

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, 11 AUGUST 2021

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

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Kevin Griffin (Head of Customer Services & ICT), Jenny Legge (Principal Performance, Research and Consultation Officer) and Simon Till (Senior Planning Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Dennis Benneyworth

PART I

11. Minutes

The Chairman proposed a non-notice procedural motion for standing orders be suspended, to permit Members (including those who are not Members of the Committee), officers and members of the public engaging remotely to speak at the option of the Chairman.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Hilary Cole.

At the vote, the motion was carried unanimously.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2021 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

12. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Adrian Abbs, Carolyn Culver and Tony Vickers 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.

13. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. and Parish: 20/02779/COMIND, Land South of Newbury College, Monks Lane, Newbury, Greenham

(Councillors Adrian Abbs and Phil Barnett declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that they were members of Greenham Parish Council. Councillor Abbs also declared that he was the Chair of Greenham Parish's Planning Committee. 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 Tony Vickers declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a member of Greenham Parish Council and Newbury Town Council. 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.)

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

(Councillor Carolyn Culver declared that she had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1))

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 20/02779/COMIND in respect of a Section 73 variation of conditions 2 (plans), 3 (boundary treatments), 4 (hardscaping), 6 (BREEAM), 7 (external lighting), 9 (noise from services), 11 (sport England), 12 (travel plan), 13 (cycle and scooter parking), 17 (landscaping) and 24 (E V charging points) of approved 17/03434/COMIND - Construction of a new 1 FE single-storey primary school south of the existing Newbury College, with associated soft and hard landscaping. Construction of a temporary access to the school from the Newbury College site and a permanent access from the A339 to serve the allocated strategic housing site and form the permanent access to the school. Construction of bunds adjacent to the temporary and permanent access roads to prevent access from the roads to private land, on land South of Newbury College, Monks Lane, Newbury.
2. Mr Simon Till, Team Leader (Western Area Planning), 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 acceptable in planning terms and officers recommended that the Head of Planning and Development be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update report.
3. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mark Lewis (WBC Education Place Planning and Development Manager and Project Sponsor) and Mr Greg Bowman (WBC Property Project Officer), applicant, addressed the Committee on this application.

Applicant Representation

4. Mr Lewis and Mr Bowman in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Mr Bowman noted that the Committee had visited the site and would have seen what an inspiring addition the development would be to Newbury and West Berkshire, and how it would benefit children for generations to come.
 - The purpose of the application was two-fold, to provide information required to clear outstanding conditions as appropriate, and to bring to the Committees attention some minor amendments to the existing permission.
 - As the case officer has outlined, these amendments included the introduction of lighting to the north-south path between the college and the school to allow safe pedestrian and cycling access, the reduction of the BREEAM rating, and amendments to the parking, and changes to the electric vehicle charging provision. He hoped that the Committee would consent and he welcomed their questions.

Member Questions to the Applicant

5. Councillor Adrian Abbs noted that during the site visit Members had seen that there were only six and a half drop-off bays marked out, rather than seven. Mr Bowman explained that this was an error and the line-marking would be completed shortly.
6. Councillor Carolyn Culver noted that the report stated that the school would be at full capacity by 2025, however she queried whether this should have read 2024. From her calculations it appeared that the projected pupil numbers would be 60 in 2022, 90 in 2023, and 120 in 2024. Mr Bowman advised that full capacity would be 210, which would occur in 2026/27.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

7. Councillor Culver explained that she was seeking clarity on when the 13 Kiss and Drop places would be required. Mr Bowman concurred that with a capacity of 120 pupils almost half the school would be occupied in 2024. This would be the point at which Highways Officers felt that there would need to be further parking bays within the site. Up to this point it was felt that the school would be able to manage with seven bays on the southern side, and the lay-by on the public highway to the west of the school.
8. Councillor Culver further questioned the mention of a turning circle in point 6.9 and on page 38 of the report. She noted that on the site visit questions were raised as to whether there should be a turning circle at the end of the widened road, as there was concern around students alighting from their cars, and walking out in front of other cars. She queried whether the lack of a turning circle would lead to the pupils being in danger on that stretch of road.
9. Mr Bowman explained that the adoptable highway was designed by Highways, and built by a contractor specifically for this application, to meet up with any development that might come from Sandleford, if and when it came about, therefore there was no turning circle.
10. The issue of the possible health and safety for children was related to within the school boundary, and to do with the location of spaces, as per the original 2018 planning permission on the northern side of the Kiss and Drop within the school boundary.
11. Councillor Culver concluded her questioning by noting that point 6.17 mentioned the running track, and the concern expressed by Sport England that the use of it would be impeded by fencing. She queried whether it was intended that there would be a running track for students. Mr Bowman explained that currently, with the fence across the expansion area of land, there was the required total external space for one Form of Entry (FE) primary school. Within the available area the school could reasonably lay out a running track of approximately 60m in length, should they wish. Officers had met the Department of Education requirements in terms of providing for the curriculum for the school. If the school moved to two FE in the future and took on additional land, then they would have space for a running track of approximately 80m.
12. The Chairman stated that the total number of pupils in the school with one FE would be 210, with potentially 210 sets of parents or carers, who would be driving all the way to the Swan roundabout and back up again to the school. In the Travel Plan, there was mention of a voluntary no-drive zone. He asked whether officers envisaged that the route to Swan roundabout and back up again would be permanent and if so, where the no-drive zone would be placed.
13. Mr Bowman explained that there had been a survey commissioned by Highways officers, which had investigated the number of people travelling to the school, and the various methods of travel they might use. As the catchment area of the school was not defined, there would be more modes of transport than for a normal primary school. He believed that those driving to the school would be travelling down to the Swan roundabout and back up, as that was the way the highway was laid out. In terms of the no-drive zone, he was not aware of the details of where it was to be positioned.
14. The Chairman sought further clarification of the changes included in the revised travel plan. Mr Bowman explained that the elements of the changes were: actions had been re-assigned; contact details had been updated; sustainable travel schemes

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

had been clarified, e.g. to reduce car usage; information on how students and parent would be educated about active travel and healthy lifestyles had been included; a commitment from the school to offer a cycle to work scheme for staff, and a commitment from the school to take part in the Hands up Travel Survey had been added.

15. Councillor Jeff Cant was concerned as to whether officers had calculated catchment area projections for the school and if so, whether the significant housing development in Donnington to the north of Newbury had been taken into consideration. He lived in that area and noted that there was already congestion on the Robin Hood roundabout. Residents had been promised changes which had not yet appeared. He queried whether the broad catchment area would make it likely that people would be drawn across town from the new development.
16. Mr Bowman commented that Travel Survey undertaken in 2016 had included travel projections, however he did not have the details to hand. Mr Lewis explained that the North Newbury development had separate mitigation in place. He noted that the Highway Copse School were their own admission authority, however he believed that those who lived nearer to the school would be given priority.
17. Councillor Abbs asked a supplementary question regarding the reduction in the BREEAM level. He noted that it was initially envisaged that the school would have solar panels installed, however due to budgetary restraints this was no longer the case. The decision had been taken around the time that Members had declared a Climate Emergency. He queried whether it would be possible for solar panels to be installed in the future.
18. Mr Bowman confirmed that should funding be found in the future, then solar panels could be installed. It had been explored previously, however the Council's own budget for capital spend on solar panels did not stretch to buildings that it did not own. The school was owned by Newbury Academy Trust, and managed by Newbury College as it was not a maintained school. Officers sought to make use of the government's Decarbonisation Fund opened in December 2020, however they had been advised by consultants that the scheme was oversubscribed and funds could not be accessed.
19. Councillor Abbs asked whether installing solar panels would have meant that the development would have been able to reach the level of BREEAM excellence. Mr Bowman explained that when the previous main contractor had gone into administration, information regarding the BREEAM points had been lost.
20. Councillor Phil Barnett commented that it was preferential to see children cycling and walking to school, instead of being driven, however there would clearly be a group of parents that would have to drive to the school. He questioned whether the expectation was that all the parents or guardians would arrive at the same time, which could cause a bottle neck with regards to parking. He also queried whether, due to the young age of the pupils, it had been taken into consideration that parents would need to take the children into the school, rather than dropping them off and letting them make their own way. His concern was that the number of parking spaces would not be adequate during the interim period.
21. Mr Bowman concurred with Councillor Barnett's point that those initially attending the school would be younger children, who would need to be walked into the school from the Kiss and Drop and parking spaces. He would anticipate that parents would be arriving at various times to drop off their children. The school would manage arrival times.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

Ward Member Representation

22. Councillor Abbs in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The Sandleford development was meant to deliver new homes by 2016, and therefore the school was meant to be delivered after the building work on the site had begun. The road that was half constructed was meant to link eventually through to Monks Lane, which would have made the Travel Plan make more sense, as parents would have accessed the school through Monks Lane.
- There was also the situation where there was a temporary access through Newbury College. As Chairman of Greenham Parish Council (GPC), he was under the impression that the college did not have any objections, however they had now raised concerns. Had GPC known of the college's concerns it might have altered their view of the proposal.
- As ward member, he saw the temporary access as being a very viable solution, and could not see why it could not remain in place until such time as Sandleford was delivered, and if it was not delivered, then there was a viable solution.
- Councillor Culver had already mentioned that on the site visit the lay-by of the new road would be an absolute disaster in regards to health and safety.
- He suggested that Members considered that they should link this application to the Sandleford development in the conditions, as either the temporary highway solution became permanent, or Sandleford was delivered.
- He also suggested that a solution be worked upon with Newbury College to create a drop-off within the college boundary to allow for a "walking bus" from their site to the school in an aim to reach a greener travel solution.
- Finally, he urged Members to be cautious about reducing the BREEAM level, as he was disappointed as Ward Member to be seen to be delivering a new school without solar panels.

Member Questions to the Ward Member

23. Councillor Lynne Doherty wondered where Councillor Abbs had got the impression that the school was built for Sandleford, as her understanding was that it was built for the overflow for primary schools in the south of the area.
24. Councillor Abbs suggested that the Travel Plan had suggested the links with the Sandleford development. He noted that there would be a connection through Sandleford to Monks Lane. The connection was that the road had been built as though the Sandleford development had been built, so it could not be ignored that the Travel Plan had been designed as though there was a road through Sandleford, and therefore it was now linked, even if it had not been originally.
25. The Chairman concurred with Councillor Abbs that it was always intended, at the time of road being built, that it would link through to the Sandleford site. However, it was not serving the Sandleford residents.

Member Questions to Officers

26. Councillor Culver raised the issue of the need to have the extra Kiss and Drop by the time the student cohort had reached 120, which would be by September 2024, not September 2025. It was important that the date was correct and it clearly stated in point 6.11 of the report that there would be 30 in 2021, 60 in 2022, 90 in 2023, and 120 in 2024. It might appear pedantic, but the conditions needed to be clear on when the extra places needed to be available.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

27. Councillor Culver noted that in order to provide the extra Kiss and Drop places, there was a need to move some of the trees, mentioned in point 6.10 of the report. She wondered whether it would be better to do this sooner rather than later, as the trees would be well established in three years' time.
28. Councillor Culver also referred to point 6.25 of the report to a risk of vandalism to the lights. She sought clarification as to whether other lower lights in the district had been subject to vandalism.
29. Mr Till noted that in respect of the timing of the provision for the Kiss and Drop he did not pretend to have the level of familiarity as Mr Bowman had with the application. Mr Bowman had advised that the date was 2025, however Councillor Culvers' maths did seem to be correct, therefore if members were minded to amend the condition to 2024, the grounds would be reasonable and should it prove unnecessary, the applicant could seek an amendment to the condition at a later date.
30. Mr Till noted that moving the trees was at the schools own prerogative in terms of ensuring that the trees were moved in such a manner as to prevent harm to them. Should the trees need to be moved at an earlier date, then the landscaping advice from their consultant would affect their decision.
31. In respect of Councillor Culver's question regarding vandalism of lighting columns, Mr Till had no pertinent information with which to advise the Committee. The applicant had indicated a preference towards the higher column solution, rather than the bollard solution. The officer who had assessed this matter had raised no objection to either, so he suggested that school was likely to install the solution which would cost the least.
32. Councillor Hilary Cole had a question on the lighting condition 5. She queried whether the Committee was able to decide which lighting scheme could be used, should they express a preference. Mr Till confirmed that the committee could amend the recommended condition. The condition was recommended thus, as the case officer's view had been that he had no material grounds to prefer one scheme to the other.
33. The Chairman questioned officers regarding paragraph 6.9 of the report, and the ability to park on the link road in the lay-by. The Committee had already heard reference to the lack of a turning circle. He queried whether officers envisaged that parking would be banned in the lay-by, in the short term, to avoid the chaos of drivers turning round in the road, or would people be allowed to use the lay-by as the school filled up.
34. Mr Till explained that the Highways officer had made a comprehensive assessment of the parking provision and the road layout in respect of this application and the previous existing planning permission on the site. The extant planning permission was the applicant's fall-back position, therefore imposing conditions in respect of a matter that had already been approved would be fundamentally unreasonable. In respect of the limitation of parking, the school had duty of care to people who used their roads for access and should take sufficient precautions in order to ensure no dangerous vehicles movements would occur on the site. He did not believe there was any reasonable grounds for the Committee to impose additional conditions in this instance.
35. The Chairman asked a supplementary question, regarding the schools duty of care, and whether this fell to the school or Newbury College. He noted that Newbury College had a huge area of land that could resolve the situation. He sought clarification as to who would be responsible in a planning or a legal sense for the

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

safety of the pupils. He understood who was responsible once the pupils were on the school land. However who was responsible when the pupils were on the highway, and what could the Committee do about it tonight. Mr Till explained that this was going somewhat beyond the reach of the planning application. The Committee was considering what was within the red line of the application site. Ultimately the duty of care for parents and children attending their site fell to the school and the Head teacher. Land owned by Newbury College did not form part of the site under consideration, and the Committee had no control other than what was within this planning application.

36. Mrs Armour concurred with Mr Till and directed the Committee to continue to focus on the application before them.
37. The Chairman continued to query whether Members could continue to work within the red line to provide a solution, as it included land to the north of the link road. Mrs Armour noted that the Chairman should be mindful of the extant permission and of what was being applied for in terms of the amendments.
38. Councillor Clive Hooker asked Mr Till about the information the Committee had been given about the original developer going into administration. He questioned how robust officers had been in interrogating the previous company in getting the information regarding BREEAM. He found it strange in this day of being paperless and computer driven projects that this information would not have been backed up if officers had persisted. The position was now that the level of BREEAM had to be reduced to "very good" and he felt it was very disappointing. Mr Till agreed that it was disappointing to reduce the level of compliance, however he was aware from the discussions that had taken place with the applicant, that the missing information was a perfectly legitimate problem with proving that the development could meet BREEAM "Excellent". He was also aware that the development was managed with that task in mind, however where information was held purely by the contractor, and the contractor went into administration, then the records went into the hands of various third parties, and he was minded to say that he could accept that the information had gone missing. He found it implausible to suggest that there was any intention to deceive and cover any failure to comply with BREEAM. He was aware that the point system of BREEAM meant that if points were lost in certain areas, then this greatly affected the overall score.
39. Councillor Abbs referred to the unfinished parking bay mentioned earlier in the meeting. He queried what the measurement was for a turning circle so that a vehicle could smoothly exit out of the back-gate. Mr Till noted that he would have to answer the question from the point of not being an expert on technical highways details. He stated that the Highways officer had checked over the scheme and had confirmed that it provided parking in accordance with the site requirements.
40. Councillor Abbs asked whether Members could ensure that the turning circle was sufficient through an amendment to the conditions. Mr Till assured the Committee that the Highways officer had measured the provision from the plans that had been provided. He could confirm that the plans complied with Highways standards. If a discrepancy was found to have occurred then it could be investigated and action taken to rectify it. The conditions required compliance with the plans and those plans did show sufficient space.

Debate

41. Councillor Hilary Cole opened the debate by commenting that the Committee was edging towards being in danger of amending the application on the fly. She wanted to

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

remind Members that they should be considering the application as it was before them, and not to try to change things because they felt that they have a better idea. Her comment was on the lighting, and her preference for the lighting was for low level bollards to avoid excessive light pollution. She appreciated that the column lights were direct, however for the aesthetics she would prefer to see low level bollards.

42. Councillor Hooker wished to give his general overview of the project. He recalled sitting down with Members two years ago and discussing this application at length. Members were quite specific with the conditions, such as Kiss and Drop. He noted that the Committee had heard tonight that the developer had lost the information about BREEAM. He wanted to ask Members to give consideration as to the process that this applicant had gone through to have made numerous changes to the extant permission. The applicant was requesting approval for amendments such as, tarmacking the play area at behest of the new Head Teacher, reducing the Kiss and Drop area, the introduction of lighting, effectively taking away a whole football field of play area, and the erection of 2m high fences and knee high fences. He was questioning who project managed this development, and who had given the developer the approval to make these changes with the expectation that this Committee would rubber-stamp them. On this basis any developer would make any change they like with the expectation that this Committee would approve it. He asked the question, considering who the applicant was, how West Berkshire Planning Officers would react if a private developer had built a hotel for example, and then returned a year later having made ten changes and asked for approval. He queried where the link was between the project manager, the developer and the Planning Department of this Council to give a pre-application consideration as to whether this was acceptable. He found this application rather embarrassing, and not a good example going forward.
43. The Chairman thanked Councillor Hooker and concurred with his view. He was also concerned that the Council, as an applicant, sometimes behaved less robustly in terms of process than some other applicants. He reminded Members that they were faced with approving the application with the respective changes or not. He considered that the area where they did have discretion was in the area of the Travel Plan, which seemed clear to Ward Members.
44. Councillor Cant was concerned as to what extent the delivery of educational services to young people in the area would be affected were the Committee to impede the progress of this planning application. He had every sympathy with the points made about adequate project management and better control, however he reflected on the impact on the generations of children who might use the school that not going ahead with the project might have.
45. The Chairman asked whether it would be helpful if he suggested something as Chairman that he and other Ward Members had previously discussed. He considered that what had been proposed was acceptable for two or three years, however the Travel Plan already proposed to establish a voluntary no-drive zone by Easter 2022. He noted that within the College grounds there was a bus stop that had the potential to be a drop-off. He suggested that the Committee could request that the school negotiate with Newbury College and set up a Park and Stride facility from the bus stop within three years. He queried whether a condition could be imposed to review the Travel Plan within three years, so that the newly evolving situation could be considered and addressed.
46. Councillor Hilary Cole understood the points made, however the question that needed to be clarified by officers was whether what had been proposed by the

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

Chairman was too much of deviation from the application before the Committee tonight. If it were considered acceptable to the officers, then she would support it.

47. Mrs Armour stated that on the assumption that the Chairman was discussing the amendment of condition 10, she understood that he was proposing that the Travel Plan came into effect, but included a revision clause within a certain time limit. There would then need to be clarity on who would be approving the revisions, usually this would be the responsibility of officers.
48. Mr Till's interpretation of what had been said was that Members would seek an amendment to condition 10, which would require a review of the Travel Plan within three years of the commencement of the use of the school. The review would consider the adequacy of the Kiss and Drop facility and explore options for the provision of a Park and Stride facility, in order to account for any shortfall of parking provision for parents/carers. He thought that this was a requirement that could be imposed to the condition without imposing an additional onerous requirement on the applicant.
49. Councillor Doherty remarked that she was happy with the officer's proposal for the amendments to condition 10, however she was not happy with the detail, as she felt that should be left to the school to decide as they were responsible for managing the site and the pupils. The Chairman agreed with Councillor Doherty's view.
50. Councillor Cant sought clarification on what was being proposed. He posited that it appeared that what was being proposed was to do with the future management of the access of parents and children attending the school. He felt that this might not be a planning matter, but might instead be a continuing management review of the way the school was used as a facility. He was baffled that he might be being asked to vote on something that was beyond the Committee's capacity to impose.
51. The Chairman explained that it was part of the application for the Committee to discharge the Travel Plan. He suggested that it was better for the Committee to amend the Travel Plan at this point, rather than Ward Members such as himself, having to beg the school to change its management plans in the future.
52. Councillor Doherty wished to make a point of order. She acknowledged that she was inexperienced in planning meetings, however she queried whether the Chairman was taking part in the debate as the Chairman, or as a Ward member, as his suggestions seemed to be unduly influenced by his role as Ward Member.
53. The Chairman explained that he was picking up on a point raised by Councillor Abbs, and merely wished to move the debate along.
54. Mrs Armour sought to clarify the situation and asked the Chairman to confirm in terms of the debate and decision that he would be in his role as a Member of the Committee, and not as Ward Member. The Chairman confirmed this was correct.
55. Councillor Hooker asked whether the Chairman should abstain. Mrs Armour explained that it was the Chairman's decision whether he felt he had an interest that would prevent him from voting. She agreed that the comment the Chairman had made might have sounded like it was made from a Ward Member point of view, and it was for him to decide whether he had an interest, and if so whether it would bar him from voting. Councillor Hooker remarked the Committee had to ensure that they were transparent in their decision.
56. The Chairman advised that unless he had a personal interest, he represented his Ward and had to think about issues that would arise. He did not see that he should not vote on this item.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

57. Councillor Hilary Cole remarked that in her personal opinion and using her experience as a long-serving member of the committee, she considered that the Chairman had compromised himself with regards to voting on this item. The Chairman advised that he would consider the views of the Committee.
58. Councillor Abbs proposed to accept officer's recommendation and grant planning permission, despite it being retrospective, with the following amendments: officers proposed amendment to condition 10, low level bollard lighting, and amend the date from 2025 to 2024.
59. This was seconded by Councillor Hilary Cole.
60. At the vote the motion was carried.
61. Councillor Hooker and the Chairman abstained.
62. Councillor Hooker explained that the reason he had abstained was the number, extent and timing of retrospective amendments.
63. **RESOLVED** that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

64. Conditions

1.	<p>Approved Plans</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site Location and Existing Site Plan drawing number PL 002 rev. C;• Landscape Proposals General Arrangement drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-1001 Rev 13;• Proposed Ground Floor drawing number PL004 rev. 1;• Roof Plan drawing number 18026-RFT-00-01-DR-A-0202 Rev CR2;• Sections drawing number PL007 rev. 1;• Elevations drawing number 18026-RFT-00-ZZ-DR-A-0300 Rev CR2;• Elevations drawing number 18026-RFT-00-ZZ-DR-A-0301 Rev CR2;• Proposed Road Layout Signals drawing number PL011-27599-010 rev. B;• Site Sections Plan drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-5001 Rev 6;• Site Sections Plan drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-5002 Rev C02;• Tree Retention & Protection Plan drawing number LLD919/04 rev. 04;• Boundary Plan drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-1003 Rev 04;• External Lighting Plan drawing number 180730/001/E08;• Hard Landscape and Fencing Plan drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2001 Rev 10;• Hard Landscape and Fencing Plan drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2002 Rev 04;• Hard Landscape and Fencing Plan drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2003 Rev 02;• Foul and Surface water Drainage (Sheet 1 of 3) drawing number 101:1 rev. P3;• Foul and Surface water Drainage (Sheet 2 of 3) drawing number 101:2 rev. P1;• Foul and Surface water Drainage (Sheet 3 of 3) drawing number 101:3
----	---

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

	<p>rev. P1;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kiss and drop arrangement drawing number 1967-TF-XX-00-SK-L-20210723-05 received on 26th June 2021, the implementation of which is secured by condition 20. <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.</p>
2.	<p>Boundary Treatments</p> <p>The school hereby approved shall not be bought into use until the boundary treatments, to include external boundaries around the site and internal boundaries within the site, have been erected in accordance with the details shown on drawing numbers 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-1003 Rev 04, 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2001 Rev 10, 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2002 Rev 04 and 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2003 Rev 02. The boundary treatments shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: The boundary treatments are an important element in the design of the scheme. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).</p>
3	<p>Hardstanding</p> <p>The school hereby approved shall not be bought into use until the areas of hard standing have been constructed in accordance with the details shown on drawing numbers 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2001 Rev 10, 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2002 Rev 04 and 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-2003 Rev 02. The areas of hard surfacing shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details with the exception of the kiss and drop parking area to be provided by condition 20 which is to be retained in accordance with that condition upon implementation.</p> <p>Reason: The areas of hardstanding are an important element of the design of the scheme. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).</p>
4	<p>BREEAM</p> <p>Evidence confirming that the development achieves a BREEAM Education rating of Very Good shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The evidence required shall be provided in the following formats and at the following times unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Evidence of Submission to the BRE for a Post Construction Final Certificate shall be provided within 8 weeks of Occupation of the building. 2) A copy of the Final Certificate certifying that BREEAM Very Good has been achieved for the development, shall be provided within 12 Months of Occupation of the building.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

	<p>Reason: To ensure the development contributes to sustainable construction. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS15 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).</p>
5	<p>External Lighting</p> <p>The school hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the external lighting to be used around the school and on the access road has been installed in accordance with drawing number 180730/001/E08. Within 2 years of the school being brought into use the bollard lighting along the access road from Newbury College will be installed in accordance with drawing number D41196(003)/PMU/A (bollard lighting) and datasheet Deco 2.0. No external lighting shall be installed on the building or across the site except for that expressly authorised by the approval of details as part of this condition. The approved external lighting shall thereafter be retained with the exception of the lighting adjacent to the kiss and drop parking area to be provided by condition 20 upon implementation of that scheme. The re-located lighting columns within the school grounds following the implementation of the new kiss and drop parking arrangement will be thereafter retained.</p> <p>Reason: To have regard to the setting of the development and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and wildlife. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).</p>
6	<p>Contamination</p> <p>Should any unforeseen contamination be encountered during the development, the developer shall inform the Local Planning Authority immediately. Any subsequent investigation/remedial/protective works deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out to agreed timescales and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. If no contamination is encountered during the development, a letter confirming this fact shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority upon completion of the development.</p> <p>Reason: In order to protect the amenities of future users of the site in accordance with Policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007) and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
7	<p>Mechanical Plant</p> <p>The school hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the mechanical air handling plant and chillers have been installed in accordance with the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attenuator Drawings dated 3/6/2020; • Hall AHU Summary Fan Data Sheet; • i-Max Chiller Heat Pumps; • Kitchen Extract Summary Fan Data Sheet;

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kitchen Supply AHU Summary Fan Data Sheet; • Maxa i-HP Data Sheet; • Maxa i-HP Performance Tables; • MSY-TP35V Comms Room System data sheet; • MTS001-ASHP-AC data sheet; • Noise Assessment dated 12th June 2020; • PLA-ZM50 Cassette IT Suite System; • Roof Plant Layout Plan drawing number LO-Y34-R1-50-01 Rev C1. <p>Noise resulting from any other plant, machinery or equipment to be installed shall not exceed a level of 5dB(A) below the existing background level (or 10dB(A) below if there is a particular tonal quality) when measured according to British Standard BS4142, at a point one metre external to the nearest noise sensitive premises.</p> <p>Reason : In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy OVS5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007) and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
8	<p>Construction Hours of Work</p> <p>No construction works shall take place outside the following hours: 7.30 am to 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays 8.30 am to 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays and no work shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
9	<p>Playing Field Construction</p> <p>The school hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the playing field and MUGA within the school site have been provided in accordance with drawing numbers HWC-MAC-DR-L(90)100 Rev C01, HWC-MAC-DR-L(90)101 Rev C01, HWC-MAC-DR-L(90)102 Rev C02, HWC-MAC-DR-L(90)103 Rev C02, HWC-MAC-XX-XX-RP-L1000 and 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-4001.</p> <p>The playing field and MUGA shall thereafter be provided and maintained in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the quality of the pitches is satisfactory, in accordance with Policy CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
10	<p>Travel Plan</p> <p>The Travel Plan received on 26th May 2021 shall be implemented as approved on commencement of the use as a school and its provisions shall continue to be implemented until 20th August 2024. Prior to 20th August 2024 a review of that</p>

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

	<p>Travel Plan shall be undertaken to assess whether the parking levels for the school are sufficient and shall include an investigation as to whether additional measures are required to be implemented to assist with the movement of traffic such as the provision of a "park and stride" facility. That investigation is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to 20th August 2024 and any additional measures identified shall be implemented prior to commencement of the school term in September 2024 and maintained thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the efficient function of the site and to promote sustainable forms of transport. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).</p>
11	<p>Cycle and Scooter Parking</p> <p>The school shall not be brought into use until the cycle and scooter parking and storage spaces have been provided in the location shown on drawing number 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-1003 in accordance with drawing numbers SK00714 Rev A and BXMW-SJ-1.02[A] and the spaces shall be retained for this purpose at all times.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that there is adequate and safe cycle and scooter storage spaces within the site. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).</p>
12	<p>Tree Protection</p> <p>Protective fencing shall be implemented and retained intact for the duration of the development in accordance with the tree and landscape protection scheme identified on approved drawing number LLD919/04 rev. 04. Within the fenced areas, there shall be no excavations, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles or fires.</p> <p>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 National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</p>
13	<p>Arboricultural Watching Brief</p> <p>The development (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Supervision 'Watching Brief', dated 12th July 2017 produced by Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology and Supplementary letter reference - LLD1220/KM/14.08.2017.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in</p>

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

	accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
14	<p>Tree Retention</p> <p>No trees, shrubs or hedges shown as being retained on the Tree Retention & Protection Plan (drawing number LLD919/04 rev. 04) shall be pruned, cut back, felled, wilfully damaged or destroyed in any way without the prior consent of the local planning authority. Any trees, shrubs or hedges felled, removed or destroyed, or any that die, become seriously damaged or diseased within five years from completion of the approved development, shall be replaced with the same species in the next planting season unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any subsequent variation.</p> <p>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 National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</p>
15	<p>Landscaping</p> <p>The Landscaping Scheme shall be implemented in full in accordance with drawing numbers 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-3002 Rev 05, 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-1005 Rev 01 and 1967-TF-00-00-DR-L-3001 Rev 04 including the planting of a wildflower mix on the proposed bunds and will be managed and maintained in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan (ref: 1967-TF-00-ZZ-RE-L-8001), with the exception of the landscaping adjacent to the kiss and drop parking area to be provided by condition 20 which is to be managed and maintained in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan (ref: 1967-TF-00-ZZ-RE-L-8001) once that additional kiss and drop parking has been implemented in accordance with condition 20.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure an acceptable landscaping scheme is implemented and managed and maintained in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</p>
16	<p>Construction Management Plan</p> <p>The demolition and construction works shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan and addendum dated February 2018.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers, and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).</p>

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 11 AUGUST 2021 - MINUTES

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.00 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature