Note: These Minutes have been amended. Please see Minutes of 13 June 2018 for amendments.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 23 MAY 2018

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

Also Present: Sharon Armour (Solicitor), Stephen Chard (Principal Policy Officer), Gareth Dowding (Senior Engineer), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Masie Masiiwa (Planning Officer), Andrew Morrow (Team Leader (Minerals and Waste)), David Pearson (Development Control Team Leader), Linda Pye (Principal Policy Officer) and Simon Till (Senior Planning Officer)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Keith Chopping

PART I

3. Minutes

The Minutes of the meetings held on 2 May 2018 and 8 May 2018 were approved as true and correct records and signed by the Chairman.

4. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Emma Webster declared an interest in Agenda Items 4(1) and 4(2), but reported that, 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 Tim Metcalfe declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(5), and reported that, as his interest was a disclosable pecuniary interest, he would be leaving the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter.

All Committee Members declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(5), but reported that, as their interest was a personal or an other registrable interest, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, they determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

5. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. & Parish: 17/01683/MINMAJ - Veolia Environmental Services, Padworth IWMF, Padworth Lane, Lower Padworth

Councillor Graham Pask opened the meeting by proposing that the speaking rights for agenda items 4(1) and 4(2) would be combined due to the linkage between the two items. Therefore, each group of speakers for these items would have up to ten minutes each to address the Committee. Once these combined representations had concluded, individual debates would be held and specific resolutions formed for both items. Members unanimously agreed to this proposal.

Standard speaking rights would resume from item 4(3).

Councillor Emma Webster declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 4(1) and 4(2) by virtue of the fact that through her work, she worked with Pegasus Planning. However, the representative, Mr Kirby, was not known to her. As her interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, she 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 17/01683/MINMAJ in respect of a Section 73 application to vary Condition 7 'Hours of operation (HWRC)' of previously approved application 14/01111/MINMAJ and a Section 73a application to vary Condition 16 'Travel Plan' of planning permission reference 13/01546/MINMAJ.

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 17/01684/MINMAJ in respect of a change of use application to amend the approved details to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Facility.

Andrew Morrow (Team Leader (Minerals and Waste)) presented the two items. He started by explaining that, as seen in the agenda, two reports had been produced and two separate resolutions would need to be formed by the Committee. Mr Morrow then highlighted a number of key issues:

- The proposals were in line with the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (dated December 1998) and the Padworth site was allocated as part of this.
- The original 2008 planning applications were given consent on the basis that there would have been a maximum throughput of 7,200 tonnes per annum. The current proposal would have a smaller 6,000 tonnes per annum. The Padworth site would only serve West Berkshire residents and traffic distribution had been revisited based on this fact with 62.8% A4 East, 18.1% Padworth Lane, 15% A4 West and 4.1% A340. Updated 2017 traffic surveys were used to assess the applications with all traffic models updated for up to 2022. There were traffic increases for the am peak period (8am – 9am) but the modelling results did not show any significant impact and was considered acceptable by Officers. Highways Officers and also a Highways Consultant employed on behalf of the Council had concluded that the Environmental and Transport Assessments were suitable without the need for additional mitigation. There were errors in the weekend traffic figures on pages 47, 48, 128 and 129. The Highways Officer would give more detail if required, but overall conclusions were unaffected.
- Officers had also concluded environmental factors, i.e. air pollution and noise impact, would not have a considerable impact. Conditions would also help to mitigate the impact.
- Mr Morrow also highlighted that residents living in the east of the district currently had to travel to the Newtown Road Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) in Newbury to dispose of non-recyclable waste. Approval of this proposal would be a positive outcome for those residents.
- Officers considered that there were strong reasons to support the applications, they were in line with the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Conditional permission was proposed.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Mike Warner and Mr John Russell, Parish Council representatives and Mr Kirby (Pegasus Planning), objector, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr Warner in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr Warner was Chairman of the Parish Council and the Parish fully understood the reasons for this proposal. However, approval of the applications would have a negative impact upon Padworth Lane and Rectory Road. These were local lanes that served three schools, Padworth College and two industrial units amongst others. The increase in traffic from these proposals was very concerning. He questioned how a 90% increase in traffic could not be considered significant. Large parts of the roads in the area were narrow as was the nearby road bridge which also had poor sight lines.
- A greater level of signage was required to warn motorists of the single track access and the presence of local schools.
- Visibility was not sufficient when considering the speed of traffic. Mr Warner felt that a speed limit would have a calming effect on drivers, currently a large number travelled in excess of 40mph. There was not an adequate stopping distance for this speed. Visibility would be improved by the enforcement of hedgerow maintenance, particularly near the schools.
- Passing places needed to be enhanced.
- The Parish Council requested that approval be withheld until highway concerns had been addressed.
- The proposal for increased hours was difficult to understand. The Parish felt that use of the facility would be minimal between the morning peak traffic times of 8am and 9am.

Mr Russell in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr Russell was a Transport Consultant and advised the Parish on highway matters.
- There were no limits in place for either traffic volume or for tonnage of waste for the HWRC.
- The width of Padworth Lane and Rectory Road was in most places between 4 and 4.5 metres wide and, in some areas, narrower. Therefore many sections were not sufficient for two way traffic flow. Forward visibility was indeed poor and this was limited by the hedgerows.
- Pedestrians had to walk on the carriageway and there were no points of safety for pedestrians.
- The Transport Report contained insufficiencies and road safety had not been given proper consideration. Mr Russell felt the Transport Report to be flawed and urged the Committee to place no weight on it.
- Mr Russell also felt that the EA addendum was flawed. It failed to recommend mitigation. The EA addendum did not recognise the close proximity or sensitivity of schools, the college, the playground, sports pitches and the village hall. The local carriageways were also well used by non-motorists.
- The proposals would cause harm. Current access points did not meet safe access requirements.
- An independent traffic survey had been produced. Mr Russell felt that traffic speeds should be restricted in some places to 20mph, particularly in close proximity to the swing bridge. However, average speeds were observed as being above 40mph.

- On average, 1,260 extra vehicles would travel to the site each day. This was clearly a significant increase in traffic movements. Mr Russell estimated that during Saturday peak times, a car would pass a pedestrian every 30 seconds.
- To summarise, the transport plans were not sustainable, access was unsafe and there was a risk to vulnerable road users (non-motorists). Mr Russell urged the Committee to refuse the application as it was contrary to Paragraph 32 of the NPPF.

Councillor Alan Law referred specifically to the application for the change in hours and asked if the Parish would have objected to this application if the weekday opening time was proposed for 10am. Mr Warner confirmed that the Parish considered a 10am opening to be acceptable as this was past the peak time for morning traffic. Mr Russell added that the transport assessment considered both applications as one and it was difficult to identify the highways impact of the applications in isolation.

In response to a query from Councillor Graham Bridgman, Mr Russell confirmed that an extra 1,260 vehicle movements were estimated per day at weekends.

Councillor Bridgman followed this up by referring to paragraph 6.5.5 of the report which stated that on a Saturday or Sunday there would be circa 249 additional HWRC trips. He questioned therefore the figure of 1,260. Mr Russell explained that a full technical report had been submitted in support of this, he also referred Members to the comments in the report made by the Council's Highways Consultant which estimated traffic flows of between 549 and 662 vehicles per day (one way) at weekends. He accepted this forecast was made in 2008 but the report did state that current figures would be broadly consistent with those reported in 2008. The forecast was based on an estimation that 64% of trips took place on weekdays and 36% at weekends.

Mr Russell added that seasonal variations had been considered, with a greater level of usage in the spring and summer months. It was also considered that Sundays were the busiest day of the week.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe referred to the concern raised in relation to traffic using the swing bridge. In noting that the facility would only be used by West Berkshire residents, Councillor Metcalfe queried the usage of the swing bridge from the south. Mr Warner felt that residents from Mortimer and Burghfield would travel in from that direction. His concern from a road safety viewpoint was for those residents who did not have a knowledge of the local roads and where roads were single track etc. Mr Russell added that there was also concern in relation to the level of traffic accessing the site from the A4, particularly at weekends, and the potential for queueing traffic.

Councillor Marigold Jaques queried whether accidents were a regular occurrence. Mr Warner explained that while serious accidents were not a factor, there were regular shunts and near misses, often resulting in damaged wing mirrors.

Councillor Jaques also made reference to the Jubilee Nursery and questioned whether this was open during weekends. Mr Warner confirmed that a holiday club remained open over the weekends and therefore the traffic generated by the nursery would still be on the road.

Mr Kirby in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He was a Town Planning Consultant and Town Planner and he worked for Pegasus Planning.
- He represented a group of local residents who objected to the applications. They would suffer significant impacts.

- Approval of the applications would result in a significant increase in the use of the site and therefore traffic movements, in particular at weekends. Reference had been made to a wider spread of traffic as a result of increased opening hours, but this could not be guaranteed and regardless of this, peak times and disruption would continue.
- Mr Kirby noted the point that this site was identified as a preferred area for waste management and disposal, but this fact should not override other policies which sought to protect existing neighbours to the site. The impact on the local amenity and on the environment also needed strong consideration.
- Local residents already suffered disruption from the existing recycling facility and Mr Kirby questioned whether further disruption would be acceptable from these proposals. Significant weight needed to be given to protecting the amenity of residents.
- There was a risk to highway safety from increased usage and this was a matter of great concern.
- Noise pollution was a further factor. The noise generated by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) was a concern from the proposal to increase opening hours, with an expectation of HGV movements between 7.30am and 8.00am before the HWRC would open at 8am. Mr Kirby felt the transport assessment and data to be flawed. More realistic data would highlight a significant acoustic impact.
- The proposals offered no economic benefit, and adverse environmental and social impacts.
- Within the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire, potential uses were listed for the 'preferred areas' in the Plan and 'Civic amenity site' was not listed as a potential use at the Padworth Sidings site.
- Other identified civic amenity sites in Berkshire were in significantly more urban areas and were well served by more appropriate road networks.
- The increase in traffic movements referred to (1,260 per weekend day) was a significant safety concern in this sensitive location that consisted of narrow country lanes. This was a safety risk for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.
- Roads used to access/egress the site were also used as the main walking route between Padworth College and the community centre and to the A4 (bus stops).
- Objectors felt that no mitigation measures had been proposed to offset highway concerns. While current surveys suggested that increases would not be significant, the Motion transport assessment could show a greatly worsened situation.
- The existing amenity of local residents should be protected and safety concerns recognised. As such, the applications should be refused.

Councillor Crumly questioned the concern of the site being used from the earlier time of 8am on weekdays. He considered that the usage in this peak time would be minimal and queried where the use would come from. Mr Kirby acknowledged this point and explained that this was why the earlier opening time proposed was being questioned by objectors.

Councillor Metcalfe noted that aside from highways concerns, a concern was raised in relation to the local impact of processing non-recyclable waste. He queried that as the existing wider site already served as a transfer centre for such waste. In response, Mr Kirby explained that West Berkshire Council's policies were explicit in stating that the

process described was acceptable, but the site was not appropriate as a civic amenity site. As already described, objectors felt there to be more appropriate identified civic amenity sites across Berkshire that had more suitable road networks.

Councillor Mollie Lock highlighted the following points as Ward Member:

- Councillor Lock was speaking on behalf of concerned residents. She accepted that the proposals would likely be welcomed by many residents in the east of the district who would prefer to dispose of their non-recyclable waste in Padworth rather than travelling to Newbury, having previously used the Smallmead site in Reading. However, for local Padworth based residents, this was an entirely different matter and the proposals were of great concern.
- The increase in traffic was a real issue. She disagreed with the point made in the report that there would be no significant impact on Rectory Road. The proposals would negatively affect Rectory Road residents and the road itself was not suitable for the increase in traffic.
- Both Rectory Road and Padworth Lane were very narrow and two way traffic flow was difficult. This could create some congestion, particularly when considering that passing places were minimal. As noted earlier, traffic from the Jubilee Nursery was a factor all through the calendar year.
- Overhanging vegetation impacted on visibility, particularly on Rectory Road.
- A greater degree of signage was needed alerting motorists to the existence of the swing bridge. The bridge could only accommodate single file traffic and visibility beyond the bridge, particularly from the Padworth Lane end, was poor. This needed to be traffic light controlled.
- There was also a concern from traffic entering/exiting the site via the A4. This could cause queuing traffic.
- Should the applications be approved then mitigation was needed. Measures included increased signage, improved management of vegetation and improvements to the road surfacing (the edges of the country roads were crumbling).
- The village hall was used for many private functions and football matches were held on the green. The parking at the village hall was limited and therefore cars often had to park on the road for such events.
- There was a need for a HWRC for residents living in the east of the district, but many difficulties would be created if approved in this location and Councillor Lock asked the Committee to respect the views and concerns of residents.

Councillor Graham Bridgman, speaking as Ward Member, highlighted the following points:

- He shared Councillor Lock's views. Padworth residents had deep concerns which dated back to the application for the existing site and the existing use.
- However, many residents in the east of the district were unhappy at being unable to use the Smallmead HWRC and they would wish to make use of this site for non-recyclable waste.

Councillor Lock concluded Ward Member comments with stating that many Mortimer residents would have been willing to pay to use Smallmead, but this was felt to be too expensive.

Councillor Webster noted the points around overhanging vegetation and queried the land ownership/responsibility for maintenance. Councillor Lock explained that this was unclear. It was potentially highways land, certainly some closely located dead trees that had to be removed were on highways land.

Councillor Peter Argyle pointed out that while Mortimer/Burghfield residents could access the site via Rectory Road, they could also do so via the A4. Councillor Lock felt that queuing traffic would still be a factor from either direction over the bridge.

Councillor Crumly queried the residents' view of an opening time earlier than 10am. Councillor Lock was unclear on this point, she had not questioned residents on this particular aspect and no views had been forthcoming.

In considering the above application Members had a number of questions for Officers. Councillor Alan Law questioned whether the 8am opening time on weekdays was considered essential. He accepted this was really a question for Veolia and the Council's Waste Officers, but this was a concern for objectors. The report did contain traffic projections but it did not provide the evidence base for this.

Mr Morrow, while not able to offer input from an operational perspective, explained that an assessment had been undertaken of an 8am opening. It was considered that a later 10am opening could result in more condensed traffic movements throughout the day. Paul Goddard (Team Leader – Highways Development Control) also responded on this question and explained that use between 8am and 9am was considered to be limited. He added that the data provided in the report was the outcome of traffic surveys undertaken at the Newbury HWRC. This data was also consistent with information provided by the re3 Waste Partnership on the use of the Smallmead HWRC.

Two traffic surveys were undertaken at Newbury HWRC, one by Motion for Padworth Parish and one by the applicant. They both pointed to usage between 8am and 9am being at a lower level than off peak times. Greater use was anticipated in the late morning, but this was at a time when there would be less traffic on the road network.

Councillor Webster followed up her earlier question on the ownership of and responsibility for the overhanging vegetation. Mr Goddard responded that he did not know the hedge ownership and explained that if vegetation had overgrown then it could be reported by residents or the Parish Council at any time so that it could be investigated. However, he did not feel this matter to be relevant to these planning applications.

Councillor Webster then asked what would be considered to be a significant impact in highways terms. Mr Goddard advised that the consented use of the site was to process 7,200 tonnes of waste per annum and this was assessed, modelling and approved in 2008. The current proposals were estimated to generate 6,000 tonnes per annum, therefore a reduction to the consented volume. Overall traffic movements would be lower than the already consented level, the only increase would be to the morning traffic resulting from the proposed extended opening times.

Councillor Bridgman referred to the assumptions made in the report around the level of waste displaced from Smallmead to either the Newbury HWRC or a potential HWRC in Padworth and queried whether there was the ability to understand additional green waste disposal already being received at Padworth, having been displaced from Smallmead, and what there could be additionally. Mr Morrow explained that this breakdown was not available.

Councillor Bridgman continued by seeking to accurately establish the impact of the proposals on traffic flows. The report indicated that the existing usage generated 117 vehicles per day on weekends and it was forecast that this would increase to 662 one way trips if Padworth became a HWRC. However, a figure of 249 additional car trips on a

Saturday or Sunday was also indicated in the report. Councillor Bridgman queried the difference between the figures.

Mr Goddard responded by clarifying that the existing vehicle trips per day was the current situation in Padworth and this was based on the existing 1,500 tonnes of recyclable waste being disposed of at the site per annum. 6,000 tonnes was higher than 1,500 tonnes and would have a higher traffic generation, but he reiterated that consent was already in place for 7,200 tonnes per annum and these proposals, if approved, would forecast this annual amount to a lower 6,000 tonnes.

Councillor Metcalfe referred to the possible mitigation measures listed in the report from the Parish Council's transport consultant and queried if these were being considered/would be implemented. Mr Goddard made the following comments:

- Introduction of a 30mph speed limit on the route - Mr Goddard explained that a speed limit review had been conducted in September 2015. This found that the 85th percentile traffic speed south of the canal bridge was 38mph when the limit was 60mph. A reduced limit of 30mph was not considered justifiable when this was not a built up area and for a limit of 40mph, there was a concern as it could be seen as a target by motorists. Therefore no change had been proposed by the review. It could be reconsidered, but Mr Goddard felt that it would likely have the same outcome.
- Hedgerow maintenance had already been discussed.
- Improved signage along the route to warn motorists of change in environment and that they should give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians – Mr Goddard firstly questioned the justification when considering that consented tonnage would reduce from 7,200 to 6,000 tonnes per annum. He also explained that signage had been reviewed and additional signs were already in place since 2009 warning of the single track road both south and north of the bridges. There was also a national drive to reduce sign clutter and signs should only be erected where essential. This also applied to signage for public rights of way.
- Introduction of weight restriction along the route between Baughurst Road and swing bridge – a width restriction of 2.0 metres was already imposed from the canal bridge to Rectory Road that restricted larger vehicles.
- Introduction of formal one way working at the canal and river crossings – the current practice was considered sufficient. Mr Goddard felt there was sufficient signage for the river bridges and the existence of the canal bridge was clearly visible to motorists from the south.

Councillor Metcalfe queried whether a 20mph speed limit could be imposed on the bridge. Mr Goddard explained that the site access near the canal bridge had been designed in detail in 2008 when speed surveys were undertaken. The 85th percentile speed was 19mph and therefore Mr Goddard did not feel a 20mph limit was required when it was in his view difficult to travel in excess of that speed. Mr Goddard was also concerned that a speed limit could become a target for drivers. He added that the site access and sight lines were adequate for the speeds recorded.

Councillor Pamela Bale noted that many of the potential mitigation measures listed by the Parish Council related to existing traffic issues, i.e. speed limits and signage, and these matters existed regardless of what was proposed by these applications. She accepted that the issues and measures proposed had been considered, and would be taken forward where considered appropriate to do so.

Councillor Graham Pask stated that the Committee had held a general and rounded debate on the applications. He then asked Members to focus their attentions on reaching a conclusion for each of the two planning applications.

Councillor Bridgman voiced his disappointment that neither the applicant nor their advisers were present in order to answer the Committee's questions. He then stated that the Parish Council was quite rightly active and vociferous on the issues highlighted of traffic speeds and overhanging vegetation/maintenance of hedgerows. This included making their case for the speed limit review. Councillor Bridgman noted the comments made by the Highways Officer on this particular point.

However, the increase in the volume of traffic forecast should these applications be approved was concerning for residents and would have a significant impact. Taking the figure quoted by the Parish of 1,260 extra vehicle movements per weekend day and, alongside that, noting the point made in the report that 82% of traffic accessing/exiting the HWRC was predicted via the north to/from the A4 and the remainder from the south, then Councillor Bridgman estimated that there would, on average, be an additional vehicle movement every five minutes from the south and two additional movements every minute from the north. This impact was a strong point for the Committee to consider.

Councillor Pask commented that he chaired the Speed Limit Review Working Group and if there were material changes to issues such as traffic volume then the group would reconsider requests.

Councillor Alan Macro added his concerns in relation to the absence of any representative from Veolia (the applicant) or West Berkshire Council's Waste Officers. He then commented that the applications were desirable for residents in the Theale Ward and neighbouring wards who currently had to travel some distance to dispose of non-recyclable waste. However, he also voiced his concern for local residents arising from increased traffic. Councillor Macro queried whether a different spread of hours would be more acceptable, i.e. 9am-7pm rather than the proposed 8am-6pm on Mondays to Fridays.

Councillor Law recalled that many similar debates were held and concerns raised when the original application for the recycling centre was approved in 2008. These were understood, however, the issues feared by residents at that time had not materialised.

Councillor Law questioned the alternatives available in the east of the district with the Smallmead HWRC not available to West Berkshire residents. He felt there to be no alternative, but highlighted the Council's duty to do what it could to help mitigate the impact on local residents. He too was frustrated that the applicant was not represented at the meeting.

Councillor Law proposed acceptance of Officers' recommendation for agenda item 4(1) (variation of hours of operation) but with a condition imposed to restrict the opening time to 10am on weekdays subject to the Council's Waste Team and Veolia considering/evaluating the practicality of a 10am opening. Councillor Pask stated that Officer advice would be needed on this matter and Members were required to consider the application put before them.

Councillor Webster referred to the Environmental Statement provided by the applicant. This was clear in stating that the proposed opening time of 8am was to help spread the volume of traffic. This could also be beneficial to residents on their way into work. Councillor Webster did however share her sympathy with local residents and their concerns. She referred to a similar experience for residents in her Ward with the development of the Ikea Store and the impact this would have/had on peak time traffic

volumes. Members needed to be mindful of the traffic data projections provided based on the Newtown Road HWRC usage.

Councillor Webster then turned to the need to consider the sustainability of developments on economic, social and environmental grounds. Economic – the provision of infrastructure was made clear in the report. Recycling levels would increase and there would be a reduction in penalties for not recycling.

Social – the NPPF was clear in highlighting the need for residents to be able to access services that were needed locally. It was important for residents to have convenient access to recycling facilities.

Environmental – the concerns of the local community were noted, in particular in relation to increased traffic. However, Councillor Webster felt that there were a number of possible informatives that could help mitigate the impact as already debated. For example, hedgerow maintenance and improved signage. Members had the opportunity to make a Members Bid for funding for such measures.

Councillor Bridgman felt there was scope to improve signage within the site to help manage vehicles exiting the site, i.e. to turn left on exiting. He felt this should be conditioned or an informative should the applications be approved.

David Pearson commented that as the Local Planning Authority the Committee could only consider signage within the red line. On site signage would be a management issue for the applicant. Mr Morrow felt that this could be an informative.

Councillor Bale restated the point that the issues raised for these applications by objectors were also concerns when the original application for the site was considered. These concerns had to be considered. An area of concern yet to be considered was the need for pedestrian crossing facilities on Padworth Lane between the A4 and the village hall. Mr Goddard stated the view that this was unjustified for the anticipated traffic volumes. Councillor Pask reiterated that traffic levels could be revisited should they become a concern.

Councillor Crumly felt that the greatest concern to local residents/the Parish Council was the impact of the 8am opening time. He then commented that the existing site had been in place for some time. Its approved capacity of 7,200 tonnes per annum had not materialised and the site was underused. He felt therefore that there was scope to accommodate these planning applications.

This was a much needed service for residents in the east who could no longer utilise the Smallmead HWRC. Usage could also come from residents living in eastern Thatcham. Councillor Crumly felt that the majority of residents would access the site from the A4. Concern had been raised in relation to the impact of residents accessing the site from the south but he considered that in general, motorists took greater care on rural roads.

Councillor Crumly was supportive of the applications and the benefits they would bring to residents in the east of the district.

Councillor Metcalfe made reference to the swing bridge, he was aware that the bridge was often open at weekends which resulted in queuing traffic. This could increase and be a factor. Mr Goddard explained that access to the site had been fully assessed for the original application when approval was given on the basis of 7,200 tonnes per annum. It was considered, based on data analysis, that these applications would generate a lower figure of 6,000 tonnes per annum.

Councillor Macro commented on the suggestion of signage within the site that asked residents to turn left on exit. While he acknowledged that this could benefit roads to the

south, he was not supportive of the suggestion as this would result in more traffic along Padworth Lane and going past the village hall.

(Councillor Sheila Ellison left the meeting at 7.20pm).

Debate then turned to the proposal of Councillor Law to accept Officers recommendation for agenda item 4(1) subject to the addition of an informative that a thorough evaluation took place to investigate the feasibility of alternative opening hours on weekdays from that proposed prior to implementation of the permission.

Mr Pearson recommended to Members that they should impose clear conditions on opening hours. He was concerned should the Committee resolve to grant permission without clarity on this point. If Members wanted an investigation into opening hours then he recommended that the Committee should defer the applications. In response, Councillor Law stated that he was content to delegate negotiation on this point to Officers to work with the applicant.

Councillor Webster, whilst sharing the frustration at the absence of the applicant, felt that the applicant's environmental and technical report covered the reasoning behind the proposed opening hours. Councillor Law did not accept this to be the case as the impact of alternative opening hours had not been documented.

Councillor Webster proposed acceptance of Officers' recommendation for agenda item 4(1) with no amendments. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Somner. However, Councillor Law's original proposal needed to be resolved.

Councillor Law remained eager to discover how essential an 8am opening was considered to be rather than, for example, a 10am opening. However, he accepted that this was an operational question. Mr Pearson reiterated his view that the only option to achieve a firm view on this matter would be deferral.

Councillor Law clarified his proposal as acceptance of Officers' recommendation for agenda item 4(1), subject to a request that West Berkshire Council's Waste Officers and Veolia consider and evaluate the practicalities of opening at the later time of 10am on weekdays. Councillor Crumly seconded this proposal.

Councillor Pask sought legal advice on this proposal. Sharon Armour (Solicitor) felt there was a need to be clear on what would be delegated to Officers in terms of timings and whether the delegated authority would be given to the Head of Development and Planning. Councillor Law felt that the impact of alternative opening hours needed to be investigated and then taken into account before the weekday opening time was set. This would be an operational decision. He felt that such a condition/informative would be comparable to other works required to take place before building work commenced.

Mr Morrow voiced a concern that such a condition or informative could not be enforced and the Council would not be able to prevent the site being opened from 8am.

Sharon Armour was also concerned at this proposed delegation to Officers and the ability to take this forward without referring the matter back to Committee given the significance of the application. She felt that any investigation would need to be interlinked with a revised traffic assessment. Mr Pearson reiterated his view that the application would need to be deferred to conduct this investigation and revisit traffic assessments.

Councillor Webster sought to understand how a decision, as proposed by Councillor Law, would impact on agenda item 4(2), i.e. what timings would be imposed. Sharon Armour stated that a proposed condition of item 4(2) was for 8am to 6pm, seven days a week. The permission, if granted, for item 4(2) would need to follow the timings set by item 4(1).

Councillor Law withdrew his proposal.

Councillor Crumly proposed acceptance of Officers Recommendation to grant planning permission for agenda item 4(1). This was seconded by Councillor Webster.

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

Conditions

1. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following submitted documents and plans:

- Site Layout Plan A4069 AL100P Rev P4 dated 27/06/11
- In-Vessel Composting Facility GA Sections - Plan 4069 AL113 Rev C4 dated 19/11/10
- In-Vessel Composting Facility Elevations - Plan 4069 AL112 Rev C5 dated 15/03/11
- Bio Filter elevations - Plan 4069 AL122 Rev C4 dated 15/03/11
- WTS-MRF Elevations SW/NW - Plan 4069 AL132 Rev C3 dated 14/03/11
- WTS-MRF Elevations NE/SE - Plan 4069 AL133 Rev C3 dated 17/11/10
- Vehicle Workshop Elevations - Plan 4069 AL181 Rev C2 dated 15/03/11
- HWRC Proposed layout plan A4623 204 M dated 30/03/09 as approved under planning permission 09/02521.
- HWRC Office floor plans and elevations A4623 1007 D dated 06/03/08 as approved under planning permission 08/01166
- Administration and Visitor Centre N&W elevations - Plan 4069 AL164 Rev C5 dated 03/06/11
- Administration and Visitor Centre S&E elevations - Plan 4069 AL165 Rev C6 dated 03/06/11
- Administration and Visitor Centre roof plan - Plan 4069 AL161 Rev C4 dated 03/06/11
- Administration and Visitor Centre floor plan - Plan 4069 AL160 Rev C5 dated 03/06/11
- Weighbridge office floor plans and elevations A4623 1006 D dated 03/06/08 as approved under planning permission 08/01166
- Traffic management schematic (Drawing A4623 205 E dated 30/03/09) as approved under planning permission 09/02521
- Outline landscape management plan 4 dated November 2008 approved under planning permission 08/01166.
- Flood Risk assessment dated 25th April 2008 and addendum dated the 16th January 2009 approved under planning permission 08/01166.
- Site Status before remediation plan CS003563_EWS_001 B dated Apr 2008 as approved under planning permission 08/01166.
- Site Status after remediation plan CS003563_EWS_003 C dated Apr 2008 approved under planning permission 08/01166.
- Site clearance Plan Drawing L02 Revision A dated 11/09/08 approved under planning permission 08/01166.
- Site Remediation Strategy (appendix 13.4 to the Environmental Statement submitted alongside 08/01166 and the addendum submitted alongside 09/02521).
- Invertebrate Mitigation Strategy (appendix 11.4 to the Environmental Statement submitted alongside 08/01166 and the addendum submitted alongside 09/02521).
- Tree Survey (appendix 14.5 to the Environmental Statement submitted alongside 08/01166 and the addendum submitted alongside 09/02521).

- Landscape masterplan Drawing L04/ES FIG 14.18 Revision Q dated 28/04/11.
- Planting Proposals Drawing L05/ES FIG 14.19 Revision P dated 28/04/11.
- Letters from Scott Wilson dated 15th September 2008, 14th October 2008 and 7th November 2008 approved under planning permission 08/01166.
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.
- Paragraphs 2.5 to 2.7 (inclusive) of 'Integrated Waste Management Facility, Padworth Lane, RG7 4JF Planning Application Supporting Statement in respect of 2 planning applications: 1. Change of Use Application to amend the approved details to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Centre. 2. S73 planning Application for variation of condition 7 (to extend the opening hours of the Household Waste Recycling Centre to include weekday mornings) of Planning Permission 14/01111/MINMAJ' (June 2017) (submitted as part of 17/01683/MINMAJ and 17/01684/MINMAJ)

The details of which are approved except as amended by the following conditions.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to adequately control the development, to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with policy WLP31 of Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

2. Details of buildings

The development of the household waste recycling facility, vehicle wash, fuelling area, sprinkler tank and any other structures on the site that are hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the following details (approved in accordance with condition 3 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00923, as amended by this permission). The approved details are:

- Plan AD03 Revision P1, dated 30/01/09 - HWRC Plan and Sections
- Sprinkler Tank and Pump House -Plan 4069 AL147 Rev C4 dated 17/11/10
- Plan AD05 Revision P1, dated 29/10/09 - Vehicle Wash Booster Set and Tank Room
- Plan AD06 Revision P1, dated 30/10/08 - LV Housing
- Fuel Island plan - Plan 4069 AL149 Rev C3 dated 20/06/11

The buildings and other structures shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed structures are agreed in accordance with policy WLP30 and WLP31 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

3. Hours of operations (depot)

No operations or activities authorised by this permission associated with the operation of the depot shall be carried out except between the following hours:

0500 - 2000 Monday to Saturdays
0600 - 2000 Sundays, bank and public holidays

No operations shall take place on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Years Day (with the exception of operations associated with waste from street cleansing and litter collection).

Reason: In the interests of the local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

4. Hours of operation (operational vehicle movements)

No HGV or RCV movements associated with the activities authorised by this permission shall be carried out except between the following hours:

0600 - 2000 Monday to Saturdays
0600 - 2000 Sundays, bank holidays and public holidays

No Street Cleansing Vehicle movements associated with the activities authorised by this permission shall be carried out except between the following hours:

0500 - 2000 Monday to Saturdays

No operations shall take place on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Years Day (with the exception of operations associated with waste from street cleansing and litter collection).

Reason: In the interests of the local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

5. Hours of operations (WTS and IVC)

No operations or activities authorised by this permission and associated with the operation of the waste transfer station and in vessel composting facility, including the vehicle wash associated with the IVC, shall be carried out except between the following hours:

0700 - 1900 Monday to Sunday

No operations shall take place on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Years Day (with the exception of operations associated with waste from street cleansing and litter collection).

Reason: In the interests of the local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

6. Hours of operations (MRF)

No operations or activities authorised by this permission associated with the operations of the materials recycling facility shall be carried out except between the following hours:

0700 - 2200 Monday to Saturdays

0700 - 1900 Sundays, bank and public holidays

No operations shall take place on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Years Day.

Reason: In the interests of the local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

7. Hours of operation (HWRC)

The Household Waste Recycling Centre shall not be open for the receipt of waste except between the following hours:

0800 – 1800 Monday to Sundays and bank and public holidays

No operations shall take place on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Years Day.

Reason: In the interests of the local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

8. Schedule of materials

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the schedule of external finishes for the Integrated Waste Management Facility, Padworth dated April 2011.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

9. Deposit Limits

The throughput of waste at this site shall not exceed 95,000 tonnes per annum.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity and in accordance with policies WLP30 and WLP31 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

10. Records of waste

The operators shall maintain records of the monthly receipt of waste and shall make them available to the Local Planning Authority at any time upon request. This should include separate tonnages of waste throughput for the WTS, IVC, MRF, and HWRC. All records shall be kept for at least 24 months following their creation.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can monitor the receipt of waste to the site in accordance with policy WLP31 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

11. Security details

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following details of the access control, security for site buildings, intruder alarm coverage, lighting, CCTV coverage of the facility (including the entrance and exit roads both to allow management supervision and monitoring of queue build up and to record any incidents for evidential purposes) and proposals for fire suppression (approved in accordance with condition 12 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480 as amended by this permission). The approved details are:

- Security, Fencing and CCTV Layout plan AL144 Rev C2 as amended by site plan 4069 AL100p Rev P4 dated 27/06/11, which details the security fencing layout.
- Specification for dome CCTV camera - DM2060
- Specification for fixed CCTV camera - Redwall 4010/3020/404
- Specification for Vehicle Number Plate Recognition system - Visita VPRN Lite
- Fire suppression layout - Drawing CL100 1550/10 Rev $
- CCTV remote monitoring narrative

The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the all the details herby approved which shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure the prevention of crime and disorder in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

12. Foul water drainage

The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following Foul Water Drainage Scheme (approved in accordance with condition 14 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786). The approved details are:

- Integrated Waste Management Scheme, Drainage Design Report H15501 Dated 14/12/09
- Drainage Network simulations 0901211 simulations 1-4
- Overall site drainage layout, drawing No. 124 Rev P2, Dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 1 of 4, drawing Number 120 Rev P1 dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 2 of 4, drawing Number 121 Rev P1 dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 3 of 4, drawing Number 122 Rev P2 dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 4 of 4, drawing Number 123 Rev P2 dated Nov 2009

No discharge of foul or surface water from the development into the public system shall occur until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed and are acceptable to the sewerage undertaker.

Reason: The development may lead to flooding; to ensure the sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

13. Surface water drainage

The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following Surface Water Drainage Scheme (approved in accordance with condition 15 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786). The approved details are:

- Integrated Waste Management Scheme, Drainage Design Report H15501 Dated 14/12/09
- Drainage Network simulations 0901211 simulations 1-4
- Overall site drainage layout, drawing No. 124 Rev P2, Dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 1 of 4, drawing Number 120 Rev P1 dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 2 of 4, drawing Number 121 Rev P1 dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 3 of 4, drawing Number 122 Rev P2 dated Nov 2009
- Site Drainage Layout Sheet 4 of 4, drawing Number 123 Rev P2 dated Nov 2009

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and such drainage shall be retained and maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and water pollution in the interests of the water environment and to ensure the integrity of the adjacent railway in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

14. Traffic management scheme

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following Traffic Management Scheme (approved in accordance with condition 16 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00842). The approved details are:

- Drawing 100604_001a dated 05/04/11
- Drawing 100604_001b dated 05/04/11
- Drawing 100604_001c dated 05/04/11

The scheme hereby approved shall be implemented in full and the approved signage shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to accord with the WBC freight strategy in accordance with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

15. Travel Plan

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with the Workplace Travel Plan (approved in accordance with 16 of 13/01546/MINMAJ approved under planning reference 14/01111). These approved details are:

- Workplace Travel Plan, Veolia ES, Padworth Lane, Lower Padworth, Reading, RG7 4JF, July 2014 received by the Local Planning Authority on 30 July 2014.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles in accordance with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

16. Contaminated Land

The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following contaminated land assessment (approved in accordance with condition 18 of planning permission 08/01166 under planning reference 09/01564). The approved details are:

- Enabling works remediation strategy dated December 2008.
- Interpretive ground investigation report dated March 2005.
- Supplementary site investigation interpretive report dated April 2009.
- Environmental site investigation interpretive report dated February 2008.
- Land quality documentation (ES Volume 4) dated June 2008.
- Desk Study Report dated September 2004

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved contaminated land assessment.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of existing or proposed occupant/users of the application site or adjacent land in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

17. Remediation Works

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following remediation schemes (approved in accordance with condition 19 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning references 10/01965 and 10/02125). The approved details are:

- The disposal of Asbestos Contaminated Material Method Statement received by West Berkshire Council on the 20/08/10 as amended by the e-mail from Mr J.Hunt dated the 30/09/10
- The Remediation Strategy for the Re-Use of site won material at Padworth Sidings by Norwest Holst dated the 14/09/10 (Ref F15911 - F01)

If any further contamination is identified, that has not already been identified then the additional contamination shall also be fully assessed. No further remediation works shall take place, unless otherwise agreed in writing, until a report detailing the nature and extent of the previously unidentified structures and contamination and the proposed remedial action plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of existing or proposed occupant/users of the application site or adjacent land in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

18. Contaminated land closure report

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following contaminated land closure (approved in accordance with condition 20 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786). The approved details are:

- Padworth Sidings, Entrance Way Area Validation Report on Remedial Works, (February 2010) by Capita Symonds CS037148
- West Berkshire Remediation and Roads Validation Report Revision A Dated 02/02/2010 including appendices.

On completion of any further remediation works a closure report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The report shall make reference to all published information associated with the development and shall demonstrate compliance with the remediation strategy. It shall include the following: details of quality assurance certificates to show that all works have been carried out in full and according to best practice; consignment notes demonstrating the removal of contaminated materials; certification to show that new material brought to the site is uncontaminated; and details of any on-going post remediation monitoring and sampling, including a reporting procedure to the Local Planning Authority and Environment Agency.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of existing or proposed occupant/users of the application site or adjacent land in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

19. Odour

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and thereafter operated in complete accordance with the following odour mitigation scheme (approved in accordance with condition 21 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786). The approved details are:

- Odour Management Plan dated February 2010

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

20. Artificial Lighting

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and thereafter operated in complete accordance with the following lighting scheme (approved in accordance with condition 22 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00986). The approved details are:

- External Lighting Statement.
- Schedule of lights, mountings and images.
- 3D images showing external lighting.
- Site Plan showing external lighting, Drawing 4069 AI119 Rev C1 dated 05/04/11.
- Lighting time plan (Monday to Friday).
- Lighting time plan (Weekend).
- E-mail from Mr O. Dimond dated the 22nd July where that relates to lighting matters.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

21. Operational Dust

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and thereafter operated in complete accordance with the following operational dust scheme (approved in

accordance with condition 23 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480). The approved details are:

- Dust and Litter management plan, dated February 2011.
- Mist Air dust and odour suppression system.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

22. Litter

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and thereafter operated in complete accordance with the following litter management scheme (approved in accordance with condition 24 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480). The approved details are:

- The Dust and Litter management plan, dated February 2011.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

23. Air Handling Plant

The development hereby permitted shall be constructed and thereafter the site shall be operated in complete accordance with the following air handling plant details (approved in accordance with condition 28 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786). The approved details are:

- The Air Handling Plant Details set out in the Noise Report D126362-NOIS-R1/01 dated February 2010

The development shall be carried out and operated in complete accordance with the approved details and the approved plant installed before the development site becomes operational. The approved air handling plant shall operate at all times the site is operational.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

24. Reversing Beepers

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following reversing alarm details (approved in accordance with condition 29 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480). The approved details are:

- Reversing Alarms, Plant and Machinery report dated February 2011
- Brigade Alarm Technical Drawing
- Brigade Smart White Sound Reversing Alarm - SA-BBS-97
- Brigade Declaration of Conformity, dated 10 November 2009

- Details of the Michigan L90
- Hitachi Zaxis 160W details

No plant, machinery and operational vehicles shall be used within the site unless fitted with the approved reversing alarms and only those approved alarms shall be used.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

25. Reversing alarms

Between 0500 and 0730 hours on any day, reversing beepers on any vehicles shall be switched off and alternative safety methods be used.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

26. Doors

All vehicular access doors to building on site shall be kept closed at all times except to allow for ingress and exit from buildings. All vehicular access doors will close automatically either on sensors or induction loop systems in accordance with a scheme previously approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No vehicles (save for private cars at the HWRC) may load and unload unless within the enclosed space of the buildings hereby permitted.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

27. Jet Wash and external cleaning

Any use of external jet / vehicle wash facility associated with the depot and identified on the site layout plan (Planning Site Layout Plan A4069 AL100P Rev P4) and any external cleaning operations shall only be carried out between 0800 and 1800 hours Monday to Friday and 0830 to 1600 hours on Saturday with no jet washing or external cleaning operations on Sunday or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

28. External operations

With the exception of the HWRC, no waste transfer, recycling, processing operations shall take place on the site outside of the proposed waste transfer, materials recycling or in vessel composting buildings. No waste materials or recovered materials shall be deposited or stored outside the buildings (other than within the HWRC) and no part or fully loaded trailers shall be parked or stationed in the open air.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

29. Operational Noise

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and thereafter operated in complete accordance with the following noise scheme (approved in accordance with condition 34 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786, as amended by this permission). The approved details are:

- The Noise Mitigation scheme detailed in the Noise Report D126362-NOIS-R1/01 dated February 2010
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.

The existing background noise levels (LA90) measured one metre from the façade and 1.5 metres above ground level, at the noise sensitive locations identified in (a) and carried out in (e) or as requested by the Local Planning Authority, shall not be exceeded, as a consequence of operational noise levels (LAeq) generated at the site.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP 30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

30. Oil tanks/fuel/chemical storage

Any chemical, oil, fuel, lubricant and other potential pollutants on site shall, at all times, be stored in containers which shall be sited on an impervious surface and surrounded by a suitable liquid tight bunded area. The bunded areas shall be capable of containing 110% of the container's total volume and shall enclose within their curtilage all fill and draw pipes, vents, gauges and sight glasses. The vent pipe should be directed downwards into the bund. There must be no drain through the bund floor or walls.

Reason: To minimise the risk of pollution of the water environment and soils in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

31. Plant

The development hereby permitted shall be operated in complete accordance with the following plant details (approved in accordance with condition 36 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480). The approved details are:

- Reversing Alarms, Plant and Machinery report dated February 2011
- Brigade Alarm Technical Drawing
- Brigade Smart White Sound Reversing Alarm - SA-BBS-97
- Brigade Declaration of Conformity, dated 10 November 2009
- Details of the Michigan L90
- Crambo Turned container drawing
- Crambo Installation layout drawing, dated 03.02.11

- Hitachi Zaxis 160W details
- Komptech Crambo 5000 details
- Baler location drawing Z-049050-0 Rev D
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 are hereby approved as the formal Plant and Machinery details as required by condition 36 of planning permission 09/02521/MINMAJ.

The plant and machinery shall be operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details and the approved acoustic attenuation measures retained.

Reason: In the interest of local amenity of the area and to ensure that the operation of the plant and machinery is in accordance with policies WLP30 and WLP31 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policies OVS.5 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

32. Site access and highway improvements

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following site access and highway improvement details (approved in accordance with condition 37 of planning permission 08/01166 under planning reference 09/01150). The approved details are:

- Plan PS ENB 08-1B
- Plan PS ENB 08-2B

All highways works forming part of the approved details shall be maintained as effective during all times that the site is operational. The approved planting set out in the approved details shall be maintained in accordance with the conditions of this permission.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to accord with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006 and in the interest of highway safety.

33. Parking/turning in accord with plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following parking and turning details (approved in accordance with condition 38 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786 as amended by this permission). The approved details are:

- Car Parking Management Plan Dated January 2010
- Planning Site Layout Plan A4069 AL100P Rev P4
- Traffic Management Schematic plan A4623 205 E dated 30/03/09

The parking and turning space shall be provided in accordance approved plans before the development becomes operational and shall be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times and not used for any other purposes).

Reason: To minimise traffic related impacts in accordance with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

34. Visibility Splays

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following visibility splay details (approved in accordance with condition 39 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480). The approved details are:

- The overview of proposed improvements visibility splays drawing PS-ENB-08-5 Rev D dated June 2008.

These visibility splays shall be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of road safety in accordance with WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

35. Tree Protection Scheme

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the tree and landscape protection scheme identified on approved drawing numbered L 02 and dated 11/09/08. The approved fencing shall be retained intact for the duration of the development. Within the fenced area(s), there shall be no excavations, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles or fires and any existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows scheduled to be retained on plan L02 dated 11/09/08 shall not be damaged, destroyed, uprooted, felled, lopped, topped or removed without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any such vegetation removed without approval, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within the area of operations permitted by the permission shall be replaced with trees or shrubs of such size and species as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in the planting season immediately following any such occurrences.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees identified for retention at the site in accordance with the objectives of policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

36. Ecology

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following ecological details (approved in accordance with condition 44 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786). The approved details are:

- The submitted Method Statement for Landscape and Ecology, Revision 3 dated April 2010.

The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of wildlife in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

37. Ballast

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following ballast details (approved in accordance with condition 45 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/01426). The approved details are:

- The details of the ballast to be used in the car parking areas identified on drawing L04/ES Fig 14.18 Rev E, comprising of the letter from Mr C. Ward Dated the 12th February 2010 confirming that the ballast to be used shall be a Type 1 Limestone SHW C1.803 material.

Reason: In the interests of wildlife in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

38. Ecological Fencing

The fencing to protect the ecological mitigation areas, as detailed on plan L03/ES fig 14.17 (approved under planning permission 08/01166) shall be erected and retained and maintained until the completion of the erection of the 2400mm High Galvanised Palisade fence enclosing the site shown on plan 4069 AL100P Rev P4 dated 26/07/11. The 2400mm High Galvanised Palisade fence enclosing the site shall thereafter be retained and maintained as effective during all times that the site is operational.

Reason: In the interests of wildlife in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

39. Ecological management

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following ecological management details (approved in accordance with condition 48 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786). The approved details are:

- The submitted Method Statement for Landscape and Ecology, Revision 3 dated April 2010.

The approved scheme will be implemented in full (with bi-annual ecological monitoring reports comparing the ecological status of the site pre and post development submitted to the Local Planning Authority by the 1st December in each of the following years - 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 and 2021) and the mitigation and enhancement measures will be maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of wildlife in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

40. BREEAM

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following BREEAM details (approved in accordance with condition 49 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786) and those details submitted with this application. The approved details are:

- West-Berkshire Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF) BREEAM Industrial 2006 - Design and Procurement Assessment. Dated February 2010

- West-Berkshire Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF) BREEAM Offices 2006 - Design and Procurement Assessment. Dated February 2010
- West-Berkshire Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF) BREEAM Industrial 2006 Post Construction Report June 2013

Reason: In accordance with WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

41. New scheme of planting

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the New Scheme of Planting (approved in accordance with condition 51 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786 as amended by this permission). The approved details are:

- The Method Statement for Landscape and Ecology, Revision 3 dated April 2010
- Planting Plan L 05/ES FIG 14.19 Revision Q,
- Landscape Masterplan L 04/ES FIG14.18 Revision R.

The planting and landscaping schemes shall be implemented, maintained and managed as per the details contained in the Method Statement for Landscape and Ecology, Revision 3, dated April 2010.

Reason: To comply with Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity and to minimise the impact of the proposed development in accordance with policies WLP29 and WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

42. Maintenance of planting

Trees, shrubs and hedges planted in accordance with the approved planting schemes shall be maintained for a period of 5 years following their planting and any plants which within 5 years of planting die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity and to minimise the impact of the proposed development in accordance with policies WLP29 and WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

43. Railway

No operations associated with the development hereby approved shall take place within a lateral distance of 10 metres from the railway boundary. Cranes and jibbed machines used in connection with the development hereby approved must be position so that the jib or any suspended load does not swing over railway infrastructure or within 3 metres of the nearest rail if the boundary is closer than 3 metres. All cranes, machinery and constructional plant shall be so positioned and used to prevent the accidental entry onto railway property of such plant, or loads attached thereto, in the event of failure. Trees planted close to the railway should be located at a distance in excess of their mature height from railway property.

Reason: To ensure the stability of the railway and to ensure that the development does not cause a hazard to the railway in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

44. Drainage (Railway)

Soakaways or lagoons constructed as a means of storm/surface water disposal or storage must not be constructed within 10 m of the railway boundary or at any point which could adversely affect the stability of Network Rail infrastructure.

Reason: To ensure the stability of the railway and to ensure that the development does not cause a hazard to the railway in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

45. Fencing (Railway)

The trespass-proof fence that has been provided adjacent to the railway boundary as shown on plan A4623 2016B dated 02.07.08 (approved under 08/01166) shall be maintained and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the development does not cause a hazard to the railway in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

46. Acoustic barriers

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the acoustic barrier details (approved in accordance with condition 56 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786, as amended by this permission). The approved details are:

- Noise Report D126362-NOIS-R1/01 dated February 2010
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 are hereby approved as the formal Plant and Machinery details as required by condition 36 of planning permission 09/02521/MINMAJ.
- Additional 2.5m high acoustic barrier illustrated on landscape masterplan, DWG L04/ES Fig 14.18 Rev R dated 28/04/11

The acoustic barriers shall be maintained and retained at the site.

Reason: To ensure the protection of the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

47. Advance Planting.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the Scheme of Advance Planting (approved in accordance with condition 57 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786 as amended by this permission). The approved details are:

- The Method Statement for Landscape and Ecology, Revision 3 dated April 2010
- Planting Plan L 05/ES FIG 14.19 Revision Q,
- Landscape Masterplan L 04/ES FIG14.18 Revision R.

The planting and landscaping schemes shall be implemented, maintained and managed as per the details contained in the Method Statement for Landscape and Ecology, Revision 3, dated April 2010. Trees, shrubs and hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme shall be maintained and any plants which at any time during the development and the aftercare period die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is adequately screened and in the interests of amenity in line with policies WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

Councillor Webster proposed acceptance of Officers Recommendation to grant planning permission for agenda item 4(2) (to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Facility) subject to the inclusion of the following informatives: hedgerow maintenance, addition of onsite highway signage if deemed operationally appropriate and public rights of way signage if deemed appropriate by technical professionals. This was seconded by Councillor Somner.

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

Conditions

1. Approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following submitted documents and plans:

-HWRC Proposed layout plan A4623 204 M dated 30/03/09 as approved under planning permission 09/02521 (submitted as part of 17/01684/MINMAJ)
-Paragraphs 2.2 to 2.4 (inclusive) of 'Integrated Waste Management Facility, Padworth Lane, RG7 4JF Planning Application Supporting Statement in respect of 2 planning applications: 1. Change of Use Application to amend the approved details to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Centre. 2. S73 planning Application for variation of condition 7 (to extend the opening hours of the Household Waste Recycling Centre to include weekday mornings) of Planning Permission 14/01111/MINMAJ' (June 2017) (submitted as part of 17/01683/MINMAJ and 17/01684/MINMAJ)

The details of which are approved except as amended by the following conditions.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to adequately control the development, to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with policy WLP31 of Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

2. Hours of operation

The Household Waste Recycling Centre shall not be open for the receipt of waste except between the following hours:

0800 – 1800 Monday to Sundays and bank and public holidays

No operations shall take place on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Years Day.

Reason: In the interests of the local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

3. No non-recyclable waste left in the open overnight

General or non-recyclable waste deposited in any container utilised for such purposes in the HWRC shall not be left out in the open overnight. Such containers shall be emptied on a daily basis and taken to the Waste Transfer Station (as shown on the Site Layout Plan A4069 AL100P Rev P4 dated 27/06/11, approved under 11/00923/MINMAJ) and where there is non-recyclable waste left in such a container when the HWRC closes for the day, the container shall be covered overnight.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to adequately control the development, to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with policy WLP31 of Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

4. Records of waste

From the date on this decision notice the operators shall maintain records of the monthly receipt of waste at the HWRC and shall make them available to the Local Planning Authority at any time upon request. All records shall be kept for at least 24 months following their creation.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can monitor the receipt of waste to the site in accordance with policy WLP31 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

5. Traffic management scheme

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following Traffic Management Scheme (approved in accordance with condition 16 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00842) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Drawing 100604_001a dated 05/04/11
- Drawing 100604_001b dated 05/04/11
- Drawing 100604_001c dated 05/04/11

The scheme hereby approved shall be implemented in full and the approved signage shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to accord with the WBC freight strategy in accordance with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

6. Odour

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the 'Odour Management Plan' (dated February 2010) (approved in accordance with condition 21 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786) as applicable to the HWRC, excepting where Section 3.3 of the 'Odour Management Plan' (dated February 2010) references the sole acceptance of recyclable waste at the HWRC.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

7. Artificial Lighting

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following lighting scheme (approved in accordance with condition 22 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00986) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- External Lighting Statement.
- Schedule of lights, mountings and images.
- 3D images showing external lighting.
- Site Plan showing external lighting, Drawing 4069 AI119 Rev C1 dated 05/04/11.
- Lighting time plan (Monday to Friday).
- Lighting time plan (Weekend).
- E-mail from Mr O. Dimond dated the 22nd July where that relates to lighting matters.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

8. Operational Dust

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following operational dust scheme (approved in accordance with condition 23 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Dust and Litter management plan, dated February 2011.
- Mist Air dust and odour suppression system.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

9. Litter

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following litter management scheme (approved in accordance with condition 24 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- The Dust and Litter management plan, dated February 2011.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

10. Reversing Beepers

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following reversing alarm details (approved in accordance with condition 29 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Reversing Alarms, Plant and Machinery report dated February 2011
- Brigade Alarm Technical Drawing
- Brigade Smart White Sound Reversing Alarm - SA-BBS-97
- Brigade Declaration of Conformity, dated 10 November 2009
- Details of the Michigan L90
- Hitachi Zaxis 160W details

No plant, machinery and operational vehicles shall be used within the site unless fitted with the approved reversing alarms and only those approved alarms shall be used.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

11. Operational Noise

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following noise scheme (approved in accordance with condition 34 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786, as amended by this permission) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- The Noise Mitigation scheme detailed in the Noise Report D126362-NOIS-R1/01 dated February 2010
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.

The existing background noise levels (LA90) measured one metre from the façade and 1.5 metres above ground level, at the noise sensitive locations identified in (a) and carried out in (e) or as requested by the Local Planning Authority, shall not be exceeded, as a consequence of operational noise levels (LAeq) generated at the site.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP 30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

12. Oil tanks/fuel/chemical storage

Any chemical, oil, fuel, lubricant and other potential pollutants on site shall, at all times, be stored in containers which shall be sited on an impervious surface and surrounded by a suitable liquid tight bunded area. The bunded areas shall be capable of containing 110% of the container's total volume and shall enclose within their curtilage all fill and draw pipes, vents, gauges and sight glasses. The vent pipe should be directed downwards into the bund. There must be no drain through the bund floor or walls.

Reason: To minimise the risk of pollution of the water environment and soils in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

13. Plant

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and thereafter operated in complete accordance with the following plant details (approved in accordance with condition 36 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Reversing Alarms, Plant and Machinery report dated February 2011
- Brigade Alarm Technical Drawing
- Brigade Smart White Sound Reversing Alarm - SA-BBS-97
- Brigade Declaration of Conformity, dated 10 November 2009
- Details of the Michigan L90
- Crambo Turned container drawing
- Crambo Installation layout drawing, dated 03.02.11
- Hitachi Zaxis 160W details
- Komptech Crambo 5000 details
- Baler location drawing Z-049050-0 Rev D
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 are hereby approved as the formal Plant and Machinery details as required by condition 36 of planning permission 09/02521/MINMAJ.

The plant and machinery shall be operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details and the approved acoustic attenuation measures retained.

Reason: To ensure that the plant and machinery operates in accordance with policies WLP30 and WLP31 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policies OVS.5 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

14. Parking/turning in accord with plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following parking and turning details (approved in accordance with condition 38 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786 as amended by this permission) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Car Parking Management Plan Dated January 2010
- Planning Site Layout Plan A4069 AL100P Rev P4
- Traffic Management Schematic plan A4623 205 E dated 30/03/09

The parking and turning space shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans before the development becomes operational and shall be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times and not used for any other purposes).

Reason: To minimise traffic related impacts in accordance with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

15. Visibility Splays

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following visibility splay details (approved in accordance with condition 39 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480). The approved details are:

- The overview of proposed improvements visibility splays drawing PS-ENB-08-5 Rev D dated June 2008.

These visibility splays shall be provided prior to the occupation of the buildings and shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of road safety in accordance with WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

Informatives

1. Hedgerow maintenance.
2. Addition of onsite highway signage if deemed operationally appropriate.
3. Public rights of way signage if deemed appropriate by technical professionals

(2) Application No. & Parish: 17/01684/MINMAJ - Veolia Environmental Services, Padworth lWMF, Padworth Lane, Lower Padworth

The debate and decision taken for Agenda Item 4(2), concerning Planning Application 17/01684/MINMAJ, in respect of a change of use application to amend the approved details to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Facility, was recorded within the minute for Agenda Item 4(1) due to the linkage between the two applications.

(3) Application No. & Parish: 17/03411/OUTMAJ - Land north of Stretton Close, Bradfield Southend

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 17/03411/OUTMAJ in respect of an outline application for the proposed erection of 11 no. new dwellings on land to the rear of Stretton Close. Matters for consideration in detail at this stage were layout, access and scale only. All other matters (appearance and landscape) were intended to be dealt with in detail at the reserved matters stage should the application be approved.

Masie Masiiwa, the Planning Officer, in introducing the report stated that the proposal would deliver 2 x two bedroom dwellings; 1 x three bedroom dwelling and 8 x four bedroom dwellings. Access into the application site was via a gated entrance in the southern boundary of the application site and the gate was accessed off Stretton Close and between nos. 7 and 9 Stretton Close onto an existing turning head.

The immediate area was rural in character, being located within the North Wessex Downs AONB. The area was characterised by linear ribbon developments along Southend Road, and the existing Stretton Close development. There had also been very small limited infill developments and further limited development in terms of depth. New development in this location should respect the local distinctiveness and rural landscape character.

The application site was located mostly within the recently reviewed settlement boundary with the settlement boundary line dissecting the site. Policy HSA 22 of the HSADPD was the site specific policy for the application site. The allocated site had a developable area of approximately 0.6 hectares and the Policy allocated approximately 10 dwellings, taking into account the outcomes of the Landscape Capacity Assessment (2014). According to the HSADPD, this site was expected to deliver early and to contribute immediately to the supply of land needed to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The proposed development would provide up to 11 dwellings within a 0.7 hectare area of residential development. The total site area was 1 hectare, with 0.3 hectares of the land covered by the trees along the boundaries and within the site. The residential area shown on the Illustrative Landscape Plan was not consistent with the HSADPD plan, however it had undergone landscape appraisal in its own right and to ensure the protected trees could be retained and protected, the proposed developable area had been slightly reviewed. The Council's Tree Officer stated that the landscaping for the site, needed to take the existing site features into consideration, its position in the countryside and the future relationship with existing residents, the boundaries would need to be landscaped to improve on the already existing site features and natural screening and help reduce any visual impact of new dwellings.

Following the Committee site visit, the application was deferred from the Planning Committee scheduled for 11 April 2018. The Planning Policy team had now provided comments in respect of affordable housing and had indicated that given this site was greater than 0.5 hectares and was a greenfield site, the policy would require the provision of 40% affordable housing on site. This equated to 4 units (rounded down). This was notwithstanding that the development was for less than 15 dwellings. It was noted that the developer was willing to agree to the provision of affordable housing at 40% and to enter into a Section 106 agreement should there be a resolution to approve the application.

The dwellings had been designed such that their layout, size and scale did not appear out of context in relation to the adjacent properties to the south and east. The height of the dwelling at Plot 1 was lower than the height of the nearest dwelling at Stretton Close.

Section 1.4 of Part 2 (Residential Development) of the Council's Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) considered the relationship of new housing to the open countryside and landscape setting. Paragraph 1.4.1 commented that new development on sites close to the edge of a settlement would need to demonstrate how the inter-relationship between open countryside and development form was respected. It went on to state that particular care and attention should be taken to protect and enhance the AONB.

Given the location of the site on the edge of a rural settlement within the AONB and the fact the proposal sought to develop beyond the identified developable area of the site, Officers were satisfied, that sufficient landscaping could be achieved at reserved matters stage to justify the proposed development. Further consideration had been given to the requirement for a drainage pond to serve the development.

In conclusion having regard to the relevant development plan policies and other material considerations it was considered that the development was acceptable and should be

approved. The proposal would not harm the existing character and appearance of the surrounding AONB area and how it functioned. The proposal would not have a material impact on neighbouring amenity, would secure sufficient garden amenity for future occupiers and would not present an adverse impact on highway safety. These considerations carried significant weight and indicated that conditional planning permission should be approved.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Andrew House, Parish Council representative, and Mr Jon Alderman, objector, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr House in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr. House was Chairman of Bradfield Parish Council and he confirmed that the Parish Council had no objections in terms of layout and scale. However, it did have concerns in relation to the developable area, affordable housing, the AONB and water logging on the site;
- AONBs were of national importance and there was great weight in preserving the landscape in these areas;
- The boundary screening and tree line were important and there were concerns that this proposal would expand outside of the developable area. He felt that the reasoning set out in the report was subjective;
- The report referred to the developable area being both 0.6 hectares and 0.7 hectares;
- The north-west corner of the site had been the area discussed in the most detail and there was a woodland group of trees in this location which abutted the AONB;
- The Parish Council were supportive that social housing should be retained in the development as this was important;
- As could be seen at the site visit the site could be wet at times. Prior to the site visit only 2mm of rain had fallen within the previous 48 hours;
- The Parish Council was of the opinion that the site had significant challenges which would need to be overcome but they also felt that should the application be approved then the provision of affordable housing was of great importance.

Mr Alderman in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr. Alderman confirmed that he had lived for 25 years in 14 Stanbrook Close and had liaised mostly with other residents in Stanbrook Close in making representations in relation to this proposal;
- He concurred with the Parish Council in terms of the developable area. The settlement boundary for the village was around the path of the landscape buffer and therefore some of the proposed development (plots 7 and 8) would be outside the settlement boundary;
- Plots 4, 5 and 6 in the north east corner of the site backed on to Stanbrook Close residents and it was felt that the layout of those plots were out of character;
- The report stated that the separation distances were generous but the gaps were outside the character of neighbouring properties. Mr. Alderman therefore felt that concerns around distances had not been considered and he asked if the arrangement of plots 4, 5 and 6 could be reconsidered so that they were not back to back with properties on Stanbrook Close;

- In terms of screening trees and hedges would only provide cover for six months of the year;
- Stanbrook Close residents were west facing and therefore would lose sunlight earlier than they did at present;
- He asked the Committee to consider removing plots 7 and 8 and revising the layout of plots 4, 5 and 6 (possibly reducing to two dwellings).

Councillor Graham Pask asked for clarification as to whether Mr. Alderman had requested that plots 7 and 8 should be removed from the proposed development. Mr. Alderman confirmed that that was the case as they were outside the settlement boundary.

Councillor Graham Bridgman referred to the distances between plots 4, 5 and 6 and those properties in Stanbrook Close. The report stated that the rear elevations of all of these dwellings were located at least 21 metres from the proposed houses and he asked if Mr. Alderman accepted that fact. Mr. Alderman confirmed that he did. Councillor Bridgman therefore felt that there would be no loss of sunlight as had been suggested. Mr. Alderman responded that he could only base that on his current experience from his shed. The houses behind would be 10-11m high and therefore the sun would be obscured earlier than it currently was.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe noted that the site was boggy in places and that the green area to the back of plots 4, 5 and 6 and 7 and 8 would have a SUDS pond. He would enquire about the drainage plan as by disturbing soil this might have an impact on the watercourse. Mr. Alderman confirmed that there had been some localised flooding on site. SUDS did not link into the system and therefore there would be some element of surface water ponding.

Councillor Graham Pask, as Ward Member, noted that representation had been heard from the Parish Council and local residents. Mr. Alderman had accepted the principle of development but Councillor Pask still felt that further clarification was required around the number of plots, the settlement boundary and surface water. He was torn in two directions as he accepted that the residents had concerns about the change to their outlook and the loss of sunlight but there were questions in respect of the settlement boundary and whether it was acceptable to redraw boundaries around DPD sites. The Planning Officer confirmed that it was unusual but the settlement boundary dissected the site. However, when consideration was given to site constraints, protected trees, the need for a sustainable drainage plan and the need to incorporate ten houses on the site then it was felt to be appropriate to move the settlement boundary in this case. There was potential for mitigation in terms of landscaping on the boundaries.

Councillor Alan Law referred to paragraphs 6.3.13 and 6.3.15 in respect of comments from Planning Policy which clearly stated that plots 7 and 8 were outside of the settlement boundary. Policy C1 of the HSADPD stated that there would be a presumption against new development outside the settlement boundary and that exceptions to this were listed in the policy. However, this site was not an exceptional circumstance. The Planning Officer responded that in this case in order to deliver the required number of dwellings and to maximise the use of the land Officers had reviewed the proposal at the planning application stage and had taken the view that the proposal would not be achievable in the developable area and had therefore agreed that two dwellings would be acceptable outside the settlement boundary because of these exceptional circumstances.

Councillor Graham Bridgman noted that the site was an allocated site within the DPD for ten dwellings. Why had this site been accepted for ten dwellings in the DPD if that was not achievable within the settlement boundary.

Councillor Peter Argyle noted that the application was for outline planning permission and he queried whether the plan that came back for reserved matters approval would then adopt the layout being considered that evening. The Planning Officer confirmed that the layout, scale and number of dwellings would be fixed if the current outline application was approved.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe asked about the drainage issues. The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been no objections raised from the Drainage Team. Condition 12 referred to the drainage details which would need to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. There was also an informative in respect of surface water drainage and set out the need to obtain approval from Thames Water to discharge to a public sewer.

In response to a query in relation to affordable housing it was noted that four affordable units would be provided on the site and these would be – Plot 1 (3 bedroom) shared ownership and plots 10 and 11 (2 bedroom) social rented. The fourth dwelling would be one of the four bedroom plots and this would be agreed with the Housing Officers.

Councillor Graham Bridgman proposed that the application should be refused on the basis that plots 7 and 8 were outside the defined settlement boundary and that no exception had been demonstrated in respect of rules about building in the countryside. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Crumly.

Councillor Alan Law confirmed that a lot of work had been undertaken in respect of the DPD and site allocation and various issues had arisen but never one in relation to development outside of the settlement boundary. Settlement boundaries had been reviewed about 24 months ago but this site had not formed part of that review. In his view this application contravened Policy C1. Councillor Richard Somner agreed that the issue around settlement boundaries was one that came up regularly and the Committee had always been advised against development outside the settlement boundary.

Councillor Emma Webster referred to a similar application which had been approved in her Ward. She referred to paragraph 6.3.18 which stated that the layout should sufficiently protect the existing key features of the site. The proposal did take into account the quirk of the site and the protection of the SUDs area. She commended the developers for committing to the provision of 40% affordable housing on the site and if the Committee refused the application this would reduce the number of affordable housing units available within the village of Bradfield.

Councillor Graham Pask was concerned that if the developer came back with a different scheme within the settlement boundary that might concentrate the dwellings closer to neighbouring residents.

Councillor Alan Law agreed with the comments made by Councillor Webster in relation to the loss of affordable housing. However, there was no guarantee that the developer would deliver the number of affordable housing units proposed and he was concerned about setting a precedent in relation to a development which was partly outside the settlement boundary.

David Pearson, the Development Control Team Leader, stated that it was rare that Officers would recommend housing outside of the settlement boundary. Colleagues in Planning Policy had indicated that achieving ten dwellings within the developable area would be tight. He understood why Members would want to refuse the application but he felt that the circumstances of the site would make it difficult to defend at appeal. He asked Members to consider if harm to the AONB could be demonstrated.

Councillor Graham Bridgman referred to the issue around the settlement boundary and in particular a discussion on another application where Members had been told that they

had to adhere to the Council's policies. This application contravened Council policy and did not fit criteria where an exception could be made. In his view the application should therefore be refused.

The motion to refuse the application was put to the Committee and the majority of the Committee agreed. Councillor Alan Macro abstained from voting.

RESOLVED that the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission as the application contravened the Council's Planning Policies in respect of development in the countryside outside of settlement boundaries.

(4) Application No. & Parish: 18/00332/FULD - Pamber Green, Blandys Lane, Upper Basildon

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(4)) concerning Planning Application 18/00332/FULD in respect of a replacement house type for previously approved plot 1 under application 17/02446/FULD.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Ian Parsons, Parish Council representative, and Mr Mark Williamson, objector, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr Parsons in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The Parish Council had consistently objected to proposals for the site and viewed there to be problematic features with this planning application.
- It was felt that this application represented an attempt to maximise profit from the site at the expense of the immediate environment and local residents, as well as negatively impacting on those living more widely in the village and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The proposal was out of keeping for the area.
- Larger windows were proposed. This would result in overlooking of neighbouring properties. It was proposed that the house for plot 1 would be built closer to the road, increasing the overlooking/overbearing concern.
- It was also the case that the hedge, which had previously covered the frontage of the plot, had been removed in its entirety as had some trees, prior to the submission of any planning applications for housing.
- There would be an increased loss of the view for walkers in Blandys Lane.
- An amendment was proposed to the roof which was a concern for the Parish, as was the small increase in the overall floor area.
- The Parish Council considered that approval of this application would result in a worsened impact on neighbours than that arising from the already approved dwelling.

Councillor Alan Law sought to understand the extent to which the dwelling would be moved from that already approved. Mr Parsons confirmed that the frontage of the property would be moved a matter of metres towards the road.

Mr Williamson in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He lived in the neighbouring Moorings property and was also speaking on behalf of other directly affected neighbours.
- The windows proposed for the front of the property had been changed. They would be increased in size and moved. The move of the master bedroom window would result in his property being directly overlooked, impacting on their privacy.

- The proposed location of the bay windows on the ground floor would impact on the privacy of his Moorings property by overlooking the bathroom. There would be a two metre difference between the ground floor windows of his and the proposed property.
- No screening would be in place during the winter months.
- The design had been changed and the plot size increase from that approved.
- If this application was approved, the two new dwellings would be symmetrical. This would not be in keeping with the area, which was one of unique character properties.
- Approval of the application would do nothing to enhance the AONB any more than the already approved application. Refusal was requested.

Councillor Richard Crumly asked whether overlooking could be avoided if evergreen foliage was planted. Mr Williamson explained that the existing protected trees would provide screening for half of the year. Additional planting within his land would result in an unfair loss of land from his garden.

Councillor Pamela Bale queried if a degree of screening was also provided by a remaining hedge. Mr Williamson confirmed this was the case, but it was very old and did not hold leaves during the winter when many sections of the hedge were bare. He added that there was a straight line of sight between his bathroom window and the ground floor bay windows of the proposed dwelling.

Councillor Graham Pask queried the difference made to the privacy of Mr Williamson's property when compared to the existing permission. Mr Williamson advised that the introduction of bay windows would have a negative impact as would the proposal to move the front door closer towards his boundary, increasing the overlooking concern, particularly upon his bathroom.

Councillor Pask felt that clarity in relation to the movement of the property and its height/levels should be sought from Officers.

Councillor Law, speaking as Ward Member, made the following points:

- The objections made were as per those highlighted when the previous application was approved by Committee in November 2017.
- The proposal was within the settlement boundary and the site could potentially accommodate four or five houses. The two large executive style houses would be similar in size to existing neighbouring properties.
- He shared the concern of the Parish Council in relation to the removal of the hedge which had previously covered the frontage of the plot. This was very regrettable.
- Councillor Law acknowledged concerns of overlooking. However, revised plans showed that the total height and floor levels were as already approved. This was protected via conditions.
- He considered that the amendments proposed with this application were relatively minor. The proposed house would be slightly larger and deeper than that already approved.
- The proposed movement of windows would result in an urbanising affect but development of this type was not unusual in Upper Basildon.
- Councillor Law felt that this proposal was not as satisfactory as the dwelling already approved, but he did not feel this provided grounds on which to refuse the application.

- He did however agree that clarity was needed on the amount that the location of the proposed dwelling had been moved and the impact of this. Councillor Law could then reconsider his view.

Councillor Pask asked Officers to comment on the level of movement for the proposed property from the dwelling already approved and its height.

Simon Till (Senior Planning Officer) reminded Members that there was a request for the height to be reduced when the existing application was approved in November 2017. A one metre reduction to the ridge height, ground floor and first floor height was secured via a condition. The levels proposed in this application were fully in line with that height.

In terms of the location of the dwelling, Mr Till demonstrated the alteration by referring the Committee to the site plans. He explained that the front gable of the previously approved dwelling was three metres in front of the rest of the front elevation. This was set at a distance of seven metres from the road, which was the distance assessed by Officers in recommending approval of that application. Therefore, the shortest gap between the house and the road would be unchanged, but the rest of the front elevation would come forward by three metres to match this seven metre setback from the road. It was therefore not the case that the dwelling itself would be located closer to the road.

Councillor Graham Bridgman noted the removal of a hedgerow, but referred to the condition for a landscaping plan which indicated a new hedgerow. He queried the planting proposed. Mr Till clarified that the condition would ensure that new planting would be retained for a five year period following completion of the development.

Mr Till then referred Members to revised information in the update report in relation to hedging. This confirmed new hedging proposed alongside the southern boundary with the Moorings property.

In response to a point made earlier in relation to evergreen planting, Mr Till confirmed that it was proposed that 25% of the new hedge would be evergreen, thereby providing some screening throughout the year. He also confirmed the planting would be indigenous.

Councillor Law highlighted the need to ensure appropriate site lines were achieved alongside new planting.

Councillor Emma Webster proposed acceptance of Officers' recommendation to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Richard Crumly.

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

Conditions

1. **Full planning permission time limit**
   The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004); to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. **Standard approved plans**
   The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 1066.18A received by email on 21 April 2018 and 1066.11A

received 14 May 2018.

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

3. **Samples of materials**

Development of the approved dwelling shall be carried out in accordance with the schedule of materials shown on drawing number 1066.18A.

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.

4. **Construction method statement**

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the construction method statement received on 14 May 2018.

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).

5. **Parking in accordance**

No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning spaces have been surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the details shown on drawing number 1066.11A. The parking and turning spaces shall thereafter be kept available for parking of private motor cars 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).

6. **Drive gradient**

The gradient of the private drives on the site shall not exceed 1 in 8.

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).

7. **Access surfacing**

The approved dwelling shall not be occupied until the access has been surfaced in accordance with the details shown on drawing number 1066.11A received 14

May 2018. The access surface shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved drawing.

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).

8. **Visibility splays**

No development of the dwellings hereby approved shall take place until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres have been provided at the access. 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).

9. **Cycle storage**

No dwelling shall be occupied until the cycle parking and storage space has been provided in accordance with the details shown on drawing number 1066.11A. The cycle parking shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details and kept available for purposes of providing cycle parking and storage at all times.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate and safe cycle storage space within the site. 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).

10. **Landscaping plan**

The landscaping scheme for the approved development shall be undertaken in accordance with the details shown on drawing 1066.11A and 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 NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

11. **Tree protection**

No development of the dwelling hereby approved shall commence until the tree

protection for the site has been erected in accordance with the details shown on drawing number 1066.11A 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.

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.

12. **Removal of Permitted Development Rights for extensions and outbuildings**

Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), or any subsequent revision thereof no extensions or outbuildings shall be erected in the curtilage of the dwellings hereby approved without planning permission having first been granted on a planning application made for this purpose.

Reason: The site is in a visually sensitive location in the AONB and adjacent to the curtilage of a Grade II Listed building. This condition is imposed in order to prevent the overdevelopment of the site, detrimental visual impacts in a sensitive location in the AONB on the edge of the settlement or adverse visual impacts on the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed building 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.

13. **Removal of Permitted Development Rights for alterations to roof**

Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), or any subsequent revision thereof no alterations or extensions to the roofs of the dwellings hereby approved without planning permission having first been granted on a planning application made for this purpose.

Reason: The site is in a visually sensitive location in the AONB and adjacent to the curtilage of a Grade II Listed building. This condition is imposed in order to prevent detrimental visual impacts in a sensitive location in the AONB on the edge of the settlement or adverse visual impacts on the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed building 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.

14. **Removal of Permitted Development Rights for side windows in south facing elevation of plot 1**

Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), or any subsequent revision thereof no additional windows shall be installed in the south facing elevation of the dwelling

hereby approved unless they are obscure glazed and fixed shut except for parts that are more than 1.7 metres above the floor level of the room served.

Reason: In order to prevent any adverse impact on the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring dwelling, Moorings in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

15. **Levels**

The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the ground and floor levels have been developed in accordance with the approved drawings. The levels on the site shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity on a sensitive site within the North Wessex Downs AONB and adjacent to the curtilage of a Grade II Listed building 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.

16. **Set back of gates**

No gates shall be installed across the access drive to the site shall unless they are erected at a distance of at least 5 metres from the highway edge. Any such gates shall open inwards.

Reason: To prevent the obstruction of the highway, in the interests of highway safety in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

17. **Surface water drainage**

The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until drainage measures for the site have been constructed in accordance with the drainage details received on 14 May 2018. The drainage measures shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design - Part 4 Sustainable Design Techniques (June 2006)."

(5) Application No. & Parish: 18/00415/FULD - Home Farm, Purley Village, Purley On Thames

(Councillor Tim Metcalfe declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 4(5) by virtue of the fact that he was the applicant for the planning application. As his interest was personal and prejudicial and a disclosable pecuniary interest, he would be leaving

the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter and would take no part in the debate or voting on the matter other than to speak as the applicant).

(All Committee Members declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(5) by virtue of the fact that the applicant was known to them as a fellow Councillor and Committee Member. 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.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(5)) concerning Planning Application 18/00415/FULD in respect of the demolition of an existing bungalow and double car port, the erection of a replacement house with triple car port and storage, and new roof and cladding to existing outbuilding.

Simon Till, the Planning Officer, introduced the report and stated that the application site was located outside of the settlement boundary, in land defined as countryside under Policy ADPP1 of the Core Strategy and situated within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site consisted of an existing bungalow which had been extended over the course of several previous planning permissions.

The proposed works were for the demolition of the existing bungalow on the site and the erection of a two storey replacement dwelling on a similar footprint to the existing bungalow. The office accommodation to the north of the existing dwelling would be retained via works to separate it from the main dwelling, make good the demolition works, clad the building in feather board and re-roof it and a triple garage and store building was proposed to be erected to the rear of the site, adjacent to the north-eastern boundary. Previous planning permission was granted by the Eastern Area Planning Committee for a two storey replacement dwelling on this site on 26 October 2016.

The existing dwelling was a large, considerably extended bungalow. Nevertheless, despite its size and considerable footprint it was relatively low key in form, due in part to the substantial screening offered by the existing surrounding hedge, and in part to the low ridge height of approximately five metres and the simplicity of design. By contrast, the proposed replacement dwelling would be a more imposing building, with an overall ridge height of approximately 9.7 metres opposed to the 8.5 metre ridge height of the previously approved replacement dwelling. Nevertheless it was noted that the proposed building was a farmhouse, situated amongst land including a farm, farm buildings and other two storey dwellings, and therefore a large main farm dwelling would not be uncommon to find in such circumstances.

It was noted that the proposed replacement dwelling would occupy a slightly smaller floor area than that of the previously approved replacement dwelling, particularly in terms of its two storey elements, reducing the visual impact of this aspect of the built form by relying more on single storey elements and concentrating the two storey elements into a smaller area. A timber framed design would assist the replacement dwelling in responding to the rural character of the surrounding landscape in the AONB. Officers considered that the proposed replacement dwelling was an improvement on that previously approved in terms of the elements of its design and impact on the surrounding landscape of the AONB.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Tim Metcalfe, applicant, addressed the Committee on this application.

Councillor Metcalfe in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Councillor Metcalfe confirmed that the design of the new dwelling would be less symmetrical in nature than the existing bungalow;

- The ridge height would increase to 9.7m but that this type of dwelling would not be uncommon as a farmhouse;
- The gable end of the dwelling would only be visible from the public footpath.

In considering the above application Members queried what screening would be put in place. It was confirmed that screening would be via a hedge the height of which would be in the region of 2.6 metres.

(Councillor Tim Metcalfe left the room at 9.09pm)

Councillor Emma Webster proposed the Officer recommendation of approval as she felt that the design of the proposed dwelling would make good use of the site. This was seconded by Councillor Alan Law.

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

Conditions

(1) The development hereby approved shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

(2) The development of the replacement dwelling hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the location plan and drawing numbers 201-04, 201-06, 201-05, 201-03, 201-02 registered on 22 February 2018.

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

(3) Irrespective of any details given in the approved plans and application form no development of the approved replacement dwelling shall commence until a schedule and samples of materials to be used in the external surfaces of the replacement dwelling has been submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. Thereafter development of the replacement dwelling shall take place in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason: In order to ensure that sufficient consideration is given to the impact of materials on visual amenity in the North Wessex Downs AONB in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policies C3 and C7 of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) 2012.

(4) No demolition of the existing dwelling or development of the approved dwelling shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Method Statement. The Construction Method Statement shall provide for:

(a) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors

(b) Delivery, loading and unloading of plant and materials

(c) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development

(d) Wheel washing facilities

(e) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction

(f) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason: The site is located adjacent to land in an existing agricultural use that generates traffic flow into Purley Village and past the access to existing residential properties, and where construction activities might have a detrimental impact on existing traffic flow and the existing agricultural use if not appropriately controlled. The proposed works might also result in high levels of dust and mud arising from the development which would impact detrimentally on highway safety without appropriate measures for their control in place. This condition is imposed in order to safeguard the amenity of land uses and occupiers surrounding the site and in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies CS5, CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

(5) Development of the approved replacement dwelling shall not commence until details of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments to be implemented on the site have been submitted and approved under a formal discharge of conditions application. Such details shall ensure:

(a) The identification of all trees to be retained;

(b) The use of native species of trees and shrubs;

(c) The full implementation of the scheme of soft landscaping in the first planting season following completion of the development;

(d) The full implementation of the approved hard landscaping before the approved dwelling is occupied;

(e) The implementation of the approved boundary treatments before the dwelling is occupied.

(f) Measures for the protection of any trees and shrubs to be retained on the site through the course of development;

(g) Retention of all approved landscaping for a period of five years;

(h) Any trees or shrubs that become diseased, damaged or die shall be replaced with examples of the same species and a similar size within the following planting season. Irrespective of the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, or any subsequent version thereof, no means of enclosure shall be erected on the site apart from in accordance with the approved details of means of enclosure unless planning permission has been granted on a planning application made for this purpose.

Reason: The site is located in a visually prominent location within the North Wessex Downs AONB. This condition is imposed in order to ensure that the development is provided with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping in order to soften its impact in surrounding views, and to ensure that no harm to the character of the surrounding AONB results from the use of visually intrusive means of enclosure and hard surfaces in the development of the site, in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policies C3 and C7 of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) 2012.

(6) The finished floor levels in the approved dwelling shall match those shown in the approved drawings.

Reason: In order to safeguard visual amenity in the North Wessex Downs AONB and to assist in flood resilience in accordance with the NPPF (2012) and Policies CS13, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

(7) Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any subsequent version thereof, no extensions or alterations shall be made to the dwelling hereby approved, or alterations and extensions made to its roof, nor any outbuildings erected in its curtilage, without planning permission first having been granted in respect of a planning application made for this purpose.

Reason: The site is located in a visually prominent part of the North Wessex Downs AONB, and the works hereby permitted significantly increase the amount of built form on the site. This condition is required in order to prevent an accumulation of outbuildings and extensions that might otherwise detrimentally impact on the character and appearance of the site within the surrounding AONB, in the interests of visual amenity in the North Wessex Downs AONB in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policies C3 and C7 of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) 2012.

(8) Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or any subsequent version thereof, the outbuilding and car port hereby approved shall be used only for purposes ancillary to a) the residential enjoyment of the main dwelling on the site OR b) business activities associated with the surrounding agricultural landholding/business known as Home Farm. The outbuilding and car port shall not be sold, leased, rented or otherwise separately used or disposed of from the main dwelling. No separate curtilage shall be created. The car port shall be retained for the purpose of parking vehicles and storage and shall not be used for other purposes.

Reason: In order to prevent the creation of a separate dwelling unit and to avoid pressure for additional outbuildings which would result in an increase in built form on a visually prominent site in the North Wessex Downs AONB in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with the NPPF (2012), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policies C3 and C7 of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) 2012.

(9) The hours of work for all contractors, site operatives and other persons employed in the development of the replacement dwelling hereby approved, for the duration of the site development, shall be limited to:

7.30 am to 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays 8.30 am to 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays and

NO work shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with the NPPF (2012) and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.

(10) No development of the approved dwelling shall take place until a scheme of parking and turning has been submitted and approved under a discharge of conditions application made for this purpose. The dwelling shall not be occupied until the parking and turning has been surfaced and laid out in accordance with the accordance with the approved details. The parking and turning shall be retained on

the site for the parking of private motor cars in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure that sufficient parking and turning for the use of the approved dwelling are provided on the site in the interests of highways safety in accordance with Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policy P1 of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2006-2026) 2012.

6. Appeal Decisions relating to Eastern Area Planning

(Councillor Tim Metcalfe returned to the meeting at 9.10pm).

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

7. Site Visits

The 6 June 2018 was agreed for site visits if necessary. This was in advance of the Eastern Area Planning Committee scheduled for 13 June 2018 which would commence at the earlier time of 5.30pm.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30pm and closed at 9.12pm)

CHAIRMAN …….

Date of Signature …….