

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, 9 DECEMBER 2020

Councillors Present: Jeremy Cottam, Alan Law (Chairman), Tony Linden, Royce Longton, Ross Mackinnon, Alan Macro (Vice-Chairman), Geoff Mayes, Graham Pask and Joanne Stewart

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)), Stephen Chard (Principal Policy Officer), Gareth Dowding (Principal Engineer), Bob Dray (Development Control Team Leader) and Sarah Melton (Senior Planning Officer)

PART I

30. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2020 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Item 28 – 20/00674/FUL – land to the south east of Mortimer Station, Station Road, Mortimer (third paragraph of debate):

Councillor Macro stated that his ward had been mentioned during discussions. Other potential sites for Theale Primary School had been ruled out due to the impact on the countryside. Regarding Theale Station, a bid had been submitted to improve the station including increasing the size of the car park and had been granted conditional **funding approval by the Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership.**

31. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Alan Law explained that he had asked Councillor Alan Macro, as Vice-Chairman, to Chair Agenda Item 4(1). This was not a declaration of interest and Councillor Law had not pre-determined the item, but he did have a different interpretation of some aspects of the officer's report that he wished to comment on and did not feel it would be appropriate to do so from the Chair.

All Members of the Committee 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.

32. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. & Parish: 20/00723/FULD - land to the rear of Timberley, Pangbourne Road, Upper Basildon

(Councillor Alan Law explained that he had asked Councillor Alan Macro, as Vice-Chairman, to Chair Agenda Item 4(1). This was not a declaration of interest and Councillor Law had not pre-determined the item, but he did have a different interpretation of some aspects of the officer's report that he wished to comment on and did not feel it would be appropriate to do so from the Chair.)

(Councillor Alan Macro in the Chair).

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 20/00723/FULD in respect of an application for a new dwelling and relocated access.

Removal of Speaking Rights

As resolved at the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 29 April 2020, public speaking rights were removed for virtual Council meetings. This right was replaced with the ability to make written submissions. This decision was made in accordance with The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panels Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

The above changes to speaking rights were subsequently amended at the Council meeting on 10 September 2020. It was agreed that parties making written submissions in relation to a planning application would be invited to attend the Remote Meeting of the Planning Committee to answer any questions that Members of the Committee might wish to ask in order to seek clarification on any part of their statement.

In accordance with the Extraordinary Council resolution, written submissions relating to this application were received from Mr Ian Parsons, Parish Council representative, and from Mr Graham Starkins, Mr William Howard and Mrs Camille Howard, objectors.

Parish Council Representation

The written submission of Basildon Parish Council was read out by the Clerk to the Committee as follows:

- The Parish Council had objected to the building of a house at the rear of Timberley on each occasion that the application had been made. The location of the proposal, the garden site, was the central reason for these objections. Pangbourne Road did have some housing behind the main pattern of housing parallel with the road but these buildings had minimal impact upon immediate neighbours, unlike this proposal which would overlook a number of houses in the vicinity, and would change the character of this part of the village.
- There were many grounds for objection to this proposal outlined by a very wide range of residents in their individual submissions. The Parish Council was particularly concerned about the following.
 1. There would be an increase in cars using the relatively small access point onto Pangbourne Road.
 2. The rear of the proposed construction consisted of a series of paddocks and a wood: the proposed construction would intrude upon the natural landscape.
 3. There was a continuing concern that the site would cross the settlement boundary.
 4. Building in the back garden of properties had been opposed consistently by the Parish Council and by residents. One of the remarkable features of this application was how little space was available for building, and parking, and how cramped the site would be if approval was granted.
 5. Access to the proposed building between Southcroft and Timberley was very narrow. Should the application be passed it might well establish a pattern for more 'infill' applications in this area as well as the possibility of further encroachment into the settlement boundary.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

6. At least four neighbouring properties would be immediately affected both in terms of loss of privacy and in the direct impact upon the rear of these properties.
7. The proposal was out of character with the general pattern of building and plots in the immediate area.
8. Application 20/00723 was not significantly different from the previous applications, all of which had been refused by the Planning Committee.

Member Questions of the Parish Council

(Mr Parsons was in attendance to answer questions from the Committee)

Councillor Graham Pask queried the concerns raised of potential encroachment beyond the settlement boundary when the Planning Officer had confirmed that the site fell within the boundary. Mr Parsons acknowledged that the plans showed this proposal as being within the settlement boundary. However, the concern was that the proposal abutted the site boundary and the owner of Timberley also owned land to the rear of the site. Therefore, there was concern of informal extensions to the rear of the application site that could encroach upon the rear boundary.

Objectors Representation

The written summarised submission of the objectors was read out by the Clerk to the Committee as follows:

- There was disagreement with the findings of the Committee report, the dwelling Elangani was not comparable to the proposal scheme as it was in a significantly larger plot with a private access, and the development at Knapps Wood was not comparable as it was a substantially larger plot with its own access to the cul-de-sac.
- The proposed scheme was for a substantial dwelling squeezed to the rear of the host dwelling with no private access. The location plan showed how unusual, cramped and at odds with the neighbouring properties the proposed development would be. By allowing this application, the Council would set a precedent for dwellings to be built in any private, rear garden along the Pangbourne Road. Was this a precedent the Council wished to set?
- Two previous applications had been refused and dismissed at appeal. As stated by the Inspector in the 2017 appeal, 'development at this location would have an unacceptable urbanisation effect' and this would have an 'adverse effect on landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB'. This had not been mitigated by this latest application.
- Paragraph 6.16 of the Committee report stated that the proposed application would have a reduced impact on the local environment because the proposed design had a lower mass than the previous application. However, paragraph 1.8 showed the proposed dimensions of the design had increased rather than decreased. The previous application had a maximum height of 6.8m and a footprint of 83.8sq.m. This application had both a greater maximum height of 7.3m and a larger footprint of 99.5sq. m. This meant the adverse impact on the landscape, character and scenic beauty of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NWDAONB) was greater than the previous application.
- Many of the photographs submitted were inaccurately labelled. They had been taken from the adjoining open countryside; land that lay outside of the settlement

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

boundary, and did not form part of the planning application. This made the site appear much larger than it was. For example, the photographs labelled 'existing structure on site' contained a structure that lay outside of the planning application site and the photograph labelled 'within the site looking west' was taken from a position approximately 10m outside the site and the village settlement boundary.

- Approving this application would result in the overdevelopment of a cramped site, with no private access, which would ruin the landscape, character and scenic beauty of the NWDAONB. Building a four-bedroom house in the back garden of Timberley's modest plot was totally opposed to the rural nature of the surrounding area. To repeat the appeal Inspectors words, 'development at this location would have an unacceptable urbanisation effect'. The slight amendments to this latest scheme had not changed this.
- There were concerns raised regarding the grubbing up of a mature orchard providing various wildlife habitats just before the very first planning application was submitted where in that application the space the orchard had occupied until a week or so before was what was considered disingenuously described as "garden".
- Attention should be paid to the Basildon Village Design Statement.

Ward Member Representation

Councillor Alan Law in addressing the Committee as Ward Member made the following points:

- He pointed out, from the planning history, that two previous applications to build a house in the rear garden had been refused. Both of these decisions had been upheld at appeal.
- Both Planning Inspectors had commented on the importance of the setting and character of the site in the AONB and within the local landscape. The Officer's report did state that the design of the two previous refusals had been criticised. However, the Officer view was that the changes made for this application were enough to address this criticism. In relation to this point, Councillor Law advised that the height of the proposed dwelling was unchanged from the previously refused scheme and the footprint was slightly larger. There was a reduction in bulk as the dwelling had been reduced to 1.5 storeys, but he questioned whether this still constituted overdevelopment.
- Councillor Law did not feel that the report addressed the Planning Inspector comments in relation to the impact on the setting and character of the AONB and the local landscape. He made specific reference to comments made in the Planning Inspectorate appeal decision. The decision commented on the need for an application in this area to have an acceptable relationship to the adjoining open countryside and landscape setting. In the Inspector's view, the previous proposal would result in a more built up and enclosed appearance to the appeal site and its environment. The decision stated that the application considered at appeal 'would fail to protect the setting of the AONB and therefore its special landscape character and scenic beauty, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)'. Councillor Law therefore queried whether the design had changed enough to reduce the impact on the AONB and the local landscape.
- Councillor Law had further questions in relation to the access to the paddock at the rear of the property. Who owned the access and how would it be utilised?

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Member Questions of the Ward Member

Councillor Pask queried the dimensions of the proposal. The written submission of the objectors stated that while a comparison had been made with the dimensions of the first refused application, the same had not been provided for the second refused application. The objector stated that the maximum height had increased from 6.8m to 7.3m and the footprint showed an increase from 83.8sq.m to 99.5sq.m. He queried the accuracy of these figures alongside noting Councillor Law's comments on this point.

Councillor Law advised that he took his view, i.e. that the height was unchanged and that the footprint was slightly larger, from the officer's report as the measurements were not made clear on the plans.

Questions to Officers

Councillor Pask queried if a comparison could be made between the dimensions of the second refused application and this proposed scheme. Sarah Melton, Senior Planning Officer, referred Members back to the plans in her presentation which gave the dimensions of both of the refused applications.

Debate

Councillor Pask referred to the location plan on page 65 of the agenda pack. This showed in outline the site layout and size of Timberley and its neighbours, and also that of the Knappswood Close dwellings. It had been suggested that the Knappswood Close properties had undergone back garden development, but these were located within deeper plots than those of Timberley. Councillor Pask felt that the location of the Timberley property and its immediate neighbours had its own unique character.

Councillor Pask had given very careful consideration to the two appeal decisions relating to this site and he drew attention to a point made in the 2018 appeal decision that 'the adverse effect on landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB carries with it great weight. This would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited benefits that have been identified.'

Councillor Pask added that he recalled the location from past site visits and he felt that if approval was given then this new dwelling would be squeezed in. He acknowledged that minimum distance requirements between properties might be achieved, but this was within the AONB. He was not supportive of the officer recommendation for approval.

Councillor Jeremy Cottam commented that the current view from the AONB was of the rear of Timberley and neighbouring properties. The Knappswood Close properties were closer in that respect. Councillor Cottam felt that the Knappswood Close dwellings had set a precedent. He did not therefore feel that the application could be refused based on the impact to the AONB.

He added that the reduced bulk from previous applications was an improvement and additional car journeys created by the development would not be significant.

Councillor Cottam was of the view that the applicant had done just enough on balance to overcome the concerns raised by the proposal.

Councillor Jo Stewart noted that the parking area of Timberley and that of its immediate neighbours were at the front of the properties. This proposal would change that as traffic would need to pass Timberley and the dwelling to its left. Cars to the proposed dwelling would therefore need to travel past neighbouring gardens. Councillor Stewart was concerned therefore at the impact on existing residents as there would be a negative impact on their peaceful garden space.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Councillor Stewart did not feel that a precedent had been set as none of the neighbouring properties were accessed via rear gardens.

Councillor Stewart concluded her comments by giving her view that this was overdevelopment on a relatively small piece of land.

Councillor Law referred back to the point made by Councillor Cottam that, on balance, the application could not be refused due to the impact on the AONB. Councillor Law stated that this had not been the view of two Planning Inspectors who considered earlier applications at appeal. They both felt that the application would negatively impact the AONB. The Planning Officer view was that this proposal was slightly smaller and therefore had less of an impact, but he reiterated that this application was almost identical in terms of height and had a slightly larger footprint.

On comparisons to Knappswood Close, Councillor Law clarified that the second row of houses shown on the plan were not back garden developments, instead a large field had been built out into a cul-de-sac.

Councillor Law also stated that if permission was granted, then Timberley and the new property would be the only properties that shared an access. It would therefore not be in keeping with the rest of the street scene.

Councillor Pask proposed refusal of the application, contrary to the Officer recommendation, on the basis that the application would have an adverse impact on the landscape character and scenic beauty of this part of the AONB. The proposal constituted overdevelopment, it was therefore out of character and out of keeping with the immediate neighbouring properties. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Stewart.

Bob Dray, Development Control Team Leader, clarified the reasons for refusal prior to the vote.

RESOLVED that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The application site is located within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), wherein great weight is given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty. The dwellings sited along this section of Pangbourne Road are set within long, narrow, rectangular gardens which create a sense of spaciousness within the rear gardens. The dwellings generally follow an established building line with properties fronting onto the highway. The generous plot to dwelling ratio, nature of the properties and their position within the site, which are set back from the highway, contributes towards an open spacious character. Whilst there are examples of backland development in the wider area, the immediate vicinity features gardens of smaller depth. Two previous appeals have been dismissed in light of objections to design and impact on the AONB. Owing to the size and scale of the proposed building, the ratio with its uncharacteristically small plot, and the uncharacteristic access and parking arrangements, the proposed development would result a cramped form of overdevelopment which fails to respect the established residential character and rural spatial characteristics of the locality. The proposed development would have an adverse visual impact and detract from the setting of village with the adjoining open countryside.

As such, the application conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Policies C1 and C3 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD 2006-2026, the Council's adopted Quality Design SPD (Part 2), the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-24, the North Wessex Downs Position Statement on Housing, and the Basildon Village Design Statement.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Informatives

1 In attempting to determine the application in a way that can foster the delivery of sustainable development, the local planning authority has approached this decision in a positive way having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to try to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application the local planning authority has attempted to work proactively with the applicant to find a solution to the problems with the development, however; an acceptable solution to improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area could not be found.

2 This application has been considered by West Berkshire Council, and REFUSED. Should the application be granted on appeal there will be a liability to pay Community Infrastructure Levy to West Berkshire Council on commencement of the development. This charge would be levied in accordance with the West Berkshire Council CIL Charging Schedule and Section 211 of the Planning Act 2008.

(2) Application No. & Parish: 20/01637/FUL - land adjacent to 10 The Street, Englefield

(Councillor Alan Law resumed in the Chair)

(All Members of the Committee declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that Richard Benyon, Chairman of Englefield Estate and former MP, was known to them. 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 Alan Macro declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that his children had attended Englefield Primary School and one of the supporters was an acquaintance of his. 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.)

(Councillor Ross Mackinnon declared that he was the Ward Member for the item and had called it in however, had not pre-determined the application and would consider it with an open mind.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 20/01637/FUL in respect of the change of use of land from agricultural use to a car park.

Ms Sarah Melton, Senior Planning Officer, gave a detailed presentation on the application and highlighted the key points, including:

- The site was within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and was adjacent to a listed building.
- The main issues for consideration were whether the proposed scheme would have an acceptable impact on the protected landscape and designated heritage asset and whether it was justified and appropriate limited development.
- The application was recommended for refusal for five reasons: inappropriate development for location; harm to Englefield conservation area; harm to the setting of a listed building; landscape and visual impacts within the AONB and loss of green infrastructure.

Removal of Speaking Rights

As resolved at the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 29 April 2020, public speaking rights were removed for virtual Council meetings. This right was replaced with the ability to make written submissions. This decision was made in accordance with The Local

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panels Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

The above changes to speaking rights were subsequently amended at the Council meeting on 10 September 2020. It was agreed that parties making written submissions in relation to a planning application would be invited to attend the Remote Meeting of the Planning Committee to answer any questions that Members of the Committee might wish to ask in order to seek clarification on any part of their statement.

In accordance with the Extraordinary Council resolution, written submissions relating to this application were received from Mr Richard Smith, Parish Council Representative, Mrs Hilary Latimer and Mr Chris Gittins, supporters, and Mr Phil Brown, the Agent.

Parish Council Representation

The written submission of Englefield Parish Council was read out by the Clerk to the Committee as follows:

- The proposed development was primarily justified, and overwhelmingly supported, on the grounds of road safety in that it would remove cars particularly from a constricted area around the school and provide for safer walking and cycling in that area. On the basis of road safety alone any sensible risk assessment must surely lead to the conclusion that some such mitigation was essential to provide a level of risk that was as low as reasonably practical. It was particularly noted that the Committee report included a number of photographs taken when there was no traffic but none of those supplied with the application that showed a very different picture.
- However, there were other considerations. Englefield remained a real village community that had evolved over time, with the few 18th century buildings added to throughout the 19th century after the old village was removed and with further development in the 20th and 21st century.
- Unfortunately, changing social and economic conditions had overtaken the community. Within living memory, the village survived as almost an enclosed community where cars were counted on the fingers of one hand and visitors from outside were rare, for the most part tradespeople some of whom still used horse drawn transport. The number of schoolchildren numbered no more than 30 and all arrived on foot or by bicycle. That was no longer the case and owing to the constraints of the original layout the village suffered greatly from the impact of those changes – suffering that might readily be alleviated.
- In landscape terms, while the proposal might impact somewhat adversely on the setting, that impact would be minimal and outweighed by the benefits from the car park. No erection of any structure was proposed, just some permeable surface treatment replacing a small area of grass and some screening vegetation – none of which would have any irremovable effect on the land. Against this must be set the visual intrusion, inconvenience, reduction in air quality and risk to personal safety from the present situation.
- Considered on the basis of a full social cost-benefit analysis this proposal must surely succeed and Members were urged to approve the proposal.

Member Questions to the Parish Council

(Mr Smith was in attendance to answer questions from the Committee)

Councillor Jeremy Cottam asked Mr Smith if there was any written agreement signifying that the car park could only be used for school traffic and queried who owned the land.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Mr Smith confirmed that Englefield Estate owned the land and there was no agreement that the car park would be for use only by the primary school.

Councillor Ross Mackinnon noted that the written submission highlighted the current traffic situation at particular times of the day and asked Mr Smith to describe this in more detail. Mr Smith reported that the photos submitted as part of the application showed cars parked along the entire length of The Street. There was another road that ran from a point opposite the proposed car park around the back of the housing and then joined back up with the main street. This road was often congested with parked cars and the visual splays at either end were non-existent. The area immediately outside the school was kept clear by the school, but everywhere else within close proximity was often congested with cars. Mr Smith urged Members to view the photos submitted with the application.

Councillor Graham Pask referred to a picture showing the view from The Street and noted that there seemed to be a dropped kerb. Councillor Pask asked if this area was used for parking on an ad-hoc basis. Mr Smith clarified that this area was on the opposite side of the road from the application site and stated that cars did park there from time to time. There was a nursery located at the old fire station, which sometimes used the area referred to for parking.

Councillor Geoff Mayes mentioned that a similar issue had been faced in Mortimer several years ago. He asked Mr Smith to confirm if the car park would replace the on street parking, which he thought was put in place using grasscrete in around 2011 to 2015. Mr Smith was uncertain about the grasscrete area being referred to. The area referred to by Councillor Pask was not grasscrete, but it was possible that there was some grasscrete further down the road. The car park, if approved, would replace all on street parking.

Councillor Alan Law understood that the area referred to by Councillor Mayes had formed part of a previous planning application and conditions had included some grasscrete along the verge closest to the school. Gareth Dowding (Highways) clarified that the area referred to had formed part of a planning application for the nursery in the old fire station and had included a reinforced grass verge area. It had been for use by parents of both school and nursery children.

Supporters Representation

The written summarised submission of the supporters was read out by the Clerk to the Committee as follows:

- There were significant concerns that the potential barrier to having this application passed was the perceived lack of need. It was questioned whether the Council required an accident to happen outside the school before they saw a need for safety measures.
- The school's position in the conservation area limited the safety signage and traffic calming measures that could be put in place. With a growing number of pupils from outside of the rural catchment area, the number of cars coming in and out of the village at either end of the day was growing. Surely housing some of these cars in a discreet, off-road parking area would be far preferable to the roads and verges being blocked, both in terms of safety and in terms of preserving the conservation area.
- The Council had already passed the building of a large primary school on a green field site in Theale which had had a big impact on the look of the local area. The proposed car park in Englefield would be far more discreet and would ease traffic

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

congestion rather than create it, as the new school seemed to have done on the Englefield Road.

- The school was in an extremely fortunate position to have the support of the Englefield Estate who were proposing to provide this car park without any financial burden on the taxpayer.
- The objections of the Conservation Officer seemed to be based more on technicalities than on experience and knowledge of the actual village environment that locals wanted to protect.
- Despite the fact that limited development was permitted, the objection centred on five aspects claiming that the car park would be to the detriment of a green space and a countryside vista which was part of the special character of the village.
- There was a long open vista to the left of The Street as you travelled into the village, more than 60% of this would be retained. The Conservation Officer might not be aware that there was already parking on the other side of The Street, an eyesore causing a muddy mess and disrupting the view of the similar open field on that side of the road. This extended further than the proposed car park so there would be a net gain of open field vistas in addition to the tidying of the area and improvement to green infrastructure at the base of a magnificent stand of trees.
- Although the view of and from number 10 The Street would be marginally diminished from one of 4 sides to the building, it would remain in an open setting.
- The view of numerous other buildings, including the school, church and Englefield House with its magnificent deer park would be majorly improved by the absence of a long string of parked cars blocking the road and the view of anyone walking down The Street. Including the parents, children and staff of the school coming to and from the school twice a day.

Member Questions to the Supporters

(Mrs Latimer and Mr Gittins were in attendance to answer questions from the Committee)

Councillor Jo Stewart acknowledged Mrs Latimer's impassioned plea in her written submission. It had been mentioned by Officers that there had not been any incidents in the last 20 years. Councillor Stewart asked why a car park was now being sought and if something had changed recently to spark the need for the application like an increase in pupil numbers or cars. Mrs Latimer stated that she had taught at the school since 2011 and had been Headteacher since 2018 and in this time parking at the school had always been an issue. Recently, fewer children from the local catchment area had attended the school with most of the school's pupil numbers made up by children living outside of the catchment area. In 2019, there was an intake of 80 children and only two were from the catchment area.

Mrs Latimer stated that there were over 70 families within the school's pupil population of 100 children and there were very few siblings. This had led to an increase in car traffic to and from the school. Car sharing had always been difficult however, this issue had been compounded due to Covid-19.

Mrs Latimer added that there had been an increased number of lorries, coaches and delivery vehicles to the area due to thriving business and community ventures in the local area. Regarding accidents there had been a number of incidents but nothing that had required reporting because no-one had been injured. Mrs Latimer was aware of incidents where toddlers had run on to the street or where people had needed to walk in to the road to avoid dogs being walked along the narrow path. This was very dangerous with cars

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

parked along the road and partially on footpaths. The advantage of the car park would be that the parked cars would not get as far as the narrow part of the street and it was this area that was most dangerous. Walking buses had been arranged however, due to the school being small there had not been enough staff available to sustain the scheme. Other options had also been looked at with the local community, including use of the garden centre car park, to try and reduce the problem however, every year parking continued to be a concern.

Councillor Law asked Mrs Latimer if she would be happy if there was a condition in place that meant only parents of children attending the school could use the proposed car park and secondly if double yellow lines were placed along The Street near the school. Mrs Latimer commented that the area was a conservation area and therefore yellow lines had never been used. She believed the yellow lines were not something that had been supported by the local community. Mrs Latimer was unsure if she was placed to agree to the conditions however, commented that she would be happy if such conditions were used.

Agent Representation

The written submission of the agent was read out by the Clerk to the Committee as follows:

- This statement was on behalf of the applicant, the Englefield Estate. The Estate's planning consultant, Mr Brown of Savills, was available to answer any questions that the Committee might have in relation to the application proposals.
- Englefield village was at the heart of the Englefield Estate. Together with the community, the Estate was committed to ensuring that the village, under its long-term stewardship, maintained its social, economic and environmental vitality by supporting local people, services and facilities. In this context, the proposal for a car park was one of a number of small scale projects which were key to supporting the long-term vitality of the village. These were discussed with the community at a consultation event in 2019 and the suggestion for a car park was overwhelmingly supported.
- As a result, this application had the support of the local primary school, Parish Council and local residents - some 45 letters of support had been noted in the Officer's report.
- It was accepted that the location of the car park was sensitive, being in the countryside, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and a Conservation Area. Through sensitive use of materials and landscaping efforts had been made to minimise the impacts, and indeed the Officer's report acknowledged that the harm to these assets was not substantial. Any harm was, in the view of the applicant, clearly outweighed by the benefits of the car park which included:
 - The improvement in highway safety for school children that had consistently been supported by the primary school;
 - The provision of a safe, off-road footpath for children which would be provided from the car park to the school;
 - The removal of a proliferation of parked cars around the village, including that which blocked the entrance to the garden centre (opposite the school) and which damaged the grass verges and tree roots further along The Street and which detracted from the Conservation Area.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

- This was a case of applying the planning balance: weighing the significant public benefits of the scheme against the less than substantial harm. We recognised that your Officers had recommended that the application be refused, but this was a matter of planning judgement, and so it was open to Members to come to a different view.
- We were aware of other cases in the District where car parks for schools (including within the AONB) had been granted, for example close by at Pangbourne School, at Bradfield College and at Ufton Nervet. In all these cases, the harm to the landscape and heritage aspects was judged to be outweighed by the benefits to the schools. This car park was therefore not a new precedent, and we respectfully request that Members move to approve the application.

Member Questions to the Agent

(Mr Brown was in attendance to answer questions from the Committee)

Councillor Mackinnon asked Mr Brown to explain the look of the material that would be used for the car park if approved. Mr Brown reported that it would be a buff colour resin that would be filled with gravel. It was the same material that was used for Cobbs Farm Shop not far away from the application site. The site would be enclosed by a hedge. The Estate could plant a hedge and this would not require any planning permission.

Councillor Pask referred to comments about the use of the car park being for the school only and he queried why this was not included as part of the proposal. Mr Brown stated that this had been offered as an option to Officers and the report included information on a proposed condition suggested to the Headteacher limiting use to the school. Englefield Estate felt that this was a reasonable condition however, Officers were of a different view.

Councillor Mayes noted that there were gates located at the entrance of the site on the site drawing presented to the Committee and he queried if these would be open all day, seven days per week. Councillor Mayes also queried if there would be lighting within the car park area. Mr Brown stated that if the decision was taken to limit use to the school then the gates could be closed. There were a number of Estate staff who lived in the village, so this could be managed. There was some low level lighting included as part of the proposal for safety reasons however, Mr Brown stressed that this was not street lighting and was in keeping with the rest of the village. Mr Brown was concerned regarding a condition for double yellow lines due to the site being within a conservation area and rural in nature.

Councillor Alan Macro raised a query regarding the pathway shown on the drawing, which he believed was not part of the application. Councillor Macro asked why this was the case. Mr Brown stated that if on street parking was eliminated then this would also reduce conflict between vehicles being parked on the footpath and pedestrians. This would make it safer to walk along The Street. As an alternative, Englefield Estate had considered a route around the rear of number 10 to the school, which would also improve access to the village hall. This would be on land controlled by Englefield Estate and could therefore be delivered if necessary.

Councillor Stewart queried if there would be anything to stop parents from parking in existing areas or did the proposal incorporate or remove this area. Councillor Stewart was concerned that if the car park got too full then parents might chose to avoid it and still park elsewhere. Councillor Stewart queried if this was to be prevented from happening. Mr Brown clarified that the existing area that had been referred to was separate to the car park area on the opposite side of the road to the site and impacted on the pine trees close to it. He added that the school was very proactive in managing

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

school traffic and parking, and Mr Brown therefore felt that some parking enforcement was achievable with the inclusion of controls implemented by the school.

Ward Member Representation

Councillor Ross Mackinnon stated that he was neither for nor against the application and looked forward to hearing and taking part in the debate.

There were no Member questions for the Ward Member.

Member Questions to Officers

Councillor Alan Macro referred to the planning report which stated that there was an 18m gap between the car park and a footpath. Councillor Macro queried if this was the footway along the side of the street. Ms Melton confirmed that this was correct.

Councillor Law noted from the report that Officers were not supportive of the car park being designated to parents of the school as this would be difficult to enforce. Councillor Law accepted this however, queried if there was any other reason why a condition on this could not be included. Secondly, Councillor Law was of the understanding that double yellow lines could be implemented in a conservation area and asked if there was any reason yellow lines could not be used in this instance.

In response to Councillor Law's question regarding restricting the car park to use by the school, Ms Melton did not believe that this would pass the test of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in terms of what was considered reasonable. Councillor Law queried who would appeal the condition if it was approved. Mr Bob Dray stated that Officers had to make assessments against the tests of the NPPF. If the Committee accepted that the harm identified by officers was justified as a result of the benefits from the proposal, then Officers would question if a limit to parents only was necessary. What added harm could come from others using the car park when it was not full?

Mr Gareth Dowding expressed his concern regarding a condition to restrict use to school access because this could potentially cause parents to park in the road if the gate was not opened on time. Regarding the question of double yellow lines, Mr Dowding stated that yellow lines could be provided in a conservation area however, this would be subject to a full consultation with residents in the area and could be objected to. Councillor Law noted the point and commented that planning permission could be subject to a consultation being carried out with residents.

Councillor Pask queried the suggestion of double yellow lines and suggested that a single yellow line could be used with time restrictions in place, for example, no parking between 8am to 10am and 2.30pm and 4.30pm. Mr Dowding reported that a single yellow line with time restrictions could be provided however, a full consultation would still need to take place. Mr Dray added that because the provision of yellow lines would be subject to a separate process with uncertainty of its success that he would be concerned about planning permission being subject to a condition on this. He advised that it would be considered unreasonable as it was out of the applicant's control.

Debate

Councillor Mackinnon stated that he understood the objections from reading the Officers report which were in line with policy including the loss of green infrastructure and impact on a listed building. Councillor Mackinnon however felt that the impact on green infrastructure would be low given the site was located in the corner of a paddock and would use materials that were sympathetic to the countryside setting. Councillor Mackinnon reported that the current impact caused by parked cars was high and he felt that this would be improved by the proposal.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Councillor Mackinnon stated the importance of considering the application in context. The policies, if strictly applied, benefitted those who visited the AONB however, they did not benefit the people who lived in the village, who clearly supported the proposal. He acknowledged that it was going to be a difficult decision however, suggested that the benefits of the scheme needed to be taken into consideration and balanced with the concerns of Officers.

Councillor Macro referred to the point that there had been no objections from local residents to the proposal and stated that most of the properties in the area were owned by Englefield Estate and therefore this could have caused some reluctance to object. Councillor Macro knew the area very well and commented that at the end of the street there was a T-junction with a private road leading off it. This used to be open and parents could use the area if they were unable to find a space and needed to turnaround. Councillor Macro noted that this was now gated off and therefore increased the risk of vehicles carrying out three point turns near the school.

Councillor Macro reported that initially he had not been supportive of the application however, he had changed his mind after reading the submissions. Children's safety was paramount and he felt this outweighed the less than substantial harm that would be caused if the application was approved. Councillor Macro stated that he had some concerns about the 18m gap from the car park to the footpath and then 175m to the school. He felt that this could put off some parents who might try to park more closely. Regarding suggestions to restrict the use of the car park, Councillor Macro felt that this would be a mistake as the car park was near to and could be used by the local shop, post office and tea rooms. Councillor Macro declared that he was reluctantly minded to support the application.

Councillor Graham Pask commented that planning applications were not determined on the level of support or objection. He understood all the points raised within the Planning Officer's report. Councillor Pask noted from Mr Brown that the Estate could plant a hedge and obscure the gap between the dwellings. Councillor Pask stated that there would still be a gap between dwellings and this could have cars parked on it especially at drop off and pick up times and other times if the use was not restricted. Councillor Pask noted however, that cars currently parked on the road and in front of the site. Councillor Pask queried the ultimate harm in approving the application and noted the benefits. He stated that he was leaning toward supporting the application. Councillor Pask noted the points made by Officers regarding the yellow lines however, he felt assured that the school would manage the situation. Councillor Pask felt there were both advantages and disadvantages of restricting the use of the car park to the school and was interested to hear what other Members had to say on this point.

Councillor Cottam stated that he concurred with the points made by Councillor Mackinnon and the application needed to be judged on balance. Safety was very important and just because there had not yet been an accident did not mean that there would not be one. In his view if the proposal was approved, cars that were normally parked along the road would be moved to a confined area which would decrease the visual impact on the area. Councillor Cottam stated that he was therefore minded to support the application.

Councillor Law noted that the AONB had not commented on the application. He invited Members of the Committee to make a proposal regarding the application.

Councillor Pask felt that on balance the benefits of the application outweighed the disadvantages. Councillor Pask proposed that planning permission be approved. He suggested that a standard set of conditions be applied including start times, landscaping and surface treatment. Regarding restricting access to the school, Councillor Pask noted

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

that no Members had voiced an opinion in strong favour of enforcing this and therefore he did not feel a condition on this should be proposed. Councillor Cottam seconded the proposal.

Mr Dray suggested that conditions be delegated to Officers for determination and he read out the standard ones which would be applied. Councillor Law suggested that the condition regarding dark skies be added and queried if a gate was included within the drawings. Ms Melton confirmed that a gate was shown in the drawing. Mr Dowding suggested that a condition be added regarding drainage and SuDS.

Councillor Law invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Pask, seconded by Councillor Cottam. 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:

Conditions

1. Commencement of development

The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

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 plans/documents:

- Location Plan, reference 6027E/SK24 B, received 17/07/2020;
- Village Parking Plan, reference 6027ESK9A, received 17/07/2020;
- Badger Survey Report, by Lockhart Garratt, received 17/07/2020, recommendations at Section 7.

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

3. Schedule of materials

No development shall take place until a schedule of the materials to be used in the construction of the car park hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Samples of materials shall be made available upon request. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials respect the character and appearance of the area. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006). A pre-commencement conditions is required due to the highly sensitive location of the site and because the materials will be used throughout construction operations.

4. Drainage

No development shall take place until a scheme of surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall incorporate sustainable drainage principles to deal with surface water run-off within the application site. The car park shall not be first brought into use until the scheme of surface water drainage has been implemented in accordance with the approved details. The approved method of surface water drainage shall be retained thereafter.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Reason: To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner; to prevent the increased risk of flooding; to improve and protect water quality, habitat and amenity and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system can be, and is carried out in an appropriate and efficient manner. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Part 4 of Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006) and the Sustainable Drainage SPD (December 2018). A pre-commencement condition is required because the sustainable drainage measures will need to be implemented during construction.

5. Construction method statement

No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the demolition and construction works shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved CMS. The CMS shall include measures for:

- (a) A site set-up plan during the works;
- (b) Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- (c) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (d) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- (e) Erection and maintenance of security hoarding including any decorative displays and/or facilities for public viewing;
- (f) Temporary access arrangements to the site, and any temporary hard-standing;
- (g) Wheel washing facilities;
- (h) Measures to control dust, dirt, noise, vibrations, odours, surface water run-off, and pests/vermin during construction;
- (i) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
- (j) Hours of construction and demolition work;
- (k) Hours of deliveries and preferred haulage routes.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers, and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policies OVS.5, OVS.6 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007). A precommencement condition is required because the CMS must be adhered to during all demolition and construction operations.

6. Hours of work (construction/demolition)

No demolition or construction works shall take place outside the following hours, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

7:30am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays;

8:30am to 1:00pm Saturdays;

No work shall be carried out 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, and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

7. Tree protection scheme

No development (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) shall commence on site until a scheme for the protection of trees to be retained is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include a plan showing the location of the protective fencing, and shall specify the type of protective fencing. All such fencing shall be erected prior to any development works taking place and at least 2 working days notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority that it has been erected. It shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or until such time as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities or storage of materials whatsoever shall take place within the protected areas without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Note: The protective fencing should be as specified at Chapter 6 and detailed in figure 2 of B.S.5837:2012.

Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; tree protection installation measures may be required to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

8. Surface specification (prior approval)

No development or other operations shall commence on site until details of the proposed carpark and access surface specification in the root zones of existing and proposed trees, has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026. A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; details of satisfactory foundations are a key element of the scheme and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

9. Provision of access, parking and turning spaces, and cycle facilities

The car park shall not be first brought into use until the accesses, parking and manoeuvring spaces, and cycle parking facilities have been fully provided in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter the parking and turning spaces shall be kept available for parking and manoeuvring, and the cycle parking facilities kept available for their purpose, at all times.

Reason: To ensure the access, parking and turning is laid out in the approved condition, in the interests of public safety, and to ensure cycle parking is provided as proposed to encourage sustainable modes of transport. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007), and the Council's Cycle and Motorcycle Advice and Standards for New Development (November 2014).

10. Soft landscaping (prior approval)

A detailed soft landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed plans, planting and retention schedule, programme of works, and any other supporting

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

information. All soft landscaping works shall be completed in accordance with the approved soft landscaping scheme within the first planting season following completion of building operations / first use of the car park (whichever occurs first). Any trees, shrubs, plants or hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme which are removed, die, or become diseased or become seriously damaged within five years of completion of this completion of the approved soft landscaping scheme shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedges of a similar size and species to that originally approved.

Reason: A comprehensive soft landscaping scheme is an essential element in the detailed design of the development, and is therefore necessary to ensure the development achieves a high standard of design. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Quality Design SPD.

11. Lighting strategy (prior approval)

No external lighting shall be installed until a lighting strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall:

- (a) Include and isolux diagram of the proposed lighting.
- (b) Ensure all lighting levels are designed within the limitations of Environmental Lighting Zone 1, as described by the Institute of Lighting Engineers.

No external lighting shall be installed within the application site except in accordance with the above strategy.

Reason: To conserve the dark night skies of the North Wessex Downs AONB. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-24, and Policies CS17 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

12. Hard landscaping (prior approval)

The car park shall not be first brought into use until the hard landscaping of the site has been completed in accordance with a hard landscaping scheme that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping scheme shall include details of any boundary treatments (e.g. fences and gates) and hard surfaced areas to be provided as part of the development.

Reason: A comprehensive hard landscaping scheme is an essential element in the detailed design of the development, and is therefore necessary to ensure the development achieves a high standard of design. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Quality Design SPD.

13. Permitted development restriction (gates, fences, walls etc)

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order with or without modification), no gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure which would otherwise be permitted by Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of that Order shall be erected, constructed, or materially altered without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose. This restriction excludes any development expressly permitted by this permission, and does not prevent repairs or replacements (in full or in part) that do not materially affect the external appearance of any gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Reason: To prevent the erection of such development which may have an adverse impact on the rural character and appearance of the area, or fail to conserve the open landscape of the AONB. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Quality Design SPD (June 2006).

The decision to grant Planning Permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, South East Plan 2006-2026, West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (WBDLP) Saved Policies 2007, the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire, adopted 1998, the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire 1991-2006 (incorporating the alterations adopted in December 1997 and May 2001) and to all other relevant material considerations, including Government guidance, Supplementary Planning Document; and in particular guidance notes and policies.

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

INFORMATIVES:

1 The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that above conditions must be complied with in full before any work commences on site, failure to do so may result in enforcement action being instigated.

2 The above Permission may contain pre-conditions, which require specific matters to be approved by the Local Planning Authority before a specified stage in the development occurs. For example, "Prior to commencement of development written details of the means of enclosure will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority". This means that a lawful commencement of the approved development cannot be made until the particular requirements of the pre-condition(s) have been met. A fee is required for an application to discharge conditions.

3 This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has secured and accepted what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

4 Before arriving at its decision, the Eastern Area Planning Committee considered the recommendation of planning and conservation officers, and listened to the representations made by interested parties. It was determined that the public benefits of the proposal outweighed the harm to the landscape and heritage assets.

(3) Application No. & Parish: 20/01940/LBC2 - West Streatley House, High Street, Streatley

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 20/01940/LBC2 in respect of the addition of a kitchen vent through the roof of the rear extension.

Bob Dray, Development Control Team Leader, presented the report. He reminded Members that the only consideration for this application was whether the proposal preserved the special architectural and historical interest of this listed building and its setting.

Mr Dray explained that the Conservation Officer originally had concerns that the proposed flue would appear overly obtrusive due to its height and positioning. This had resulted in alterations being made to replace the flue with an inline vent and the

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Conservation Officer was satisfied with this revision. The Conservation Officer felt that the in-line clay tile vent would not be in any way obtrusive or harm the appearance of the building as long as the colour of the clay tile matched the approved tiles.

The 14 objections from members of the public were primarily concerned with the height and obtrusiveness of the flue and the flue had been amended in the way described.

Concerns raised of odour and noise did not apply to a listed building consent.

The Officer recommendation was to grant listed building consent subject to conditions, which included a condition for the materials that would be used.

No written submissions were received.

Ward Member Representation

Councillor Alan Law in addressing the Committee as Ward Member made the following points:

- By way of background, Councillor Law explained that there had been a level of controversy in the planning history of West Streatley House and some enforcement issues raised in relation to set times for deliveries and for works. A level of concern had persisted in the local area and there had been objections to this application for listed building consent, primarily in relation to the flue.
- As explained by the Planning Officer, the changes made to the proposed flue and vent had done much to alleviate the concerns. The Conservation Officer was satisfied with the revisions made.

No questions were asked of the Ward Member.

Questions to Officers

Councillor Geoff Mayes queried if it was a gas flue and whether there was a window overlooking the adjacent neighbouring property.

In response, Mr Dray explained that he was unclear on the fuel to be used but this was not relevant to an application for listed building consent. The only consideration was the impact on the character of the listed building.

The rear extension and its windows were at some distance from the neighbouring property as shown on the plans.

Debate

Councillor Tony Linden proposed acceptance of Officers' recommendation to grant listed building consent subject to conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Jeremy Cottam.

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

Conditions

1. Commencement of works

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

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. Approved plans

This listed building consent relates only to work described on the following drawings:

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

1618-L01 (Location Plan), received 21st August 2020

1618-1B 50 C (Floor Plan and Section Elevation), received 16th November 2020

The works shall be carried out in strict conformity with the approved plans and associated approved submitted information.

Reason: To clarify what has been approved under this consent in order to protect the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

3. Materials

The works shall not take place until details of the colour and finish of the in-line clay tile vent have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Samples shall be made available to be viewed at the site or by arrangement with the Planning Officer. All materials incorporated in the work shall match the approved samples.

Reason: To ensure that the materials are appropriate to the special architectural or historic interest of the building. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) and Policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

4. Making good

All works of making good and repair to the retained fabric, whether internal or external, shall be finished to match original/adjacent work with regard to the methods used and to materials, colours, textures and profiles.

Reason: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the building. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) and Policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 8.14pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature