

DRAFT

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

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

Councillors Present: Howard Bairstow, Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Paul Bryant (Vice-Chairman), Hilary Cole, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Paul Hewer, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson and Virginia von Celsing

Also Present: Michael Butler (Principal Planning Officer), Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Rachel Craggs (Principal Policy Officer (Equalities)), Gareth Dowding (Senior Engineer (Developers Scheme)) and Shiraz Sheikh (Principal Solicitor)

PART I

45. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 January were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Item 43, page 11, 39th point, 3rd line: change 'In addition the obligations required for ecological enhancement and monitoring of the open space in perpetuity, for the newt population and the following conditions:' to 'In addition the obligations required for ecological enhancement for the newt population and monitoring of the open space in perpetuity and the following conditions:'

46. Declarations of Interest

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

Councillor Pick declared that he had been lobbied with regard to Agenda Item 4(2).

47. Schedule of Planning Applications

48. Application No. and Parish: 16/03469/FULD - 3-5 Porchester Road, Newbury

(Councillors Jeff Beck, Adrian Edwards and Anthony Pick declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that they were Members of Newbury Town Council (NTC), but would consider the application afresh. As their interest was a personal and not an other registrable interest or disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 16/03469/FULD in respect of the erection of a third floor at 3-5 Porchester Road, Newbury to provide four 1 bed flats with associated parking and amenity space.
2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Ms Sonya Green, objector, Mr Nick Cobbold, agent and Councillor Anthony Pick, Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

3. Michael Butler introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy and other material considerations. It had been brought to Committee as more than 10 objections had been received and officers were recommending approval. Mr Butler noted that the building was not listed and the area was outside the local conservation area. However the Conservation Officer had commented that he preferred the original symmetry of the first scheme, although the current scheme still remained acceptable in overall design terms. Michael Butler also drew the Committee's attention to point 5.3 of the report, which referred to the inclusion of a pair of Juliette balconies. The plans were not completely clear and the agent had since confirmed that there would be no Juliette balconies on the southern elevation; however the rear fire escapes would remain.
4. The Update Report recommended the inclusion of an additional condition for the inclusion of a sprinkler system on the top floor to control/prevent fire. This would negate the need for the additional external fire escape to the top floor and so prevent overlooking.
5. In conclusion, the report stated that the proposal was acceptable and conditional approval was justifiable. Therefore, officers recommended the Committee grant planning permission subject to the additional conditions.
6. Councillor Paul Bryant noted that Michael Butler had referred to the shadowing being as a result of the solstice, whereas it was in fact the winter equinox. He went on to query whether the sprinkler system would apply to all three floors. Michael Butler responded that it would only be the top floor, although Members could ask the applicant's agent to include a sprinkler system on the other floors. Councillor Bryant further asked for confirmation that the fire escapes would be retained on the first and second floors, which Michael Butler affirmed.
7. Councillor Adrian Edwards enquired where the large water tank for the sprinkler system would be located. Michael Butler replied that this was a building regulation matter and if an external water tank was required, it would be included as a non-material amendment, negating the need for a new planning application.
8. Councillor Anthony Pick asked if consideration had been given to the overlooking of gardens from the fourth floor. Michael Butler confirmed that it had been considered and, as a result, the inclusion of a condition requiring obscured glazing had been contemplated, but as these were kitchen windows, the planners had not thought it was necessary. However, Members might have a different view.
9. Ms Sonya Green attempted to address the Committee but her voice was seriously impaired by a cold. It was, therefore, proposed by Councillor Jeff Beck and seconded by Councillor Howard Bairstow that her companion should do so on her behalf. As a result, Mr Seán Coughlan raised the following points:
 - The strongest objection concerned the asymmetric nature of the roof line, which had been offered by the Planning Officer as a 'better' scheme on the grounds that it would comply with the towers of 1 and 2 Porchester Road. This was a strange comparison as these buildings predated 2-4 and 3-5 Porchester Road by a decade or so.
 - If 3-5 Porchester Road were similar to 4-6, then the attic floor was not load bearing and nor was it one level as the front of the house was some two feet lower than the rear with a brick 'wall' holding the higher section in place. Therefore, the rear of number 5 would offer a much lower ceiling than the front of number 3.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

- Newbury Town Council had stated that the amended plans would harm the character of the area; the Conservation Officer preferred the original symmetry; the current site comprised attractive Victorian villas that added character to the area. Despite all this, the design was claimed on balance to be acceptable with the asymmetry 'fitting' with the other buildings, although it was of a very different style.
 - If the planning application was granted, he requested that the parking area was completed before occupancy and space was given to the construction vehicles.
10. Councillor Bairstow enquired whether a discussion had been held with the architect about the difference in height and Mr Coughlan confirmed that it had not.
11. Mr Nick Cobbold in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
- It was two years since they had first approached the Council for pre-application advice.
 - None of the current lease holders had objected to the scheme as they could see the benefits to their amenity.
 - The roof needed replacing so it was a logical time to carry out the work.
 - He had not previously had sight of the Council's analysis in relation to loss of light, but it showed that the impact of the development would be minimal.
 - The Applicant had used the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance in order to assess the loss of light and considered that a 45° angle was acceptable. He had looked at the distances and the angle from the middle of the windows to the top of the proposed developed was 40°, which was 5° less than the BRE guidance.
 - With regard to overlooking of neighbouring properties, there was already a degree of overlooking from the existing building so this would not have a great impact.
 - The original application had included a consistent roof line but had been changed following advice from the planners. However design was subjective and there was no right or wrong answer. There was a mixture of flats and buildings of differing heights in the area so the character of the neighbourhood had already changed over time.
 - Parking would be provided in accordance with the Council's standards.
 - There were ten flats on the site already so this would not be a new development and the current impact had to be taken into account.
12. Councillor Virginia von Celsing asked what the benefits would be to the current lease holders. Mr Cobbold replied that 9 of the 10 units had been flooded recently and a new roof was required, so it would mean they would not have the financial burden of this.
13. Councillor Bryant enquired how the sprinkler system would be fitted and if it would be viable. Mr Cobbold responded that this had only been raised the previous day and so he had been unable to consider the detail. However the options were to either have a water tank or connect each unit to the mains water supply, which might be the easier solution.
14. Councillor Bairstow pointed out that the drawings were incorrect as they showed three chimneys, but there should be two more on the rear elevation. Mr Cobbold conceded that he might be correct.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

15. Councillor Bairstow further enquired about the difference between the two floors and how it changed the accommodation. Mr Cobbold explained that one of the flats in the roof would have a pitched roof and the other a flat roof.
16. Councillor Pick asked if all the top floor flats would be in the roof space and Mr Cobbold replied that only two of them would be.
17. Councillor Clive Hooker noted that the renovation and alteration provided a good opportunity to tidy up the exterior of the building. However he asked Michael Butler whether applying sprinklers to the first two floors would negate the need for the fire escapes. Michael Butler responded that it would, but in his view, such a condition would be unreasonable.
18. Councillor Pick in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The property was a fine Victorian building.
 - Opposite were semi detached buildings which were identical except for an extension on the ground floor.
 - He differed from Michael Butler's acceptance of the application, as he believed that the integrity of these buildings should be respected and he felt they made a substantial contribution to the area which would be impacted by the additional floor.
 - The overlooking from the fourth floor would have a greater impact than the current overlooking from the third floor.
 - The flats located in the roof would be cramped.
 - The building would contravene pages 48–49 of the Newbury Plan Statement.
 - The building was a heritage asset even though it was not listed as there were few buildings in Newbury of a similar nature.
19. Councillor Bryant asked if he was objecting to the addition of the fourth floor or the asymmetry of the design to which Councillor Pick replied he objected to the addition of the fourth floor.
20. Councillor von Celsing asked what the rationale was for the uneven roof. Michael Butler replied that he had taken account of the villas on the other side of the road and the towers. He had also discussed it with other officers and they had considered that the varied roofline would create more visual interest in a similar way to 1 Porchester Road. If the Conservation Officer had objected to the design, they would have suggested it was revised but he had found it was acceptable. Design was subjective and it was a highly sustainable area with massive demand for additional housing. Therefore, although there would be some harm, it was not sufficient to refuse the application and he could not envisage a planning inspector dismissing the application if it went to appeal.
21. The Committee debated the points raised and Councillor Bryant stated that he had a difficulty with the aesthetics of the design and the legality of the proposal. He further added that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated committees should only accept planning applications for extensions that were of a high quality design and yet many that came to the committee were not. He did not like the asymmetry of the design but there was little reason to object to the merits of the proposal as it was outside the conservation area and it would be approved by a planning inspector at appeal. Therefore, with great reluctance, Councillor Bryant proposed acceptance of the planning application. This was seconded by Councillor

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

Beck who added that he thought the asymmetry helped the development to blend in with the neighbourhood and he considered it would be an improvement.

22. Councillor Hooker invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor Bryant, as seconded by Councillor Beck to accept Officers' recommendation. At the vote this was carried.
23. **RESOLVED that** the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

24. 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 the advice in the DMPO of 2015 should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development must be carried out in strict accord with the following plans as received on 10 January 2017 - plan number 2760-02b rev B, [proposed plans and proposed elevations] plus site plan and survey plan number 2760-01. Location plan received on 8 December 2016.

Reason: To clarify the permission in accord with the advice in the DMPO of 2015.

3. The development shall be completed as one whole phase.

Reason: To ensure there is no unacceptable visual imbalance in the north elevation of the proposed development which would otherwise be harmful to the street scene and setting of the adjacent conservation area, so being contrary to policy CS19 in the West Berkshire Core Strategy of 2006 to 2026.

4. No new dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and/or turning space have been provided in accordance with the approved plan(s). The parking and/or 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 with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

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

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and assists with the parking, storage and security of cycles. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

2007).

6. No development shall take place until details of a contractors temporary parking and turning area to be provided and maintained concurrently with the development of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved parking and turning area shall be provided at the commencement of development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details until the development has been completed. During this time, the approved parking and turning area shall be kept available for parking and used by employees, contractors, operatives and other visitors during all periods that they are working at or visiting the site.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking and turning facilities during the construction period. This condition is imposed in order to minimise the incidences of off-site parking in the locality which could cause danger to other road users, and long terms inconvenience to local residents. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

7. The materials to be used in the development shall match those on the existing development to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. This shall relate to the slate roof and the existing facing render.

Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy of 2006 to 2026.

8. The hours of work for all contractors (and sub-contractors) for the duration of the site development shall, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, be limited to; 7.30 am to 6.00 pm on Mondays to Fridays, 8.00 am to 1.00 pm on Saturdays, and NO work shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of surrounding residents in accordance with the advice in the NPPF of 2012.

9. Prior to the first occupation of the flats as permitted on the new top floor, a sprinkler system (or alternative mist system) shall be inserted in order to prevent fire.

Reason: In the interests of public safety in accord with the NPPF.

The decision to grant This decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy for the south east of England 2009 West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (WBDLP) Saved Policies 2007, the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire, adopted 1998, the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire 1991-2006 (incorporating the alterations adopted in December 1997 and May 2001) and to all other relevant material considerations, including Government guidance, supplementary planning guidance notes; and in particular guidance notes and policies:

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

The reasoning above is only intended as a summary. If you require further information on this decision please contact the Council via the Customer Call Centre on 01635 519111.

INFORMATIVE:

1. The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that above conditions must be complied with in full before any work commences on site, failure to do so may result in enforcement action being instigated.
2. The above Permission may contain pre-conditions, which require specific matters to be approved by the Local Planning Authority before a specified stage in the development occurs. For example, "*Prior to commencement of development written details of the means of enclosure will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority*". This means that a lawful commencement of the approved development cannot be made until the particular requirements of the pre-condition(s) have been met. A fee is required for an application to discharge conditions.
- 3 This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to secure and accept what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.
- 4 The development hereby approved results in a requirement to make payments to the Council as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) procedure. A Liability Notice setting out further details, and including the amount of CIL payable will be sent out separately from this Decision Notice. You are advised to read the Liability Notice and ensure that a Commencement Notice is submitted to the authority prior to the commencement of the development. Failure to submit the Commencement Notice will result in the loss of any exemptions claimed, and the loss of any right to pay by instalments, and additional costs to you in the form of surcharges. For further details see the website at www.westberks.gov.uk/cil

49. **Application No. and Parish: 15/03196/COMIND - Land off Tull Way, Thatcham**

(Councillor Pick declared that he had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(2).)

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 15/03196/COMIND in respect of a flood alleviation scheme at land off Tull Way, Thatcham.
2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Richard Crumly, adjoining Parish Council representative, and Councillor Garth Simpson, Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.
3. Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy and other material considerations. It had been brought to Committee as it was a major application that had been submitted by West Berkshire Council. The area had been flooded in 2007 and the application was a resubmission of a previous permission with some amendments. These related to a proposed access

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

via a field to the north, parking for inspection vehicles after construction and a change to the materials for the headwall and wingwall within the bund.

4. The Update Report referred to the fact that the appellant wished to provide sheep netting and had therefore provided amended plans on the location and type of badger gate.
5. In conclusion, the report stated that the proposal was acceptable and conditional approval was justifiable. Therefore, officers recommended that the Committee grant planning permission subject to the inclusion of the additional conditions.
6. Councillor Howard Bairstow asked if sheep would be able to climb up the slope to which Derek Carnegie responded that he was unable to provide a clear answer and would refer this to the appropriate officer.
7. Councillor Garth Simpson referred to a condition relating to a requirement for wildflower grass planting and he questioned why this was required. Derek Carnegie advised that he would clarify this with the case officer.
8. Councillor Richard Crumly in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Thatcham Town Council would benefit from the bund and gave its support to this application and the original one.
 - Florence Gardens had been flooded in 2007 and again in 2008.
9. Councillor Garth Simpson in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The amendment to the original allocation would provide improved access.
 - The public benefit was clear and most welcome.
 - The bund would be a large structure and visible to car users and some residents.
 - The landscaping would do much to soften the impact of the structure and he had no hesitation in recommending approval of the planning application.
10. After considering the above application Councillor Anthony Pick proposed acceptance of the proposal which was seconded by Councillor Jeff Beck.
11. Councillor Hooker invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor Pick, as seconded by Councillor Beck to accept Officers' recommendation. At the vote this was carried.
12. **RESOLVED that** the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

13. Conditions:

Time Limit

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 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); to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development should it not be started within a reasonable time.

Plans

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers:

3189-GA-100 Rev H, 3189-GA-01 Rev H and 81561-LD51-004 received on 17 February 2016; 3189-SD-101 Rev G received on 20 January 2017; WBC/118/8K1/Rev E received on 11 July 2016; 3189-ATR-01 Rev F, 3189-ATR-02 Rev E, 3189-ATR-03 Rev E, 3189-ATR-04 Rev E, 3189-GA-02 Rev F, 3189-GA-03 Rev E, 3189-RP-100 Rev E, 3189-RP-101 Rev E, 3189-RP-102 Rev D, 3189-SD-100 Rev D, 3189-SD-102 Rev D received on 28 August 2016; 3189-RP-01 Rev G and 3189-RP-02 Rev B received on 2 December 2015;

Geotechnical Interpretative Report by Geo Environmental Services received on 20 November 2015;

Geotechnical Lab Test Results Summary, documents GE10924-App6-1, GE10924 EWKSPEC and email received on 19 April 2016;

Cotswold Archaeology project ref 77022 received on 22 February 2016.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details assessed against Policies ADPP1, ADPP2, ADPP3, CS13, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 – 2026, TRANS.1 and OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007, the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) should it not be started within a reasonable time.

Access Construction

3. As a first development operation the western access at Tull Way shall be constructed in accordance with the approved drawing 3189-ATR-03 Rev E received on 23 August 2016. The access at the site shall not be brought into use for construction until give way markings have been implemented across the entire access for the temporarily widened access during construction.

Reason: In the interest of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Construction Method Statement

4. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved revised Technical Note and the revised Construction Method Statement received on 20 January 2017. These documents provide for:

The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;

Loading and unloading of plant and materials;

Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;

The erection and maintenance of security hoarding;

Wheel washing facilities;

Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

Materials

5. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be as specified on the plans and supporting documents unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The headwall and wingwall concrete finish shall be as per drawing 3189-SD-101 Rev G received on 20 January 2017. The bund shall be constructed in accordance with the details submitted within documents: Geotechnical Interpretative Report by Geo Environmental Services received on 20 November 2015; Geotechnical Lab Test Results Summary, documents GE10924-App6-1, GE10924 EWKSPEC and email received on 19 April 2016.

Reason: To ensure that the materials respond to local character and do not impact features of special interest for which the River Kennet Site of Special Scientific Interest is notified. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies CS14, CS17, and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Set Back of Gates

6. Any gates to be provided at accesses where vehicles will enter or leave the site, shall open away from the adjoining highway and be set back a distance of at least five metres from the edge of the highway.

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 2012 and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Visibility Splays

7. The use shall not commence until the visibility splays at both accesses on Tull Way have been provided in accordance with drawing number 3189-GA-100 Rev G received on 20 January 2017. The land within these visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of one metre above the carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Parking Provision

8. The vehicle parking and turning spaces shown on approved drawing number 3189-GA-100 Rev G received on 20 January 2017 shall be provided within four weeks of the bund becoming operational. The parking and turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities,

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

Landscaping

9. The hard and soft landscaping as detailed on drawing number WBC/118/SK1/RevE received on 11 July 2016 shall be implemented in full within the first planting season following the completion of the development. 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 next planting season by plants of the same size and species.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping and enhance the biodiversity of the area. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies CS14, CS17 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Vegetation removal

10. No vegetation to be removed during the bird nesting season (1st March – 30th September) unless a report has been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority that shows there are no breeding birds present. Vegetation removal will be undertaken within 5 days of such approval.

Reason: To ensure the protection of species protected by law and to accord with Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

No Steep Sided Holes

11. During the construction period no steep sided holes will be left over night without either being covered or having a means of escape such as the insertion of a scaffold plank in the hole.

Reason: To ensure the protection of species protected by law and to accord with Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Sheep Netting and Badger Gate

12. The badger gate identified on drawings 3189-GA-100-H, 3189-GA-01-H and 81561-LD51-004 received on 17 February 2017 shall be installed next to the footpath on the line of the badger run prior to the completion and first use of the development hereby approved. No sheep netting shall be attached to site fencing until the badger gate has been installed.

Reason: To ensure the protection of species protected by law and to accord with Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22 FEBRUARY 2017 - MINUTES

Boundary treatments

13. No operation of the development shall take place until the boundary treatments shown on drawing number WBC/118/SK1/RevE received on 11 July 2016 and 3189-RP-01 Rev G received on 2 December 2015 have been implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure that the boundary treatments are constructed in a timely manner following completion of the development. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Archaeological Watching Brief

14. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the Archaeological Watching Brief produced by Cotswold Archaeology and received on 22 February 2016.

Reason: To ensure that any significant archaeological remains that are found are adequately recorded. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies ADPP2, ADPP3 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

50. Appeal Decisions relating to Western Area Planning Committee

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

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 7.45 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature