

## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 10 JULY 2013**

**Councillors Present:** David Allen, Howard Bairstow (Substitute) (In place of George Chandler), Jeff Beck, Hilary Cole, Adrian Edwards (Substitute) (In place of Paul Bryant), Paul Hewer, Roger Hunneman, Garth Simpson, Anthony Stansfeld, Julian Swift-Hook and Ieuan Tuck

**Also Present:** Emmanuel Alozie (Solicitor), Michael Butler, Derek Carnegie, Paul Goddard and Jenny Legge (Principal Policy Officer)

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor Paul Bryant, Councillor George Chandler and Councillor Virginia von Celsing

#### **PART I**

#### **12. Election of Chairman for this meeting**

In the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, Councillor Garth Simpson proposed Councillor Hilary Cole be elected as Chairman for this meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Adrian Edwards.

**RESOLVED** that Councillor Hilary Cole be elected Chairman of the Western Area Planning Committee for this meeting.

#### **13. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2013 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **14. Declarations of Interest**

Councillors David Allen, Howard Bairstow, Jeff Beck, Adrian Edwards, Paul Hewer, Julian Swift-Hook and Ieuan Tuck declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(1), but reported that, 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.

Councillors Beck, declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(2), but reported that, 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.

Councillor George Chandler attended the meeting, although he was not a member of the Committee, but on advice from Officers left the meeting prior to discussion of Agenda Item 4(2) as the applicant was his wife.

#### **15. Schedule of Planning Applications**

##### **15(1) Application No. and Parish: 13/00995/FULD - Land adjoining 12 Barn Crescent, Newbury.**

*(Councillor Swift-Hook 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 who had previously considered the application, but reported that he would view the application afresh on its own merit. Councillor Swift-Hook also reported that his use of a computer*

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

*during the meeting was in order to access information to the application. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

*(Councillor Jeff Beck declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Newbury Town Council and the Planning and Highways Committee. He had been present when the application was discussed, but would consider the application afresh. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

*(Councillor Paul Hewer declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was employed by Sovereign Housing. However, he had no involvement in Policy making and therefore, as his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate, but would not vote on the matter).*

*(Councillor David Allen declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Newbury Town Council and the Planning and Highways Committee. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

*(Councillor Ieuan Tuck declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Newbury Town Council, however he had not been present when this application had been discussed. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

*(Councillor Adrian Edwards declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Newbury Town Council and had been Chairman when this application had been discussed. However, as there was additional information available to this Committee, he would consider the application afresh. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

*(Councillor Howard Bairstow declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a Member of Newbury Town Council and the Planning and Highways Committee. He would consider the information afresh at this meeting. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 13/00995/FULD in respect of the construction of three, 3 bed houses on land adjoining 12 Barn Crescent.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Anthony Pick, Newbury Town Council representative, Mr Lawrence Fletcher, objector and Mr Adrian Best, applicant, addressed the Committee on this application.

Michael Butler introduced the application. He brought to the Committee's attention that Sovereign Housings proposal for a development at Himley Lodge had been withdrawn and this therefore threw doubt on whether the proposal at Barn Crescent would be used for Affordable Housing or would be put on the open-market.

Councillor Jeff Beck asked for clarifications on the Officer's view expressed on page 15 point 6.2.2. Michael Butler explained that even if the proposed site were not Affordable Housing it would still be supported by Officers.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

Councillor Julian Swift-Hook asked if the extension to the on-street parking could be achieved as the land was owned by Highways. Paul Goddard confirmed that this would be covered under the S.278 agreement.

Councillor Roger Hunneman sought clarification as to who would fund the curtilage parking being provided. Michael Butler replied that the applicant would have the definitive answer, but that the applicant would be funding the cross-over parking areas.

Mr Pick in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- There were 40 houses in Barn Crescent, 25 of which had no off-road parking. The road was 4.2m wide and curved sharply.
- Residents habitually parked on the pavement causing obstruction to pedestrians and traffic. 12 garages had already been demolished by Sovereign Housing.
- The hard standing parking areas were fully utilised by residents. Sovereign Housing had stated that this was unauthorised and did not consider it their responsibility to replace it. The area was unmaintained, however its loss would impact detrimentally on the resident's quality of life. The compensations of cross over points and road widening were insufficient.
- Numbers 11, 13, 15 and adjacent properties had sloped frontages which were dangerous in icy weather.
- He urged the Committee to reject the application.

Councillor Garth Simpson asked how long parking had been an issue. Mr Pick was unsure, however he suggested it might have been around the time of the 'Right to Buy' scheme, when the garages were sold separately to the houses.

Councillor Adrian Edwards inquired if Mr Pick was aware of any problems with access to the crescent. Mr Pick confirmed that the road was narrow.

Mr Fletcher in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He explained that the properties had been built in the 1950's when fewer people owned cars, but that this situation had now changed.
- He lived at No.15 and his household parked four cars and a van in the crescent.
- He stated that there were six garages currently on the proposed site. 12 garages had been demolished by Sovereign Housing and the hard standing area that remained was parked on by residents without permission. He acknowledged that it would be a great loss to lose this amenity.
- He rented three garages from Sovereign Housing for approximately £10 a week each.
- He updated the Committee regarding a car seen on the site visit which was parked on a front lawn; the owner had registered it as SORN as she was unable to drive it due to illness.
- He recognised that some felt the hard standing area was unmaintained and therefore an eyesore, but it was necessary.
- The majority of the estate parked on the pavements, but the crescent would be impossible to navigate if they did not.
- The site traffic would make the situation more difficult, although he recognised this was only a temporary problem.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

- In summary, he proposed that the development of the site would aggravate an already congested area. In the past, a fire engine had been unable to access a house and the firemen had moved cars in order to reach the property.

Councillor Roger Hunneman asked if the strip of land pictured in the presentation was used. Mr Fletcher responded that it was not and it was banked. He noted it was maintained by the Town Council. Councillor Hunneman further enquired if residents parked there. Mr Fletcher confirmed that they did.

Councillor Simpson queried how long parking had been a problem for residents. Mr Fletcher suggested that the situation worsened when the 12 garages (also used by residents in Hill Close) were demolished approximately ten years ago.

Councillor Hilary Cole asked how Mr Fletcher used the three garages he rented. He replied that two were used for storage of motorbikes, both his own and a neighbour's, and a car his son was renovating. The remaining one was empty, but the space in front of it was used to park his vehicle.

Mr Best in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He considered the area opposite No. 12 Barn Crescent as an asset.
- A survey was undertaken in 2010 to ascertain if residents would support a development; a concern about parking had been raised.
- An initial proposal for four properties had been applied for and then withdrawn due to adverse feedback and resubmitted for three terraced properties.
- Residents were given a copy of the scheme and the plans for parking.
- He recognised that the site was used for informal parking, however as there was no formal agreement it was not incumbent upon Sovereign Housing to reprovide this space.
- Parking provision had been investigated in regards to the verge opposite the site, however full bays could not be implemented.
- It was a surrogate site, in terms of affordable housing provision, for Himley Lodge. The plans for Himley Lodge would be resubmitted shortly.
- The proposed site would provide much needed family housing and was appropriate to the area; in a sustainable location; close to amenities; near an established residential area and with travel links.
- If the site was linked to Himley Lodge these units would be used for Affordable Housing.

Councillor Hower asked if the 12 demolished garages had been removed due to deterioration and if the remaining six garages might be demolished for the same reasoning. Mr Best confirmed they had and that the condition of the remaining six was poor.

Councillor Edwards inquired if all the houses opposite the site were owned by Sovereign Housing. Mr Best responded that only No.11 was owned by the applicant. Councillor Edwards further questioned the ownership of the garages. Mr Best explained that Sovereign owned the garages and rented them back to the residents.

Councillor Hunneman sought clarification as to which properties would be provided with on-street parking. Mr Best confirmed that No.11 only would be given a defined parking space as this was a Sovereign house. The other properties would be provided with drop-kerbs. Councillor Hunneman further noted that Sovereign Housing were offering to widen

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

the road on the southbound western side and queried the extent of the width. Mr Best answered that the dimensions had been taken on advice from the Highways Officers.

Councillor Beck asked for clarification on the number of cars that could be accommodated in the on-road parking. Mr Best replied that there was space for six vehicles, parallel to the crescent.

Councillor Swift-Hook drew attention to the Planning Officer's comments that this application should not be considered in conjunction with Himley Lodge, but on its own merits. He asked if Members could defer their decision so that the applications could be considered simultaneously.

Councillor Anthony Stansfeld commented that Sovereign Housing were taking rent for the six remaining garages and yet they were not being maintained satisfactorily. He conjectured if this was a policy of 'development through neglect' being pursued by Sovereign Housing, he had witnessed something similar in Hampstead Marshall. Mr Best answered that buildings were maintained and he was not aware this was a policy.

Councillor Howard Bairstow asked why the houses and garages were sold separately. He conjectured that it had been decided that it wasn't important for people to have garages and that the land had been held back in order to benefit developers. Mr Best was unable to answer as he had no knowledge or involvement in how policy had been decided at the time of 'Right to Buy'.

Councillor Cole inquired if the garages were adequate to house a modern vehicle. Mr Best proposed that they had lived beyond their design life.

Councillor Edwards, speaking as Ward Member, in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He had called in the application as he felt it should be debated at Committee, as parking was a serious problem in this area.
- He felt there was little difference between this application and one received for a development in Pond Close which had been refused.
- He noted that 25 vehicles were going to be displaced and suggested that they would be forced to park on the southern aspect of the road.
- If the application were to be approved access for refuse and emergency vehicles would be impeded. He felt that widening the road would have little impact.
- The design of the build was unattractive and would lower the ambience of the crescent.

Councillor Hewer observed that due to the deterioration of the garages the area might be fenced off for Health and Safety reasons.

The Chairman asked Paul Goddard to give the Highways department's point of view. He noted that the three new dwellings would have two spaces each; more than the standard demanded. Sovereign Housing would provide a space for No.11; drop-kerbs for other plots and further on-road parking. Highways Officers had endeavoured to persuade the applicant to recognise the difficulties residents had with parking, but had been unsuccessful. He recognised that the need was real and that vehicles would be displaced onto the public highway. One test for an application was whether it could be defended at appeal. In this case the use of the garages was legal, whereas the use of the hard standing was not. His advice was that it would be difficult to defend a refusal at appeal. Sovereign Housing had proposed: to widen the road to 4.8m (wide enough for a car and a large vehicle to pass) and widening the on-road parking southwards to 26m to enable eight more cars to park.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

Councillor Edwards expressed concern as to where the remaining cars would find space to park. Paul Goddard observed it would not be reasonable to provide 25 spaces when between seven and eight vehicles had been seen on most site visits.

Councillor Allen inquired if the agreement regarding Affordable Housing linked with Himley Lodge was now annulled as the application had been withdrawn. Michael Butler confirmed that the written agreement was now cancelled. He reiterated that this should be considered as a stand alone proposal as it was quite possible the Himley Lodge application would not be resubmitted, or indeed, approved.

The Chairman commented that she would prefer to see both applications simultaneously in order to give the Committee confidence that Affordable Housing would be included in the plan. She noted that the garages were currently unsightly and unsuitable for modern vehicles. Mr Fletcher rented three garages and used none of them to park in.

Councillor Hunneman asked Officers if a possible way forward was to defer the decision to allow for a better design from Sovereign Housing. Derek Carnegie concluded that Officers would prefer a prompt decision. He felt the link to Himley Lodge was tenuous and that this application should be considered on its own merits. Officers considered the road widening scheme and the provision of three homes in such a sustainable area was sufficient to lead to a strong recommendation to approve.

Councillor Hunneman proposed that the application be deferred. There was no seconder.

Michael Butler advised the Committee that the applicant could appeal against non-determination, if the application had been deferred.

Councillor Bairstow expressed the view that deferring the decision would not affect the issues and that the objections would still stand. He felt that parking was the problem not whether the units would be used for Affordable Housing. Michael Butler informed the Committee that tenure was not a land use planning consideration.

Councillor Hunneman's proposal was seconded by Councillor Swift-Hook.

The Chairman invited the Committee to vote on the proposal. At the vote the proposal was refused.

Councillor Swift-Hook reluctantly proposed that the application be approved as he felt a refusal would be overturned at appeal and the Council would incur costs. This was seconded by Councillor Allen.

The Chairman invited the Committee to vote on the proposal to accept Officer Recommendation and grant planning permission. At the vote the proposal was carried.

**RESOLVED that** the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to **grant** planning permission, subject to the completion of a s106 planning obligation by the end of August 2013. and the following conditions:

### Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved plans.

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

2. Prior to the commencement of development, samples of the materials to be used in the proposed development shall be submitted on the application site, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

irrespective of any indications as to the details that may have been submitted with the application, and shall where necessary include the submission of samples of glass, plastic and mortar materials. Thereafter the materials used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved samples.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

3. Irrespective of the provisions of the current Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any subsequent revision), no additions or extensions to the dwellings shall be built or ancillary buildings or structures erected within the curtilage, unless permission in writing has been granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for the purpose.

Reason: To prevent the over-development of the site and to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Saved Policy HSG1 of the West Berkshire District Local plan 1991 to 2006.

4. Prior to the commencement of development details of floor levels in relation to existing and proposed ground levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the proposed dwellings and the adjacent land in accordance with Policy HSG1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 - 2006.[Saved Policies 2007].

5. The hours of work for all contractors (and sub-contractors) for the duration of the site development shall, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, be limited to; 7.30 am to 6.00 pm on Mondays to Fridays, 7.30 am to 1.00 pm on Saturdays, and NO work shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of surrounding residents in accordance with policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

6. No development shall take place until details of a 1.5 (or 1.4 if insufficient space) metre wide footway to be constructed on the northern side of Barn Crescent, to link with the existing footway, have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be brought into use until the footway has been provided in accordance with the approved scheme and any statutory undertaker's equipment or street furniture located in the position of the footway/cycleway has been re-sited to provide an unobstructed footway.

Reason: In the interest of road safety and to ensure adequate and unobstructed provision for pedestrians and/or cyclists. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

7. The gradient of private drives shall not exceed 1 in 8 or, where dwellings are likely to be occupied by the mobility impaired, 1 in 12.

Reason: To ensure that adequate access to parking spaces and garages is provided. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

8. No development shall take place until details of the surfacing arrangements for the vehicular access(es) to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall ensure that bonded

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

material is used across the entire width of the access(es) for a distance of 3 metres measured back from the carriageway edge. Thereafter the surfacing arrangements shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid migration of loose material onto the highway in the interest of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

9. No development shall take place until visibility splays of 2 metres by 43 metres have been provided at the accesses. The visibility splays shall, thereafter, be kept free of all obstructions to visibility above a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

10. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking has been surfaced, marked out 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 (March 2012), 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).

11. No dwelling shall be occupied until the cycle parking has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings and this area shall thereafter be kept available for the parking of cycles at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and assists with the parking, storage and security of cycles. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), 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).

12. No development shall take place until details of a temporary parking and turning area to be provided and maintained concurrently with the development of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved parking and turning area shall be provided at the commencement of development and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details until the development has been completed. During this time, the approved parking and turning area shall be kept available for parking and used by employees, contractors, operatives and other visitors during all periods that they are working at or visiting the site.

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with adequate parking and turning facilities during the construction period. This condition is imposed in order to minimise the incidences of off site parking in the locality which could cause danger to other road users, and long terms inconvenience to local residents. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

13. 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 schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, an implementation programme and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment. The scheme shall ensure;
- a) Completion of the approved landscape scheme within the first planting season following completion of development.
  - 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.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of Policy CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

14. No development (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) shall commence on site until a scheme for the protection of trees to be retained is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include a plan showing the location of the protective fencing, and shall specify the type of protective fencing, all in accordance with B.S.5837:2012. Such fencing shall be erected prior to any development works taking place and at least 2 working days notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority that it has been erected. It shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or until such time as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities or storage of materials whatsoever shall take place within the protected areas without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Note: The protective fencing should be as specified at Chapter 6 and detailed in figure 2 of B.S.5837:2012.

Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Policy CS18 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

15. No development or other operations shall commence on site until an arboricultural method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include details of the implementation, supervision and monitoring of all temporary tree protection and any special construction works within any defined tree protection area.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site in accordance with the objectives of Policy CS18 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

16. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be commenced, until the s278 works as agreed for vehicle crossovers to numbers 11, 13 and 15 Barn Crescent have been undertaken and completed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.

Reason: to ensure there is no undue parking pressures caused in the area, in accord with policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 to 2026.

17. The dwellings shall achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainability for house design which replaces that scheme). No dwelling shall be occupied until a final Code Certificate relevant to it, certifying that Code level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainability for house design which

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES

replaces that scheme) has been achieved, has been issued and a copy has been provided to the Local Planning Authority.

18. 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).

### **15(2) Application No. and Parish:13/00988/FUL - Land at Manor Farm, Farnborough, Wantage.**

*(Councillor Jeff Beck declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that the applicant was the wife of a Councillor and a personal friend, however he would consider the application on its own merits. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest he determined to take part in the debate and vote on the matter).*

*(Councillor George Chandler left the meeting at 19:45 on advice from Officers prior to discussion starting, as the applicant was his wife. In addition Councillor Julian Swift-Hook also left the meeting at 19.45.)*

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 13/00988/FUL in respect of the change of use of land for the siting of a temporary dwelling on land at Manor Farm, Farnborough, Wantage.

Derek Carnegie introduced the application and explained that this had been brought to the Committee as demanded by the constitution. There were no objections against the proposal. He noted that as this was a temporary structure, there was no requirement for a S.106 agreement.

The Chairman asked if a S.106 agreement would be required should there be a future application for a permanent unit. Derek Carnegie confirmed that it would. Councillor Roger Hunneman queried if the business was successful whether the application could be renewed or a permanent structure be proposed. Derek Carnegie explained that an application for a permanent property might be justifiable in future.

Councillor Jeff Beck sought clarification on the wording of Condition 2 on page 29. Derek Carnegie explained that these were model Conditions. Emmanuel Alozie commented that the Conditions were designed to be comprehensive, and suggested that he clarify them in an Opinion for the Committee.

Councillor Howard Bairstow enquired if the temporary unit proposed would be capable of lasting permanently. Derek Carnegie advised that it was of a log-cabin design and he considered it was therefore not intended to be a permanent dwelling.

After considering the Committees deliberations, Councillor Jeff Beck proposed to accept Officer Recommendation to grant permission. This was seconded by Councillor David Allen.

The Chairman invited the Committee to vote on the proposal. At the vote the proposal was carried.

**RESOLVED that** The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to **approve** planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

#### **Conditions**

1. The temporary agricultural dwelling hereby approved shall be removed on or before the 10th July 2016. All associated plant, materials and equipment shall be removed within 3 months of this permission ceasing. The land shall be returned to

**WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 10 JULY 2013 - MINUTES**

a condition agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of this permission ceasing.

Reason: In accordance with the criteria of the NPPF and with regard to the temporary nature of the building.

2. The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed, (or retired through old age or ill health), in the equestrian enterprise on site, as defined in Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or a dependant of such a person residing with that person (but including a widow of such a person), on the land identified in this planning permission.

Reason: This permission has been given because the need for the dwelling outweighs the planning objections to the development. The Local Planning Authority are concerned to ensure that the dwelling remains available for the equestrian use on site in accord with the NPPF.

3. The materials to be used in this development shall be as specified on the plans or the application forms. No other materials shall be used unless prior agreement in writing has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 - 2026.

4. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing title numbers: LOCATION PLAN; PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AND CONSTRUCTION DETAILS received on 15th May 2013.

Reason: To ensure that the development is constructed in accordance with the submitted details assessed against Policy CS14 of The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

**16. Appeal Decisions relating to Western Area Planning Committee**

Members noted the outcome of appeal decisions relating to the Western Area.

*(The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and closed at 8.15pm)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

**Date of Signature** .....