

Notice of Meeting



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

Eastern Area Planning Committee

Wednesday, 20th March, 2019 at 6.30pm

At the Calcot Centre, Highview (off Royal Avenue), Calcot

Members Interests

Note: If you consider you may have an interest in any Planning Application included on this agenda then please seek early advice from the appropriate officers.

FURTHER INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Note: The Council broadcasts some of its meetings on the internet, known as webcasting. If this meeting is webcasted, please note that any speakers addressing this meeting could be filmed. If you are speaking at a meeting and do not wish to be filmed, please notify the Chairman before the meeting takes place. Please note however that you will be audio-recorded. Those taking part in Public Speaking are reminded that speakers in each representation category are grouped and each group will have a maximum of 5 minutes to present its case.

Plans relating to the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting can be viewed in the Calcot Centre between 5.30pm and 6.30pm on the day of the meeting.

No new information may be produced to Committee on the night (this does not prevent applicants or objectors raising new points verbally). If objectors or applicants wish to introduce new additional material they must provide such material to planning officers at least 5 clear working days before the meeting (in line with the Local Authorities (Access to Meetings and Documents) (Period of Notice) (England) Order 2002).

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact the Planning Team on (01635) 519148

Email: planapps@westberks.gov.uk

Further information, Planning Applications and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at www.westberks.gov.uk

Any queries relating to the Committee should be directed to Stephen Chard / Jessica Bailiss on (01635) 519462/503124 Email:

stephen.chard@westberks.gov.uk/jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk



Agenda - Eastern Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 20 March 2019
(continued)

To: Councillors Peter Argyle, Pamela Bale, Graham Bridgman, Keith Chopping, Richard Crumly, Marigold Jaques, Alan Law (Vice-Chairman), Alan Macro, Tim Metcalfe, Graham Pask (Chairman), Richard Somner and Emma Webster

Substitutes: Councillors Rob Denton-Powell, Lee Dillon, Sheila Ellison, Tony Linden and Mollie Lock

Agenda

Part I

	Page No.
(1) Application No. & Parish: 18/03195/FULMAJ - Land at Springs Farm, Westbury Lane, Purley on Thames	5 - 6
Proposal: Change of use of land from agricultural to equestrian use. Associated paddocks and bridge. Retrospective application for stable block, manege, track, and 4 staff flats in stables.	
Location: Land at Springs Farm, Westbury Lane, Purley on Thames.	
Applicant: Mr Otaibi	
Recommendation: The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to GRANT conditional planning permission.	
(2) Application No. & Parish: 18/02635/COMIND - Shalford Farm, Wasing	7 - 8
Proposal: Conversion and redevelopment of land and buildings at Shalford Farm. Wedding shop, estate farm shop, overnight accommodation, bakery and cookery school, restaurant and yoga studio, biomass boiler and associated parking and landscaping.	
Location: Shalford Farm, Wasing.	
Applicant: Trustees of the 1975 Wasing Settlement.	
Recommendation: The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to REFUSE planning permission.	
(3) Application No. & Parish: 18/03367/FUL - Manderley, School Lane, Frilsham, Thatcham	9 - 12
Proposal: Creation of an all-weather 20m x 30.8m outdoor riding arena.	
Location: Manderley, School Lane, Frilsham, Thatcham	
Applicant: Mr E Caloia and Mrs E Morando	
Recommendation: The Head of Development and Planning be authorise to GRANT planning permission	



Agenda - Eastern Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 20 March 2019
(continued)

Background Papers

- (a) The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
- (b) The West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire, the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire and relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents.
- (c) Any previous planning applications for the site, together with correspondence and report(s) on those applications.
- (d) The case file for the current application comprising plans, application forms, correspondence and case officer's notes.
- (e) The Human Rights Act.

Andy Day
Head of Strategic Support

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.



This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4.(1)

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 20TH MARCH 2019

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 18/03195/FULMAJ **Page No.** 17-28

Site: Springs Farm, Purley On Thames

Planning Officer Presenting: Michael Butler

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Councillor Rick Farrow

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Lucy White
Matthew Evans

Ward Member(s): Councillor Tim Metcalfe
Councillor Rick Jones

Update Information:

On the agenda report –following corrections/update,

1. The applicant should read as Springs Farm Limited not Mr Otaibi.
2. The section under 6 [other issues] needs to be revised –the archaeologist is now satisfied that no further assessment is required so no conditions required.
3. The EA have still not removed their objection. However from recent correspondence on the file, it is understood that this is likely to be removed in due course. Accordingly the officer recommendation remains one of approval but subject to the objection from the EA being removed and conditions applied. No notice will be issued until this is clarified, by the EA.
4. Para 5.2 refers to one listed building. In fact there are a number of listed buildings on the estate as a whole.
5. In the officer conclusions the three strands of sustainability are examined. Members need to be aware that in the light of revised guidance in the NPPF of 2019 the prevailing Development Plan must be given

due priority in approving or rejecting decisions. In this case given the officer recommendation, officers are satisfied that the scheme accords with the Statutory Plan.

6. In terms of conditions 1 is now no longer required since all of the forward splays lie within highways land, and thus control by the Council.

Condition 2 should be amended to read as follows.

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

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018), 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).

Condition 5 needs to be slightly revised in terms of updating amended plans received.

Condition 7 can now be deleted, since the heras fencing has all been removed from the site adjoining the footpath. Photos have been taken to note this yesterday.

Following the Committee site visit there was a debate about the precise approved line of PURL1/1. It has been agreed at officer level with the applicants, that the line on the ground is the correct one in relation to the definitive line. The applicant is also providing a 4m width which is considered "generous".

The applicants' agent has circulated a note to all Members of the Committee about the application by way of an update. Officers are satisfied that this provides no "new" information within the 5 working day rule but simply clarifies the situation re the application.

Revised Recommendations

Subject to confirmation that the objection from the Environment Agency being removed, the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to GRANT Conditional Planning Permission.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 20TH MARCH 2019

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (2) **Application No:** 1802635COMIND **Page No.** 29-37
Site: Shalford Farm, Aldermaston

Planning Officer Presenting: Michael Butler

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Councillor Mary Cowdery

Objector(s) speaking: Nick Caiger-Smith

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Josh Dugdale
Steven Smallman

Ward Member(s): Councillor Dominic Boeck

Update Information:

The EA have now formally removed their objection to the application and are recommending conditional permission. Accordingly if the application is approved at Committee additional conditions will be placed regarding finished floor levels, permeable fencing, and contamination.

Additional information has been provided to the Council about the proposed surface water drainage on the site should it be permitted and developed. The Council SUDS engineer is now satisfied that this is acceptable and is accordingly recommending approval.

The applicant's agent has submitted further information as to why they consider the provision of the bus shuttle service will be effective and viable in transporting both employees and visitors to the site. The Council highways engineer has responded noting that he is still not content with the deliverability or future viability / monitoring/effectiveness of the service, and so does not alter his recommendation to refuse.

One additional letter of objection received on the application. Similar to other views already made – concerns about need, future viability, if fails what will then happen, if successful will be very damaging to the local environment, and will create unacceptable levels of traffic in the locality.

Following the Committee site visit a number of queries were raised :

The number of existing employees on the site is currently 7. Existing footpaths around the site are considered by officers to not assist in the sustainability of the site, one leads to Brimpton to the east another to the Wasing Estate. The likelihood of these being used to any effective extent by employees / visitors is low, in the view of officers.

The distance from the application red line site boundary to the building [farmhouse] to the north is 41m. The conservation officer has responded with no overall objections to the application, in relation to the setting of the listed Shalford farmhouse, which was originally part of the curtilage of the group of barns now part of the application site. The separation distances to the Wasing Historic Park and the 6 listed buildings there is too great to have any impact.

Amended reasons for refusal.

Delete reason for refusal number 3 re EA/ Drainage.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 20TH MARCH 2019

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (3) **Application No:** 18/03367/FUL **Page No.** 39-49
Site: Manderley, Frilsham

Planning Officer Presenting: Sarah Melton

Member Presenting: David Pearson

Parish Representative speaking: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Simon Dimick
Trevor Furse

Ward Member(s): Councillor Quentin Webb
Councillor Graham Pask

Update Information: Consultee response from North Wessex Downs AONB

The AONB has continuously raised concerns over development of a riding arena/manege at this site for a number of years and maintains these concerns.

When new horse-related development is necessary, it should preferably relate to an existing group of buildings or be sited as inconspicuously as possible. In this instance this cannot be achieved.

Generally new structures should be related to existing features and respect the lie of the land. Elevated or skyline sites should be avoided. The use of earth mounding and cutting into the ground should also be avoided unless it merges with the landscape. Planting can usually reduce the adverse effects of development but again this should complement existing tree and hedge cover rather than producing unnatural features in the landscape.

The proposed development would urbanise the site as a result of the introduction of engineered structures that fail to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB but

would materially alter the profile of the local topography to the detriment of the special qualities of the AONB.

The change in the natural contours of the land would be of significant harm to a topography that has not be subject to change and would therefore form part of a historic landscape. The changes whether planted or not would be notable in the local landscape and could set an unfortunate precedent.

Shifting the manege to the other side of the tree line does not improve the scheme as the changes in levels and engineering works will still be notable from wider view points, particularly in the winter months when there is no tree cover.

No fence (apart from a small section close to the access) is detailed, however given the significant change in levels, it is likely that the applicants would install a fence on at least one side (left of section AA) for safety reasons due to the potential risk which could indeed be life threatening if a horse and rider went over the side where there is a drop of 1.57 metres, and with the manege being within close proximity of the lane, there is an increased risk of scaring and the horse jolting as a result, it only takes one beep of a horn or a speeding vehicle to cause distress to a horse.

The proximity of the manege/riding arena close to the house would in my opinion alter the character of the property to the detriment of the local street scene, as it would in part be visible from the lane, the proposed surface material could be a shade darker, but I am aware that there are only a limited number of options for surfaces, the most used being pale sand colour or dark grey/black, neither of which would be appropriate.

The landscape assessment is again a poor attempt, it picks views that are partly screened rather than those that are open and could again increase the number of viewpoints assessed.

No justification has been provided as to why these structures/facilities are required, there appears to be no need for these within the AONB or this locality only a personal desire/want in order to accommodate a leisure activity. The development will provide no benefit to the local environment (no biodiversity gains), local community or local economy. The applicant has failed to provide any evidence that there is an essential need for these structures/facilities or that there are no alternative sites within the village (renting use of a manege/arena at an existing stable or renting land adjacent to a group of farm buildings for exercising horses). There are no benefits to outweigh the harm caused to the natural beauty of the AONB.

The applicant again refers to the ground conditions which can be very muddy, this will not change with the addition of a riding arena as the horses will still be grazed in the paddocks and will still move around creating the same problems. The land in itself due to the bowl shape of the topography is not ideal for the keeping of horses (or cattle) as water holds in the upper layer making it boggy for lengthy periods.

The change in levels could also affect the natural route of surface water runoff. Historically this land has been grazed during the summer months when the ground is firm under foot, this process has naturally managed the grassland.

There are concerns that the addition of a manege in addition to the existing stables would be of a scale that could result in the site being used by other horse riders/owners, this would commercialise the use of the site and result in further intensification of the use of land and further erosion of the landscape.

There are also concerns that if such a development were permitted that the next step would be for external lighting, an element which would be most inappropriate for this locality, characterised by dark skies, a special quality of the AONB. Therefore, if the officer is minded to approve, the AONB would request that a condition be attached stipulating that no external lighting be installed.

As it stands the NWD AONB would consider the principle of development to be unacceptable in this locality and special circumstances cannot be demonstrated. Therefore, the development is contrary to paras 8, 130, 170, 172 of the NPPF (2018), the NWD AONB Management Plan and WB Core Strategy Policies CS10, CS12, CS17 and CS19, and the saved local plan policies OVS.5.

Letters of objections

There are 17 letters of objections submitted with this application, and not 21 as per the main report. All the points listed in the main report remain up-to-date and accurately represent the comments made by members of the public.

This page is intentionally left blank