

Notice of Meeting



Scan here to access the public documents for this meeting

Western Area Planning Committee

Wednesday, 8th June, 2022 at 6.30 pm

**in the Council Chamber Council Offices
Market Street Newbury**

The Council will be live streaming its meetings.

This meeting will be streamed live here: <https://www.westberks.gov.uk/westernareaplanninglive>

You can view all streamed Council meetings here:
<https://www.westberks.gov.uk/councilmeetingslive>

Further information for members of the public

Plans and photographs relating to the Planning Applications to be considered at the meeting can be viewed by clicking on the link on the front page of the relevant report.

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

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

Any queries relating to the Committee should be directed to Democratic Services Team on Email: executivecycle@westberks.gov.uk



Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 8 June 2022
(continued)

To: Councillors Clive Hooker (Chairman), Tony Vickers (Vice-Chairman), Adrian Abbs, Phil Barnett, Dennis Benneyworth, Jeff Cant, Carolyne Culver, Claire Rowles and Howard Woollaston

Substitutes: Councillors Jeff Beck, James Cole, Lynne Doherty, David Marsh, Steve Masters, Andy Moore, Erik Pattenden and Martha Vickers

Agenda

Part I

Page No.

- (1) **Application No. and Parish: 22/00493/FUL, Sterling Gardens, Hectors Way, Newbury** 5 - 14

Proposal: New link road connecting Hectors Way to Kings Road through the Sterling Estate Development with associated retaining walls.

Location: Sterling Gardens, Hectors Way, Newbury

Applicant: Nelson Land Limited

Recommendation: To **DELEGATE** to the Service Director, Development and Regulation to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the schedule of conditions (Section 8.3 of the report) and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

OR

If the legal agreement is not completed by the 09th September 2022, to **DELEGATE** to the Service Director, Development and Regulation to **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION**, for the reasons set out in Section 8.4 of the report or to extend the period for completion if it is considered expedient to do so.



West Berkshire
C O U N C I L

Agenda - Western Area Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 8 June 2022
(continued)

- (2) **Application No. and Parish: 21/03132/HOUSE, 14 Lime Close, Newbury, RG14 2PW** 15 – 20
Proposal: Partial Retrospective: Retention of existing metal staircase to side gable end wall and addition of proposed privacy screen.
Location: 14 Lime Close, Newbury, West Berkshire RG14 2PW
Applicant: Mr Pawel Kuzdak
Recommendation: To **DELEGATE** to the Service Director – Development and Regulation to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to conditions.
- (3) **Application No. and Parish: 22/00648/FULD, 61 Russell Road, Newbury, RG14 5JX** 21 – 22
Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of four dwellings
Location: 61 Russell Road, Newbury, RG14 5JX
Applicant: Bartlett Property Development
Recommendation: To **DELEGATE** to the Service Director – Development and Regulation to **REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION** for the reasons listed in Section 8 of the report.

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 Stephen Chard on (01635) 519462.

This page is intentionally left blank

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 08TH JUNE 2022

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 22/00493/FUL **Page No.** 43 to 69

Site: Sterling Gardens, Hectors Way, Newbury

Planning Officer Presenting: Masie Masiwa

Member Presenting:

Parish Representative speaking: Cllr Nigel Foot – Newbury Town Council – In Person

Objector(s) speaking: Ms Nicola Blythe – In Person

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: N/A

Ward Member(s): Councillor Phil Barnett, Councillor Billy Drummond, Councillor Erik Pattenden

1. Additional Information

During the committee site visit, queries were raised by members and residents and these are addressed below by the Highway Authority Officer.

The B3421 link road through the site is secured with Policy TRANS 1A of the Local Plan Saved Policies 2007 and was approved with planning application 15/00319/FULEXT.

The purpose of the link road through the site would be:

- To reduce traffic along most of Kings Road and Mill Lane to the north by diverting traffic from these roads to the new link road. This would then enable these roads to be made into quieter residential streets.
- Would also enable the provision of improved pedestrian and cycle routes through this area of Newbury to connect towards the town centre.

- Would reduce traffic levels on the A339 / B3421 / Bear Lane roundabout, as traffic wishing to travel east from Sainsbury would be able to turn right instead of needing to 'u – turn' around the roundabout.
- There is an economic benefit in providing an improved route from the Hambridge Road commercial area to the A339, particularly with the existing weight restriction on Mill Lane.

The overall design of the road through the site and the associated off site highway works were approved with 15/00319/FULEXT. The purpose of this planning application is to seek approval of changes to the design, with four main changes tabulated below:

Change	Reasoning	Amelioration
Reduction in road widths on the east to west sections of the link road particularly the section alongside the railway with reductions from 7.3 to 6.1 metres.	Reduces height and costs of retaining structures between link road and Gordon Road.	Provides a width in line with rest of B3421. Should reduce vehicle speeds. The north/south section of the link road was always proposed to be 6.1 m wide.
Deletion of the footway on the southern side of the link road alongside the railway line.	The requirement to provide a surface water drainage infiltration trench due to limited drainage connections around the site.	2 metre wide footway on northern side retained. Crossing points provided from development to northern side footway. Additional green verge around trench.
Raising of site and road levels by 1.0 metre in places, particularly on the eastern side of the site.	Unauthorised development, but did reduce amount of spoil removed from site significantly reducing disruptive vehicle movements and lowering carbon emissions.	Reduced gradient of north to south section of link road. Retaining wall structure alongside railway line.
Deletion of the proposed traffic signals at the B3421 Kings Road / Hambridge Road / Boundary Road crossroads and widening of Hambridge Road on south east corner	This was originally estimated at £250,000, however due to the cost of diverting services, this cost increased and the likely cost of the junction was projected to be in excess of £1m. This cost became prohibitive. The scale of the project to deliver, including the diversion of underground services would have been extremely disruptive as it would have required lengthy road closures.	Traffic modelling showed limited difference between providing original scheme and not providing signals. Zebra crossing retained fronting London Apprentice PH. Further crossings provided on Boundary Road arms, and footways on south western corner retained. Additional Zebra crossing on Boundary Road (south).

All the works to widen Boundary Road to the north of the new widened railway bridge allowing two-way flow, the additional footway on the eastern side of Boundary Road are unchanged, except the proposed addition of a new Zebra crossing.

Following completion of this link road, future plans for Kings Road and Mill Lane will need to be devised by this Council in consultation with local residents, etc. These plans will be based on the principle that Kings Road will become two separate dead-end streets, in order to ensure that through traffic uses the new link road, but with access maintained for pedestrians and cyclists. Through traffic will also be discouraged from using Mill Lane.

At the committee site visit, a number of questions were raised, the answers are outlined below:

- 1) Why should the road be constructed with raised levels, and can it still be constructed at the same level as previously approved.

Much of this is answered within the above table. The road cannot be constructed to the original levels due to the building also not being constructed at the original levels. This would result in difficulty in entering the building for all modes including the mobility impaired.

- 2) Why is no formal pedestrian crossing along the link road for use by Kings Road residents if they are to use the building's car park. They are concerned with regard to the safety of crossing the busy new link road without a designated crossing.

It is considered that a formal crossing is not justified due to the presence of the zebra crossing to the east and the limited space between junctions. However a crossing consisting of dropped kerbs and tactile paving may be possible within this section of road.

- 3) What is the weight limit for the HGV vehicles using the new link road.

No weight restriction was considered with the 2015 consent. It would also undermine the purposes of the link road outlined above. Therefore it will be standard highway restrictions which is currently 44 tonnes.

- 4) Can a condition be applied that there is no two way traffic along Kings Road between Boundary Road/Kings Road Junction and the new mini roundabout (Kings Road/New Link Road).

This was not provided with the 2015 consent, and unfortunately this would also undermine the purposes of the link road outlined above.

- 5) There is concern with the removal of the previously proposed traffic lights on the Kings Road / Hambridge Road / Boundary Road crossroads Junction. There is suggestion that the junction will be unsafe with the addition of traffic from the new two way traffic accessing the junction from the new link road.

Much of this is answered within the above table. The proposed crossroads without signals complies with all standards regarding geometry and sight lines. Additional pedestrian facilities are being provided including crossings and additional footways on the south western

corner, that should improve safety and overall visibility. The design will be subject to the Road Safety Audit process.

Highway officers are also aware of concern regarding the loss of residents on street car parking in Kings Road. This is for consideration within the non-material amendment application 22/00039/NONMAT. It has always been the aim of the Council to allow these residents to park within the development. This has so far not been agreed by the developer. However highway and planning officers will aim to secure this by condition within 22/00039/NONMAT.

2. Additional Consultation Responses

Since the publication of the committee report, additional consultation comments have been submitted by the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) requesting additional information. Condition 4 has been amended to insert the requirement for the submission of details of a second road gully constructed adjacent to the proposed gully. The amended condition 4 is outlined below:

Sustainable drainage measures

Irrespective of the submitted details, the development hereby approved shall not be first used or open to traffic until details of the full sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water runoff within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

These details shall:

- a) Include a second road gully constructed adjacent to the 'new' gully already built at the south-east 'corner' of the roundabout and connected to catchpit CP9

The sustainable drainage measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the link road hereby permitted is open to traffic, in accordance with a timetable to be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority as part of the details submitted for this condition. The sustainable drainage measures shall be maintained in the approved condition thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that surface water will be managed in a sustainable manner. This condition is applied in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS16 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026), and Part 4 of the West Berkshire Supplementary Planning Document Quality Design (June 2006).

No additional representations have been received.

3. Highways section from previous Committee report

During the Western Area Planning Committee Chairman's Briefing, Cllr Vickers requested that the Highways section from the 2015 committee report (15/00319/FULEXT) is included in the Update Sheet for the benefit of members. The section is shown in full below section 5 as an appendix to this update.

4. Amended Conditions

The applicant's response to the LLFA's drainage comments and an amended drainage plan were received on 27 May 2022 after the committee report had been finalised. The

submissions are added to the approved plans condition 2. The amended condition 2 – Approved Plans is now shown in full below :

Approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents and plans:

Received on 24 February 2022

- Jakoustic reflective fence details
- Noise assessment
- Application form

Received on 28 February 2022

- Location plan
- Highway construction details
- Section 38 long sections
- Section 38 swept path analysis bus
- Section 38 setting out plan
- Amended Section 278 cross sections

Received on 08 March 2022

- Drainage strategy, SUDS and sewer system improvements part 1
- Drainage strategy, SUDS and sewer system improvements part 2
- Drainage strategy, SUDS and sewer system improvements part 3
- Construction management plan logistics plan

Received on 15 March 2022

- Amended Section 278 site clearance
- Amended Section 278 contours and levels
- Amended Section 278 pavement finishes and kerb types
- Amended Section 278 road markings and signage
- Amended Section 278 plan
- Amended Section 278 proposed street lighting sheet 1
- Amended Section 278 proposed street lighting sheet 2
- Amended Section 278 swept path analysis rigid bus
- Amended Section 278 boundary road railway bridge proposals
- Amended Section 278 scheme layout
- Amended Section 278 proposed drainage
- Amended Section 278 swept path analysis refuse vehicle sheet 1
- Amended Section 278 swept path analysis refuse vehicle sheet 2
- Amended Section 278 new routes temporary signing plan

Received on 05 May 2022

- Applicant response regarding acoustic fence

Received on 06 May 2022

- Jackure fence 25 year guarantee
- Fencing due diligence statement
- Section 278 comments
- Amended construction management plan statement
- Amended section 38 proposed phasing and drainage plan
- Amended Newbury remaining construction method schedule
- Amended section 38 retaining walls
- Amended section 38 scheme layout
- Amended section 38 proposed levels
- Amended section 38 pavement finishes and kerbs
- Amended section 38 road markings and signage
- Amended section 38 adaptable highway infrastructure plan
- Amended section 38 cross sections
- Amended section 38 proposed street lighting
- Amended section 38 swept path analysis refuse vehicles
- Cable ducting plan
- Amended drainage construction details

Received on 26 May 2022

- Amended acoustic fence details plan

Received on 27 May 2022

- Applicant response to drainage comments
- Section 38 Amended drainage plan

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

5. Updated Recommendation

The recommendation remains for approval as set out in the agenda committee report, subject to the amended conditions in the update sheet.

Appendix 1 (Highways section from Committee report for application 15/00319/FULEXT):

6.5 Highways

6.5.1 One of the reasons that the previous planning application was refused was the omission of the B3421 Kings Road link road through the site that will connect Hectors Way (near Scats) to Boundary / Kings Road. Land for the link road is protected by the Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) under Policy TRANS.1A. The improvement is also included in the

current Local Transport Plan 3 (2011 – 2026) and supporting Implementation Development Plan with the emerging Core Strategy.

6.5.2 The link road is required to provide an alternative east to west route along the B3421 Hambridge Road corridor connecting the Hambridge Road / Bone Lane commercial areas to the A339. The link road would then provide a bypass avoiding Mill Lane and much of Kings Road. Mill Lane is a one way street from west to east, with Kings Road also providing a one way route in the other direction. These roads are increasingly considered to be unsuitable for the current volumes and types of traffic, and with the link road these could be made into quieter residential streets. The link road would also provide a good route for pedestrians and cyclists in an area where footways are often narrow or non-existent and with roads that are often unattractive to cyclists. Furthermore traffic leaving the Kings Road area and J Sainsbury when wishing to travel east must 'U – turn' around the A339 / Bear Lane roundabout to travel along Mill Lane to travel eastwards. There will therefore be a small reduction in traffic on the roundabout with the removal of these 'U – turning' traffic movements.

6.5.3 After refusing the previous planning application on this site, the Council made a bid for funding from the Berkshire Local Transport Body (BLTB). At the time of writing it is now known that the Council have been successful in obtaining a conditional £2.3 million bid for funding for the link road. The money will be allocated to this scheme by the Local Enterprise Partnership subject to i) satisfactory conclusions of the funding settlement with various UK government departments and ii) the approval of a full business case for the scheme by the Berkshire Local Transport Body. Accordingly, the applicant will no longer be required to fund / provide any of the link road except as potentially Section 38 and 278 works with the funding being passed to the developer to provide the road with construction of the proposal. Otherwise this proposal will as with any other proposal, be expected to comply with the Council's SPD Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development and provide a financial contribution. This is of course subject to the viability reviews noted. The Developer will however be providing the land free of cost to the Council.

6.5.4 The link road overall is overall to cost £2,935,000 of which £2,335,000 is now obtained from the Berkshire Local Transport Board, and the remaining £600,000 from existing Section 106 contributions and the Council's own capital programme.

Access and layout

6.5.5 Access to the under-croft car park serving the larger eastern side of the development will be via a proposed roundabout onto the proposed link road. Two further priority junction accesses are provided to serve the western side of the development. All of these accesses are considered acceptable. West Berkshire Council Western Area Planning Committee 18 March 2015

6.5.6 For the main eastern part of the site, refuse will be collected by the refuse vehicle pulling into a lay-by adjacent the car park entrance, although more detail is currently required on this lay-by. Further work is also required to ensure access to these for refuse vehicles to enter and turn within the site to serve the western part of the site.

6.5.7 170 parking spaces have been provided for the 167 flats, which is considered to be acceptable, however some amendments are still required to reduce the number of parking

spaces allocated for disabled persons. An issue previously was the loss of parking on Kings Road to serve existing properties. Highway Officers are still concerned regarding this issue. Some parking should be allocated within the site to these dwellings.

6.5.8 Network Rail are scheduled to replace the Boundary Road railway bridge from next month. The opportunity is being taken to provide a wider bridge along with a wider footway over the bridge and along Boundary Road fronting the site. Additional land would be required from the application site to provide the footway. This is to be provided as shown on the Proposed Block Plan with the carriageway realigned to provide the footway on the eastern side of Boundary Road. This provision of land by the applicant, will be considered as part of any Section 106 contribution that will be outlined later.

Traffic generation

6.5.8 To enable a projection for the potential traffic generation with proposal to be made, the applicant's highway consultants SMA have used the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS), which is a national database containing traffic survey information from many different land uses within the United Kingdom. The following results have been produced: a. The existing industrial site is projected to generate a potential 42 vehicle movements (28 arriving, 14 leaving) between 08.00 and 09.00 hours with 42 vehicles (9 arriving, 33 leaving) between 17.00 and 18.00 hours. b. The proposed development is projected to generate 55 vehicle movements (13 arriving, 42 leaving) between 08.00 and 09.00 hours with 52 vehicles (37 arriving, 15 leaving) between 17.00 and 18.00 hours.

6.5.9 To ascertain any effects, traffic models have been submitted for the Hectors Way / Sainsbury Access Road Roundabout and the Boundary Road / Hambridge Road / Kings Road crossroads. Except for the proposed Boundary Road / Hambridge Road / Kings Road traffic signals, no further checks have been made on the models at this stage, as it needs to be stated that during detailed design of the link road and the Boundary Road / Hambridge Road / Kings Road traffic signal junction, further work may need to be done on the signal phasing and cycles. The models submitted may provide a base for this further work.

Mitigation

6.5.10 Network Rail are currently scheduled to replace the Boundary Road railway bridge from October 2015. The opportunity is therefore being sought to provide a wider two way bridge along with a wider footway over the bridge. A wider footway along Boundary Road will also be provided with additional land from the application site to provide the footway. The provision of this land has been considered as part of any Section 106 contribution. West Berkshire Council Western Area Planning Committee 18 March 2015

6.5.11 In line with the NPPF and the Council's SPD, taking account of existing uses within the site, to mitigate any additional travel impact and to encourage sustainable travel, contributions and / or highway works to a value of £241,500 were initially being sought. As mentioned above £10,200 is then deducted for the cost of the land to provide a footway with the new railway bridge. This gives a figure of £231,300.

6.5.12 The Boundary Road / Hambridge Road / Kings Road traffic signal junction will cost circa £250,000, with circa £200,000 from existing Section 106 contributions. A design for this junction was generally agreed with previous planning applications. There is therefore a

shortfall of some £50,000. 6.5.13 A Framework Travel Plan (TP) has been submitted that includes items such as a Travel Plan Coordinator that will finalise the TP, set targets to reduce use of cars, monitor and market TP measures.

6.5.14 It is therefore considered that the £231,300 mentioned above will be used in the following ways:

- i. £50,000 to cover the funding shortfall in the Boundary Road / Hambridge Road / Kings Road traffic signal junction.
- ii. The cost of delivering the road realignment / footway in connection with the new railway bridge –this is estimated to be £80,000.
- iii. A further reduction of £72,000 for what would have been local improvements to the Newbury Racecourse station. Officers do not consider this meets the tests set out in para 122 of the CIL Regulations of 2010.
- iv. Measures to deliver the Travel Plan and encourage sustainable travel choices to be made by residents of the development .This is estimated to be just over £26,000.
- v. In terms of a breakdown of the above figure noted in 3 above, £22,760 is for a car club contribution, £417 is for travel information packs, and Council monitoring incentives to encourage measures within the Travel Plan has a budget of £3,000.
- vi. For clarity, it should be noted that items 1, 2 and 3 above will be deducted from the overall s106 request figure. These are direct costs to be met by the Council/ Developer so need to be taken off the s 106 request
- vii. A further £3,000 will be paid direct by the applicant/developer for local travel plan incentives but these are not part of payments to the Council.
- viii. This leaves a highway s106 developer contribution request of £26,177 as noted.

6.5.15 Therefore under Section 38 of the 1980 Highways Act, the developer is to construct the link road and associated footways through the site using funding from the BLTB and WBC. Under Section 278 of the 1980 Highways Act, the developer is to provide the following using funding from the BLTB, WBC and the developers own funding through the SPD and own funding to facilitate site access:

- a. The provision of a mini roundabout onto Kings Road along with the widening of Kings Road from the mini roundabout to Boundary Road with associated footways fronting the application site.
- b. Provision of the Boundary Road / Hambridge Road / Kings Road traffic signal junction West Berkshire Council Western Area Planning Committee 18 March 2015
- c. The realignment of the Boundary Road between Hambridge Road and the railway bridge with provision of a footway along the eastern side of Boundary Road

6.5.16 Under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990:

- a. Measures to deliver the Travel Plan and encourage sustainable travel choices to be made by residents of the development will be required to be funded.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 08.06.22

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (2) **Application No:** 21/03132/HOUSE **Page No.** 71 to 79

Site: 14 Lime Close, Newbury

Planning Officer Presenting: Mr Scott Houston

Member Presenting: N/A

Parish Representative speaking: Cllr Nigel Foot - Newbury Town Council – In person

Objector(s) speaking: Ms Karen Munroe – In Person

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Ms Amanda Olley - Summit Planning Associates Ltd – In person

Ward Member(s): Cllr Jeff Beck
Cllr Jeff Cant

Update Information:

For the members information/clarification, certain existing dimensions of the external staircase are as followed:

- Height from external landing to top of existing rail: 1m
- Height from external landing to top of existing door: 2m
- Height of external staircase landing above ground level: 2.9m

Please also find attached for reference the appeal decision for 21/00445/HOUSE which was the previous application to retain/formalise the staircase.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 November 2021

by Martin Chandler BSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/D/21/3276930

14 Lime Close, Newbury RG14 2PW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Pawel Kuzdak against the decision of West Berkshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00445/HOUSE, dated 19 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is Erection of metal staircase on the side gable end wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - i) the living conditions for the occupants of neighbouring properties, having regard to privacy; and
 - ii) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The proposal would introduce an external metal staircase that would provide access to a first-floor doorway located on the gable end of the existing building. Due to the location of the appeal site, the gable end of the property directly faces the rear gardens and rear elevations of Nos 38 and 40 Creswell Road. The rear elevations of these properties contain numerous windows which directly serve living areas and bedrooms. In addition, the rear gardens share boundaries with the side boundary of the appeal site. Accordingly, due to the location and height of the proposed structure, it is highly visible from neighbouring properties.
4. The proposal would provide external access to a first-floor bedroom. It would not seek to facilitate use as a separate dwelling, but the intention is to provide an independent access for a relative that has certain care needs. This matter will be discussed further below, but due to the intended use, the proposal would be highly likely to result in daily comings and goings. Accordingly, the staircase would be subject to a noticeable level of movement to and from the bedroom. I note that the staircase and point of access are functional structures and are not designed to provide either a viewing platform or amenity space. Movements associated with the structure would therefore have a specific

purpose. However, the activity would be at an upper level and would represent a highly anomalous form of movement. As a consequence, due to the prominent location of the structure when viewed from Nos 38 and 40, and the proximity to these neighbouring properties, in my judgement, this would give rise to a substantial level of actual and perceived overlooking with a demonstrable loss of privacy. This is a matter to which I give significant weight.

5. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions for the occupants of neighbouring properties. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy C14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) (CS) and guidance contained within the Council's 'Quality Design Part 2' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and 'House Extensions' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). Taken together, these seek amongst other things, development which has regard to the wider context and locality as well as the living conditions for neighbours.

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site is located adjacent to the corner of a turning area for a short cul-de-sac. Due to its corner location, the existing dwelling sits discreetly within the road, set back from the highway with its flank wall facing away from the public realm. As a consequence, views of this elevation are distinctly limited from within Lime Close and therefore it would not represent a dominant or imposing addition within the street scene. Views from Cresswell Road could be achieved between buildings, however, due to the distance from the staircase as well as the nature of the gaps, these views would only be glimpses of a distant structure. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be visually intrusive in these glimpsed views.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. On this basis, it would comply with Policies CS14 and CS19 of the CS, as well as guidance contained within the Council's SPD and SPG. Taken together, these seek amongst other things, high quality design that respects the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would assist in providing accommodation for a family member who, due to health reasons, would benefit from living with a family where enhanced support could be provided. The staircase and associated access at upper level would enable the relative to retain a degree of independence whilst also benefitting from additional care. Accordingly, the development would bring demonstrable social benefits for the appellant's family, a matter which weighs in favour of the proposal. However, as identified above, the location of the staircase would be such that these benefits come at a cost for the occupants of neighbouring properties regarding living conditions, and specifically loss of privacy. In my judgement, the scale of this impact would be substantial and consequently, I am satisfied that it would outweigh the benefits that have been identified. In arriving at this conclusion, I have had due regard to the Human Rights Act 1998.

Conclusion

9. Although the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and would bring with it specific benefits for the appellant, for the reasons identified above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR

This page is intentionally left blank

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 08/06/2022

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (3) **Application No:** 22/00648/FULD **Page No.** 81-90

Site: 61 Russell Road, Newbury, RG14 5JX

Planning Presenting: **Officer** Cheyanne Kirby

Member Presenting:

Parish speaking: **Representative** Nigel Foot - Newbury Town Council – In Person

Objector(s) speaking: Ms Linda Philo

Supporter(s) speaking: Sukey Russell-Hayward - Zoom

Beth Graham - Zoom

Applicant/Agent speaking: Stuart Bartlett - Bartlett Property Development – In person

Ward Member(s): Cllr Andy Moore
Cllr Martha Vickers

Update Information:

No update.

This page is intentionally left blank