

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 29 NOVEMBER 2017

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

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Gareth Dowding (Senior Engineer), Charlene Hurd (Democratic Services Officer), David Pearson (Development Control Team Leader) and Simon Till (Senior Planning Officer)

PART I

35. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2017 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Item 32(1) Application 17/01540/RESMAJ

Page 11, third bullet point: Councillor Bale queried whether **was pleased that** there were permitted development restrictions placed on the houses.

Page 11, eight bullet point: her article was in the Pangbourne Magazine [2015].

Page 20, fourth paragraph: Councillor Law stated that it would be the foundation that would be reduced in height rather than the ridge height of the properties.

36. Declarations of Interest

Councillor(s) Graham Bridgman and Keith Chopping declared an interest in Agenda Item 4 (1), but reported that, as their interest was a personal or a other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

37. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. & Parish: 17/01524/COMIND - Beech Hill Road, Beech Hill, Reading, Berkshire RG7 2AT

(Councillor Graham Bridgman declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was aware of, and to an extent had been involved in, discussions with those associated with the application/site and local residents. 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 Keith Chopping declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he had attended the venue for functions, albeit not for some time. 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.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 17/01524/COMIND in respect of retrospective permission for the temporary change of use of land to the south of the existing hotel to assembly and leisure for holding events

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

ancillary to the use of the hotel as a venue for weddings and leisure events and the temporary retention of three conjoined marquees on the land for a period of 12 months. Erection of a new 3 storey extension to the existing hotel to provide 16 new bedrooms, restaurant extension and internal alterations and improvements, formalised parking area and associated landscaping. Permission for the temporary siting of a marquee extension to the existing garden marquee immediately to the rear of the existing hotel to be removed following completion of the hotel extension. Following removal of the existing 3 conjoined marquees on land to the south of the site, temporary erection of a new single marquee for 25 occasions per year for purposes of assembly and leisure ancillary to the use the main site as a venue for weddings and leisure events. Use of the remaining land adjoining the temporary single marquee site and parking areas to the south of the hotel only for purposes ancillary to the use of the main hotel site as an assembly and leisure venue for weddings and leisure events for 25 days per year.

(a) In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Geoff Mayes, Parish Council representative, Mr Chris Bridges, objector, and Mr Graham Bell, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

(b) Councillor Geoff Mayes in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

In general, the Parish Council supported the application to build a 16 room extension, a single storey extension to the dining area, remove the existing garden marquee and the associated tents.

They recognised the plans to construct a permanent pavilion.

He disagreed with the contention of West Berkshire Council following the 2010 planning permission, that construction was commenced on the works which covered the application including the pavilion area.

The garden marquee location was a source of unacceptable noise currently under scrutiny and monitoring by environmental health.

The Parish Council wished to have it confirmed that there was no possibility, or intention, to further extend the hotel as detailed in the extant planning permission of 2010 – assuming the current application was approved.

The Parish Council did not support the change of use proposals in respect of the agricultural land in the southern part of the site - permission should not be granted for this.

Planning control had been very weak and views of the site had been spoilt since the mid 2000's. The site was also a major noise pollutant for residents to the south of the site.

It was suggested that the temporary marquee would be better sited where the present garden marquee now stood – behind the main hotel.

The Parish Council wanted to see a tightly controlled programme of work, actively monitored by West Berkshire Council, with completion of the hotel extensions within 2 years.

Councillor Alan Law asked Mr Mayes to clarify those elements of the current application which the Parish Council contested/supported – as detailed in point 6.1.6 of the Officer's report. Mr Mayes stated that they disagreed with the proposed siting of the temporary marquee, provision of a parking overspill car park and change of use associated with the agricultural land.

Councillor Pamela Bale asked whether the Parish Council requested enforcement action following the erection of multiple marquees/ supporting structures. Mr Mayes advised that

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

the Parish Council reported issues associated with the noise levels from the site in 2016 but he could not say whether they requested enforcement action earlier than this.

In response to questions asked by the Committee, Mr Mayes stated that he wanted clarification from Officers regarding, potential, further development of the site as permitted under planning application 09/02252/XCOMIND.

Mr Chris Bridges in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He spoke in support of the application in 2007 but, since then, there had been a catalogue of missed opportunities to mitigate the extent of works undertaken.
- The site was visible from the nearby road and he considered the extent of development as an abuse of a rural location.
- The current issues were inherited by the new management since the site licence was transferred from Trunkwell Legacy in 2016.
- Noise was an issue from the site [garden marquee] but noise levels from the grand marquee were closely monitored through a Noise Management Plan.
- The site did not provide staff accommodation and there was heavy vehicle movement to/from the site as a result of staff travel and goods' deliveries.
- He disagreed with the location of the overspill car park.
- He accepted the application, in principle, according to the approval granted in 2007.

Councillor Graham Bridgman asked Mr Bridges to confirm what his stance would be on the application had it been presented to him for the first time, without the colourful history known to him now. Mr Bridges believed that he would accept the application because he strongly supported local businesses and because it would be similar to the application he had originally supported in 2007.

In response to questions asked by the Committee, Mr Bridges advised that he lived adjacent to the site. He also stated that he supported the need to introduce a programme of works – in light of the history of the site, albeit through a different owner to that in place now.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe asked Mr Bridges to confirm his stance on the location of the overspill car park. Mr Bridges advised that the neighbouring car park was used by the Thrive Trust would be available for use outside core hours (evenings and weekends) and could be used by the hotel. He considered that this was a far more logical solution to an overspill issue and would avoid the need to change the use of agricultural land.

Mr Graham Bell in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

He sat in a similar position some years ago to discuss a controversial matter in relation to a local asset, the small shop in the church, which was now a well used and well established part of the local community.

The hotel was a well liked venue with supporting links to the local church and offered one of only a few amenities in the local area.

The site was good for Beech Hill – proving 2 local jobs within a very small community.

The venue was well known for corporate events, weddings and social events. The applicant sought to improve the venue for future events.

The proposed hotel extension sought to provide fewer bedrooms because the requirement for en-suite bathrooms had changed significantly since the previous application was submitted.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

Planning permission was already in place for parking at the paddock and landscaping formed part of the current application.

The current application reflected careful consideration of the site with help from the Planning Officers to minimise adverse impacts. It aimed to remove the large structure and replace with a [occasional use] temporary structure to allow flexibility for events.

The applicant had a genuine vision for the site but the scheme of works required significant funding which would be a challenge to conjure.

The impact from noise had decreased significantly with only three complaints having been registered in 2017 - to date.

There was plenty to like about the application, and very little to dislike. He hoped that the Committee would support it.

Councillor Graham Bridgman asked a series of questions relating to the construction of the pavilion, the order of work (including timelines) and the conditions relating to the removal of the garden marquee. In response to these questions Mr Bell advised that it was likely that the pavilion would be made from permanent materials. However, he was not privy to the planning details but he was confident that the drawings illustrated a need for brick walls and glazed windows. Mr Bell stated that the scheme of works would commence in summer 2018 with an initial focus on the hotel extension followed by the work on the car parks. The construction of the pavilion would follow this work – all of which should take approximately 2 years in total to complete.

Mr Bell advised that his knowledge around the garden marquee was limited – noting that the most recent information had been provided in the update report so he was not able to discuss that with the applicant prior to the meeting. Notwithstanding the fact that the current garden marquee was a lawful structure and had events booked for the next 12 to 18 months – the removal of the garden marquee would be part of the overall process and, where possible, events would be transferred into the pavilion to allow removal of the garden marquee according to the proposed conditions.

Councillor Bridgman highlighted an inconsistency in conditions 7 & 8 which referred to the number of days the temporary marquee could be used alongside the paddock parking. Mr Bell advised that the overspill car park would only be required on the day of the event so he was not clear about the reference to using the paddock for 3 days.

Councillor Keith Chopping was concerned that the temporary marquee could be considered a permanent marquee if it remained in situ to accommodate consecutive events. Mr Bell agreed that there could be an issue if there were consecutive events but that this would be avoided where possible. He assured the Committee that the applicant sought to deliver a different style of wedding event to those previously held at Trunkwell House – making use of the proposed pavilion in the majority of cases but having a temporary marquee available for exceptional cases.

Councillor Marigold Jaques highlighted that the site lacked accommodation for staff and the plans failed to mention any extensions to the kitchen which, in her opinion, would be necessary if the hotel expanded. Mr Bell agreed that the plans did not show changes to the internal layout. Mr Bell did not have any more information to provide the Committee regarding staff accommodation.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe asked whether the site had a staff travel plan in place. Mr Bell advised that a travel plan was requested by the Highways Officer.

In response to questions asked about the new marquee and noise limitation, Mr Bell stated that the noise management plan would inform the conditions for use to minimise the impacts to local residents. Furthermore, it was expected that the hardstanding

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

pavilion would be used for the majority of events which would reduce the noise levels further.

Councillor Mollie Lock, speaking as Ward Member, in addressing the Committee raised the following points.

She raised concerns on behalf of the residents of Beech Hill. The hotel itself did not cause significant concerns and it was a valued asset in the area – providing jobs for local residents.

There were concerns relating to the proposed use of the paddock as overspill parking.

Residents were concerned about the multiple structures in place, including a portakabin and the affect this had on the nearby trees.

Residents had raised concerns regarding noise which was still an issue when people left the tented areas and congregated outside.

She asked when condition 3 (removal of the Grand Marquee) would take effect from when/if the application was approved.

Councillor Law asked for clarification regarding Councillor Lock's position on the proposed parking in the paddock. Councillor Lock advised that she contested the acceptability of the proposed overspill parking.

Councillor Bale asked whether parking was an issue in the local area - on event days. Councillor Lock advised that the parking was an issue as it spilled off-site and that the Parish Council had met to discuss measures to alleviate pressure in the village.

Councillor Bridgman highlighted the parking blocks, as detailed within the current site plan, and asked Councillor Lock whether the current provision was insufficient therefore, resulted in overflow parking in/ around the village. Councillor Lock advised that the provision was sufficient and the public generally used the venue's designated parking.

In response to questions asked by Members of the Committee, Simon Till advised that permission 152769 was approved on the same land proposed for hotel extensions within the current application. Therefore, if the current application was approved, it would supersede the hotel extensions approved in permission 152769. However, Members were advised that permission 09/2252/XCOMIND would remain valid if the current application was approved due to the proposed land for development being unaffected by the current application.

Councillor Chopping asked whether a programme of works with an end date could be conditioned if the application was approved. David Pearson stated that it could fail the tests of 'reasonable and enforceable' to impose a finish date on the development.

In response to questions asked by the Committee, Simon Till explained that the portakabin was in situ to provide temporary office accommodation while the refurbishment of the boutique hotel was underway. Part of the General Permitted Development Order allowed for the provision of such temporary structures, but it must be removed once the development was completed.

The Committee was advised that noise levels would be monitored through the Noise Management Plan and mechanisms within the Environmental Health Team.

Councillor Emma Webster supported the venue and how it supported the local community in terms of employment. She suggested that condition 5 could be amended to allow seamless trade. The proposed change would enforce the removal of the garden marquee 12 months post the first anniversary of the first use of the hotel extensions.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

David Pearson advised that this could be incorporated into the condition if Members were minded to approve the application.

Councillor Bridgman requested clarification regarding the number of days the proposed [temporary] marquee could be in situ alongside the use of the paddock for overflow parking (conditions 7&8). Simon Till advised that the total number of days per year was 125. There had been drafting error and that the reference to 3 consecutive days in condition 8 was incorrect. Members heard that the condition 7 proposed 5 days for the erection and dismantling of the temporary marquee with a limit of 1 day for each event held in the marquee and condition 8 proposed a maximum of 3 consecutive events on the paddock land.

Councillor Law stated that he supported the majority of details within the application but he was troubled by the overflow parking proposals – he was minded to request a deferral to allow the applicant time to reconsider the parking proposals. David Pearson advised against deferring the application and suggested that overflow parking would ensure that any impacts within the village were minimised.

Councillor Bridgman suggested that this was a complex case because of the history regarding the site and issues associated with noise. He noted that there was a lot of controversy around the use of an overflow car park and the change of use proposal. He acknowledged that West Berkshire Council failed to use enforcement powers when necessary but he considered that the current proposal sought to take a pragmatic approach towards addressing these issues.

He acknowledged concerns regarding the impact of traffic in/around Beech Hill and noted that the overflow car park aimed to minimise the effect. Notwithstanding the fact that elements of the parking layout had existing planning permission.

Councillor Bridgman supported the application - including the suggested change to condition 5.

Councillor Webster upheld her suggestion to amend condition 5 of the application and stated that, in doing so, she would fully support the application. Therefore, Councillor Webster proposed acceptance of Officer's recommendation to grant planning permission, including the additional condition and amendments to conditions stated on the update sheet. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Richard Crumly.

Councillor Law stated that he agreed with the economic benefits delivered by the venue but he also had three key concerns regarding the application: the temporary marquee; the sequence/ frequency of events; and car parking. He was especially concerned about the location of the temporary marquee – noting that it would be better positioned at the rear of the hotel but he suspected that this option was not followed through because it would interfere with the potential development under application 09/2252/XCOMIND. He disputed the need for a permanent overflow car park and suggested that there could be an agreement to use the adjacent Trust's car park as/when required. He was minded to approve the application minus the proposal to deliver additional parking but noted that this was not possible so he suggested that the Committee deferred the decision.

Councillor Alan Macro considered that the current application aimed to make the best of a less desirable situation. However, he could not support the proposed overflow car park either and was cautious about the [proposed] number of days the temporary marquee could be in place. For those reasons he could not support the application.

David Pearson advised that the planning application proposed that the temporary marquee could be in situ for [up to] 125 days per annum and that, in terms of the worst case scenario, if the current appeal went ahead, an Inspector might take a view that the Grand Marquee was in fact lawful and therefore be deemed a permanent feature with no

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

control over its usage. The Committee was reminded that the Inspector's decision would be made based on lawfulness and not the desirability of its retention assessed against planning policies.

Councillor Keith Chopping stated that he understood the situation in respect of lawful structures since reading the report and hearing the discussion this evening. He believed that the majority of concerns had been addressed, therefore he supported the application. However, he was mindful of the fact that the venue could generate noise complaints and was insistent that this should be monitored closely going forward.

Councillor Metcalfe highlighted concerns regarding the internal layout of the kitchen and dining area. Although this was not a matter for planning consideration, he was concerned that this could lead to accidents in the future.

He requested that the conditions were amended to insist that landscaping occurred at the earliest opportunity, noting that the condition currently linked to the first use of the temporary marquee. Simon Till advised that the condition requested sight of the landscaping plans within 12 month of the application being approved and that Part A of the condition stated that landscaping should commence at the first 'planting season' after first use of the temporary marquee. Councillor Bridgman agreed that the condition could be improved and requested an amendment to condition 13 stating that landscaping should commence 12 months after the completion of any development on site. David Pearson advised Members that the change should pass the reasonability test. He suggested that linking landscaping to the development of the hotel could be considered unreasonable. He proposed that the condition could be amended to request submission of landscaping details within 6 months, sticking with the original requirement for completion of landscaping if Members were concerned about the timescales associated with the condition.

Councillor Webster accepted the proposed changes to conditions 5, 7 and 8 and the proposed alteration to condition 13 and upheld her proposal to accept Officer's recommendation. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Richard Crumly.

(c) In considering the above application Members voted in favour of the proposal to accept Officers recommendation.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions

Conditions

1. Approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 70009715-SK-101 Rev. A and 635-LA-01 Rev. A received by email dated 17 November 2017, and drawing numbers 1604-RFT-00-XX-DR-A-0001-SO-, 1604-RFT-00-01-DR-0102-A-SO-P01, 1604-RFT-00-02-DR-A-0103-SO-P01, 1604-RFT-00-GF-DR-A-0101-SO-, 16104-RFT-00-02, 3.-DR-A-0104-SO-01, 16104-RFT-00-ZZ-DR-A-0401-SO-P01 and the location plan received 19 June 2017. Any material change to the approved plans will require a formal planning application to vary this condition under Section 73 of the Act. Any non-material change to the approved plans will require a non-material amendment application prior to such a change being made.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

2. Samples of materials

Development of the approved extensions to the hotel building on the site shall not commence until a schedule and samples of the external materials to be used in construction of the dwellings has been submitted and approved in writing under a formal discharge of conditions application. Development of the hotel buildings shall take place in accordance with the approved schedule and samples of materials.

Reason: Additional information on materials is required due to the visual sensitivity of surrounding views from the AONB. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

3. Removal of Grand Marquee

Within 12 months of the date of this decision the three conjoined marquees located in the paddock land alongside the south western boundary of the site known as the Grand Marquee and any associated structures or temporary buildings shall be removed from the site.

Reason: The permanent retention of the large conjoined marquee would result in a severe detrimental impact to the quality of the landscape surrounding the site and views from the public right of way to the west and Beech Hill Road to the south. This condition is imposed in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

4. Noise Management Plan

The approved temporary marquee and marquee extension shall not be taken into use until a scheme, known as a Noise Management Plan, has been submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. The noise management plan shall specify the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from all proposed works on the site including the temporary marquee, marquee extension and hotel extensions. Thereafter, the temporary marquee, marquee extension and hotel extensions shall not be taken into use until the approved noise management plan has been fully implemented and all future operations and events will be undertaken in accordance with its provisions.

Reason: To protect the occupants of nearby residential properties from noise disturbance in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan (2006-2026) 2012 and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

5. Removal of garden marquee

The marquee immediately to the west of the hotel shown on the approved drawings as the Garden Marquee shall be removed from the site within 12 months of the first use of the hotel extensions hereby approved as specified on drawing number 635-LA-01 Rev A (Landscape principle strategy plan).

Reason: In order to prevent the overdevelopment of the site and in the interests of neighbouring amenity in accordance with Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan (2006-2026) 2012 and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

6. Elevations of temp marquee

Within 3 months of the date of this planning permission full elevations of the temporary marquee to be located on the southern part of the site shall be submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. The temporary marquee shall be erected and thereafter retained in accordance with the approved elevations.

In the interests of visual amenity and proper planning in accordance with the NPPF (2012) and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

7. Temporary marquee

The temporary marquee hereby approved shall not be used for more than 25 events per calendar year. Each event shall consist of no more than 5 days in total for the erection and dismantling of the marquee and not more than 1 day per event for the use of the marquee for purposes of entertainment and leisure ancillary to the use of the hotel as an assembly and leisure venue for weddings and leisure events. A record shall be kept of the events held in the marquee to be presented in writing to the Local Planning Authority or its representative on request.

Reason: In order to ensure that the use of the temporary marquee is limited so as not to result in harm to visual amenity and surrounding residential amenity in a rural location in the countryside, in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan (2006-2026) 2012 and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

8. Temporary use of paddock

The use of the paddock land surrounding the temporary marquee to the south of the hotel for purposes of entertainment and leisure ancillary to the use of the hotel as an assembly and leisure venue for weddings and leisure events shall be for no more than 25 days per year, and no more than 3 consecutive events per year.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

Reason: In order to prevent undue levels of disruption to nearby residential amenity in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policy OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007.

9. Construction method statement

No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The statement shall provide for:

- (d) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- (e) Loading and unloading of plant and materials
- (f) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- (g) The erection and maintenance of any security hoarding
- (h) Wheel washing facilities
- (i) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- (j) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

10. Vehicle parking provided to standards

The approved temporary marquee and Garden Marquee extension shall not be taken into use until details of the parking areas and turning spaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall show how the parking spaces are to be surfaced and marked out. The approved temporary marquee and Garden Marquee extension shall not be taken into use until the parking spaces and turning areas have been provided in accordance with the approved details. The parking and turning spaces shall thereafter be kept available for parking of private motor cars and light goods vehicles at all times. No parking of vehicles shall take place on the site other than within the approved areas.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which 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

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

11. Traffic Management Plan

Within three months of permission being granted, a Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall show how parking and accessibility to/from the site are to be implemented. Thereafter, the Traffic Management Plan shall be adhered to in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with a managed parking and accessibility methodology to mitigate the risk of delays on the adopted highway and to reduce the reliance on private motor vehicles. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007) and the Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

12. Tree protection

No development of the hotel extensions hereby approved (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) shall take place 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. This scheme shall include a plan showing the location of the protective fencing, and shall specify the type of protective fencing. All 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 the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

13. Landscaping

Within 6 months of the date of this permission a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site shall be submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. The details shall include schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, an implementation programme and details of

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

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 first use of the approved temporary marquee.
- b) Any trees shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of the first use of the approved temporary marquee 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 the interests of improving the visual contribution of the site to surrounding amenity and to soften the visual impact of the temporary marquee on views from Beech Hill Road and the public right of way to the south and west of the site, in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

14. Drainage

No development of the hotel extensions hereby approved shall take place until details of sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water within the site have been submitted and approved under a discharge of conditions application. The details shall address the matters below:

- 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 West Berkshire Council local standards;
- b) Include and be informed by a ground investigation survey which establishes the soil characteristics, infiltration rate and groundwater levels;
- c) Include a drainage strategy for surface water run-off from the site to retain rainfall run-off within the site and allow discharge from the site at no greater than the existing run-off rate;
- d) Include pre-treatment methods to prevent any pollution or silt entering SuDS features or causing any contamination to the soil or groundwater;
- e) Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site; and
- f) Include a timetable for the implementation of all SuDS measures on the site and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. This plan shall incorporate

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 29 NOVEMBER 2017 - MINUTES

arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a residents' management company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Thereafter the SuDS measures shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved timetable.

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), and Part 4 of Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006). 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.

15. Arboricultural Method Statement

No development of the approved hotel extensions shall take place until an arboricultural method statement has been submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. The statement 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. Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

38. Appeal Decisions relating to Eastern Area Planning

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

39. Site Visit

A date of 13 December 2017 at 9.30am was agreed for site visits if necessary. This was in advance of the Eastern Area Planning Committee scheduled for 20 December 2017.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.45 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature