

Notice of Meeting

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday, 23 January, 2013 at 6.30pm

in 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.

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday, 15 January 2013

FURTHER INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

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 Elaine Walker on (01635) 519441
e-mail: ewalker@westberks.gov.uk

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



Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 23 January 2013
(continued)

To: Councillors David Allen, Jeff Beck, Paul Bryant (Chairman), George Chandler, Hilary Cole, Paul Hewer, Garth Simpson, Anthony Stansfeld, Julian Swift-Hook, Ieuan Tuck, Tony Vickers and Virginia von Celsing (Vice-Chairman)

Substitutes: Councillors Howard Bairstow, Billy Drummond, Marcus Franks, Roger Hunneman, Mike Johnston, Gwen Mason and Andrew Rowles

Agenda

Part I

Page No.

- (1) **Application No. and Parish: 12/02395/FUL - Falkland Service Station, 170-174 Andover Road, Newbury** 1 - 4
- Proposal:** Demolition of existing service station. Redevelopment to provide new petrol filling station consisting of: canopy/forecourt; sales building with ATM; underground storage tanks, parking, landscaping and other ancillary works.
- Location:** Total, Falkland Service Station, 170 - 174 Andover Road, Newbury.
- Applicant:** Total Bonjour Ltd.
- Recommendation:** To delegate to the Head of Planning and Countryside to grant conditional planning permission.
-
- (2) **Application No. and Parish: 12/02655/COMIND - Red Shute Industrial Estate, Red Shute Hill, Hermitage** 5 - 10
- Proposal:** Change of Use to include a skip waste recycling and transfer facility to import, store and process up to 18,000tpa of general skip waste (including wood, metal, plastic, paper and card).
- Location:** Unit 3, Red Shute Industrial Estate, Red Shute Hill Hermitage, Thatcham, Berkshire RG18 9QL
- Applicant:** Harwood Recycling
- Recommendation:** The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to **GRANT** Planning Permission subject to the imposition of the suggested conditions and informatives.



Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 23 January 2013
(continued)

(3) **Application No. and Parish:12/02420/FULD - 20 Manor Crescent,** 11 - 20
Compton

Proposal:

Proposed dwelling.

Location:

20 Manor Crescent, Compton, Newbury.

Applicant:

Mr and Mrs Pipikakis.

Recommendation:

To DELEGATE to the Head of Planning and Countryside to GRANT permission subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement by 13th February 2013.

Or

Should the legal agreement not be completed by 13th February 2013 to DELEGATE to the Head of Planning & Countryside to REFUSE planning permission, where expedient, for the following reason:-

The development fails to provide an appropriate scheme of works or off site mitigation measures to accommodate the impact of 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 CS5 West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 as well as West Berkshire District Council's adopted SPG4/04 – Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development.



- (4) **Application No. and Parish:12/02476/FULD - Land opposite Fairbank, between Cedar House, The Lythe and Rectory Cottages, Wickham** 21 - 22
- Proposal:** Erection of four dwellings.
- Location:** Land opposite Fairbank, between Cedar House, The Lythe and Rectory Cottages, Wickham.
- Applicant:** Mr and Mrs J D'Arcy.
- Recommendation:** To **DELEGATE** to the Head of Planning and Countryside to **REFUSE** planning permission for the following reasons:
1. The application site lies outside of the settlement boundary, as defined within Policy HSG.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007, and is in a location that would not encourage the use of non-car modes of transport. As such the application site is considered to be contrary to the Government's guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework as well as Policies ADPP1, ADPP5 and CS1 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and Policies CC1 and CC6 of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East of England 2009.
 2. The proposed dwellings and residential use of the application site is considered to harm the intrinsic rural character and appearance of the area and is not considered to conserve the landscape or scenic beauty of the AONB as required in paragraph 15 of the NPPF. The development of the site would formalise the street scene through the proposed fencing and clearance of the vegetation that exists at present. Views of the built form proposed would be possible from the public realm and elements such as the storage of bins in front of the garage opposite the access and the positioning of bins adjacent to the access on collection days would further urbanise the existing rural appearance of the street scene. Moreover the layout of the proposed dwellings at an angle to the road is considered to run contrary to the rhythm of development in the area which largely accommodates built form that runs parallel to the road.
- As such the proposal is considered to harm the character of the area contrary to the NPPF as well as Policies CS14 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Policies CC1, C3 and CC6 of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East of England 2009. In addition the proposal is contrary to Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Quality Design'



Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 23 January 2013
(continued)

in particular part 2.

3. No information, evidence or study such as an archaeological field evaluation has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the potential archaeological significance of the site would not be harmed by the proposed development. Given the lack of an archaeological field evaluation an informed judgement about the impact of the proposal on the archaeological significance of the site cannot be made.

As no such field evaluation has been submitted the application is considered to run contrary to the NPPF as well as Policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy.

4. 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, regional Spatial Strategy May 2009 and Policy CS5 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 as well as the West Berkshire District Council's adopted SPG4/04 - Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development.

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 Strategic Support

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 or translation, please contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4.(1)

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 23RD JANUARY 2013

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 12/02395/FUL **Page No.** 11

Site: Falkland Service Station, 170 - 174 Andover Road, Newbury

Planning Officer Presenting: Derek Carnegie

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Anthony Pick

Objector(s) speaking: Mrs Fiona Dickens
Mrs Shields
Mr Edward Mason

Support(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Jonathan Harper

Ward Member(s): Councillor Bairstow and Councillor Edwards

Update Information: Additional Representations:

A further 6 letters of objection have been received.

Additional matters raised include:-

- Whether a risk assessment of the site is required and whether one was submitted.
- Comments on the transport statement submitted with the application including that there is no dedicated lane for turning into the site and that the additional traffic entering and exiting the site where pedestrians cross is hazardous.

The objections also include matters raised previously with regard to:-

- Additional traffic in an area used by pedestrians to access local facilities;
- Impact on residents' quality of life in terms of smell, noise, lighting;
- Extension of trading hours in a residential area;
- Competition with local shops, and the lack of need for the facility given the presence of existing supermarkets in the wider locality.

A petition of 508 signatures received against the re-development of the site. The petition states:-

'We, the undersigned, do not believe that the proposed re-development is in the interests of local people and appeal to the West Berkshire Planning Committee to reject this application'.

Amended Plans and Additional Information:

The applicant has submitted amended plans which lower the flood lighting on the western boundary from 5 metres to 3 metres by placing them on the proposed 3 metre acoustic fence. The proposed air/water pump has been moved into a recess within the 3 metre fence with a roof above it. Additional information has been submitted with regard to deliveries, employment, lighting, air/water pump compressor noise and opening hours.

Deliveries and Opening Hours:

Deliveries for fuel are not proposed to significantly alter. There are approximately 3 per week at present and 3 to 4 per week expected with the proposed scheme. The shop element currently has 3 deliveries per day and one every 2-3 days. The proposal expects 5 deliveries per day to the shop element.

The applicant is willing to agree to opening hours of 7am to 10pm Monday to Saturday, rather than the 11pm closing proposed. However, the 9pm closing on Sundays and Bank Holidays which is recommended by officers, is considered overly restrictive on the operation of the site by the applicants and 10pm has been requested with no deliveries on these days after 6pm.

The additional two deliveries per day have not raised objections from Environmental Health or Highways. The condition that deliveries shall only be made during opening hours and not before 8am on Sundays or Bank Holidays is still considered appropriate. Should the 10pm closing on Sundays and Bank Holidays be considered acceptable the condition would be re-worded such that deliveries would not be made after 6pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

With regard to closing at 10pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays, background noise levels are at their lowest and the noise impact of customers on site greatest on Sundays between 9pm and 10pm on of 3.4dB. This was the basis for seeking to restrict opening hours until 9pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays. The noise assessment submitted with the application noted that under previous and superseded national planning legislation, an increase of less than 5dB would have a moderate impact on perceptible noise levels. It is the case that Environmental Health have no objections to the proposed opening hours, their concerns relate to deliveries on site which generate greater noise impact than customers on site. Whilst the additional hour on Sundays and Bank Holidays to 10pm is not considered ideal, a restriction on deliveries not to occur after 6pm on these days is considered a benefit. On this basis a revised opening hours condition is on balance considered acceptable of 7am to 10pm Monday to Saturday and 7.30am to 10pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Employment:

Employees on site are expected to be up to 7 at any one time with 3 full time and 4 part time staff. Of the 20 full time equivalent staff proposed to be employed, it is likely that 10 would be full time and 10 part time. The applicant's recruitment policy is for staff to be within a 1.5 mile radius of the site and encouraged to walk, cycle or use public transport. Provision has been made for cycle storage on site, there are 2 staff car parking bays (1 guaranteed for the Shift Manager), and there are bus stops on Andover Road and the local area.

This additional information has not substantially altered the response of Highways to the application other than to change the condition on cycle parking for details to be submitted. This is recommended so that enclosed cycle storage can be achieved on site which would be more secure and useable for prospective employees.

Lighting:

A full lighting scheme and lighting specification has been submitted detailing the canopy lighting would be 8 Philips Bisymmetric type DC300/KS-WB-BD and area flood lighting would be 5 Bulkhead type 70w Thorn Piazza. The lighting layout drawing (ref DM17) details the light spillage areas and luminance levels to be below that of street lighting levels.

The lighting amendments are considered an improvement to the amenity of residents over the original scheme. The details submitted are considered sufficient to be conditioned, with any future additional lighting to be restricted. The condition requiring external illumination to be switched off is still considered appropriate. It is acknowledged that the lighting would be equal to or less in luminance than street lighting. However, some lighting is close to rear gardens where street lighting is not present and being switched off when the site is closed is considered of benefit to those residents during the night. The condition will be adjusted to take account of the later Sunday opening hours, if approved.

Noise:

The compressor unit for the air/water pump noise levels have been reviewed by the applicant. Noise levels of an air and water machine have been taken by their consultant from the Air Serv manufacturer. This unit has a noise level of 57.7dB at a distance of 10 metres. The machine is assumed to run for 3 minutes and used up to 4 times per hour. By locating the unit within the acoustic fence with a roof above it, a 15dB reduction has been assumed, and a 5dB penalty for its intermittent use. (The existing unit on site has a 6dB reduction from limited screening). The rating level of the proposed unit is calculated to be 40dB. In relation to background noise levels presented for Monday to Sunday 8pm to 11pm and Sundays 8am to 10am the unit would be above background noise levels after 10pm Monday to Saturday and after 8pm on Sundays by 1 to 2 dB, and 4dB after 10pm on Sundays.

The site is not recommended to be open after 10pm so the greatest noise impact of the compressor of 4dB would not occur. The re-location and acoustic screening of the unit are considered to be an improvement and to secure it being able to meet the condition that any plant machinery on site not exceeds background noise levels. This condition is still considered appropriate as it would apply to all plant machinery on site, including the generator on the roof of the proposed building.

Conclusion:

The additional information received since the committee report was drafted is not considered to alter the overall conclusion that the application be recommended for approval subject to conditions. Conditions remain as proposed except for the following inclusions and alterations:-

Conditions:

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with:-
 - Drawings 110643_PL3G, 110643_PL4E, proposed lighting layout DM17, gw lighting specification received on 14 January 2013;
 - Site sections of 110643_PL5A received on 29 November 2012;
 - Phase 1 Environmental Assessment SLR Ref: 412.03953.0002.009 REV_1 July 2012 received on 29 November 2012;
 - Noise Assessment Report 12/3440/R2-2 received on 29 November 2012;
 - Noise Assessment memorandum 12/3440/M2 received on 14 January 2013;
 - Transport Statement ADL/AMC/H829/23A July 2012 received on 29 November 2012,Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details assessed against Policies CC6, NRM1, NRM2, NRM9 and NRM10 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy for the South

East of England 2009, Policies CS 14 and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012, and Policies OVS.5, OVS.6, and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

3. The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be as specified on the application form and drawing 110643_PL3G received on 14 January 2013. No other materials shall be used unless prior agreement in writing has been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the materials are of a quality appropriate to the nature of the development, the site and its surroundings. This condition is imposed to comply with Policies CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East of England 2009, Policies CS 14 and CS 19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012.

10. No development shall commence until details of the cycle parking and storage space to be provided within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the cycle parking and storage space shall be provided prior to the development being brought into use in accordance with the approved details and retained for this purpose at all times.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate and safe cycle storage space within the site that reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and assists with the parking, storage and security of cycles in accordance with Policies CS 5 and CS 13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012 and Policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

17. No additional flood lighting or external lighting other than that hereby approved shall be installed unless details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and/or highway safety in accordance with Policies CS 13 and CS 14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012 and Policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

18. The hours of all external illumination on site including flood lighting and fore court canopy lighting be limited to 06:45 to 22:15 Monday to Saturday and 07:15 to 22:15 Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents in accordance with Policy CS 14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012.

19. No deliveries shall take place outside of the hours of 07:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturday and 08:00 to 18:00 on Sunday and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of surrounding residents in accordance with Policy CS 14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012 and Policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

28. The development hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside of the hours of 07:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturdays and 07:30 to 22:00 Sunday and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of surrounding residents in accordance with Policy CS 14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2012, and Policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

DC

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON 23 JANUARY

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (2) **Application No:** 12/02655/COMIND **Page No.** 31

Site: Unit 3, Red Shute Hill Industrial Estate, Red Shute Hill, Hermitage

Planning Officer Presenting: Matthew Meldrum

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking:
Cold Ash: Councillor Geoff Findlay
Hermitage: A representative
Chieveley: Rob Crispin

Objector(s) speaking: Mr Stewart Wright
Mr Christopher Marriage
Mr Mike Schofield

Support(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mr Kevin Parr

Ward Member(s): Councillor Garth Simpson

Update Information: Highways information

At the members site visit, the Cllr Bryant sought clarification in respect of the total vehicle numbers that are currently generated by the Red Shute Hill Industrial Estate.

Highways officers do not have any actual surveyed data to rely upon in this regard and have therefore interrogated the TRICS database (the same approach used by the applicant when attempting to ascertain the potential vehicle movements that could be generated by the existing uses permitted at the application site).

This TRICS database suggests that an industrial area the size of the Red Shute Hill estate would generate circa 970 movements per day (485 in and 485 out).

The applicant, when using the TRICS database, suggests that unit 3, under its current permissions, would be expected to generate some 36 vehicle movements (rounded up from 35.507).

The applicant has confirmed that the proposed development will generate 6 large HGV movements (3 in and 3 out) and 26 skip lorry movements (13 in and 13 out) and 10 car movements (5 in and 5 out) making a total of 42 vehicle movements.

As such the proposed development would result in an increase of total vehicle movements from the Red Shute Hill Industrial estate from circa 970 movements to circa 976 movements per day.

It is accepted that the TRICS database is not an accurate measure of vehicle movements but it is a national system that is universally used to predict trip generation from a variety of development types. It is also acknowledged that these overall figures do not necessarily indicate whether the proposal will increase the percentage of HGV's given that the 26 skip lorry movements would be classed as HGV's. However highways officers have confirmed that with distribution uses (B8) there is a significant potential for movements of larger HGV vehicles.

Typographical errors

The Recommendation in the report should read:

The Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to Grant Planning permission subject to the following conditions and informatives:-

Ward Member Update

Cllr Garth Simpson (Ward Member for Cold Ash Parish, within which the application site is located) is unable to attend this meeting and has submitted the following written statement:-

Harewood Waste Recycling Ltd Proposal, Unit 3, Red Shute Industrial Estate, Red Shute Hill, Hermitage, Application No: 12/02655/COMIND

Introduction

I am being allowed to enter a pre-meeting update, as I am unable to attend the Western Area Planning Committee meeting for health reasons. Andrew Rowles is kindly acting as my substitute.

Although its address is Hermitage, the Red Shute Hill Industrial estate falls within the ward of Cold Ash & Ashmore Green and is therefore of prime concern to Cold Ash Parish Council and me, as West Berkshire Councillor for the ward.

Basis of my assessment of the application

Owing to my inability to attend the Western Area Planning Committee meeting, I have kindly been given early access to a draft of the case officer's assessment of the application, in which he recommends approval under his delegated powers. I have a copy of the Harewood Recycling Ltd's consultant's report, and I attended the site visit by members and spoke to the designated operations manger from Harewood Recycling.

Grounds for acceptance of the application by the West Berks case officer can be summarised as follows:-

- The industrial site has 11 units which are licensed to carry on B1(a), B1(c), B8 and B(2) activities;
- Since the waste processing involved is limited to the processing of general skip waste, storage and transfer, primarily of card, metals, wood and plastics, it can be handled within the B2 category, and why should unit 3 not be upgraded, since there are already four B2 licences on the industrial site? I question whether this is a sound planning argument;
- This application involves the use of HGV movements. Since WBC Traffic has approved the impact of the proposal, and argues that it is not truly incremental, since other industrial estate occupiers use HGVs. Hence, HGV movements are not seen to be an issue;

- The industrial site is not within the AONB, therefore the application is acceptable. However, the NPPF is expressly clear, in forthright terms, upon the importance of the AONB. The Cold Ash ward is on the borders of the AONB and about 10% a part of it, with perhaps another 10%, visually de facto a part of it. At the Red Shute Hill Industrial park, the distance is c.100m of sheep pasture from the AONB border. Some sensitivity should be accorded to this;
- The noise appraisal by the consultants is within the guidelines. However, I am not sure what value the consultants place on back ground noise, as this can have a significant effect on the perceived 'noticeability' of vehicle reversing warnings etc. The NPPF makes specific note on para 123 on the need to avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life.;
- The site is too small to require an Environmental Impact Assessment, an EIA, by virtue of its size;
- The NPPF emphasizes that we must be pro-business and not inhibit the expansion of economic activity. Whereas the NPPF advises Councils to support economic activity, it notes at para 5 that the Framework does not include specific waste policies, since national waste planning policy will be published as part of the National Waste Management Plan for England. Until that Plan is published by the Waste Planning Policy Statement remains in place;
- The Framework does not contain specific waste policies - see above. The only guidance we get in the NPPF is " local authorities taking decisions on waste applications should have regard to the policies in the Framework".
- Anyway, the NPPF accords the right to process waste on industrial sites, not just approved waste sites, provided criteria are met. WHERE, 100m from the AONB?
- There is then a discussion on how the application meets all the reserved policies of West Berks Council with respect to Planning and Waste Disposal.

The case officer approves the application, with the following provisos:

- Parking and turning and skip storage details must be documented;
- The mechanical extraction system for suppressing noise and smells and dust, must be specified and approved;
- A litter management scheme must be defined and approved,
- The layout and description of the plant to be used must be defined and approved.

My analysis of the application

This application is defective, since such detail that is included harbours many omissions that are important for the residents of the neighbourhood and the other users of the industrial site. I explain them below:

Unit 3, Red Shute Industrial Estate

This is a cramped site of 0.1ha (1000 m squared) with a main warehouse of 450 metres squared and a staff unit of 90 metres squared. Guidelines for waste facilities talk in terms of 0.25ha as being sensible. As such, the main industrial facility is approximately 45m x 10m, with roller doors at each end, and was used as a coach transport repair and service facility. The access drives are c. 10m long for goods inwards and c.12 m long for exported goods. The rest of the site is proposed for skip storage and presumably, the skip trucks parking.

We were told at the site visit, that the conveyor belt system would be installed to run **across** the warehouse, with goods inwards HGVs depositing their skip loads onto the belt, whereupon extraction and sorting equipment would process the waste. Additional equipment, electric trucks would transport the processed waste into storage bays, until export.

The warehouse roller doors are only c. 4m wide, which means that reversing HGV skip trucks will have to 'crab across' the facility to unload at the end of the moving belt. The exporting HGVs will have to reverse to the roller door, as well. Hence, there will much more sound emanating from this part of the operation, due to the reversing alarms which are necessarily intrusive.

Just what waste sectors are to be handled at this facility?

The application proposal talks in terms of the straight processing of card, wood, metals and plastics. But what are the target markets for this operation? Verbally, I was told that this site would be the centre of a waste catchment area of **no less than 18 mile radius or 1,017 square miles**. I was told the real attraction of this application was the proximity of the site to junction 13 of the M4. I was told that if waste recovery was contracted for waste that could not be processed at the site, it would be processed at waste sites that could handle it in the locality. This site was designated for domestic waste of a non-putrescible, no-plant matter, no-soils and non-mineral nature. That is, 'clean waste' that could be easily sorted. **Oh, but there would be screens and a sorting stage at the end of the belt for the residual waste.**

I was also told that when skip contracts were being signed, the nature of the waste to be processed would be agreed, on the spot, so that skip trucks would be directed to take loads to whichever site was required.

This raises a number of questions:

- Just how will the operator guarantee that putrescible matter, soil, plant matter or building minerals will **not** arise from domestic waste? After all, the request by a domestic customer is usually triggered by a project of a DIY nature. Most people are always happy to get rid of waste from the domestic bins provided by WBC, especially when they overflow, as they do at peak festive seasons, and paper/card most of the time. Human nature will prevail, and additional materials will get secreted onto skips. Will all contracts be closed at the customers' sites, or over the telephone? The proposal says that just four people will be employed on the site. The commercial manger is going to be very busy. **This is not a high value – added business.**
- Does this not mean that there will always be smells at the Red Shute site?
- Will there not have to be a shovel loader operating inside the facility and possibly outside?
- If this to be a facility with offices that transact for a wide range of categories of waste from both domestic and industrial users, then will many more in/out HGV movements of empty skips occur than portrayed?
- And will there not have to be additional outward HGV movements using skips, rather than 20 -T HGVs to export the soil, putrescibles and minerals that will inevitably arise from domestic waste?
- And what controls are there, so that waste containing soil, putrescibles, plant matter and minerals is kept to an absolute minimum? No guarantees are being offered, yet by implication a 1, 017 square mile catchment could yield multiples of the waste tonnage envisaged in this application.

Just what will be the traffic from Unit 3, Red Shute Hill?

The traffic forecast in the application is, as follows:

Skip trucks	26
Export 20-T trucks	6
Staff cars	10
Total	42 per day

This forecast is based on an assumption of a 5-tonne load per skip truck. The devil lies in this assumption. The application suggests that there will be single-skip and double-skip Ro-Ro HGVs. Outside the unit on the day of the site visit were 75% 3.5-5T skips and 25% 5-7.5 tonne skips. No clarity was offered as to the mix of single skip and Ro-Ro skip HGVs. This would evolve over time. Waste is notorious for 'bulking out'. Thus one does not expect a full payload to the rated weighted loading of a skip. A working assumption is that waste could bulk out by as much as 40%.

So, the forecast of skip truck movements has to be increased by a sizeable percentage, for:

- Bulking out;
- Export in skip HGVs of putrescibles, soil, minerals and plant matter that nevertheless arise, (not 20T HGVs);
- Empty skip movements for waste that is contracted for, but processed elsewhere,
- Abortive skip movements.

The real number of movements could, perhaps, be as much as 100% or even 200% more. **Remember, this catchment area is 1017 square miles large.**

The incrementality of these traffic forecasts

The case officer's analysis concludes that these traffic movements are not incremental to what can be licensed out of the industrial estate. But this conclusion ignores the fact that the other tenants have different kinds of business, mostly receiving/exporting their goods inwards in a mixture of light vans, pickup trucks and cars. There are three exceptions: Barlow Timber does have HGV goods inwards movements but retails its timber to small builders and DIY customers; Barlow coaches has coach movements, but these are way below the level of the proposed waste facility; and Frontier Country Store has a much lower frequency of goods inwards and outwards in large HGVs. It is the sheer intensity of the skip lorry movements and their unknown daily average which makes this clearly incremental, and an issue for both other tenants of the Red Shute site and neighbours.

Noise

Noise is clearly an issue for appellants, and I have the following questions:

- Does the position of the sensor MPC do justice to the real noise that would be received at Fairmeade?
- Will the noise levels, both shock and ambient, not be much higher, due to the real size of the traffic forecast?
- Will the cramped nature of the site not cause higher ambient noise levels:
 1. Roller doors kept open more often to rid the inevitable putrescent smells?
 2. A shovel loader loading up skips for export?
 3. Traffic contention with other users of the site?
 4. All goods inwards and outwards will entail reversing the HGVs?
 5. Higher number of movements of skip stacks, due to limited skip storage space?

Traffic implications for Cold Ash and Ashmore Green ward and immediate neighbours

Cold Ash and Ashmore Green lies on the frontier of the AONB. It is a very beautiful place. Unfortunately, its roads and lanes provide rat runs for vehicles wishing to drive to/from the Junction 13 of the M4 and Thatcham and to/from the outlying villages and Newbury. The only protection available is a 7.5t weight limit on the Cold Ash Hill/Hermitage Road/Red Shute Hill. Traffic was running at such a speed, that ten years ago a series of chicanes were installed to calm it. Routinely, indeed daily, our lanes and our critical artery are abused by heavy trucks that exceed the weight limits.

The bridge at the bottom of Red Shute Hill is set at an awkward angle, making it difficult for HGV vehicles. The splay from the junction of Long Lane (B4009) with Red Shute Hill is extremely difficult, due to the rise in the elevation of the road, looking towards Newbury. At rush hour time, this makes for mayhem and drivers take risks. Extra traffic is not needed, as at peak times it is already very intense.

The exit of the Red Shute Industrial Estate leads onto the exact spot on Red Shute Hill where water routinely accumulates. There have been a number of dangerous accidents there, due to ice.

St Marks School in Cold Ash is on a cramped site on Cold Ash Hill. I am working with the parish council, stakeholders (parents, teachers and neighbours) as to how best solve the problem of set down and pick up of children. Numerous arrangements have been tried, the number of health and safety incidents that have arisen is alarming, and none of the proposed traffic engineering remedies look feasible. The standard solutions offered by West Berks Council have not remedied the problem. Almost daily, cars seek ways out of the relentless queues that build up outside the school and gridlock the cross roads with The Ridge and Ashmore Green Road. Their solution is to drive up onto the pavement in order to pass the parked cars! Does Cold Ash need additional skip trucks along Cold Ash Hill/Hermitage Road/ Red Shute Hill? No. But they can legally drive along there? Yes, since they have the legal right of access to the site, despite the weight limit. **This is an accident waiting to happen and everyone is worried.**

Conclusion

This application does not spell out the implications of what Harewood Recycling wishes to do. The case officer's provisos and the real size and nature of the business are not examined in sufficient detail to permit approval by committee members. The traffic, noise and potential vehicle contention on site is far higher than portrayed, by virtue of the cramped site and the real size and nature of this operation.

This operation is attracted to its location as a hub near to key routes and corridors. The size of its catchment area, 1017 square miles would suggest that it should be located on one of West Berks' designated sites.

St Mark's school is a huge safety issue.

Recommendations

I ask committee members to refuse this application. If they are still minded to grant approval, I propose the following conditions on the operator:

- No skip trucks and exporter trucks to drive through Cold Ash, unless a skip truck is handling waste arising from Cold Ash ward;
- No shovel loading of waste within or out of the facility;
- Random checks by West Berks Council,
- Three strikes and Harewood Recycling should lose its licence.

Cllr Garth Simpson, Cold Ash Ward

20th January 2013

DC

Agenda Item 4.(3)

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 23RD JANUARY 2013

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (3) **Application No:** 12/02420/FULD **Page No.** 53

Site: 20 Manor Crescent, Compton, Newbury.

Planning Officer Presenting: Jake Brown

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Alison Strong

Objector(s) speaking: Colin Jackman

Support(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mr and Mrs Pipikakis

Ward Member(s): Councillor Von Celsing

Update Information:

Reason for Committee determination:

In addition to the Development Control Manager calling the application to the Western Area Planning Committee, the application was also called to Committee by the Ward Member, Cllr Von Celsing.

Further representations from Compton Parish Council:

Since the production of the Committee report, a supplementary statement has been submitted by Compton Parish Council. The full document is attached to this update and the photographs will be shown during the presentation of the Parish Council at the meeting.

The Parish Council also state in their submissions that:-

'The previous applications have a fuller explanation of the above viewpoint:-

Under application 12/00301/FULD (which was withdrawn) the following was submitted:-

The reasons for Compton Parish Councillors objecting were:-

1. It is contrary to the Compton Village Design Statement, which states "13. The pleasant visual character of the street scene should be maintained by new development by avoiding overbearing extensions and inappropriate in-filling which can have a terracing effect".
2. The development cannot even be classed as 'in-filling' as there is NO space available between 20 and 22 Manor Crescent.
3. The plans are unclear as to exactly where this new dwelling would be located. The space in the rear garden of 20 Manor Crescent is very limited and it is difficult to see how any new property built there would not be overbearing and have a seriously detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.

Under application 12/01519/FULD (which was returned as invalid) the following was submitted:-

The proposal would have the same effect as the original proposal "a terracing and urbanising effect" and is "not in keeping with the Guidelines of our Village Design Statement". From the road there is very little difference in the proposed elevation of that of the original proposal. The building has been moved closer and parallel to the South boundary with a gap of about 18" between house and next door's garage, leaving a larger gap between the house and No. 20. It will still have the same terracing/urbanising effect.

The Village Design Statement is available on our website if you would like to have a look at it. You can select it from the menu box through this link: <http://www.comptonparishcouncil.org/dnn/Documents/tabid/58/Default.aspx>

N.B. The Point 13 quoted above is actually Point 7 in the VDS.

Point 6 may also be useful: Open green spaces, whether private or public, are important elements in the conservation of the rural character of Compton and should make a positive contribution to the public realm.

Another interesting observation is that the picture at the top of page 6 highlights the 'Open Green Spaces at Manor Crescent' and No. 20 is included in the picture.

Another factor which may or may not be useful is the response from Highways.

Under application 12/00301/FULD the following comment was made:

...the proposed dwelling has two double bedrooms but only one parking space. Compton is one of the less sustainable locations within West Berkshire and it would not be unreasonable to assume that this size dwelling in this location could generate two car owners. Two parking spaces are more appropriate therefore. Alternatively I would suggest that the proposed dwelling be reduced to a one-bedroom dwelling which would also reduce the requirement for parking to one space.

In the current application the following comment was made by Highways:-

Two parking spaces are shown for the existing dwelling with one space for the proposed dwelling. Given that this is a two bedroom dwelling in one of the less sustainable locations within the District I would prefer to see two parking spaces for the proposed dwelling. However, it would be difficult to sustain a refusal on this basis alone. Given this I would be unable to object to this application on the basis of the provision of one parking space.'

Further representations from Applicant:

The applicant has submitted a series of photographs that will be shown during the applicants' presentation at the meeting. In respect of the photographs the applicant states that the presentation will show 'pictures of other extensions /developments in the area close to my application.

The applicant further states that 'As you can see the area has many different types / styles of houses on our street. Many have been extended with single, double story and loft extensions. Most of these have gone to the edge of the boundary. I do not think we will be setting a precedent or a terracing effect as ours is a detached proposal and all applications need to be considered on their individual circumstances. We have worked closely with the planning officers to come up with the design. We have changed many details with their advice so that it meets all required regulations.

We feel that a double story extension would not be a better option in this case. This is not garden grabbing as this is our own garden and we have not bought the garden for development purpose from anyone else

We have also read the current Parish Plan and they actually say that there is a need for small dwellings in the area. Please also note that my neighbour who is affected the most has not objected to this application. Some of the objections are the same and also they do not even live in the area, we have only had 2 households object, neither of which would be directly affected by the development, their concerns are mostly unrelated to planning issues. I do not understand why this application has gone to committee as the planning officer has recommended approval and there has been less than 10 objections.'

In addition the applicant has submitted an extract of the Compton Parish Plan which is attached at the end of this document.

Officer Conclusion.

Taking into consideration the additional representations received, the Officer recommendation remains unchanged.

DC

Compton Parish Council respectfully request that during the decision-making process the Western Area Planning Committee give due consideration to the following items drawn from the National Planning Policy Framework, along with the supplementary commentary relating directly to the village of Compton and the application.

NPPF

6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

49. Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

52. The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities, local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way of achieving sustainable development. In doing so, they should consider whether it is appropriate to establish Green Belt around or adjoining any such new development.

53. Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.

7. Requiring good design

56. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

61. Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

64. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Compton, will within the next 12-60 months see the redevelopment 2 major sites within the village creating new homes that will contribute to both local and WBC housing needs.

Fairfield Estate now approved, with works to commence in 2013 replacing 6 x 2 bed flats with 2 x 1 bed maisonettes, 6 x 2 bed houses and 4 x 3 bed houses.

IAH Site currently going through SPD, will significantly increase the overall housing density and demographic of Compton.

Compton Parish Council sponsored the development of a Village Design Statement through lengthy community consultation. The VDS states:

7. The pleasant visual character of the street scene should be maintained by new development by avoiding overbearing extensions and inappropriate in-filling which can have a terracing effect”.

9. New developments, however small, should respect neighbouring properties in scale siting, style and the use of materials.

Compton has two ‘Crescents’ both formed of the same 1940’s institutional designed family housing. Their crescent curve is further enforced by the open space between each pair of houses. While over the years, some of these houses have seen development of end single story laundry rooms and coal stores for more general family use, the visual open space remains.

Compton Parish Council holds the application in contradiction to the Compton VDS and to the National Planning Policy Framework.

- The proposed site cannot be classed as ‘in-filling’ as the space between 20 and 22 Manor Crescent is formed of a family sized garden designed originally, and still serving the purpose of, enhancing quality of living and the character of the rural setting.
- The proposal will have overbearing presence that will cause a serious detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.
- Surrounding properties do, in a small number of cases, differ in style and character but less than 10%of dwellings within Manor Road, Westfields Road and Manor Crescent have extensions to date. Therefore, the housing density of this area is truly enhanced by the appropriate allocation of open space between the pairs of houses.
- With these houses being ‘institutional family homes’ this open space and garden allocation contributes to sustainable and healthy living which must be allowed to remain.
- The application is of low design and has access requirements that bring further limitations to the use of the open green space that sets the front scene of the Crescent.
- The application is not *“improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions” (NPPF #64).*

These comments are supplementary to those already submitted by Compton Parish Council through the formal planning consultation process.

20 & 22 Manor Crescent



24 & 26 Manor Crescent



Manor Crescent Street Scene



Gordon Crescent



Extract of Compton Parish submitted by applicant



Compton Parish Plan



The Landscape

The area is farmed, mostly arable with many large fields bordered by old hedges with multiple species. There are small areas of ancient woodland on hill tops. The area is criss-crossed by ancient drove roads and tracks including the Ridgeway National Path. The underlying rock is chalk with flints, which is reflected as a local material used throughout the village in flint walls.

Over 45% of households give country or village life as their main reason for settling in Compton. Over 80% of respondents said that the quality of the countryside around Compton was very important to them. Over 80% thought that it was very important to keep the River Pang and ditches clean to improve the environment of Compton. Over 50% commented that looking after woodlands was also important. Over 75% suggested that there should be special open spaces in Compton for picnicking and for children to play.



The Built Environment

The working party met on a wet and windy day to walk the village, keen to explore areas not yet known. It is interesting that when living in a village, or anywhere for that matter, our daily lives take us on a routine, which is difficult to break. We have no reason for taking a left hand turn instead of the daily right – a junction on which we take no real notice of the fabric, the materials of the boundaries – we tend just to watch for a safe place in the traffic to turn and be on with our business! The look at detail led the working party to believe that the fabric of the village could be improved with the use of vernacular materials and the preservation of its

individual character with sympathetic new development. Rather than duplicate work by providing information here, it was decided that the way forward was a 'Parish or Village Design Statement' (VDS). As there is already a planning process for this particular mechanism, the Working Party decided that this was the way forward. Consequently a Village Design Statement for Compton is underway and will be available on www.compton-village.org.uk and on the West Berkshire District Council website (www.westberks.gov.uk) when approved. In this particular case, the action point – the VDS – has already commenced and is an example of how the Parish Plan acted as a catalyst for this work.



Housing

The majority of existing dwellings in Compton are owner-occupied, detached or semi-detached dwellings. A survey carried out recently by the Rural Housing Trust demonstrated that there was a need for small, affordable dwellings in Compton. Many young people who are currently living with parents, or renting, could not afford to buy their own property. Results from the Household Questionnaire indicated that most people were keen to see small family units, homes for the young, single people and special category needs e.g. with disabilities. There was agreement that these would best be provided by either rented or shared equity housing schemes.

Education

Compton is privileged in having a Church, Primary School and the Downs Secondary School located within the village, as well as being well served by pre-school provision. Both schools are

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4.(4)

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON 23RD JANUARY 2013

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (4) Application No: 12/02476/FULD Page No. 67

Site: Land opposite Fairbank, between Cedar House, The Lythe and Rectory Cottages, Wickham.

Planning Officer Presenting: Jake Brown

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: N/A

Support(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Andrew Plumridge

Ward Member(s): Councillor Stansfeld and Councillor Rowles

Update Information:

No update information to provide.

DC

This page is intentionally left blank