

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 2022

Councillors Present: Graham Pask (Chairman), Alan Macro (Vice-Chairman), Jeremy Cottam, Ross Mackinnon, Geoff Mayes, Richard Somner, Keith Woodhams and Joanne Stewart (Substitute) (In place of Tony Linden)

Also Present: Jessica Bailiss (Policy Officer (Executive Support)), Gareth Dowding (Principal Engineer (Traffic and Road Safety)), Lydia Mather (Team Leader - Development Control, Development and Planning), Matthew Shepherd (Senior Planning Officer), Kim Maher (Solicitor) and Lizzie Reeves (Zoom Host)

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Alan Law and Councillor Tony Linden

PART I

24. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5th October 2022 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26th October 2022 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment:

Item 23 (1) Application 22/01062/FULD, under the debate section, page 39, paragraph one to read as follows: Councillor Stewart understood that the changes proposed were to accommodate home working however, the amount of additional changes put forward seemed to be excessive to accommodate two people now needing to work from home.

25. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

26. Schedule of Planning Applications

(1) **Application No. and Parish: 21/01698/FULMAJ - 12 -16 Chapel Street Thatcham West**

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 21/01698/FULMAJ in respect of the partial demolition of existing dwellings (14 & 16 Chapel Street), construction of 9No. one bedroom apartments and 2No. two bedroom houses, including parking and stores.
2. Matthew Shepherd (Senior Planning officer) introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy considerations and other material planning considerations. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms and officers recommended that the Service Director for Development and Regulation be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the main and update reports.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

3. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Councillor Owen Jeffery and Mr Simon Pike, (Thatcham) Town Council representatives, Mr James Dunne, objector, Mr Sean Kelly, agent and Councillor Jeremy Cottam, Ward Member, addressed the Committee on this application.
4. The order in which representations were made to the Committee were changed due to Mr Pike arriving slightly late.

Objector Representation

5. Mr James Dunne in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - His main objection was the matter of overlooking. There was a distance of 21m proposed however, with the elevated areas the proposal would look directly down in Mr Dunne's garden, kitchen and the rear bedrooms.
 - Looking at the plans it could be seen that the shed at the rear and the trees would be located directly on Mr Dunne's boundary. As a resident he had the right to light, the right to privacy within his own home and the right to not be overlooked. It was felt that this matter was being railroaded.
 - The amenities of the proposed site would be immediately on M Dunne's boundary. If a football was kicked against his fence there was little he would be able to do.
 - Mr Dunne was unsure about the flooding aspect of the site. He was of the understanding that the area was a flood zone. It would be quite a large area that would be built on if the application was approved and he could only foresee this causing flooding.
 - Noise was a major concern. The building and the trees gave access to his garden should someone want to break in.
 - General noise disturbance to residents and also to the care home and nursery was a great concern. The proposed development was vast for the small area.
 - At certain times of year the sun and moon would be low and the whole development was too big for the area. The areas detailed above were Mr Dunne's main concerns.

Member Questions to the Objector

6. Councillor Geoff Mayes noted that Mr Dunne had said that the fence belonged to him. Councillor Mayes asked Mr Dunne to confirm if the fence was within his ownership and if he maintained it. Mr Dunne explained that the good side of the fence faced towards his garden but he was unsure if this meant that he owned it or if the new residents of the proposed dwelling backing onto the fence would own it. If the new residents owned it they would need to maintain it but the plans showed buildings and trees directly against the fence, which would make maintenance very difficult. Trees would undermine the foundations of the fence and would take moisture from the existing gardens impacting on plants and grass. Mr Dunne stressed that existing residents had the right to light. Proposed trees would reduce sunlight in to Mr Dunne's house.
7. Councillor Mayes asked if the area had ever flooded with water above the surface of the ground. Mr Dunne confirmed that it had not.

Parish/Town Council Representation

8. Mr Simon Pike in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

- Thatcham Town Council had objected to the application. He understood that there was a previous application for the site that had gone to appeal and that the appeal was refused.
 - It seemed that the applicant had taken each of the grounds for refusal and tried to address them all individually. The cumulative impact was, however, still not acceptable in the Town Council's view and therefore the application should be refused again.
 - The site was very constrained and despite the plan to demolish one of the existing terrace houses, the access onto the road was very poor. The area was frequently congested in both directions, particularly at rush hour.
 - Vehicles entering the site from the Newbury direction would need to obstruct the road. Vehicles leaving the site would need to wait for a long time and would likely pull forward and obstruct the footpath, which was an important footway along the A4.
 - Regarding the site itself, the location of the properties had been modified from the previous application to try and address the issues of overlooking. The sites that would be overlooked were particularly sensitive. On the one side was the pre-school in the Methodist church and on the other side was a care home for people with dementia. Although the amount of overlooking had improved with the current application, it was still significant.
 - The proposed site would be densely packed, even by the standard of infill developments, which there had been a number of along the A4. This would increase traffic and the number of people pulling out/in from the A4 at busy times.
 - It was disappointing that the proposal included the demolition of one of the existing terrace houses. This would leave a new brick wall, which would be out of keeping with the aesthetics of the area.
 - All the areas highlighted including those highlighted by Mr Dunne had cumulatively led to the Town Council to opposing the application.
9. Councillor Owen Jeffery in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
- He drew attention to page 47, bullet point 6.1.9 of the agenda pack, which talked about 'tipping the balance in favour'. Councillor Jeffery did not feel that the balance was tipped in favour and felt that from a building conservation view this was not a fair comment.
 - The developer had cited 12, 14 and 16 Chapel Street as being merely three old cottages and therefore demolition and refurbishment had been identified as a suitable way forward. Sadly it was not in the Town Council's view.
 - The three cottages had been built in one process with a continuous architectural theme. They were at least early 19th century. They had been built together to a flush design. Demolition of even one cottage would diminish the character and alter the street scene. The cottages were an architectural unity with architectural integrity and were of good quality with red bricks. In the words of Dr Nick Young, the local Thatcham historian, the cottages were around 200 years old. They were built possibly as early as 1780 and no later than 1830. They were a unique trio of cottages that needed to be retained.
 - The site was close to the conservation area and although the existing entrance would not support the development taking place, the three cottages should remain in place.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

Member Questions to the Parish/Town Council

10. Councillor Jo Stewart stated that it had been heard and also seen at the site visit that there were questions about accessing and exiting the site. There were other properties along the road that also required access and Councillor Stewart asked if there was already regular issues experienced given the volume of traffic. There would be a need for traffic entering/exiting the site to cut across traffic, pathways and cycle ways. In response to Councillor Stewart's question, Mr Pike confirmed that there was not another site with such a high level of properties. The section of road in question was particularly troublesome because there were two sets of traffic lights either side of the exit meaning there could be traffic build up on both sides.
11. Mr Pike explained that further along the road there was a similar sized development however it was an open section of road that did not experience the same level of congestion. The other development nearby was the site at the former police station where there were five or six houses. The visibility looking towards Newbury was much better because there was not a building in the way and drivers would feel more comfortable about staying back and not crossing onto the pavement. The residential home had been included in the traffic light scheme.
12. Councillor Jeffery concurred with the comments from Mr Pike regarding Councillor Stewart's question. The proposed site would be the one place where there would not be a good view and there would be a number of vehicles entering and exiting. The former police station site was very different as it was totally open at the point where vehicles entered and exited the A4.

Applicant/Agent Representation

13. Mr Sean Kelly in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - He worked for RNV architecture and was the agent working on behalf of Youngs Estates and Land Ltd for the application.
 - 12 – 16 Chapel Street was the only remaining parcel of undeveloped land. Sited within the town centre area of Thatcham, the site was highly sustainable due to its proximity to amenities and public transport links. The proposal therefore adhered to paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which stated that the presumption should be in favour of sustainable development. The site was within the settlement boundary and therefore the principle of development was already established.
 - The proposal provided two two storey three bedroom houses, and nine one bedroom apartments. All dwellings benefitted from the access to outside amenity space and exceeded the minimum space requirements as set out in Nationally Prescribed Space Standards. The proposal provided much needed low cost housing for first time home buyers in Thatcham
 - The site had been the subject of a previous application for 17 units, which following West Berkshire Council's refusal was the subject of an appeal. Whilst the appeal was unsuccessful, important design and material considerations had come out of the decision, which had informed the design of the proposed site, in particular the siting of the buildings, which the Appeal Inspector had found would not negatively impact neighbours.
 - Further important considerations by the Appeal Inspector had also been incorporated. The Inspector had concluded that the existing buildings were not considered a non-designated heritage asset and did not have concerns about partial or full demolition. As part of the application it was proposed that two of the

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

dwelling be retained and only number 16 would be demolished to provide a safer access to the site.

- The Appeal Inspector had raised concerns about the previous one way access to the site however, importantly did not raise any concerns about access for 17 dwellings from Chapel Street.
- The proposal before the Committee included a redesigned two way access, which provided both pedestrian and vehicle visibility space, which was a significant improvement from the existing situation and improved highway safety.
- There were no concerns raised regarding the building to the south area of the site, where plots one and two were proposed. The Appeal Inspector considered that the two storey building located within 16 metres of the dwellings in the Henrys would not be overbearing to their amenity. Regardless of this the distance had been increased to 23.4 metres. The footprint of the proposal had been reduced by 35 percent compared to the previous proposal and all dwellings now benefited from outdoor amenity space.
- There had been a number of objections raised to the proposal from locals and Members:
 - Overlooking – in regards to the Bupa building, the Appeal Inspector was concerned about the side windows of the previous proposed apartments causing overlooking of Bupa. The building had been redesigned to remove the side windows with the exception of obscured glazed windows to bathrooms. It was therefore considered that the proposal caused no overlooking to the Bupa building. Overlooking to the Henrys by providing a back to back distance of 23.4m, which exceeded the minimum requirement set out in West Berkshire’s own residential development section of the SPF DPD and also exceed the previously proposed distance of 16 metres, was acceptable with the Appeal Inspector. Plots one and two had been orientated north to ensure they would not create any overlooking of the Bupa building or surrounding buildings.
 - Overshadowing – this had been raised as a concern regarding the gardens of the Henrys however, as previously mentioned the Appeal Inspector had no concerns of over shadowing in the location accepting that a 16 metre separation distance was sufficient. The application before the Committee proposed to increase this distance by over seven metres to 23.4 metres. This further improved the relationship between buildings that the Appeal Inspector had previously found acceptable. It was therefore considered that there would not be any overshadowing or over bearing to the Henrys.
- It was important to note that the Highways Team had raised no objection to the proposal and therefore accepted there would be no impact on highway safety.
- The application before the Committee had a proposed two way access, which improved visibility splays for pedestrians and vehicles.
- In conclusion the proposal provided much needed and well designed affordable local housing for first time buyers in a highly sustainable location. It accorded with all local and national policies, supplementary planning documents and design guides.
- The application had been informed by the material considerations of the previous appeal decision and was for a high quality residential development.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

Dwellings would sit comfortably within their surroundings and had been designed to reinforce the distinctive details of Thatcham.

- The Committee was urged to support the Officers well considered recommendation for approval.

Member Questions to the Applicant/Agent

14. Councillor Jeremy Cottam noted that two levels had been mentioned by Mr Kelly but noted a third level in the roof. Mr Kelly stated that the proposal was for a three storey level at the rear. It was not two level and Mr Kelly believed he had referred to it as three storey.
15. Councillor Cottam asked if the balconies proposed could be removed from the application if the Committee desired. With permission from the Chairman, Mr Kelly conferred with his client and confirmed that if the Committee were minded to approve then the balconies could be removed. The Chairman confirmed that he would seek Officer advice on the point later in the discussion. Normally applications had to be determined based on what was in front of the Committee.
16. Councillor Mayes noted that Mr Kelly had mentioned the site of No.16, which was due to be demolished as part of the plans. Councillor Mayes queried how wide the road access would be that would be put in the area of No. 16. Mr Kelly stated that 4.4 metres was proposed and there was an adjacent verge.
17. Councillor Woodhams stated that the Committee had heard from the Town Council that, due to the age of the existing 1800s style buildings, they were linked. He noted that the proposal involved knocking one of the dwellings down and queried if there was a risk that this would cause the other two to fall down. Mr Kelly stated that significant structural work would be carried out in order to allow No.16 to be demolished without causing structural issues to the remaining properties.

Ward Member Representation

18. Councillor Jeremy Cottam in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - Taking in to account the issues raised by the public he had narrowed them down to those that were relevant to planning.
 - There was a great concern of overlooking, particularly as it would be into a bedroom. This could be normally be mitigated however, this was difficult when balconies were proposed. Councillor Cottam was aware that in the past the Committee had been minded to ask for certain aspects of an application to be changed and this was his reasoning behind raising the point.
 - Another issue raised by the public was the influx of vehicles crossing pavements. There was a question of whether a vehicle could enter and exit the site at the same time. This was mentioned in the report on page 68 and was mainly a concern for vehicles turning left traveling eastbound, where there would be the risk of a sudden stop in traffic. A high number of HGVs used the road and travelled at high speed even though this was within the speed limit. Stopping distances for HGVs was much further than for cars.
 - Thirdly, Councillor Cottam referred to the street scene or 'vernacular' as referred by the Appeal Inspector. The vernacular was the way local people referred to things and Councillor Cottam thought the Appeal Inspector had been referring to the concerns of local people regarding the value of the local historian's comments when using this phrase, who was very intergraded in to society. The existing dwellings were very valuable to Thatcham and were some of the oldest in the town

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

and Councillor Cottam felt they were precious. He felt it would be a shame for one of the dwellings to be removed and cause an eyesore. The continuous smooth line of the street would be interrupted and Councillor Cottam believed that this was one of the reasons why the previous application had been refused.

- Councillor Cottam stated that Thatcham was in great need of affordable housing and he was concerned to hear that the application went against policy CS6 and the lack of affordable homes.
- The application would also not be in line with the Council's net zero target and would not be sustainable with the reduced energy requirements. Councillor Cottam felt that it would be a retrograde step to approve the application.
- Councillor Cottam stated that he would listen to what others Members of the Committee had to say on the application.

Member Questions to the Ward Member

19. The Chairman stated that the Highways Officer was present for questions relating to the entrance to the site. His interpretation of what Councillor Cottam had referred to on page 68 of the report pack was the Appeal Inspector's decision, which referred to a single width carriage way. The current application appeared to include a double width carriageway, which would allow vehicles to travel in and out of the site at the same time. Councillor Cottam reported that he still had concerns about the width.

Member Questions to Officers

20. Councillor Alan Macro stated that he had three questions for the Planning Officer. Firstly he referred to section 6.3.2 of the report, which stated that the retained dwellings would have an outside amenity of 15 square metres. It was felt that this was very low. Mr Matthew Shepherd confirmed that this was correct.
21. Councillor Macro stated that he had tried to measure the distance between the proposed block of flats and the Bupa care home and he thought it was somewhere between eight and ten metres, he queried if this was correct. Mr Shepherd confirmed that this was correct.
22. Councillor Macro noted from the plans that the second floor flats only had roof lights/Velux windows and he asked if this was correct. Mr Shepherd confirmed that this was correct. Regarding the flats to the front, one had dual aspect and the other two within the roof line. Councillor Macro asked if this was deemed acceptable and Mr Shepherd explained that in terms of internal amenity, if this was the only reason for refusal balanced against the delivery of the dwellings, the Case Officer was content with the amenity space.
23. Councillor Geoff Mayes referred to the main road from the A4 Chapel Street into the site and queried if this was going to be adopted. Mr Gareth Dowding stated it would be up to the developer if they wished to offer the road for adoption. Usually in terms of the sort of site in question adoption would not be desired because the road would serve a private blocks of flats. If the road was offered for adoption the developer would have to follow all rules and regulations for the provision of an adopted highway. Councillor Mayes stated that this was a fundamental question, which would determine the way he would approach the application. Mr Dowding stated that the Local Authority could not force a developer to offer a road for adoption.
24. Councillor Richard Somner referred to the balconies and asked if they contributed towards outdoor amenity space and if they did he queried if the size of the balconies was included in current calculations. Mr Shepherd reported that balconies did

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

contribute towards outdoor amenity space and would provide private amenity space for the flats in combination with the shared amenity space to the north of the proposed flats. Part of the Appeal Inspector's issue with the previous application was that some of the flats had no amenity space and there was a blurring between what was considered public and private in terms of the shared amenity space proposed. Councillor Somner noted that the potential removal of the balconies would require a re-calculation.

25. The Chairman stated that although he did not wish to draw out the process, technically in terms of the balconies the application could be deferred to allow revised plans to be submitted. Normally the Committee would determine an application as it stood.
26. Councillor Somner stated he would like to have a discussion regarding the financial aspects of the application. The Chairman stated that in this case the meeting would have to move to Part II. It was suggested that the meeting first move in to debate where any Part I comments could be raised before moving to Part II.

Debate

27. Councillor Woodhams reported that the applicant had stated in the report that provision of affordable homes and renewable energy measures made the development unviable and evidence had been included to this fact. The Committee had also been asked to take in to consideration the economics of the scheme. In response to this, Councillor Woodhams made two clear points. Firstly, the West Berkshire Council Housing Officer had stated that for 13 dwellings, four affordable dwellings should be expected as part of the site.
28. Secondly and equally as important, Councillor Woodhams stressed that in 2019 the Council had declared a climate emergency, confirming that it would create a strategic plan for West Berkshire that aimed to deliver a carbon neutral district by 2030.
29. Councillor Woodhams stated that he was aware that sites had become unviable, especially where contamination had needed to be removed at considerable cost to the applicant before construction could begin with the unfortunate loss of affordable housing. He asked if the Officers could tell him that if the Committee were minded to approve the application in its present form, if this would set a precedent for future applicants to follow suit and declare that provision of affordable homes and renewable energy measures made a development unviable.
30. Finally, Councillor Woodhams referred to section 6.18 of the report, where it was stated that although the Appeal Inspector was not convinced of the historic importance of the existing frontage buildings, he noted their vernacular appearance and their contribution to the traditional character of the street, despite some unsympathetic alterations reducing their visual quality. Councillor Woodhams stated that he had since learnt that the age of the existing frontage buildings dated back to the mid-1800s and this was another reason why there was a desire to keep the local history intact for future generations.
31. In response to Councillor Woodhams' question about a precedent being set, Mr Shepherd stated that it was built in to the policy that economics and viability were issues that needed to be considered in relation to C6 on affordable housing and CS15 in terms of renewable energy. Therefore a precedent would not be set. There would be acknowledgement that there were concerns and issues with a site and policy would have to be followed in response to this.
32. Councillor Macro stated he was not very happy about the application for various reasons. Firstly he was concerned about the amenity space for the two retained

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

- cottages at 15 square metres. This was the equivalent of one and a half parking spaces, so was not much use to anyone particularly families with children.
33. Councillor Macro was also concerned about the loss of outlook from the care home, which would look out on to the site wall of the flat and the closest point was only eight metres. The care home's windows would also be overshadowed. There would also be overlooking to the properties in the Henrys to the rear of the site.
 34. Councillor Macro reported that the Appeal Inspector had complained about the amount of hard surfacing included as part of the previous application. There seemed to be a similar amount proposed as part of the current application.
 35. Councillor Macro referred to the flats and noted that the first floor balconies projected out over the ground floor windows and he was therefore concerned that the ground floor windows would be overshadowed.
 36. Finally, Councillor Macro stated that he agreed with Councillor Woodhams regarding the lack of renewable energy. He understood that affordable housing could make a scheme unviable however, to have solar panels included as part of the development would cause a minimal increase in cost and he felt strongly that this was something that should be insisted on.
 37. Councillor Cottam stated that he was equally concerned about abandoning the policy on net zero. Energy efficient buildings helped to reduce costs for residents. He saw no reason why the policy should be sacrificed, which had been put in place following a full Council decision. It would be very regretful to not keep to sustainable development.
 38. Councillor Cottam referred to affordable housing and stated that there was a very strong demand for this. He felt to approve the application would be a retrograde step. He supported Councillor Somner that a Part II discussion was required on the viability of the site. Councillor Cottam was concerned that the application was against policy and provided no affordable housing. He was concerned about the historic value of the existing dwellings, which was subjective. On balance Officers were recommending approval however, on balance he was concerned about the recommendation.
 39. Councillor Stewart stated that she had spent some time comparing the previous application to the current one to try and understand the differences that had been made. Councillor Stewart referred to comments made by the Appeal Inspector under point 47, on page 70 of the pack, where it was stated 'however, I have found that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of neighbouring and future occupants, would adversely affect highway safety, and would fail to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing'. Councillor Stewart could see that it was no longer significant harm that would be caused however, agreed with Councillor Macro in terms of the outlook for residents of the care home, which would look out on to a building where previously there was no building.
 40. Councillor Stewart raised concerns about the traffic situation and the safety of the piece of road in question. Councillor Stewart could not envisage herself having to pull in or out of the proposed site without being concerned about pedestrians, the cycleway and all of the traffic going east and west. Councillor Stewart agreed that a Part II discussion was required and stated she also did not believe the new application completely addressed the concerns that the inspector had previously.

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

41. Councillor Somner proposed that the meeting moved in to Part II and this was seconded by Councillor Cottam. The Chairman invited the Committee to vote and at the vote the motion was carried.
- 42. All non-panellists were asked to leave the meeting, but would be able to return once the Part II discussion had concluded. At 7.43pm the broadcast was stopped whilst a Part II discussion took place.**
- 43. At 8.04pm the meeting moved back into Part I.**
44. Councillor Macro proposed that the application be refused against Officer recommendation, on the grounds of insufficient amenity space for the retained cottages; the loss of outlook from the care home; the impact on the living standards of occupants of the flats caused by balconies overshadowing their windows; because day light to the top floor flats would only be provided by roof lights, which meant there would be no outlook; and finally because the application was opposed to policy CS15.
45. Councillor Cottam stated he wished to second the proposal if it was included that the application also went against policy CS19 regarding the historic street scene. Councillor Macro stated he would be happy to accept this however, was concerned that the Appeals Inspector might have rejected this as part of the previous application.
46. Mr Matthew Shepherd referred the Committee to paragraph nine on page 63 of the report pack where the Appeal Inspector considered the vernacular and appearance of the terrace houses did contribute to the traditional character of the street, but did not fall within a conservation area and were not included in any local list of heritage assets. It was also noted that no evidence had been provided to demonstrate they were of historical importance. The Inspector had noted that there were some less sympathetic alterations however, taking all elements into account, the Inspector was of the view that any replacement achieved a similar or better contribution to the street scene. It was up to the Committee to decide if the loss of one of the cottages was sufficient enough to cause harm.
47. Councillor Macro felt that the matter of policy CS19 would be difficult to sustain because two of the three cottages were being retained rather than a complete replacement. Councillor Cottam withdrew the request for this to be included within the proposal.
48. Ms Lydia Maher asked for clarification regarding the reason for refusal regarding the living standards for the flats and asked if this was due to overshadowing from the balconies. Councillor Macro confirmed that it was overshadowing of the flats on the ground floor.
49. The Chairman invited the Committee to vote on the proposal by Councillor Macro, seconded by Councillor Cottam to refuse planning permission and at the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Service Director for Development and Regulation be authorised to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

Reasons

1. Insufficient garden area to retained dwellings to the front

The proposed units to the south of the site, the retained dwellings fronting Chapel Street, would have rear gardens of approximately 10-17 square metres. The SPD Quality Design

EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 16 NOVEMBER 2022 - MINUTES

Part 2 states that gardens for 1 and 2 bedroom houses and bungalows should be from 70 sq.m.

As such the proposed development does not constitute quality design due to the lack of private amenity space and would not contribute to the quality of life of future occupants. The development is therefore contrary to Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, the SPD Quality Design Part 2, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Loss of outlook from care home due to proximity of flats

The proposed development would have a harmful impact on the neighbouring care home and its amenity. Plots 3-11 (the block of flats) to the north of the site would be sited approximately 9 metres at its closet to the adjacent care home. Due to the size and proximity of the proposed plots 3-11 the development would have an unacceptable impact on the outlook of the care home.

The development therefore fails to achieve a satisfactory layout that fails to make a positive contribution to quality of life and would have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity. As such the development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and the Quality Design SPD Part 2.

3. Failure to comply or contribute towards zero carbon from onsite renewables

Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that renewable energy or low/zero carbon energy generation on site can be provided as part of the development, or that such provision is not technically or economically viable. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, and policy CS15 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

4. Internal Amenity Plots 3-11

The proposed balconies on the first floor on units 3-11 (the block of flats) would overshadow the ground floor units below them and insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate ground floor units would receive adequate daylight. The balconies are therefore considered to cause an unacceptable loss of daylight. This is exacerbated by some of the flats/rooms affected being north facing.

The flats to the second floor on plots 3-11 would only be served by roof lights and insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate the units would receive adequate daylight or outlook. This is exacerbated by some of the flats/rooms being north facing.

The development therefore fails to achieve a satisfactory design and layout to make a positive contribution to quality of life and would have an adverse impact on the amenity future occupiers. As such the development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, the National Design Guide, Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026, and the Quality Design SPD.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.09 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature