

Notice of Meeting

Eastern Area Planning Committee

Wednesday, 21 December, 2011 at 6.30pm

in Calcot Centre, Highview (off Royal Avenue), Calcot

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.

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 13 December 2011

FURTHER INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Plans relating to the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting can be viewed in the Calcot Centre 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 Stephen Chard - Tel: (01635) 519462 - Email: schard@westberks.gov.uk or .

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



Agenda - Eastern Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 21 December 2011
(continued)

To: Councillors Peter Argyle, Pamela Bale, Brian Bedwell (Vice-Chairman), Richard Crumly, Alan Law, Royce Longton, Alan Macro, Geoff Mayes, Tim Metcalfe, Irene Neill, Graham Pask (Chairman) and Quentin Webb

Substitutes: Councillors Jeff Brooks, Roger Croft, Sheila Ellison, Manohar Gopal, Tony Linden, David Rendel and Keith Woodhams

Agenda

Part I

Page No.

- (1) **Application No. & Parish: 11/01345/FULMAJ, Burghfield** 1 - 4
- Proposal:** Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 14 residential dwellings.
- Location:** Springwood Engineering, Bunces Lane, Burghfield Common, Reading
- Applicant:** Bewley Homes
- Recommendation:** The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission
- (2) **Application No. & Parish: 11/01564/FULMAJ, land adjacent to Kennet and Avon Canal** 5 - 10
- Proposal:** Erection of 11 no. 4 x 2 bed, 2 x 3 bed and 5 x 4 bedroom dwellings, together with access, car parking, landscaping and associated works (including demolition of attached garages and garden walls and the relocation of existing Visitor Centre car parking and pumping station).
- Location:** Land Adjacent to Kennet and Avon Canal, Wharf Side, Padworth, Reading
- Applicant:** H20 Urban LLP
- Recommendation:** To DELEGATE to the Head of Planning and Countryside to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement no later than the 23rd December 2011.



Agenda - Eastern Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 21 December 2011
(continued)

(3) **Application No. & Parish: 11/02234/FULD, Thatcham** 11 - 12

Proposal: A courtyard development of 5 no. detached houses with garages/home offices similar to the refused application 11/01060/FULD on the site of the previously approved layout for 3 no. detached houses and detached garages/home offices 06/02377/FULD, 07/02497/FULD and 09/00932/FULD.

Location: Elizabeth Farm, Thornford Road, Crookham Common, Thatcham

Applicant: Donnington New Homes

Recommendation: To DELEGATE to the Head of Planning and Countryside to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION given the harmful impact of the scheme on the character of the area and failure to mitigate the impact of the development on local services.

Background Papers

- (a) 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.
- (b) Any previous planning applications for the site, together with correspondence and report(s) on those applications.
- (c) The case file for the current application comprising plans, application forms, correspondence and case officer's notes.
- (d) The Human Rights Act.

Andy Day
Head of Policy and Communication

West Berkshire Council is committed to equality of opportunity. We will treat everyone with respect, regardless of race, disability, gender, age, religion or sexual orientation.

If you require this information in a different format, such as audio tape, or in another language, please ask an English speaker to contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045, who will be able to help.



This page is intentionally left blank

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 21ST DECEMBER 2011

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 11/01345/FULMAJ **Page No.** 29
Site: Springwood Engineering, Bunces Lane, Burghfield Common

Planning Officer Presenting: David Pearson

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Mr S James

Objector(s) speaking: Mrs Mandy Wimbush
Mr Martyn Henderson
Mrs Jackie Lewis

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: N/A

Ward Member(s): Councillor Carol Jackson-Doerge
Councillor Dr R E Longton

Update Information:

1. Further letters of representation

Further letters have been received from two respondents,
Additional issues which have been raised are:

1. Concerns are now raised about possible noise pollution from the rumble strips proposed across the access to the site.
2. Concerns expressed regarding the entrance to the site being restricted by the amended siting of plots 13 and 14.
3. Parking in Bunces Lane
4. Loss of privacy and overbearing nature resulting from repositioning of plot 14.
5. Request that if permission granted street lighting should follow the low level of existing lighting in Bunces Lane and not cause light pollution.

2. Amendment to condition 26.

This amendment adds the words in italics to include Plot 1 in this condition. There is no first floor window shown on the north elevation of Plot 14 and this has been removed from the condition.

Condition 26. The window at first floor level in the north facing elevation of plot 12 *and the north-west facing landing window of plot 1*, shall be fitted with obscure glass before the dwelling is occupied and the obscure glazing shall thereafter be retained in position to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any subsequent revision), no additional openings shall be inserted in the first floor north facing elevation of plot 12 *and the north-west facing elevation of plot 1* and no openings shall be inserted into the north elevation of plot 14, without a formal planning application made to the Local Planning Authority for that purpose.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighboring properties in accordance with Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 - 2006 Saved Policies 2007.

3. Additional conditions to be added to those recommended:

3.1 . It is recommended that permitted development rights are removed from any permission granted by adding the following condition:

Condition 27. Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any subsequent revision), no additions or extensions to the dwellings shall be built or ancillary buildings or structures erected within the curtilage, unless permission in writing has been granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for the purpose.

Reason: To prevent the overdevelopment of the site and to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan 2009 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

3.2 Concerns have been expressed regarding the flooding of adjoining gardens and the footpath alongside the site after heavy rain. It is recommended that a further condition be added regarding drainage.

Condition 28:

No development shall commence until details of a sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the drainage scheme has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The development may increase the likelihood of flooding on the adjoining land and footpath unless a drainage system is in place to ensure that localised flooding is

not exacerbated and in the interests of the amenity of users of the footpath in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

4. Response from Thames Water:

The consultation response from Thames Water was omitted from the main report. They have no objections to the proposal subject to the following **informatives** which should be added to any permission granted.

1. Where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater into a public sewer, a groundwater discharge permit will be required. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Groundwater permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 8507 4890 or by emailing wwriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991.

2. Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

3. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

This page is intentionally left blank

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 21 DECEMBER 2011

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (2) **Application No:** 11/01564/FULMAJ **Page No.** 45

Site: Land adjacent to Kennet and Avon Canal, Wharf Side, Padworth

Planning Officer Presenting: Emma Fuller

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Mr David Clark

Objector(s) speaking: Mr Rob Ebrey

Support(s) speaking: Mr Mike Rodd, Chairman, Kennet & Avon Canal Trust

Applicant/Agent speaking: Dominic Eaton
Aiden Johnson-Hugill
Steven Smallman

Ward Member(s): Councillor Geoff Mayes
Councillor Mollie Lock

Update Information:

Amendment to the recommendation to read:

To DELEGATE to the Head of Planning and Countryside to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions and completion of a Legal Agreement no later than the 1st February 2012.

Or

Should the legal agreement not be completed by the 1st February 2012 to DELEGATE to the Head of Planning and Countryside to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reason:

The development fails to provide an appropriate scheme of works or off site mitigation measures to accommodate the impact of the development on local infrastructure, services or amenities or provide an appropriate mitigation measure such as a planning obligation. The proposal is therefore contrary to

government advice, Policy CC7 of the South East Plan: The Regional Spatial Strategy for South East England 2006 - 2026 May 2009 and Policy OVS3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 as well as the West Berkshire District Council's adopted SPG4/04 - Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development.

Amendment to condition 2: approved plans to read:

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:

Location Plan drawing number 30892_P001 Rev.C received 21st July 2011

Proposed Site Plan drawing number 30892_P090 Rec.C received 30th November 2011

Block A Proposed Plans, Sections & Elevations drawing number 30892_P101 Rev.C received 21st July 2011 – to include amendment (removal of first floor side window serving plot 4).

Block B Proposed Plans, Sections & Elevations drawing number 30892_P102 Rev.B received 21st July 2011

Block C Proposed Plans, Sections & Elevations drawing number 30892_P103 Rev.C received 21st July 2011

Proposed Context Elevations drawing number 30892_P104 Rev.C received 21st July 2011

Context Elevations and Proposed Materials drawing number 30892_P105 Rev.C received 21st July 2011

Visibility Splays and Refuse Collection Strategy drawing number 30892_P114 Rev.B received 30th November 2011.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with national planning guidance and the relevant policies within the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and the relevant Policies within the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

Letter of representation:

Supplementary letter of objection raised:

- Concern for the impact of the development on parking in the local area.

As a household without any off-street parking we are reliant on parking on Station Road, which is becoming an increasing problem and will only become worse as more houses are built without adequate parking (as is the case with these houses due to the planning restrictions on parking spaces limiting the parking for each property to less than is realistic for a rural area). There are a number of things that could be done to alleviate the problem, including stopping charging for the station car park (which means commuters now park on the street) and looking at where further parking can be provided for visitors to the area (which is popular with canal users). Eg there is a large tarmaced area near the substation at the entrance to Mallard Way, which looks like it could easily be used as a car park (not sure who owns it). The briefing only refers to the existing visitor parking being maintained. Is the adverse impact on parking more widely not a valid basis for objection? I believe a number of other people raised concerns too?

Parking has become significantly worse in the 7 or so years we have lived here. The main drivers of the problem are (1) the addition of the pavement to Station Road, subsequently resulting in it being considered necessary to add yellow lines to restrict parking as the road was now narrower and (2) the charging for the station car park from Jan 2011 (which I believe the Council encouraged Network Rail to do in return for CCTV which never materialised and has only served to force the rail users to park on the street to avoid the charges). NB – the consultation for the yellow lines incorrectly stated the number of parking spaces due to the failure of the highways team to allow for dropped kerbs and a traffic Island.

What would be really appreciated is for some more “joined up thinking” in making some of these decisions, such that the overall impact on the area can be mitigated (or improvements made!). Perhaps some of the s. 106 money could be used to alleviate the parking issues.

Emma Fuller

From: Rob Ebrey [mailto:Rob.Ebrey@microfocus.com]
Sent: 26 September 2011 22:53
To: Planapps
Subject: Representation letter (11/01564/FULMAJ). Land at Aldermaston Wharf - objection

Rob & Tiffany Ebrey
 2 Wharf Cottages
 Station Road
 Padworth
 Reading
 RG7 4JN

We wish to object to the planning application submitted by British Waterways (11/01564/FULMAJ) and comment as follows:

Planning process

As observed by a number of other residents in their representation letters, there continues to be no sign of orange site notices on display. This is a major planning application that will have a significant impact on the local area, therefore it is important that the proper processes are followed. Letters were sent to residents initially giving an inadequate period for response, particularly given it was during the summer holiday season. No site notices have been displayed, which means that the application has not been publicised in the appropriate manner, which given that this site impacts a large number of both local residents and visitors to the area seems particularly inappropriate.

Preparation of BWs application/inaccuracies

BWs initial application was rejected due to them failing to follow the appropriate procedures. This application would also appear to be poorly prepared and contain a number of inaccurate statements and/or statements that may mislead. The list below may not be comprehensive, but provides a number of illustrations:

1. The site plan on page 4 of the design and access statement has a label saying "Canal cottage to be renovated into visitor centre". The building labelled is already the visitor centre. The toll house is labelled "location of existing visitor centre". This building is currently not in regular use and is not the main visitor centre building.
2. Para 1.5 of the design and access statement states "the site comprises the Visitor Centre and garden, with car parking adjacent to the buildings..... The remainder of the site is scrub area and vacant land". It fails to mention that it also includes parts of the gardens of 14/15 Wharfside, which will be reduced to an excessively small size relative to the size of these houses.
3. Para 1.5 also includes out of date pictures of 14/15 Wharfside (when they were boarded up and neglected by BW) which would appear to attempt to make the area look in a worse state than it is, perhaps to support BWs misleading assertion that this is a regeneration project, as opposed to over development of a rural area.
4. Para 1.9 attempts to justify the use of timber cladding, which is out of keeping with the local area by a spurious link to the canals industrial history. It also claims the slate roof's are a response to history. Whilst we agree that slate is much more appropriate than the previous proposal for metal clad roof's, it would be more honest simply to say that there was significant local objection to the previous proposals.
5. Para 1.10 states that there has been a local consultation in respect of this application. This is not correct. There was a consultation in respect of the previous rejected application, but no consultation in respect of this application. We trust that BW will either conduct such a consultation (with an appropriate extension to the planning timetable), or that all previous responses to the last

application will be carried forward.

6. Page 17 of the design and access statement refers to the roof's being metal. Are they metal or slate? There appears to be inconsistency in the references.

Without spending more time than is available it is impossible to identify how many more errors may be contained within the application, however for an organisation the size of BW and a development of this size we would expect that a greater level of attention to detail would be given to the application.

Comments on the development

Parking

Our property does not have off-street parking, therefore we are dependent upon the availability of spaces on Station Road. Whilst there is a local station, in common with most local residents in this rural area, we are dependent on our cars and therefore need appropriate provision for parking. When we moved to our property in 2003 car parking in the area was not a significant problem. Over the last few years parking has become significantly worse, due to the following:

1. The addition of yellow lines to sections of Station Road, reducing the number of spaces (in our opinion) excessively. Note – the consultation on this implied that more spaces would be available than actually are due to errors which the Highways Department have admitted in failing to acknowledge the existence of dropped kerbs and the traffic island.
2. The introduction earlier this year of parking charges for the station car park. This is totally counter-productive in that whilst it was justified as a way to fund CCTV, all that has happened is that users of the station (as well as other visitors to the area) park on the street whenever possible so as to avoid the parking charges. This means that the number of cars parked on Station Road all day by commuters as well as for shorter periods by rail users and other visitors to the area has increased significantly.

As a result we often find it difficult to find parking spaces and are forced either to borrow a space on our neighbours drive when it is free (which is not a sustainable or reliable solution), or park on Mallard Way (which the residents do not appreciate) or in the visitor centre car park (which is not its purpose). The parking situation is therefore already unacceptable and will become much worse once the already approved development next to the station is completed and will be even worse if the BW development goes ahead.

BW are proposing to charge for the visitor centre car park but assert that this will not discourage its use. It is human nature that given the option to park for free or pay a charge, people will opt to park where it is free, provided the inconvenience is minimal. It was claimed that a small charge for the station car park would not discourage its use, however it has done exactly that and the same can therefore be expected to apply if a charge is made for the visitor centre car park, with people choosing to park on Station Road, Mallard Way, etc where they can find a space. Hence this will make the parking situation worse for local residents, including our household and most likely mean that we will periodically need to pay to park in the visitor centre car park due to the lack of available parking.

Whilst writing this objection, on Thurs 22 Sept at approx 1:45 we looked at how many cars were parked in the visitor centre and station car parks. The visitor centre car park had only one available space (and one car parked on the pavement, ie not in an allocated space), Station Road had no available spaces. The station car park was completely empty. The following morning when getting the train to work at 8:25am, the station car park was again completely empty. It would therefore appear clear to us that charging for parking will only make the parking situation worse by increasing demand for on street parking even further.

BW state that their car park utilisation study highlighted that a reduction in the number of spaces at the

visitor centre could be justified, albeit that they are not proposing to reduce the number. Over the past year the car park is regularly full or nearly full. Was this study completed before the rejuvenation of the visitor centre?

We also assume that the residents of the new properties will have visitors. Where will they park??

On page 12 of the Design and Access statement, BW refer to their "generous gift" of land to West Berkshire Council to improve access to the station car park and state that too much parking would be unsightly and out of keeping with the conservation area. Are BW implying that they wish Network Rail to solve the problem of inadequate parking by the station car park becoming the overflow for the lack of spaces available to local residents, visitors and residents of the new properties? We cannot see how this can be relied upon as solution, given that the primary purpose of the station car park is to provide a facility to rail users. This would appear to be a tacit acknowledgement by BW that the area cannot support their proposal.

Note – we have seen a suggestion that more car parking is made available using some of BW's land adjacent to Station Road. At present our outlook is onto the road and a large amount of trees/shrubs. We do not wish to look out onto a carpark, which would be a further overdevelopment and inappropriate near the canal basin, which is an attractive area. Could car parking be made available on the tarmaced area off Mallard Way, near the junction with Station Road (ie by the substation)?

Adverse impact on local area for residents and visitors during construction and loss/damage to local shop/visitor centre

We understand that during construction the canal visitor centre will be closed for a period of c. 6 months. The visitor centre has recently been given a new lease of life by a energetic couple running it, who provide an excellent service both to visitors to the area and local residents, through operating a tea room and small shop selling bread, milk, newspapers, gifts, etc. The impact of the construction on this business is likely to be irreparable and at a minimum will result in the loss of an important local amenity for the period of construction.

Also, Will alternative parking be made available during this period to replace the visitor centre car park?

Nature of development

The proposed development is in a rural conservation area. It would constitute a significant over-development of an area much loved by residents and visitors.

Whilst the number of houses has been reduced, there are still too many for the available space, particularly given the strain on local infrastructure.

The style of the properties is inappropriate and not in keeping with the local area. In particular:

1. Based on other similar developments, timber cladding may look good when new, but often ends up stained or unevenly weathered, such that it looks scruffy after a relatively short period of time
2. 2.5 storeys is not consistent with other properties in the area and is excessively high. In particular we object to Building B, which is very close to our property and the canal, making it particularly inappropriate.
3. The properties are also excessively close to the visitor centre, which is a listed building. It will become crammed in between the properties on either side which will detract from its overall amenity value.

Whilst residential developments fronting canals in urban areas have often significantly improved run-down areas, this development seeks to overdevelop a rural canal setting for the economic gain of BW. We consider the close proximity of the houses to the canal (which are much closer than the other recent developments in the area) to be inappropriate.

The reduction in size of the canal visitor centre garden is particularly inappropriate. This garden is very well used both for teas/coffees by visitors and for functions operated by the visitor centre and will be adversely impacted by the reduction in size.

The new location of the sewage pumping station is unsightly and inappropriate.

The properties will overlook our property resulting in a loss of light and privacy.

Summary

We object to this application, which would significantly over-develop this conservation area and put excessive strain on the local infrastructure. We would suggest that BW reconsider their application and either withdraw it completely, or reduce it significantly. There would appear to be an opportunity for BW to significantly improve the utilisation of the land if they amalgamate 14/15 Wharfside into the development and do not relocate the sewage pumping station (which the cost of relocating must necessitate the excessive housing density in order to provide an acceptable rate of return on the development).

We do not object to Building A, which would appear an appropriate place to develop.

We would also note that as well as being residents of the area, we also own a boat which is moored locally and pay a licence fee to BW and hence appreciate the budgetary demands on BW and the need to develop their property portfolio to provide much needed funds to maintain the canals and constrain the licence fee. This must however be done in a sensitive and appropriate way and not at the expense of the local community and the many visitors to the canal.

Please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss further.

This constitutes two objections.

Best regards

Rob & Tiffany Ebrey

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

This message has been scanned by [MailController](#).

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 21 DECEMBER 2011

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (3) **Application No:** 11/02234/FULD **Page No.** 65

Site: Elizabeth Farm, Thornford Road, Crookham Common, Thatcham

Planning Officer Presenting: Emma Fuller

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Support(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mr Mark Norgate
Mr Stuart Goodwill - WYG

Ward Member(s): Councillor Boeck
Councillor Croft

Update Information:

Additional consultation responses:

Open Space: £10,292

Representation letters:

1 additional letter of support has been received since the completion of the committee report. The responded raised questions with respect to the power and water supply in the area, access onto Thornford Road and the proposed footway and an existing right of way. Shows improvement to site over its present use.

Additional information:

The applicant has confirmed their commitment to constructing the footway from the site to the A339 under a section 278 agreement, the specification of which is to be agreed with the Council.

This page is intentionally left blank