

Councillor James Mole entered the room before the next application was introduced and took his seat with the Sub-Committee APPLICATION NO. 03/01672/FUL TRIANGLE FIELD, PRIORY ROAD, HUNGERFORD The Sub-Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning planning application 03/01672/FUL for alterations and extensions to the existing sports pavilion including addition of an upper floor to form club room with bar, kitchen, meeting room and balcony, and single storey extensions for storage and recreational use. Also the formation of additional car and coach park and alterations to access.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Objector Ms Shirley Holland, and the Applicants' Agent Mr Chris Strang addressed the Sub-Committee on the following application; Ms Holland in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points: In agreement with her neighbours, she felt that the development was unnecessary Was surprised that there had been £8000 made available for the application when she had understood that the Town Council did not have the funding for this scheme Was unaware that planning permission had been applied for Understood that the pavilion was leased by West Berkshire Council to the rugby club and that it was intended for sports use only; the lease terms would be counteracted if used as proposed by St Johns Ambulance, a theatre group and the Hungerford band Soundproofing would be pointless without air conditioning; air condition negates the need to open the windows and would keep the noise within the building Neighbours would be disturbed by the social activities within the pavilion i.e.; the tannoy system and floodlighting people urinating in their gardens vandalism and rubbish

traffic movements in the narrow lane leading to the pavilion Reminded the Committee that the application was to improve the sports facility and not for use as a 24 hour facility In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, Ms Holland confirmed that she lived nearby at Priory Gardens. Mr Strang in addressing the Sub-Committee raised the following points: He was there to answer questions from the Sub-Committee The principle of the application had been approved by the Sub-Committee They had, in consultation with the Ward Members and the Council's officers, addressed the two main issues that had arisen from the last meeting of the Sub-Committee, i.e. alterations to the design and the conditions In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, Mr Strang confirmed that he was happy for conditions to be made regarding soundproofing and to conform to building regulations In discussing the application, the Sub-Committee considered the following issues: the benefits from the works to the pavilion outweighed the issues raised about the application being in area of AONB the band was only going to use the pavilion for rehearsals understood the need for control relating to the use of the tannoy were aware of condition 12 in the report regarding the limits for the use of the pavilion that the issues raised about the lease were not related to planning matters RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Transport Strategy be authorised to grant planning permission

---

subject to the following conditions: Full recommendation

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission and implemented strictly in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act and thereby allowing the Local Planning Authority to review the desirability of the development should it not be started within a reasonable time.

2. The development permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the amended plans received on 19.04.2004 Reason: To ensure that this permission relates to the revised plans only.

3. Samples of the materials to be used in the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development starts. 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 the submission of samples of glass, plastic and mortar materials.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies OS1 and LD3 of the Berkshire Structure Plan 1991 - 2006 and Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991 - 2006.

4. The development shall be landscaped in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences and shall ensure:- (a) the carrying out of any earth moving operations concurrently with the carrying out of the building and other works; (b) completion of the scheme during the planting season next following the completion of the building(s), or such other date as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority; (c) the maintenance of the landscaped areas for a period of five years or until established, whichever may be longer. Any trees or shrubs removed, or which in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, are dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting, shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping which will in due course improve the environmental quality of the development, in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

5. Details of all exterior lighting, including the type and position of luminaires and the hours of illumination shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Subsequently, the exterior of the site shall not be illuminated outside the approved hours.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

6. Details of the bicycle shed and provision of cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development, and shall be constructed and made available for use prior to the first use of the extended pavilion, and shall be maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces reliance on private motor vehicles in accordance with Policy TRANS 4 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

7. The extended pavilion shall not be taken into use until the proposed alterations to the access have been completed, and a footway to a standard approved by the local planning authority has been provided between the end of the existing footway in Priory Road and the site entrance.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 8. No development of the site shall commence until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 90 metres have been provided at the access from Priory Road. 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 interests of road safety in accordance with Policy OVS 2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

9. The extended pavilion shall not be taken into use until the access has been surfaced with a bonded material across its entire width of the access for a distance of 10 metres, measured back from the carriageway edge. It shall thereafter be maintained as such at all times.

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.

10. The hours of use of the building shall be restricted to 0700 to 2330 on any day.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

11. The extended pavilion shall not be taken into use until car and coach parking spaces have been provided in accordance with the approved plan(s). The space shall thereafter be kept available for parking of 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 Policy TRANS 1 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

12. Other than informal gatherings on match days in connection with a sporting event taking place on the Triangle Field, the incidence of organised social functions at the premises shall be restricted to no more than one in the period Monday to Thursday in any week, and no more than one in the period Friday to Saturday in any week, and no such functions shall take place on Sundays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

13. No storage shall take place in the northern storage extension of the building except for items ancillary to the sport and playing field use of the site.

Reason: To prevent the establishment of a general storage use in the building without proper consideration of its implications, in accordance with Policy OVS.2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

14. No business or trade shall take place from the development hereby permitted, other than ancillary to the authorised use as a sports pavilion."

Reason -to prevent an over intensive commercial use of the building concerned, which could lead to excessive disturbance in this rural area, close to the edge of the settlement by virtue of increased noise and disruption, and increased traffic movements, in accord with policy OVS2 of the WBDLP 1991 to

2006. " 15. At no time shall any external tannoy system be incorporated within the scheme.

Reason--to ensure there is no noise nuisance for local residents in accord with policy OVS2 in the local plan 1991 to 2006.

16. Before any building commences on site a scheme indicating how the new building is to be sound insulated to reduce external noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the lpa. The scheme shall then be implemented in accord with that scheme.

Reason --to reduce noise generation from the scheme to protect local amenity, in accord with policy OVS2 in the local plan 1991 to 2006.

APPLICATION NO. 04/00415/HOUSE 147 PRIORY ROAD, HUNGERFORD

The Sub-Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(5)) concerning planning application 04/00415/HOUSE for a two storey front and rear extensions, single storey rear extension and first floor extension over existing garage The Officer in response to questions from the Sub-Committee, advised that extensions of up to 100% increase on the original building could be allowed provided it was reasonable to do so. In this instance, an extension of 100% was allowed due to the substantial size of the plot, i.e. the garden where the extension was to be built. With regards to the extension overlooking the neighbours, the Officer made the following points: that there was overlooking but it was at an acceptable level and was not a sufficient reason for refusal of the application due to the shape of the plot and the relationship of the houses on the plot, it was inevitable that there would be some overlooking if the hedge that bordered the curtilage of the Applicants' site was trimmed down, an issue would arise regarding the neighbours privacy that the distance between the end of the extension and the neighbouring house was approximately 4.5 metres In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Objector Mr Hawkins, and the Applicants' Agent Mr Strang addressed the Sub-Committee on the following application.

Mr Hawkins in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

He had an interest in the site as the designer of the five houses that formed the end of the row and also as a neighbour In relation to his interest as a designer: the row of houses were designed with adequate spacing between adjoining properties with the aim of blending into countryside the Applicants' plot was originally proposed to be in Council ownership and act as a green buffer the angle of the house was such that the garage was close to the neighbouring property the proposed application would spoil the visual amenity of the area, giving a cramped and shoehorned appearance that was out of character to the area In relation to his interest as a neighbour:

the new building was big

it would dominate the skyline

the windows of the extension would overlook his property and was close to their boundary as a result of the close proximity of the extension to their house, they will hear their neighbours the gable end of the extension will darken their home the orientation of the proposed application would overlook their property and would be reduced by the existing hedge. However, the existence of the hedge should not be considered as part of the grounds for accepting the application, the hedge may be removed in future the size of the project was too big for the site In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, Mr Hawkins confirmed that the hedgerow was his.

Mr Strang in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

The application was recommended for approval

The property was within a built up area and there were no restrictions on the size of the extensions. The area had no special character and was not in a conservation area. It was a one off development relating to the size and shape of plot and the angle of the house on the plot. Neighbouring properties were close together. The second storey was well screened to the south by hedgerow. The extension had minimal effect on the street scene.

Only one first floor window overlooked the neighbours and that was to have obscured glazing. The other windows were bedroom windows with minimal overlooking and the gable end did not have any overlooking ground floor windows. In discussing the application, the Sub-Committee considered the following points: the concern regarding the size of the extension, the orientation of the property i.e. can be seen on three sides and that the conservatory would be seen from the Triangle Fields and beyond it was the last house of a row of houses, it was in keeping with the area in its current form, the effect it would have on the visual amenity to the area.

that it was in a sensitive area

the development was in a built up area

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Transport Strategy be authorised to refuse planning permission subject to the following conditions: 1. The scale, bulk and height of the proposed extension is considered excessive and would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, as such the proposal runs contrary to the provisions of Policy OVS2 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991- 2006, Policy LD3 of the Berkshire Structure Plan 1991- 2006 and the guidance contained in PPG1.

2. The site is set on the inner edge of the settlement boundary of Hungerford. To the east of the property is the Triangle Field sports ground which is outside of the settlement boundary. Nos. 139 to 147 Priory Road are all large residential dwellings set within spacious plots. The density of these dwellings is lower than that of the lower number of Propery Road, which are closer to the town centre. It is considered that the decrease in density results in a transition zone between the urban and rural areas.

Policy C5 of the Berkshire Structure Plan 1991 - 2006 seeks to reduce the visibility of buildings from the countryside. The proposal is considered contrary to this policy as it will materially increase the visual intrusion of the dwelling and will detrimentally impact on the soft settings of the dwelling currently afforded from the surrounding countryside. APPLICATION NO. 04/00564/FUL 1 BURTONS HILL, KINTBURY. The Sub-Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(6)) concerning planning application 04/00564/FUL for the demolition of office, store and flat. and the erection of a pair of semi-detached houses.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Applicants' Agent Mr Hedges addressed the Sub-Committee on the following application.

Mr Hedges in addressing the Sub-Committee raised the following points:

The plan in the agenda was misleading, the plot was actually bigger than it appeared on the map. The application would restore the plot to detached housing that would cover 38% of the plot and remove the existing buildings on the site that currently occupied 78% of the plot. There would be no impact to the visual amenity of the adjoining houses. The proposed size of the houses and plot would be similar to others in Newbury and Kintbury. Highways had raised no objections.