

# Supplemental Items for Eastern Area Planning Committee

**Wednesday, 4 October, 2023 at 6.30 pm**  
in Council Chamber, Council Offices,  
Market Street, Newbury

Part I	Page No.
(1) 23/01552/REG3, Four Houses Corner Caravan Site, Reading Road, Ufton Nervet	3 - 8
(2) 23/00879/FUL, 6A Victoria Road, Mortimer Common	9 - 10
(3) 22/01953/FULD, Reservoir (covered), Tutts Clump, Reading	11-14

*Sarah Clarke.*

Sarah Clarke

Service Director (Strategy & Governance)

For further information about this/these item(s), or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact Democratic Services Team on

e-mail: [executivecycle@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:executivecycle@westberks.gov.uk) / [jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk)

Further information and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at

[www.westberks.gov.uk](http://www.westberks.gov.uk)



## Supplemental Items

**Eastern Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 4 October 2023** *(continued)*

West Berkshire Council is committed to equality of opportunity. We will treat everyone with respect, regardless of race, disability, gender, age, religion or sexual orientation.

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Stephen Chard on telephone (01635) 519462.



West Berkshire  
C O U N C I L

# Agenda Item 4.(1)

## EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

4 OCTOBER 2023

### UPDATE REPORT

**Item No:** (1)      **Application No:** 23/01552/REG3      **Page No.** 25-46

**Site:** Four Houses Corner Caravan Site, Reading Road, Ufton Nervet

---

#### 1. Registered Speakers

Please refer to List of Speakers provided under separate cover.

#### 2. Additional Consultation Responses

<b>Public representations:</b>	None received post Committee report date .
<b>Ufton Nervet PC</b>	Objection. No specific public consultation has been undertaken on the application. What future monitoring will take place on the site in the future ? Concerned about future flooding on the site and the poor visibility splays and lack of a footway along the Padworth Road to Burghfield Common. Also how will future occupancy numbers be controlled given the site lies in the DEPZ for AWE Burghfield ?
<b>Council tree officer .</b>	Conditional permission is recommended. [ see below].
<b>Environmental health officer</b>	Whilst much of the site has been effectively now decontaminated there remains the possibility of high methane gas levels in the day rooms. Accordingly a condition is required to ensure correct implementation of the flooring is identified. Also a standard condition re unforeseen contamination should be applied. No objections.
<b>SUDS</b>	The amended scheme is a betterment over that as previously submitted however there remains concerns over the overall details of the new scheme. However should the officers be minded to recommend approval a condition is supplied. Officer comment . In the light of the betterment identified a conditional approval is recommended. In addition the condition is a pre condition.

#### 3 Officer Comment

In relation to the Ufton Nervet objection, it has been confirmed that no specific additional public consultation was considered necessary other than the normal process for an application which has been correctly undertaken.

Typographical correction -para 3.4 last sentence. Cil room should read Day room.

#### 4 Updated Recommendation

The recommendation remains as set out in the agenda committee report, subject to the following additional/amended conditions.

1`	<p><b>Landscaping</b></p> <p>No development or other operations shall commence on site until a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities</li> <li>• an implementation programme providing sufficient specifications to ensure successful cultivation of trees, shrub and grass establishment.</li> </ul> <p>The scheme shall ensure;</p> <p>a) Completion of the approved landscape scheme within the first planting season following completion of development.</p> <p>b) Any trees shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of this development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.</p> <p>A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; landscaping measures may require work to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> <i>Required to safeguard and enhance the character and amenity of the area, to provide ecological, environmental and bio-diversity benefits and to maximise the quality and usability of open spaces within the development, and to enhance its setting within the immediate locality. This is to ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the NPPF and Policies ADPP1, CS14, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</i></p>
2	<p><b>Unforeseen contamination</b></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 LPA shall be carried out to agreed timescales and approved by the LPA in writing. If no contamination is encountered during the development, a letter confirming this fact shall be submitted to the LPA upon completion of the development.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To protect future occupiers and users of the site from the harmful effects of contamination, in accord with the advice in the NPPF.</p>
3	<p><b>Gas protection</b></p>

	<p>The gas protection measures to make the land suitable for its intended use, as set out in the Earth Environmental &amp; Geotechnical Report dated April 2022 shall be completed in full and a validation report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To protect future occupiers and users of the site from the harmful effects of contamination, in accord with the advice in the NPPF .</p>
4	<p><b>SUDS</b></p> <p>No development shall take place until details of sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>These details shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Incorporate the implementation of Sustainable Drainage methods (SuDS) in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (March 2015), the SuDS Manual C753 (2015) and the WBC SuDS Supplementary Planning Document December 2018 with particular emphasis on Green SuDS and water re-use;</li> <li>b. Include flood water exceedance routes (low flow, overflow and exceedance routes), both on and off site;</li> <li>c. Include a drainage strategy for surface water run-off within the site since no discharge of surface water from the site will be accepted into the highway drainage system by the Lead Local Flood Authority;</li> <li>d. Include attenuation measures to retain rainfall run-off within the site and allow discharge from the site to an existing watercourse or piped system at no greater than 1 in 1 year Greenfield run-off rates (or as subsequently agreed with the LLFA);</li> <li>e. Include run-off calculations based on current rainfall data models, discharge rates (based on 1 in 1 year greenfield run-off rates), and storage capacity calculations for the proposed SuDS measures based on a 1 in 100 year storm +40% for climate change;</li> <li>f. Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site;</li> <li>g. Ensure permeable paved areas are designed and constructed in accordance with manufacturers guidelines if using a proprietary porous paved block system; otherwise ensure any permeable areas are constructed on a permeable sub-base material, such as MoT/DoT Type 3;</li> <li>h. Include a management and maintenance plan showing how the SuDS measures will be maintained and managed after completion for the lifetime of the development. This plan shall incorporate arrangements for adoption by the Council, Water and Sewage Undertaker, Maintenance or Management Company (private company or Trust) or individual property owners, or any other arrangements, including maintenance responsibilities resting with individual property owners, to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. These details shall be provided as part of a handover pack for subsequent purchasers and owners of the property/premises;</li> </ol>

- i. Include details of how surface water will be managed and contained within the site during construction works to prevent silt migration and pollution of watercourses, highway drainage and land either on or adjacent to the site;
- j. Include an Application for an Ordinary Watercourse Consent in case of surface water discharge into a watercourse (i.e stream, ditch etc);

The above sustainable drainage measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the use hereby permitted is commenced in accordance with a timetable to be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority as part of the details submitted for this condition. The sustainable drainage measures shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

**Reason:** To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner; to prevent the increased risk of flooding; to improve and protect water quality, habitat and amenity and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system can be, and is carried out in an appropriate and efficient manner. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Part 4 of Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006) and SuDS Supplementary Planning Document (Dec 2018). A pre-condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; sustainable drainage measures may require work to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.

PLANNING APPLICATION NO: 23/01552/REG3FOUR HOUSES  
CORNER CARAVAN SITE – STRATEFIELD MORTIMER

SULHAMSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL **OBJECTS** TO THIS  
APPLICATION ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:

1 The Parish Council considers that due process has not been followed.

Page 4 of the Design and Access Statement clearly says there will be Pre-Application Consultations:

- 1 - with the Local Community, and
- 2 - with Residents

Neither of these have taken place and the Parish Council is of the opinion that this application should not be progressed until such consultations have taken place.

2 There appears to be some confusion over the number of people that will be resident on the site, and how that will be impacted by the Aldermaston DEPZ.

The Joint Emergency Planning Comment says 'Having reviewed the information and taking into account the facts that the site previously had permissions in place for a greater number of pitches, and the site is accounted for in the AWE off site emergency plan, we do not object'

However, the application is actually for an increased number of pitches to those that were on the site before it was cleared. There were 18 pitches x 4 people per van = 72 people.

Now there are 17 double pitches which could equate to 136 people (17 x 2 pitches = 34, and 34 pitches with 4 people per pitch (it could be more) = 136) and some pitches are even longer, so could house another van.

3 This is a busy road and safe access to and from the site is critical. The entrance to the site is close to a tight bend in the road, with traffic on that road travelling at at least 60 mph. There appears to be no pedestrian access.

Similar to the DEPZ, it is considered that the response from Highways is based upon incorrect information as it says :

‘as the proposal is to replace the existing 18 pitches with 17, I would not be expecting any increase in traffic generation.’ But clearly there will be a lot more traffic with the potential for at least 34 cars as opposed to 18.

4 Reading Road at the junction with Island Farm Road is a black spot for flooding. Highways have tried to fix this in the past but without success. It is understood that engineers have been engaged but their report on Page 10 states: ‘there are no historical incidents of flooding within proximity to the site’ which is incorrect. The application mentions permeable material but there is still concern that the current flooding options could be exacerbated.



## EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 04 OCTOBER 2023 UPDATE REPORT

<b>Item No:</b>	(2)	<b>Application No:</b>	23/00879/FUL	<b>Page No.</b>	47-57
<b>Site:</b>	6A Victoria Road, Mortimer Common, Reading, RG7 3SE				

---

### 1. Registered Speakers

Please refer to List of Speakers provided under separate cover.

### 2. Points of clarification

Following the site visit, officers would like to make the following points of clarification:

Odour is considered to have the potential to be a Statutory Nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. This legislation is separate from the principal planning legislation and falls outside of the remit of planning. Planning includes consideration of sensible measures for control of odour when considering a new development. Such measures were considered when granting planning permission for the bistro on the site, including those referred to below.

Environmental Health report that they have investigated three reports of odour nuisance originating from the bistro on the site. Their investigations resulted in the installation of odour filters that were required to be provided under the original planning permission for the bistro use and had not been installed. This was accompanied with a schedule for the maintenance and cleaning of these filters. Environmental Health confirmed the outcome of their investigations on the 15<sup>th</sup> of August, and have not received further complaints since.

This application does not include any proposal to alter the filters that were required to be provided and maintained on the site as part of that extant planning permission. The proposal is purely for external works to provide a flu to improve the existing system by diverting the filtered emanations.

In the event that further odour nuisance is detected from the site, it falls within environmental health's remit to investigate. Such action as can be taken in respect of an identified odour nuisance, including service of an Abatement Notice, falls under the remit of environmental health.

Officers would also like to clarify that the second floor of the building (currently unbuilt) has approval to be an additional bedroom serving the existing first floor flat, and your officers advice is that the matter of placement of the flu in this location is therefore a commercial concern between the building owner and occupants.

### 3. Updated Recommendation

The recommendation remains as set out in the agenda committee report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 4<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2023

### UPDATE REPORT

**Item No:** (3)      **Application No:** 22/01953/FULD      **Page No.** 59-81

**Site:** Reservoir (covered), Bishops Road, Tutts Clump, Reading

---

#### 1. Registered Speakers

Please refer to List of Speakers provided under separate cover.

#### 2. Additional Consultation Responses

No further responses received.

#### 3. Planning Use Class

The application form advises that the existing use class of the floorspace as 'Other' specifying that it is a former reservoir and water pumping station.

It is considered that a site used for the operational purposes of a statutory water undertaker would be a Sui Generis use (a use that does not fall within any of the other use classes).

The proposal would change the use of the site to Use Class C3 (dwellinghouses).

#### 4. Policy C1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD

Please see copied on the next page the extract from the HSA DPD with the wording for Policy C1:

## Policy C 1

### Location of New Housing in the Countryside

There is a presumption in favour of development and redevelopment within the settlement boundaries of the following settlements:

Aldermaston	Donnington	Newbury
Aldermaston Wharf	East Garston	Pangbourne
Ashmore Green	East Ilsley	Peasemore
Beenham	Eastbury	Stockcross
Boxford	Eddington	Streatley
Bradfield	Enborne Row	Tadley/Pamber Heath
Bradfield Southend	Great Shefford	Thatcham
Brightwalton	Greenham	Theale
Brightwalton Green	Hampstead Norreys	Tidmarsh
Brimpton	Hermitage	Eastern Urban Area (Tilehurst, Calcot, Purley)
Burghfield	Hungerford	Upper Basildon
Burghfield Bridge	Kintbury	Upper Bucklebury
Burghfield Common	Lambourn	West Ilsley
Chieveley	Leckhampstead	Woolhampton
Cold Ash	Lower Basildon	Wickham
Compton	Mortimer	Yattendon
Curridge		

There will be a presumption against new residential development outside of the settlement boundaries. Exceptions to this are limited to rural exception housing schemes, conversion of redundant buildings, housing to accommodate rural workers, extension to or replacement of existing residential units and limited infill in settlements in the countryside with no defined settlement boundary. All proposals will need to satisfy the other policies in this section of the Plan.

In settlements in the countryside with no defined settlement boundary, limited infill development may be considered where:

- i. It is within a closely knit cluster of 10 or more existing dwellings adjacent to, or fronting an existing highway; and
- ii. The scale of development consists of infilling a small undeveloped plot commensurate with the scale and character of existing dwellings within an otherwise built up frontage; and
- iii. It does not extend the existing frontage; and
- iv. The plot size and spacing between dwellings is similar to adjacent properties and respects the rural character and street scene of the locality.

Planning permission will not be granted where a proposal harms or undermines the existing relationship of the settlement within the open countryside, where it does not contribute to the character and distinctiveness of a rural area, including the natural beauty of the AONB or where development would have an adverse cumulative impact on the environment or highway safety.

## **5. Interpretation of Policy C1**

At the committee site visit clarification was sought on the difference between building line and frontage. "Frontage" is identified as the building elevation fronting, or addressing, a road and the land in between this elevation and the highway. In the case of Policy C1 it refers to a row of buildings fronting a highway, forming a broadly linear pattern of development. "Building line" is distinct from frontage and refers to an established line within a frontage that the built form is usually aligned to along a row of buildings. This policy considers frontage rather than the building line. The application is not being recommended for refusal due to the position of the dwelling in relation to the existing building line at Bishops Road. It is being recommended for refusal because it would extend the existing frontage of dwellings fronting the highway rather than being within that frontage, and therefore is contrary to points (i) and (iii) of the Policy.

The appeal decision for the previous application and the committee agenda report identifies the extension of the frontage. This is because the application site is positioned adjacent to an established built-up frontage (to the north) and by redeveloping the site this would extend the frontage towards Cock Lane to the south. It was identified that the existing application site was not part of the existing frontage due to the visual differences between the site and the linear residential dwellings to the north.

Furthermore, infill usually consists of a developing a plot in which there is development on either side. Criteria (i) advises that the plot is required to be within a closely knit cluster of 10 or more existing dwellings. The intervening road to the south and the land uses to south, east and west all demonstrate that it would not be within a closely knit cluster of 10 existing dwellings. This pattern of development was also identified as a reason why the proposal would extend the frontage.

## **6. Residential Development within the Surrounding Area**

To the south of Cock Lane, and to the south-west of the application site is a recently constructed dwelling. This forms part of the Boot Farm. The dwelling was granted under permission 17/00149/FULD and a later section 73 permission 17/02736/FULD. The new dwelling replaced a temporary mobile home and was found to be acceptable in principle because it met an exception to Policy C1 of the HSA DPD. It met the exception of housing to accommodate rural workers in which as part of considerations, it is necessary for the applicant to provide evidence to demonstrate the need. A condition was applied to this permission so that the person occupying the dwelling is solely or mainly employed at Boot Farm Stables and Stud and could not be separated from the equestrian business.

The current application before the committee sought to demonstrate that the proposal meets the exception for limited infill development in Policy C1. However, it does not meet all the criteria for this and therefore does not meet the exception. No evidence is submitted to demonstrate that it would meet any of the other exceptions in the policy.

## **7. Updated Recommendation**

It is recognised that there is support for the proposed development and that there would be benefits to redeveloping the site. However, it was demonstrated as part of the appeal for 22/00697/FULD that significant weight should be given to the conflict with the housing policies of the development plan for West Berkshire. This is due to the regard given to its consistency with the NPPF as well as housing need and supply considerations. The Inspector within their appeal decision concluded that the inappropriate location of the proposal and harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area attracted significant weight leading to the dismissal of the appeal. Similarly, it is considered that with this revised application the conflict with the development plan and harm to the rural character demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The recommendation remains as set out in the agenda committee report.