

# Notice of Meeting



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

## Eastern Area Planning Committee Wednesday 10 March 2021 at 6.30pm Written Submissions

### Members Interests

Note: If you consider you may have an interest in any Planning Application included on this agenda then please seek early advice from the appropriate officers.

Date of despatch of Agenda: Tuesday 2 March 2021

### FURTHER INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

For further information about this Agenda, or to inspect any background documents referred to in Part I reports, please contact the Planning Team on (01635) 519148

Email: [planningcommittee@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:planningcommittee@westberks.gov.uk)

Further information, Planning Applications and Minutes are also available on the Council's website at [www.westberks.gov.uk](http://www.westberks.gov.uk)

Any queries relating to the Committee should be directed to Stephen Chard / Jessica Bailiss on (01635) 519462/503124 Email: [stephen.chard@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.chard@westberks.gov.uk) / [jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk](mailto:jessica.bailiss@westberks.gov.uk)



**Agenda - Eastern Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 10 March 2021**  
(continued)

**To:** Councillors Alan Law (Chairman), Tony Linden, Royce Longton, Ross Mackinnon, Alan Macro (Vice-Chairman), Geoff Mayes, Graham Pask, Jo Stewart and Keith Woodhams

**Substitutes:** Councillors Peter Argyle, Graham Bridgman, Jeremy Cottam, Nassar Hunt, Owen Jeffery and Richard Somner

---

# Agenda

## Part I

**Page No.**

- (1) **Application No. & Parish: 20/02861/FUL - Land at 18 Sandhills Way, Calcot** 3 - 14
- Proposal:** Demolition of 2 storey side extension and erection of an attached dwelling to form 2 no 3 bed dwellings, with associated access and additional parking, cycle stores and refuse.
- Location:** Land at 18 Sandhills Way, Calcot
- Applicant:** Mr Vickers
- Recommendation:** That the Head of Development and Planning be authorised to grant conditional permission.

### Background Papers

- (a) The West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.
- (b) The West Berkshire District Local Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire, the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire and relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents.
- (c) Any previous planning applications for the site, together with correspondence and report(s) on those applications.
- (d) The case file for the current application comprising plans, application forms, correspondence and case officer's notes.
- (e) The Human Rights Act.

Sarah Clarke  
Service Director (Strategy and Governance)

If you require this information in a different format or translation, please contact Moira Fraser on telephone (01635) 519045.

## Eastern Area Planning Committee

### Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021

### Written Submissions

<b>Item:</b>	(1)
<b>Application Number:</b>	20/02861/FUL
<b>Location:</b>	18 Sandhills Way, Calcot, Reading, RG31 7PQ
<b>Proposal:</b>	Demolition of existing two storey extension and garage and erection of two-storey building to form 1 x 3-bedroom dwelling with associated car parking, access, hard and soft landscaping, refuse and cycle stores.
<b>Applicant:</b>	VIRH Limited - Adam Vickers

#### Submissions received

Parish Council	Holybrook Parish Council
Adjoining Parish Council	N/A
Objectors	Ian Savill Julius Stephens Peter & Sue Stagg Robin and Margaret Rimmington
Supporters	None
Applicant/ Agent	None

This page is intentionally left blank

**20/02861/FUL: 18 Sandhills Way, Calcot:  
Summary of Holybrook Parish Council's main objections**

**The proposed development should be REFUSED.**

- A shortfall of one parking space is a shortfall and reason enough for refusal. Parking provision, as cited in West Berkshire Council: Housing Site Allocations DPD (2006-2026) states that, in the Eastern Urban area, a three bedroom house should have two spaces '(as a minimum)';
- The parking plan states 'do not scale', so how can a desktop assessment be made on a plan not to scale? The application should be refused until the plans can be proved and verified. The Parish Council has completed a measurement of the parking entrance and questions the dimensions given. This application seems to rest entirely on the 'parking plan' which we refute. There is not enough room to enable the manoeuvres required to use the three spaces shown let alone the four actually required. Plus, the spaces are not allocated. Due to the difficult nature of the parking design, it will lead to disputes in the future.
- This application was previously refused: 'the layout does not comply with the Local Planning Authority's standards...this could result in on street parking in the vicinity, adversely affecting road safety and the flow of traffic'. This fact has not changed. Therefore, the refusal must be upheld.
- There is no right of way to the new property. Existing owners have easement rights over the forecourt but this would not automatically extend to the new property. The garage owners have financial responsibility for the maintenance of the forecourt. It would be irresponsible to not refuse this application until rights of way and compensation for damage caused to the forecourt during construction, has been agreed.
- Officers accept that 'harm' will be caused to No 16. A reason for refusal. Especially noise and light pollution at night by parking cars so close to this resident's window is unacceptable. 'Planting' is not a viable or appropriate measure to excuse and ignore policy and poor design. The harm caused to residents' health and wellbeing cannot be ignored.
- Reliance on cycle racks in order to pass a design that lacks appropriate parking provision is inconsistent with design guidance and building standards. The proposed location of the cycle racks is wholly inappropriate. There is no external front to back access and, therefore, necessitates bikes (6 shown) being carried through the house. The 'new' house is of small proportions, making this almost impossible and more so with a car parked as close to the property as shown on the proposed plan.
- The planning conditions as proposed in the EAPC reports are unworkable and do not go far enough to protect existing residents and the local environment.
- It is absolutely not necessary to inflict another house in this cramped space to assist in fulfilling the housing quota. There are plenty of other applications in the Eastern Area with 199 already under construction in Holybrook Parish.

**In summary, there is tangible and reasonable doubt regarding the robustness of the parking provision, access and turning space and, subsequently, harm will be caused to existing residents. The application must be refused.**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **20/02861/FUL - Land at 18 Sandhills Way**

### **Statement to be read at Eastern Area Planning Committee 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

I refer to extracts from the previous (refused) application and the current application, which are annexed for convenience of reference but do not contribute to the 500 word count.

I remain of the view that this application should be refused on the basis of:

#### **Parking Provision:**

The previous application was refused on grounds of parking provision, with the Highways Officer citing Policy P1:

*“Two car parking spaces are required for each dwelling”.*

The same Highways Officer in the current application somehow concludes that he cannot object to the application:

*“there is just one existing car parking space on the existing driveway. Therefore, there is an existing parking shortfall of two car parking spaces for the existing dwelling. With this dwelling being reduced from four bedrooms to three, the car parking shortfall is in turn being reduced from two to one.”*

The conclusion that he cannot object on the basis of parking is erroneous based on his own contradictory statement as there is still manifestly a shortfall in the plans of one parking space.

There is an attempt to deal with this in the Planning Officer’s report (though, notably, the wording is not attributable to the Highways Officer in his report):

*“...which in the light of surrounding available communal parking, he considers will be satisfactory and not cause harm to the wider locality.”*

The Highways Officer admitted to not attending the site due to Covid, therefore how can an effectual assessment be made to justify this statement? With respect to any officer visits that take place during office hours (or when the Google vehicle/ satellite passes), they are not going to witness the increasing problem with parking in the area – they need to visit during the evening or at weekends to see that residents have resorted to parking on grass verges because of the lack of communal spaces.

The in excess of 25 objections of the local residents that widely cite parking as a major issue in the locality should be regarded as reliable and it would appear that the current plans still breach Council Planning Policy P1 and should be refused (and by the look of case law, this is not an exceptional circumstance).

#### **Garden size:**

SPD Quality Design recommends gardens of 100sqm.

The current plans are in breach of this recommendation. The current application should be refused.

#### **Character:**

Sandhills Way is a traffic free location. Seeing cars on the frontage of one of the properties would be a prominent and incongruous feature and erode the fundamental feature of Sandhills Way. I would suggest that, contrary to the Planning Officer’s report, it completely justifies the merit in rejecting the application.

This page is intentionally left blank



I wish to make a submission to the above meeting,as below.

20/92861/FUL 18 SANDHILLS WAY, CALCOT

It goes without saying that the lack of site visiting,and face to face discussion has been less than helpful to residents.

There remain a number of apparent discrepancies which have served to increase confusion.

1/ The Applicant's assertion that 'most' residences in the vicinity have private driveways,is false. 4 out of 42 is not 'most'.

Despite this having been mentioned many times,there has been no apparent understanding that parking is already tight.

2/ Attention of Committee members is drawn to the objection lodged by the Parish Council. In particular to the map of proposed parking provision at the back.

The access is 2.6 metres, not 2.8 as claimed by the Highways Officer.It would only have taken a moment during a visit to verify this.But the 2.8 figure remains.

The map shows how tight this will be,in terms of access and egress. Living at 21 Wheatlands,overlooking these garages,I can attest that I have never seen a car from 18 Sandhills make a three point turn.They have always reversed in,or more normally,reversed out the whole length of the garages.

3/ The Highways Officer has always been clear that 3 Bedrooms means 2 Parking spaces. Confusion reigns when 2x3 Bedroomed houses,in this case, apparently means only provision for 3,not 4. By some sleight of hand we are encouraged to accept that because Unit A (the existing property) was only deemed to need one space in the mists of time,it doesn't need 2 now like Unit B next door! 2 parking spaces for 3 Bedrooms is either right or wrong. Of course 4 parking spaces really would be impossible at this site.

4/ The Highways Officer suggests,in his closing remarks, that should approval be given,a "construction management plan would need to be included". Such a plan would need to provide method statements for such matters as traffic management, public access and protection, Health and Safety and Security,and Material storage,and many other things.This is not a little extension job.It is demolition and rebuild in a tight corner.A different kind of job and governed by different rules.Should not this necessary plan,which will affect the lives of so many, be produced before a decison is made rather than after?

With respect,this application should be REFUSED

This page is intentionally left blank

1. Parking shortfall cannot be solved by paving front lawn adjacent to walkway without highway access, except over private property.
2. Conflicting parking information from both applications stated by Mr Goddard causing confusion. (Highways 6.13)  
 05/08/20 **"2 parking places for each dwelling"**  
 07/09/20 (final statement) **"the plans do not change my previous comments 2 parking spaces for each dwelling... results in on street parking adversely affecting road safety and traffic flow"**  
 22/09/20 **" Thank you Emma for your phone call, I understand the existing dwelling already has a parking shortfall that would be reduced by the reduction in size from 4 bedrooms to 3. Therefore I cannot object to the existing shortfall."**

*The dwelling was always to be reduced from 4 to 3, why was this overlooked by Mr Goddard?*  
 This meant as 4 spaces required, 1 vehicle had to be parked on the highway in contradiction to the decision above.

Subsequently this last minute change and emails were a material consideration in the prediction of this second proposal. (Confirmed by Mr Vickers in his Design statement) It appears that 3 parking spaces are now fully acceptable (confirmed on Pg1 of design statement) What caused this decision change?

Furthermore pg11 design statement quotes **"there is enough space within the front garden to accommodate 3 spaces but on balance it is proposed to provide the additional spaces off site"**. Presumably it is now acceptable for 2 cars to be parked on the highway . Another decision change?

3. Mr Goddard requests (Consultation response 18/02/20) should planning be granted **"a construction management plan would need to be included"**

Where is it?

Need to see this plan BEFORE planning decision to show the following conditions will make it impossible for this building to be completed.

- \* access arrangements for vehicles, plant and personnel.
- \* storage areas
- \*site waste management plan
- \* drainage control measures
- \*access / protection arrangements for public
- \* point of contact / complaints procedures.

The only para 8.1 condition 3 regarding construction is times when work can occur.

4. Para 8.1 Condition 4 Mr Butler's report **"thereafter the parking and turning spaces shall be kept available for parking and manoeuvring at all times."**

This condition cannot be met as there is insufficient turning space (see Parish Council Report 04/02/21 with measurements done on site rather than virtually) without using privately owned land outside the curtilage of 18 Sandhills Way. In conjunction with this if it's impossible for smaller vehicles how will plant equipment manoeuvre within the same curtilage space in order to access and egress the 27 metres from the highway over private land.

5. The private forecourt is for traversing to access / egress a garage. This was granted in 1972 and is in the deeds of the properties. As the only garage in 18 Sandhills Way is to be

removed, the arrangement is no longer applicable. It never was and is still not an access / egress arrangement for plant machinery for a new build.

Statement to be read at Eastern Area Planning Committee 10<sup>th</sup> March, 2021

(Noted paragraph numbers refer to Planning Officer's report. Please emphasise words in capitals . Thank you)

A Paragraph 6.7: 'front grassed area enhances visual setting' , please note.

B Paragraph 6.8 : 'car parking already available' , yes but discrete, at far side of house. Previous owners used it primarily as access to their garage.

C Paragraph 5.1 : WBC Highways say, 'access acceptable, safety not unduly compromised'. I TOTALLY refute this and it is a serious error caused by no visit to the site. To quote from the Parish Council supplementary response on planning website, 04/03/21: 'the proposed parking arrangements are false and misleading'. Also in appendix 1 : 'no space for turning'. Regarding safety, at certain times of the day , the footpath is a thoroughfare for school children, families, dog walkers and cyclists from surrounding streets.

D Paragraph 6.12, regarding impact on Sandhills Way: no mention of noise disturbance from vehicles accessing driveway late at night and noise from car doors closing. Our bedroom will be very close to the two parked cars. There is an implication that they will be electric, but that cannot be guaranteed . Exhaust fumes have not been mentioned either. We bought our house in the knowledge that Sandhills Way was located in a quiet, CARLESS WALKWAY.

E Paragraph 6.7, last sentence paraphrasing: 'no planning permission required for lawn car park '. This detracts from the problem of entering and particularly reversing out of the lawn car park which would be very awkward for a small car, let alone a larger vehicle. Reversing out from the lawn car park will require three different reversing directions, two on the driveway and at least one on the forecourt, close to the public footpath.

In summary , a PRFOUND, IRREVERSIBLE change to Sandhills Way is being proposed: a WALKWAY is being made into a 'CARWAY'. The 'emotional and environmental harm is being swept aside, as are safety aspects.'

Please note the comments from your 25 residents and the Parish Council, several of whom live on or close to Fords Farm.

MOST of the planning committee and certainly NONE of WBC Highways have visited the site.

Please refuse this application.

Thank you ,