

Supplemental Items for Eastern Area Planning Committee

Wednesday 4 December 2024 at 6.30 pm
in Council Chamber Council Offices
Market Street Newbury

Part I

Page No.

2. **Minutes**

3 - 14

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting of this Committee held on 6 November 2024.

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 / jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk

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

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) 519052.



This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6 NOVEMBER 2024

Councillors Present: Alan Macro (Chairman), Paul Kander, Justin Pemberton, Vicky Poole, Clive Taylor, Janine Lewis (Substitute) (In place of Jeremy Cottam) and Christopher Read (Substitute) (In place of Geoff Mayes)

Also Present: Simon Till (Development Control Team Leader), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Alice Attwood, Gemma Kirk (Senior Planning Officer), Thea Noli (Acting Senior Paralegal), Thomas Radbourne and Jessica Bailiss (Democratic Services Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Richard Somner, Councillor Jeremy Cottam, Councillor Ross Mackinnon and Councillor Geoff Mayes

PART I

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4th September 2024 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Vicky Poole declared an interest in Agenda Item 4 (1), by virtue of the fact that the application site in Sulhamstead bordered her own Ward and she held Councillor Surgeries at the Willink School and Burghfield Library and was regularly visited by members of the public from the Bradfield Ward. The application had not been discussed during Councillor Poole's Councillor Surgeries however, she wished to declare that she lived within proximity to the application site. As her interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Janine Lewis declared an interest in Agenda Item 4 (2), by virtue of the fact that she was predisposed for this item. Due to the level of interest, Councillor Lewis determined to leave the Committee for the duration of the item and not take part in the discussion or vote.

Councillor Clive Taylor declared an interest in Agenda Item 4 (2), by virtue of the fact that he believed that it might be considered and perceived that he was predetermined on the item. Councillor Taylor stated that he would therefore leave the Committee for the duration of the item and not take part in the discussion or vote. Councillor Taylor would, however, make a representation on the application on behalf of the Parish Council and in his role as Ward Member.

The Chairman declared an interest in agenda item 4(2), by virtue of the fact that he had received a phone call from the agent asking if an email could be sent to all Members of the Committee. It was presumed that all Members had received this information and therefore all had this same interest to declare.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

Councillor Vicky Poole declared an interest in agenda item 4(3) by virtue of the fact that she was the Portfolio Holder for the Transformation Service, which was the service presenting the application to the Committee on behalf of West Berkshire Council. Councillor Poole stated that she would participate in the discussion on the item however, would not take part on the vote.

Councillors Paul Kander and Janine Lewis declared an interest in Agenda Item 4 (4), by virtue of the fact that they were Ward Members for the area.

3. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) 24/00533/FULMAJ - Sulhamstead

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 24/00533/FULMAJ in respect of Section 73a: Variation of conditions 16 (Private Equestrian Use), 4 (CEMP), 6 (Landscaping), 7 (Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan) and 15 (Manure Storage and Disposal) and remove condition 5 (Tree Protection) of previously approved application 21/03260/COMIND: Change of use of agricultural land to equestrian and erection of stable block/yard, menage and creation of associated access. Retention of 4 No. temporary field shelters and mobile stable unit on skids.
2. Ms Gemma Kirk 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 Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.
3. The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard if he had any observations relating to the application and his full representation can be viewed here: [Eastern Area Planning Committee - 6th November 2024](#). In summary it was confirmed that Highways' Officers raised no objection to the proposal.
4. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Peter James and Mr John Braithwaite, objectors and Ms Amanda Cottingham, applicant, addressed the Committee on this application.

Objector Representation

5. Mr Peter James and Mr John Braithwaite addressed the Committee. This representation can be viewed on the recording: [Eastern Area Planning Committee - 6th November 2024](#)

Member Questions to the Objector

6. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - It was since the Oakdown Fields facility had started operating that a degradation of the surrounding trails had been noticed, and horses and riders from Oakdown Fields had been noticed using these paths. If riders kept to the bridle paths there would not be an issue. Horses and riders from the facility had been noticed travelling along Short Heath Lane and using the woods.
 - A complaint had been submitted to West Berkshire Council regarding the use of certain paths by horse riders from the site. It had taken a long time to receive a response from officers and the only response received had been in relation to the campervan. The matter of the paths in question being used by

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

horse riders had been raised on local Facebook groups. It was believed that the local Ward Member, Councillor Ross Mackinnon, was aware of the issue.

- The rate of growth of the occupancy of the premises had only accelerated since spring 2024. In 2023, the property had been mainly vacant. There had only been one spring/summer where 16 horses had been accommodated at the facility, which was why the quality of paths was getting worse. This was not believed to be anecdotal evidence as it had been witnessed and raised by several members of the public. It was not felt that the owners engaged with the community.

Applicant Representation

7. Ms Amanda Cottingham addressed the Committee. This representation can be viewed on the recording: [Eastern Area Planning Committee - 6th November 2024](#)

Member Questions to the Applicant/Agent

8. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - There were not currently 16 horses on site and there were eight empty stables.
 - The site did not have the facilities to cater for foaling. The facility was for private people who had a horse as a hobby. Many worked full time and therefore wanted somewhere to keep their horse where someone else looked after them and they then ride when they could.
 - Ms Cottingham lived within the village in Burghfield Common.
 - Regarding the visitor hours imposed by condition 17, Ms Cottingham confirmed that they were not envisaging having visitors after eight o'clock in the evening however, she questioned if by 'visitors' this also included people who owned one of the horses kept at the yard. In the summer it was often light after nine o'clock and therefore it was possible for owners to ride after work. The condition in question would cause stress due to the need to rush off-site by eight o'clock due to the risk of breaking a planning condition.

Member Questions to Officers

9. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Regarding condition 16 on the restriction on externally stored equestrian paraphernalia, Mr Till confirmed that in his view the reason the condition contained a number of elements was to ensure it was precise and specific. He felt that the requirements of the condition and what was meant by equestrian paraphernalia was clear and in Officers' view the condition was enforceable however, if Members wished for there to be a bullet pointed list then this was possible however, the advice was that this was unnecessary.
 - Regarding essential items such as hayracks and water troughs, Mr Till was of the view that these were included in condition 16 and therefore prohibited as it caused clutter across the site. If Members disagreed with the intent of the condition to prevent cluttering of the site with various equestrian paraphernalia, then the alternative was to remove the condition as it did not meet with what was reasonable in terms of the planning permission granted.
 - Regarding the condition being overly restrictive, Mr Till clarified that the condition did not set out to prevent activity that was incidental to what was being carried out on site. There had to be a test of expediency with a planning

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

condition and its enforcement. The aim of the condition was to prevent the permanent storage of items on the land rather than that of a temporary nature. It was not felt that the condition implied the temporary nature of storage and was in the event that the land became cluttered with paraphernalia that should be stored the apron curtilage of the buildings.

- Mr Till clarified that the word 'visitors' related to any person who was not the owner/occupant of the site. A person paying for the services of the business would be deemed a visitor.
- In relation to visitors to the site, Ms Kirk clarified that there was not a dwelling on the land. The site only consisted of land for equestrian use.
- Regarding water troughs in the land, Mr Till confirmed that if Members felt it reasonable, a clause could be included to exclude water troughs from condition 16 and Officers would support this change.
- In terms of being clear regarding what was included in condition 16 and in order to avoid unnecessary work and complaints, Mr Till reiterated his point about expediency. If an Enforcement Officer was asked to visit the site with a view to taking action against a piece of paraphernalia that had been extensively stored on the land, then it would need to be examined that it had been stored for the long-term following discussion with the applicant.
- Councillor Taylor suggested that the wording 'equestrian paraphernalia' could be removed from condition 16.

Debate

10. Councillor Christopher Read noted that it had been heard from objectors regarding the poor conditions of footpaths. He queried if this was about specific controls needing to be placed on footpaths such as kissing gates to dissuade horse riders from using them. Councillor Read commented that if the application was within his own Ward of Bucklebury it would likely be welcomed by residents as there was a shortage of equestrian sites.
11. Councillor Vicky Poole commented that as an avid walker, the paths across Burghfield, Mortimer and Bradfield were used by more than just walkers including bikers. Councillor Poole had only once noticed a horse. Much of the land was privately owned and it was therefore difficult to enforce kissing gates as access was required by landowners for clearance activities, litter picking etc. Councillor Poole did not believe that horses and riders were solely responsible for the path degradation.
12. Councillor Read queried if there could be a condition stating that there should be strong guidance for the owner of the equestrian site not to use the footpaths. Mr Till confirmed that footpaths fell under different legislation to planning and he believed a person would be committing an offence if a non-bridleway was used for horse riding.
13. Councillor Poole referred to condition 17 and stated that she would like to see a definition included to clarify what a visitor was. Regarding condition 16, Councillor Poole supported Councillor Taylor's suggestion to make it very evident what could and could not be stored on the site in order to keep the animals in good condition, such as the availability of water troughs and anything else required for daytime feeding.
14. Councillor Read felt that there was little else in terms of long-term equestrian paraphernalia, apart from water troughs, that should not be tidied away by an

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

evening. Councillor Read proposed that condition 16 be amended to enable water troughs to be left out on site.

15. Mr Till suggested that, based on comments by Councillor Read and Councillor Poole, there be an exemption within condition 16, enabling water troughs to be kept on the land.
16. Regarding condition 17 on visitors and visitor hours, Mr Till commented that there was already a definition included, which was 'except for employees and in emergencies'. This could be tightened up to a visitor is a person who is not an owner or an employee of the business on the site. Councillor Poole was satisfied with this suggestion.
17. Councillor Justin Pemberton referred to Councillor Taylor's point and queried if the wording 'equestrian paraphernalia' was going to be retained within condition 16. The Chairman felt that a proposal was required, and an amendment could be proposed as part of this if desired.
18. Councillor Read proposed to accept Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report, update report, and amendments to condition 16 regarding water troughs being permitted and a change to condition 17 regarding the definition of visitors. This was seconded by Councillor Poole.
19. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Read, seconded by Councillor Poole, to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the main report and update report, subject to the following amendments:

- Condition 16:

No materials, goods, plant, machinery, equipment, storage container, waste containers or other items of equestrian paraphernalia, but excluding water troughs, shall be stored, processed, repaired or displayed in the open land on the site other than that approved or such tools and equipment as required to carry out upkeep and maintenance of the land.

Reason: In the interest of the rural character of the site. This condition is applied in the accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS12, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy ENV.29 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

- Condition 17:

The stable yard shall not be open to visitors outside of the following: 07:00 - 20:00 on every day of the week. For the purposes of this condition a visitor is a person who is not the owner or an employee of the business on the site.

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of surrounding occupiers and to protect the rural character of the area. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Polices ENV.29 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

4. 24/01667/TPW - Tilehurst

20. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 24/01667/TPW in respect of Step 1. Installation of new fencing around field margins and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) routes within the RPAs of Tree Protection Order (TPO) trees. Step 2. Methodology and design for upgraded footpath along the central tree lined and hedgerow section of PRoW and within the RPAs of retained trees. Step 3. Design methodology and construction of proposed drainage improvements of existing ditches within the RPAs of retained trees.
21. Jon Thomas 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 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.
22. The Chairman asked Paul Goddard if he had any observations relating to the application. In summary it was confirmed that Highways' Officers raised no objection to the proposal.
23. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Clive Taylor, Parish Council representative, LaDonna McDonald and Joan Lawrie, objectors and Clive Taylor, Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.

Parish Council Representation

24. Councillor Taylor addressed the Committee. This representation can be viewed on the recording: [Eastern Area Planning Committee - 6th November 2024](#)

Member Questions to the Parish Council

25. Members did not have any questions of clarification.

Objector Representation

26. Ms LaDonna McDonald and Ms Joan Lawrie addressed the Committee. This representation can be viewed on the recording: [Eastern Area Planning Committee - 6th November 2024](#)

Member Questions to the Objector

27. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following response:
- Regarding the reasons for the fencing, Ms Lawrie confirmed that when the original clearance work had taken place it had been asked why fencing was proposed and it was confirmed that the intention was to put sheep on the land. This had however, not happened.

Ward Member Representation

28. Councillor Taylor addressed the Committee. This representation can be viewed on the recording: [Eastern Area Planning Committee - 6th November 2024](#)

Member Questions to the Ward Member

29. Members did not have any questions of clarification.

Member Questions to Officers

30. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
- Mr Till confirmed that it was correct that the default state of the land was agricultural unless it had received planning permission for a different purpose.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

- Livestock could be grazed on any piece of agricultural land as long as there was no extant planning permission with a restriction on grazing livestock. It was clarified, in the case of abandoned use, that livestock could be grazed without planning permission.
- The landowners did not have to specify what the land would be used for once fenced. The owners could do as they wished as long as it was an agricultural use of the land and did not involve development.
- The potential impact on trees was the principal reason for why the application had been brought to Committee, with the impact on the public right of way as the secondary reason. The Committee was however reminded that there was a separate regime governing public rights of way and their obstruction.
- Mr Till commented that in terms of whether consideration needed to be given to badger setts, the Local Planning Authority had a duty of care in terms of biodiversity, ecology and protected species. For the current application there was a duty of care by the applicant to ensure any protected species were properly administered in line with the relevant habitat regulations and the application should give sufficient consideration of any impact on protected species.
- Mr Thomas reported that the Ecology Officer had been consulted on the application and no concerns had been raised. An Ecology watching brief would be conducted due to protected species being covered by legislation. Mr Till confirmed, from a planning perspective, that everything that should have been conducted had been. There was overarching legislation that placed duties on the applicant if any endangered species were found whilst in the process of works.
- Regarding new rules for hedgerows and whether consideration needed to be given to this in terms of the current application, Mr Thomas confirmed that there were two new pieces of law. Firstly, the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and secondly the Management of Hedgerow Regulations 2024. Both were separate pieces of legislation and did not apply to a tree works application. If the applicant wished to remove a hedge, then a separate application would need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- Regarding whether a bird nesting season condition was required, Mr Thomas did not feel this was required as it was covered by separate legislation, The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which the applicant should be aware of.

Debate

31. Councillor Read referred to concerns about the fencing but understood that agricultural land could be fenced by the owner. He queried if the landowner could be advised regarding what fencing to use. Two bar fencing would enable wildlife to move around whereas movement would be near impossible if paling fencing was used. Mr Thomas reported that he had discussed the type of fencing to be used with the applicant and it had been confirmed that 1.2-metre-high stock fencing with three strands of barbed wire would be used, and therefore wildlife should only be minimally affected.
32. Councillor Kander asked if the land in question was adjacent to a piece of land allocated for development. Mr Till confirmed he was not involved in the Pincents application and therefore was not able to advise on the location however, reminded Members that the current application was not a planning application for development and was simply an application for tree protection work, which was not relevant to the allocations referred to.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

33. Councillor Read wished to hear the views of other Committee Members regarding concerns raised about the width of the proposed path and responsibilities as Ward Members in terms of residents feeling safe. He queried if this matter could be discussed with the landowner if fencing was to be erected. Mr Till advised that it was possible to place an informative on the decision notice asking the applicant to consider the layout of the land in terms of potential fencing and visibility lines of those using the path. Caution was added around adding a condition on the matter as the Town and Countryside Development Order 2015 allowed for the erection of fencing of up to two metres when not directly adjacent to a public highway.
34. Councillor Poole felt that if the path was fenced it would be problematic in terms of safety. Councillor Poole also agreed with concerns raised about the free movement of animals, particularly as there were two ancient woodlands close by where there were deer and other animals. Councillor Poole did not fully understand why fencing was required in separate spaces around the site rather than a circumference perimeter fence.
35. Councillor Kander in considering the proposal was unsure of how to balance the rights of the landowner whilst also catering for the free movement of animals. Mr Thomas referred to advice from the Forestry Commission regarding deer fencing where it was suggested Roe Deer, which had been seen on site, would be able to clear a 1.2m fence if erected.
36. The Chairman clarified that advice suggested that the landowner could have erected the fencing without planning permission however, it was noted in the planning application that fencing was proposed. It was therefore queried if this enabled the Committee to add any conditions on this matter. Mr Till stated that it was important to be mindful of the fall-back position and the fact that the principal planning legislation permitted up to two metres of fencing and did not specify the type that should be used or any special provisions. Mr Till therefore advised that a condition would be considered onerous. Given the concerns raised, an informative suggesting permeable fencing could be added for the applicant to explore.
37. Councillor Read proposed to accept Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report and update report. It was proposed that an informative be included asking the landowner to consider using fencing permeable to wildlife or temporary electric fencing. This was seconded by Councillor Kander.
38. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Read, seconded by Councillor Kander, to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the main report and update report.

- Wording would be agreed for an informative asking the landowner to consider using fencing permeable to wildlife or even temporary electric fencing.

5. 24/01163/REG3 - Thatcham

39. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 24/01163/REG3 in respect of the proposal to change the usage for Laburnam from Age Concern class F2 to class E for WBC Staff Offices
40. Ms Alice Attwood introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material planning considerations. In

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms and officers recommended that the Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.

41. The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard if he had any observations relating to the application and in summary Highways' Officers had raised no objection to the application. Mr Goddard's full representation can be found here: [Eastern Area Planning Committee - 6th November 2024](#)
42. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Stacey Bradshaw, Gabrielle Mancini and Georgie Davis applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Applicant Representation

43. Ms Bradshaw, Ms Mancini and Ms Davis addressed the Committee. They stated that they did not wish to make a representation but were happy to answer any questions on the application.

Member Questions to the Applicant

44. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - There was a maximum of nine desk spaces, and the applicants stated that full capacity would only be used when there were team meetings, and the applicant stated that these would be infrequent.
 - There would be at least two duty staff present on site as well as drop ins from staff between client visits.
 - There would be eight confirmed parking spaces on site. The applicant stated that the current staff workplace had six parking spaces which had been sufficient.
 - The office would be staff only and would not be public facing.
 - There was no designated disabled parking space on site.
 - There was no designated bike storage on site. The applicant stated that there was a private garden with sheds that were available to use by staff where bikes could be stored.

Member Questions to Officers

45. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Mr Goddard commented that Members would be able to include a condition that required a dedicated disabled parking space if it was felt it would be useful. Mr Goddard stated that normally, with a car park that had less than ten parking spaces, a disabled parking space was not requested. There was a ratio of 4% disabled car parking per car park, but it was noted that the car park in question was below the threshold of ten spaces.
 - Mr Goddard stated that if an employee who required a disabled parking space worked at the location in the future, then it was possible that this could be looked into at that time. Councillor Janine Lewis was of the view that it would be more appropriate to include a disabled space at the current time so that any future employee requiring use of it did not feel different or like they were requesting something additional.

Debate

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

46. Councillor Pemberton supported the application and noted the need for the inclusion of a disabled parking space. Councillor Pemberton noted that the change of use of the building would be a valuable use of the resource.
47. Councillor Pemberton proposed to accept Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report and update report, and the addition of an additional condition requesting that there be at least one disabled parking space outside the building.
48. Councillor Kander was concerned about restricting the space when it was not required and queried if there was a solution for this. Mr Till suggested an additional condition could be added that stated that the building should not be taken into use until a revised parking plan had been submitted, which showed a parking space that fulfilled the criteria for disabled access. Mr Goddard explained using a photo of the car park how a disabled parking space could be facilitated.
49. Councillor Pemberton referred back to his proposal to accept Officer's recommendation, which he requested be subject to the suggestion, set out by Mr Till, regarding the submission of a revised parking plan that included disabled access. This was seconded by Councillor Kander.
50. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Pemberton, seconded by Councillor Kander, to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the main report, update report and additional condition below:

- Within six months of the class E(g)(i) use commencing, details of vehicle parking spaces including one disabled accessible space for the Laburnam Centre (including surfacing arrangements and marking out) be submitted to the Local Planning Authority under a discharge of conditions application. The spaces shall be surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the approved details within three months of the date of approval of the discharge of conditions application. Thereafter the parking spaces shall be kept available for parking and manoeuvring of 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 and to improved inclusive parking. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

6. 2400955FUL - Purley Park Trust

51. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(4)) concerning Planning Application 24/00955/FUL in respect of a retrospective change of an area of waste land approx. 200sqm in the south of the site to provide car park space for up to six cars. Removal of storage shed (7.3m x 4.3m) and a derelict greenhouse.
52. Ms Alice Attwood 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 Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 6 NOVEMBER 2024 - MINUTES

53. The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard if he had any observations relating to the application. Mr Goddard did not have any further observations.

54. The Chairman noted that nobody had registered to speak on the application.

Member Questions to Officers

55. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:

- Mrs Attwood stated that there was a condition for an Arboricultural Method Statement, which would ensure there was oversight of what happened on site, and secondary triggers for mitigation and compensation. Officers noted that there could be a need for remedial work to make sure that there was longevity.
- Ms Attwood stated that the current surface was type one, which was semi permeable and partly loose.
- Regarding restrictions on opening times, Mrs Atwood stated that this was partly due to objections raised by local residents to car doors being shut at night by carers. Officers understood the extra capacity was not required at night and this was why the hours had been agreed. It was expected that administrative staff and contractors who were only present during the day would use the staff parking.
- Ms Attwood noted the need to balance priorities when resurfacing the car park. Tarmac would be quieter but would likely harm the trees covered by the Tree Protection Order (TPO). Officers noted that the noise management plan set out where the sensitive receptors were, and other mitigation methods could be introduced.
- Ms Attwood confirmed that no lighting was included as part of the scheme, but a lighting condition was included so that all external lighting details would need to be submitted to the planning department so it could be checked and confirmed as being necessary.
- Regarding why the application was retrospective, Mr Till commented that there were permitted development rights for commercial organisations to put hard standing down on their land, and it was not unusual for an applicant to be confused as to when the permitted development rights applied.

Debate

56. Councillor Lewis opened the debate by supporting the application. She proposed to accept Officer’s recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report and update report. This was seconded by Councillor Kander.

57. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Lewis, seconded by Councillor Kander, to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions in the main report and update report.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 9.06 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank