

Notice of Meeting



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

Western Area Planning Committee Wednesday 31st October 2018 at 6.30 pm in the Council Chamber Council Offices Market Street Newbury

Members Interests

Note: If you consider you may have an interest in any Planning Application included on this agenda then please seek early advice from the appropriate officers.

Further information for members of the public

Note: The Council broadcasts some of its meetings on the internet, known as webcasting. If this meeting is webcasted, please note that any speakers addressing this meeting could be filmed. If you are speaking at a meeting and do not wish to be filmed, please notify the Chairman before the meeting takes place. Please note however that you will be audio-recorded. **Those taking part in Public Speaking are reminded that speakers in each representation category are grouped and each group will have a maximum of 5 minutes to present its case.**

Plans relating to the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting can be viewed in the Council Chamber, Market Street, Newbury between 5.30pm and 6.30pm on the day of the meeting. No new information may be produced to Committee on the night (this does not prevent applicants or objectors raising new points verbally). If objectors or applicants wish to introduce new additional material they must provide such material to planning officers at least 5 clear working days before the meeting (in line with the Local Authorities (Access to Meetings and Documents) (Period of Notice) (England) Order 2002).

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact the Planning Team on (01635) 519148

Email: planapps@westberks.gov.uk

Further information, Planning Applications and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at www.westberks.gov.uk

Any queries relating to the Committee should be directed to Rachel Craggs on (01635) 519441 Email: rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 23 October 2018



WestBerkshire
C O U N C I L

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 31 October 2018
(continued)

To: Councillors Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Paul Bryant (Vice-Chairman), Hilary Cole, James Cole, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Paul Hower, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson and Virginia von Celsing

Substitutes: Councillors Jeremy Bartlett, Jeanette Clifford, Mike Johnston and Gordon Lundie

Agenda

Part I

Page No.

(1) **Application No. and Parish: 18/01657/COND1 - Cold Ash Parish Council**

5 - 6

Proposal:	Approval of details reserved by Condition 4 - External Materials Schedule and samples, 7 - Construction Method Statement, 8 - Surfacing for driveways/access points, 10 - Vehicle parking and turning, 11 - Access details, 12 - Cycle storage, 13 - Refuse storage and 15 - Boundary hedge, of planning permission reference 16/02529/OUTD.
Location:	Land adjacent to Summerfield, the Ridge, Cold Ash
Applicant:	T A Fisher and Sons Limited.
Recommendation:	The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to GRANT a split decision conditions discharge.

(2) **Application No. and Parish: 18/01914/HOUSE - Hampstead Norreys Parish Council**

7 - 10

Proposal:	Two storey side extension
Location:	Cherry Hinton, Newbury Hill, Hampstead Norreys
Applicant:	Mr Lee Clarke
Recommendation:	The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to GRANT planning permission.

(3) **Application No. and Parish: 18/02019/COMIND - Newbury Town Council**

11 - 12

Proposal:	Extension and alteration of existing cottage to create hotel restaurant with outdoor seating terrace, condenser unit to side and roof-mounted extract
Location:	Newbury Manor Hotel, London Road, Newbury, Berkshire RG14 2BY
Applicant:	SCP Newbury Manor Ltd
Recommendation:	The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to GRANT planning permission.

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 31 October 2018
(continued)

Background Papers

- (a) The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
- (b) The West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire, the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire and relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents.
- (c) Any previous planning applications for the site, together with correspondence and report(s) on those applications.
- (d) The case file for the current application comprising plans, application forms, correspondence and case officer's notes.
- (e) The Human Rights Act.

Andy Day
Head of Strategic Support

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.

This page is intentionally left blank

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 31ST OCTOBER 2018

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 18/01657/COND1 **Page No.** 19 - 23
Site: Land adjacent to Summerfield, The Ridge, Cold Ash

Planning Officer Presenting: Derek Carnegie

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Mr Bernard Clark

Objector(s) speaking: Mr Simon Vanstone

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mr Rory Baxter
Ms Kirsten Gray

Ward Member(s): Councillor Garth Simpson

Update Information:

Corrections to the report and drawing numbers:

3. Consultations and Representations

Highways: Conditions 7 (Construction Method Statement – amended), 8 (Surfacing), 10 (Vehicle Parking and Turning), 11 (Access Details) acceptable. Details relating to Condition 12 (cycle storage) not acceptable as indicative garaging not approved.

Waste Management: Condition 13 (Refuse Storage) acceptable

Tree Officer Condition 15 (southern boundary hedge amended drawing (11 C) acceptable (ash replaced with field maple)

One additional letter of Representation relating to condition details.

5. Consideration of the application.

Condition 7 - Construction Method Statement

- Correction Condition 7- Construction Method Statement- June 2018 Rev A (13th August 2018)(received by e-mail dated 17th August 2018)

Condition 8 - Surfacing for driveways/access points

Condition 10 - Vehicle parking and turning

- Correction Condition 8 and Condition 10 - Drawing 2018/0023 12 Rev C (received by e-mail dated 20th September 2018)

Condition 13 - Refuse storage

Correction Details are provided on drawings 2018/0023 08, 09, 10 and 12C

Condition 15 - Boundary hedge

Details shown on drawing 2018/0023 11 rev C received by e-mail dated 17 August 2018.

Recommendation remains unchanged:

Split Decision

Details pursuant to Conditions 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 15 of Planning Permission 16/02529/OUTD can be discharged subject to full implementation in accordance with the details submitted and wording of each condition. Note the detached garages shown on the submitted plans are not approved as part of the outline consent nor the subject of the refused application seeking approval of reserved matters (18/01977).

Details pursuant to Condition 4 - Materials and Condition 12 - Cycle Storage are refused as this relies on details either not yet agreed as part of the reserved matters application or not approved at the outline stage.

DC

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 31ST OCTOBER 2018

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (2) **Application No:** 18/01914/HOUSE **Page No.** 25-31
Site: Cherry Hinton, Newbury Hill, Hampstead Norreys

Planning Officer Presenting: Derek Carnegie

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Councillor David Barlow - Chair

Objector(s) speaking: Ms Theresa Fleetwood

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mr Lee Clark

Ward Member(s): Councillor Virginia von Celsing

The case officer wishes to update her recommendation following receipt of the Planning Inspectorate's decision hereby attached. The proposal is not considered to overcome the concerns raised by the planning inspector and hence the recommendation is now to refuse planning permission on the grounds stated in the Appeal decision.

DC

This page is intentionally left blank

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2018

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/18/3209672

Cherry Hinton, Newbury Hill, Hampstead Norreys, Thatcham, Berks, RG18 0TR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Lee Clark against the decision of West Berkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00861/HOUSE, dated 20 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension at rear and two storey extension at side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. Cherry Hinton is a modern two storey detached house with an attached flat roofed garage and utility room. It is in the village of Hampstead Norreys, in the Conservation Area, an area characterised by traditional red brick buildings.
4. Relevant policies in this case include CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, adopted 2012 (the Core Strategy). These require new development to be of a high quality of design which, among other things, makes a positive contribution to the quality of life and is appropriate in terms of location and scale in the context of the existing settlement form.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *House Extensions* 2004 (the SPG) offers advice on the effect of extensions on neighbours in terms of sunlight, overshadowing and outlook in the context of site characteristics such as variance in ground levels.
6. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, updated in July 2018, (the Framework) insofar as it encourages well designed and healthy places.
7. At the time of my visit, building works were in progress and the main external structure of the single storey rear extension appeared to be substantially complete. I consider that this is acceptable in that it is relatively modest and has no adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

8. The proposed side extension would involve the replacement of the existing garage with a two storey element with a pitched roof and small rear gabled dormer window. It would project forward of the front elevation with a front gable reflecting that of a similar gable at the west end of the house and be set slightly back from the main rear elevation. The proposal would be sympathetic in design and materials to those of the existing house and appropriate in the conservation area and, in this respect, would be acceptable.
9. I consider that the size and location of the side extension would have an adverse impact on the outlook from 1 Church Street to the east. The only private amenity space of the latter is a small rear courtyard garden. This is separated from Cherry Hinton by a high brick boundary wall. The relationship between the two is such that the solid brick and render flank wall and gable of the new structure would be very close to the common boundary and would appear overbearing in the outlook from Cherry Hinton. It would reduce some of the afternoon sunlight reaching both the courtyard and the house itself. The impact would be exacerbated by the difference in ground levels between the two, since No. 1 is at a noticeably lower level than Cherry Hinton.
10. There would be a more limited effect on the outlook from 2 Church Street. This is further from Cherry Hinton and has a larger rear garden, separated from No. 1 and Cherry Hinton by a high brick wall. The side extension would appear as a dominant feature in views from the garden, resulting in some increase in a sense of enclosure compared to the open sky view between Cherry Hinton and Flint House to the north. It would not be readily visible from the house itself, other than at an oblique angle from a first floor window and due to its location to the southeast of Cherry Hinton, there would be no loss of sunlight.
11. I consider that the impact on the living conditions of the occupant of No.2 would not be sufficient, on its own, to warrant dismissing the appeal, though it adds weight to my finding regarding the impact on No. 1.
12. I do not consider that there would be any significant loss of privacy for the occupants of either 1 or 2 Church Street. They are already overlooked by large first floor windows in Cherry Hinton. If the proposal were acceptable in other respects, the proposed small dormer window serving the en suite could be permanently glazed in obscure glass and fixed shut, by means of an appropriate condition attached to a planning permission.
13. Cherry Hinton is relatively modest in size and I appreciate the appellants' wish to improve the family accommodation. However, while it may be possible to extend the property to meet their requirements, I am not persuaded that this proposal is the solution to the particular limitations arising from the close proximity of the extension to the boundary with 1 Church Street and the lower ground level and small size of the latter and its rear courtyard.
14. I conclude that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, contrary to Core Strategy policies CS14 and CS19 and the SPG.
15. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 31ST OCTOBER 2018

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (3) **Application No:** 18/02019/COMIND **Page No.** 33 - 62

Site: Newbury Manor Hotel, London Road, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 2BY

Planning Officer Presenting: Matthew Shepherd

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: Mr Peter Harvey-Di Gioia
Mr Edward Sharp

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mr Gavin Cooper

Ward Member(s): Councillor Jeff Beck
Councillor Dave Goff

Update Information:

The Case Officer wishes to update his recommendation.

The Environment Agency have not responded to the Council's consultation and therefore the recommendation on the application must change to reflect a resolution to approve the application subject to no objections from the Environment Agency. The Case Officer is satisfied this is safe to do so given that the Environment Agency did not raise objection subject to conditions to the previous application 17/03237/COMIND and no objections subject to conditions to previous similar application 16/02902/FUL. The same condition has been recommended in this report. It is anticipated the Environment Agency's response will be received before the 13 week date of determination.

Following the site visit, the agent of the application confirms that the Copper Beech that was identified next to tree T34 will be retained as it falls within the 2.5 metre landscaping strip along the boundary with Two Rivers Way. The trees on that boundary have never been surveyed because they do not fall into the survey criteria as required under BS5837.

The agent added that the floor space referred to in both Transport Statements are actually both incorrect. The attached plans show a floor area of 514.6 sqm. This area is broken up as follows:-

Ground Floor	471.2 sqm
First Floor	43.4 sqm
TOTAL	514.6 sqm

Plant Enclosure 13.1 sqm

The minor error in the floor areas does not change any of the conclusions in the TA.

DC