

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, 16 DECEMBER 2020

Councillors Present: Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Jeff Cant, Hilary Cole, James Cole (Substitute) (In place of Howard Woollaston), Carolyne Culver, Clive Hooker (Chairman) and Tony Vickers (Vice-Chairman)

Also Present: Andrew Giles (Tree Officer), Jenny Legge (Principal Performance, Research and Consultation Officer), Kim Maher (Solicitor), Masie Masiwa (Planning Officer), Gareth Ryman (Principal Ecologist) and Simon Till (Team Leader - Western Area Planning)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Howard Woollaston

PART I

41. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2020 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of the following amendments:

Item 1, page 9, point 24, final bullet point: Councillor Carolyne Culver asked that the wording "This would be challenging for Planning Enforcement to check..." be replaced with something closer to the exact wording she had used, such as "...she was concerned about the kind of evidence that had been presented to Members evening and why the assessments had been done at such an unusual time of day. This underscored her concern that should Planning Enforcement need to do more of these monitoring exercise in the future, they needed to be done at different times of day. Rather than sending somebody out to do something at an odd time of day, such as 3am until 7am, it needed to be a much more comprehensive approach. She and the local residents would be particularly concerned that that happened."

Councillor Adrian Abbs had a query regarding correspondence he had received from an officer regarding a decibel levels condition. Neither Ms Kim Maher, the Legal advisor, nor Jenny Legge, the clerk, were aware of the conversation. Ms Maher offered to investigate the issue outside of the meeting.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2020 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

42. Declarations of Interest

All Councillor present declared an interest in Agenda Item (4)1, 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: 20/02322/FUL, Boames Farm, Boames Lane, Enborne**

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

(Councillors Dennis Benneyworth and James Cole declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that the application was within the ward they represented. As their interests were 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 Tony Vickers declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was friends with the applicant's tree advisor. As his interests were personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

(All of the Members present declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1)).

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 20/02322/FUL in respect of Boames Farm, Boames Lane, Enborne. The application sought to erect two sheds for housing cattle during winter.
2. Mr Masie Masiwa, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material planning considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was unsatisfactory in planning terms and officers recommended that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons listed in the main and update reports.

Removal of speaking rights

3. As resolved at the Extraordinary Council meeting held on 29 April 2020, public speaking rights had been removed for virtual Council meetings. This right had 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.
4. 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.
5. In accordance with the Extraordinary Council resolution, written submissions relating to this application were received from Enborne Parish Council (Mr John Leeson), Mr John Handy, supporter, and Mr Simon Tomkins, applicant.
6. Individual written submissions were published online with the agenda - <http://decisionmaking.westberks.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=155&MId=5737&Ver=4>

Parish Council's Submission

7. The Clerk read out the representation. Mr John Leeson was invited to join the meeting to answer questions from Members of the Committee.
8. Councillor Tony Vickers asked for clarification as to what was meant by "...so woodland absence". Mr Leeson indicated this was an editing error. He explained that the applicant had moved to the site in approximately 2001, and there was a photo from that time in the Design Access Statement that showed that, at that time, there was no woodland on the site of the proposed development.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

9. Councillor Adrian Abbs asked for clarification in relation to the ancient woodland status of the copse. Mr Leeson referred to the MAGIC map, maintained by Defra, which did not specify Little Copse as ancient woodland. He also noted that the latest Ordnance Survey map did not show mark the area as woodland at all. Therefore, according to the standard definitions it was clearly not ancient woodland.
10. Councillor Abbs asked if this woodland had been established after 2000/2001. Mr Leeson confirmed that it was older than that, and suggested that the applicant's tree expert would be best placed to give an estimate as to its age.

Supporter's Submission

11. The Clerk read out the representation. Mr John Handy was invited to join the meeting to answer questions from Members of the Committee.
12. Councillor Vickers noted that the elevations showed the drainage sloping towards the woodland, but Mr Handy's statement indicated the natural gradient would prevent the likelihood of run-off towards the copse, doing away with the need for a habitat buffer.
13. Mr Handy explained that the natural fall of the land, including the paddock, was towards Little Copse, however within the site it began to fall away to the north of the copse.
14. Councillor Vickers further queried Mr Handy's description of the site as, "once polluted, much excavated, made-up ground". He noted that officers' preference was for the woodland to be left to restore itself to wild wood. He asked Mr Handy if he considered there was much chance of recovery and restoring tree growth from the seed bank situated under the made-up ground.
15. Mr Handy explained that seed bank or bed referred to residual old seeds within the soil, which would flourish when exposed to light. However, this site had been much excavated, therefore the upper few inches of soil in which the seeds would usually have resided had been disturbed, buried or destroyed, and this was after damage from slurry run-off in the period to 1995 when there had been a dairy. He noted the dominant tree species on the site were oak, ash, birch and cherry, which produced seeds that germinated quickly and would therefore have rotted if they had been buried in the seed bank. He indicated that the seed bank had been turned over by excavations undertaken to create the pond 20 years ago and a new seed bank was created. Growth from the new seedbank had shown itself to be made up of predominantly grass, thistle and dock, basically weeds rather than trees.
16. Councillor Dennis Benneyworth queried what damage had been caused by the slurry run-off.
17. Mr Handy noted that he had experience of working on cattle farms and in forestry, however he had not taken notice of damage from slurry in the past. He had sought the opinion of an agronomist who had indicated that the nutrient from the slurry that damaged the soil would leach out and some seeds would survive that, particularly oil-based seeds (e.g. oil-seed rape).

Applicant's Submission

18. The Clerk read out the representation. Mr Simon Tomkins was invited to join the meeting to answer questions from Members of the Committee.
19. Councillor James Cole noted in the applicant's statement that he had not removed trees to facilitate the application, however the site was pretty clear of trees. Also, he noted that the site had been slurry damaged and a 2004 survey which referred to the site as 'rank grassland'. He asked if this was an accurate description of the site when

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

Mr Tomkins' father took on the site in 2001, and who was responsible for the slurry damage. He also asked what effect the slurry would have had on any trees or undergrowth that was there.

20. Mr Tomkins highlighted the statement by a qualified ecologist in 2004, which described the site as a pond area with mound surrounds and rank grassland. He was unable to speculate about the activities of previous occupants.
21. Councillor James Cole sought confirmation that it wasn't Mr Tomkins father that had caused the issue. Mr Tomkins confirmed this was correct.
22. Councillor James Cole asked how the proposed drainage would protect Little Copse. Mr Tomkins confirmed that a drainage plan had been submitted as part of the Design and Access Statement, which showed the existing and proposed levels of the site. In conjunction with the elevations, this showed that the land sloped away from Little Copse. He indicated that he had also spoken to an agricultural planning consultant, prior to submitting the application, to ensure that they were complying with all relevant regulations. The consultant had proposed the addition of two slurry channels at the exit doors which would lead to an effluent tank in case the roof failed and rain got in. This meant that there was no possibility of any run-off reaching Little Copse.
23. Councillor Hilary Cole asked why the barns were necessary, how many animals would occupy them and for how many months would they be needed each year. Mr Tomkins explained that at the heart of things, this was a grassland, livestock farm. They had been keeping the small herd in a converted hay barn, however for economic reasons they needed to become 'Farm Assured' in order to maximise the value of their animals. This involved meeting high standards of welfare for the cattle, which could not be achieved with the current housing. Also, they needed to keep a large enough herd to be economically viable. He confirmed there would potentially be up to 150 cattle on the site comprised of 50 breeding cows, 50 one year old and 50 two year old calves.
24. Councillor Hilary Cole asked if it was essential for the cows to be contained in barns. Mr Tomkins stated it was vital. Due to refusal of the first application, half the herd was now living outside and causing extensive damage to the wet fields. He stressed that it was important to keep the animals inside, not only for their benefit, but also for the benefit of the wider landscape.
25. Councillor Hilary Cole asked if the reason for Site 2 not being considered, was the impact on a neighbour. Mr Tomkins indicated that they had given a lot of thought to the first application. They had considered and sought advice on the planning policies and had assessed all potential sites in terms of the effect on the character of the area and the historic landscape, the public's enjoyment of the countryside, etc. The impact on the neighbour was one reason, but not the sole reason. He noted that the case officer had framed his response as though the applicant had submitted alternative sites, however they had submitted a potential sites appraisal, which considered whether other sites were feasible locations.
26. Councillor Benneyworth noted that Policy CS14 required efficient use of land and asked why Site 2 would be inefficient. Mr Tomkins stated that the proposed site was already partly hardstanding farmyard. Other potential sites would require an extension of the farmyard equivalent to the entire area of the barns, which would be inefficient. Site 2 would require 0.35 hectares, including for access and movement.
27. Councillor Benneyworth asked if this would involve the loss of a paddock. Mr Tomkins confirmed that the paddock was used as a quarantine area where they kept sick animals and indicated that this needed to be close-by so they could keep an eye

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

on the animal. He referred to a recent outbreak of New Forest Eye, which was incredibly infectious, and the paddock had been used to isolate affected animals.

28. Councillor James Cole asked the applicant what he would do if the application was not approved. Mr Tomkins confirmed that it would put an end to their livestock enterprise. He indicated that local people had expressed shock and concern about using the alternative locations for the barns proposed by the planners. He suggested that the only option would be to expand the hay-making side of the business. Again more barns would be needed, which they may be able to erect under permitted development rights.
29. Councillor James Cole asked for confirmation that Site 2 was considered impractical. Mr Tomkins stated that it was not feasible for many reasons.
30. Councillor Hillary Cole asked the applicant if he had enough pasture land for the enterprise or whether he was trying to squeeze a quart into a pint pot. Mr Tomkins confirmed that they had sufficient pasture land.

Ward Member Representation

31. Councillor Claire Rowles in addressing the Committee made the following points:
 - A site visit was essential to understand the development of the proposed site and why alternative sites were unrealistic.
 - Much attention had been on historical removal of trees from the site, which was not of the applicant's making. There was nothing worth keeping on the site and it was in a poor, damaged state.
 - Members should consider the economic use of the land, particularly in the current challenging economic climate for farmers e.g. bovine TB, rural crime, Covid and Brexit. The benefits and advantages of the scheme needed to be balanced against the disadvantages.
 - The Tree Officer recognised that Little Copse was not designated as ancient woodland and was not listed as such on Natural England's inventory. He had classified it as historic woodland, but there was no such legal definition. He acknowledged that ash trees would need to be felled soon, due to ash dieback.
 - The previous occupant had let slurry leak over time and damage the seed bed.
 - The current occupants dug a pond to solve a problem and filled it in when it was no longer needed, which further damaged the seed bed.
 - Regarding biodiversity, the applicant had proposed a drainage plan, which highlighted the gradient away from Little Copse to the adjacent field. A much greater area of trees would be planted adding to tree and hedge planting already carried out, creating additional habitat to mitigate against any potentially lost.
 - The existing site where the cattle are located now was two miles away, which was too far away and the other side of the bypass and Redding's Copse, which was a true semi-natural ancient woodland.
 - Theoretically, there were two potential sites next to Boames Farm. Officers claimed these were put forward by the applicant as alternative sites, but this was incorrect.
 - The first site was in front of the Grade II listed farmhouse, which was unacceptable.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

- The second site had high voltage wires across it, restricting the area that could be used and requiring the cattle sheds to move towards a neighbouring house, which was a non-designated heritage asset.
- Planning officers had said that the paddock was not used, but this was factually incorrect, since it was used as an isolation paddock. The site was also right by the road.
- She could not see either site being supported by the Heritage Champion.
- In the current economic climate, local businesses needed to be supported. This application would safeguard the future of a rural enterprise and maintain jobs.
- It would also secure conservation of a rare breed of cattle of national importance.
- It is best practice in terms of safety and animal welfare for cattle to be nearby in case of sickness or when calving.
- The cattle were essential for the maintenance of rare grassland habitats on this farm and grazing animals supported a more diverse range of insects and birds than redundant or mechanically managed grassland.
- More trees would result in more habitats. The siting of the new trees would create a wildlife corridor between the two copses.
- All young livestock would live under cover in the winter.
- Carbon emissions would be reduced since the applicant would not need to travel to attend to their cattle.
- She encouraged Members to reject the officers' recommendation.

Members' Questions to the Ward Member

32. Members did not have any questions for the Ward Member.

Members' Questions to Officers

33. Councillor Abbs asked Mr Andrew Giles, Senior Tree Officer, to confirm if the site was ancient woodland. Mr Giles confirmed that it was not classified as ancient woodland, which was classified as being there for since 1600, but historical maps suggested it had been there for at least 170 years.
34. Councillor Abbs noted that ancient woodland required a 15m buffer, and asked if there should be a similar buffer for the other types the woodland.
35. Mr Giles stated that there was distance from the roots as set out in the arboricultural report produced by Mr Handy, however he noted that the barns would be sited within the woodland footprint, which was a concern.
36. Councillor Abbs noted that more woodland would be planted than lost, and asked about the net level of biodiversity gain. Mr Giles indicated that the new planting on the eastern side (25m x 50m) was double the size of the new buildings.
37. Councillor Vickers asked Mr Gareth Ryman, Principal Ecologist, about the potential loss of biodiversity and carbon storage if Site 2 were developed.
38. Mr Ryman explained that woodland stored far more carbon than grassland, particularly given the expected grazing densities.
39. Councillor Vickers asked if much of the carbon had been released when the soil was disturbed previously.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

40. My Ryman was unable to comment on this. However, he noted that the proposed site would cause leaching of nitrogen into the woodland at much greater levels than for Site 2. This would lead to biodiversity loss in the woodland unless there was adequate drainage. Also, he explained that his previous assumptions were based on 50 cattle rather than 150 that Mr Tomkins had indicated. He explained that the proposed 6,000 litre effluent tank would be 6m x 1m x 1m, which did not seem enough for the number of cattle, so there was a real risk of a pollution event.
41. Councillor Clive Hooker called for clarity as to whether the tank would be big enough for the number of cattle to be accommodated in the sheds and suggested that a condition might be required to stipulate a larger tank if the development were approved.
42. Mr Ryman indicated that a larger tank would help, but his concerns about proximity to the woodland remained, as not all of the effluent would be caught. In addition to the liquid and solid effluent, cattle produced methane, although methane did not travel far. He suggested eutrophication of terrestrial habitats, identified in research carried out by the Forestry Commission in 2004, might occur on the site. However, the effects of methane production had not been included in his ecology report.
43. Councillor Hilary Cole asked Mr Masiwa if the committee favoured an alternative site whether that would require a new application. Mr Masiwa explained that prior to the application determined in August, officers had highlighted objections to the applicant regarding the proposed site and had invited him to consider alternative sites. The applicant identified two alternative sites. On balance, officers felt that Site 2 would have less of an impact. Officers had also invited the applicant to amend the red line to include Site 2. He confirmed that there was scope to amend the red line without the need for a new application.
44. Councillor Hilary Cole noted that the Council had decided to give more weight to economic considerations above environmental and social, in the current climate, but she did not see this reflected in the application. She asked if sufficient weight had been given to economic considerations in this application. Mr Masiwa confirmed that officers had given appropriate weight to the economic benefits of the proposal and had not disputed the need of the development. Officers had given every opportunity to the applicant to put forward an alternative site or to amend the proposal. Officers had added weight to the economic impacts, however there were still environmental and social impacts and had arrived at the recommendation for refusal.
45. Councillor Hilary Cole asked why the Council's animal welfare officer had not been consulted. Mr Masiwa stated that officers did not consider that animal welfare was a significant consideration and that, as indicated in the presentation, it was acknowledged that the two mile round trip for the farmer was inadequate and officers had attempted to support the farmer in finding an alternative.
46. Councillor Benneyworth noted that the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre conducted a survey in 2004 suggesting that this area could be removed from the local wildlife site list and invited officers to comment. Mr Ryman explained that if the site were left to go wild, then there would be ecological succession in the area over time. In the last two years, if changes had not happened there would have been further ecological success and the edge habitats would have provided extra value to the woodlands in terms of biodiversity. If the ash tree had been left in place, there would have been value in having 'dead standing'.
47. Councillor Jeff Cant asked if operational facilities, such as slurry storage tanks, were a legitimate planning consideration. Mr Ryman indicated that there had been

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

previous cases in the Lambourn Valley where sewage treatments plants had been required to protect the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and there could be similar eutrophication problems that could impact this site.

48. Mr Masiwa confirmed that drainage and slurry management were legitimate planning considerations and these were key considerations in this application and the previous one. He stated that it was a planning consideration for example, where intensive livestock development could have high levels of environmental impact, and if that were the case an environmental impact statement may be required.
49. Councillor Cant asked what the most important reason for refusal was for this application. Mr Masiwa explained that the objections were: the location of the barns in the woodland; and the impact on the retained woodland by the operation of the building, with the second of these being the main issue.
50. Councillor Hooker asked if the objections related to particular policies. Mr Masiwa confirmed that objections related to policies CS17, CS18 and CS19.
51. Councillor Abbs noted that there did not appear to be evidence about drainage from Site 2, but observed that the levels suggested that the flow would be towards the copse. He asked for clarification as to why Site 2 was preferred. Mr Masiwa explained that the tree officer and ecologist were content that there would be sufficient distance to the woodland for the mitigation measure of ditches to be installed around the barns to protect the surrounding environments.
52. Councillor Abbs indicated that he was unclear about the level of mitigation required, but it appeared that more mitigation was required for Site 2. He indicated that he did not have sufficient information to be able to draw a clear conclusion. Mr Masiwa indicated that the ecology report addressed the mitigation measures required, as it mentioned a ditch and 7m buffer to the trees.
53. Mr Ryman explained that in his original response he had asked for a 5m buffer and 2m ditch to protect the woodland. Additionally, he indicated that there were areas within Site 2 that could be used as a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) and potentially offer on-site grazing for any quarantined animals. In his opinion, this made Site 2 a better choice. He also noted that monitoring surveys would be required to ensure that effluent was not entering the woodland.
54. Councillor Hilary Cole asked if a condition could be imposed to require a larger effluent tank to be provided, or if the application would need to be deferred.
55. Mr Simon Till stated that there was no guarantee that there would be enough space within the red line currently proposed to condition additional mitigation, but there may be potential for amendment of the red line and for officers to explore additional measures. If members were minded to recommend approval, they could ask for these details to be secured by officers within 3 months, with the application to be brought back before the Committee if no resolution could be achieved.
56. Councillor James Cole asked why there was confusion about the number of cattle. Mr Ryman indicated that the Design and Access Statement specified 50 cattle, but at the meeting, the applicant had indicated that the number would be 150.
57. Councillor James Cole indicated that in his experience, it was normal to have cows, yearlings, calves and a bull.
58. Mrs Kim Maher highlighted the information in section 6.8 on page 57 of the papers, which confirmed the intention to have up to 50 cows with associated young stock.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

59. Councillor James Cole indicated that this added up to 75 cattle now, doubling over time to 150.

Debate

60. Councillor Cant opened the debate by stating while he did not usually go against Officer's recommendations, he felt this young entrepreneur who could accommodate 450 cattle on his farm, had a genuine operational need for facilities to make it more profitable and productive. He noted that the community would benefit from the barns being in the proposed location, which combined with the economic needs of the farmer made him inclined to support the application, despite other concerns. He proposed to reject Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report and update report.
61. Councillor Abbs indicated that he had initially been minded to oppose the application on the grounds that ancient woodland would be destroyed. However, he was satisfied this was not the case and there would be significant biodiversity gain. He was not convinced that Site 2 was a better option. He seconded Councillor Cant's proposal.
62. Councillor Vickers indicated that he saw many positives in the proposal. He considered that Site 2 had significant disadvantages in terms of impacts on the landscape and the neighbour. Site 2 was also more intrusive from the lane and other directions, and the proposed site, with appropriate screening and the back drop of Little Copse, would have a negligible impact on the landscape. He noted that the previous wood had gone from the site and there would be little impact on the adjacent woodland. He supported the proposal, but indicated that the drainage needed to be looked at carefully. There would also need to be landscaping mitigation. Overall he felt that the application would have a positive impact.
63. Councillor James Cole acknowledged that he had called the application in, but was disappointed at planners' lack of concern for animal welfare. He welcomed the wildlife corridor and indicated that he would have objected to the alternative sites, which would have brought the noise and smells of a cattle barn to the roadside. He felt that the current site was equivalent to a brownfield site and benefits expected from rewilding the site would not have been achieved. He felt that using this site for two barns made sense.
64. The Chairman asked members if they would like to amend conditions, including those relating to the drainage and tank size, which may require the red line to be moved either as part of a new application or as a continuation of this application. He also asked members if they wanted a condition relating to methane and if there needed to be a condition relating to the emptying of the tank.
65. Councillor Hilary Cole felt that planners were clutching at straws in their reasons for refusal. She felt that the area was scrubby and would benefit from regeneration and she could not see the benefits of the alternative sites. Her concerns related to the tank size and mitigation of drainage, but if these could be addressed then there was no reason to refuse the application. She did not feel that sufficient weight had been given to the economic factors, which were important in current times.
66. Councillor Benneyworth felt that the proposal would make efficient use of a site that would not otherwise return to woodland, since it would continue to be used to store farm machinery. He felt that the applicant husbanded his land responsibly and was passionate about environmental matters. He noted that this was not a dairy farm where the parlour would be washed out, but rather this was for overwintering cattle,

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

with straw that would be cleared out at the end of the winter. As such, it would not have as much impact as officers feared.

67. Councillor Phil Barnett regretted that he had been unable to visit the site. He indicated that some evidence put before the committee had been confusing, but he was supportive on the basis of animal welfare.
68. Councillor Cant modified his proposal such that the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions on drainage.
69. The Chairman sought advice from the Planning Officers.
70. Mr Till suggested the following conditions:
 - Materials as per the drawings
 - A landscaping scheme to be provided and agreed
 - A mitigation strategy for ecology
 - Officers be given 3 months to negotiate an acceptable scheme of drainage measures with the applicant and subject to this being achieved for the application to be approved, but if this cannot be achieved for the application to come back to committee
71. The Chairman confirmed that Members were happy with these conditions and invited Members to vote on the proposal by Councillor Cant, seconded by Councillor Abbs to grant planning permission contrary to officer's recommendation. At the vote the motion was carried.
72. **RESOLVED that** the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Commencement

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

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

2. Approved drawings

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings (list to be included following the outcome of discussions regarding condition 6).

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

3. Materials as specified

The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be as specified on the plans and/or the application forms.

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 and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

4. Landscaping

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 DECEMBER 2020 - MINUTES

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until, a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall ensure:

- Completion of the approved landscape scheme within the first planting season following completion of development.
- 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. Mitigation for Ecology

No development above floor level of the building hereby approved shall take place until a scheme of mitigation measures to address the impacts on ecology and biodiversity associated with the development has been submitted and approved in writing under a discharge of conditions application. The scheme shall include clear recommendations on the measures to be taken and a schedule for their implementation. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and schedule.

Reason: In order to secure the satisfactory identification and mitigation of impacts of the approved works on ecology and biodiversity in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and Policies CS17 and CS18 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

6. Drainage

To be confirmed by officers following the outcome of discussions with the applicant as requested in the resolution.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.30 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature