

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 21 MARCH 2012

Councillors Present: Peter Argyle, Pamela Bale, Brian Bedwell (Vice-Chairman), Richard Crumly, Alan Law, Royce Longton, Alan Macro, Geoff Mayes, Tim Metcalfe, Irene Neill, Graham Pask (Chairman) and Quentin Webb

Also Present: Jessica Bailiss, Karen Buckingham, Stephen Chard (Policy Officer), Gareth Dowding, Liz Patient and David Pearson

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting:

Councillor(s) Absent:

PART I

63. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 29 February 2012 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

64. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Pamela Bale declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(3), but reported that, as her interest could be construed as prejudicial, she would be leaving the meeting during the course of consideration of the matter, apart from speaking as Ward Member.

65. Schedule of Planning Applications

65(1) Application No. & Parish: 11/01345/FULMAJ - Springwood Engineering, Bunces Lane, Burghfield Common

Agenda Item 4(1) concerning Planning Application 11/01345/FULMAJ in respect of the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 14 residential dwellings was deferred as the application was found to be invalid. The item was therefore not discussed and would be rescheduled once a new valid application had been submitted.

65(2) Application Nos. 11/02395/HOUSE & 11/02396/LBC2 - Bryar Cottage, North Street, Theale

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Applications 11/02395/HOUSE and 11/02396/LBC2 in respect of a new detached garage and office to the rear alongside house.

Councillor Graham Pask confirmed that a single debate would be held for both applications, but there would be a separate decision made in respect to each application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mr Barry Morris, Parish Council representative, Mr Jake Brown, [name restricted], objectors, and Mr Simon Hynes and Ms Lisa Witham, applicants, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mr Morris in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- On considering the most recently refused planning application, the Parish Council had considered it to be inappropriately bulky and were therefore opposed to that

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

application. Since that time the applicants had consulted all interested parties, including the Parish, and this was felt to be a far more acceptable proposal which would have little impact on the street scene.

- Only one letter of objection had been received from within the parish. This was from the tenant of a neighbouring property (Sheldon) who was concerned with the loss of light to their property. However, the Parish felt this issue had been adequately covered by Planning in the report.
- A Parish Council representative had attended the site visit and did not have any concerns. The Parish Council were in support of the application.

Members noted that one of the objectors, Mr Jake Brown, was a West Berkshire Council Planning Officer, however, his attendance was only in the capacity of an objector. The Chairman acknowledged that the Members of the Committee all knew Mr Brown in his professional capacity.

[name restricted] in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- She was speaking on behalf of the objectors to both planning applications. They were of the view that the garage and the office building would inappropriately close the existing gap between buildings. The gap needed to be retained as it contributed to the street scene and provided a suitable setting for the listed building.
- The proposal would block views from her home (Sheldon) and would have an urbanising impact on the area.
- The application would bring no benefits to the listed building and this was necessary in order to combat negative impacts.
- The half-hip aspect of the design, which would face the road, would be an unsympathetic feature.
- The proposal would significantly limit the amount of daylight on the Sheldon property as it would have an overbearing impact, most particularly on the well used kitchen and lounge. In addition, the kitchen window would overlook the proposed garage. Although the application had been improved, the main bulk of the outbuildings would still be visible.
- If approved, the garage would be only one metre from the boundary fence.
- The impact on the garden area was also an important consideration. Much of the garden was already overlooked and only the area outside the kitchen had any privacy. However, this would be lost by the height and close proximity of the garage and office.
- [name restricted] respectfully asked for refusal of the application to avoid the harm it would bring, particularly to the setting of the listed building, the loss of light to the Sheldon property and the overbearing impact on the outdoor space of Sheldon.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe queried whether surrounding properties also had the half-hip design. Mr Brown confirmed that this was the case, but these did not face the road as would be the case with Bryar Cottage.

Mr Brown also confirmed, in response to a question from Councillor Brian Bedwell, that it would be a benefit if the proposed garage roof was flat as it would reduce the height.

Councillor Pamela Bale asked the objectors to comment on the references in the report to loss of light. This included a statement that there would be no loss of direct sunlight between 9am - 10am from November to February. The report also stated that the

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

available day light to the side windows of Sheldon would not reduce by more than 20%. Mr Brown advised that the calculations for this had not been made publicly available and he was therefore unable to analyse this in detail. However, he did point out that if the light was reduced at or above 20% then this would become unacceptable in line with the BRE publication 'Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight'. He also reiterated that the kitchen would be overshadowed and would only receive direct sunlight in the early part of the day.

Councillor Alan Law commented that he had gained a different perception of the loss of light on entering the neighbouring Sheldon property and asked whether the case officer had done likewise in assessing the impact. Mr Brown advised that this had not been the case.

Mr Alston in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He lived in Rose Cottage which was directly opposite Bryar Cottage, and his property and Sheldon would be most affected by this application. His view of Bryar Cottage showed that it was not detached.
- In his 20 years of residing at Rose Cottage, there had been four owners of Bryar Cottage, it had been subject to two fires and had clearly needed to be rebuilt on both occasions. Bryar Cottage was formerly two small cottages and originally had a tiled roof (this was many years ago). The planning permission granted in 1996, which had since elapsed, was for a similar scheme.
- He was keen to see Bryar Cottage looked after and the current owners had shown a willingness to do so.
- North Street had a huge diversity of houses, many of which already had garages which had been built at the agreement of neighbours as well as extensions. He did not therefore feel that the addition of a garage would look out of place.
- The garage had been set back when compared to earlier plans to reduce its impact. He had examined the 3D model produced of the site and felt that the garage would in fact be an attractive addition.
- He felt the Planning website did not show the balanced views for the application. If the views of only local people were considered then the application would not have come before the Committee, as the majority of concern came from people living outside the local area.
- He did not feel that refusal of the proposal would be reasonable or fair on the basis that it was a listed building.
- The garage and office would be finished to a high standard which would help it blend in with existing buildings. Approval would also create work for the building industry.

Councillor Quentin Webb asked Mr Alston to give his view on the impact of the garage on the neighbouring Sheldon property. Mr Alston felt that as the garage would be set further back from the previous application, it would allow more light to enter the neighbouring property. The 3D model, which was able to show the impact in terms of loss of light over different times of the year and times of day, had helped to better illustrate the impact on Sheldon and Mr Alston felt that the garage/office would be small enough to sit in the existing shadow and not exacerbate the impact.

Mr Hynes in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- He purchased Bryar Cottage approximately four and a half years ago. It was their dream home and they had great neighbours.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

- The previous owners had made him aware of the previous planning permission which had since expired. It was his intention to resurrect this as he felt it was a natural space to incorporate a garage and not an unreasonable proposal.
- He wrote to each of the objectors for the most recently refused planning application to advise that he had sought to address their issues and create a more sympathetic build. He was encouraged that these objectors did not object on this occasion. The majority of the objections came from the tenants of Sheldon and their relatives. While he respected and understood their issues, he had gone to a huge effort to minimise the impact of the proposed development which would largely sit in the existing shadow of his property. A 3D model had been devised and a range of photographs had been produced to help evidence this. This showed that the front window of Sheldon would not be obstructed and there would be a reduced impact on other windows.
- The double garage would be single storey and of standard width. The height of the proposed garage had been kept as low as possible and would be a similar height to the fence between the properties. The half-hip was a deliberate inclusion to minimise the impact and increase light. The height of the office would be lower than the main building.
- The Sheldon property had many shrubs in place which previously impacted on the level of light they received. These had recently been cut back.
- The Case Officer, Cheryl Willett, had been very helpful and had invested a great deal of time on the potential loss of light. The report concluded that, on balance, the loss of light was not sufficient to justify refusal of the application.
- He had incurred a personal cost in seeking to resolve the issues that had been raised which he estimated at 10% of the overall cost of the build. It was by no means his intention to devalue his property.

Councillor Brian Bedwell asked Mr Hynes if he had visited his neighbours (Sheldon) to help understand their issues and better assess the impact of his proposed development. Mr Hynes explained that while he had not done so, he would have welcomed the opportunity. However, he had made improvements from the previous design and did seek comments from his neighbours prior to submitting plans. The 3D model also enabled analysis to be undertaken. Ms Witham added that the 3D model was able to consider the impact during different times of day and of the year.

Councillor Bale asked for clarification on the dimensions proposed for the outbuildings. Mr Hynes confirmed that the garage would be 6 metres in width and 6 metres in depth, and the office 4.6 metres in width and 4.3m in depth. Ms Witham added that the garage would be 4.4 metres to the ridge and while other options had been considered for the roof, this was felt to be the best one.

Councillor Bale then asked Officers for confirmation that the proposed double garage was indeed of standard size. Gareth Dowding confirmed that this was the case.

Councillor Bedwell then asked for clarification on whether the building would continue to be listed considering it had been rebuilt following two fires. David Pearson advised that he had not been made aware of the fires previously and was unable to confirm the basis on which it had remained listed. However, Officers had considered the matter and decided it was appropriate to proceed on the basis that a listed building consent was required. He also added that the Conservation Officer was minded to recommend approval of listed building consent. David Pearson then stated that Officers felt that the key issue for Members to consider was the impact on neighbours rather than the listed building. Liz Patient agreed that whether the building should still be listed was not a key

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

consideration for Members particularly as Members did not know any of the facts surrounding the previous fires at the property or the extent to which they had damaged the building. The application was before Members as a listed building consent and they should consider it accordingly.

Having heard views from the tenant of Sheldon, Councillor Tim Metcalfe queried whether the owner had lodged an objection. David Pearson was unable to give confirmation on this point, but stated that the greater considerations for Members were the issues being raised rather than who raised them. Councillor Pask added that decisions needed to be made based on local and national policy rather than the level of support or objection.

Councillor Quentin Webb questioned the level of regard that could be given to the 3D model. David Pearson advised that a number of illustrations had been submitted which showed the impact of the development at different times. However, this was unfamiliar technology and there was the potential risk that it could be manipulated in some way. Planning were more used to receiving conventional drawings that were required to be drawn to scale and Mr Pearson recommended that Members determine the application based on these.

Councillor Alan Macro felt that a reduction in light of up to 20% would be significant. He also referred to the update report which stated that a previous reason for refusal was that the outbuilding would fill the existing gap and this would be detrimental to the street scene. Although the outbuildings proposed for this application would be set further back, they would still fill this gap.

Councillor Law referred to the point made by Officers that this was a finely balanced proposal and repeated his concern with regard to the impact on the Sheldon property, which he was able to fully appreciate after entering that property at the site visit. Councillor Law therefore proposed, against Officers' recommendation, to refuse planning permission for application 11/02395/HOUSE due to the negative impact on the amenity of Sheldon caused by a combination of loss of light and the visual impact; and the negative impact caused by the filling of the existing gap by the proposed outbuildings to the detriment of the street scene and character of the area. This was seconded by Councillor Royce Longton.

Councillor Richard Crumly was of a differing view. He felt that this would be a reasonable addition and the garage would not be overbearing. It would in fact supplement the street scene and therefore remove any concern over the filling of the gap. Councillor Crumly was in support of the application.

Councillor Tim Metcalfe felt that a benefit of the site visit was to observe that the hedges/bushes on the Sheldon property had recently been cut back. Prior to this he believed that these hedges were quite tall and would have blocked the light being received by Sheldon.

The proposal to refuse planning application 11/02395/HOUSE was then put to the vote and agreed by Members.

In terms of planning application 11/02396/LBC2, David Pearson advised Members that unless specific reasons for refusal could be identified which were felt to be of harm to the listed building and which could be defended at a potential appeal, then the application should be approved. He added that this application could be approved regardless of the decision taken on the planning permission.

Councillor Quentin Webb proposed to accept Officers' recommendation to grant listed building consent of application number 11/02396/LBC2 as he did not feel this would have an impact on the listed building or on neighbouring properties. This was seconded by Councillor Crumly and approved by the Committee.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

For clarification, Councillor Pask confirmed that while listed building consent had been granted, the planning permission had not and development could therefore not proceed.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to refuse planning permission of application number 11/02395/HOUSE for the following reasons:

The negative impact on the amenity of Sheldon caused by a combination of loss of light and the visual impact; and the negative impact caused by the filling of the existing gap by the proposed outbuildings to the detriment of the street scene and character of the area.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant listed building consent for application 11/02396/LBC2 subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be started within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 21645-01A and 21645-02A received on 20th February 2012.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details assessed against Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 and the guidance contained in PPS5.

3. The materials to be used in the development hereby approved shall be as specified on the plans or on the application forms.

Reason: In the interests of the character of the listed building in accordance with Policy BE6 of the South East Plan, Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007 and the guidance contained in PPS5.

65(3) Application No. & Parish: 11/02739/HOUSE - The Chestnuts, Flowers Hill, Pangbourne

(Councillor Pamela Bale declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(3) by virtue of the fact that one of the objectors was a close friend. As her interest could be construed as prejudicial she left the meeting at 7.25pm and took no part in the debate or voting on the matter, apart from speaking as Ward Member).

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(3)) concerning Planning Application 11/02739/HOUSE in respect of two front elevation dormers, entrance door porch, single storey rear bay window extension and construction of front boundary wall with entrance gates.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mrs E White, Parish Council representative, and Mr Maurus Rimmer and Mr J D Dutson, objectors, addressed the Committee on this application.

Mrs White in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- The Parish Council had no objections regarding the alterations to the main house, however, they were opposed to the proposed wall.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

- The current wall was deemed acceptable, however, the proposed wall was in contrast to the Pangbourne Village Design Statement and other walls on Flowers Hill.
- The Parish Council would have had no objections had the proposed wall been lower, or preferably railings and landscaping.

Councillor Bedwell asked Mrs White if the Parish would have raised an objection to a hedgerow rather than the wall and Mrs White confirmed that there would have been no objection to this. Mrs White confirmed that no discussions had taken place between the Parish Council and the applicant regarding the height of the wall.

Councillor Law noted that there were similar walls to that proposed within the Village Design Statement such as on Tidmarsh Hill however, not on Flowers Hill itself.

Mr Rimmer in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- Mr Rimmer had lived in the property opposite The Chestnuts for 29 years. He had no problem with the proposed extension to the house, however, was opposed to the garden wall.
- He understood that the applicant was aiming to reduce the sound and sight of the passing road, however, the wall proposed would hinder the scene of Flowers Hill. It was felt that Flowers Hill could not be compared to Tidmarsh Hill.
- Railings rather than a brick wall would be much more acceptable.

Mr Dutson in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- 36 years ago Flowers Hill had been an old country lane and over the years the surface had deteriorated. The community had raised £3k to have the surface tarmaced.
- He had planted daffodils to the left hand side of Flowers Hill with the aim of retaining the character of the area. It was felt that railings and a hedge like that used opposite The Chestnuts would be much more suitable and in-keeping.
- Properties opposite The Chestnuts were open fronted. The understanding was that they would stay open fronted.
- Residents of the property next door to The Chestnuts were concerned that if planning permission was granted, in the future the brick wall might be extended.
- It was agreed that the wall would soften passing traffic and keep intruders out, however a hedge with railings would do the same job without compromising the visual aspect of the area.
- He had no objections to the proposed extension.

(Councillor Bale joined the meeting at 7.37pm to speak as Ward Member).

Councillor Bale, speaking as Ward Member, made the following points:

- It had been important for Members of the Committee during their site visit to see the potential impact of the wall on the area.
- The Pangbourne Village Design Statement should have been taken into consideration, however, was not mentioned in the planning report.
- Most of the properties on Flowers Hill had open frontages, lawns and shrubs.
- The extension of the wall around the property was the main issue. There were similar walls on Tidmarsh Hill however, they led onto a more built up area.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

- It was felt that the proposal needed to be more in-keeping with Flowers Hill, such as a wrought iron gate.

Councillor Pask asked if the Pangbourne Village Design Statement had been adopted by West Berkshire Council and it was confirmed by Councillor Bale that it had been.

(Councillor Bale left the meeting at 7.41pm).

Councillor Tim Metcalfe questioned whether a wall required planning permission. Karen Buckingham confirmed that it depended upon whether the proposed wall would be considered to be adjacent to the public highway, but that it was unclear if Flowers Hill would constitute a public highway. David Pearson clarified that part of the wall certainly required planning permission as it was adjacent to Tidmarsh Road which was definitely a public highway. Regarding the height of a wall, it could be two metres high if not adjacent to a highway and one metre if it was adjacent to a highway. If a wall was further forward than the dwelling then it was considered adjacent to a highway.

If Members of the Committee were opposed to the wall, then the whole application would have to be refused.

In considering the above application Members felt that the proposed wall would be intrusive and that railings and a hedge, like that used elsewhere on Flowers Hill, would be much more suitable. It was felt that the wall would encourage urbanisation, was contrary to the Village Design Statement and would be out of character to the Street Scene.

David Pearson confirmed that the Pangbourne Village Design Statement was taken into account when the planning report for the application was written and apologised to Councillor Bale that it did not actually feature within the report.

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

65(4) Application No. & Parish: 11/02602/FULD - Former Applecroft, Bethesda Street, Upper Basildon

(Councillor Pamela Bale returned to the meeting at 7.50pm).

The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(4)) concerning Planning Application 11/02602/FULD in respect of the erection of a detached house on plot 1.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Ms Nicola Taplin, applicant/agent, addressed the Committee on this application.

Ms Taplin in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

- She was the applicant's planning consultant.
- The applicant had recently purchased the property and had identified modifications they wished to make to the approved planning permission for the erection of three detached houses. Two of these had been built and the modifications therefore related to the one house that remained to be built (plot 1). Prior to the applicant purchasing the property, an application had been dismissed for a larger house on this plot.
- The applicant had taken on board the comments of the Planning Inspector in formulating this planning application, in particular its design.
- A table of dimensions had been provided within the report to help Members assess the differences between the extant planning permission, the refused application and the one being proposed.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

- Ms Taplin then sought to address some of the concerns that had been raised with the application:
 - The closer distance between the proposed dwelling and the neighbouring property (Willowdene) - the proposed property would be 1.8m from the boundary of Willowdene.
 - Possible overlooking from a balcony on the rear elevation – the way that this balcony would be used would mean that any overlooking would be similar to that from a window. In addition, some screening would be provided by a wall. Officers were supportive of what was being proposed in this regard.
 - A modest increase in height of the proposed property – it was felt that the design would achieve the transitional effect required by the Planning Inspector. Again, Officers were supportive of what was being proposed in this regard.
 - Lack of garage – there would be provision for necessary car parking which was in line with Council guidelines.
- The applicant had accepted the removal of permitted development rights.
- The development would not have a negative impact on the character of the area, which was in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- The Officer's report had concluded that the proposal would be sympathetic, in keeping with the character of the area and an improvement on the extant consent.

Councillor Richard Crumly questioned the absence of a garage from the application and asked whether other homes in Bethesda Street had a garage. Ms Taplin confirmed that other properties did have a garage, but following consideration by the applicant of the balance between having a garage or increased living space, they opted for additional living space. She added that there were no plans for a garage and it was the intention to park at the front of the house.

Councillor Alan Law, speaking as Ward Member, made the following points:

- He firstly advised that the Parish Council had not addressed the Committee as they missed the deadline to register to speak by five minutes. Their objections were however made clear in the report.
- The site had a long and chequered history. After many attempts, the Planning Inspector had given approval to the erection of three houses on the site. However, this permission was very precise and was based on some strict conditions. These included the need for the houses to be sympathetic to each other, to neighbouring properties and to the street scene (this included their size and placement). This had been a key consideration of the Planning Inspector when the application for a slightly larger house had been refused as it was viewed that the property would be larger overall and set further forward in its plot. This was in fact one of the main reasons for refusal.
- The table of dimensions referred to showed that overall the size of the proposed property when compared to the extant permission was slightly bigger and set further forward. For this reason, Councillor Law felt that the application should be refused as well as the fact that the house would only be 1.8 metres from the neighbouring property (Willowdene) and there would be no garage. This would be a very urban type of house which would be out of keeping and not appropriate for Bethesda Street. The proposal did not align with the precise approval given by the Planning Inspector.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

Councillor Royce Longton commented that there was a need for a house on the site. He felt the proposal would fit in well and the lack of a garage was not a sufficient reason for refusal. Councillor Tim Metcalfe added his view that this was an improvement to the extant permission and would be an appealing addition, particularly when the property was viewed from the rear. Although the house would be slightly higher, it was narrower and there was little difference in terms of depth in comparison to the extant permission. He had no objections to the proposal.

Councillor Pamela Bale noted removal of permitted development rights, but this would not remove the potential for a garage to be built in future. David Pearson agreed that an application for a garage could be submitted and a decision would need to be made based on the merits of that application. There were examples of garages on narrow plots in Basildon so there was some precedent for this, although there was a mixed appeals record for such applications. While a garage was not proposed, there was adequate parking provision.

Councillor Law pointed out that the extant permission included the erection of a garage.

Councillor Crumly noted there was a considerable history for this site, but a decision needed to be made based on the merits of the application. The lack of garage was a concern, but was not a reason for refusal. He also felt that the footprint of the proposed dwelling would sit comfortably with neighbouring properties. Officers had given a strong recommendation for approval of the application and the risk of incurring costs from a potential appeal should be avoided. He was therefore supportive of Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Longton proposed to accept Officer's recommendation to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Brian Bedwell.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions and completion of a legal agreement no later than the 30 March 2012.

OR in the absence of a completed legal agreement by the 30 March 2012 to delegate to the Head of Planning and Countryside to refuse planning permission for the failure of the applicant to mitigate the impact of the development.

Conditions

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

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:

Location Plan drawing number PL01 received 7th December 2011

Site Plan as proposed drawing number PL02 received 7th December 2011

Floor Plans as proposed drawing number PL03 received 7th December 2011

North West & North East Elevations as Proposed drawing number PL04 received 7th December 2011

South East & South East Elevations as Proposed drawing number PL05 received 7th December 2011

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

Reason: To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with national planning guidance and the relevant policies within the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and the relevant Policies within the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

3. No development shall commence on site until samples of the external materials to be used in the development have been submitted to or left on site to be checked and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to the details that may have been submitted with the application. Thereafter the materials used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved samples.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

4. No development shall commence on site until details of the external hard surfaced areas of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall apply irrespective of any indications as to the details that may have been submitted with the application, and shall where necessary include a schedule of materials, means of treatment, and drawings demonstrating the layout of these areas. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be first occupied until the hard surfaced areas have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

5. No development shall commence on site until details of the floor levels in relation to existing and proposed ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the proposed building and the adjacent land in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

6. No development shall commence on site (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a detailed scheme of landscaping for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, an implementation programme and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment. The scheme shall ensure:
 - a) completion of the approved landscaping within the first planting season following the completion of the development, and
 - b) any trees, shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of the completion of the development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.

Thereafter the approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of Policies CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policies OVS2 (a, b) and OVS3 (b) of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

7. No development shall commence until details of the design of the cycle storage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the cycle storage is provided in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles and assists with the parking, storage and security of cycles in accordance with Policy OVS3 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

8. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be brought into use until visibility splays of 2.0 metres by 45 metres south-westerly and 2.4m x 43m north-easterly have been provided at the access. The visibility splays shall, thereafter, be kept free of all obstructions to visibility above a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.

Reason: In the interest of road safety in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

9. No works shall take place with the construction of the building until the vehicular access and associated engineering operations have been constructed in full in accordance with the approved drawings.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to accord with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

10. Any gates to be provided at the accesses shall be set back a distance of at least 5.5 metres from the edge of the highway.

Reason: To ensure that vehicles can be driven off the highway before the gates are opened, in the interest of road safety in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

11. No development shall commence until details of the surfacing arrangements for the vehicular access to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall ensure that bonded material is used across the entire width of the access for a distance of 5 metres measured back from the carriageway edge. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the access has been surfaced in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid migration of loose material onto the highway in the interest of road safety in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

12. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the vehicle parking and turning space has been provided in accordance with the approved

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

plans. The parking and turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided for adequate parking facilities in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking which would be a danger to other road users in accordance with Policies OVS.2 and TRANS.1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

13. Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any subsequent revision), no additions or extensions to the dwelling shall be built or ancillary buildings or structures erected within the curtilage, unless permission in writing has been granted by the Local Planning Authority in respect of a planning application made for the purpose.

Reason: To prevent the overdevelopment of the site which adjoins the countryside and is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policy OVS2 and ENV1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

14. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the en-suite window at first floor level in the side elevation of the dwelling has been fitted with obscure glass and a top hung opening fan light which shall thereafter be retained in position to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Irrespective of the provisions of the Town and Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any subsequent revision) no additional openings shall be inserted at a first floor level or above in the side elevations of the property without a formal planning application made to the Local Planning Authority for that purpose.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 Saved Policies 2007.

15. The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the sky lights in the side elevation have a sill height of 1.8m above internal floor which shall thereafter be retained in position to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CC6 of the South East Plan Regional Spatial Strategy, May 2009 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006, Saved Policies 2007.

Informatics

1. The Highways (Planning) Manager, West Berkshire District Council, Highways and Engineering, Council Offices, Faraday Road, Newbury RG14 2AF, telephone 01635 519169, 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 applicants behalf.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 MARCH 2012 - MINUTES

2. 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.
3. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Highways Act 1980, which enables the Highway Authority to recover expenses due to extraordinary traffic.
4. In order to protect the stability of the highway it is advised that no excavation is carried out within 15 metres of a public highway without the written approval of the Highway Authority.
5. Any incidental works affecting the adjoining highway shall be approved by, and a licence obtained from, the Highways (Planning) Manager, West Berkshire Council, Highways and Engineering, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury, RG14 2AF, before any development is commenced
6. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
7. Legal agreement informative.

66. Appeal Decisions relating to Eastern Area Planning

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

67. Special Meeting and Site Visits

It was confirmed that the Special Eastern Area Planning Committee on 4 April 2012 to consider the IKEA planning application would be held at Theale Green School and would commence at the usual time of 6.30pm. An offer was made to those Members who were unable to attend the briefing meeting to contact Paul Goddard if they required further information.

A date of 4 April 2012 at 9.30am was agreed for site visits if necessary. These would relate to the next scheduled Committee meeting being held on 11 April 2012.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.20 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature