

Notice of Meeting



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday 10 June 2020 at 6.30pm

Written Submissions

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

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 Jenny Legge on (01635) 503043/ Email: jenny.legge@westberks.gov.uk

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 2 June 2020



Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 10 June 2020
(continued)

To: Councillors Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Jeff Cant, Hilary Cole, Carlyne Culver, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Tony Vickers (Vice-Chairman) and Howard Woollaston

Substitutes: Councillors Jeff Beck, James Cole, David Marsh, Steve Masters, Andy Moore, Erik Pattenden, Garth Simpson and Martha Vickers

Agenda

Part I

Page No.

- (1) **Application No. and Parish: 18/03340/COMIND, Newbury Racecourse, Racecourse Road, Greenham** 5 - 8
- Proposal:** Permanent use of hostel (Use Class Sui Generis) as a hotel (Use Class C1).
- Location:** Newbury Racecourse, Racecourse Road.
- Applicant:** Newbury Racecourse.
- Recommendation:** The Head of Development & Planning be authorised to **GRANT** conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.
- (2) **Application No. and Parish: 19/00225/COMIND, The Lodge at Newbury Racecourse, Racecourse Road, Greenham** 9 - 12
- Proposal:** Erection of a three storey extension to the front elevation of The Lodge to provide additional rooms.
- Location:** The Lodge at Newbury Racecourse, Racecourse Road.
- Applicant:** Newbury Racecourse.
- Recommendation:** The Head of Development & Planning be authorised to **GRANT** conditional planning permission subject to completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 10 June 2020
(continued)

- (3) **Application No. and Parish:** 20/00231/HOUSE, 20 The Green, Chieveley 13 - 16
Proposal: Rear garden extension to replace existing conservatory. Single storey side extension to south-east elevation. Two storey side extension replacing detached garage.

Location: 20 The Green, Chieveley, Newbury.

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Lorraine.

Recommendation: To DELEGATE to the Head of Development and Planning to **GRANT** PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions.

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.

Sarah Clarke
Service Director (Strategy and Governance)

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

Wednesday 10th June 2020

Written Submissions

Item:	1
Application Number:	18/03340/COMIND
Location:	Newbury Racecourse, Racecourse Road, Newbury
Proposal:	Permanent use of hostel (Use Class Sui Generis) as a hotel (Use Class C1)
Applicant:	Newbury Racecourse

Submissions received

Greenham Parish Council	N/A
Adjoining Parish Council Newbury	N/A
Objectors	Raymond Beard
Supporters	N/A
Applicant/ Agent	N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

1. This is an unfair process: after unexplained delay, during which The Lodge's hotel's operation continued without consent, this application is on short and unadvertised notice, notwithstanding strong opposition. This procedure has prevented any review by the affected town and parish councils.
2. It's a major departure from the stated intention of NRC not to build the 123-room hotel on its clearly established and confirmed site: Unless that hotel is to be built as approved between the Grandstand and the Central Area, the existing consents don't apply. It is misconceived for officers to say the limit of 123 bedrooms 'is imposed across the entire planning site', (i.e., the entire racecourse) when the hotel is only permitted on one identified place.
3. There cannot be two hotels without a case to justify that development: With one at The Lodge, the case for retaining permission for a 123-room hotel is lost. Approval would be an unfair green light to extending The Lodge to 123 rooms.
4. NRC's evidence was to avoid high costs of a new hotel, when it could use The Lodge. This proposal is inviting WBC, based on later private representations, to ignore that evidence.
5. It is not for officers, tasked with carrying out instructions as to the terms of a s.106 agreement, to abandon that task and instead spend months in private negotiations about major changes to the conditional approval.
6. It is questionable whether s.106 provides authority to permit such arrangements, there being no legal report to justify them. Alternatively, reliance on it must be after a detailed reopening of the planning history and public engagement.
7. If NRC won't sign a s.106 agreement in the terms presently required, then this application should be refused. If the 123-room hotel is to be retained, then there should not be a hotel at The Lodge. Instead, NRC should seek an extended temporary permission. Alternatively, the consent must require NRC to revert the use of The Lodge to a racing-related hostel upon it building and opening its permitted 123-bed hotel.
8. It is pure fiction for officers to state that The Lodge is a 'valuable amenity', when there has been minimal community support for it. Community members have actively opposed it being used other than a hostel. Planning condition 4 would only serve NRC's purposes, by avoiding having to meet its planning obligations to provide community facilities close to residential Eastern and Central Areas and not just adjacent to the residential Western Area. Further, this proposed condition is akin to a licensing matter, and is not for planning. The Racecourse site, including The Lodge, is already subject to the terms of a full entertainment licence.
9. To permit The Lodge's closure for 'private functions' implies an operation inconsistent with a full-time hotel or community facility. NRC's 'Heart Space' already fully services private and other functions; there is no need for The Lodge to be another such venue.

This page is intentionally left blank

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday 10th June 2020

Written Submissions

Item:	2
Application Number:	19/00225/COMIND
Location:	The Lodge at Newbury Racecourse, Racecourse Road, Newbury
Proposal:	Erection of a three storey extension to the front elevation of The Lodge to provide additional rooms.
Applicant:	Newbury Racecourse

Submissions received

Greenham Parish Council	N/A
Adjoining Parish Council Newbury	N/A
Objectors	Raymond Beard
Supporters	N/A
Applicant/ Agent	N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

1. Once The Lodge is extended to 76 rooms there are no legitimate, properly assessed, and established planning grounds to retain the right to a 123-bed hotel or any other hotel at the Racecourse. It makes no sense to build on the site of the presently permitted 123-hotel, that is, between the Grandstand and the Central area apartments, a hotel with only the remaining 47 bedrooms. Such a second hotel at the Racecourse has never been envisaged.
2. It would be ridiculous, in order to build the 123-bedroom hotel as intended since 2009 between the Grandstand and the Central area apartments, then to leave the extended hotel at The Lodge as a redundant building with no apparent alternative purpose or use, and with no planning consent. A 76-bed hotel building could never revert back to being just a racing related hostel or have any other sensible use.
3. The justified suspicion is that this application is a stalking horse and that there will, if it granted, follow an application to use the Lodge site for an even larger hotel taking up much, if not all, of the original 123 bedroom consent.
4. The history of The Lodge gives support for that happening. First, The Lodge was only to be a hostel. Next, as soon as the adjacent residential dwellings had been built and sold, it opened as a hotel and there followed a 'temporary' planning consent for hotel use on non-racedays. In fact, it was used as a hotel on racedays and also advertised to outsiders for provision of food and drink in its bar and inside and outside dining and drinking areas (i.e., as an unofficial public house). Then, with no regard to the expiry of the temporary consent, there followed the current two linked applications, both with the unequivocal commitment to abandon the 123-hotel. Now it is proposed that not even that should apply.
5. It would be manifestly unfair on the adjacent residents to The Lodge to be left with the real risk of The Lodge being extended to 123 bedrooms, because NRC can rely on the terms of the s.106 agreement to avoid arguments that such a proposal should start entirely afresh with a full sequential assessment to justify a later further enlargement.
7. Under existing permissions the permitted 123-bedroom hotel should have been built before the houses and apartments in the Eastern Area. There's been no application to explain that non-compliance; instead, NRC appears to be disregarding its planning obligations and the interests of the racecourse community to pursue its own commercial interests.
8. Short notice has prevented any review by the affected town and parish councils.

This page is intentionally left blank

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday 10th June 2020

Written Submissions

Item:	3
Application Number:	20/00231/HOUSE
Location:	20 The Green, Chieveley, Newbury
Proposal:	Rear garden extension to replace existing conservatory. Single storey side extension to south-east elevation. Two storey side extension replacing detached garage.
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Lorraine

Submissions received

Chieveley Parish Council	N/A
Objectors	N/A
Supporters	N/A
Applicant/ Agent	Roger Scully

This page is intentionally left blank

The following statement is in **support** of application **20/00231/House**. It has been prepared by Absolute Architecture on behalf of the applicant.

The design presented to the committee has been updated during the application process in response to officers and consultees concerns.

The planning officer has already set out to the committee the basis upon which, under current local and national planning policy this application is being recommended for **approval**.

We therefore address directly the concerns raised by the consultees, which are the reasons this application has been brought before you.

Bulk & linear design:

The design is in keeping, ridge heights are subservient to the host dwelling and building lines are set back. Neighbour and applicant amenity is unaffected. The design meets with design guidance.

The design is not linear. It is designed to appear as a separate mass (the garage) with a subservient link to the main house. This creates character, definition and reduces bulk. The proposals will be well screened from the end of the close and from the wider AONB.

We note that other two storey side extensions of linear design that close gaps have been approved within The Green development.

AONB impact, views in and out:

There are no public views through the application site following the growth of natural vegetation. The impact on the AONB is negligible as the proposals replace an existing structure of similar size and character. The site is well screened from surrounding public rights of way. No views will be lost as a result of closing a gap between the existing garage and house as none currently exist.

Neighbour's issues:

The proposals are sympathetic in character to the host dwelling and surroundings.

The proposal maintains the existing 3m gap between No20 & No21. The mass of the extension moves away from No21. Views from the new first floor windows are angled away from the garden of No21 and will have views of the southwest corner of No21's garden only and these will be through existing mature boundary vegetation. Note, this view already prevails in the existing building. The impact on the amenity on No21 is negligible.

There is no loss of views to the surrounding AONB which No21 currently enjoys. Only a negligible view directly into No20's garden and beyond which they are not entitled too and has no bearing in planning policy.

If the committee have concerns over the development creating a separate dwelling on this site then they can impose a condition to restrict this, as is common and typical to restrict new development within the countryside.

Conclusion:

Your officer and planning professional has recommended this application for approval and along with this statement will have set out the reasons why this application should be granted.

It is our contention that there are no significant or reasonable grounds to refuse this application. The Committee should therefore be aware that the applicant will appeal the decision and seek costs should this application be refused.

This page is intentionally left blank