

9. No development shall take place before a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the grit blasting temporary tented enclosure. Thereafter, the development shall not commence until the approved scheme has been fully implemented and retained for the duration of the works.

Reason: To protect the occupants of nearby residential properties from noise disturbance in accordance with OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 saved Policies 2007..

10. The development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the mitigation and enhancement measures outlined in the Ecological Scoping Survey dated June 2010.

Reason: To ensure the protection of the environment and protected species in accordance with policy ENV.14 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

11. The temporary footbridge shall be provided and open for public use prior to the closure of the bridge and shall be available for public use at all times throughout the construction period and until the bridge re-opens for public use.

Reason: To ensure the continuity of access to both sides of the river in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire district Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

12. No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan should detail items such as phasing of construction, layout of operations, travel and parking arrangements for construction workers, maintaining access to existing premises and pedestrian routes, hours of work. The plan shall be implemented in full and retained until the development has been completed. Any deviation from the plan shall be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure potential disruption is minimised as much as possible during construction in accordance with Policy OVS 2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

13. Within three months of the reopening of the main bridge the temporary footbridge shall be removed and the land/river restored to its previous condition.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and local land users in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

14. No development shall commence until a construction traffic management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority. The plan shall thereafter be implemented as agreed for the duration of the works.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Reason: In order to minimise the impact on traffic in accordance with Policy OVS.3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

15. No development shall commence until a traffic management scheme based on a more detailed origin and destination survey, (and in co-operation with Oxfordshire County Council and Reading Borough Council) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the bridge shall not be closed until the scheme has been implemented and it shall be retained for this purpose until the development is complete and the bridge is re-open for public use. Any deviation from the scheme shall be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to minimise the impact on traffic in accordance with Policy OVS.3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

16. No development shall commence until a scheme of Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No bridge closure shall take place until the Traffic Regulation Orders have been implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In order to minimise the impact on traffic in accordance with Policy OVS.3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

17. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the reinstatement of the bridge shall not commence until details of the new footway and carriageway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: There is insufficient information available to fully consider the appropriate location for the new footway at this time in accordance with Local Plan Policies.

18. No development shall commence until details of suitable, temporary alternative arrangements for the launching of craft by the Dolphin Adventure Centre have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works to provide the proposed construction compound shall not be commenced until the approved alternative arrangements have been made available.

Reason: To ensure the retention of important recreational facilities in accordance with Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

Informatives:

1. In England, it is a legal requirement to have a site waste management plan (SWMP) for all new construction projects worth more than £300,000. The level of detail that your SWMP should contain depends on the estimated build cost, excluding VAT. You must still comply with the duty of care for waste. Because you will need to record all waste movements in one document, having a SWMP will help you to ensure you comply with the duty of care. Further information can be found at <http://www.netregs-swmp.co.uk>

Under current legislation developers have a Duty of Care, which requires all waste to be handled, recovered or disposed of responsibly. Records should be kept on site to demonstrate that the Duty has been adhered to. Similarly, for hazardous

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

wastes, copies of consignment notes should be kept. Environment Agency officers may audit these records during the demolition/construction phase. Further information can be found at www.environment-agency.gov.uk/netregs

Due to the proximity of the site to the Thames all works carried out in connection with this development should comply with Environment Agency pollution prevention guidelines (PPG5): 'Works and maintenance in or near water'. Copies and further information are available from your local Environment Agency office or from www.environment-agency.gov.uk/ppg

2. HI 3 Damage to footways, cycleways and verges

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

3. HI 4 Damage to the carriageway

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

4. HI 9 Incidental works affecting the highway

Any incidental works affecting the adjoining highway shall be approved by, and a licence obtained from, the Highways Manager, West Berkshire Council, Highways & Engineering, Council Offices, Market, Newbury, RG14 5LD, telephone number 01635-519169, before any development is commenced.

5. H 100 Developer Coordination Requirements

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

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

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

6. The access track to the rear of the Dolphin Adventure Centre which is to be used to access the construction compound, may need reinforcement to enable it to take any heavy construction traffic.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

OR

Should the Section 106 not be completed within three months of this decision, it is recommended that the application is refused for the following reason:

The development fails to provide an appropriate scheme of works or on and off-site mitigation measures to accommodate the impact of the development on local infrastructure, services, or amenities or provide an appropriate mitigation measure such as a planning obligation. The proposal is therefore contrary to government advice, Policy OVS3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 - 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

36(2) Application No. & Parish: 11/00985/FUL, Pangbourne

(Councillor Geoff Mayes declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that he was a member of English Heritage. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).

The debate and decision for this item was recorded as part of Agenda Item 4(1) – 11/00984/LBC.

36(3) Application No. & Parish: 11/02147/FULD, Theale

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 11/02147/FULD in respect of the change of use and conversion of The Lamb Public House to create 3 additional residential units and the construction of a separate new detached dwelling including the demolition of an existing outbuilding and alterations/extensions to the existing building and associated landscaping works.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr David Wood, Parish Council representative, and Mr Edward Mather/Mr Tim Ennett, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr Wood in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The loss of the public house was disappointing, but there was acceptance that it did not have sufficient business and the six other licensed premises in Theale provided adequate alternatives.
- The site was too small for the proposed development. As a result it would be overdeveloped and cramped, and would provide too small an amenity space. In addition, the new dwelling would be too close to the existing building.
- The fact that there were two separate applications for this site was confusing and only one application should have been made.

Derek Carnegie advised that it was acceptable to have two separate applications. Planning Officers were satisfied that the application before the Committee was adequate in terms of amenity space. This was not the case for the separate application and this was likely to be refused.

Mr Mather in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The previous scheme for this site had been withdrawn in response to the concerns that had been raised. A lengthy consultation process had been undertaken for this application which sought to address these concerns.
- The proposed design reflected the character of Theale and was sensitive to the Conservation Area.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

- The development was part of two applications. This followed consultation with a neighbouring landowner over the rear of the site, which delayed certain aspects and resulted in a split application.

Councillor Alan Macro, speaking as Ward Member, made the following points:

- He voiced his sadness at the loss of the public house, but also added his understanding that its continued viability had proved difficult. In addition there were alternatives, one of which was located very close by.
- He shared the concerns of the Parish Council in relation to the density and cramped layout of the proposed development. This was particularly the case when making a comparison with existing properties.
- The windows of the new dwelling would overlook the garden of 24 Church Street, however some privacy was afforded to that property by the existing hedge.
- The Conservation Officer had commented that the scheme could be enhanced by incorporating some of the land outside of the site to provide for parking and allow for additional landscaping. This would reduce the cramped feel of the proposal.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe queried whether the impact of the proposed new modern house on neighbouring dwellings had been considered. Derek Carnegie responded by saying that the Case Officer had looked at the relationship between buildings and, while noting that care was needed, was satisfied that this was acceptable for this scheme. Dwellings were proposed to be closely located, but this was in accordance with other areas of Theale.

Councillor Macro proposed to reject Officers' recommendation and refuse planning permission due to the cramped layout/amenity and overlooking. This was seconded by Councillor Alan Law.

This proposal was put to the vote and was rejected by the Committee.

Councillor Royce Longton then proposed to accept Officers' recommendation and grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Brian Bedwell.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 agreement by the 23 December 2011 and the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be started within three years from the date of this permission and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:
Site Location and Boundary Plan drawing A-02-002 P received 12th October 2011.
Proposed Section Through unit 3 drawing A-04-200 R received 12th October 2011.
Rear car park site proposed ground floor plan drawing A-03-200 received 30th November 2011
Rear car park site proposed roof plan drawing A-03-202 received 30th November 2011

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Rear car park site proposed first floor plan drawing A-03-201 received 30th November 2011

Proposed elevation sheet 1 of 4 drawing A-05-200 P received 12th October 2011

Proposed elevation sheet 2 of 4 drawing A-05-201 P received 12th October 2011

Proposed elevation sheet 3 of 4 drawing A-05-202 P1 received 12th November 2011

Proposed elevation sheet 4 of 4 drawing A-05-203 P received 12th October 2011

Roof Plan drawings 03-102 received 12th October 2011

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with national planning guidance and the relevant policies within the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and the relevant Policies within the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

3. No development shall commence on site until samples of the external materials to be used in the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to the details that may have been submitted with the application. Thereafter the materials used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved samples.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009 Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

4. No development shall commence on site until details of all fencing and other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to the details that may have been submitted with the application, and shall where necessary include a schedule of materials and drawings demonstrating the layout of the means of enclosure. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be first occupied until the fencing and other means of enclosure have been erected in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The fencing and other means of enclosure are essential elements in the detailed design of this development and the application is not accompanied by sufficient details to enable the Local Planning Authority to give proper consideration to these matters in accordance with Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

5. No development shall commence on site until details of the external hard surfaced areas of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to the details that may have been submitted with the application, and shall where necessary include a schedule of materials, means of treatment, and drawings demonstrating the layout of these areas. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be first occupied until the hard surfaced areas have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

6. No development shall commence on site until details of the floor levels in relation to existing and proposed ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the proposed building and the adjacent land in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

7. No development shall commence on site (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, an implementation programme and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment. The scheme shall ensure:
 - a) completion of the approved landscaping within the first planting season following the completion of the development, and
 - b) any trees, shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of the completion of the development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.

Thereafter the approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of Policies CC6 and C3 of the South East Plan, and Policies OVS2 (a, b) and OVS3 (b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

8. Irrespective of the provisions of the current Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any subsequent revision of the Order), no additional openings shall be inserted in the west facing elevation of plot 3 without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority through a planning application made for that purpose.

Reason: To prevent the overlooking of adjoining properties and in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 and Policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009 Regional Spatial Strategy.

9. No development shall commence until details of a scheme of work or other steps as may be necessary to minimise the effects of dust from the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

10. The hours of work for all contractors for the duration of the site development shall unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing be limited to:

7.30 am to 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays 8.30 am to 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays and NO work shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

11. Plot 2 shall not be occupied until the two bat tubes have been fitted in the northern gable end of plot 2 as detailed in the bat report by Arbtech Environmental Services.

Reason: To ensure the protection of a protected species in accordance with the guidance contained within PPS9.

12. The detailed layout of the site shall comply with the Local Planning Authority's standards in respect of road and footpath design and vehicle parking and turning provision. This condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications to these matters which have been given in the current application.

Reason: In the interest of road safety and flow of traffic in accordance with Policies OVS.2 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

13. No development shall commence until details of the proposed access into the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the access shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details before the commencement of building and other operations on the site.

Reason: To ensure that the access into the site is constructed before the approved buildings in the interest of highway safety and in accordance with Policy OVS 2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

14. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning space has been provided in accordance with the approved plans. The parking and turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided for adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would be a danger to other road users in accordance with Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

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

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and assists with the parking, storage and security of cycles in accordance with Policy OVS3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

16. No development shall commence until details of the temporary parking area and turning space which is to be provided and maintained concurrently with the development of the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved parking area and turning space shall at

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

the commencement of development be provided and thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details until the development has been completed and shall during that time be used for parking by all employees, contractors and operatives or other visitors during all periods that they are working at or visiting the site.

Reason: In accordance with Policy OVS 2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007 to ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities during the construction period, in order to minimise the incidence of off site parking in the locality which could cause danger to other road users or long term inconvenience to local residents.

Informatives:

1. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
2. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the requirements of Section 60 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 in respect of the minimisation of noise on construction and demolition sites. Application, under Section 61 of the Act, for prior consent to the works, can be made to the Environmental Health and Licensing Manager.
3. The Highways (Planning) Manager, West Berkshire District Council, Highways and Engineering, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury RG14 5LD, telephone 01635 519169, should be contacted to agree the access construction details and to grant a licence before any work is carried out within the highway. A formal application should be made, allowing at least four (4) weeks notice, to obtain details of underground services on the applicants behalf.
4. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Berkshire Act, 1986, Part II, Clause 9, which enables the Highway Authority to recover the costs of repairing damage to the footway, cycleway or grass verge, arising during building operations.
5. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Highways Act 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic.
6. Any planting, other than grass, in areas to be adopted by the Highway Authority, may be considered to be an obstruction of the highway and action could be taken to remove it.
7. In order to protect the stability of the highway it is advised that no excavation is carried out within 15 metres of a public highway without the written approval of the Highway Authority.
8. Any incidental works affecting the adjoining highway shall be approved by, and a licence obtained from, the Highways (Planning) Manager, West Berkshire Council, Highways and Engineering, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury, RG14 5LD, tel. no. 01635 519169, before any development is commenced.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

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

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

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

OR

Should a legal agreement not be completed by the 23rd December the application be refused for the following reason:

The development fails to provide an appropriate scheme of works or off site mitigation measures to accommodate the impact of the development on local infrastructure, services or amenities or provide an appropriate mitigation measure such as a planning obligation. The proposal is therefore contrary to government advice and Policy CC7 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policy OVS3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007 as well as the West Berkshire District Council's adopted SPG4/04 - Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development.

36(4) Application No. & Parish: 10/00490/HOUSE, Basildon

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(4)) concerning Planning Application 10/00490/HOUSE in respect of the demolition of an existing garage block and store rooms, and the erection of new garage block over two storeys to provide covered parking for thirteen cars associated with the Grotto House.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Martin Gray, architect, addressed the Committee on this application.

Councillor Alan Law forwarded apologies from the representative of Basildon Parish Council who was due to address the Committee on this application.

Mr Gray in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The proposal for a new garage block was part of the proposed restoration of The Grotto and its grounds to its former glory. Separate applications had been submitted to extend The Grotto itself and for the new boat house.
- No objections had been raised by Highways.
- The proposed design of the new garage block would be an enhancement on the existing and would be on the same plot. Two levels had been proposed that would be for the use of The Grotto and adjoining studios.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

- The Conservation Officer had given support to the proposal subject to landscaping conditions.
- The Grotto was visible from the surrounding landscape and this included the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Thames Path. While there would be a minimal loss of trees, it was not felt that this would impact on the AONB or the Thames Path as 30 trees would remain between the garage block and the river. Overall only 10 out of 327 trees would be lost from the entire site.
- The proposal would only create a moderate change to the visual impact from the surrounding landscape.
- The conclusion of the report stated that the proposal would not be detrimental to the character of the North Wessex Downs and Chilterns AONB, with the inclusion of landscape management.
- The proposal was acceptable to the Ecology Officer.
- No comments of concern had been made by the Chilterns AONB Board.
- The Committee were requested to approve the application in line with Officer's Recommendation.
- The nearest property, off site, was the Old Lodge which was located approximately 40-50m from the site.

Councillor Law, speaking on behalf of the Parish Council, made the following points:

- Although they did not object in principle, they did have concerns in relation to the proposed size of the garage block. There was also some confusion as a result of the development of the site being submitted in three parts.
- Their main concern was the impact of the garage block on the Chilterns AONB.

Councillor Law, speaking as Ward Member, made the following points:

- This was a unique set of buildings and was a matter for Committee to determine as it was a prominent structure in the AONB.
- The new garage block would clearly create a different view from the AONB and Members needed to consider whether or not this was an enhancement. The impact on the view would be added to by the separate applications that had been submitted.
- He became aware from the update report that much of the house was a recent extension (1995) and when taking into account the proposed extensions to the property together with the garage block, the development would be disproportionate in size to the original house.

Cheryl Willett responded to the final point of Councillor Law by stating that an increased floor area of 42% was being proposed from the original house which excluded the 1995 extension. However, this was possibly an overestimate as historical photographs showed that there was an extension of some kind at the site of the three storey extension. In addition, advice received from the Planning Team Leader, which was included in the update report, stated that as the garage was more than 5m from the original house it would not normally be considered in ENV24 calculations. However, if all proposed extensions were approved and taken into consideration then the floor area could increase by approximately 70%.

Cheryl Willett added another point from the update report which stated that conditions had been recommended to ensure that a landscaping scheme as well as a landscape

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

management plan be prepared and agreed with the Council to ensure that there was no impact upon the North Wessex Downs and Chilterns AONB.

Councillor Law referred to the three applications and advised that it was his intention to call the boat house application in for the Committee's determination.

Councillor Quentin Webb commented that the garage block was well designed and in his view it was not contrary to Council policy. Councillor Tim Metcalfe added that the proposed garage block would improve the view from across the river. He therefore proposed to accept Officers' recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Crumly.

Councillor Pamela Bale commented that it would be good for the house to be restored.

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

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be started within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 825/OD320A and 825/ODD337A received on 1st November 2011, 825/OD322, 825/OD323, 825/OD324, 825/OD326, 825/OD327, 825/OD330, 825/OD331, 825/OD335 received on 13th July 2011; the Ecological Surveys Report validated on 25th March 2010; the Design and Access Statement 2 received on 13th July 2011; the Landscape Masterplan LIV17734-10A; the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, the Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan, the Tree Report, the Arboricultural Implications Assessment received on 1st November 2011, the Landscape Design Statement, the Historic Landscape and Garden Assessment, and the Tree Constraints Plan LIV17734-01 received on 13th July 2011.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details assessed against Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

3. No development shall commence on site until a schedule of materials to be used in the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to these matters which have been detailed in the current application and shall include where necessary, a schedule of glass, plastic, or mortar type materials. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reasons: In the interests of amenity and character of the North Wessex Downs and Chiltern Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

4. The garage hereby approved shall be used solely for purposes incidental to the use of the existing dwellings. No trade, business or commercial enterprise of any kind whatsoever shall be carried on, in or from the garages.

Reason: To ensure that the garages is kept for vehicle parking in the interests of road safety and to accord with Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

5. No development shall commence on site (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a scheme for the protection of trees to be retained has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter all works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Such a scheme shall include protective fencing, all in accordance with BS5837:2005. No development works shall take place until the approved fencing has been erected and at least 2 working days notice has been given to the Local Planning Authority that is has been erected. It shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or such a time as agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No activities or storage of materials whatsoever shall take place within the protection areas without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority. Note: The protective fencing should be as specified in Chapter 9 and detailed in Figure 2 of BS5837:2005.

Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009 Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy OVS2(b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

6. No development shall commence on site (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until an Arboricultural Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include details of the implementation, supervision and monitoring of all temporary tree protection and any special construction works within any defined tree protection area including the demolition of buildings. Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site in accordance with the objectives of Policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009 Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy OVS2(b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

7. No development shall commence on site (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until details of the proposed foundations providing for the protection of the root zones of trees to be retained shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site in accordance with the objectives of Policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009 Regional Spatial Strategy and Policy OVS2(b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

8. No development shall commence on site until a detailed schedule of tree works including timing and phasing of operations has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason: To ensure the retention of selected trees at the site in accordance with the objectives of Policy OVS2 (b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

9. No development shall commence on site (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, an implementation programme and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment. The scheme shall ensure:
 - a) completion of the approved landscaping within the first planting season following the completion of the development, and
 - b) any trees, shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of the completion of the development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.

Thereafter the approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of Policies CC6 and C3 of the South East Plan, and Policies OVS2 (a, b) and OVS3 (b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

10. No development shall commence on site until a detailed Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall also include tree and shrub cover to be retained, and replanting of the area north and west of the garage. Thereafter the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan.

Reason: To ensure the long term integration of the garage in to the garden landscape and setting of the house. This is in accordance with Policies OVS2 and ENV1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

11. No development shall commence on site until samples of hard landscaping materials 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.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and character of the North Wessex Downs and Chiltern Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

12. No development shall commence on site until details of the floor levels in relation to existing and proposed ground levels have been submitted to and approved in

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the proposed building and the adjacent land, and to ensure the development will conserve and enhance the vegetation on site, in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

13. Should any new or replacement fencing or other means of enclosure be proposed no development shall commence on site until details of all fencing and other means of enclosure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to the details that may have been submitted with the application, and shall where necessary include a schedule of materials and drawings demonstrating the layout of the means of enclosure. Thereafter, the garage hereby approved shall not be first brought into use until the fencing and other means of enclosure have been erected in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Fencing can have a significant impact upon the rural and historic character of the site and the application is not accompanied by sufficient details to enable the Local Planning Authority to give proper consideration to these matters in accordance with Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

14. Should any lighting be proposed for the garage no development shall commence until details of the lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: Lighting can have a significant impact upon the rural and historic character of the site, particularly when viewed from the opposite side of the river. This is in accordance with Policies OVS2 and ENV1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 and the West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design Part 5 – External Lighting.

15. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has informed the Local Planning Authority. Any subsequent investigation/remedial/protective works deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out to agreed timetables and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. If no contamination is encountered during the development, the developer shall inform the Local Planning Authority upon completion of the development.

Reason: To ensure that groundwater is protected from any contamination that may be present. This is in accordance with OVS2 and OVS5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 and the guidance contained within PPG23.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7 DECEMBER 2011 - MINUTES

16. No development shall commence on site until a scheme to dispose of surface and foul water has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that no direct discharge of dissolved petroleum hydrocarbons or sewage is made directly or indirectly to groundwater. This is in accordance with OVS2 and OVS5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 and the guidance contained within PPG23.

17. The hours of work for all contractors for the duration of the site development shall unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing be limited to:

7.30 am to 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays 8.30 am to 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays and NO work shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 – 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

36(5) Application No. & Parish: 11/01790/FUL, Englefield

Agenda Item 4(5) concerning Planning Application 11/01790/FUL in respect of a change of use from printer's studio (B1) to nursery school (D1) was deferred. The item was therefore not discussed and would be rescheduled.

37. Site Visits

A date of 19 December 2011 at 9.30am was agreed for site visits if necessary.

(The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature