

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, 13 MARCH 2019

Councillors Present: Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Paul Bryant (Vice-Chairman), Hilary Cole, James Cole, Adrian Edwards, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Anthony Pick and Garth Simpson

Also Present: Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Rachel Craggs (Principal Policy Officer (Equalities)), Gareth Dowding (Senior Engineer (Developers Scheme)) and Matthew Shepherd (Planning Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Billy Drummond and Councillor Virginia von Celsing

Councillor(s) Absent: Councillor Paul Hewer

PART I

41. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2019 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following:-

Page 11, paragraph 58: Councillor Jeff Beck noted that the requested informative regarding the use of traffic marshals had not been included in the conditions and Derek Carnegie agreed to check that this had occurred.

Page 6, paragraph 3: replace 'form' with 'from'.

Page 8, paragraph 29, last line: replace 'ion' with 'on'.

Page 9, paragraph 32: replace 'MRs' with 'Mrs'.

Page 9, paragraph 36: replace 'Here' with 'There'.

Page 11, paragraph 56: replace 'form' with 'from'.

Page 60, paragraph 60: replace 'uses' with 'using' and 'strong mandate' with 'strongly mandated'.

42. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Jeff Beck, Adrian Edwards and Anthony Pick declared in 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.

43. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) **Application No. and Parish: 18/03398/HOUSE - Kintbury**

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 18/03398/HOUSE in respect of a two storey and single storey extension at Winterley House, Kintbury.
2. Derek Carnegie introduced the report to members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was unacceptable and consequently officers recommended the Committee to refuse planning permission. Derek Carnegie further added that a decision was currently awaited from the Planning Inspector on the earlier planning application and this was due very shortly.
3. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr M McNally and Mr Ian Lasseter, applicant/agent, and Councillor Anthony Stansfeld, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.
4. Mr McNally and Mr Lasseter in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - They bought the house in 2008 because they had fallen in love with it, along with its setting and wanted to make it their family home for a long time.
 - At the time their three boys had been young children but they were now teenagers and consequently they needed more space, which was the reason for submitting the planning application.
 - The house was very pretty and dated back to the 1780s. It was an I-shape when they bought it and they had since squared it off with a new façade made of high quality materials, which gave the impression that this extension was part of the original house.
 - Therefore they wanted to retain the high quality build by using old bricks and they were also intending to replace the modern garage.
 - The house was extended twice during the Victorian era, delisted in the 1980s and squared off in 2010. Therefore it was not a symmetrical Georgian house and consequently a balanced judgement was required with regard to the harm this application would cause.
 - They considered that the extension was subservient to the existing dwelling.
 - There was no heritage imperative for the dwelling to be symmetrical.
 - The decision on the previous application was at appeal as stated by Derek Carnegie, but the decision was not expected for another three months, as they had only just received an acknowledgement from the Planning Inspector.
5. Councillor Hilary Cole asked why they had submitted this planning application when the earlier one was still awaiting the appeal decision. Mr Lasseter advised that as they had made some changes to the earlier application, they had hoped it would be acceptable to the Committee.
6. Councillor Anthony Pick enquired what evidence they possessed that showed the dwelling dated back to the 1780s. Mr McNally explained that they had been told this by the previous owners and it was also referenced in various documents, as well as on the heritage gateway site.
7. Councillor Pick further enquired whether a Heritage Impact Assessment had been undertaken and he was assured by Mr McNally that it had. Mr McNally added that the dwelling had originally been a small farmhouse, which had been extended in the

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

- eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which was evident from the chimneys on the north side of the building.
8. Councillor James Cole asked what percentage of the house was Georgian and was told that it was probably less than fifteen percent, with the rest being either Victorian or modern.
 9. Councillor Paul Bryant requested clarification as to which part of the house had comprised the I-shape when they had purchased it and Mr McNally pointed out on the plan that it had been the kitchen and dining room, with a single storey above the kitchen.
 10. Councillor Anthony Stansfeld in addressing the committee, as Ward Member, raised the following points:
 - No objections had been received from Kintbury Parish Council. However, the dwelling was actually situated in Inkpen and no objections had been received from Inkpen Parish Council either, which was unusual.
 - He had known the previous owners of the dwelling and considered that the house looked much better following the 2010 extension than it did previously.
 - There had been much discussion about the balance of the house and it was often the case with extensions that the roof sloped down on one side, which was often because applicants could not afford to extend both sides. He also believed that the need for subservient extensions often made the original dwelling look terrible.
 - This house was not visible from the road and might be seen from the woods.
 - He was not concerned about the Planning Inspector's decision and felt the Committee's decision was more important.
 - He felt it was extraordinary that planning permission had been granted for the extension to the large mansion in West Woodhay and in comparison the extension for this house was an improvement and he had no objections to it.
 11. The Committee had no questions for Councillor Stansfeld.
 12. Councillor Bryant enquired what the definition in planning legislation was for a non-designated heritage site. Derek Carnegie replied that Planning Officers had relied on the view of the Conservation Officer for both applications and she had outlined a number of concerns with them. As the dwelling was tucked away, it might appear that there would be no harm from approving the application, but planners had a duty to protect Areas of Natural Beauty (AONB) in their entirety. Consequently they would prefer to await the view of the Planning Inspector, who was an independent specialist and would evaluate the drawings before making a decision.
 13. Councillor Bryant noted that the non-subservience of the extension had been mentioned by officers and requested clarification on this. Derek Carnegie explained that the roof of the two storey extension should be half a metre lower than the original dwelling and it was only one brick lower, which they did not consider was sufficient. He added that this was why it would be beneficial to allow an independent expert to decide if it was acceptable.
 14. Councillor Pick asked if the requirement for appropriate materials to be used in the construction of the extension had been given sufficient weight in the officer's report. Derek Carnegie responded that in his view, the word of the applicant and the agent on this point were sufficient and the Council would also apply conditions to cover it.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

15. Councillor Hilary Cole noted that reference was made to Grade 3 listed buildings in the Council's Core Strategy and that officers would have adhered to this.
16. Councillor Jeff Beck asked why the lack of a response from the Archaeological Officer during the consultation period had not been followed up. Derek Carnegie said that the comments received on the first application had been sufficient, so it had not been necessary to do so and nor did they have the resources for this.
17. Councillor James Cole enquired whether the planning applications would have been approved if the building had not previously been Grade 3 listed. Derek Carnegie assured him that they would still have taken advice from officers who had the knowledge and experience in this area.
18. In considering the application, Councillor Garth Simpson noted that during the site visit, he had been in agreement with the Conservation Officer's view that the extension was large and disruptive. However, he had been impressed by the presentation given by Mr McNally and Mr Lasseter and he now considered that it was only the orangery and the office that were the disruptive elements of the proposed extension. Consequently, this extension was no different to the way the house had been extended over the centuries,
19. Councillor Pick agreed with Councillor Simpson's sentiments as it was evident that the dwelling had originally been a small Georgian cottage, which had changed over the centuries and his view was that the application should be considered on its merits.
20. Councillor Beck said that he did not object to the application and he proposed that planning permission was granted. This was seconded by Councillor Simpson.
21. Councillor Pick added that the choice of materials would be critical.
22. Councillor Hilary Cole opined with Councillor Simpson and noted that it was a classic example of a building being extended over the centuries and therefore, it was already compromised. She understood the applicant's need to accommodate a growing family but she felt they should have considered this when they purchased the property. In addition, as the earlier application was currently at appeal, she felt it would be foolish to approve it prior to receiving the Planning Inspector's decision and if the Committee was minded to do so, she considered it should be referred up to the District Planning Committee.
23. Councillor Bryant conjectured that the building was either listed or not listed and he could see the arguments on both sides. The western side of the building was the most attractive and uncompromised and well screened. However, he too was aware that the earlier planning application was awaiting the appeal decision and therefore he would not be supporting approval of this application. He therefore proposed that it was deferred until the Planning Inspector's decision had been received, as it might include useful information for the Committee to base its decision upon.
24. Councillor James Cole remarked that he had also been going to propose a deferment and he agreed that a growing family was not the right reason to extend a building. He was surprised the application had come before the Committee. With the current building only compromising 15% of the original building, he would be minded to approve it, but in the current circumstance, it made more sense to defer it.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

25. Councillor Dennis Benneyworth agreed with Councillor Hilary Cole. He had been impressed by the extension undertaken by the applicant in 2010 but he was swayed by the Conservation Officer's argument and felt it was wise to defer it.
26. Councillor Adrian Edwards added that he had been impressed with the building during the site visit and noted there were a considerable number of buildings in Newbury that were historic, and although not listed, should be preserved. He therefore considered that this building should be preserved and he agreed with the Conservation Officer that the proposed extension would materially harm the building.
27. Councillor Beck said that having heard the views of other Committee Members he wished to withdraw his earlier proposal and agreed that the decision on the application should be deferred but he asked for the redlines to be reviewed. Derek Carnegie assured him that they would be.
28. Councillor Hilary Cole seconded the proposal to defer the decision until after the Planning Inspector's decision was received.
29. The Chairman noted that the Constitution allowed for a previous proposal to be withdrawn and he invited the Committee to vote on the proposal made by Councillor Bryant and seconded by Councillor Hilary Cole to defer the application. At the vote, six Members voted in favour of the proposal, one Member voted against it and there was one abstention.

RESOLVED that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to defer the decision on the planning permission until the decision had been received from the Planning Inspector.

The Chairman suspended the meeting at 7.30pm.

(2) Application No. and Parish: 19/00019/HOUSE - Newbury Town Council

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 7.35pm.

(Councillors Jeff Beck, Adrian Edwards and Anthony Pick declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 4(2) by virtue of the fact that they were Members of Newbury Town Council and were present at the meeting when the application was discussed but said they would consider it afresh. As their interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter. Councillor Pick also stated that he had been lobbied on the application.)

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 19/00019/HOUSE in respect of a single storey extension and basement at 19 Battery End, Newbury.
2. Matthew Shepherd introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable and a conditional approval was justifiable. Consequently officers recommended the Committee to grant planning permission.
3. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Stephen Beck, objector, Mr Jack and Mrs Danielle Stacey, applicant, and Councillor Adrian Edwards, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.
4. Mr Stephen Beck in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

- He was one of a number of residents who had submitted objections to the application.
 - They had been surprised by the lack of consultation by the applicant with neighbours on the application.
 - The applicant had moved the eastern boundary fence that adjoined the track and installed a membrane without prior consultation and it was not possible to assume that the covenant allowed for this to occur. The track was privately owned and other residents also had rights of access. As a result there had been confusion at the recent site meeting as to where the boundary was situated.
 - The Deeds included a restrictive covenant that stated the front of the house should be set back no less than six feet from the footpath.
 - They wanted a dropped kerb to be installed in keeping with the rest of the street as this was also a safety issue.
 - They also wanted the boundary to be restored before the work commenced.
 - Parking would be accessed by driving across the shared track and they requested that the applicant provided a front and back access to the property instead.
 - They were pleased that conditions had been included on the storage of building materials and restrictions on the working hours. However, they would also like to see the inclusion of a deadline for completion of the building work, since the applicant would be undertaking the work himself.
5. Councillor Hilary Cole noted that Highways had commented on the dropped kerb in the report, but it was not something they could insist upon. She also questioned whether it was realistic to ask the applicant to restore the boundary prior to commencement of the work, as it would be more beneficial to do so after it had been completed.
 6. Mr Beck replied that the applicant had not undertaken any consultation with neighbours prior to the work and in his view the best way to move forward was to consult with them.
 7. Councillor Paul Bryant asked for clarification about the impact of the covenant and Mr Beck explained it stated that the house should be set back six feet from the track.
 8. Councillor Bryant observed that Mr Beck had raised a number of issues, however he asked if they were corrected, whether this would resolve the situation.
 9. Mr Beck responded that they were glad someone had moved into the house as it had been empty for some time, but they just wanted to be consulted on the changes and have their views taken into consideration. However, if conditions were included that would ensure the track was restored, a dropped kerb installed along with the other issues he had mentioned, many of their concerns would be addressed.
 10. The Chairman asked Derek Carnegie if he could explain the relationship between a covenant and planning. Derek Carnegie advised that as planning legislation was confined to ownership of land and the planning merits of a development, covenants were outside of the planning remit.
 11. Councillor Adrian Edwards asked Mr Beck when he had found out about the detail of the planned development. Mr Beck responded that this had been when the orange notice had been put up and he had spoken to the applicant when the work on the track started.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

12. Councillor Edwards further enquired whether the track had been damaged and Mr Beck replied that it had been a grassy area with bats, but these had now disappeared as several trees had been removed.
13. Councillor Anthony Pick asked who was responsible for the track and whether it was used for access. Mr Beck replied that it was used by dog walkers and as a cut through, however as its ownership was unknown, residents would on occasions cut back the brambles.
14. Mr and Mrs Stacey in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The application had been called to Committee because over ten objections had been received and it was unfortunate that the detail of the objections had not been included in the presentation, as a large number of them had either been fabricated or were irrelevant.
 - They had not discussed the application with all their neighbours but had spoken to those who would overlook the extension.
 - The dropped kerb had been mentioned but there was no requirement for one to be installed.
 - They had received a considerable number of positive comments from neighbours to the development and when concern was raised about the working hours, they had dealt with this immediately. However other objectors had not approached them to discuss their concerns and therefore, it was difficult to address them.
 - The development would be confined to within the red lines and the extension had been designed to avoid the need for a two storey extension, which would have made the dwelling look like a block of flats.
 - He questioned the conduct of some of the local Newbury Town Councillors who had asked family members from other parts of Newbury to submit objections to the application.
15. Councillor Beck asked if a condition was included setting a deadline for completion of the building works, what they would suggest. Mr Stacey advised that they were aiming to complete the work within 18 months but, as he would be undertaking the building work around his paid employment, he would not be able to commit to that timescale.
16. Derek Carnegie interjected that a completion deadline was not something that could be included within a planning condition.
17. Councillor Pick asked for an assurance that the border would be restored and Mr Stacey confirmed that the fence would be replaced when the extension had been completed, and it had only been removed because it was rotten.
18. Councillor Bryant wondered how the border would be restored and Mr Stacey replied that he was considering either planting cherry laurels or installing a short fence.
19. Councillor Edwards raised concerns about the removal of the soil following the excavation of the basement. Mr Stacey replied that the soil would be placed on the land in front of the orange notice to enable lorries to collect it from the highway, as they did not want lorries accessing their land or the track.
20. Councillor James Cole asked whether they currently parked on the track and Mr Stacey agreed that at times the rear of his van protruded slightly onto the track, but

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

this was because of the positioning of a tree, which would be resolved on completion of the extension.

21. Councillor Edwards noted the raised planted area on the plans and asked how it would be constructed. Mr Stacey advised that the plans had been superseded and the revised ones did not include any garden landscaping.
22. Councillor Edwards in addressing the Committee as Ward Member, raised the following points:
 - He knew the site well and had been pleased about the application as the dwelling had been unoccupied for five to six years and had deteriorated. However the fact the applicant had undertaken the work on the track was unhelpful.
 - He agreed that the plans for the extension were acceptable in design and size. However the basement was more contentious as the excavations were causing concern to neighbours. Consequently, if there had been earlier communication on the application, a number of the objections could have been resolved, which would have saved the application being brought before the Committee.
 - He suggested that a condition was included relating to the installation of a holding tank for the harvesting system.
 - He also suggested that the excavation of the soil was undertaken before building work started on the extension, to avoid any disruption along the track.
 - He agreed with the Archaeologist that there was no need for an archaeological investigation to be undertaken, but asked for any artefacts of interest to be passed over to the Council.
 - He noted that it would be helpful if part of the front hedge obscuring the entrance was removed.
23. Councillor Hilary Cole noted that she had concerns around the basement and its effect on the geology of the site, however the comments from the land drainage engineer were comforting. Nevertheless she enquired whether officers were confident that the building regulations were sufficiently robust to ensure it would be constructed appropriately. Matthew Shepherd assured her that the Council's Building Control officers had not raised any issues about the company undertaking the building control function.
24. Councillor Beck enquired whether it was possible to include a condition requiring the installation of a holding tank for the harvesting system, as suggested by Councillor Edwards. Matthew Shepherd replied that he was content the Building Control team would ensure the requirements were met.
25. Councillor Beck further enquired whether there was any protection that could be enforced to limit the term of the building work. Matthew Shepherd explained that whilst Environmental Health would be able to deal with any noise issues, planning practice guidance did not enable them to limit the term of the building work. Derek Carnegie added that in extreme circumstances it would be possible to serve a completion notice on the applicant requiring him to complete the work, but they would not recommend it for inclusion as a planning condition.
26. Councillor Pick asked where the parking plan was and was advised it was provided in the top left hand corner of the plans. Councillor Pick then drew attention to the comments made by the Sustainable Drainage Officer on page 32 of the report with regard to the Ordnance Survey mapping and expressed concern about unforeseen

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

problems coming to light during the construction. Matthew Shepherd assured him that it would be possible to include a condition covering this eventuality.

27. Councillor James Cole asked whether the Council would receive any feedback from the external company undertaking the building control function. Matthew Shepherd advised that the Council would receive a notice setting out the work that had been undertaken but they would not be provided with a report and any unforeseen events would be covered by building control insurance.
28. Councillor Dennis Benneyworth enquired whether it would be necessary to install a dropped kerb and Matthew Shepherd confirmed that it was not something the Council would insist upon, but the applicant was at liberty to implement it.
29. In considering the above application Councillor Bryant commented that he had no objections to the application in principle with regard to the design and the street scene. However the objections had been in relation to other aspects such as the dropped kerb, boundary treatment and disturbance of the peace and tranquillity of the neighbourhood, all of which could be overcome. Therefore he proposed that the Committee approved the planning permission.
30. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Hilary Cole who added that she thought it was a very acceptable scheme but it was unfortunate that the neighbours had not been consulted. The applicant did have access to the track and, as a result, it made sense not to extend the fence to the footpath. The track did appear to be overgrown and consequently she could not understand why neighbours were so concerned about it.
31. Councillor Pick said he also supported the application, however if any unforeseen problems arose, he hoped that Building Control officers would be able to respond quickly. Derek Carnegie advised that the building regulation legislation was precise and it was not a planning issue.
32. The Chairman invited the Committee to vote on Councillor Bryant's proposal to approve the planning permission, seconded by Councillor Hilary Cole and the motion was carried unanimously.

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).

2. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings

- Drawing title "Overall Plan" including block and location plan. Drawing number not present. Date received 31st January 2019.
- Drawing title "Floor Plans". Drawing number not present. Date received 30th January 2019.
- Drawing title "Elevations". Drawing number not present. Date received 30th January 2019.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

- Drawing title "Basement Plan". Drawing number not present. Date received 30th January 2019.

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

3. Schedule of materials (optional samples)

The development shall be carried out in matching materials as stipulated within the application form and supporting documentation with this application.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) AND Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

4. Landscaping

A detailed scheme of landscaping for the site is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, an implementation programme and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment.

The scheme shall ensure;

- a) Completion of the approved landscape scheme within the first planting season following completion of development.
- b) Any trees shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of this development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

5. Construction method statement

The development shall take place in accordance with the Construction Method Statement document submitted to the council on the 23rd February 2019. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details

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 (2019), Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

6. The Spoil shall be removed in accordance with the details submitted

All spoil arising from the development shall be used and/or disposed of in accordance with the details submitted to the Local Planning Authority on 18th February 2019 and 23rd February 2019.

Reason: To ensure appropriate disposal of spoil from the development and to ensure that ground levels are not raised in order to protect the character and amenity of the area. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

7. Boundary treatment

Prior to the use of the side extension and basement details including a plan, indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme. The approved boundary treatments shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: The boundary treatment is an essential element in the detailed design of this development and the application is not accompanied by sufficient details to enable the Local Planning Authority to give proper consideration to these matters. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

8. Hours of Deliveries

All deliveries shall be made outside of school drop off times to the site. No deliveries shall be made before 0930 and after 1445 during construction.

Reason: To safeguard the highway network from construction traffic congestion at peak times. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

9. HIGH12 - Parking/turning in accord with plans (YHA24)

The development shall not be brought into use until the vehicle parking and/or turning space have been surfaced, marked out and 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 (2019), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

10. Hours of work (construction)

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

8:00a.m. 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 applied in accordance with The National Planning Policy Framework (2019), CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and OVS5. And OVS6. Of the West Berkshire Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

Informatives:

HI 3 Damage to footways, cycleways and verges

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

HI 4 Damage to the carriageway

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 13 MARCH 2019 - MINUTES

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

44. 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 8.37 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature