DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 2 NOVEMBER 2016

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

Also Present: Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Paul Goddard (Team Leader - Highways Development Control), Jo Reeves (Principal Policy Officer) and Matthew Shepherd (Planning Officer)

Councillor Absent: Councillor Howard Bairstow

PART I

29. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21 September 2016 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Item 24, page 5, 4th paragraph, 4th line: change 'Planning Policy Task Group' to 'Planning Advisory Group'

Item 24, page 5, 4th paragraph, 5th line: change 'proposal' to 'suggestion' and change 'seconded' to 'supported'.

Item 26 (1), page 7, paragraph 10, 9th bullet: change 'and' to 'to' and change 'roof light to' to 'roof light of'.

30. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Paul Hewer declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(2), and reported that, as his interest was a disclosable pecuniary interest, he would be leaving the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter.

Councillor Virginia von Celsing declared an interest in Agenda Item 4(2) and (3), but reported that, as her interest was a personal, but not a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

31. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) Application No. and Parish: 16/02277/HOUSE - 36 Church Street, Hungerford

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 16/02277/HOUSE in respect of 3 Church Street, Hungerford and a replacement garage building to rear of the property.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Ben Hutchins, objector, and Mr Kevin Brearley and Mr David Moore, applicant and agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations. Permission was sought to

replace the single storey garage buildings with a triple garage with workshop/garden room, and a home office above. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable and a conditional approval was justifiable. Officers strongly recommended the Committee grant planning permission.

Councillor Anthony Pick recalled that the Committee had visited a neighbouring property on the site visit and enquired what the distance from the proposed garage that property was; Derek Carnegie responded that it was 15m.

In response to a query from Councillor Adrian Edwards, Derek Carnegie indicated that the Conservation Officer's comments were on page 18 of the agenda.

Councillor Hilary Cole noted that the application had come before the Committee for determination due to the number of objections. She advised that she had read the 23 letters of objection and was disappointed that only three had provided the name and address of the objector. For a minor application, the level of objection was extreme so she should like to know where the other twenty objectors lived.

Councillor Paul Bryant sought clarification on the positioning on the proposed garage in relation to the road.

Mr Hutchins in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He was the resident at 1 Oaks Court, which had been visited by the Committee on their site visit.
- He welcomed the plan to replace the garage but objected to the proposed two storey garage which would be overbearing.
- He was concerned that other garages could be converted and lead to further development on the byway.
- This plan was no different to the plan which was withdrawn the previous year due to its scale, bulk and impact.
- The windows of the guest suite would overlook his property and garden.
- The proposed garage would front directly onto a road.
- The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on his privacy and was not inkeeping with the single storey garages in the area.
- The Council's own policies stated there should be a distance on 21m between facing windows.
- The application proposed a change of use to living space.
- His right to privacy was protected by the Human Rights Act and local and national planning policies.

In response to a query from Members, Derek Carnegie advised that officers had considered the potential impact of the windows and believed the proposal sufficiently addressed any concerns.

Councillor Cole stated that Mr Hutchins' had the only property which would be directly effected by the proposed garage and asked what he knew of the other objections. Mr Hutchins responded that the other objectors had raised parking issues. Councillor Paul Hewer noted that the proposed garage would provide three parking spaces off the road and asked whether this would allay their fears. Mr Hutchins responded that there was already a problem in the area as emergency and refuse vehicles were not able to access

the area but they were able to previously. Councillor Bryant supposed that the objectors were concerned that other garages in the area might be converted into dwellings.

Mr Brearley (Applicant) and Mr Moore (agent) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr Brearley was surprised that the application had received 23 objections but he had changed the plans to address those concerns.
- He had adult children and required extra parking space.
- The current garage was an eyesore and unusable due to damp and asbestos.
- He was a designated home worker and required suitable working space.
- The application included secure parking and was essentially a single storey building with a converted loft space.
- They had been mindful of quality in designing the garage and had sought to ensure it was subservient to the area.

Councillor Billy Drummond asked whether the garage was intended to be used for storage space. Mr Brearley confirmed that he intended to use it to store cars.

Councillor Pick asked whether Mr Brearley would be amenable to accepting a condition to obscure the glazing of the rooflights. Mr Brearley advised that he would be disappointed if the Committee chose to apply such a condition as the windows did not directly overlook the neighbouring property.

Councillor Paul Hewer, speaking as Ward Member in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He had sympathy with any objector.
- The Committee should be mindful of setting precedence.
- This application was more sympathetic to the area than a neighbouring garage.

Councillor Pick asked for Councillor Hewer's view on the distance between the proposed garage's windows and those of the objector's property. Councillor Hewer advised that he would be concerned if it was the gable end but did not imagine that there would be significant overlooking from a Velux window.

Councillor Garth Simpson asked whether, if the Committee allowed the application, a precedence might be set regarding the size of garages to the east of the property. Councillor Hewer responded that there was a mismatch of garages in the area.

Councillor Cole stated that 1 Oaks Court would overlook the garage just as much as the garage would overlook 1 Oaks Court.

Councillor von Celsing, in commencing the debate expressed the view that the garage was a nice design and an improvement to the area. She did not see merit in imposing a condition to have obscured glazing. Councillor von Celsing proposed that the Committee accept officer's recommendation to grant planning permission.

Councillor Bryant in seconding the proposal commented that he did not think it would effect parking in the area and the feared overlooking did not carry much weight as they were angled down the road.

Councillor Simpson advised that he would find the proposal acceptable if there were no further permitted development rights. Councillor Pick explained that this was covered by Condition 8.

Councillor Hooker invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor von Celsing, as seconded by Councillor Bryant to accept officers recommendation. At the vote this was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development of the extension shall be started within three years from the date of this permission and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development against Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Design·& Access Statement and drawings 16059/001 G Rev B and 002 G Rev B received on 5 October 2016.

Reason: To ensure that the development is constructed in accordance with the submitted details assessed against Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

3. No development shall take place until samples, and an accompanying schedule, of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Samples shall be made available to be viewed at the site or by arrangement with the Planning Officer. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

4. No development shall take place until details of the rooflights have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall be conservation style and flush fitting). Details clarifying the window opening size are required. The window shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring properties and visual character of the Conservation Area in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies CS14 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

5. No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The statement shall provide for:

(a) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors

(b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials

(c) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development

(d) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during demolition/construction

(e) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining land uses and occupiers and in the interests of highway safety. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

6. No demolition or construction works shall take place outside the following hours:

- 8:00am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays;
- 8:30am to 1:00pm Saturdays;
- nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no windows/dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) which would otherwise be permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B or C of that Order shall be constructed without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority in respect of an application made for that purpose.

Reason: In the interests of the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 04/2 House Extensions (July 2004).

8. The garage and home office hereby approved shall be used only as an integral part of the existing dwelling known as '36 Church Street', and for residential purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the occupiers of that dwelling. It shall not be used as a separate dwelling unit, nor shall it be sold, let, rented or otherwise separately occupied, or disposed of, and no separate curtilage shall be created.

Reason: The creation of a separate unit of accommodation is inappropriate for the site, and would be detrimental to the amenities of the area and therefore would be contrary to the provisions of Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy 2006-2026.

9. The use of the building hereby approved shall not commence until the vehicle parking space have been surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the approved plan. The parking spaces shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

(2) Application No. and Parish: 16/01052/FULMAJ - Prosperous Home Farm, Salisbury Road, Hungerford

(Councillor Paul Hewer declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that he was employed by Sovereign Housing, the proposed

affordable housing provider. As his interest was a disclosable pecuniary interest, he would be leaving the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter and would take no part in the debate or voting on the matter.)

(Councillor Virginia von Celsing declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that she was acquainted with the agent. As her interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 16/01052/FULMAJ in respect of Prosperous Home Farm, Salisbury Road, Hungerford and an application to renovate existing buildings and erect new dwellings, including two affordable housing units.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Martin Crane, Parish Council representative and Mr Rod Kent and Mr Stuart Roberts, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations. The proposal was for the removal of existing agricultural buildings/structures to facilitate the creation of 7 dwellings; including the conversion and extension of 4 traditional agricultural buildings and grain silos, and the erection of 3 new build dwellings, two of which would be affordable, with associated parking, turning, landscaping, private amenity space, ecological enhancements, and provision of footway to existing bus stop. There would also be improvements to the existing farmhouse; including the removal of an existing car port, erection of new garage, remodelling works and the erection of replacement single storey agricultural storage barn. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal unsatisfactory and a conditional approval was not justifiable. Officers strongly recommended the Committee refuse planning permission.

Councillor Hooker asked why the Highways objection had only been received on the day of the Committee meeting. Derek Carnegie responded that the Highways Team had been in consistent discussions with the applicant but needed to reach a conclusion.

Paul Goddard explained that Highways officers had assessed the proposals and noted the proposed footpath to a bus stop on the A338. The sight lights onto the A338 were almost at an acceptable level considering the speed of the road. The Highways Team sought for developments of over five dwellings to have roads built to adoptable standards but this would not be possible as there would not be sufficient width.

Councillor Anthony Pick noted the connection with Jethro Tull who was an important historical figure and asked whether any of the buildings dated from his occupation of the farm. Derek Carnegie advised that the majority of the buildings would not. Councillor Pick further sought clarification on the proposed large house and noted that the council's new Housing Sites Allocation Development Plan Document (HSA DPD) did not change the policy on rural exception sites.

Councillor Paul Bryant noted that the policy on rural exception sites was irrelevant as the site in question was not one. Councillor Bryant asked whether a landowner would be required to use previously-used land to erect a barn. Derek Carnegie advised that the Local Planning Authority might comments on its location but it was not required to be on brownfield land.

Mr Crane, (Parish Council representative), in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The proposal would be an exciting development and would bring into use redundant agricultural buildings.
- Wiltshire County Council raised no objections.
- The site currently coped without intervention from the Highways Team.
- The proposed development would provide much needed affordable housing in a rural area.
- He was an advisory partner for the North Wessex Downs Area on Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- The officer's comment in the committee report that the development was unsustainable was a subjective opinion.
- The development would protect a Heritage asset.
- Councillor Hilary Cole noted that residents of the affordable housing might not have their own transport and enquired upon the regularity of the bus service. Mr Crane responded that the 20 and 22 services between Hungerford and Marlborough operated every two hours.
- Derek Carnegie read an appeal decision by the Planning Inspector in relation to the Rising Sun near Woolhampton which outlined what 'sustainable' was considered to mean. Mr Crane responded that people choosing to live at the site would be aware of the public transport offer in advance.
- Mr Kent (Applicant) and Mr Roberts (Agent) in addressing the committee made the following points:
- The site was a redundant farm yard sited some 600 yards away from the site of Jethro Tull's farm.
- There were no public objections or objections from other authorities.
- A similar application in Winterbourne had recently been approved by the Committee.
- Government policy was in favour of converting redundant agricultural buildings for housing.
- The application would not diminish the natural beauty of the AONB and instead would remove ugly buildings and concrete hardstanding.
- It would not be viable to provide the affordable hosuing if the whole site was not developed.
- There was a high demand for affordable housing in Hungerford.
- Two new affordable dwellings would enhance Sovereign's existing housing stock.
- Councillor Pick enquired whether the site was still in use as a farm. Mr Kent responded that there was some arable use and parts were sublet for grazing. Councillor Pick further asked why the buildings were redundant; Mr Kent replied that they were not appropriate for storing machinery. Councillor Pick further sought clarification regarding the size of the large house; Mr Kent advised it would be a 4 bedroomed house with the attic laid to plank. Councillor Pick asked if the affordable housing would be protected for agricultural workers. Mr Kent advised that it would not but the Coach House would be offered to an existing tenant whom he wished to treat as a Protected tenant, although not legally defined as such.

- Councillor Bryant sought further clarification on the connection to Jethro Tull. Mr Kent advised that he was writing a biography of Jethro Tull who dies in the 1750s whereas the oldest buildings on the site were built in the 1850s. Councillor Bryant enquired upon the purpose of the new barn. Mr Kent advised that it would be used to store the remaining agricultural equipment securely.
- Councillor Jeff Beck asked if Mr Kent was aware of any other silo conversions. Mr Kent responded that he knew of one near Grateley, south west of Andover and numerous conversions in the USA.
- Councillor James Podger, speaking as Ward Member, in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
- The Town council strongly supported the proposal.
- Affordable housing was needed in Hungerford.
- The silo conversion was innovative and the new buildings would have longevity.
- The period buildings would be protected.
- There were no Highways objections from Wiltshire County Council.
- Members had seen on the site visit that there was good visibility on the exit to the A338.
- He did not agree that there would be harm to Planning Policy.
- Councillor Adrian Edwards asked if Councillor Podger knew of any other similar sites in Hungerford; Councillor Podger replied that Councillor Hewer would be likely to know that information.
- Councillor Cole asked Derek Carnegie whether the proposal might have been more acceptable if only the conversion of existing buildings had been proposed and the erection of new dwellings had not been included. Derek Carnegie responded that it might and reminded the Committee that West Berkshire aimed to be a plan-led authority.
- Councillor Bryant asked whether a building needed to be suitable for conversion in order for conversion to be permitted. Derek Carnegie confirmed that it would.
- Councillor Beck asked if Members were minded to approve the application, whether permission would be practicable given the Highways objections. Derek Carnegie explained that the application would still be a clear departure from Planning Policy and so would be referenced to the District Planning Committee for determination. Councillor Beck asked whether this could be overcome if the applicant was prepared to accept the Highways recommendations; Derek Carnegie advised that if that was the case he would suggest the application was held in abeyance until any proposal on the Highways aspect had been approved by officers, but the application in total was still against the Council's policies.
- Councillor Cole commended the exciting concept of the development, particularly noting the silo conversion, however she expressed concern about the new build properties. It was good to see an application put forward which included affordable housing and would have no problem if the application was just a conversion but could not support the application.
- Councillor Bryant stated that he was happy with the conversion of the farm building but could not support the new dwellings and proposed that the committee accept officers recommendation to refuse the application. Councillor Edwards in

seconding the application expressed concern that it might set a precedent and as a cyclist disputed that the A338 was a safe road to cycle on.

- Councillor Hooker invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor Bryant, as seconded by Councillor Edwards to accept officers recommendation. At the vote this was carried with one abstention.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

Reasons:

1. The West Berkshire Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2015 (Housing - January 2016) shows that the Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The Core Strategy, in accordance with the advice within paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, provides an up to date framework for development planning in West Berkshire.

The application site is situated in an unsustainable location outside of a defined settlement boundary. It comprises greenfield land within the countryside, and a protected nationally designated landscape of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where new development is strictly controlled. The site is not included in the Core Strategy district settlement hierarchy which identifies the most sustainable settlements for development. The proposed development is not considered to be a Rural Exception site under the criteria set out in Policy HSG.11 of the Local Plan or Policy C2 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document. Nor does it represent any other exceptional circumstance for housing development in the countryside assessed against Policy HSG.1 of the Local Plan and Policy C1 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document. The proposed development therefore fails to comply with Policies ADPP1, ADPP5, CS1 and CS13, of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, Policy HSG.1 and HSG.11 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007, and Policy C1 and C2 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Character of the Countryside

2. The proposed development would by virtue of the extent of the alterations and extensions to the existing agricultural buildings in conjunction with the proposed new dwellings would result in a substantial isolated form and scale of domestic development which would be inappropriate to this agricultural site. Furthermore, the site is located within the North Wessex Downs AONB and is clearly visible. The development would adversely affect the natural beauty of the landscape and special visual qualities of the countryside and AONB.

This form of development is to the detriment of the visual, spatial and environmental character of the area within the countryside. The proposal conflicts with Development Plan Policies ADPP1, ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 (West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2016), HSG1 and ENV20 (West Berkshire Local Plan Saved policies 2007), Policies C1, C4 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document, Supplemental Planning Document Quality Design and advice contained within the NPPF.

Lack of S106 Housing

3. The proposed development fails to provide a planning obligation to secure the appropriate provision of affordable housing. As such, the development fails to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, the Planning Practice Guidance, Policies CS5 and CS6 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

Lack of S278 Agreement

4. The application fails to provide a Section 278 agreement for an appropriate scheme of works to accommodate the impact of the development on local infrastructure, or provide an appropriate mitigation measure such as a planning obligation. The proposal is therefore contrary to Government advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies CS5 and CS13 of the West Berkshire District Core Strategy 2006-2026, and Policy TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007.

(The Committee adjourned at 8.18pm and reconvened at 8.23pm.)

(3) Application No. and Parish: 16/02365/FUL - Scilla, High Street, Compton

(Councillor Virginia von Celsing declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(3) by virtue of the fact that she was acquainted with the agent. As her interest was personal and not a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(3*)) concerning Planning Application 16/02365/FUL in respect of Scilla, High Street, Compton for the demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with new two storey dwelling.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr John Thomason, Parish Council representative, and Mr Steve Simkins, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Matthew Shepherd introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material considerations. The proposal was considered to be of a high quality design which should be encouraged. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable and a conditional approval was justifiable. Officers strongly recommended the Committee grant/refuse planning permission

Mr Thomason (Parish Council representative) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He had been appointed by the Parish Council to give a statement on their behalf.
- The proposal would not be in keeping with the street scene or the village design statement. It was a contemporary design in a prominent location.
- The flat roof was alien to Berkshire housing design.

Councillor Pick noted that the Compton Village Design Statement supported a variety of styles and was in favour of innovation. Mr Thomason responded that they supported the gable as an architectural feature but the flat roof did not correspond with the street scene.

Councillor Garth Simpson noted that the scale was compatible with the street scene and asked what the most important design feature was to the Parish council. Mr Thomason responded that the box appearance did not sit comfortably with the high street.

Councillor Clive Hooker asked whether the tree to the front of the site would be protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO); Derek Carnegie advised that the tree was situated away from the site and a TPO was not required.

Councillor Edwards enquired whether the Parish council had spoken with the Conservation Officer before submitting their objection. Mr Thomason responded that he did not know the answer to that query.

Mr Simkins (Agent) in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The design followed the pattern of development along the high Street and had the same position and building line as the current bungalow.
- The front garden would be retained.
- The mix of roof styles would retain the variety of the street.
- Local material would be used to complement the two immediately neighbouring properties.
- The village Design Statement encouraged distinctive features.
- It would be a high quality building and complied with policy.

Councillor Hilary Cole asked whether the applicant had consulted with their neighbours prior to submitting the application. Mr Simkins responded that he knew the two immediate neighbours had been consulted but was unable to comment whether wider consultation had occurred.

Councillor Beck asked what material would be used for the flat roof; Mr Simkins advised that it would be a green roof laid with sedum.

Councillor Virginia von Celsing speaking as Ward Member in addressing the Committee made the following points:

- The Parish Council was not against development in general or the scale of the proposed house but was against the Cathedral-style glazing overlooking the conservation area.
- There had been a subjective comment from the Panning Officer that it was of 'high-level architectural merit'.
- The design was not sympathetic enough to the Village Design Statement.

Councillor Beck proposed that the Committee accept officer's recommendation to grant planning permissions as the development would fit in with and enhance the surrounding area. Councillor Cole in seconding the proposal agree that the design was innovative and noted she was pleased that it was not a pastiche of the existing properties.

Councillor Hooker invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor Beck, as seconded by Councillor Cole to accept officers recommendation. At the vote this was carried with one abstention.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. Standard approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings

- Drawing title "Proposed Elevations". Drawing number P103 Rev A. Date stamped 20th September 2016
- Drawing title "Proposed Elevations 2". Drawing number P104 Rev B. Date stamped 20th September 2016
- Drawing title "Proposed Section". Drawing number P105. Date stamped 6th September 2016.
- Drawing title "Proposed Plans". Drawing number P101 Rev A. Date stamped 20th September 2016.
- Drawing title "Proposed Site Plan". Drawing number P100 Rev A. Date stamped 20th September 2016.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

3. Samples of materials (to be submitted)

No development shall take place until samples, and an accompanying schedule, of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling and hard surfaced areas hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policies ADDP5, CS14, and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Document Supplementary Planning Guidance Quality Design (June 2006) and Compton Village Design Statement.

4. HIGH12 - Parking/turning in accord with plans (YHA24)

The dwelling shall not be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning space have been surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the approved plans. The parking and turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

5. HIGH19 - Cycle parking (YHA35)

The dwelling shall not be occupied until the cycle parking has been provided in accordance with the approved drawings and this area shall thereafter be kept available for the parking of cycles at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and assists with the parking, storage and security of cycles. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

6. HIGH20 - Cycle storage (YHA41)

No development shall take place until details of the cycle parking and storage space have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

dwelling shall not be occupied until the cycle parking and storage space has been provided 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. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and Policy TRANS1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

7. Hours of work condition

The hours of work for all contractors for the duration of the site development shall unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing be limited to:

7.30 am to 6.00 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays 8.30 am to 1.00 p.m. on Saturdays and NO work shall be carried out on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

8. Landscaping

No development shall take place until details of a scheme of landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, an implementation programme and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment. The scheme shall ensure;

a) Completion of the approved landscape scheme within the first planting season following completion of development/first occupation of the dwelling.

b) Any trees shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of this development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping, in the interests of amenity in accordance with the objectives of Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

9. SuDS

No development shall commence until a details of Sustainable Drainage Methods to be used within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall ensure that all surface water is contained within the site and that no surface water is directed to existing highway drains nor existing water courses unless through controlled attenuation. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the approved sustainable drainage methods have been implemented in full and these shall be maintained and operated in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not create unsustainable surface water run-off or adversely affects important areas of bio and geo diversity in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS16 and CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006 - 2026.

10. Means of Enclosure

The Dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until a scheme of fencing and other means of enclosure to be erected on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and erected in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The fencing and other means of enclosure are essential elements in the detailed design of this development and the application is not accompanied by sufficient details to enable the Local Planning Authority to give proper consideration to these matters. In the interests of amenity and the character of the area. In accordance with Policies ADPP5, CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

11. Restriction of Permitted Development Rights

Irrespective of the provisions of the current Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any subsequent revision), no additions or extensions to the dwelling shall be built, unless permission in writing has been granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for the purpose.

Reason: To prevent the over-development of the site, in the interest of amenity and visual character of the area. In accordance with Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Informatives

1. Approval objection

This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has secured and accepted what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

2. CIL Liable

The development hereby approved results in a requirement to make payments to the Council as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) procedure. A Liability Notice setting out further details, and including the amount of CIL payable will be sent out separately from this Decision Notice. You are advised to read the Liability Notice and ensure that a Commencement Notice is submitted to the authority prior to the commencement of the development. Failure to submit the Commencement Notice will result in the loss of any exemptions claimed, and the loss of any right to pay by instalments, and additional costs to you in the form of surcharges. For further details see the website at www.westberks.gov.uk/cil

3. HI 3 Damage to footways, cycleways and verges

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Berkshire Act, 1986, Part II, Clause 9, which enables the Highway Authority to recover the costs of repairing damage to the footway, cycleway or grass verge, arising during building operations.

4. HI 4 Damage to the carriageway

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Highways Act, 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic.

5. HI 8 Excavation in close proximity to the highway

In order to protect the stability of the highway it is advised that no excavation be carried out within 15 metres of a public highway without the written approval of the Highway Authority.

6. Informative – Construction / Demolition Noise

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the requirements of Section 60 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 in respect of the minimisation of noise on construction and demolition

sites. Application, under Section 61 of the Act, for prior consent to the works, can be made to the Environmental Health and Licensing Manager.

7. Code for Sustainable Homes

The dwelling should seek to achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainability for house design which replaces that scheme). To ensure the development contributes to sustainable construction.

32. Appeal Decisions relating to Western Area Planning Committee

Members noted the outcome of appeal decisions relating to the Western Area.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.52 am)

CHAIRMAN …….

Date of Signature …….