Public Document Pack

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 21 MAY 2025

Councillors Present: Phil Barnett (Chairman), Clive Hooker (Vice-Chairman), Antony Amirtharaj, Dennis Benneyworth, Carolyne Culver, Paul Dick, Nigel Foot, Denise Gaines and Tony Vickers

Also Present: Michael Butler (Principal Planning Officer), Sam Chiverton (Zoom Host), Gareth Dowding (Principal Engineer – Traffic and Road Safety) Hannah Hutchison (Legal Adviser), Debra Inston (Team manager – Development Management) Isabel Oettinger (Planning Officer), Thomas Radbourne (Clerk)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Adrian Abbs and Councillor Howard Woollaston

PARTI

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 April 2025 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Tony Vickers declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1), by virtue of the fact that he was the Vice Chairman of the North Wessex Downs National Landscape. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Nigel Foot declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that he was the West Berkshire Heritage Champion. As his interest was personal and not prejudicial or a disclosable pecuniary interest, he determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Foot declared that he had been lobbied via letter on Agenda Item 4(2).

3. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) 25/00233/HOUSE - Trapps Hill Cottage, Trapps Hill, Inkpen, Hungerford

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 25/00233/HOUSE Inkpen in respect of demolition of existing rear extensions, garage and home office. New two storey rear extension and single storey side extension with new open porch. New garage with store over. New landscaping work. Trapps Hill Cottage, Trapps Hill, Inkpen, Hungerford

 Ms Isabel Oettinger 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.

2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Ms Sian Griffiths, agent, and Mr Tony Vickers, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.

Agent Representation

3. Ms Griffiths addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here: Western Area Planning Committee - Recording

Member Questions to the Applicant/Agent

- 4. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - The applicant wished to retain the character of the cottage, which would be lost if it was demolished.
 - The applicant had agreed to a planning condition, which required an ongoing recording program for approval by Officers.

Ward Member Representation

5. Councillor Vickers addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

Western Area Planning Committee - Recording

Member Questions to the Ward Member

6. Members did not have any questions of clarification.

Member Questions to Officers

- 7. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Officers were satisfied with the application and the heritage statement and noted that the applicant would retain as much as possible of the original frontage.
 - Officers stated that no objections were received.
 - Officers indicated that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Team would verify
 if the development would result in a net increase of more than 100 square metres
 in floor space. A CIL charge would be levied if the floor space increase more than
 100 square metres. Any exemption would be dealt with after the Committee
 decision had been issued.
 - Officers would investigate the CIL statement, and would clarify that in future reports, as other exemptions could apply.

Debate

- 8. Councillor Paul Dick opened the debate by stating that he was content with the recommendation of Officers and was in favour of it, and he praised the quality of the report.
- 9. Councill Denise Gaines noted that the frontage of the development would not be changed and was disappointed that the catslide roof would be removed but indicated that it was not part of the original design. She was in favour of Officer recommendations.
- 10. Councillor Tony Vickers considered that the current cottage was not suitable for modern habitation, and an extension would enable it to be habitable. He noted the balanced nature of the application but was supportive of the application.

- 11. Councillor Anthony Amirtharaj agreed with the statements made by Councillor Dick and Councillor Vickers and supported the application.
- 12. Councillor Dennis Benneyworth considered that villages needed to improve over time and felt that the development was planned sympathetically and would keep a notable amount of the original design and was in favour of the application.
- 13. Councillor 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 Dick.
- 14. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Vickers, seconded by Councillor Dick 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 listed in the main report and update report.

(2) 24/01999/FUL - Mount Pleasant Farm, Enborne

- 1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 24/01999/FUL in respect of change of use of land to gypsy and traveller site 1 pitch. Mount Pleasant Farm, Enborne.
- 2. Mr Michael Butler 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 Tony Vickers, Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.

Ward Member Representation

4. Councillor Tony Vickers addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

Western Area Planning Committee - Recording

Member Questions to the Ward Member

5. Members did not have any questions of clarification.

Member Questions to Officers

- 6. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - Officers advised that whilst it was not an ideal site from a sustainability point of view, it was possible given the location of the site to walk and cycle to local facilities with shops less than one mile away.
 - Officers indicated that as the development was outside settlement boundary, a residential development would have been recommended for refusal, however DM1 of the local plan review identified traveller sites as an exception, therefore Officers recommended approval.

- Officers drew attention to condition 5, which restricted occupation of the site to gypsies and travellers as defined by the planning policy for travellers' sites December 2024.
- Officers highlighted conditions 6,9,10 which related to highway conditions, which were the parking, the EV, and the provision of gates.
- Officers considered that whether a development was isolated was a matter of professional interpretation of the physical characteristics of an area and the policies that applied.
- Officers noted that there was a presumption in favour of development on previously developed land. In terms of the core strategy, new development could be more readily permitted if it was a brownfield site, however, because it was greenfield that did not apply.
- Officers highlighted that if permission was granted, it was recommended that a condition be included that removed permitted development rights for fencing. If the applicant wished to erect any fencing, they would be required to submit a planning application.
- Officers stated that condition 11 for hard landscaping and boundary treatments in the application was still to be discussed with the applicant in terms of details and what was appropriate for that condition discharge.
- Officers considered that it was not specific government policy and best practice, but if an application came forward and the applicant did not specifically need a day room, there were no legal or policy requirements which required one to be built. A day room was not permitted development, and a request for planning permission would be needed and would be considered on its merits at the time.
- Officers noted that on the first application in 2022 there was a day room on the application, which had been removed from the current application. Officers believed this made the application more acceptable as there was less built form on the site.
- Officers were satisfied that although there was a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on the site, having the condition of the woodland management plan was effectively satisfactory ecological enhancement of the area, because if the permission was not granted then there would be no requirement on the applicant to manage that woodland in an effective way.

Debate

- 7. Councillor Tony Vickers opened the debate by noting the concerns of local residents and the quantity of similar applications in Enborne. He did not want applications to be retrospective and believed that this had been a significant problem experienced among residents in the area with this type of application. He believed that what had been proposed would impose proper conditions on the built form, removal of poor buildings on site, and make it more acceptable in totality. He was supportive of the application.
- 8. Councillor Anthony Amirtharaj highlighted the objections of the Parish Council and residents but believed that the comments were judgemental and believed it would be prudent to accept Officer's recommendation as it would add one more traveller pitch to the site.

- 9. Councillor Paul Dick indicated that on balance he was minded to approve the application.
- 10. Councillor Vickers noted that the site was not connected to utilities and felt that it should be highlighted that it was not a planning matter that sites must be connected to electricity and foul drainage.
- 11. Officers clarified that there was electric power on-site.
- 12. 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 Paul Dick.
- 13. Officers noted that the Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) condition was more related to surface water, rather than foul water. Officers could condition details of the package treatment plant for foul water proposed by the applicant.
- 14. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Tony Vickers, seconded by Councillor Paul Dick 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 listed in the main report and update report.

4. 24/02080/FUL - Hungerford Park

15. The Planning Application (Agenda Item 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 24/02080/FUL in respect of Part retrospective external alterations to barns, Hungerford Park, was withdrawn from consideration before the meeting.

CHAIRMAN	
Date of Signature	

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 7.51 pm)

