

DRAFT

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

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 1 JULY 2026

Councillors Present: Alan Macro (Chairman), Richard Somner (Vice-Chairman), Jeremy Cottam, Paul Kander, Ross Mackinnon, Geoff Mayes, Justin Pemberton and Clive Taylor, Christopher Read.

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Nick Carter

PART I

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 April 2026 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the inclusion of the following amendment:

- Councillor Clive Taylor was not present at the meeting.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2026 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

3. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) 26/00662/MINMAJ Padworth IWMF, Padworth Lane, Lower Padworth

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 26/00662/MINMAJ in respect of 26/00662/MINMAJ | Section 73: Variation of condition 7 'Hours of operation (HWRC)' of previously approved application 14/01111/MINMAJ: Section 73A: Variation of Condition 16 - Travel Plan, of planning permission reference 13/01546/MINMAJ// Section 73: Variation of condition 4-Hours of operation, of approved application 17/01683/MINMAJ | Veolia Environmental Services Padworth IWMF Padworth Lane Lower Padworth Reading RG7 4JF.
2. Mr Alistair Buckley (Senior Minerals and Waste 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. The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard (Team Leader – Highways Development Control) if he had any observations relating to the application. Mr Goddard indicated that the proposal would result in a maximum of two additional vehicles in and out

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1 JULY 2026 - MINUTES

during the extended hours. From a highway's perspective, this was considered very little additional vehicle movement, and therefore no objection was raised.

Member Questions to Officers

4. Members asked questions of clarification and were given the following responses:
 - The limit was for two vehicles per day in and out.
 - The proposal would increase the current operating hours by four, as the site currently opened at 06:00 and closed at 20:00.
 - The extended hours would only be for operational vehicles requiring repair.

Debate

5. Councillor Richard Somner opened the debate by stating that the application felt very straightforward. He noted the importance of the site to the district and believed the extension of hours was a suitable measure to ensure the facility could maintain its own vehicles on-site, which he fully supported. He considered the number of vehicles involved to be modest and believed that it would be appropriate for vehicles to travel to this site from Basingstoke for maintenance purposes.
6. Councillor Jeremy Cottam viewed the application as simple and one that would improve the service to the public by ensuring vehicles could be repaired promptly.
7. Councillor Cottam 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 Somner.
8. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Jeremy Cottam, seconded by Councillor Richard Somner 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 in the main report and update report.

4. 26/00711/OUT Land to the east of Hippo Pools, Upper Basildon.

9. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 26/00711/OUT in respect of outline application for the erection of 2 self build detached dwellings with associated access. Matters to be agreed - access and layout. Land to the east of Hippo Pools, Upper Basildon.
10. Mr Michael Butler (Principal 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 conditional planning permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.
11. The Chairman asked Mr Paul Goddard (Team Leader – Highways Development Control) if he had any observations relating to the application. He made the following observations:
 - The proposal for two large dwellings would be expected to generate approximately 12 additional vehicle movements per day (six in and six out).
 - The access was via a private drive approximately 60m long, which had opportunities for vehicles to pass.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1 JULY 2026 - MINUTES

- The access onto the public highway was wide and the sight lines met national standards.
- The two additional houses and traffic generation would not have a noticeable impact on the general highway network.
- Highways Officers had no objection to the application.

12. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Ms Trish Kilgour, Parish Council representative, Mr Robin Fountain, objector, Ms Kerry Pflieger, agent, and Councillor Laura Coyle, Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.

Parish/Town Council Representation

13. Ms Kilgour addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Eastern Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Parish/Town Council

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

- Regarding the consultation process for the 2022 settlement boundary change, the Parish Council at the time had not commented. Ms Kilgour acknowledged that was an unfortunate oversight.

Objector Representation

15. Mr Fountain addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Eastern Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Objector

16. Members had no questions of clarification.

Agent Representation

17. Ms Pflieger addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Eastern Area Planning Committee - Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Agent

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

- The gap in the boundary trees was visible from the footpath.
- Since her involvement, the proposal had always been for two dwellings, and she could not comment on any prior discussions.

Ward Member Representation

19. Councillor Coyle addressed the Committee. The full representation can be viewed here:

[Eastern Area Planning Committee – Recording](#)

Member Questions to the Ward Member

20. Members had no questions of clarification.

Member Questions to Officers

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

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1 JULY 2026 - MINUTES

- Officers confirmed that all statutory publicity requirements had been met, including a site notice and letters to 20 occupants. An additional 18 invitations to the committee meeting had been sent to 18 separate objectors.
- Members must assess the application before them on the site as it currently exists. As the Tree Officer had not formally objected to the proposals themselves, albeit opposing the removal of trees that had already taken place, a recommendation for approval was made taking account of the planning balance. Officers added that a landowner had the right to remove unprotected trees.
- Officers did not believe that any Rights of Way would be encroached upon.
- Regarding a question on the report's language that Policy SP1 overruled other policies, Officers accepted the language was strong and this it was a matter of the weight applied to competing policies.
- Officers believed that with appropriate landscaping conditions, the visual harm to the National Landscape would not be so significant as to merit refusal.
- "No backland development" was a historic policy consideration that no longer applied. Officers explained that while "infill" had no formal definition that applies within settlement boundaries, policy required consideration of the pattern of development, and that density was a key element of an area's character.
- Officers advised that the addition of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was a separate process to planning conditions, but the Parish Council could make representations to the Tree Officer.
- The access drive was single-track but could accommodate the modest increase in traffic.
- Officers confirmed the North Wessex Downs National Landscape board would not typically comment on an application of this scale within a settlement boundary, but have published advice to which officers had regard.
- The Waste service had not objected to the refuse collection arrangements, as the 60m carry distance to the highway was acceptable.

Debate

22. Councillor Jeremy Cottam opened the debate by stating that while he sympathised with residents, he felt the officers had a strong case for approval under planning law. He considered the visual impact on the landscape to be the only potential reason for refusal but was not convinced it carried sufficient weight. He wanted to listen to the views held by Members.
23. Councillor Ross Mackinnon stated that he sympathised with residents but could see little in the objections that would justify a refusal. He felt the application was within policy and supported appropriate development in villages.
24. Councillor Justin Pemberton stated that while the principle of development was accepted, he remained concerned about the loss of trees. He argued that Policy SP1 did not override other policies concerning trees and landscape (SP10, DM15). He gave weight to the Tree Officer's expert opinion that the felling was contrary to policy and that a different layout could have retained an A-grade tree. He felt this concern had been downplayed and was not convinced the proposed layout was the least harmful way to develop the site.
25. Councillor Chris Read considered the proposed garden sizes to be reasonable in the context of the wider area. While he regretted the tree loss, he felt this was a matter for

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 1 JULY 2026 - MINUTES

the reserved matters stage and could not see a policy reason to object to the outline application.

26. Councillor Richard Somner acknowledged residents' concerns but noted that loss of a view was not a planning consideration and that the settlement boundary line was definitive. He was frustrated by the pre-emptive tree felling but recognised it was not unlawful. He suggested the best approach was to approve the application but with strengthened conditions regarding landscaping and preventing any site work until all conditions were satisfied. On balance, he felt the application should be approved.
27. Councillor Paul Kander agreed with the points made by Councillor Somner. He shared the concerns over the trees but felt this could be addressed through strong landscaping conditions. He noted positive elements of the proposal, such as the removal of permitted development rights and the two-storey height restriction. He could see no reason within the Committee's remit to refuse the application.
28. Councillor Clive Taylor stated that he agreed with much of what Councillor Pemberton had said. He was concerned about the tree felling, the lack of a response from Thames Water, and the general impact on the National Landscape. He felt a single house may have been acceptable and, on balance, believed the application should be refused due to loss of amenity and landscape impact.
29. Councillor Somner was supportive of approving the application if there was strengthening of the language of Condition One. Following advice from the officer, the amended recommendation would require that details of appearance, landscaping, and scale be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development, including site clearance and any preparatory works, takes place.
30. Councillor Richard Somner proposed to accept Officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the main report and update report, amending Condition One to require that details of appearance, landscaping, and scale be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development, including site clearance and any preparatory works, takes place. This was seconded by Councillor Paul Kander
31. The Chairman invited Members of the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Richard Somner, seconded by Councillor Paul Kander 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 conditions listed in the main report and update report, amending Condition One to require that details of appearance, landscaping, and scale be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development, including site clearance and any preparatory works, takes place.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8:20pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature

This page is intentionally left blank