

Item No.	Application No. and Parish	Statutory Target Date	Proposal, Location, Applicant
(1)	19/01406/RESMAJ Hungerford	17 September 2019 ¹	<p>Approval of reserved matters application following outline permission for up to 100 dwellings, public open space and landscaping, with all matters reserved except for the access to the A338. Matters to be considered: Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale.</p> <p>Land South Of Priory Road Hungerford Berkshire</p> <p>Bewley Homes Plc and Wates Developments Ltd</p>
²¹ Extension of time agreed with applicant until 29 November 2019			

The application can be viewed on the Council's website at the following link:
<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=19/01406/RESMAJ>

Recommendation Summary:	To DELEGATE to the Head of Development and Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions
Ward Member(s):	Councillor Benneyworth; Councillor Cole; Councillor Rowles
Reason for Committee Determination:	More than 10 letters of objection received.
Committee Site Visit:	21 November 2019

Contact Officer Details

Name:	Simon Till
Job Title:	Principal Planning Officer
Tel No:	01635 519111
Email:	Simon.till@westberks.gov.uk

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for matters reserved, including appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, following approval of outline planning permission 16/03061/OUTMAJ (granted permission 30 November 2017). The proposed development is for up to 100 dwellings.
- 1.2 The application site consists of two fields located to the south of Kennedy Meadow and Priory Road, and to the east of Salisbury Road. Access to the site, which was approved at the outline stage and in subsequent discharge of conditions, is taken from Salisbury Road, via a new roundabout which is to be constructed under a Section 278 Legal Agreement to highways standards. John O'Gaunt School is located alongside the east of the site. The site has a gentle gradient downwards towards the south, with the field boundary delineated by a dense line of mature trees to the south, separated from the site boundary by arable land. A further belt of dense mature trees separates the site from houses on De Montfort Grove and Priory Road to the north-east, but the site directly abuts the rear boundaries of several dwellings along Kennedy Meadows to the north-west. The site is divided by an existing line of mature hedging which runs alongside public right of way Hungerford 31/2, which traverses the site north to south. The site was allocated for development of up to 100 dwellings under Policy HSA18 of the West Berkshire Housing Site Allocations DPD (2017).
- 1.3 The application proposes to develop 100 houses across the entire site, and includes proposals for landscaping, including enhancing the landscape buffer to the north-west alongside Kennedy Meadow, and providing additional new landscaping to the south alongside the open arable land on the retained part of the two fields, as well as landscaping alongside the public right of way and open space throughout.
- 1.4 During the consideration of this application, following discussions with the Council's planning officers and feedback from the Council's landscape consultant revised drawings were submitted including a comprehensive reconfiguration of the proposed layout to distribute housing across the entire site area, alterations to the landscaping proposals alongside the access and to the north-west of the site, alterations to the proposed elevations and floorplans and re-instatement of the emergency service access to the north west. As these alterations were consistent with the outline approval and have been fully re-consulted on a new application was not required.

2. Planning History

- 2.1 The table below outlines the relevant planning history of the application site.

Application	Proposal	Decision / Date
16/03061/OUTMAJ	Outline planning application for up to 100 dwellings, public open space and landscaping, with all matters reserved except for the access to the A338.	Approved 30 November 2017

3. Procedural Matters

- 3.1 Outline application 16/03061/OUTMAJ was screened against the EIA Regulations and a screening opinion was issued stating that the proposed development was not EIA

development and that therefore an Environmental Statement was not required. This screening opinion was given in specific relation to the EIA Regulations and without prejudice to any environmental considerations that might be material to consideration of a planning application for development on the site.

- 3.2 A site notice was displayed on the 28th June 2019 with an expiry date of 1st July 2019 in two locations, alongside the access to the public right of way on Priory Road, and alongside the site access on Silchester Road. An advertisement was published in the local press on the 4th July 2019.
- 3.3 The proposed works would attract payment of the CIL. This matter is to be addressed under separate correspondence with the developer.
- 3.4 A number of queries have been raised regarding the validity of the original submission, prior to its amendment due to the significant reduction in developed area of the site. Your officer notes that while permission 16/03061/OUTMAJ approved the access to the site it did not approve the layout or scale of development, as both of these were matters reserved. Therefore as this application was submitted for up to 100 dwellings, and addressed the reserved matters of permission 16/03061/OUTMAJ, irrespective of the proposed layout, your officer's view is that the application was have been submitted in a valid form whereby it can be determined in accordance with the relevant material planning considerations, including compliance with local and national policy.

4. Consultation

Statutory and non-statutory consultation

- 4.1 The table below summarises the consultation responses received during the consideration of the application. The full responses may be viewed with the application documents on the Council's website, using the link at the start of this report.

Parish Council:	<p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over development or overcrowding of the site as the proposal is out of character with the area; • Negative/adverse visual impact of the development particularly on the landscape and or locality; • Detrimental effect of proposed development on the character of the local area (in the AONB); • The proposed development by reason of its size, depth, width, height and massing would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of the properties immediately adjacent to the site and the surrounding area by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and visually overbearing impact; • With a note that the reserved matters should signify a variation of the outline planning. <p>(Case officer's note: Comments made on original submission and prior to receipt of amended layout.)</p>
WBC	I am satisfied with the responses given. Aspects such as the preference for a footway along the shared surface streets cannot be

Highways:	<p>insisted upon and so these are accepted.</p> <p>Swept paths have submitted detailing the Council's refuse/recycling vehicles can manoeuvre within the site have now been provided.</p> <p>An amended car parking layout has been submitted. 236 driveway spaces are now proposed.</p> <p>Cycle storage details are conditioned.</p> <p>Given these amendments, the highway recommendation is for conditional approval.</p> <p>Conditions recommended in respect of electric vehicle charging points, construction method statement, access construction, layout and design standards, provision of visibility splays, parking and turning and cycle storage provision.</p>
Landscape consultant:	<p>The purpose of this landscape consultation was to assess the proposal against the reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and also assess the Landscape and Visual Impact Review.</p> <p>The original LVIA was based on the proposals as submitted within the outline planning application for up to 118 houses, with a landscape masterplan showing an area proposed for development which extended across to the school boundary within the east. The new proposal is for 100 houses in a reduced area only occupying the western area of the site (about 60-65% of the allocated site). As only 60-65% of the site is being developed the allocated housing number should be around 60-65 and not 100. The site is set within the North Wessex Downs AONB. As stated within ADPP5, new development will need to conserve and enhance the local distinctiveness, sense of place and setting of the AONB whilst preserving the strong sense of remoteness. Development will need to respond positively to the local context and respect identified landscape features and components of natural beauty. Due to the higher housing density, the development has not been able to comply with these objectives resulting in a generic urban style development which fails to enhance local character, distinctiveness in this semi-rural location within the AONB.</p> <p>Policy HSA18 details a list of guidelines and parameters for this allocated housing site. The proposed Planning Layout drawing has not been developed in accordance with these, leading to a style of development which includes landscaping, layout and scale which also are not in line with the objectives or guidance for this area of the North Wessex Downs AONB. The LVIA was originally undertaken for the whole site, for reasons stated under section H5, the revised LVIA Review also fails to provide accurate information.</p> <p>Policy CS14 considers design principles, stating that... new development must demonstrate high quality and sustainable design that respects and enhances the character of the area. Additionally, the policy states that... Development shall contribute positively to local distinctiveness and sense of place. Policy CS19 also considers the conservation and enhancement of the local Landscape</p>

	<p>Character Areas of West Berks. The proposals include a development of a generic quality and of a higher density which has not met the designs standards which would respect and enhance the character of North Wessex Downs AONB. As the development has failed to provide a suitable entrance, woodland buffer along the southern edge or mitigate the PRoW successfully, there will also be a greater visual intrusion on the adjacent undeveloped AONB than at present.</p> <p>The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF. It is also contrary to local plan policies CS14, CS18, CS19 and ADPP5 as stated above.</p> <p>(Case officer's note: Comments on original submission and prior to receipt of amended layout. Full comments available to view on the Council's website.)</p>
<p>Planning Policy:</p>	<p>The site is included as an allocation for approximately 100 dwellings within the HSADPD, so the principle of development is acceptable in policy terms. Nevertheless, specific proposals for the site must still comply with the development plan and the requirements for the development of the site are set out in policy HSA18 and policy GS1 of the HSADPD.</p> <p>You specifically requested comments on the proposed layout and density of the proposals.</p> <p>The development plan is absolutely clear that as the site lies within the AONB, development should be genuinely landscape led, respond positively to its local context and conserve and enhance the AONB. The developable area of the site allocated in the HSADPD has therefore been informed by the recommendations of the 2011 Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (LSA) and Policy GS1 makes clear that the final capacity, development design and layout of the site will be further informed by a more detailed LVIA. In any reserved matters application the recommendations of the 2011 LSA should therefore inform the more detailed LVIA submitted. The decision taker would need to satisfy themselves that any submitted LVIA meets the requirements of policy GS1 in this respect. It is noted that a review of the LVIA accompanying application 16/03061/OUTMAJ has been submitted as part of this pre app. In my view this review does not meet the requirements of policy GS1 and a full detailed LVIA of the current proposals should therefore be submitted as part of any reserved matters application.</p> <p>Policy HSA18 states that the site will make provision for approximately 100 dwellings with a mix of dwelling types and sizes. This equates to a density of approximately 20dph. Core Strategy policies CS14, CS19 as well as HSA18 and GS1 are relevant here and regard also has to be had to Part 2 (Residential Development) of the Council's Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Section 1.4 of the SPD considers the relationship of new housing to the open countryside and landscape setting. Paragraph 1.4.1 comments that new development on sites close to the edge of a settlement will need to demonstrate how the inter-relationship</p>

	<p>between open countryside and development form is respected. It goes on to state that particular care and attention should be taken to protect and enhance the AONB. In addition, paragraph 1.4.3 of Part 2 of the SPD states that there should be a reduction in density on the outer edge of development. The development pattern should visually recede and soften at the edge and provide a harmonious transition using strong structural landscaping. In my view, by condensing development into a smaller area of the site, effectively increasing the density in this particular area, the submitted plans fail to respect this inter-relationship. The current proposals do not conserve and enhance the AONB and therefore would need to be reconsidered as part of any reserved matters application.</p> <p>As far as both density and layout are concerned, I also have concerns over the relationship of the submitted plans with the existing settlement. The current plans propose development covering only part of the allocated site with the eastern area currently 'reserved for farmland'. Regard needs to be had to the relationship of this area with the existing settlement to the north and school to the east. As part of an allocated site this area now lies within the settlement boundary of Hungerford and so the principle of development in this area 'reserved for farmland' is acceptable in policy terms. The long term role of this area therefore needs to be much more clearly set out as part of any reserved matters application. I would draw your attention to Policy GS1 which makes clear that 'each allocated site will be master planned and delivered as a whole to achieve a comprehensive development that ensures the timely and coordinated provision of infrastructure, services, open space and facilities. A single planning application will be submitted for each allocated site, either an outline or full application, to ensure this comprehensive approach to development is achieved'.</p> <p>(Case officer's note: Comments on original submission and prior to receipt of amended layout.</p>		
Environmental Health:	I have reviewed the above planning application and have no comments to make.		
Housing:	<p>Thank you for your memo regarding the above proposed development, and please find my response on a without prejudice basis.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework strongly supports the delivery of affordable housing that meets a recognised housing need in the District. The Council's policy for affordable housing provision is set out in CS6 of the West Berkshire Local Plan 2006-2026. It enables the authority to seek affordable housing either on site or as a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision on sites of 5 units or more. The contribution levels for affordable housing are as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>5 to 9 dwellings</td><td>20% affordable housing</td></tr> </table>	5 to 9 dwellings	20% affordable housing
5 to 9 dwellings	20% affordable housing		

10 to 14 dwellings	30% affordable housing
15 or more units or 0.5 ha or more	30% affordable housing on brownfield sites or 40% on greenfield

This contribution is rounded up or down to the nearest whole unit.

The Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was formally adopted by the Council on the 11th December 2014. This provides guidance to landowners, developers and West Berkshire residents about the use of developer contributions after the implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It sets out the Council's policy to securing affordable housing contributions and it states that affordable housing should be provided on site unless there are exceptional circumstances, or where alternatives, such as replacement provision on a separate site would better meet the Council's strategic objectives. The Planning Obligations SPD applies to planning applications or appeals determined on or after 1st April 2015.

Any request for a diversion from this policy should be accompanied by an open book viability assessment.

In accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), the element of any development which is deemed affordable (in accordance with the West Berkshire Core Strategy) will be eligible for relief from paying CIL, together with a proportional element of any communal areas forming the development.

The Government currently states that the provision of affordable housing will remain within the Section 106 regime. Requirements to deliver affordable housing will be determined during the planning application process and secured through a Section 106 legal agreement, to be completed prior to determination of the planning process. The full cost of providing affordable housing on site (in accordance with our policy) was taken into account of when setting our level of CIL.

Further details can be found within paragraphs 49 to 54 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

The developers are proposing 100 dwellings on this site, and as this is greenfield land, 40% of all dwellings on site are required for affordable housing provision, which equates to 40 units. The Design Compliance Statement indicates an intention to deliver in line with this policy and that 40 units will be delivered, however the proposed mix differs from our identified need in West Berkshire, as summarised in the table below:

Bedroom size	100 new homes					
	WB Housing Need				Bewley Proposed	
	SHMA %	Units required	Social Rent	Shared ownership	Social Rent	Shared ownership
1 bed	30-35%	12-14	8-10	4	4	0
2 bed	30-35%	12-14	8-10	4	12	6
3 bed	25-	10-12	7-8	3-4	12	6

	30%					
4+ bed	5-10%	2-4	1-3	1	0	0
totals		40	28	12	28	12

Due to changes in Government policy, which dictates we must now provide smaller properties for affordable housing, predominantly 1 and 2 bed, due to the number of applicants on the Common Housing Register and SHMA data requirements.

The SPD states the affordable housing should consist of 70% social rent and 30% intermediate housing options such as shared ownership. We therefore require 28 units for social rent, and 12 units for shared ownership, and the developers are proposing to deliver in line with this.

It is an expectation that the affordable housing units should be pepper-potted in blocks of no more than 5. In order to keep service charges to a minimum, it is preferable to have any affordable housing flats situated in a separate block, or where this is not possible, to be located in a part of the block with its own core and entrance.

The Council will assess all affordable housing development proposals against the Nationally Described Space Standards (updated March 2015), as tabled below:

Number of Bedrooms (b)	Number of bed spaces (persons)	1 storey dwelling (m²)	2 storey dwelling (m²)	3 storey dwelling (m²)
1b	2p	50	58	
2b	4p	70	79	
3b	6p	95	102	108
4b	8p	117	124	130

To ensure the dwellings are suitable for future occupants, all two bedroom dwellings should provide a minimum of 4 bed spaces, 3 beds should provide a minimum of 6 bed spaces, and 4 should provide a minimum of 8 bed spaces.

The Council recommend that all affordable housing dwellings should be developed to Lifetime Home Standards and conform to the latest Design and Quality Standards published by Homes England, to ensure that they are readily adaptable for those with additional needs.

The Council also encourages developers to consider sustainable features and methods of construction to reduce energy consumption and conserve resources.

Please note that the SPD requires all affordable housing on planning gain sites to be delivered with nil pub subsidy. Developers are expected to make full provision for nil grant affordable housing on all qualifying planning gain sites and pay due consideration when

	negotiating the land value of a site.
Waste Management:	No comments received by date of writing.
Ecologist:	No comments received by date of writing.
Public Rights of Way:	No comments received by date of writing.
Rambler's Association:	<p>The Ramblers Association wish to make the following comments regarding the amended plans within the above Planning Application.</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges that the public Right of way has to be retained throughout the site (Hungerford footpath31). It does not however state whether the path is to be retained as a grassy path or become tarmacked.</p> <p>Nor does it explain how traffic calming measures will be undertaken to ensure the walking public can cross the shared surface street 3 safely.</p> <p>To the East of plots 65, 66, and 67 there appears to be a "dog leg" in the route and therefore is different to the definitive line this would require a diversion order and recorded onto the definitive map and statement.</p> <p>According to the Amended Planning statement in the section headed Access/Highways, paragraph 3.13 it states that "Further pedestrian access will be available on the Northern boundary leading to Priory close" This requires an explanation as Priory Close is not near the site.</p> <p>The Ramblers Association ask the developer to answer the above problems.</p>
SuDS:	<p>We have reviewed the information submitted for the above application and note that there is no information with regards to the drainage system. We understand that the application was granted Outline Approval within application 16/03061/OUTMAJ with Condition 8 relating to SuDS and drainage issues.</p> <p>We therefore have no comment to make on the current application and await the submission of information pertaining to Condition 8 of the Outline Application.</p>
Crime Prevention Adviser:	<p>Thank you for consulting me on the above planning application. I have reviewed the submitted plans and documentation and analysed the crime statistics.</p> <p>Unfortunately there are aspects of the design that could be problematic in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour, therefore at this time I am unable to support the application. However these concerns could be addressed with suitable amendments to the</p>

	<p>submitted plans.</p> <p>I make the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The far corner of the amenity land neighbouring plot 20 is vulnerable to crime and ASB. There is limited surveillance into this area due to the positioning of the garage for plot 20, reliant on visibility from plot 18. The angle of the rear fence for plot 45 potentially provides a recessed area. <p>I ask that the rear boundary line of Plot 45 to be amended as above and that plans submitted and approved prior to planning permission being granted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rear Courtyard Parking A rear courtyard is present in the middle of the development lacking surveillance whilst having a high level of permeability. Rear courtyards are problematic in terms of anti-social behaviour providing an area of questionable ownership with no active surveillance present to deter those intent on criminal activities and generally become unkempt areas. They provide easy access to the vulnerable rear elevations (in this case 13 plots) the point of entry for the majority of burglary offences. The risk of crime and ASB is exacerbated by the splayed fence line which produces recesses within the courtyard out of sight of passing casual surveillance. The close proximity of the public footpath through the centre of the site provides easy access and a high level of anonymity both of which would further assist an offender. <p>Ref. Secured By Design New Homes – Section 16.3 – 16.4</p> <p>Plots 65 and 67 are particularly vulnerable with three elevations easily accessible due to the pathway located along the rear boundary treatment providing an additional route into the courtyard.</p> <p>I ask that amendments are made to the submitted plans and that these are approved prior to planning permission being granted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpaths There are two footpaths that provide access to the eastern side of the development. These are in close proximity of one another and could produce a high level of anonymity. Whilst it is appreciated that this will allow occupants to connect with the neighbouring school and fields they provide a high level of permeability to the site which could assist those intent on crime and anti-social behaviour. <p>Plots 97 – 95 are particularly vulnerable. The footpaths are located either side of these plots potentially undermining the defensive space for these dwellings. The occupants are unlikely to provide guardianship or surveillance due to the level of activity and anonymity undermining their confidence and ability to identify suspicious persons or activity.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>The footpath located between plots 97 and 98 is narrow, with limited surveillance and located between high side boundary treatments. During school opening and closing times it is likely to have sufficient legitimate usage to safeguard this area however at other times this has the potential to attract crime and ASB.</p> <p>Amalgamating the two footpaths could ensure a higher level of legitimate usage throughout the day with a mix of activities capable of safeguarding the route from crime and anti-social behaviour. Positioning a single wider route would help to reduce the fear of crime, ensure appropriate surveillance is present providing a safer connected route that would not undermine the defensive space of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I ask that plans are amended and approved prior to planning permission being granted.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Public representations

- 4.2 Representations have been received from 18 contributors, 1 of which supports, and 18 of which object to the proposal.
- 4.3 The full responses may be viewed with the application documents on the Council's website, using the link at the start of this report. In summary, the following issues/points have been raised in objection:
- Concerns regarding condensing the approved development of 100 houses onto only a part of the allocated site and the level of deviation from the indicative drawings that accompanied the outline permission;
 - Impact on the character of the surrounding landscape and the setting of the AONB;
 - The potential for future applications for additional development if part of the site is left undeveloped;
 - Concerns regarding the density of housing proposed;
 - Lack of landscape screening, particularly for existing development to the north-west;
 - Increase in traffic;
 - Overlooking of dwellings to the north-west;
 - Impact on the outlook of existing dwellings to the north-west;
 - Lack of an accompanying environmental study (case officer's note: Please see 3.1 above);
 - Lack of sufficient parking provision;
 - Lack of sustainable energy technology - e.g. solar panels, electric car charging points;
 - Concerns regarding the validity of the application due to an effective reduction in the developed area of the site;
 - Fails to meet the criteria of Policy HSA18;
 - Contrary to the NPPF which states that major development in the countryside should only be allowed in exceptional cases;
 - Application should be accompanied by a full landscape and visual impact assessment;
 - Lack of access to agricultural land to the west of the site;

- Impact of 100 houses on local services and amenities;
- Lack of views through the development;
- Concerns the decision to grant outline planning permission for development of 100 dwellings on the site;
- Requests that a fresh full planning application is submitted;
- Concerns regarding the impact on existing services and amenities in Hungerford.

4.4 The following issues/points have been raised in support:

- The amended layout is accordant with the details approved under the outline permission;
- The amended proposed works are a comprehensive development of the whole site;
- The amended density of the development is appropriate to the rural edge location in the AONB;
- The amended proposals are for a more informal layout which is appropriate for the edge of settlement location.

5. Planning Policy

5.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The following policies of the statutory development plan are relevant to the consideration of this application.

- Policies ADPP1, ADPP5, CS1, CS5, CS6, CS13, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 (WBCS).
- Policies GS1, HSA18, C1 and P1 of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2006-2026 (HSA DPD).
- Policies OVS5, OVS6, TRANS1, RL1 and RL2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007).
- Policies 1 and 2 of the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire 2001 (RMLP).

5.2 The following material considerations are relevant to the consideration of this application:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-19
- WBC House Extensions SPG (2004)
- WBC Quality Design SPD (2006)
- Planning Obligations SPD (2015)
- The Hungerford Town Plan (Refresh 2013)

5.3 Other matters: Hungerford has been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan Area. At present the Hungerford 36 Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of preparation and as such carries limited weight at the time of consideration of this application, although the weight attributed to this plan may increase in future as the plan progresses through the stages of preparation and adoption.

6. Appraisal

6.1 The main issues for consideration in this application are:

- The principle of development;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the AONB and surrounding landscape;
- Design, scale and landscaping;
- Housing mix;
- Impact on neighbouring amenity and the amenity of future occupants;
- Highway safety and parking provision;
- Ecological impacts.

Principle of development

- 6.2 The application site lies within the defined settlement boundary and is situated in the North Wessex Downs Area of outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed works are for 100 new dwellings on the site, which constitutes a major development type. The NPPF identifies the AONB as a protected landscape and states that major development shall only be allowed in the AONB where exceptional circumstances exist to justify it. In this case the principle of development of up to 100 houses on the site was established when the site was allocated under Policy HSA18 of the Site Allocations DPD which followed on from a review of housing need in West Berkshire by allocating sites to meet that exceptional need for new housing. As such the proposed works are accordant with the established principle of development. Outline planning permission reference 16/03061/OUTMAJ (*the outline permission*) granted permission for development of up to 100 dwellings. Under that permission and subsequent discharge of conditions access to the site was approved, while layout, design, scale and landscaping for the site were to be considered under a subsequent reserved matters application.
- 6.3 Policy HSA18 requires that the development of the site meets with certain criteria. As noted by both the policy officer and landscape consultant in their respective consultation responses, the initial submission, which sought approval for a layout that condensed all 100 houses subject of the allocation onto the western two-thirds of the site, was not considered to meet with the majority of these criteria, and particularly in terms of landscape impact in light of the rural fringe location of the site and density of housing proposed. This matter has been raised in a number of objections to the proposal and by the Town Council in its consultation response. Following discussions with officers and feedback from the policy officer and landscape consultant a revised set of proposals re-distributing housing across the entire site has been submitted. These proposals have been reviewed by officers and are considered to meet the detailed criteria set out in Policy HSA18 and are discussed in greater detail in the sections on landscape impact and design below. In light of these considerations the amended scheme is considered to meet with the requirements of policy in terms of the principle of development.

Impact on the character and appearance of the AONB and surrounding landscape

- 6.4 The indicative layout submitted with the outline permission shows development distributed across the site in a loose and less formalised layout. The initially submitted layout condensed this development of 100 houses onto a smaller developed part of the site utilising a formalised “village green” style layout. The landscape consultant assessed this layout and considered that it would result in an urbanising impact on the character of the landscape in this part of the AONB, which is a rural fringe location, and as such would detract from landscape quality and the setting of the AONB, contrary to both the NPPF and local policies, specifically Policies CS14, CS19 and HSA18. Furthermore it was considered that this proposed layout would fail to comply with the specific criteria set out under Policy HSA18 in that it failed to create an adequate buffer to define the edge of the settlement, the design would not enhance the gateway approach into Hungerford or respect the site’s semi-rural location, that due to the

pattern, linearity and density of the layout it would fail to retain views through the site to the wider landscape, and that the proposed layout had not been sufficiently informed by the findings of the previous Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).

- 6.5 Following discussions with officers the applicants submitted a revised layout that distributes the proposed 100 houses across the entire length of the site area in more of a sparse, informal pattern. Blocks of dwellings are reduced and more integrated open space is introduced to break up the impression of built form, allowing views through the development, and in particular reducing the intrusion of building lines alongside the public right of way, the key public viewpoint and pedestrian transition through the site from north to south. Roads are configured around a meandering central road design serving cul-de-sacs throughout the development and similarly to the indicative outline layout allowing the development to adopt a less formal and lower density pattern that responds to its semi-rural location.
- 6.6 In considering this revised layout your officer has taken account of both the criteria of Policy HSA18 and the comments from the landscape consultant, and is of the view that the proposed layout will respond appropriately to the transitional character of the landscape between the suburban edge to the north and the wider rural landscape to the south. Such views as are available from outside the site will be softened by the new landscaping and will be broken up by the gaps in building lines that permeate the blocks of the proposed development. As such your officer is satisfied that the proposed works have taken sufficient account of the pattern of development and the character of the surrounding rural landscape so as not to result in a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the AONB or the quality of the local landscape.

Design, scale and landscaping

- 6.7 As the road layout has been altered to provide a more natural and less regimented form it will provide an attractive transition through the development, allowing the retention of a generous setback from Salisbury Road and softening of views into the development by the vegetation and green space to the west. The layout effectively divides the development into a pattern of six smaller blocks of development within the site delineated by the pattern of roads and open space/landscaping, with a high level of pedestrian permeability facilitated by footpath connections to the existing public right of way and along the south of the site, as well as providing a link through to the John O'Gaunt school site for potential future connection to the school grounds as required by Policy HSA18.
- 6.8 Strong structural landscaping is proposed to delineate the site's boundaries, and additional landscaping is proposed to the north west of the development in order to break up the built form between the site and the existing recent development of Kennedy Meadows. The revised layout has been designed with reference to feedback from officers and in particular the advice of the landscape consultant, and the previous LVIA for the outline permission. Open space throughout the site will contribute to the semi-rural qualities of the development and visual continuity throughout. The retention of existing woodland to the west alongside the access, along with new planting alongside the road frontage will provide a green gateway into the development, with dwellings set back to the north of the new access and addressing the new access road to the south. The development then follows the pattern of the access road with secondary roads limiting and defining the size of the housing blocks, which narrow to the east of the site, incorporating more open space alongside the northern boundary, thereby allowing more open views from the public right of way and the intervention of less built form within those views.
- 6.9 In terms of scale, the predominant character of the development is one of conventional two storey dwellings rather than incorporating larger blocks of apartment dwellings.

While some terraces have been included in the design the density has been kept to the same level as shown in the indicative layout submitted at the outline application stage, less than 30 dwellings per hectare, although the larger plots are mainly situated to the east where higher landscape sensitivity due to the gateway views from Salisbury Road indicates that a more generous spacing between plots is required. Your officers consider that the scale of the proposed dwellings, with roof heights of between approximately 8.3 and 9.3 metres is appropriate in responding to the pattern of nearby development on the suburban fringe of Hungerford.

- 6.10 In terms of design the proposed works incorporate a variety of house design types that borrow from styles within the surrounding vernacular. These utilise features such as half hipped roofs, mixtures of render and brick, timber framed gables, hung tiles with pattern brickwork, bay windows and external porches to add interest to the street scene. The palette of materials is of both a traditional appearance and good quality with a mixture of brick and tile types and sympathetically chosen materials that reflect traditional house building and high quality design. The proposed dwellings are not of a size or character to appear intrusive in their surroundings and are considered by officers to reflect a sympathetic design ethos within the sensitive landscape of the AONB.
- 6.11 Your officer notes that objections to this application raise concerns in respect of sustainable construction and energy efficiency with a view towards climate change considerations. Such matters are certainly an important concern in terms of modern house building and in light of the Council's declaration of a Climate Change Emergency. The Hungerford Town Plan refers to requiring compliance with best practice for energy and resource efficiency and compliance with Code for Sustainable Homes level 6, which is also a requirement of Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy. However, officers note that since the Government discontinued the Code for Sustainable Homes in 2015, setting out that the requirements for compliance with the Code under Policy CS15 could no longer be imposed on new developments the Council has not had a policy requirement for the integration of a formalised scheme of sustainable construction and sustainable energy technology in new development, or guidance on the requirements for such measures to be implemented into new housing. Furthermore, many of the construction requirements previously specified under the Code, such as insulation methodology, roofing and fenestration and provision of energy efficient technology and appliances, have been incorporated into the Building Regulations that house builders have to comply with, thus improving the sustainability of construction quality and establishing a threshold of "best practice" as was the Government's intent when integrating these requirements. Both the policies of the statutory development plan and the recommendations of the Hungerford Town Plan are silent on other measures by which to test either the energy efficiency or constructional characteristics of new housing development. It is, however, notable that Policy P1 of the HSADPD requires the provision of electric vehicle charging points, which is set to be an important issue in future-proofing new development and transitioning to more sustainable modes of power and fuel in the short term. A condition of the outline permission requires that electric vehicle charging points are provided. In respect of other constructional matters your officer's view is that without a policy or guidance to clarify what sustainable construction measures are to be integrated within new housing developments, and with the building regulations already addressing this matter, such concerns should not constitute a reason for the refusal of this application.
- 6.12 The Rambler's Association have raised queries in respect of the surfacing and crossing points of the section of the Public Right of Way that crosses the site. Your officer notes that the drawings indicate hard surfacing throughout the length of the right of way within the site, with tactile paving at the crossing point over the main street. Comments in respect of the diversion of the approved route of the PROW are also noted. The rights of way officer has not commented on this application, but legislation related to public

rights of way and diversion orders is not a planning matter and therefore is not a consideration in this application.

- 6.13 The crime prevention adviser has noted concerns in respect of some spaces within the site, and in particular the footpath to the east which is a requirement of Policy HSA18, linking the site to John O'Gaunt School. Therefore a condition is recommended to require that this footpath remains stopped up until such a time as a footpath link to the east has been agreed between the landowners. The response also refers to some minor matters in terms of plot layout which have been referred to the agent for alteration and will be addressed in the update to the Committee. However, in respect of concerns raised in respect of a parking court to the rear of plots 56 to 71 this matter has previously been raised with the agent, but is retained in the drawings. Unfortunately your officer notes that in order to achieve a sufficiently loose layout of development, some concessions do have to be made, and it is hard to envision how this amount of parking could be provided in another manner without resulting in larger amounts of parking predominating and urbanising the southern street scene. Therefore on balance your officer is satisfied that the benefits of the proposed layout in terms of achieving the objectives of Policy HSA18 and preventing an adverse and urbanising impact on the surrounding rural landscape are sufficient to outweigh security concerns associated with parking courts.
- 6.14 In light of the above considerations the proposed works are considered to meet with the requirements of Policy HSA18 in respect of design, layout, scale and landscaping, and to comply with the guidance of the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS19.

Housing Mix

- 6.15 The housing officer has identified some concern with the proposed mix of affordable housing on the site, and in particular the levels of provision of 1 bedroom dwellings (under-provision) and 3 bedroom dwellings (over-provision). While it is understood that the Council's SMAA has identified a need for more 1 bedroom units in this area, the requirements of Policy HSA18 are for a very low density of development, and it is your officer's view that seeking to significantly alter the proposed mix of affordable housing would result in the need to alter the layout in such a manner as would ultimately be likely to lead to an increase in housing density on some parts of the site, resulting in an urbanising impact that would detract from the qualities of spaciousness and generous plots that are beneficial to the location of the site within this part of the AONB. It is noted that the tenure split of 28% social rent and 12% shared ownership is agreed through the Section 106 agreement associated with the outline permission, and as such has not altered. Consequently on balance your officer is satisfied that the proposed mix of affordable housing would not result in a reason for refusal in this case, and that the proposed affordable housing will contribute towards addressing the high level of affordable housing need in the District.

Impacts on neighbouring amenity and amenity of future occupants

- 6.16 Concerns have been raised in respect of the impact on neighbouring amenity. The majority of these related to the originally submitted layout and particularly along the north-western boundary, where a number of the dwellings were orientated with a back to back relationship with dwellings along Kennedy Meadows. During discussions regarding the amended plans officers were able to raise these concerns, and in re-distributing dwellings across the site the applicant also sought to reduce the amount of development proposed on the northern boundary, provide an increase in landscaping in this location and re-orientate the dwellings so that those along the north-western boundary have a side on relationship with dwellings to the north.

- 6.17 Concerns have also been raised in terms of the impact on views from dwellings to the north of the site. While it is acknowledged that in allocating the site for the development of up to 100 houses, and in subsequently granting outline planning permission for these works a certain amount of impact on neighbouring views was accepted it is also acknowledged that the outlook of dwellings along the northern boundary of the site will be altered. Nevertheless, officers have reviewed the drawings and are satisfied that none of the relationships between existing and proposed dwellings will entail significant overshadowing or overbearing impacts such as would result in a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. Furthermore, the spacing of dwellings on the site will allow some views through the site to open countryside to be retained, both within the development and from the first floor windows of neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, it accepted that the outlook of existing dwellings will be altered, and your officer's view is that this alteration to outlook will not result in sufficient impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupants as to have been unforeseen at the aforementioned phases of allocation and consideration of the outline permission or to result in a significant and detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.
- 6.18 In terms of amenity standards for the future occupants of the development, officers have examined the submitted details and note that while a few of the proposed dwellings fall slightly short of the recommendations of the Quality Design SPD in terms of garden size, gardens are laid out in such a manner as to provide a usable and functional space for family activities. The site provides generous areas of open space and a scheme of high quality landscaping as well as linking into the recreational public rights of way network. Concerns have been raised in respect of the provision and maintenance of open space and landscaping on the site. In regard to these matters conditions are recommended requiring the provision of a timetable and details of open spaces including play equipment and details of open space management, to ensure that open space is provided and maintained for the benefit of residents. Conditions recommended by the tree officer secure the provision and maintenance of all specified landscaping for a period of fifteen years, which is considered appropriate in order to allow the landscaping to establish itself. In light of these considerations the proposed works are considered to provide for the amenity of both existing and future occupants in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy.

Highway safety and parking provision

- 6.19 The principle of the access from Salisbury Road onto the site was established under the outline permission and its delivery is secured under the provisions of both that planning permission and a Section 278 highways legal agreement. As such the highways officer is satisfied with these works. In respect of parking provision an amended parking strategy was provided and the highways officer has confirmed that this provides a level of parking compliant with the requirements of Policy P1, and as such is acceptable. Therefore no objections are raised in respect of matters of highway safety or parking provision.

Ecological impacts

- 6.20 Your officer notes that the ecological survey accompanying the outline permission made reference to the value of existing trees surrounding the site in terms of biodiversity, and recommended the retention of as much of this existing vegetation as possible. The proposed works concentrate development away from the edges of the site, providing good buffers that would retain the majority of the existing vegetation. Details of arboricultural methodology, tree retention and reinforcements to the landscaping have been submitted as part of this application and are recommended to be secured by way of condition. Subject to the recommended conditions your officer considers that the proposed works will provide a net gain to biodiversity in securing, reinforcing and

enhancing the quality of the existing vegetation. The tree officer is satisfied with the landscaping and tree protection measures set out in the amended scheme and has recommended conditions accordingly.

- 6.21 While the Council's ecology officer has not commented on the submitted ecology information your officer notes the content of the preliminary ecological appraisal that accompanies the application, and its recommendations that Phase 2 surveys are submitted in respect of breeding birds, dormice and reptiles. However, the phase 1 survey does not raise any concerns in respect of the accomplishment of suitable mitigation being provided through the works. Therefore your officer is satisfied that subject to a condition requiring the submission of the Phase 2 surveys recommended along the northern boundary, and an accompanying scheme and timetable of works for providing mitigation the proposed works would not result in an undue impact on ecology or biodiversity.

Other matters

- 6.22 It is noted that correspondence received in respect of this application requests that an Environmental Statement is submitted in order to examine the sustainability of the development. Your officer notes that this application was screened against the Environmental Impact Regulations at the outline stage and that it was determined that it was not EIA development requiring an Environmental Statement. Furthermore, your officer notes that this is not the function or purpose of the EIA Regulations, which are directed towards examining the strategically significant environmental impacts of EIA development as set out under the schedules of the regulations, rather than whether a non-EIA development uses sustainable technologies in its construction. The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the NPPF are both clear in requiring that a planning application is considered against the relevant environmental impacts and other material concerns, and that the starting point for considering a planning application is the policies of the local development plan.
- 6.23 Objections to this application have raised concerns in terms of the impact on local services and amenities. Infrastructure provision is addressed through the CIL and has been assessed when allocating the site for housing development.
- 6.24 Matters relating to provision of the access, controls on hours of work, construction management, archaeology, drainage, internal road and footpath layout, fire hydrant provision, SuDS, water supply infrastructure, storage of refuse and recycling, cycle storage, electric vehicle charging and provision of a travel plan for the site are controlled by way of conditions on the outline planning permission.

7. Planning Balance and Conclusion

- 7.1 The proposed works are considered to accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy HSA18 of the HSADPD and other relevant policy considerations. While it is acknowledged that the works will have a localised impact on the outlook of dwellings to the south of Hungerford, and will be visible in some wider views from within the AONB the proposed layout of housing is considered to be such as to relate well to its semi-rural setting on the edge of Hungerford, and not to be of such a high level of impact as to detrimentally effect the outlook or amenity of existing occupants. The proposed works preserve such aspects of the site as permeability and high levels of vegetation while providing benefits in terms of providing housing in what is considered to be a sustainable location close to the services and amenities of a Rural Service Centre (Hungerford) and addressing the need for affordable housing. In light of these considerations your officer's recommendation is approval subject to the conditions listed in part 8 of this report.

8. Full Recommendation

- 8.1 To delegate to the Head of Development and Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the conditions listed below.

Conditions

1.	<p>Link to outline permission</p> <p>This permission relates solely to the reserved matters referred to in Condition 2 of the Outline Planning Permission granted on 30 November 2017 under application reference 16/03061/OUTMAJ. Nothing contained in this proposal or this notice shall be deemed to affect or vary the conditions imposed on that outline planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: The reserved matters cannot be considered separately from the permission to which they relate and the conditions imposed on that outline permission are still applicable.</p>
2.	<p>Approved plans</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed below:</p> <p>[To be confirmed on Update Report]</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.</p>
3	<p>Materials</p> <p>The external materials used in the development of the approved dwellings shall be in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawings.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with the NPPF and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.</p>
4	<p>Parking</p> <p>No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning spaces for that dwelling have been surfaced, marked out and provided in accordance with the approved plans. The parking and turning spaces shall thereafter be kept available for parking of private motor cars at all times.</p> <p>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, 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).</p>
5	<p>Ecology surveys</p> <p>No development, or other operations, shall take place within 5m of the northern boundary until Phase II surveys have been submitted for breeding birds, dormice and reptiles. Such surveys shall include recommendations for mitigation and improvement measures to address the impacts of development on these protected species, and a timetable for the implementation of those measures. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the surveys and the approved timetable of mitigation and improvement measures.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012.</p>

6	<p>Footpath provision</p> <p>Upon the provision of an access from the John O'Gaunt school site the footpath between plots 97 and 98 shall be provided in accordance with a plan to be submitted and approved in writing by the Council.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of high quality design and pedestrian permeability in accordance with the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policy HSA18 of the West Berkshire Site Allocations DPD (2017).</p>
7	<p>Open space provision and management</p> <p>No dwelling on the site shall be occupied until details of the provision and maintenance of all open space on the site has been submitted and approved in writing under a formal discharge of conditions application. Thereafter the open space on the site shall be provided and maintained in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure that the open space on the site is provided and maintained in the interests of visual amenity and the amenity of the residents of the development in accordance with the NPPF, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and Policies RL1 and RL2 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Saved Policies (2007).</p>
8	<p>No separate disposal of open space</p> <p>No parts of the public open space and landscaped areas within the site shown on the approved drawings shall be taken into private gardens, or shall be sold or disposed of separately from any other part of the public open space on the site.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure that the public open space and landscaped areas are retained, in order to mitigate the impact of the development on views from the surrounding landscape and the neighbouring public right of way, and in the interests of securing biodiversity and environmental gain in accordance with the NPPF, Policies CS14, CS17, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012 and Policies RL1 and RL2 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Saved Policies (2007).</p>
9	<p>Landscaping (scheme submitted)</p> <p>All landscape works shall be completed in accordance with the submitted plans, schedule of planting and retention, programme of works and other supporting information including drawing numbers dwg no.1386 101-1-6 rev C. Any trees, shrubs or hedges planted in accordance with the approved scheme which are removed, die, or become diseased within five years from completion of this development shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedges of a similar size and species to that originally approved.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy July 2006-2026.</p>
10	<p>Landscaping implementation</p> <p>The approved landscaping plan dwg no.1386 101-1-6 rev.C shall be implemented within the first planting season following completion of development or in accordance with a programme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees, shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within Fifteen years of this development shall be replaced in the following</p>

	<p>year by plants of the same size and species.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</p>
11	<p>Tree Protection (scheme submitted)</p> <p>Protective fencing shall be implemented and retained intact for the duration of the development in accordance with the tree and landscape protection scheme identified on approved drawing(s) numbered plan BEW22432-03B (Sheet 1&2) rev B dated 21/10/19. Within the fenced area(s), there shall be no excavations, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles or fires.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</p>
12	<p>Arboricultural method statement</p> <p>No development other than the access shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until the applicant has secured the implementation of an arboricultural watching brief in accordance with a written scheme of site monitoring, which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; tree protection installation measures and site supervision works may be required to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.</p> <p>To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</p>
13	<p>Arboricultural Supervision</p> <p>No development other than the access shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until the applicant has secured the implementation of an arboricultural watching brief in accordance with a written scheme of site monitoring, which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: A pre-commencement condition is necessary because insufficient detailed information accompanies the application; tree protection installation measures and site supervision works may be required to be undertaken throughout the construction phase and so it is necessary to approve these details before any development takes place.</p> <p>To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF and Policies CS14, CS18 and CS19 of West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.</p>

Informatives

1.	<p>Approach of the LPA</p> <p>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 worked proactively with the applicant to secure and accept what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.</p>
2.	<p>CIL</p> <p>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</p>
3.	<p>Access construction</p> <p>The Highways Manager, West Berkshire District Council, Transport & Countryside, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury, RG14 5LD, telephone number 01635 – 519887, should be contacted to agree the access construction details and to grant a licence before any work is carried out within the highway. A formal application should be made, allowing at least four (4) weeks' notice, to obtain details of underground services on the applicant's behalf.</p>
4	<p>Damage to verges,etc.</p> <p>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.</p>
5	<p>Section 106</p> <p>This decision to grant reserved matters planning permission is to be read in conjunction with the Section 106 Legal Agreement associated with outline planning permission 16/03061/OUTMAJ dated 30 November 2019.</p>