

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, 13 JUNE 2018

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

Also Present: Paul Anstey (Head of Public Protection and Culture), Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)), Gareth Dowding (Senior Engineer), David Pearson (Development Control Team Leader) and Simon Till (Senior Planning Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Alan Law and Councillor Emma Webster

PART I

8. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23rd May 2018 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Item 3 Application no. 17/03411/OUTMAJ – page 42, third paragraph: Councillor Alan Macro reported that he had not abstained from voting and had voted in line with the proposal to refuse the application. Officers would check the detail on this point and if clarification could not be reached the comment should be removed. *(Post meeting comment: this could not be verified through checking the written version of the minutes and therefore the comment should be removed).*

9. Declarations of Interest

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

10. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. & Parish: 17/03489/FUL - Sabre House, Bath Road, Midgham, Reading

(Councillor Tony Linden joined the meeting a 6.35pm)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 17/03489/FUL in respect of the mixed use of the site for: vehicle sales and leasing (sui generis), vehicle preparation and washing (B1), and MOT and servicing (B2). Alteration to east elevation to remove roller shutter door and install glazing to provide for vehicle display, internal alterations to workshop layout, visitor reception and WC and replacement windows to office area. Variation to authorised operating hours (for

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

customers, workshop based operations, and lighting). Alternative scheme to the development approved under 16/03528/FUL.

Councillor Graham Pask asked members of the public if anyone intended to record the meeting. If this was the case then those making a representation had the right to refuse to be recorded. It was confirmed by Mr Steve Russell that he would be recording the meeting.

David Pearson introduced the report to Members of the Committee which was recommended for approval and ran through the key points. He highlighted that there was an amendment to Condition 21 set out within the update report. Mr Pearson also suggested that an amendment be made to condition 16 to state that the windows on the southern elevation of the workshop building should be 'top hung and obscured glazed windows'.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Anthony Fenn, Parish Council representative, Mr Steve Russell, objector, Mr P Felton, supporter and Mr Simon Joyce, agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr Anthony Fenn in addressing the Committee raised the following points (*Mr Fenn confirmed that he was happy to be recorded*):

- At its meeting on the 23rd January 2018, Midgham Parish Council recorded an objection to the application on the grounds that a vehicle showroom was not suitable for the location, which was rural and close to dwellings.
- The Parish Council strongly objected to any attempt to remove or change previously imposed conditions relating to operating hours, lighting, use of pressure washers and undertaking work outside the building. Conditions were put in place to protect those living near to a site and therefore all conditions should be upheld.
- The extra 15 hours of activity per week was excessive and would fail to protect the amenity of the area. Extended hours of lighting would impact upon the neighbouring dwellings and would cause a visual impact on the area.
- Pressure washers operated at about 85 to 100 decibels, which could damage hearing and would affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties.
- The Planning Officer's report had considered the impact from pressures washers to be low however, the Parish Council disagreed with this.
- Mr Fenn had visited the adjacent properties six times in the last year and on two of these occasions the workshop doors had been left open. The noise had been so loud, no other ambient noise could be heard. When the doors were closed ambient noise could be heard as well as the noise from the A4.
- Based on the reasons set out above the Parish Council was opposed to the application. If the Committee was minded to approve the application then the Parish Council pleaded that all existing conditions were retained.

Councillor Graham Bridgman asked Mr Fenn to clarify the extra 15 hours he had mentioned. Mr Fenn stated that this was the difference between the existing times and the proposed times for the site. Councillor Bridgman struggled to see where Mr Fenn had identified the extra 15 hours as he could only identify an additional 7.5 hours. Mr Fenn stated that an extra 2.5 hours was proposed each side of the day Monday to Friday and then there was an extra 5 hours proposed at the weekend. Councillor Bridgman stated that according the report, no additional hours were proposed for weekdays and he could only identify a proposed increase in hours on a Saturday from 1300 to 1800.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Mr Steven Russell in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Objections had been raised against the two applications requesting changes of use in autumn 2016 and summer 2017. Objections raised had included changes to the street scene; impact upon local residents, particularly those living at the four dwellings which were adjacent to the site; noise and smells generated by the site and increased traffic.
- Conditions had been put in place to protect residents and a strategy was now being applied by the applicant to weaken the conditions.
- Mr Russell presented two pieces of media to the Committee. The first piece was a video including sound taken from a back bedroom window. A banging noise could be heard as part of the video. Mr Russell stated that the banging noise could be heard from within the dwelling, The Barn, that the video had been recorded from.
- The second video was an audio recording of two of Mr Russell's neighbours standing next to his fence with equipment that he stated was a pressure washer. Talking could be heard prior to commencement of the operation of the equipment to give an idea of the sound levels. Mr Russell felt that noise was unacceptable when children were trying to get to sleep; working from home or studying.
- In particular Mr Russell asked that the condition be transposed from the previous planning permissions on the site that stipulated that no work should take place outside the building; no pressure washing to take place outside and no external lighting.
- Mr Russell added that a hedge had been removed from the front of the site by the applicant.
- Residents were against the industrialisation of Midgham and the impact this would have on people's lives.

Councillor Graham Pask recalled from the site visit that the main concern had been the east facing roller-shutter door. The new application involved the removal of this door. Mr Russell stated that the video he had shown had been taken whilst the door was open. When the door was shut there was a big improvement to the level of noise. Mr Russell stated that it was not just this that concerned residents. The introduction of a new showroom and lighting that would be visible from the bedrooms of his house would further exacerbate the impact on neighbouring dwellings.

Councillor Marigold Jaques referred back to the site plan and noted that the plans showed what seemed like a large distance between the dwellings and the boundary fence however photos shown indicated that this gap was much smaller. Mr Russell stated that Orchard Cottage, Wisteria Cottage, Old Acre House and The Barn were all dwellings that were very close to the site and conditions were required to protect them.

Councillor Bridgman asked Mr Russell to clarify where the recordings were taken. Mr Russell stated that the first recording had been taken by his neighbours who lived at The Barn and the second video had been taken at the fence that was adjacent to the site.

Councillor Richard Crumly noted that Mr Russell had referred to unpleasant smells and asked what the smells related to. Mr Russell stated that the business sold and repaired vans and therefore the smell generated was due to solvents used to spray the vans. This had now been restricted and the neighbours were grateful as there had been much improvement.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Councillor Crumly referred to Mr Russell's comment about the hedge being removed. Mr Russell stated that there had been a very mature hedge along the A4 side of the site, which was Council owned. This had been removed by the applicant.

Councillor Bridgman asked where the audio recording of the pressure washer had been taken and Mr Russell confirmed that the recording was taken on the other side of the fence and a pressure washer was operated within the vicinity that the recording was taken.

Councillor Bridgman further queried Mr Russell's reference to the hedge on the A4 side of the site and Mr Russell explained that this was a sensitive issue as the residents of Midgham considered the area to be part of the countryside and removal of the hedge had increased the industrial feel of the area.

Finally Councillor Bridgman asked if when taking the recording of the pressure washer, if the east side roller-shutter door had been open and Mr Russell confirmed that it had been.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the hedge in question did not form part of the application and therefore was not for consideration.

Councillor Keith Chopping asked Mr Russell to confirm the four areas where he wished conditions to be retained and Mr Russell confirmed that these were; no increase to working hours; no extension to the hours of lighting; no pressure washer usage and no extension to allow activity to take place outside of the building.

Mr Fenton in addressing the Committee raised the following points (*Mr Fenton confirmed that he was happy to be recorded*):

- He had worked for Anchor Vans for four years and it had been a tremendous experience. It was a family run company and although starting off small was continuing to grow.
- A business could not grow without teething pains or the odd mistake and it was a business's responsibility to rectify any issues.
- Anchor Vans employed 60 people in total and 500 vans were kept in rolling stock. Customers from all over the country used the business and they were increasingly asking for an increased service that included MOTs and maintenance.
- Mr Fenton gave varying examples of loyal customers who used services provided by Anchor Vans and explained that the business was made up of a variety of customers and employees. Employees included those who had left school with low qualifications to those with professional degrees. Ongoing secure employment was offered to those working for the company.
- Mr Fenton felt that opportunities to help the business grow should be utilised and in order to grow a company had to change.

Councillor Jaques referred to the number of employees mentioned (60) and asked if this referred to the site in question or the business as a whole, which consisted of three sites. Mr Fenton reported that there were 60 employees spread across the three sites operated by Anchor Vans and some were part time.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe asked what the purpose of the tent like structure was located next to the east side roller door. Mr Fenton confirmed that this was a temporary structure that had been used for storage whilst high quality flooring was laid down within the main building. The Chairman reminded Members of the Committee that they could only ask questions in relation to Mr Fenton's presentation. Councillor Tim Metcalfe stated that he

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

was trying to find out if the structure was permanent and if it could be used for pressure washing. The Chairman felt that this question would be better directed to applicant.

Councillor Bridgman asked if there was any notice on the site to keep the roller-shutter door closed. Mr Fenton confirmed that the door was currently kept shut however, he was not aware of any such notice. From a health and safety perspective Mr Fenton did not feel a notice enforcing that the door remained shut would be advisable as the air in the building might need changing on occasion.

Councillor Chopping noted that the business was growing and asked if it was possible that it had actually outgrown the site. Mr Fenton stated that in an ideal world the business would be on a custom-built site rather than an existing site and have plenty of room to grow. The business had originally operated out of a small shed. He did not feel that the business had finished expanding and in remaining where it was currently located was a benefit to the community. The proposed showroom would offer a much improved facility.

Mr Simon Joyce in addressing the Committee raised the following points (*Mr Joyce confirmed that he was happy to be recorded*):

- He gave apologies on behalf of his father Graham Joyce (applicant) who was unable to attend the meeting and that he would do his best to answer the Committee's questions.
- The planning application being considered did not include any major changes and were in line with the services provided by the business.
- The changes would help standardise the business and would bring the site and services up to the same quality and standard as the other two sites owned by Anchor Vans.
- He felt that some of the objections raised by Mr Russell were unfair. Expensive research had been conducted on the site in the way of sound reports and all the plans included within the application were in line with findings from these reports.
- A new roller-shutter door had been constructed on the north elevation of the building on the site to address concerns of local residents. Regarding the lighting concerns raised by Mr Fenn, he had failed to state that the site was located next to the A4 where LED street lighting had recently been installed. Mr Joyce commented that the light impact from the site would not be as great as this new street lighting.
- Regarding Mr Russell's pressure washer recording, Mr Joyce stated that this had not been a recording of a pressure washer being used by Anchor Vans on the site. The sound reports conducted had concluded that the noise generated by pressure washers on the site would not be harmful. No pressure washers were currently operated on the site.
- The temporary marquee structure referred to alongside the building on the site had been erected while the new flooring was being installed and would be removed shortly.
- In conclusion Mr Joyce asked Members to support the scheme of minor alterations applied for.

Councillor Alan Macro asked where it was anticipated the pressure washers would be situated. Mr Joyce apologised that he was not best placed to answer this question however, monitoring would be carried out from the location of the pressure washer.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Councillor Richard Crumly noted that Mr Fenton had said that MOTs were carried out on vehicles not in the ownership of Anchor Vans. Mr Joyce confirmed that Mr Fenton actually worked on one of the other sites, which was based at Padworth. Mr Fenton might visit the application site however was not based there. MOTs were carried out on the site in question on vehicles that were sold. MOTs were not proposed to be carried out on external vehicles from the Sabre House site.

Councillor Richard Crumly noted that MOTs were not carried out on Anchor Van's own vehicles. Mr Joyce confirmed that Mr Fenton actually worked on one of the other sites, which was based at Padworth. Mr Fenton might visit the application site however was not based there. MOTs were carried out on the site in question on vehicles that were sold. MOTs were not carried out on external vehicles.

Councillor Bridgman referred to plans and noted that there were a number of locations highlighted as suitable for a pressure washer. Mr Joyce responded that pressure washer systems were not particularly portable so a location was required where all vehicles could be pressure washed.

The Chairman drew attention to Condition 1 regarding the precise location of external pressure washing and Councillor Bridgman felt that an informative would need to be added to this if the application was approved.

Councillor Bridgman moved on to question the hours of operation. He queried why if the business only operated until 20:00 lighting was required on the site until 21:00. Mr Joyce stated that staff might be leaving the site up until 21:00.

Councillor Bridgman noted that the application was seeking to operate pressure washers from 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday however, on a Saturday this time increased from 08:00 to 20:00, which seemed strange. Mr Joyce was unable to explain the request for an increase in hours on Saturdays.

The Chairman drew attention to Condition 11 (operating hours restriction – external pressure washing), which differed to the information contained within the table as stated that hours to be 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and then 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe asked if the pump for the pressure washer could be located within the building. Mr Joyce stated that a static pump system was used however he was unsure if the pump could be placed in the building. He was aware that the sound reports had not identified any real noise issues and had concluded that pressure washers were acceptable for the site.

Councillor Chopping noted that it was proposed that the hours of external lighting on the site be increased from 16:00 on a Sunday until 21:00. Mr Joyce confirmed that most operations would cease at 16:00 on a Sunday and only external lighting would continue until 21:00.

Councillor Chopping asked for clarification on whether the pressure washer used for Mr Russell's recording had belonged to Anchor Vans and also asked what the banging noise had been. Mr Joyce confirmed that the pressure washer used had not belonged to the site and he was unaware of what had caused the banging noise. However, he believed it to be a one off event. There were over 20 vehicle technicians working on the site at a time and it was not possible to report the actions of each one. There was a very robust management policy in place to help ensure such events did not happen.

Councillor Pamela Bale noted that the proximity of the site to residents was obviously a problem and asked if the applicant had ever met with residents to try and remedy any concerns. Mr Joyce stated that originally meetings had been set up with residents however, the relationship had broken down very quickly.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Councillor Quentin Webb asked for clarification on whether Mr Joyce was happy with the timings set out in Condition 12 with regarding to timings for pressure washing on a Saturday being from 08:00 to 13:00 rather than until 20:00. Mr Joyce stated that he could not personally comment on this however, as far as he was aware Mr Joyce was not happy with the changes to conditions.

The Chairman asked if Members had any new questions for Officers. Councillor Chopping referred to condition 10 regarding the precise location of pressure washers. He understood the location would need to be approved by the Local Authority, but nothing specified what would be classed as a suitable location. It was felt that further precise wording was required for this condition. David Pearson stated that this was something Members were being asked to approve and trust Officers to implement in the appropriate manner. A location proposal would be provided to Environmental Health and then a noise assessment would be carried out. Councillor Chopping queried if the Parish Council should be involved in this decision and David Pearson stated that West Berkshire Council was the Local Planning Authority and therefore it should make the decision in liaison with Environmental Health.

Paul Anstey reported that he was not the Officer from Environmental Health that had conducted the assessment on the application, but the reason for Environmental Health being consulted on this application was to protect residents. The point of a 4142 assessment being carried out was that it assessed the likelihood of complaints. The area of the site considered to cause the least disturbance would be chosen and this would need to be agreed before work could commence.

Councillor Macro referred to comments from the Environmental Health Officer on page 57 and asked for an explanation of negative decibels. Paul Anstey explained that the context of the survey was about the assessment of noise and if complaints were likely. Different noises would be identified e.g. machinery and then it would be assessed on whether it would cause complaints and adversely impact upon amenity. He was unable to comment on the decibels in detail however was confident that all the information required was included within the report.

Councillor Metcalfe felt that the location of the pressure washer recorded by Mr Russell was not clear. Councillor Bridgman stated that he had questioned specifically where the pressure washer in Mr Russell's recording had been located and had been told it was on the other side of the fence in a neighbours garden.

Councillor Tony Linden noted that many comments had been made in relation to noise levels and queried how much weight should be given to this in planning terms. David Pearson stated that he had a lot of confidence in his colleagues in Environmental Health and that the evidence provided could be relied upon. There were many reasons not to give too much weight to the recordings presented by Mr Russell they were subjective rather than being verifiable as a true reflection of noise from the site.

Paul Anstey commented that a thorough assessment of noise had been conducted and surveys undertaken. Assessments anticipated what life would really be like for local residents if the application was approved and whether it would generate complaints. The evidence provided by Mr Russell had added to the debate however, could not be viewed as a true reflection of what noise generated would be like for those experiencing it. The Environmental Health Act enforced that the Local Authority had to assess planning applications that might entail a detrimental noise impact on residents. Measurements within the noise survey were based on the noise generated at other sites and provided estimates and a professional interpretation. Locations of noise sources could dramatically change how those living nearby experienced a noise and there was a condition included that ensured this could be tested in real terms in relation the pressure washing. If

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

complaints were generated then there would be a definitive location for Officers to refer to.

Councillor Bridgman asked if there was any indication on whether glazing would be single double or even triple glazing. David Pearson was not aware of stipulations regarding glazing.

Councillor Bridgman referred to previous applications where conditions had specified that the site was only suitable for noise generated by hand washing. He queried what had changed. David Pearson reported that a new noise survey had been assessed by Environmental Health. Paul Anstey reported that the information provided was based on an assessment of activity that would be conducted. He stated that if different information had been provided previously then a different conclusion would have been reached.

Regarding hours of operations Councillor Bridgman stated that Members were being asked to approve changes to timings. For example vehicle servicing, MOT, repairs and washing had been originally from 08:30 on a Saturday until 13:00 in the interest of amenity and Councillor Bridgman what had changed to justify this alteration. David Pearson stated that it was a new application and Members needed to be mindful of Government guidelines on what was considered reasonable.

Councillor Bridgman queried the extension of the hours of lighting as he felt they should be turned off outside the hours of operation. David Pearson referred to the proposed new showroom and stated that the facility would be used to showcase vehicles and this could be why extended lighting was being requested. Councillor Bridgman stated that he was referring to external lighting only. David Pearson commented that if Members had an issue with the extended hours of external lighting then they could look to vary this.

Councillor Alan Macro reported that he was not satisfied regarding the pressure washer issue. In his opinion it seemed like the survey was carried out in the most unlikely place. There were also numerous types of pressure washers. He understood that Officers would be determining the most acceptable place but he felt he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Bridgman concurred in that there were a large variety of pressure washers and a big difference between a household brand and the professional pressure washers proposed for the site. Councillor Bridgman however felt that with the appropriate informatives, restrictions on hours and the correct noise limits in place, with officer agreement the application could be acceptable.

Councillor Bridgman highlighted his main concerns as follows:

- He was concerned about the hours of operation and the extension to the hours of operation;
- He felt that vehicles works should be brought forward to 18:00 and external lighting should be in line with the approved operating hours of the site.
- Finally he was concerned that there was no reference to glazing and insisted that double glazing should be installed throughout the site.

David Pearson stated that conditions regarding the glazing could be applied. He then referred to the noise management plan mentioned by Paul Anstey and felt that the noise level could be clarified in the management plan.

Paul Anstey stated that in some circumstances a different approach had been used to standardise procedures whereby opinions from different parties had been obtained in order to agree requirements of a noise management plan. Standards were then set on what both parties agreed on.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Councillor Chopping felt that some of the expectations outlined by Mr Russel seemed unreasonable, including:

- No activities to take place outside;
- No use of pressure washers.

Councillor Chopping felt that pressure washers were a useful tool if operated correctly. However Councillor Chopping agreed with Councillor Bridgman regarding the increase to working hours and did not feel that this should be extended from 16:00 on a Sunday. He also felt that vehicle servicing should cease at 13:00 on a Saturday in the interest of the adjoining property. Councillor Chopping commented that he found the principle of the proposal acceptable.

Paul Anstey noted that the table on page 63 stated that pressure washing would continue until 20:00 on a Saturday however Condition 11 stated 13:00. David Pearson acknowledged that the errors with the table were confusing however, the conditions had been verified with the applicant who had accepted that pressure washing would only continue until 13:00 on a Saturday.

Councillor Quentin Webb stated that his question to Mr Joyce had been if he was happy with the 13:00 end time for pressure washing on a Saturday and as far as he was aware Mr Joyce had replied that he was not. David Pearson stated that as far as he was aware the applicant was happy with the conditions. The Chairman concurred that his interpretation had been that the applicant was happy with the conditions. David Pearson confirmed that condition 11 with an end time of 13:00 would be enforced if the application was approved.

Councillor Webb stated that he concurred with all the comments made by Councillor Bridgman. He was not happy about the additional five hours on a Saturday. If any operations were to take place on the site after 13:00 on a Saturday then it should be carried out inside the building. He did not want to see any increase in external operations particularly on a Sunday.

Councillor Bridgman proposed that Members approve the Officer recommendation to grant planning permission. However, he referred to Condition 12 (floodlighting and external lighting restriction) and suggested that the last sentence be removed and the following be added:

- The approved lighting shall only be in operation from 08:00 to 20:00 Monday to Saturday and from 08:00 to 16:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Sharon Armour suggested that other hours were also clarified particularly in relation to Saturdays.

Councillor Bridgman suggested that the Condition 8 (operating hours) be changed from the end time of 18:00 on a Saturday to 13:00.

Councillor Bridgman also suggested that an informative be added to ensure windows were at least double glazed.

David Pearson stated that he felt an additional condition was required to cover double glazing and also a noise management plan.

Councillor Chopping seconded the proposal by Councillor Bridgman and at the vote the motion was carried.

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

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. Approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documentation:

Plans:

- 14/052/02 Rev A - Location plan and visibility splays
- 17/033/02 - Proposed Floor Plans
- 17/033/04 - Proposed Elevations
- 16/784_005F - Proposed Site Layout Rev A (with the exception of the indicated 'cold water external pressure' washing areas which are not approved)

Documentation:

- Report 02434 - Sound Survey and Impact Assessment

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

3. Use of building

The use of the building on site hereby permitted shall be limited to vehicle washing, vehicle MOT and servicing, and ancillary office accommodation. Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any subsequent version thereof, the building shall not be used for any other purpose unless permission has been granted by the Local Planning Authority in respect of a planning application.

Reason: In order to prevent a change of use of the building that might result in disruption to the amenity of neighbouring occupants in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

4. Use of hard-standing

Other than details permitted under planning condition no.10 below relating to the precise location of external pressure washing of vehicles within the site, the hard-standing on the site shall be used only for the purposes of parking and turning, sui generis vehicle sales and B8 storage and distribution ancillary to the use of the site for vehicle sales. Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any subsequent version thereof, the hard-standing shall not be used for any other purpose unless permission has been granted by the Local Planning Authority in respect of a planning application.

Reason: In order to prevent a change of use of the hard-standing that might result in disruption to the amenity of neighbouring occupants or a detrimental impact on highway safety in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

5. No recovery trucks

The site shall not be used for purposes of vehicle recovery, and no recovery truck shall be kept on the site.

Reason: In order to prevent a use of the site that may have an undue and detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity, and in the interests of highway safety in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

6. Parking and turning

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until vehicle parking and turning areas have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing 'proposed site layout rev A - 16/784_005 F'. The parking and turning spaces shall thereafter be kept available for the parking and turning of private motor cars and light goods vehicles in accordance with the approved details at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which 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).

7. HGV transporter access

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved drawing 'proposed site layout rev A - 16/784_005 F' which details the approved HGV vehicle transporter entry path, unloading/reloading area, turning area and exit path parking and turning areas. The approved HGV entry path, unloading / reloading area, turning area and exit path parking and turning areas shall be kept available for the access, parking, turning and egress of the transporter in accordance with the approved details at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate delivery facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of deliveries taking place on the roadside which 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).

8. Operating hours restriction – servicing, etc

The use of the site for vehicle servicing, MOT, repairs and washing hereby permitted shall be restricted to the hours of 0800 to 1800 Monday to Friday, and 0830 to 1300 Saturday. No operations shall be undertaken at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of people living nearby in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007

9. Operating hours restriction – sales etc.

The use of the site for purposes of sales and the use of the ancillary office

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

accommodation hereby permitted shall be restricted to the hours of 0800 to 2000 Monday to Saturday, and 0800 to 1600 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of people living nearby in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

10. Precise location of external pressure washing

Notwithstanding the information provided on drawing no. 'proposed site layout rev A dated 19 Feb 2018', prior to any external pressure washing hereby permitted being undertaken in association with external vehicle cleaning (outside of the existing workshop building within the site), details of the precise location for such activity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external pressure washing shall thereafter be undertaken strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of people living nearby, and taking into account the supporting sound survey only assessed the external use of the power/pressure washer being undertaken in the north-western part of the site, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007

11. Operating hours restriction – external pressure washing.

The use of the site for external pressure washing hereby permitted shall be restricted to the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday, and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturday. No operations shall be undertaken at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of people living nearby in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

12. Floodlighting / external lighting restriction

No floodlighting or other form of external lighting scheme shall be installed on the site except in accordance with the lighting report registered by the Local Planning Authority on 22 April 2016 under application reference 16/01016/FUL.

The use of the permitted external lighting shall be restricted to between the hours of 08:00 to 20:00 Monday to Saturday, and 08:00 to 16:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in the interests of the amenities of people living nearby in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

13. Solvent-based products restriction

No use or storage of solvent-based products shall be carried out on the site.

Reason: To ensure that neighbouring properties are not unreasonably affected by odours in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

14. Amplified sound restriction

No sound reproduction or amplification equipment (including public address systems, tannoys, loudspeakers, etc) which is audible outside the site boundary shall be installed or operated within the site.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring occupants in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

15. Ancillary servicing of vehicles only

The use of the building on the site for the carrying out of vehicle MOT, servicing, repair and washing and valeting hereby permitted shall be restricted to the carrying out of MOT, servicing, repairs and washing and valeting to vehicles in the ownership of the business operating from the site. The site shall not be used for purposes of carrying out vehicle servicing, repairs, washing and valeting on any other vehicles.

Reason: In order to prevent an intensification of these uses that would result in a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity and highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the NPPF, Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Core Strategy (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

16. Obscure glazed windows

The windows on the southern elevation of the workshop building shall remain obscure glazed and of a top-hung design in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to prevent an increase in the overlooking of neighbouring properties associated with the intensification of the use of the building for the uses hereby approved. This condition is imposed in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

17. No additional openings on southern boundary under permitted development

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development Order) (England) 2015 or any subsequent version thereof, no additional windows or openings shall be inserted in the southern elevation of the workshop building other than those hereby granted planning permission under this application without permission first being granted in respect of a planning application made for such development.

Reason: In order to prevent an increase in the overlooking of neighbouring properties associated with the intensification of the use of the building for the uses hereby approved. This condition is imposed in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

18. No change of use under permitted development

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Development Order) (England) 2015 or any subsequent version thereof, the site shall not be used for any purpose other than those hereby granted planning permission under this application without permission first being granted in respect of a planning application made for this purpose.

Reason: In order to prevent a change of use that would result in a detrimental impact on neighbouring residential occupants, highway safety or harm to visual amenity in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF, Policies CS13, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

19. Delivering management plan

The use hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Delivery Management Plan set out drawing 'proposed site layout rev A - 16/784_005 F'. The approved Delivery Management Plan shall be adhered to at all times.

Reason: To provide safe and suitable access for all and reduce the potential impact on the public highway 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).

20. Front boundary fence

A two metre high fence shall be maintained along the northern boundary of the site between the access to the north east and the boundary with Orchard Cottage to the north-west as shown on approved drawing numbers 16 784 005 Revision F and 16 784 012 (approved by application reference 16/03402/COND1 on 27 April 2017).

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in order to ensure that views across the hardstanding used for vehicle sales, parking and ancillary B8 storage of vehicles do not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding rural area in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

21. Activities restricted to inside the building

Other than details permitted under planning condition no.10 above relating to the location of external pressure washing of vehicles within the site, all MOT testing, vehicle servicing, repair, refurbishment and valeting on the site shall only be undertaken inside the building on the site when all openings to the eastern, western and southern elevations to the workshop building including the roller/sliding doors and windows are shut.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of people living nearby in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007

22. Window glazing details

The MOT use hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the glazing to be used in the approved new windows and glazed areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The windows shall be double glazed (or of similar acoustic specification). The MOT use hereby

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

permitted shall not commence until the windows and glazing have been installed accordance with the approved details and the glazing of the approved design shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the workshop building is provided with a satisfactory level of sound proofing to prevent undue levels of noise and disturbance to the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF which considers amenity of existing and future occupants of land and buildings, and the requirement in Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) to secure a high quality and sustainable design that preserves and enhances the quality of life in West Berkshire, and Policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007

23. Noise Management Plan

The vehicle servicing, repair, MOT and external pressure washing uses permitted under this planning permission shall not commence until a Noise Management Plan for the application site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Noise Management Plan shall include measures to ensure compliance with the planning conditions that form part of this planning permission and measures to ensure all existing and new equipment/machinery within the site is operated in accordance with the planning conditions that form part of this planning permission (e.g. periodic staff training, guidance for new employee's, posters/notices erected within the workshop building/site setting out, how, where and for what duration permitted activities can be undertaken within the site).

The uses permitted under this planning permission shall operate in accordance with the provisions of the approved noise management plan.

Reason: To ensure the on-going management of noise from the permitted activities within the site do not result in undue levels of noise and disturbance to the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF which considers amenity of existing and future occupants of land and buildings, and the requirement in Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) to secure a high quality and sustainable design that preserves and enhances the quality of life in West Berkshire, and Policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007

INFORMATIVES

Proactive actions of the LPA

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 secured and accepted what is considered to be a development which is acceptable in terms of the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

11. **Application No. & Parish: 18/00386/HOUSE - Norton Cottage, Tutts Clump, Reading**

(Councillor Marigold Jaques declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that she had once lived in the area and had known some of the residents. As her interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

(Councillor Graham Pask declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that his children had played at one of the properties on the list many years ago. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 18/00386/HOUSE in respect of the demolition of existing detached garage and construction of ground and first floor side extension, rear single storey extension.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mrs Janetta Kennedy and Mr Roderick Grafton, objectors and Ms Waveney Thomson, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Simon Till introduced the report to Members, which was recommended for approval and ran through the key points. He drew attention to an amendment to Condition 2 on the update sheet.

Mrs Kennedy and Mr Grafton in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mrs Kennedy introduced her husband Dick Kennedy. Their objection was to the rear single storey extension proposed.
- They had welcomed the new owners to Norton Cottage after the death of the previous owner. The property had been left to become derelict.
- Mrs Kennedy and her husband had lived at Rose Cottage for over 40 years. The cottages had originally been erected to house farm workers.
- When they had bought the middle cottage, it had already had a second storey extension for the bathroom. They had then joined two single storey extensions together to increase the kitchen size. Next they had built a second storey extension above the bathroom in order of moving the bathroom upstairs. Later on they had removed the flat roof.
- Mrs Kennedy reported that apart from the porch area they had not increased the footprint to the front of the property.
- Mrs Kennedy was against the single storey rear extension because there would always be the fear that it could be developed into a second storey extension in the future, which would infringe greatly on her property.
- Mr Roderick lived at number one Mead Cottage. He felt that the proposal would cause overdevelopment of the site as the plot was only designed for three small dwellings.
- The porch of the proposed extension would be 70% closer to the boundary.
- The two storey extension would intrude on the privacy of his home, which would be very close to one of his children's bedrooms. He had noted that obscured glass could be used in the side elevation and he stressed that this should be enforced if the application was approved.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

- He did not accept the conclusions of the officer's report and felt that the extension would cause a loss of light to his property.

Councillor Richard Crumly noted that the flat roof could only just be seen from Mrs Kennedy's property and the extension itself was only just visible. Mrs Kennedy was concerned about privacy. The extension rose a foot above the hedge at present and she was mainly concerned that the extension could become a two storey extension future.

Councillor Keith Chopping noted that Mr Grafton had stated that the extension would be directly opposite his child's bedroom. Councillor Chopping noted that there were already three windows that faced Mr Grafton's property and this would change to two windows and a bathroom window if the proposal was approved. Mr Grafton stated that he could only recall two windows presently. Mr Grafton stated that if the proposal was approved he would like to see obscured glass imposed.

Ms Waveney Thompson in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- She was the applicant and owner of Norton Cottage.
- She had worked very closely with Planning Officers to ensure any issues were resolved and to reach the plan that was in front of Members that evening.
- Regarding parking, by removing the existing garage and setting the side extension back, it had opened the property up and allowed parking for two vehicles.
- A pitched roof had been chosen to accord with the street scene and define the extension from the existing property.
- The rear extension had been reduced but would still allow the bathroom to be moved to the first floor.
- There had been a double pitched roof to replicate that of Rose Cottage but this had needed to be removed and replaced with a flat roof due to cost.
- The window subject of Mr Grafton's concerns would be 2.5 metres closer to his child's bedroom and obscured glass was being proposed.
- Design had needed to be particularly sympathetic due to the property being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- Ms Waveney Thompson requested that the Committee support her application and approve the recommendation.

Councillor Graham Bridgman referred to the obscured glass. He noted that one of the two windows already had obscured glass and asked if the intention was for both windows to be obscured. Ms Waveney Thompson confirmed that there would be one bedroom window and one bathroom window and both would have obscured glass.

Councillor Crumly queried the layout of the property and it was confirmed by Ms Waveney Thompson that there were three bedroom upstairs and then a bathroom downstairs. It was confirmed that the plans for the site had been scaled back.

Councillor Marigold Jaques asked if the property currently had any heating and if not whether gas or oil would be installed. Ms Waveney Thompson confirmed that there was no heating in the property and the plan was to have oil central heating installed. Councillor Jaques further queried where the oil tank would be located and Ms Waveney Thompson stated that she was happy to locate the tank in line with building regulations.

Councillor Metcalfe noted that the window to the right would be obscured. Ms Waveney Thompson confirmed that the window to the right was a bedroom and stated that if she was going to have to obscure it then she was tempted to have it removed.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Councillor Quentin Webb as Ward Member stated that in his opinion by increasing the size of the property it was allowing for modern day living. He did not feel it would have a negative impact on the street scene. The applicant had worked closely with the Planning Officer to fulfil the requirements of design policy. He did not think that the properties to the sides of the dwelling would be negatively impacted upon. In his opinion, with the amendments that had been discussed, he felt that he would be minded to support the application.

Councillor Graham Bridgman referred to Permitted Development Rights. He was concerned about subsequent owners and queried what could and could not be carried out without a planning application.

Simon Till confirmed that because the property was within the AONB permitted development rights would be quite limited. Any two storey proposal would require planning permission. Permitted development rights for any windows in the side elevation at first floor or above would also require those windows to be obscure glazed.

Councillor Bridgman asked what the applicant or future applicant could do without planning permission if the application was granted. Councillor Webb felt that the conditions already covered this. Councillor Bridgman stated that only the side elevation first floor windows were covered.

Councillor Bridgman asked if Permitted Development Rights could be removed within reason to allay fears of further development without planning permission.

David Pearson confirmed that it seemed reasonable for any extension above single storey to require planning permission and removal of Permitted Development Rights for extensions.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe referred to the obscured glass and felt that this was an unusual requirement for a bedroom window. David Pearson stated that it was unusual however, the applicant was satisfied.

The Chairman asked if the applicant would have to seek planning permission to remove the window at first floor level in the side elevation and David Pearson stated that removal of the window would be unlikely to require a new planning application as it was not likely to materially impact on amenity.

Councillor Chopping stated that he had a number of issues. He felt that obscured glass in a bedroom window was unfair on the applicant as the window had only moved about two metres from its existing location. Regarding Mrs Kennedy's point about the boundary wall, Councillor Chopping felt that this could be overcome through the planting of greenery.

Councillor Chopping could not see any major issue with the application and felt it was an imaginative scheme and therefore proposed that the application be granted planning permission. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Linden.

Councillor Bridgman agreed with the proposal however was minded to include a condition removing Permitted Development Rights for 2 storey extensions. David Pearson stated that Permitted Development Rights could be removed on any proposals that were over two storey. Councillor Chopping felt that anything 2 storey level should require planning permission so a condition restricting permitted development rights should be applied.

The Chairman invited Members to vote on the proposal by Councillor Chopping, seconded by Councillor Linden and at the vote the motion was carried.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

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

- Conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004); to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. Standard approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings; Location Plan received on 23 January 2018, Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Elevations received on 6th June 2018.

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

3. Materials to match

The materials to be used in the development shall match those on the existing development to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, and those materials shall remain at all times thereafter as the unaltered external finish to the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure that the materials are appropriate to the existing development, the site and its surroundings. This condition is imposed to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

4. Hours of work (construction)

No demolition or construction works shall take place outside the following hours:

- 8:00am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays;
- 8:30am to 1:00pm Saturdays;
- nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

5. Windows PD removal

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no windows/dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) which would otherwise be permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B or C of that Order shall be constructed at first floor level on the north elevation without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority in respect of an application made for that purpose.

Reason: In the interests of the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 04/2 House Extensions (July 2004).

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

6. **Obscure glazing before use**

The windows at first floor level in the north side elevation shall be fitted with obscure glass and top hung opening only before the extension hereby permitted is first brought into use. The obscure glazing shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties and to prevent the overlooking of 1 Mead Cottages in the interests of neighbouring amenity. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 04/2 House Extensions (July 2004).

7. **Surfacing of access (YHA15)**

No development shall take place until details of the surfacing arrangements for the vehicular access to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall ensure that bonded material is used across the entire width of the access for a distance of 1 metre measured back from the carriageway edge. Thereafter the surfacing arrangements shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid migration of loose material onto the highway in the interest of road safety. 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).

8. **Parking in accord with plans (YHA24)**

The development shall not be brought into use until the vehicle parking has been surfaced, and provided in accordance with the approved plan. The parking shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (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).

9. **PD restriction – extensions**

Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any subsequent revision to or version thereof no additions or extensions shall be constructed to the side or rear elevation of the dwelling on the site, known as Norton Cottage, unless planning permission has been granted in respect of a planning application made for such a purpose.

Reason: The dwelling is semi detached and lies in a narrow, constrained plot in close proximity to neighbouring properties and this condition is necessary in order to prevent the overdevelopment of the site and an accumulation of extensions that might otherwise result in a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity and visual amenity in the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policy C6 of the West Berkshire

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 JUNE 2018 - MINUTES

Housing Site Allocations DPD (2006-2026) 2017.

Informatives:

1 Approval - Need for revision - representations received

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.

2 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 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 Consent to enter adjoining land

You must obtain the prior consent of the owner and occupier of any land upon which it is necessary for you to enter in order construct, externally finish, decorate, or in any other way carry out any works in connection with this development, or to obtain any support from adjoining property. This permission granted by the Council in no way authorises you to take such action without first obtaining this consent.

12. Appeal Decisions relating to Eastern Area Planning

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

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 8.45pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature