

# 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, 24 APRIL 2024

**Councillors Present:** Patrick Clark (Chairman), Clive Hooker (Vice-Chairman), Antony Amirtharaj, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Carolyne Culver (Substitute) (In place of Adrian Abbs), Paul Dick (Substitute) (In place of Howard Woollaston), Billy Drummond (Substitute) (In place of Tony Vickers) and Denise Gaines (Substitute) (In place of Nigel Foot)

**Also Present:** Sharon Armour (Principal Lawyer - Planning & Governance), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Jessica Bailiss (Democratic Services Officer), Thomas Radbourne (Apprentice Democratic Services Officer), Bob Dray (Development Manager), Emily Ashton-Jelley (Environment Delivery) and Paul Bacchus (Principal Engineer)

**Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:** Councillor Adrian Abbs, Councillor Nigel Foot, Councillor Tony Vickers and Councillor Howard Woollaston

#### PART I

##### 1. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2023 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Minutes from the meetings held on 21<sup>st</sup> February and 20<sup>th</sup> March 2024 would be brought to the next meeting in May 2024.

##### 2. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Denise Gaines and Billy Drummond declared that they had been lobbied on agenda item 4(1) by one of the Ward Members regarding the application.

Councillors Dennis Benneyworth, Parick Clark, Paul Dick, Clive Hooker and Antony Amirtharaj declared that they had been contacted by individuals both for and against the application for agenda item 4(1).

Councillor Antony Amirtharaj referred to a document that had been posted to him by the applicant regarding the site and queried if it was publicly available. Mr Bob Dray confirmed that it was not part of the applicant documents and therefore should be disregarded.

Councillor Phil Barnet declared a personal interest in agenda item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was also a Member of Newbury Town Council and its Planning Committee, where the application had been discussed, along with Greenham Parish Council. Furthermore, he had lived in Andover Road 50 years ago and had been a governor at Park House School for almost 30 years. Councillor Barnett declared that he was also a patient at Falkland Surgery. Councillor Barnett stated that he would weigh up all the evidence placed before the Committee and would vote accordingly.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES

Councillor Carlyne Culver declared that she had also been lobbied on the item however, would form her decision based on the paperwork, site visit and discussion that took place at that evening's Committee meeting.

### 3. Schedule of Planning Applications

#### (1) Application No. and Parish: 23/01585/OUTMAJ - Sandlesford Park West, New Warren Farm, Warren Road, Newbury

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 23/01585/OUTMAJ in respect of an outline application for the phased delivery of up to 360 dwellings; demolition of Warren House and other buildings; widening of Warren Road to provide access through to Andover Road to the west; emergency access via Kendrick Road; provision of open space; drainage, walking, cycling, green and other associated infrastructure, including 40% affordable housing provision. All matters to be reserved, except access into the site for vehicles, pedestrians and cycles along the Warren Road corridor.
2. Niko Grigoropoulos 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 conditions and the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement (or refuse outline planning permission if the S106 Legal Agreement was not completed).
3. The update report provided detail on additional consultation responses and an amended version of condition 14.
4. The Chairman asked Paul Goddard, Highways Officer, if he had any observations relating to the application and Mr Goddard took the Committee through the highways matters set out in the report in detail (page 52). In conclusion, Highways Officers supported the overall conclusion reached by the Council's appointed transport consultants, to raise no objection.
5. It was proposed and seconded by a Member of the Committee that standing orders be suspended to enable a representative from Newbury Town Council to speak on the application, as a request had not been received until after the deadline. At the vote the proposal was carried.
6. It was proposed and seconded by a Members of the Committee that standing orders be suspended to increase the permitted speaker time to ten minutes. At the vote the motion was carried.
7. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Roger Hunneman, Town Council representative, Mr Tony Hammond, objector, Mr Christopher Tricky (on behalf of Fr. Zbigniew Budyn), supporter, Mr Tim Burden, Mr Chris Long, Mr Giuseppe Zanre and Mr Mark Norgate, agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

#### Town Council Representation

8. Mr Roger Hunneman addressed the Committee and his full representation can be viewed here: <https://youtu.be/nzzSCihcWsl?t=5667>

#### Member Questions to the Town Council

9. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:

## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES**

- Regarding where the Town Council would like to see air monitoring take place, it was stated that preferably this would be in the vicinity of Park House School. This was where the majority of the receptors would be.
- Regarding the situation outside of the school during drop and pick up times, it was clarified that all collection and drop offs of pupils occurred outside of the school on the road. Park House School had a considerable catchment area and there were often several buses parked up in laybys, which added to the general state of confusion.
- Although an alternative access for the site had been discussed numerous times by the Town Council, this was a matter that was outside the scope of a Town Council. A scheme was referred to that could join the Swan Pub roundabout with Wash Water, which could also access the development in question. It was felt that this could solve almost all of the problems relating to highways. The Town Council was disappointed that this scheme had never been seriously considered.
- The Town Council did not have access to traffic modelling however, did have contact with local residents who had communicated concerns and dislike for the proposed access. There was disappointment that the site visit had not been conducted when roads were more active.

Councillor Clive Hooker commented that Members had been sympathetic regarding timings of the site visit. The Chairman further commented that Members had arrived at 11am with the view of being able to spend as much time as possible at the site and listen to comments raised by Officers, residents and other representatives. The point about the congestion was noted and as Ward Member, Councillor Clark stated that he was aware that it was a chaotic location at rush hour.

### **Objector Representation**

10. Mr Tony Hammond, Chair of the 'Say No To Sandleford' Group addressed the Committee and his full representation can be viewed here: <https://youtu.be/nzzSCihcWsl?t=6180>

### **Member Questions to the Objector**

11. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
- In response to whether there was satisfaction with the housing mix proposed as part of the development, the overdevelopment of the south of Newbury was considered to be the main issue. The 800 homes proposed as part of Sandleford east should be deemed sufficient as an expectation for the community to absorb at the current time. The question of whether the outline permission was suitable was more relevant to Sandleford east, where an application had been approved.

### **Supporter Representation**

12. Mr Christopher Trickey on behalf of Fr. Zbigniew Budyn addressed the Committee and his full representation can be viewed here: <https://youtu.be/nzzSCihcWsl?t=6923>

### **Member Questions to the Supporter**

13. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
- Regarding comments about the reduction in the provision of the footway on Warren Road to one side only, at the point where pedestrian and vehicle movements were greatest and whether this would be an impediment to support for the application in its current form, the church were in support of the proposal

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES

however, had reservations in particular about road narrowing on Warren Road at the point in question.

### Applicant/Agent Representation

14. Mr Tim Burden (Planning Director) and Mr Chris Long (Partner, Ridge and Partners LLP) addressed the Committee and their full representation can be viewed here: <https://youtu.be/nzzSCihcWsl?t=7197> (Mr Giuseppe Zanre (Planning Director, Donnington New Homes) and Mr Mark Norgate, (Managing Director, Donnington New Homes) were also present to answer questions.

### Member Questions to the Applicant/Agent

15. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:

- Regarding when it was thought development on the site would commence and when the first cars from the site would be seen on the road, comments were provided on the position currently and the future if it was assumed planning permission was granted. The S106 was envisaged to be signed by the end of June 2024, with a decision notice being issued soon after. There would be a phased development and there would be a series of reserved matter submissions from autumn 2024 to spring of 2025. A show opening was envisaged around late summer/autumn of 2025. The build process would then follow with the first year delivering about 30 units, building up to 60 units per year. It was expected that the development would be completed in spring/summer of 2032.
- Regarding when road works would commence, there were a series of conditions that would need to be discharged with Officers. Once these had been discharged work could start on Warren Road. A sacrificial road would need to be placed on the site to enable access for construction vehicles. Warren Road was a detailed application.
- It was envisaged that there would be three future reserved matters applications at phases, moving around the site in a clockwise direction. There would be pre-application consultation on each of these applications with Officers and the local community.
- There would be three phases, with three reserved matters applications dealing with these phases, covering all aspects within each phase including affordable housing, landscaping, highway construction and SuDs. Every part of each element of a phase would be built in accordance with conditions that would be discharged with Officers.
- Regarding affordable housing and assurance that these this be pepper potted around the site and not identifiable as affordable homes, it was confirmed that the appropriate controls on this would be included in the S106 legal agreement. Regarding the external appearance of the homes, this was referred to as '10 year blind' and affordable homes would be of the same palette of materials and design quality as other homes on the site and this was also controlled through the S106.
- Regarding the mix of housing on the site and the reason for 30/35 percent one bedroom and only 20/25 percent three bedrooms, it was stated that an indicative mix had needed to be used based on the Local Authority's (LA's) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and district wide evidence. Developers were encouraged not to vary from this.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES

### Ward Member Representation

16. Councillor David Marsh addressed the Committee and his full representation can be viewed here <https://youtu.be/nzzSCihcWsl?list=PL6cepKKElwnf6MlJUKMsvcMDjCOR8wr3&t=8278>.

### Member Questions to the Ward Member

17. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
- Regarding the impact on schools, particularly the catchment areas, Councillor Marsh stated that he was the Chair of Governors at one of the local primary schools and numbers on roll were falling meaning there would be an increasing amount of capacity. Bloor Homes were also building a new school next to the Rugby Club. Highwood Copse had also been built at a time when there had been no demand for it however, would be able to take some of the children from the east of the site. Although he was against the application, he did not feel the impact on catchments was going to be a major problem.
  - Councillor Marsh confirmed that all the schools he had referred to were primary schools. In terms of secondary provision, Park House was due to expand however, St Bartholomew's School, which was the other secondary in the area, was at maximum capacity. It was felt that secondary provision could be more of an issue.

*(the meeting was temporarily adjourned for a comfort break from 9pm until 9.05pm)*

### Member Questions to Officers

18. Members asked questions of the Officers and were given the following responses:
- Regarding concern raised about a response not having been received from Thames Water in relation to the application and if Officers were content existing sewage works were not already under too much pressure, it was reported that Thames Water were governed by separate legislation in that they were required to provide the necessary connections outside of the planning process. Thames Water's engagement with planning was normally through strategic policies. Thames Water had not made any comments in relation to the recent Local Plan Review. It was clarified that fundamentally Thames Water had not objected on the grounds of insufficient infrastructure because they had the obligation to provide the connection. Thames Water would sometimes raise objection if it was felt improvements were required to infrastructure. In the case of the application in question there were conditions recommended regarding a phasing and infrastructure plan and therefore Officers were content that these matters were adequately covered.
  - In addition, there was a condition that required a strategy to be submitted for foul water drainage, which would need to be approved by Thames Water prior to development. This would ensure that only a set number of houses could be developed until there was sufficient capacity in the system. This was the same condition as that used for the Bloor Homes appeal.
  - Regarding the cumulative impact on drainage and flooding from all sites in the area, it was confirmed that the site would not be connected to the Thames Water sewers. Surface water would be discharged south to the woodland area.
  - It was confirmed that all the developments in the area had used the same traffic model including the Bewley Homes development in Wash Water and the impact from all developments had been considered together with Sandleford.

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES

- It was confirmed that the laybys would be retained when the dual cycleway/footpath was created along Warren Road.
- Regarding traffic modelling, it was confirmed that the table under section 13.34 of the report, which provided projected travel generation, was only for the current proposal for 360 dwellings and did not include further development outside of the site.
- It was clarified that the trip rates set out in the table under section 13.34 were those that had been agreed per dwelling across the whole of Sandlesford Park.
- It was confirmed that if traffic was increased on the network, traffic queues did not automatically increase in uniform. Regarding traffic queue projections and that it could be seen that traffic queues were projected to worsen with mitigations (e.g. line three of the table under section 13.38 of the report), it was confirmed that there had been a trade off at this particular junction three years ago when the traffic modelling was completed. The southbound figure (from the roundabout next to Sainsbury's) by 2031 had predicted continuous queues three kilometres long. The A343/A339 mitigations scheme broke this queue up and dramatically reduced the south and westbound figures however, in turn this had increased the northbound figure. The view had been taken that although there would be an increase in traffic northbound, it would resolve the issues in other directions and therefore the balance had been in favour. Many of the figures had been approved as part of the Bloor Homes applications.
- It was reaffirmed that there had been 'trade offs' at certain locations however, on balance Highways Officers felt that the mitigations proposed as part of the Bloor Homes application to deal with Sandlesford Park, were favourable.
- It was confirmed that the toucan crossing to the north of Warren Road had been accounted for in traffic modelling. Traffic modelling suggested it would not have an overall impact. The further crossing proposed near the mini roundabouts had not been modelled at the current stage and further work was required.
- Regarding SuDS and how this would be looked at independently for each of the three sites, it was confirmed that this was a complex process however, there were conditions included to ensure the construction process was managed appropriately. The phasing of SuDS design and development was a matter for the developer to justify in accordance with conditions to prevent any increase in flood risk.
- In response to concern raised about the drainage of water from the northern side of the site, it was confirmed that the developer had divided the site into different catchments and each catchment area had discharge rates and attenuation systems to ensure flow was not increased.
- In response to whether church traffic had been included in traffic modelling it was confirmed that churches were not expected to have a large impact during weekday peak travel periods. Regarding the access to the church along Warren Road, Officers had considered pedestrians walking to and from the church and the pathway was shown including a dropped kerb.
- Regarding a possible legal challenge concerning the footpath along Warren Road, referred to by the Ward Member, the understanding was that this matter would be covered under separate legislation, rather than a direct result of the planning application. The Public Rights of Way Officer had made detailed comments (page

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES

29 of the report) and their view was that at present pedestrians were entitled to use the whole eight metre width extent and this right would remain.

- Assurance was sought that the provision of open space and green infrastructure would be carried out in accordance with any future permissions and it was confirmed that landscaping would be dealt with under reserved matters. Parameter plans had provided reassurance and a reserved matters application would provide detail about the location of dwellings and which trees would be lost. It had been shown through indicative plans that trees would be replaced and further trees would be provided. Councillor Dennis Benneyworth referred to previous experience and voiced the importance of this matter.
- Clarification was sought regarding the quality of the ivy on the north side of Warren Road and it was confirmed that these would be pre-grown panels around 20cm wide. These would need maintenance and would provide greenery throughout the year. Maintenance would be carried out by the LA as it was currently.
- Regarding whether affordable housing units would be distributed and pepper potted throughout the site in clusters of five to 12 dwellings, it was confirmed that this would be the case as set out in the Heads of Terms in the S106 Agreement (page 119).
- It was confirmed that there were no proposals for allotments but there was a proposal for a community orchard. Councillor Billy Drummond expressed his disappointment as he felt that there were health benefits associated to allotments, particularly since Covid.
- Regarding the monitoring of air quality, it was noted that in one of the presentations it had been stated that no air quality monitoring had been undertaken however, it was confirmed that the LA had an extensive air monitoring network across the district, in line with air quality management duties. There was a continuous monitoring unit at the A339/A343/Greenham Road Burger King Roundabout. There were also 36 non automatic sites across the district for nitrogen dioxide, two of these were close to the development including one on the Andover Road outside Park House School and the other on Monks Lane. There was monitoring data available from 2015 showing the concentration of nitrogen dioxide at both locations and this had been used as part of the air quality assessment for the site. It was possible that other new monitoring sites could be added to the existing network.
- To identify changes in air quality before and after the development was constructed, if approved, this could be included in work already undertaken by Environmental Health and it was confirmed that provision for this could be included in discussions as part of the S106 Agreement.
- Regarding whether the emergency access to the site was adequate and whether a response had been received from the Fire Service on this, it was confirmed that a response had been received a day prior to the Committee. The Fire Service did not normally respond on planning applications at the building regulations stage however, no particular concerns had been indicated. Assurance had been provided by the applicant that sufficient width would be provided.
- It was confirmed that Highways Officers always sought an emergency access for any development over 100 dwellings. The purpose of an emergency access was to ensure there was still access to a site if the main access point was obstructed

## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES**

for any reason. The emergency access provided another route into the site that blue light vehicles could use.

The Chairman referred to the earlier point raised about air quality and stressed that the options for future monitoring of air quality needed to be considered carefully, given the location of the site next to a school and the likeliness of increased idling traffic.

- It was confirmed that there was a land ownership matter on Warren Road, which led to road narrowing and a speeding restriction. Without this matter, road narrowing would still be requested by Officers in order to slow traffic on what was a straight section of road. No other speeding measures were proposed on the stretch of road in question however, multiple measures would be required across Sandleford Park as a whole. Officers' were seeking to avoid speed cushions and bumps that had to be maintained and caused annoyance for residents in close proximity. Natural traffic calming would be preferable with narrowing where required. The whole of the site would be designed as a 20mph zone.
- It was confirmed that there were no plans to impose restrictions such as double yellow lines on the Andover Road. The standard approach was to assess the situation once the site was built and apply further restrictions at this stage if necessary. Any further waiting restrictions would also be subject to a separate consultation process with the community carried out by the LA.

### **Continuation of meeting**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution point 7.13.5, the Committee supported the Chairman's motion that the remaining business could be concluded by 10.30pm, and therefore continued with Agenda Item 4(1).

- The Integrated Care Board (ICB) had responded regarding the contribution for healthcare. The contribution amount of £311k had been initially requested through a generic letter however, the ICB had subsequently reviewed the development and withdrawn the initial letter. A new letter had been issued stating £187k would be required for healthcare provision. This also took account of the amount that would be contributed from Bloor Homes. The applicant had agreed with the figure and it had therefore been included in the Heads of Terms.
- Regarding what renewables were planned for the development and if they were compatible with what had been conditioned for Sandleford East, it was confirmed by Officers that this was covered in condition eight on page 29 of the report, which required that renewables provided needed to be at least the same as that to be provided by Bloor Homes. There was also an additional Heads of Terms for the S106 recommended, to ensure compliance with policy CS16, which required zero carbon emissions. This would also require an updated energy statement to be submitted by the applicant. A scheme for renewables and zero and low carbon generation on the site would need to be submitted as part of each reserved matters application.
- Regarding how the ICB had submitted a new calculation when the housing mix was not yet known, it was confirmed that the ICB had reassessed the amount based on what they had submitted originally for the expansion of Falkland Surgery, which had been considered as part of the appeal by Bloor Homes for Sandleford East. The amount to be contributed by Bloor Homes and the number of houses proposed for the site under consideration had been taken into account when producing the revised figure. The money would not only go towards the expansion of Falkland Surgery but also any other local family healthcare facilities.



## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES**

- In terms of adequate education provision, the Education Service had not sought mitigation but had stated it might be required in the future. If mitigation was required, the Education Service had stated that there were options available that would require agreement. The Education Service had concluded that the costs associated with any mitigation required in the future for primary education could be met by CIL. It was highlighted however, that there was not a concern currently about the level of primary provision. The Education Service was keen for the development to make the necessary contribution towards secondary education for schemes, including the expansion of Park House School.
- In response to a further question about the level of contribution for healthcare, it was explained that when the proposal for Sandleford East had gone to appeal, the health sector had submitted a request for the expansion of Falkland Surgery. If there was to be a contribution towards infrastructure, it had to be relevant to planning, relevant to the scheme and had to be reasonable and proportionate. The officer confirmed he was content the figures were adequate. When questioned on the matter, the ICB had indicated that if further contributions were required for primary healthcare in the area these would be considered through CIL or other means.
- It was confirmed that there would not be a continuous cycleway from the site to Newbury Town Centre however, there were other routes that cyclists could take through the Bloor Homes site, along Monks Lane and down Newtown Road. A cycle way along the Andover road had been explored however, it was not wide enough.

### **Debate**

19. Councillor Phil Barnett reflected and commented on the history of the site, and the countryside and wildlife as a Wash Commoner. He acknowledged that sometimes progress had to be accepted. He welcomed the opportunity to see another mix of housing in a development and affordable units proposed, which was a good benefit. Councillor Barnett expressed he was however, deeply concerned about the access at Warren Road. He could not foresee this improving the quality of life of many people in the surrounding area. He reflected on concerns raised about air quality and the number of vehicles that already accumulated on the surrounding roads, which he felt would be exacerbated by the development. He acknowledged the traffic modelling presented however, those who lived in the area witnessed the issues faced on a daily basis where traffic continuously increased and built up to a point where it did not move. This caused a lot of frustration. He raised concern that residents would lose their gardens and about the hedge that bordered the side of Park House School that would be replaced by insufficient ivy grating, which he could not accept. Councillor Barnett commented that he would prefer to see a site proposed with a proper access and therefore would support a recommendation to refuse planning permission.
20. Councillor Amirtharaj did not agree that south Newbury was taking the impact of new houses in the area given the major developments in the north of Newbury where he was a Ward Member and therefore understood the impact on residents. To put the development in the area in context, 1600 homes was the equivalent of building another Wash Common, adjacent to Wash Common. In his view residents were understandably concerned. There had not been an alternative access proposed to Warren Road, which was a narrow stretch of road. Regarding education and healthcare, Councillor Amirtharaj felt that the subsidiary impact was often not considered and this needed to be taken into consideration. He did not feel that he had received a convincing answer that existing Wash Common residents would not

## **WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES**

be adversely affected in terms of their access to healthcare and education. For these reasons Councillor Amirtharaj agreed with Councillor Barnett's view and proposed that planning permission be refused.

21. Councillor Paul Dick acknowledged the need for housing in the area and the need for social housing locally. He commented that the people that needed the homes, who were needed in order to grow the town socially and commercially were not at the Committee and he therefore wished to express a view on their behalf. Councillor Dick stated he was in support of the application. Councillor Dick reported that he had lived and worked in Thatcham for 30 years and commented on the Kennet Heath Development which had benefitted the school, roads and healthcare in the area. The benefit was incremental due to the time required to build a large development. Professionals had assessed the proposal and were content and Councillor Dick stated he put his faith in the view they had taken.
22. Councillor Clive Hooker reminded the Committee that the site in question was a designated strategic site that had been brought forward from the previous Local Plan in 2012. It had been voted on and approved by Full Council to be put forward for development and the Committee was required to address the outline planning conditions. He had listened to concerns expressed and had sympathy with those who found themselves on the periphery of a large scale development. Councillor Hooker commented however, that the answers provided by the officers had satisfied his concerns therefore he felt it was an application that should go forward and would receive his support for approval.
23. Councillor Hooker reminded the Committee that the Council needed to almost build one house per day as part of the Local Plan and this was why sites such as the one under consideration had been identified. Brownfield sites were not plentiful. Councillor Hooker felt the proposal was a good option.
24. Councillor Amirtharaj felt that the Committee needed to note and consider the trade-offs mentioned in relation to numbers and traffic modelling for the current application. If these were accepted at the outline stage it was likely further trade-offs could come forward as part of subsequent reserved matters applications. He stressed the risk of accepting trade-offs at the current stage to satisfy a strategic plan. In Councillor Amirtharaj's view, the Committee should rely on numbers but these should be based on best case scenarios and not trade-offs, which he was not willing to accept.
25. Councillor Carolyn Culver stated she was minded to object to the proposal as she had a lot of concerns about traffic. Councillor Culver was concerned about the pressure on the roads from building two large developments at the same time, including from construction traffic. The construction of a large site in her own Ward was currently causing a lot of problems due to the heavy vehicles. Councillor Culver expressed her concern about air pollution and stated her view would likely be different if the secondary school was not in such close proximity to the junction, where many people already dropped off and picked up pupils. Councillor Culver felt it was an overdevelopment of the area. It was acknowledged the site had been included as part of the previous Local Plan however, this was prior other developments in the area being approved. The development would place undue pressure on the area. Councillor Culver was concerned about the lack of infrastructure, particularly in relation to the school that was no longer proposed and was concerned about the impact on primary healthcare locally. Councillor Culver also voiced concern about pressure on catchment areas in relation to children who already lived in the area and the risk that they might not get into Falkland or Park House Schools due to those from the new site taking priority due to living closer to

## WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES

the schools. This would place further pressure on the home to school transport budget that was already the third highest pressure within the Council's budget. Councillor Culver understood each application had to be judged on its merit however, the cumulative impact also needed to be considered in terms of the effect on the Council's budget.

26. The Chairman clarified that there were two other primary schools close by with a third suggested as part of the Bloor Homes development.
27. Councillor Denise Gaines commented on those who would wish to live in the houses proposed as part of the development, who wanted to come to the area and work, in turn contributing to the economy. If housing was not provided then the town would struggle in the future. Housing was required to attract people to the area to improve economic viability. As Portfolio Holder for Housing, Councillor Gaines commented on the importance of affordable housing and the numbers waiting for homes and in temporary accommodation currently, which was not an ideal situation in 2024. To have an application dismissed due to not wanting further homes in Newbury was difficult to accept. Councillor Gaines stated her wish to defer the application to District Planning Committee if the Committee were minded to reject it.
28. Councillor Dennis Benneyworth expressed that he supported the views raised by Councillor Gaines on affordable housing. His primary concerns had been satisfied by the responses provided by Mr Goddard. It was acknowledged that it was an adopted site and therefore justified reasons would be required to go against the Officer recommendation and Councillor Benneyworth stated he did not feel there were any.
29. Councillor Amirtharaj stated that he wished to propose that the Officer recommendation be refused on the basis that issues with the access road had not been resolved and secondly due to there being insufficient infrastructure, particularly in relation to primary education and there being no mitigations in place for this. Councillor Amirtharaj commented on the adverse impact of this on existing families in the area. Mr Dray clarified that pupil numbers at primary level were currently down. There might be mitigation required in the future however, currently numbers were at a level that could be dealt with via CIL.
30. Mr Dray clarified the two reasons for refusal as the unsuitability of Warren Road and secondly primary education provision. Councillor Amirtharaj referred to point 23.6 of the report, which stated there would be a negative impact on existing families in relation to primary education, which he was not willing to accept. Councillor Amirtharaj was also not convinced that the proposed contribution of £187k for healthcare would be adequate in constraining the pressure on the NHS.
31. Mr Dray noted the further reason for refusal based on insufficient healthcare infrastructure. He stated that should planning permission be refused, it was recommended that two further reasons relating to the S106 Agreement were included.
32. Councillor Culver seconded the proposal to reject the Officer's recommendation to approve planning permission by Councillor Amirtharaj and at the vote the motion was not carried.
33. Councillor Hooker proposed to accept the Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report and update report. This was seconded by Councillor Gaines.
34. Mr Dray clarified the recommendation in the report along with the conditions, Heads of Terms and refusal reason if the S106 was not completed. Mr Dray clarified that there was also an amendment to the wording of condition 14 as per the update

**WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24 APRIL 2024 - MINUTES**

report, as well as, an additional Head of Terms for the Section 106 Legal Agreement (13), regarding energy efficiency.

- 35. Councillor Culver noted that it had been mentioned that Thames Water would need to sign off the foul water strategy and asked for this to be added to conditions. Mr Grigoropoulos confirmed that Thames Water sign off of this matter was included within existing conditions. Councillor Culver queried if it would be possible to index link money that went to Berkshire Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) in the same way as it was for healthcare. It was confirmed by Officers that this could be done.
- 36. Councillor Hooker and Councillor Gaines confirmed that they were happy to accept the suggested amendment to the proposal.
- 37. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Hooker, seconded by Councillor Gaines, 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 set out in the report and update reports with the addition that any contribution to BBOWT be index linked. Or refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in the report in the event that the S106 Legal Agreement was not completed.

**Conditions**

14.	<p><b>Warren Road Access construction (amended)</b>                  With the exception of any necessary early works associated with Advanced Planting, Archaeology and/or Land Contamination, no demolition, excavation, laying of foundations and/or building works, associated with the part of the development hereby approved within the confines of the New Warren Farm part of the application site (i.e. not including the Warren Road corridor), shall commence until the detailed works hereby approved along the Warren Road Corridor have been implemented to base course in relation to the roadway and to wearing course in relation to the cycleway / footways. The works along the Warren Road Corridor shall be completed in accordance with approved drawing number 5011406_RDG_C0003C and phasing plan(s) approved pursuant to condition.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, In the interest of road safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).</p>
-----	--

**Heads of Terms (HoTs) for Section 106 Legal Agreement**

13.	<p><b>Energy efficiency (Additional)</b>                  Obligation to deliver a development which complies with Policy CS15 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 in accordance with an updated Outline Energy Statement.</p>
-----	---

*(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 10.29 am)*

**CHAIRMAN** .....

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