WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 16 MARCH 2022

Councillors Present: Dennis Benneyworth (Chairman), Tony Vickers (Vice-Chairman), Phil Barnett, Jeff Cant, Carolyne Culver, Claire Rowles, Howard Woollaston, James Cole (Substitute) (In place of Clive Hooker) and Andy Moore (Substitute) (In place of Adrian Abbs)

Also Present: Sian Cutts (Senior Planning Officer), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Jack Karimi (Democratic Services Officer), Cheyanne Kirby (Planning Officer), Kim Maher (Solicitor) and Simon Till (Principal Planning Officer (Team Leader))

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Adrian Abbs and Councillor Clive Hooker

PART I

38. Minutes

The Chairman proposed that a number of clerical errors be clarified and corrected.

Councillor Howard Woollaston proposed that incorrect references to him as a member of Lambourn Parish Council be removed.

The amended Minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2021 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman proposed that the list of Members present be corrected.

The amended Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2021 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman proposed that a number of clerical errors be clarified and corrected.

Councillor Howard Woollaston proposed that a statement attributed to him referring to a number of football teams as "lower league" be corrected.

Councillor James Cole proposed that a question he asked regarding the microplastics be clarified.

The amended Minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2021 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Councillor Carolyne Culver proposed that a reference to the facility "not being used" be corrected to "not being needed".

Councillor Claire Rowles proposed that a reference to her stating that she felt pressured be minuted.

The amended Minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman noted that the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2022 had not been finalised, and were currently with Planning for comment and approval.

39. Declarations of Interest

All Members declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(1), 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.

Councillors Howard Woollaston, Caroline Culver, Phil Barnett, Jeff Cant and James Cole declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(2), 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.

40. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. and Parish: 20/02245/FUL Great Shefford

(All Members declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1).)

- 1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 20/02245/FUL in respect of Swan Inn, Newbury Road, Great Shefford, Hungerford, RG17 7DS.
- 2. Mrs Sian Cutts, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material planning considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms and officers recommended that the Head of Planning and Development be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.
- 3. The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard, Team Leader (Highways Development Control), if he had any observations relating to the application. Mr Goddard stated that the access is existing, long-standing, and should raise no issues. Mr Goddard stated that research has shown that only 30% of traffic around a new commercial development is new to the network, and Highways had concluded that there would be no significant impact. Mr Goddard noted that there were 26 spaces of proposed parking, a reduction from 27 existing spaces. Highways does not consider that loss of one parking space enough to warrant objection. In response to objections on the basis of parking overspill, Mr Goddard stated that a proposed condition limiting open hours of the shop to prevent opening when the public house is most active should mitigate these concerns, noting that a parking survey undertaken by Highways did not find any occurrences of parking overspill.
- 4. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Ms Sharon Brentnall, agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Agent Representation

- 5. Ms Sharon Brentnall in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Since 2001, West Berkshire has lost 35 public houses, with 60% lost in the last ten years. Supermarkets are undercutting pub prices, and it is essential for rural pubs to remain viable through diversifying their offering.
 - The public house has an excellent reputation, but the Covid-19 pandemic has underlined that financial viability cannot always be guaranteed.
 - A new focus on sustainability has forced public houses to look at how they can support local areas, and this proposal for a farm shop underpinned by a local

supply chain for produce supports that. This supports local suppliers and creates benefits for the wider community.

- The farm shop will be run by the public house, and not as a separate entity, and will be a linked business so that a customer can visit both. Additionally, the produce in the farm shop will be used in the meals the public house prepares.
- The applicant is happy to follow all conditions set by Planning, particularly the
 condition limiting opening hours, noting that farm shops and public houses have
 different peak times. To address concerns, the applicant has entered into an
 agreement with a local business to ensure that staff can park off-site, and the
 applicant is willing to address concerns about non-customers using the parking
 site.
- The applicant has put a significant personal and financial commitment into the public house, and have continued to strive to make improvements to their business. The public house has an outstanding restaurant, but is primarily a pub, and employs local people. Currently, it has 20 staff.
- Local people regard the public house and farm shop to be a well-designed asset, and require support, particularly if they are employing local people. Ms Brentnall noted that there were more letters in support than opposition.

Member Questions to the Agent

- Councillor Tony Vickers asked what the applicant considered to be "local suppliers".
 Ms Brentnall responded that the applicants had an ideal radius was in mind, outside of which products would not be sought.
- 7. Councillor Barnett asked for clarification that alcohol sales would not be done within the shop. Ms Brentnall confirmed that that would not be the case.
- 8. The Chairman asked if there was any risk of crossover between the two businesses. Ms Brentnall responded that there was not, as they were entirely different business models.
- 9. Councillor Andy Moore asked if there was any scope for reduction of the development's height, noting that the cited height of 6.3 metres was not on the plans. Ms Brentnall stated that they were to scale and the height in the plans would be correct. Councillor Moore asked if there were any considerations to reduce the height. Ms Brentnall stated that she would have to confirm with the applicant.
- 10. Councillor Claire Rowles asked for clarity in how the shop differed from the two existing village shops. Ms Brentnall responded that the shop sought to sell fresh produce with regular local deliveries, rather than the longer-life products of conventional shops.

Ward Member Representation

11. The Chairman noted that Councillor Clive Hooker could not attend.

Member Questions to Officers

12. Councillor Tony Vickers asked whether a public house needed to substantiate that an additional diversified business was viable or needed. Ms Cutts responded that the business such as the public house did not need to prove either, and that a desire to

expand alone was enough. On the viability of other businesses, Ms Cutts understood that it was difficult to prove that a development would not damage the viability of others, but that the applicant's statement that other products would be sold was satisfactory. Mr Till added that it was not the Council's role to regulate competition between businesses on this scale.

- 13. Councillor Howard Woollaston noted that he had regularly observed that the car park was full or overflowing, and so expressed surprise at the findings of the parking survey. Councillor Woollaston stated that it was his understanding that the planned ramp would remove four parking spaces. Mr Goddard responded that Highways did not disregard that parking overspills happened, just that it could not be substantiated as a regular issue, and that the plan quoting a loss of one parking space was possible.
- 14. Councillor Moore asked whether the height of the building should be shown definitively on the plan. Ms Cutts responded that scaled drawings were required, but that all measurements were not. The height of 4.6 metres was from the submitted plans, as well as a previous application which stated the height of the garage definitively.
- 15. Councillor Moore asked how the historical element of the application was considered. Ms Cutts responded that the application was submitted with a Heritage Impact Assessment, which referred to the historical pattern of development, and the Conservation Officer had initially raised an objection to the development blocking views of the public house. However, photographs of a similar building next to the public house in 1910 proved that the proposed development fit a historical layout.
- 16. Councillor Moore noted that light good vehicles would supply the shop, and whether the Council had any control over that. Mr Goddard responded that a condition could potentially be set to limit deliveries or delivery vehicles.
- 17. The Chairman asked for clarification that the previous enforcement matter could not be considered. Mr Cutts stated that they could not, as they did not relate to the
- 18. Councillor Carolyne Culver asked why the Environment Agency's statement was an informative, rather than a condition. Ms Cutts responded that it was a duty of care obligation to reference the need for this permit, but it was not an issue under planning legislation.
- 19. Councillor Culver asked how many houses were being built as part of a nearby housing development, and how this would impact the flood risk. Ms Cutts responded that she did not know the number, but that the Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted alongside the application. In this area, most of the flood risk came from the local landscape.
- 20. Councillor Culver asked what the cut-off point was for BREEAM to not be considered. Mr Till responded that the BREEAM scoring scale becomes impractical at this small building size, as well as for those who are open-sided. This development has very little scope to implement changes for a higher BREEAM grade.
- 21. Councillor Culver asked if an additional disabled space next to the shop could be made a condition. Mr Goddard stated that the space could be placed in a row of five closest to the shop, and that it could be made a condition through amendment of Condition 11.
- 22. Councillor Rowles noted that parking was tight, and asked whether the space closest to the shop had enough room to be safe. Mr Goddard responded that there were dimension standards for car parking spaces, which had been met by the application.

Mr Goddard accepted that the car park was narrow, but that was an existing issue with the site.

- 23. Councillor Rowles asked whether the potential cycle stands could be placed if it was made a condition. Mr Goddard stated that further details had been requested as part of Condition 12.
- 24. Councillor Rowles noted that there was a sharp bend on the road near to the public house, and asked if there was a potential scenario with parking overflow and delivery vans causing congestion. Mr Goddard added that the nearby housing development was for three dwellings, and had its own car parking spaces. Mr Goddard added that in evidence provided by objectors, no overspill cars were parked on the sharp bend, noting that it was an illogical place to park in any scenario. Mr Goddard added that no additional developments on the site were likely to be considered with this parking situation.
- 25. Councillor Rowles asked if conditioning delivery vehicles was limiting the supplies available to them. Mr Goddard noted that this would additionally break a precedent as large trucks were being used to deliver alcohol to the public house. Mr Till added that conditions needed to be deemed to be reasonable and enforceable, and that as it limited the abilities of suppliers to the applicant, it was unreasonable and unenforceable for the applicant or Council.
- 26. Councillor Barnett asked whether it was safe to cross the road at the point near the sharp bend further down the road to the south. Mr Goddard responded that the bend is 100 metres away, and so there is sufficient distance for people to cross.
- 27. Councillor Barnett asked whether the development would be secure, and whether protections around the building were feasible. Ms Cutts responded that the building was timber-clad but would likely be reinforced by concrete, and that the ramp in front would not be an issue. Ms Cutts added that the public house would likely be able to provide their own security. Mr Till stated that security issues were likely beyond planning concerns.
- 28. Councillor Woollaston stated that back in 2013, there were 33 car parking spaces for 70 covers, and added that this had since expanded, particularly in the summer. Councillor Woollaston asked for a comment on parking during the summer. Mr Goddard responded that evidence provided by objectors had been year-round, and that the parking survey was taken at a reasonable time in February in March, with no evidence to suggest seasonal variance, reiterating that it had concluded that parking overspill was not regular.
- 29. Councillor Jeff Cant asked whether the application complied with the minimum number of car parking spaces.
- 30. Councillor Cant asked for clarification that there had not been a road traffic accident for 17 years, and that if there had, that would have been taken into account by Highways. Mr Goddard stated that the crash map had been consulted, and no incidents had occurred near the site since 2005. If there were more, it would have been considered.

Debate

31. Councillor James Cole opened the debate by stated that he veered towards approval, it was within planning requirements, and that there were business and historical cases. The main issue was parking, and that he had concluded that it was not a strong enough issue to refuse planning permission.

- 32. Councillor Jeff Cant stated that debates over financial viability were beyond the remit of Planning, and that the applicant had made enough of an effort most customers would go home if they could not park. Finally, he noted that it could not be ignored that most
- 33. Councillor Tony Vickers stated that financial viability was a public concern, and this case needed to be heard, and that he agreed with others that parking was the main issue. Councillor Tony Vickers was concerned by the growth of the business, and that the policy may needed to be changed to look more thoroughly. Overall, he was in favour of the application, as it was an issue of social and economic enterprise and supporting public houses.
- 34. The Chairman stated that the two major issues of competition and parking had been thoroughly addressed. He believed that it was a credit to the applicant to see a thriving public house, and would support officers' recommendations.
- 35. Councillor Barnett stated that he was in support of officers' recommendations, as he did not see much room for competition between the shops, as it would cater to a different group of customers. Councillor Barnett expressed his concerns about parking, and concluded that he believed these issues would be resolved, along with flooding concerns.
- 36. Councillor Rowles concurred that it was good to see a public house be in some ways a victim of their own success. However, expressed concerns over whether the available parking and local roads could accommodate the additional business.
- 37. Councillor Woollaston concurred with Councillor Rowles on parking, and asked for conditions to set a minimum of 26 parking spaces, and to ensure that the development does not later become a café. Ms Cutts confirmed that the limitation of the application's use class precluded it from being a café or selling any hot foods, but that it was difficult to limit the goods sold and enforce that as a condition. Mr Till concurred, stating that he had advised on the enforceability of a condition limiting the sale of goods, and concluded that it was not reasonable or enforceable. On parking, Mr Till stated that Condition 11 could be amended to require a new parking plan before the development is used. Mr Goddard stated that he was content with the plan for 26 parking spaces, and that he would resist a provision of just 23.
- 38. Councillor Tony Vickers recalled an amendment for a condition for an additional disabled parking space near the shop be added, as well as a condition to require no less than 26 parking spaces.
- 39. Councillor Tony Vickers proposed to accept Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report and update report. This was seconded by Councillor Jeff Cant.
- 40. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Tony Vickers, seconded by Councillor Jeff Cant to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Service Director for Development and Regulation be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. **Commencement of development**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).

2. Approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:

Location Plan Drawing No P20-2236 01 received on 28th September 2020;

Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing No P2 308/0720/P.01 received on 30th November 2021;

Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations with Handrails Drawing No 308/0720/P.01 received on 6th December 2021;

Proposed Landscaping Scheme Drawing No 308/0720/P.02 received on 6th December 2021:

Proposed Site Plan Drawing No P20-2236-03 Rev B received on 3rd March 2020;

Flood Risk Assessment Prepared by Glanville Ref: 8200922/AQ/CS/002 dated 14th December 2020 and received on 16th December 2020;

Planning and Heritage Statement prepared by Pegasus Group dated September 2020 received on 28th September 2020; and

The Great Shefford Farm Shop Business Plan received on 3rd March 2020

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

3. Permitted uses within Class E

The development shall be used for the display or retail sale of goods, other than hot food, principally to visiting members of the public, (Class E (a)) only and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class E of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification). This restriction shall apply notwithstanding any provisions in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: The site is situated within the curtilage of a public house where other Class E uses would not be appropriate in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies ADPP1, ADPP5, and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Policies OVS.5, OVS.6 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

4. Connected use with the Public House

The shop hereby permitted shall only be used under the same management as the Public House within the same application site.

Reason: The justification for granting the shop unit is to assist with the long term viability and the separation of the use may affect the viability of the public house use. This condition is applied in accordance with policy CS10, and the Public Houses Supplementary Planning Guidance (2000).

5. Materials

No above ground development shall take place until a schedule of all materials and finishes visible external to the building has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to these matters which have been detailed in the current application. Samples of the materials shall be made available for inspection on request. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the materials are appropriate to the special architectural or historic interest of the adjacent listed building. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

6. Eaves/fascia

No works shall take place to the roof until full details of the eaves and fascia, at a minimum scale of 1:20, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the adjacent listed building. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

7. Handrail

The metal handrail to the ramp shall be painted black.

Reason: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the adjacent listed building. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

8. Soft landscaping (prior approval)

The shop building shall not be occupied until a detailed soft landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed plans, planting and retention schedule, programme of works, and any other supporting information. All soft landscaping works shall be completed in accordance with the approved soft landscaping scheme within the first planting season following completion of building operations. Any trees, shrubs, plants or hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme which are removed, die, or become diseased or become seriously damaged within five years of completion of this completion of the approved soft landscaping scheme shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedges of a similar size and species to that originally approved.

Reason: Landscaping is an integral element of achieving high quality design. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the Quality Design SPD.

9. Customer opening hours

The shop shall not be open to customers outside of the following hours:

Mondays to Fridays: 07:00 to 18:00

Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays: 07:00 to 12:00

Reason: To ensure satisfactory levels of car parking in the interests of highway safety. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

10. Construction Method Statement

No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the demolition and construction works shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved CMS. The CMS shall include measures for:

- (a) A site set-up plan during the works;
- (b) Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- (c) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (d) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- (e) Erection and maintenance of security hoarding including any decorative displays and/or facilities for public viewing;
- (f) Wheel washing facilities;
- (g) Measures to control dust, dirt, noise, vibrations, odours, surface water run-off, and pests/vermin during construction;
- (h) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers, and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policies OVS.5, OVS.6 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007). A pre-commencement condition is required because the CMS must be adhered to during all demolition and construction operations.

11. Parking in accordance with approved plans

The shop shall not be brought into use until vehicle parking and turning spaces (including any surfacing arrangements and marking out) have been provided in accordance with plans which have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those plans will include the provision of 26 parking spaces including at least three disabled parking spaces, one of which is accessible to the shop. Thereafter the parking and turning spaces shall be kept available for parking and manoeuvring of private cars and/or private light goods vehicles at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

12. Cycle parking/storage (pre-commencement prior approval)

No development shall take place until details of cycle parking/storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The shop shall not be first occupied until cycle parking/storage facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter the facilities shall be maintained and kept available for that purpose at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle parking/storage facilities in order to encourage the use of cycles and reduce reliance on private motor vehicles. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and the Council's Cycle and Motorcycle Advice and Standards for New Development (November 2014). A pre-commencement condition is necessary because the cycle parking/storage arrangement will need to be determined before any construction to ensure it can be accommodated within the space available.

13. External Cooling Units

No external chilling equipment or air handling plant shall be installed on the building hereby permitted until details of the unit(s) to be installed, including the number and location of such plant and the acoustic specification of the plant, including details of any measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the noise have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the residential amenity of the area and to minimise potential noise disturbance. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and policies OVS5 and OVS6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

Informatives

1. Proactive

This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has worked proactively with the applicant to secure and accept what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area

2. Environment Agency Consents

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be obtained from the Environment Agency for any activities which will take place:

- o on or within 8 metres of a main river
- on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river
- o on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
- o involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
- in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure and you don't already have planning permission

For further guidance please visit https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm) or by emailing enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk.

The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and The Environment Agency advise consultation with them at the earliest opportunity.

The applicant should contact 03708 506 506 or consult the Environment Agency website to establish if consent will be required for the works they are proposing. Please see http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/permitting/default.aspx

This includes any proposal to undertake work in, over, under, or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of a designated Main River, called a Flood Risk Activity permit.

(2) Application No. and Parish: 21/02668/FUL Lambourn

(Councillor Howard Woollaston declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that he was the local Ward Member. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

(Councillors Howard Woollaston, Carolyne Culver, Phil Barnett, Jeff Cant and James Cole declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(2).)

- 41. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 21/02668/FUL in respect of Hunt Kennels Farm, Ermin Street, Lambourn, Woodlands.
- 42. Ms Cheyanne Kirby, Planning Officer, introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material planning considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms and officers recommended that the Head of Planning and Development be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.
- 43. The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard, Team Leader (Highways Development Control), if he had any observations relating to the application. Mr Goddard stated that the existing use of the site is for kennels holding as many as 40 dogs, and so it used to a level of regular vehicle movements. The proposal is for a lower level of vehicle movement than the use case would allow, set by a condition.
- 44. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Ms Sue Cocker, Lambourn Parish Council, Mr Tony King, objector, Mr Christopher Cary and Ms Lucy Charman, agents, addressed the Committee on this application.

Parish Council Representation

- 45. Ms Sue Cocker, Lambourn Parish Council, in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The kennels are surrounded by the countryside of the AONB. The land is currently designated as agricultural.
 - Lambourn Parish Council appreciates that the application is for a family-run business, the owners of which live on the site. They have given verbal assurances that they will not be operating large transporters or allow light pollution from their warehouse. However, planning permissions run with the land, not the owners.
 - The applicants are taking an agricultural site and are repurposing it for industrial use. Lambourn Parish Council is deeply concerned about the expansion of such sites for warehousing, open storage and distribution in the AONB, particularly when planning permission is given to sites like this one which are outside the permitted employment area.
 - The scale of this new building, higher than the current ones it will encompass, and
 roof height four times the size of the existing footprint, shows that it will be an
 industrial warehouse on agricultural land. If permission is granted, it will effectively
 expand the industrial area, adding to the difficulties suffered by residents affected
 by traffic movements across local roads.
 - The Committee report raises unanswered questions, making no reference to hours
 of operation once construction is completed. Lambourn Parish Council requests
 that this be conditioned.
 - The dangerous junction onto the B4000 Hungerford Hill must also be addressed, with the application suggesting that transporters accessing the site will be using it despite its unsuitability.
 - The report refers to a personal condition to the applicant's company. According to Government guidelines, this cannot be given to a company except in cases of exceptional need such as for housing development. Lambourn Parish Council

questions what exceptional need has been demonstrated for a garden furniture business.

- The garden furniture business will be operating from March to September, and Lambourn Parish Council questions what it will be used for in the other six months of the year.
- Lambourn Parish Council asks that the Committee are responsive to local needs and concerns and rejects the application.

Member Questions to the Parish Council

- 46. Councillor Tony Vickers asked whether she would be opposed to the same building for agricultural purposes. Ms Cocker responded that the size would still be a matter of particular concern.
- 47. Councillor Carolyne Culver asked how Lambourn Parish Council believed EG3 would be a better use class than B8. Ms Cocker responded that the intention was to limit the business from expansion, but that this was ultimately for the consideration of planners.
- 48. Councillor Jeff Cant asked what the Parish Council's view on the use of the land for kennels was. Ms Cocker responded that she was not a member of the Parish Council at the time.
- 49. Councillor Claire Rowles asked whether the scale of the development was the main concern, rather than its appearance. Ms Cocker responded that the Parish Council would like a retention of the agricultural appearance.

Objector Representation

- 50. Mr Tony King in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Mr King objected to the application as the Committee report was misleading and, in his view, should have been withdrawn. He had raised his concerns with the Planning officers and members of the Committee.
 - Mr King questioned how a personal condition can be granted to a limited company, which can change its work and ownership at any time. The application is for B8 use, largely unrestricted, and all the analysis should reflect that.
 - Much of the site will be impacted. The application's red lines are not correct and the environmental impact should be reconsidered. The traffic use has been suppressed, and there will be 24 vehicles a day added with B8 use, including a number of large HGVs. There is no confirmation that the paving can accept HGVs.
 - The site is not sustainable like industrial sites in the surrounding area. There is no safe access to the site other than through motorised road vehicles, and changing that would require major investment. It is difficult to understand how industrial development on rural sites is compatible with the Council's declaration of a climate emergency.
 - Many references are made to existing documents on previous use to justify this.
 However, the previous use was for a restricted rural pursuit, which has since expired. The previous use generated little noise.
 - The roof lights, external doors and external lighting will damage the dark sky currently in the location.

• In summary, the application cannot use a personal permission and suppress its full use. Mr King considers the application misleading, and asks that it be refused.

Member Questions to the Objector

51. Members did not have any questions of clarification.

Agent Representation

- 52. Mr Christopher Cary and Ms Lucy Charman in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The application is to replace a disused, redundant kennel building with a single, well-designed storage building to service the applicant's family-run furniture business. The Committee report notes that it had received a number of objections, which raised valid concerns. The agents had worked with Planning officers to overcome these concerns with conditions.
 - The applicants are a multi-generational family running a successful garden furniture business, hoping to become an integral part of the local community. The purchase of the farm allows them to consolidate the storage needs of the business to a single site, improving profitability by reducing rental and travel costs. The applicants had already permanently relocated to the site, and hope to make it their family home and the site of the business.
 - The existing site did serve a purpose, but its condition and age necessitates replacing them with a new structure. The size of the building will increase the footprint from 510 square metres to 743. The roadside elevation is a similar length to the existing elevation. The footprint increase lies entirely within the existing hard standing on the site.
 - A landscaping plan has been agreed to lessen the impact of the development on the area, and trees are planned to be planted along the roadside of the building and dwelling on the site. The development presents a biodiversity net gain.
 - The site lies 300 metres from a protected employment area, which is considered to be fully sustainable, and so the site will be as well. The latest West Berkshire Employment Land Review states that demand is evident for B8 distribution in close proximity to the M4, and is well-located to address rural demand. There is a need to deliver commercial land in the area between 2020 and 2026.
 - The Highways Officer has raised no objection, and was satisfied that there was safe and suitable access to the site, which would see similar transport movement to the kennels. Any concern regarding sustainability of the location has been balanced by positive contribution of the economics and that the applicants lived on the site.
 - The principle of business use in the area is supported and it is acknowledged as being an area which is well-located to address rural demand. The principle of supporting small, rural businesses should be supported on a local and national level.
 - The proposal will have a positive landscape impact, and is a standard agricultural construction, with very little impact on the local amenity.

Member Questions to the Agents

- 53. Councillor Rowles asked how much HGV traffic entering the site was envisioned. Mr Cary responded that a large number of HGVs were not feasible considering the size of the site, but that they would not
- 54. Councillor Rowles asked whether the agents considered the agricultural appearance to be maintained. Mr Cary responded that rounded agricultural-style roofs were not standard, and that the exiting proposed design fit the agricultural character of the AONB.
- 55. Councillor Phil Barnett asked if sprinklers would be installed considering the treated timber furniture being constructed. Mr Cary responded that he understood the furniture to be made of teak, and that if a sprinkler system was set as a condition it would be possible to install one.
- 56. Councillor Tony Vickers noted that BREEAM was not required, but asked whether heating the building was planned. Mr Cary responded that the building would not be heated by any means.
- 57. Councillor Jeff Cant asked for clarity on the purpose of the business. Mr Cary responded that it was for local delivery of imported furniture.

Ward Member Representation

- 58. Councillor Howard Woollaston in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - This application is to support exactly the sort of business that the Council should be encouraging: small-scale, generating local employment, and discrete.
 - However, the site is in an AONB which is being continually threatened by ongoing industrial development. This is a small unit, but enough is enough for local residents, especially as it falls outside of the employment area.
 - The possibility of further development creep, adding more load to the B4000 road would make people afraid to leave their homes. This proposal would further contribute to this.
 - Councillor Woollaston asks the Committee to reject the application unless the personal permission can be fully enforced. Councillor Woollaston apologises to the applicant, stating that it is simply in the wrong location.

Member Questions to the Ward Member

59. Councillor Culver asked what his understanding of the development creep issue was. Councillor Woollaston responded that nothing is built outside of the protected employment area, and this would be the first development to do so.

Member Questions to Officers

60. Councillor James Cole asked for clarification that there was no planning permission for the site's use at present. Ms Kirby responded that the permission for use as kennels was personal, and so would elapse when the occupants vacate the site, at which point it would revert to agricultural use.

- 61. Councillor James Cole asked whether a personal condition could be granted to a business, and whether it would persevere or could be made to persevere. Mr Till responded that there were officer concerns with the B8 use class, but that the applicant had demonstrated that their business needs were below that which might potentially be associated with a more general B8 use, and that a personal condition as precise as possible was within Planning's remit to grant. Councillor James Cole asked for clarification that a new owner of the site would need to reapply for a change of use class. Mr Till responded that a new owner would.
- 62. Councillor James Cole asked how the lighting could be controlled through set conditions. Ms Kirby responded that a condition was proposed, and that roof lighting could be further conditioned.
- 63. Councillor Andy Moore asked how the personal condition restricted the use of vehicles on the site. Mr Goddard stated that the conditions did not specifically limit the number of vehicles, but that the applicant had provided details of their associated vehicle movements for the nature of their own business.
- 64. Councillor Woollaston asked whether refusing future permission would require removal of the building. Mr Till responded that it could be made a condition if necessary to retain the amenity of the AONB.
- 65. Councillor Woollaston asked whether the colour of the building could be conditioned. Ms Kirby responded that the materials were stated within the application, and the roof would be grey corrugated steel, with the building itself being green.
- 66. Councillor Woollaston asked whether the roof lighting could be conditioned. Ms Kirby responded that the applicant was willing to discuss and agree to conditions on external lighting to reduce the impact of light pollution. The Chairman asked whether the use of lights within certain hours could be conditioned. Ms Kirby responded that that was an option, as well as the material of the lighting.
- 67. Councillor Rowles asked what the extent of the tree re-greening was. Ms Kirby responded that a landscaping plan was submitted which included five additional trees near the property, as well as three saplings and local hedging. In addition, any diseased or damaged trees within five years would be replaced.
- 68. Councillor Rowles asked for clarification on the local traffic issues. Mr Goddard responded that he shared the concerns of the objectors with regards to the increasing use of vehicles in the area, and that increasing traffic was a reason for Highways objections to other applications. Highways did not object to this application due to the personal consent to a condition limiting traffic. Councillor Rowles asked if other applications could circumvent the objections by giving personal consent to limitations. Mr Goddard responded that each application would be considered on its merits, and that any particular increase would lead to objection.
- 69. Councillor Culver asked about the enforceability of the personal condition if the company was bought by a new owner. Mr Till responded that there was a proposed amendment to the personal condition to secure it specifically to the applicant's business. Mr Till added that the condition could be as precise as possible within the applicant's requirements, and that Planning was satisfied that it was in accordance with the NPPF and could withstand challenge.
- 70. Councillor Culver asked if it was usually the case that the applicant was asked to submit a Surface Water Drainage Strategy with the application, and asked for officers to briefly summarise changes to the conditions. Ms Kirby responded that the Drainage Officer was not satisfied by the existing drainage soakaway, and proposed

- a new condition. Additionally, a condition regarding groundwater suitability for new habitats were included.
- 71. Councillor Tony Vickers asked whether a condition restricting access for business purposes to access via the south of Ermin Street could be added. Mr Till responded that it would not be reasonable or enforceable, as the use of private vehicles on public highways would be outside of the applicant's control, and would therefore not meet with the tests set out in the NPPF in his view.

Debate

- 72. Councillor Cant opened the debate by stating that the key issue was that the proposed business use did not preserve the character of the AONB, and that he viewed the personal condition to be improper. Therefore, he could not support the application.
- 73. Councillor Tony Vickers stated that he was concerned by development creep, but that he was satisfied that the conditions were enough for the Committee to approve the application, and that if the business failed or ceased, the development could be reverted to agricultural use. Therefore, he leant towards approval.
- 74. Councillor Barnett stated that he was undecided. On the practical issues, he saw it as a positive that local people and small businesses were being assisted, but that he was concerned with the storage of untreated timber, and that it necessitated the condition of a sprinkler system. However, Councillor Barnett stated that he did not believe the site was the right one for the proposed use, and that access would be a lasting issue.
- 75. The Chairman stated that he agreed with a lot of Councillor Tony Vickers' points, and that there were existing vehicle movements while the site was being used as kennels.
- 76. Councillor Woollaston asked whether the conditions could be specifically set as personal to the applicant himself, and that it could be explicitly stated that it would revert to agricultural use. Mr Till stated that agricultural use was the default use of the land without any other existing permission, and so it was already implied.
- 77. Councillor James Cole stated that if conditions on external lighting and lighting spillage were tightened, he could be prepared to support the application.
- 78. Councillor Cant asked whether a precedent was being set for further industrial use of farm buildings being allowed as personal conditions, and that he was hesitant to support the application as he would sympathise with other applicants requesting the same. Mr Till stated that it was a very specific set of circumstances related to the individual merits of the application and history of the site as kennels, and so it would not necessarily set a wider precedent. On balance, officers viewed the use for furniture storage as being compatible with surrounding land.
- 79. Councillor Rowles asked whether the use could continue if the business was acquired. Mr Till stated that there was a case for further strengthening the condition to specify that it was for the applicant operating as the business. The condition as constituted was already strongly restrictive. Councillor Rowles asked if this personal permission was something which had been seen before, or whether it was a new precedent. Mr Till responded that a personal permission was rare, and that he had seen few cases, all of which reflected the specific circumstances of the applicant, proposed use, and site.

- 80. Councillor Tony Vickers stated that nothing had been raised during the debate to change his opinion, and that he was satisfied that this was a unique set of circumstances, namely that the applicant lived on the site and required the demolition of derelict buildings to conduct his business. Councillor Tony Vickers was willing to support the application as long as certain conditions relating to materials and lighting were strengthened.
- 81. Mr Till clarified that the proposed amendments to the conditions were to amend Condition 5 to specify that details of external materials and finishes be provided before building commences, that details of roof lighting and measures to prevent lighting overspill be specified (such as timing systems), and that the personal permission be specifically to the individual owner of the business.
- 82. Councillor Tony Vickers proposed to accept Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the amended conditions listed in the main report and update report. This was seconded by Councillor Andy Moore.
- 83. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Tony Vickers, seconded by Councillor Andy Moore to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Service Director for Development and Regulation be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Commencement of development

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).

2. Approved Plans (Updated)

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:

Location Plan received 20th October 2021:

Proposed Plans and Elevations 0001 received 20th October 2021:

Design and Access Statement received 20th October 2021;

Block Plan received 20th October 2021;

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal 194/R1 by Herdwick Ecology dated September 2021 received 20th October 2021;

Scheme of landscape planting received 16th February 2022.

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

3. Personal Permission

The B8 commercial building hereby permitted shall be occupied only by Kingsley Smythe Ltd under the ownership of John Lock for purposes of the storage and distribution of furniture under use class B8 in connection with the applicant's business. When the premises cease to be occupied by Kingsley Smythe Ltd the use hereby permitted shall cease and all items of storage and equipment brought on to the premises in connection with the use shall be removed.

Reason: The applicant has demonstrated through submission accompanying this application that the associated vehicle movements relating to the operation of the site for his business are such as to allow for the applicant's particular business to operate on the site under the restrictions of the conditions of this planning permission without resulting in undue detriment to the amenity of neighbouring residential occupants, highway safety and

the amenity of the highway network that might result from the operation of an uncontrolled B8 or other industrial use of the site. This condition is imposed in order that the use of the site by any alternative future occupant can be given details consideration in terms of the associated impacts on highways safety and residential amenity in the interests of residential amenity and highway safety in accordance with the NPPF, Policies CS5, CS9, CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-2026 and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

4. SUDS (Updated)

No development shall take place until details of sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

These details shall:

- a) Incorporate the implementation of Sustainable Drainage methods (SuDS) in accordance with the Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS (March 2015), the SuDS Manual C753 (2015) and the WBC SuDS Supplementary Planning Document December 2018 with particular emphasis on Green SuDS and water reuse; Page 12 Item No (2) Application No: 21/02668/FUL Page 3 of 4
- b) Include a drainage strategy for surface water run-off within the site since no discharge of surface water from the site will be accepted into the public system by the Lead Local Flood Authority;
- c) Include and be informed by a ground investigation survey which establishes the soil characteristics, infiltration rate and groundwater levels. Soakage testing shall be undertaken in accordance with BRE365 methodology;
- d) Include run-off calculations based on current rainfall data models, discharge rates (based on 1 in 1 year greenfield run-off rates), and infiltration and storage capacity calculations for the proposed SuDS measures based on a 1 in 100 year storm +40% for climate change;
- e) Include construction drawings, cross-sections and specifications of all proposed SuDS measures within the site;
- f) Include pre-treatment methods to prevent any pollution or silt entering SuDS features or causing any contamination to the soil, groundwater, watercourse or drain:
- g) Include a management and maintenance plan showing how the SuDS measures will be maintained and managed after completion for the lifetime of the development. This plan shall incorporate arrangements for adoption by the Council, Water and Sewage Undertaker, Maintenance or Management Company (private company or Trust) or individual property owners, or any other arrangements, including maintenance responsibilities resting with individual property owners, to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. These details shall be provided as part of a handover pack for subsequent purchasers and owners of the property/premises;
- h) Include measures with reference to Environmental issues which protect or enhance the ground water quality and provide new habitats where possible;
- i) Include details of how surface water will be managed and contained within the site during construction works to prevent silt migration and pollution of watercourses, highway drainage and land either on or adjacent to the site;
- j) Include an inspection and soakage tests for any existing soakaways to prove the soakaways still work properly. The owners must maintain the soakaways in a good condition thereafter;
- k) Include a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer demonstrating that the drainage system has been constructed as per the approved scheme (or detail any minor variations thereof), to be submitted immediately following construction to be approved by the Local Planning Authority. This Report shall include plans and details of all key drainage elements (surface water drainage network, attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls) and details of any management company managing the SuDS measures thereafter.

All sustainable drainage measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development hereby permitted are occupied, or in accordance with a timetable to be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority as part of the details submitted for this condition. The sustainable drainage measures shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner. To prevent the increased risk of flooding, improve and protect water quality, habitat and amenity and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system can and is carried out in an appropriate and efficient manner. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006). A pre-commencement condition is required because insufficient information accompanies the application and such measures may need to be incorporated into early building operations.

5. Materials as specified

No development of the approved building above ground level shall take place until a schedule of all external materials including samples of colours and finishes has been submitted and approved in writing under a formal discharge of conditions application. The materials to be used in the approved building shall be in accordance with the approved details, schedule and samples.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

6. Lighting strategy (AONB)

No external lighting or floodlighting shall be installed to the building until a lighting strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include a plan to show the location of any lighting, isolux contour diagram(s), an operation strategy (e.g. details of timed operation), and specifications all lighting to ensure that levels are designed within the limitations of Environmental Lighting Zone 1, as described by the Institute of Lighting Engineers. No external lighting shall be installed to the building except in accordance with the above strategy.

Reason: To conserve the dark night skies of the North Wessex Downs AONB. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-24, and Policies CS17 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

7. Ecological mitigation

The building hereby approved shall not be brought into first use until all ecological measures and enhancement measures have been implemented in accordance with the details contained in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal 194/R1 by Herdwick Ecology dated September 2021 received 20th October 2021.

Reason: To ensure there are no significant impacts on the local designated areas. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

8. Hours of work

No demolition or construction works shall take place outside the following hours, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority: 7:30am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays;

8:30am to 1:00pm Saturdays;

No work shall be carried out at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

9. Landscaping

All soft landscaping works shall be completed in accordance with the approved soft landscaping scheme (Scheme of landscape planting received 16th February 2022) within the first planting season following completion of building operations. Any trees, shrubs, plants or hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme which are removed, die, or become diseased or become seriously damaged within five years of completion of this completion of the approved soft landscaping scheme shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedges of a similar size and species to that originally approved.

Reason: Landscaping is an integral element of achieving high quality design. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and the Quality Design SPD.

10. Construction Method Statement

No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the demolition and construction works shall incorporate and be undertaken in accordance with the approved CMS. The CMS shall include measures for:

- (i) A site set-up plan during the works;
- (j) Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- (k) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (I) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- (m) Wheel washing facilities:
- (n) Measures to control dust, dirt, noise, vibrations, odours, surface water run-off, and pests/vermin during construction;
- (o) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers, and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policies OVS.5, OVS.6 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007). A pre-commencement condition is required because the CMS must be adhered to during all demolition and construction operations.

11. External Storage

No materials, goods, plant, machinery, equipment, storage containers, waste containers or other items of shall be stored, processed, repaired, operated or displayed in the open land on the site.

Reason: To prevent the overdevelopment of the site and to prevent visual harm to the sensitive North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policies OVS.5 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007)

12. Internal Lighting

The building hereby approved shall not be first taken into use until an internal lighting

strategy has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The internal lighting strategy shall include details of matters including the specification of any rooflights and blinds, hours of lighting and measures such as timing switches to be installed within the building with a schedule of how these would be operated. The internal lighting and rooflight details for the building shall be retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.

Reason: To conserve the dark night skies of the North Wessex Downs AONB. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2019-24, and Policies CS17 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Informatives

1. Proactive statement

This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has secured and accepted what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

(The meeting commenced at 18:30 and closed at 22:00)