

DRAFT

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

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 18 MARCH 2026

Councillors Present: Clive Hooker (Vice-Chairman), Adrian Abbs, Antony Amirtharaj, Paul Dick, Denise Gaines, Tony Vickers and Howard Woollaston

Also Present: Matthew Shepherd, Harriet Allen, Thomas Radbourne, Debra Inston, Kate Thomas, Darius Zarazel

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Phil Barnett, Councillor Nigel Foot and Councillor Martin Colston

PART I

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2026 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2025 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2. Declarations of Interest

Prior to the meeting, Councillor Nigel Foot declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was involved in developing the application as Executive Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Sport. As his interest was prejudicial, he determined to send apologies for the meeting and would take no part in the debate or vote on the matter. He indicated that he would attend the meeting only to address the Committee in his capacity as Ward Member and to answer questions.

Councillor Billy Drummond and Denise Gaines declared that they had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1).

Councillor Tony Vickers declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was a member of the Newbury Town Council's Planning and Highways Committee, which had considered this application, although, he had not been present when the item was considered. As his interest was personal and not a prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

3. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) 25/02139/REG3 Faraday Road Football Ground Faraday Road Newbury RG14 2AD

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 25/02139/REG3 in respect of erection of floodlighting, Faraday Road Football Ground, Faraday Road, Newbury, RG14 2AD.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 18 MARCH 2026 - MINUTES

2. Mr Matthew Shepherd (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 Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.
3. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Vaughan Miller, Town Council representative, Mr Alan Pearce and Ms Paula Saunderson objectors, Mr Danny Langford and Mr Lee McDougall, supporters, Mr Jon Winstanley, applicant, and Councillor Nigel Foot, Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.

Parish/Town Council Representation

4. Mr Miller addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Western Area Planning Committee – Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Parish/Town Council

5. Members did not have any questions of clarification.

Objector Representation

6. Mr Pearce and Ms Saunderson addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Western Area Planning Committee – Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Objector

7. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Ms Saunderson confirmed her view that the application should not be determined as it had not been properly validated according to national and local checklists.
 - Ms Saunderson's objection was based on the process and document inaccuracies, not the principle of the floodlights.
 - Mr Pearce confirmed the letter of 6 March 2026 stated that the application had been amended to be solely for the erection of floodlights, removing the elements that had been subject to objection.

Supporter Representation

8. Mr Langford and Mr McDougall addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Western Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Supporter

9. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - To the best of his knowledge, Mr McDougal confirmed that the proposed positions of the floodlights and power connections were the same as those that were previously removed.
 - With careful management, the pitch could be used for training two of three evenings a week in addition to weekend matches.

Applicant/Agent Representation

10. Mr Winstanley addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 18 MARCH 2026 - MINUTES

[Western Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Applicant

11. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
- 'FL-11' was the floodlight model name and was not related to the height, which was 15 metres.

Ward Member Representation

12. Councillor Foot addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Western Area Planning Committee – Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Ward Member

13. Members did not have any questions of clarification.

Member Questions to Officers

14. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
- While the submitted plan's scale did not match the guidance in the local validation list, this was not a legislative requirement. Citing Article 7(1)(c) of the Town and Country Planning Development Management Procedure Order (DMPO) 2015, officers advised that the plan was sufficient to identify the location and validate the application. Regarding the red line, officers cited case law (Wyatt v Fareham 2021) to confirm that access does not need to be included where no operational development is occurring on it. Officers concluded there were no material technical errors.
 - The cabling works would be considered 'de minimis' and would not require planning permission, so did not need to be included in the red line.
 - Planning Officers and the Legal Team were satisfied that the location plan complied with legislative requirements.
 - 'Reg 3' was an internal suffix used to identify an application submitted by the Council.
 - Blue lines were not determinative, and their omission of some adjoining land owned by the applicant was not a reason to invalidate an application.

Debate

15. Councillor Adrian Abbs opened the debate by supporting the improvement of the football ground. He noted the floodlights, and the power cables were a modern replacement for what was there previously. He could not find a reason to object to the proposal on planning grounds and was minded to approve the application.
16. Councillor Paul Dick expressed his support for the application, noting the importance of the clarified community use. He stated he was happy to propose the officer's recommendation.
17. Councillor Tony Vickers noted the issues with drainage on the site and supported the application as a step of progress in the long saga of the football ground. He expressed regret that the 3G pitch was not included but understood the difficulties. He stated he was happy to second a motion to approve.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 18 MARCH 2026 - MINUTES

18. Councillor Howard Woollaston expressed disappointment that a more comprehensive masterplan approach had not been taken but acknowledged that based on the application before the Committee, he could see no reason for rejection.
19. Councillor Abbs queried whether the letter mentioned by the objector could be added to the portal. Officers clarified that the letter was a standard notification of an amendment and that the applicant's formal request to amend the scheme was already publicly available on the website.
20. Councillor Paul Dick 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 Tony Vickers.
21. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Dick, seconded by Councillor Vickers to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

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

(2) 25/00572/FUL 1 Bartholomew Street, Newbury, RG14 5LL

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 25/00572/FUL in respect of Installation of extract fan system to rear elevation, 1 Bartholomew Street, Newbury, RG14 5LL.
2. Ms Harriet Allen (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 Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.
3. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Giorgio Marcello, objector, Mr Mehmet Erturk, applicant, addressed the Committee on this application.

Objector Representation

4. Mr Marcello addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:
[Western Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Objector

5. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - When asked if Mr. Marcello currently experienced noise or smells from the premises and if he had ever recorded them with the Council, Mr. Marcello confirmed he sometimes did, but he had not officially reported them.

Applicant/Agent Representation

6. Mr Erturk addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:
[Western Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Applicant

7. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Mr. Erturk confirmed he would have the system maintained regularly, as it was essential for his business. He stated that the system would be serviced every

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 18 MARCH 2026 - MINUTES

three to six months and he could provide invoices to prove this. He believed it would be an overall improvement for his staff and customers.

- The café was currently open from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm and closed on Wednesdays. The hours may extend to 8:00 pm in the summer but there were no plans for late-night opening.
- The purpose of the new system was to move the smoke and smells from inside the café to the outside, as the internal system was not working effectively.

Member Questions to Officers

8. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
9. Regarding a question on whether the flue was high enough to prevent odours from wafting back down and effecting neighbours. Officers confirmed that the impact at the proposed height had been assessed by the Environmental Health Officer and deemed acceptable with the proposed high-grade filtration system. Officers noted there were no specific height regulations for such flues as there were for wood burners
10. Officers explained that while a long-term monitoring condition would be unreasonable, if a resident experienced unacceptable levels of noise or odour, they could report it to the Environmental Health team. If the equipment was found to be faulty or in breach of a condition, it would become an enforcement matter.
11. Regarding a question on if the Council had received many complaints about noise or smells from residents living above other town-centre establishments. Officers stated that without the Environmental Health Officer present, they did not have that data, however, officers were aware that some complaints had been made.
12. The application was for permanent approval, and no application would be required to remove it.
13. Officers confirmed that the application had a post-installation survey condition, not a long-term monitoring condition.
14. The Environmental Health Officer had assessed the proposal at the specified height and concluded it would not cause unacceptable harm. The Committee had to assess the application as submitted and rely on the Environmental Health Officer's expert advice in the absence of contrary technical evidence.
15. Officers suggested a condition could be added for a management and monitoring programme. Following clarification from Councillor Adrian Abbs that he sought a one-off test rather than regular monitoring, officers agreed that Condition 6 could be expanded to require a verification report, including the results of initial commissioning tests, with the final wording delegated to officers.

Debate

16. Councillor Tony Vickers opened the debate, stating that it was important to get such applications right for the future of the town centre, which would likely see more mixed-use developments. He felt the discussion had led to an acceptable conclusion with the proposed additional conditions. While acknowledging the objector's life might not be improved, he questioned if it was reasonable to refuse the application for what might be a slight increase in discomfort.
17. Councillor Antony Amirtharaj was struck by the fact the applicant was seeking to improve the current conditions for the health and safety of staff and customers, as

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 18 MARCH 2026 - MINUTES

well as for his business. He sympathised with the objector's concerns but felt that, on balance, the proposal was acceptable, noting that noise and odours are often part of living in a town centre.

- 18. Councillor Adrian Abbs believed it was positive for Newbury and noted the balance between supporting a local business and protecting residents. He advised the objector that the Environmental Protection Act 1990 provided a powerful tool (statutory nuisance) should the system prove to be a problem. He urged the applicant to ensure the measures were as effective as possible. While he disliked the flue's proximity to the window and its potential visual impact, he was pleased that conditions would be added for testing and was likely to support the application.
- 19. In response to a point raised in the debate, officers confirmed that the application specified the flue would have a black finish.
- 20. Councillor Paul Dick stated his concerns had been for the local residents and felt that the amended wording for the conditions, as suggested by officers, would make the proposal more acceptable.
- 21. Councillor Adrian Abbs 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 Antony Amirtharaj
- 22. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Adrian Abbs, seconded by Councillor Antony Amirtharaj to grant planning permission. At the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Development Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

- An amendment to Condition 2 to include the existing site plan drawing 1500 EX01 received 12 March 2025.
- An amendment to Condition 6 to require that the post-installation survey report includes the results of commissioning tests to verify the system is working correctly, with the final wording to be delegated to officers in consultation with the Environmental Health Officer.
- An additional condition restricting the hours of operation of the extraction system to between 8:00 am and 8:00 pm daily.

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

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature