

Item No.	Application and Parish	No.	8/13 Week Date	Proposal, Location and Applicant
(2)	19/00019/HOUSE Newbury Town Council		28 th February 2019 EOT to 14 th March 2019	19 Battery End Newbury Berkshire RG14 6NX Single storey extension with basement Mr Jack and Danielle Stacey

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=19/00019/HOUSE>

Ward Member(s): Councillor H Bairstow
Councillor A Edwards

Reason for Committee determination: The application has received 10 or more objections and the Case Officer is recommending APPROVAL

Committee Site Visit: 7th March 2019.

Recommendation. **The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to GRANT planning permission.**

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Mr. Matthew Shepherd
Job Title:	Senior Planning Officer
Tel No:	(01635) 519111
E-mail Address:	Matthew.Shepherd@westberks.gov.uk

1. Relevant Site History

- 1.1. 16/01446/FULD. Erection of a 3 bed dwellings with parking, amenity space and associated works. Refused 25.07.2016.
- 1.2. Full planning history available on file.

2. Publicity of Application

2.1. This application was advertised by way of Site Notice to which was posted to the front entrance of the site on 24th January 2019 and expired on 14th February 2019.

3. Consultations and Representations

Consultations

Newbury Council	Town	No objection / comments: 1) A construction method statement is required to deal with removal of spoil and limitation of inconvenience to neighbours. 2) Given that the site lies on the site of the First Battle of Newbury, an archaeological survey should be carried out. 3) In addition to stipulation of the usual hours of working, there should be no delivery vehicles during the times that local children are walking to or leaving school. 4) A geological survey is needed to ensure that building of the proposed basement will not cause damage to neighbouring buildings, local services, or trees, or risk of flooding.
Highways		<p>A 4-bed dwelling in this location should be provided with 2.5 car parking spaces. Two spaces are proposed, however it is my view that more than 2 spaces could be accommodated on the existing drive (where the extension is proposed). I would prefer to see 3 car parking spaces for a dwelling of this size</p> <p>During the course of the application an amended parking plan was submitted to the highway officer.</p> <p>The required parking must be provided within the curtilage of the site and not on the road (as has been suggested on the site plan) or the adjacent access track. The plan detailing 3 driveway parking spaces is required and should be conditioned.</p> <p>I note that there are some representation letters referring to the vehicular access. This is an existing situation for this dwelling and so I could not insist upon a widened drop kerb.</p> <p>As the site contains a residential dwelling, the application has been assessed on this basis only.</p> <p>The highway recommendation is for conditional approval with the provision of 3 driveway parking spaces as shown on the site plan.</p>
Public Rights of Way Officer		No response 26/02/2019
Archaeology		Although there is some archaeological interest in this area from both

the First Battle of Newbury and the Wash Common barrow cemetery, I feel that the scale of this proposal is probably too small for there to be major impact on any features of archaeological significance.

When this was queried by a member of the public in response to an alternative response given for a previous application on the site, the following response was given.

When considering an archaeological response to all planning proposals, there will always be a degree of individual professional judgement, based on existing knowledge. In the example you have given of the difference between a new detached building in a back garden plot, and an extension to an existing semi-detached building, I believe that my predecessor Alex Godden would probably have responded the same way as I have to 19/00019/HOUSE. As he indicated in his 2016 memo and I also did in my email to Matthew Shepherd, there is general archaeological interest in this area, both from the First Battle of Newbury and the prehistoric Wash Common Barrow Cemetery. An additional possible feature which could have been affected by the house proposed under 16/01446/FULD was the line of an earthwork seen in the 19th century though not recorded on later OS mapping. However there has clearly been much disturbance on Wash Common through the construction of the residential streets such as Battery End (interestingly called Cromwell Road on earlier mapping).

Where large plots remain undeveloped or are likely to have had little modern disturbance then I therefore believe it is justifiable to ask applicants to fund archaeological investigations for new builds, such as the watching brief which Alex requested for the new development in the rear garden under 16/01446/FULD. However the archaeology service usually refrains from requesting a programme of archaeological work when householder extensions are proposed, unless there is very clear evidence that important archaeological features are likely to be affected. There is no specific known feature underlying the footprint of the extension of 19/00019/HOUSE, apart from the general possibility of battlefield archaeology. Experience has shown us that there is little to be gained from supervision of such extensions as the ground is usually disturbed from the original construction or from runs of services.

Elsewhere across the built up part of Wash Common we have had limited results of battlefield archaeology from other investigations, which is perhaps surprising. If people digging in their gardens have found artefacts of interest (eg musket balls, but also those of any other archaeological period), then we would be very pleased to hear about it. Our database, the Historic Environment Record (HER) is a continually growing evidence base, maintained by Beth Asbury, Assistant Archaeologist (also copied in). Feedback can be provided directly to us, or by using an online reporting form <https://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=31896>. We also have a Finds Liaison Officer Helena Costas, who identifies and records artefacts for the Portable Antiquities Scheme, and who holds regular Finds Surgeries at West Berkshire Museum https://booking.westberks.gov.uk/heritage_events.html#. I hope any local residents who wish to help update the HER get in touch.

<p>Tree Officer</p>	<p>The yew tree at the side of the house has now been felled, this would have been directly impacted by the proposal. The overall plans drawing states that they are committed to planting 7 new mature trees, this is welcomed but further details need to be submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>There are no trees directly or indirectly that will impact on this development details of the landscaping will be required.</p>
<p>Building Control</p>	<p>A basement could cause issues with the neighbour's property and garden if the works are not carried out correctly and in accordance with a structural engineers design. The requirements of the building regulations do not cover damage to the adjacent property as this will be down to the builders insurance but I would imagine that the party wall act applies and the neighbour should be contacted regarding a party wall agreement?</p> <p>I can only provide limited advice as we are in receipt of an Initial Notice application no. 18/00124 for the project and the building control function will be undertaken by JHAI Ltd and not the Council.</p>
<p>Sustainable Drainage Officer</p>	<p>I note there are a number of local representations raising the issue of high groundwater. Ordnance Survey mapping does indicate a potential groundwater emergence occurs to the south-west of the site, behind Falkland School, but that is only an interpretation of groundwater and is not conclusive. On the other hand, groundwater information we have access to suggests that locally, its depth is in excess of 5m below ground level.</p> <p>The submitted borehole log is only a record that a borehole was sunk at the nearby church - there is no geological information accompanying it and therefore it is of no use. I realise time is short, but can the Applicant provide the full borehole information as the soil make-up is important to be able to consider the effect of the basement development on groundwater movement.</p> <p>If high groundwater is likely, the only indication of this being intercepted around the basement is by the 100mm "aqueduct" sitting within pea shingle. There is a note on the basement drawing showing "20mm+ backfill" (which presumably refers to stone size) but no indication of the width of this material.</p> <p>In terms of surface water drainage proposed for the development, the sedum roof and the rainwater harvesting tank are positive points, although my interpretation of the details provided suggest that the harvesting tank will be for an external water supply only (for "outside taps"). The size of the harvester tank as shown on the layout plan at 1000 litres is very small however and rainfall run-off calculations are required based on a 1 in 100 year + climate change event in order to assess if it is adequate. In any case, an overflow system will be necessary for the times when water in the tank is not used and rainfall exceeds the remaining tank capacity. Full details of the system are required.</p> <p>A maintenance plan for the sedum and harvesting tank are required</p>

	<p>(along with that for any other drainage which may now be supplied). In particular is the sedum roof accessible? If the tank is wrapped in EPDM can it be accessed?</p> <p>Further information is therefore required before I can give a recommendation.</p> <p><u>Further information was submitted by the applicant to which the drainage officer responded as follows</u></p> <p>The info shown on the borehole log (>40m of clay/silt at 10.5m depth) indicates that the ground water issues mentioned by objectors could possibly be due to a perched water table, but that is supposition. Because of the depth of gravel above it, it is less problematic than I thought it may have been and I'm happy for site investigation/excavation to confirm that groundwater is not a problem at building control inspection stage during construction, notwithstanding of course that ground conditions could vary between the site and the borehole location.</p> <p>The holding tank for the harvesting system should have been sized already by the Applicant as this does not require any site-obtained information; however to enable progression this can be done as construction progresses to the satisfaction of the building control inspector. Since the captured water will be predominantly for garden use, it will not be required for at least 4-5 months of the year therefore an effective 'back-up' system is required for overflow. As an existing soakaway is indicated for this purpose, its condition and infiltration effectiveness needs to be determined by investigation. Again, this can be proved at construction stage.</p> <p>I do strongly recommend that an inspection shaft is included in the harvesting tank to enable future inspection and don't agree that it is not necessary due to bottom discharge (to the pump chamber). I agree however that a hydrobrake / additional attenuation is not required and that was not the intention of my previous comments, rather that the harvesting tank is sufficiently sized as covered above.</p> <p>Sedum roofs can be self-sustaining, but they can also fail. As per my previous comment, is access available to inspect and 'weed' or re-plant if necessary? A statement to this effect is ultimately all that is required.</p> <p><u>On the basis of the above, the issues I had can all be agreed with the building control inspector during construction.</u></p>
--	--

1. Representations

1.1. The Local Planning Authority received 16 letters of representation 10 of which were objection to the proposed development and 5 of which were letters of support.

1.2. The matters raised in the letters of objection (summarised by officer) are:

- Objection has been raised in regards to the changes the applicant has made to the shared access adjacent to the dwelling.

- Concerns in regards to the boundary treatments of the development have been raised.
- Concern has been raised in regards to the hours of construction being restricted to working hours and not at weekends or bank holidays.
- The application assumes the access track is part of the applicants land
- The proposed development would create a gap in the fence line which is supposed to be continuous along the access track.
- The development will disrupt the green passageway that the adjacent access track permits
- The beach tree in the adjacent garden may fall on the development
- The basement may create issues given the water table, subsidence and dewatering of the area.
- The development would change the character of the area and would have a large visual impact on the street scene
- Bats have been noted in the area a survey should be conducted
- The hours of work and deliveries should take into account the issues that the development is very close to schools
- The archaeology of the site should be surveyed
- Details of the removal of spoil should be conditioned
- Some of the questions answered with the application form are incorrect in the objectors opinion.
- A geological survey should be commission to ensure that the basement is built correctly
- The development will have an adverse impact on the environment and the ecology of the adjacent access way. The neighbourhood has recently loss the mature trees on the site which provided habitats
- The scale of the proposed development is too big and is out of proportion with the scale of the existing dwelling. Again, the disproportionate scale will impact negatively both on the surrounding environment and the character of the neighbourhood.
- The current proposal provides only limited information regarding materials, finishes etc. so it is not possible to judge whether the proposed structure will be in keeping with the character of the existing property
- A building company has been registered to 19 Battery End
- The proposed side extension shows a direct access point onto the grassy path, which is not appropriate. The width of the proposed storage/bins area and utility room goes right up to the boundary line
- From the block plan submitted, the size of the proposed extension appears to be disproportionately large compared with the existing house and plot.
- The applicant has unfortunately already made detrimental changes to the grassy footpath, by removing parts of the boundary fence, mature trees/hedgerow, and paving over the front with hardcore to use as parking/storage.
- The development is likely to affect or harm a protected species, namely bats.
- The prospect of a 3 metre excavation gives objectors concerns not only for the integrity of the lane but for the disruption to the immediate community. Working room, construction traffic, loading / offloading of materials and working hours will have to be considered.
- Objectors would ask that all materials are in keeping with the original house, that the planting mentioned in the plans is carried out, and that the proposed extension fits seamlessly into the attractive residential area that surrounds it.
- Radio noise be kept to a minimum so as not to disturb neighbours
- The developer has not spoken to neighbouring properties
- This development is in close proximity to the site of the Battle of Newbury (Civil War) hence the name Battery End where the ammunition was stored so it is likely close monitoring will be needed to look for artefacts, especially as large quantities of spoil will need to leave the site

1.3. The matters raised in the letters of objection (summarised by officer) are:

- The front elevation of the side extension appears to have been well designed to fit in with the surrounding properties.

- Given that the house had been unoccupied for up to five years prior to the Stacey's moving in the objector is delighted that it is now being turned into a spacious family home.
- The alignment of the two parking spaces in front of the extension ensures that access to the right of way adjacent to the property will be maintained.
- Given the distance of the basement excavations neighbours of battery end do not believe the development will impact upon them. The distance being some 9.5m's away.
- The objectors also consider that a basement will have no additional visual impact on the street scene (to that of the original single-storey extension proposed) and it will clearly achieve some exciting accommodation for the applicants.
- Given also that all development is proposed against the eastern boundary of the applicants' plot, objectors do not feel that this single storey solution should have any adverse influence on number 21 battery end. In fact, a glimpse of single-storey ridgeline from our back garden will add to a sense of enclosure that has been lost over recent years since the felling of the original boundary trees at no 19
- The off street parking created by the development is much appreciated in a busy and congested area.
- The planned extension is in keeping with the existing property and other properties in the road, will not have a negative visual impact from the road, will not affect traffic parking or flow and seems completely reasonable.
- Any current disturbance to the site and adjacent track will, the supporters are reassured by the owners, will be made good.
- The proposed plan seems reasonable and matches the style of the houses in the road. It is believe that it will cause no problems with parking or traffic.

2. Planning Policy Considerations

2.1. The statutory development plan comprises:

- West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026)
- Housing Site Allocations DPD
- West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007)
- Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire (2001)
- Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (1998)

2.2. The following policies from the West Berkshire Core Strategy carry full weight and are relevant to this application:

- Area Delivery Plan Policy 1: Spatial Strategy
- Area Delivery Plan Policy 2: Newbury
- CS 5: Infrastructure requirements and delivery
- CS 11: Hierarchy of Centres
- CS 13: Transport
- CS 14: Design Principles
- CS 16: Flooding
- CS 17: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- CS 18: Green Infrastructure
- CS 19: Historic Environment and Landscape Character

2.3. The West Berkshire Core Strategy replaced a number of Planning Policies in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007. However the following Policies remain in place until they are replaced by future development plan documents and should be given due weight according to their degree of consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework:

- TRANS1: Meeting the Transport Needs of New development.
- OVS5: Environmental Nuisance and Pollution Control.
- OVS.6: Noise Pollution

2.4. The following Housing Site Allocations Development Plan document policies carry full weight and are relevant to this application:

- C1: Location of New Housing in the Countryside
- P1: Residential Parking for New Development

2.5. Other material considerations for this application include:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (2019), (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

3. Proposal

3.1. The application proposes a single storey side extension and basement at 19 Battery End Newbury Berkshire RG14 6NX. The development is within the settlement boundary of Newbury, is within the site of the Newbury Battlefield but is otherwise free from constraints.

3.2. The development approximately measures 13.5 metres in length and 7 metres in width at its widest. The development has a ridge height of 4.24 metres and eaves height of 2.65 metres approximately. The basement is 3 metres deep, 3 metres wide and 9 metres long approx. according to the plans.

Determining issues:

- The Principle of Development;
- The Impact on Highway safety;
- Ecology of the Site;
- Archaeology of the Site;
- Community Infrastructure Levy.

4. The Principle of Development

4.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that the starting point for all decision making is the development plan, and planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The current development plan for West Berkshire comprises the West Berkshire Core Strategy, the Saved Policies of the West Berkshire District Local Plan and the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

4.2. The NPPF is a material consideration in the planning process. It places sustainable development at the heart of the planning system and strongly emphasises the need to support sustainable economic growth. The first core planning principle set out in the NPPF is that planning should be genuinely plan led, providing a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.

4.3. The proposed development at 19 Battery End Newbury Berkshire RG14 6NX, Newbury, Berkshire, RG14 1XA, is within the settlement boundary of **Newbury**, as defined within The West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations DPD (November 2015).

4.4. Being within the settlement boundary the principle of the proposed development is acceptable. This is subject to the proposal otherwise being in accordance with development

plan policies on design, impact on the character of the area, and impact on the amenity of neighbouring land uses.

- 4.5. The red line of the development clearly shows the domestic curtilage of 19 Battery End. This does not include the adjacent shared access track. Therefore no built form can be built outside of the red line i.e. onto the shared access track. The council does not own this shared access land, does not have a legal stake or claim to this land. It therefore cannot stipulate as part of this application works to be undertaken to land not within its ownership and land outside of the red line of development. Therefore matters of non-compliance of the regulations of the shared access that objectors have raised are civil matters to which are not planning's concern.

5. The Design and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

- 5.1. The NPPF is clear that good design is indivisible from good planning; it attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, it is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. It emphasises the importance to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings.
- 5.2. Policy CS14 seeks high quality design to ensure development respects the character and appearance of the area. Policy CS19 seeks the enhancement of the natural and built environment. It states that particular regard will be given to the sensitivity of the area to change, and to ensuring that new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character.
- 5.3. Side extensions to dwellings should be designed in accordance with the Local Planning Authorities (LPA) Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) House Extensions document. This stipulates that's development should be sympathetically designed to appear subservient the main house and should be set back from the front elevation to not unbalance a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed development is single storey in design and is set back from the front elevation (2.5metres approx.) by more than the one metre that is recommended by the SPG. The single storey side extension does not dominate the dwelling and does not appear to unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings in the street scene of Battery End. The development extends towards the rear of the dwelling alongside the boundary with the access track by 13.5 metres. There is a proposed bin store on this boundary of the development. The proposed development is not considered to have an adverse impact on this access tracks character to which is surrounded by built form.
- 5.4. The size and height of the rear extent of the side extension is considered acceptable. Although objections have been made in regards to the length of the rear extension this length would be reflective of the plot and would respond positively to the site layout. With the site being relatively long for the character of the area the development site is considered able to accommodate such a long rear extension. Given the development is single storey and the plot is long the bulk of the side extension does not dominate the site. Boundary treatment information can be secured prior to the first occupation of the development to ensure that any boundary treatments are in keeping with the area and the character of the shared access.
- 5.5. The eaves height and ridge height are not considered to dominate the original dwelling either. The basement of the development will not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. The materials of the proposed development are to match the original house where possible and some features are proposed in the front elevation which will make the proposed development attractive and sympathetic to the character of the area. The proposed landscaping can enhance the site in the street scene and from the shared

access. This can be secured via planning condition. The development therefore displays a high quality design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area making a positive contribution to the West Berkshire.

5.6. The development is therefore in accordance with CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance for House Extensions (July 2004).

6. The Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

6.1. The development is single storey in construction therefore it is not considered to have an overbearing or overshadowing impact upon neighbouring dwellings. The proposed extension is set to the east of the dwelling and therefore would not cause overshadowing to no.17 which would receive sunlight in the morning hours and the extension would be overshadowed by the built form of no.19 itself when the sun is setting in the majority. The side extension is set away from no.21 and is not considered to have an adverse impact on the light or sunlight this dwelling receives. All the windows of the proposed side extension are at first floor level and the use of roof lights is encouraged by the LPA's SPG for House extensions given they reduce privacy intrusion.

6.2. The hours of construction can be restricted via planning condition, additionally hours of deliveries can be restricted as well given the proximity to the local school.

6.3. The development is not considered to have an adverse impact on the privacy of neighbouring dwellings or lead to an unacceptable loss of sunlight or daylight. The development is therefore in accordance with CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance for House Extensions (July 2004)

7. The Impact on Highways Safety

7.1. The NPPF states that decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people. Policies CS 13 of the Core Strategy and TRANS.1 of the Saved Policies of the Local Plan, set out highway requirements. Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document sets out the residential car parking levels for the district.

7.2. A 4-bed dwelling in this location should be provided with 2.5 car parking spaces. Two spaces are proposed, however it is my view that more than 2 spaces could be accommodated on the existing drive (where the extension is proposed). The Highways officer requested to see 3 car parking spaces for a dwelling of this size. During the course of the application an amended parking plan was submitted to the Highway Officer to which they were satisfied with the three parking spaces proposed.

7.3. The Highways officer noted that there are some representation letters referring to the vehicular access. This is an existing situation for this dwelling and so the Highways Officer could not insist upon a widened drop kerb. As the site contains a residential dwelling, the application has been assessed on this basis only.

7.4. The highway recommendation is for conditional approval with the provision of 3 driveway parking spaces as shown on the site plan. A Construction Method Statement condition was requested but these details were submitted during the course of the application and were found acceptable to the Highways Department.

7.5 Therefore the proposal is considered to be, acceptable and in accordance with CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Saved Local Plan policy TRANS1 and the NPPF (2018), subject to conditions.

8. Ecology

- 8.1. Policy CS 17 of the Core Strategy states that biodiversity and geodiversity assets across West Berkshire will be conserved and enhanced. The NPPF supports the overall aims and objectives of this policy. The development site is located within the settlement boundary of Newbury in an established urban environment. Although traces of ecology interest are present and have been noted by objectors, overall the ecology value is low given the urban form the development is set within. The domestic garden will benefit from tree planting as a result of this application and the adjacent shared access will not be developed in accordance with the red line issue explain earlier in the report. Therefore any changes made to the ecology of this lane are a civil matter between parities who own the land.
- 8.2. It is considered that a request for an ecology survey was overly onerous and that the development will enhance the ecology of the site through landscaping. The development is therefore considered to comply with CS17 of the Core Strategy and advice within the NPPF.

9. Archaeology of the Site

- 9.1. Although there is some archaeological interest in this area from both the First Battle of Newbury and the Wash Common barrow cemetery, the Archaeology Officer feels that the scale of this proposal is probably too small for there to be major impact on any features of archaeological significance.
- 9.2. When this was queried by a member of the public in response to an alternative response given for a previous application on the site, a further response was given.
- 9.3. Where large plots remain undeveloped or are likely to have had little modern disturbance than the archaeology officer therefore believe it is justifiable to ask applicants to fund archaeological investigations for new builds, such as the watching brief which a previous officer requested for the new development in the rear garden under 16/01446/FULD. However the archaeology service usually refrains from requesting a programme of archaeological work when householder extensions are proposed, unless there is very clear evidence that important archaeological features are likely to be affected. There is no specific known feature underlying the footprint of the extension of 19/00019/HOUSE, apart from the general possibility of battlefield archaeology. Experience has shown us that there is little to be gained from supervision of such extensions as the ground is usually disturbed from the original construction or from runs of services.
- 9.4. Therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

10. Building Regulations

- 10.1. Building Regulations are not a planning considerations because they are handled by other legislation. Despite this these issues have been raised by objectors to which the case officer would like to respond. The councils Building Regulations consultants have responded to the application. They have commented that a basement could cause issues with the neighbour's property and garden if the works are not carried out correctly and in accordance with a structural engineers design. The requirements of the building regulations do not cover damage to the adjacent property as this will be down to the builders insurance but the consultant would imagine that the party wall act applies and the neighbour should be contacted regarding a party wall agreement if applicable. The Party Wall act is again separate legislation and cannot be requested to be seen as part of a planning application.
- 10.2. The building control officer can only provide limited advice as they are in receipt of an Initial Notice application no. 18/00124 for the project and the building control function will be undertaken by JHAI Ltd and not the Council.

- 10.3. The Land Drainage Engineer commented that a structural survey will be conducted by the applicant as noted in correspondence as part of the building regulations applications of the site. The site is not within flood zone 2 or 3 and there the development is not considered to give rise to issues in regards to sustainable drainage of the site. The applicant disputes the claims of objectors in regards to the depth of the water table. The info shown on the borehole log (>40m of clay/silt at 10.5m depth) indicates that the ground water issues mentioned by objectors could possibly be due to a perched water table, but that is supposition. Because of the depth of gravel above it, it is less problematic than the drainage officer thought it may have been and they are happy for site investigation/excavation to confirm that groundwater is not a problem at building control inspection stage during construction, notwithstanding of course that ground conditions could vary between the site and the borehole location.
- 10.4. The holding tank for the harvesting system should have been sized already by the Applicant as this does not require any site-obtained information; however to enable progression this can be done as construction progresses to the satisfaction of the building control inspector. Since the captured water will be predominantly for garden use, it will not be required for at least 4-5 months of the year therefore an effective 'back-up' system is required for overflow. As an existing soakaway is indicated for this purpose, its condition and infiltration effectiveness needs to be determined by investigation. Again, this can be proved at construction stage.
- 10.5. The Land Drainage Officer does strongly recommend that an inspection shaft is included in the harvesting tank to enable future inspection and don't agree that it is not necessary due to bottom discharge (to the pump chamber). The officer agrees however that a hydrobrake / additional attenuation is not required.
- 10.6. On the basis of the above, the issues the land drainage officer agrees that the details can all be agreed with the building control inspector during construction.
- 10.7. The development is relatively small scale and given the protections afforded to neighbours properties through the party wall agreement and building regulations, full surveys at the planning application stage are considered overly onerous on the applicant given the level of evidence and reassurance given by them throughout the application.

11. The Assessment of Sustainable Development and Recommendation

- 11.1. The NPPF states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which paragraph 197 advises should be applied in assessing and determining development proposals. The NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.
- 11.2. Being a proposed domestic house extension the scheme has limited economic considerations beyond the immediate construction period. The Environmental considerations have been assessed in terms of design, amenity and impact on the area. Social considerations overlap those of the environmental in terms of amenity. Having assessed the application in terms of design, impact on the area and impact on neighboring amenity the development is considered sustainable development
- 11.3. The application is therefore recommended for conditional APPROVAL.
- 11.4. The proposal for a side extension and basement to 19 Battery End is considered in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies ADPP1, ADPP2, CS11, CS13, CS14, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and OVS.5 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Policies 1991-2006 (Saved

2007). In addition to these the proposal is in line with supplementary planning guidance Quality Design (June 2006) and House Extensions (2004).

The Head of Development and Planning be authorised to Grant Planning Permission subject to the following 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. Approved Plans

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

- Drawing title "Overall Plan" including block and location plan. Drawing number not present. Date received 31st January 2019.
- Drawing title "Floor Plans". Drawing number not present. Date received 30th January 2019.
- Drawing title "Elevations". Drawing number not present. Date received 30th January 2019.
- Drawing title "Basement Plan". Drawing number not present. Date received 30th January 2019.

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

3. Schedule of materials (optional samples)

The development shall be carried out in matching materials as stipulated within the application form and supporting documentation with this application.

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 (2019), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) AND Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

4. Landscaping

A detailed scheme of landscaping for the site is 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.
- 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 accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

5. Construction method statement

The development shall take place in accordance with the Construction Method Statement document submitted to the council on the 23rd February 2019. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details

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 (2019), 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. The Spoil shall be removed in accordance with the details submitted

All spoil arising from the development shall be used and/or disposed of in accordance with the details submitted to the Local Planning Authority on 18th February 2019 and 23rd February 2019.

Reason: To ensure appropriate disposal of spoil from the development and to ensure that ground levels are not raised in order to protect the character and amenity of the area. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

7. Boundary treatment

Prior to the use of the side extension and basement details including a plan, indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme. The approved boundary treatments shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: The boundary treatment is an essential element 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. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

8. Hours of Deliveries

All deliveries shall be made outside of school drop off times to the site. No deliveries shall be made before 0930 and after 1445 during construction.

Reason: To safeguard the highway network from construction traffic congestion at peak times. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026).

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

The development shall not be brought into use until the vehicle parking and/or turning space have been surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the approved plan(s). The parking and/or 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 (2019),

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).

10. Hours of work (construction)

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

8:00a.m. 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 applied in accordance with The National Planning Policy Framework (2019), CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) and OVS5. And OVS6. Of the West Berkshire Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).

Informatives:

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.

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.