

Notice of Meeting



Marit

Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

Western Area Planning Committee Wednesday 22 July 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 14 July 2020



WestBerkshire
C O U N C I L

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 22 July 2020
(continued)

To: Councillors Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Jeff Cant, Hilary Cole, Carolyn 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: 20/01083/FUL, Quill Cottage, Craven Road, Inkpen | 5 - 8 |
| | Proposal: Replacement dwelling. | |
| | Location: Quill Cottage, Craven Road, Inkpen, Hungerford, RG17 9DX. | |
| | Applicant: Mr and Mrs Jones. | |
| | Recommendation: To delegate to the Head of Development and Planning to REFUSE planning permission. | |
| (2) | Application No. and Parish: 20/00540/FUL, Trabbs Farm, Seven Barrows, Lambourn | 9 - 16 |
| | Proposal: General purpose agricultural storage building to allow storage of grain; other agricultural products; and farm machinery. | |
| | Location: Trabbs Farm, Seven Barrows, Lambourn. | |
| | Applicant: E F Walters Ltd. | |
| | Recommendation: To DELEGATE to the Head of Development and Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions. | |



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 22 July 2020
(continued)

- (3) **Application No. and Parish:** 20/00612/FULD, Riverbend, Upper Eddington, Hungerford 17 - 24
- Proposal:** Section 73A variation of condition (2) plans of approved 18/02374/FULD – demolition of 2-bed dwelling house and erection of new 3-bed dwelling house.
- Location:** Riverbend, Upper Eddington, Hungerford, RG17 0HH.
- Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Denny.
- Recommendation:** The Head of Development & Planning be authorised to GRANT planning permission.

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 22nd July 2020

Written Submissions

Item:	(1)
Application Number:	20/01083/FUL
Location:	Quill Cottage, Craven Road, Inkpen
Proposal:	Replacement dwelling
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Jones

Submissions received

Inkpen Parish Council	None
Adjoining Parish Council	N/A
Objectors	None
Supporters	None
Applicant/ Agent	Ashley Jones – Applicant

This page is intentionally left blank

Quill Cottage – Applicant submission for committee

Our ambition is straightforward. We wish to create a better home for our family by replacing an unattractive 4 bedroom bungalow with an attractive and sustainable, 4 bedroom home of high quality design and construction.

We would like to address the WAPC agenda report, with the hope that our application, which is widely supported by neighbours and local residents, receives a fair hearing at committee.

1. Height

This is a two storey dwelling with reduced eaves and bedrooms pushed into the loft space. There is no scope, as in WAPC agenda, 1.1, to provide further accommodation in the loft. As the officer rightly identifies, the available loft height is a maximum of 1.6m at the ridge.

The proposed property will be 30cm higher and not 1.7m higher than the telegraph pole, as suggested by the officer in WAPC site photographs page 12. This photo is misleading due to perspective. Neighbouring dwelling The Glenn is circa 2.5m higher than the proposed dwelling. Relative building heights are demonstrated, to scale, on drawing 062A

2. Size

WAPC agenda, 1.6 details existing GIA as the sum total of individual room areas. By RICS definition GIA includes internal structures. As measured on CAD, existing GIA is 178sqm, not 165sqm.

WAPC agenda, 6.8 provides an analysis of the scale of the existing and proposed dwellings. The figures are based on part of the existing bungalow. As the officer notes: *It is important to note that the measurements of the existing dwelling are based on what is visible from the public domain, the current bungalow is staggered rather than flush as the proposed dwelling is, this is to assess the size in terms of visual impact:*

We strongly object to this as a method of analysis and believe that it is fundamentally misleading to committee. Policy C7 does not differentiate between parts of the dwelling. There are large parts of the proposed dwelling that would not be visible from the public domain, yet this is not accounted for.

The D&A statement provides a true comparison:

Footprint: existing 197.5sqm, proposed 180.6sqm, decrease 8.5%

GIA: existing 178sqm, proposed 287sqm, increase 61.2%

Frontage: existing 22.23sqm, proposed 15.19sqm, decrease 31.6%

3. Quality

WAPC agenda, concludes that dormers are inappropriate 6.27, and that the proposed materials are alien to the street scene 6.29.

We disagree, and propose that the designs meet with the predominant characteristics outlined in the Inkpen Village Design statement p15:

- i The majority of houses are two storey and constructed of red brick
- ii Some roofs are thatched but more generally roofs are tile or slate at 45 degree pitch set low on the external walls
- iii The first floor ceiling is often in the roof space with dormer windows
- iv Windows are generally side hung timber casements

Notwithstanding this, we would accept a condition requiring final approval of external materials.

4. Landscape

WAPC agenda, 6.26 objects to the brick landscape wall within the site. We will omit this from the application if conditional to approval.

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday 22nd July 2020

Written Submissions

Item:	(2)
Application Number:	20/00540/FUL
Location:	Trabbs Farm, Seven Barrows, Lambourn
Proposal:	General purpose agricultural storage building to allow storage of grain; other agricultural products; and farm machinery
Applicant:	E F Walters Ltd

Submissions received

Parish Council	Lambourn Parish Council
Adjoining Parish Council	N/A
Objectors	Precis of the comments received objecting to the application. Representations received from Nick Lawrence, Sue and Mike Lawrence, Robert Hall and Nicky Henderson
Supporters	None
Applicant/ Agent	Roger Prescott - Bourne Valley Associates Ltd - Agent

This page is intentionally left blank

Written submission from Lambourn Parish Council, regarding **20/00540/FUL – Trabbs Farm, Seven Barrows, Lambourn –General purpose agricultural storage building to allow storage of grain; other agricultural products, and farm machinery.**

Lambourn Parish Council objects to this application.

Lambourn Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

1. It will have an intrusive and unnecessary visual impact on the AONB. The proposed construction is large and not well-related to the other buildings on the site. Since one existing barn is being removed, it could be built close to the older buildings and not in such a visible position.
2. The site is at risk of flooding, particularly from ground water.
3. The increase in heavy traffic on the narrow road.

This page is intentionally left blank

Precis of comments of objection to Trabbs Farm

There is much local ill-feeling and opposition to this development which would result in a permanent blot on the landscape. The new building would be highly visible from the road and surrounding vistas and is to be used as a commercial storage building for items from over 20 miles away. It brings no benefit or employment to the local area and the applicant does not even live locally. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that this development could act as a springboard for further unnecessary development. This development is inappropriate given the open character of the area and we question whether the AONB Management Plan for West Berkshire has been applied in this case. It is not acceptable for the new building to be set away from the existing farmstead, which blends well into the landscape, and insufficient justification for the need for such a large building has been provided within the document supporting the application. The existing hedging will do nothing to screen the new building. This is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and it is incomprehensible that a large commercial building be allowed to be built in the middle of it.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that “great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty”. Is this being followed?

If the development is to be built, albeit a much smaller version, there must be a condition that no grain dryer is installed at a later date. A large number of racehorses are trained in the immediate area and a grain dryer would have a hugely detrimental effect on the air quality of the three racing stables nearby.

Lambourn is known as the Valley of the Racehorse and the racehorse industry is the largest employer. The vehicle movements stated appear to be a gross underestimate and there is significant concern over road safety if this development were allowed. The narrow roads of Lambourn are not suited to HGV traffic and additional vehicle movements would cause congestion. Moreover, the surrounding roads are regularly used by children, riders, staff of the racing yards and valuable horses and the lane is too narrow for a truck and car to pass. Large grain lorries would be a significant hazard for those that currently use this lane in relative safety. These large vehicles would also bring noise pollution.

The development sits next to a road that floods during heavy rain and opposite a field that floods due to local springs. The French drains and soakaways proposed will not work due to the water table being so close to ground level. The local residents have experienced this flooding themselves and the Council have a duty of care when considering this matter.

The local residents firmly object to this development which will bring noise and traffic pollution, road safety issues and which would be extremely unsightly and inappropriate development. Please protect this area of outstanding natural beauty.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for letting us make a representation to committee.

The comments I now make seek to avoid repetition of the case officer's report. However, I would reiterate the point that the store is necessary for our client's farm business as a whole, to serve other land parcels as well as that at Trabbs Farm. Moreover, without a store at Trabbs Farm, the land could not function in farming terms. As the officer has stated, it is not practical to utilise any of the existing buildings on the farm.

This application closely follows the advice received from the Council as part of the pre-application process, which was fundamental in ensuring the best location on the site was promoted, and guided design and materials.

We are only too aware of the national importance of the landscape character of the area. So much so that we suggested that the council's external landscape adviser should be consulted. We have liaised with her through the case officer to make appropriate modifications and designed a scheme that, as the report states, *"it is considered that the proposed design and planting scheme would ensure this new agricultural building would sit comfortably within the landscape"*.

Our client is very keen to ensure that the building and the future operations on the farm do not damage the visual amenity of his neighbours. He therefore met the occupants of the nearest properties to both North and South prior to the application being submitted. At that time, neither expressed any concerns. In the light of subsequent concerns being expressed, Mr Walters met the occupants of Trabbs Farmhouse to discuss the proposals, and the plans before the committee, dated 6th July 2020, reflect modifications made as a result of the discussions.

In short, this is an essential farm building for good husbandry of the land, to allow for food production. Its location close to the road both allows efficient farm operations and respects the character of the AONB and neighbours' amenity. We hope you will support the officer's recommendation and approve the application, with necessary conditions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday 22nd July 2020

Written Submissions

Item:	(3)
Application Number:	20/00612/FULD
Location:	Riverbend, Upper Eddington, Hungerford
Proposal:	Section 73A Variation of condition (2) plans of approved 18/02374/FULD - Demolition of 2-bed dwelling house and erection of new 3-bed dwelling house.
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Denny

Submissions received

Parish/Town Council	Hungerford Town Council
Adjoining Parish Council	N/A
Objectors	None
Supporters	Town and Manor of Hungerford – Jed Ramsay
Applicant/ Agent	Justin Packman – WYG

This page is intentionally left blank

Hungerford Town Council submission to Western Area Planning on Wednesday 22nd July for Planning application - 20/00612/FULD Riverbend, Upper Eddington, Hungerford – Mr and Mrs Denny

HTC had no objection to the **original plans** submitted for this planning application. Although it is a very distinctive modern design there are a variety of different designed houses within the immediate area of the proposed property.

However, the original plans were not implemented and the resulting structure bears only a passing resemblance to the original plans. The vast majority of these changes to proposed conditions are retrospective. Major changes were made in a blatant disregard of the original planning consent.

The natural larch wood cladding was disregarded and replaced with a garish tasteless bright blue with the assertion that it “reflected the colour of the sky” so was more in keeping with the landscape. Nothing could be further from the truth. The applicant has now agreed to revert to the original plans. If the committee are minded to approve this application, we urge them to state explicitly that all areas of the structure that are currently blue are replaced with the original Natural Wood in natural colour.

Trees on this site have been decimated, as the photographs demonstrate and the committee report supports. Again, if the committee is minded to approve the variations then we would ask that the new planting is rigidly enforced to mitigate the visual impact of the building.

The height of the structure has been increased; the applicant would have us believe this was due to an apparent architect error. This is a third of a metre, which would have been spotted long before the structure was complete. This is a major change to the building which is unacceptable. This makes the structure much more visible from every direction. As a consequence, this has a significant impact on the AONB and nearby SSSI.

The fascia boards on the building were originally supposed to be 300mm in depth. They are 600mm and a change in colour again ignoring completely the original plans.

There are other changes which appear to have “slipped under the radar”. The roof lights are dome shaped which make the structure look like a swimming pool building these, fortunately, are to be replaced under these new conditions. The balcony is the full width of the northwest elevation the original plans had the balcony only part way across the elevation. The timber screening, again on the

North west elevation, to the study should remain as it softens the whole structure on that elevation.

This is another example of a planning application being approved according to the plans submitted and a completely different structure being built. The applicant is only requesting these amendments because he has been found out.

If the committee is minded to approve this application, we would urge West Berkshire Council's building control officer to be extra vigilant in enforcing these approved conditions.



Town and Manor
of Hungerford

Town and Manor of Hungerford and Liberty of Sanden Fee

Charity Commission Registration No. 238379

Ms Mather
West Berkshire District Council
Council Offices
Market Street
Newbury
RG14 5LD

*Town Hall
High Street
Hungerford
Berkshire
RG17 0NF*

15th July 2020

Dear Ms Mather,

Re: Written Submission to Western Area Planning Committee meeting Wednesday 22 July 2020. Agenda item 4.(3) 20/00612/FULD, Riverbend, Upper Eddington, Hungerford

As the neighbouring land owner to the south of the property, across the River Kennet, we welcome the decision that the upper floor areas, currently finished in blue render, are to be finished in vertical larch cladding. May we ask that it be made completely unambiguous in your consent that this must apply to all the blue painted areas and that the cladding must be natural coloured?

On the issue of landscaping, we challenge most strongly the conclusion that the unauthorized felling of the majority of the trees on the site, and the consequent loss of screening, particularly when viewed from the river, is acceptable in planning terms.

The Committee Report acknowledges that the extensive tree felling is materially harmful to the countryside setting, the AONB and the SSSI. It states incorrectly that the proposed landscape planting returns trees to the site to mitigate the impact on the SSSI and the river to the south.

There is no new planting shown which would screen the property from the river (see the lower image on slide 2 of the Committee Report Photos) which clearly shows the loss of screening.

May we also point out the "Existing open view to River" shown in the proposed landscaping scheme only exists because the applicant felled nearly all of the mature trees to create it.

Yours faithfully,

Chief Executive

VAT Registration Number: 200294415

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/00612/FULD

SITE: Riverbend, Upper Eddington, Hungerford, RG17 0HH

**STATEMENT TO MEMBERS BY JUSTIN PACKMAN (AGENT)
ON BEHALF OF MR AND MRS DENNY**

Consent was granted for the replacement dwelling in November 2018. The approved design was for a house to be fabricated in and sourced from Germany. With the possibility of a no deal Brexit looming in the autumn of 2019, my clients had no choice but to significantly accelerate their timetable for construction to avoid significant financial penalties that would have rendered the scheme unviable. Pre-commencement conditions were discharged during the course of 2019 but there was no time to gain approval for amendments to the design before construction began.

In retrospect my clients regret this, as the changes to the scheme were clearly the source of some distress to the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Since undertaking these changes my clients have worked constructively and cooperatively with the Local Planning Authority to regularise them, scale them back, or reverse them completely.

The use of blue render instead of timber cladding was considered to be a particular point of contention with neighbours and officers alike. As such my clients have agreed to revert to the original elevational treatment of timber cladding.

Other more minor matters relating to the installation of a retaining wall, the relocation of a flue, fenestration changes and clarification about the finished height of the dwelling have also been agreed. The officer has noted in her report that the 30cm height difference is not considered to materially harm the outlook from the neighbouring dwelling.

The design of the rooflights was also discussed and my clients have agreed to replace the domed tops with flat ones, this and the sedum roof will make the rooflights less intrusive.

Finally, my clients have also agreed to a revised and expanded scheme of landscaping to include native species (to replace conifers including leylandii) to soften the appearance of the dwelling especially when viewed from the west.

The end result is a scheme that meets the needs of my clients without departing significantly from the original approved design or resulting in increased visual harm.

Given the extensive work that has been undertaken to rectify these changes and the constructive manner in which we have engaged with the Council it is hoped that members will support the officer recommendation for approval this evening.



This page is intentionally left blank