

GORING-ON-THAMES PARISH COUNCIL

We aim to serve in the best interests of our community

Meeting held on Tuesday 5th July 2016 at 7:30pm,

The Old Jubilee Fire Station, Red Cross Road, GORING ON THAMES

MINUTES – PLANNING COMMITTEE

Present: Cllrs M Brown, J Wills, M Bulmer, C Hall, Hancox

C Fox, Acting Clerk Planning, 6 members of the public

Plan 16/48 Apologies for absence

Cllr Brooker, L Reavill (Cllr Brown took the Chair in Cllr Brooker's absence)

Plan 16/49 Declarations of interest

Cllr Hancox declared an interest in item 6.2 P16/S2145/FUL Cariad Court as his father owned a flat there.

Plan 16/50 Public Forum

Mr Jules Hopkinson spoke in relation to item 6.1 P16/S1200/FUL River Gardens, The Ridgeway Path, Thames Road, Goring on behalf of his father who lived at Cleeve Firs (upstream) but who couldn't attend the meeting. He said the plot was at present a non-residential garden with a mooring and this would be the second large building on the site and it was proposed to be on stilts. He was unsure whether it was actually just going to be a storage facility as it had 6 large windows and was quite large. He thought the orientation on the plans was somewhat confused and although it had been moved 2 metres from the river this would not improve the view, and it was still unclear as to the precise siting of the building. Mr Hopkinson also had queries over the foul drains and wondered what controls there would be on this as it might cause contamination and/or foaming etc in the river.

Ms D Abbot spoke in relation to item 6.2 Cariad Court. She stated she had objected previously to the 2 earlier applications. She said on her first initial reading of the new application it appeared the scale was smaller, however it was actually much the same size just having been moved back from the boundary. She thought this new design was even more odd than the previous one, she had concerns over the Tree Report and a Structural Engineer's report in relation to the structure of the garages. She said the list of owners was now out of date and was very concerned over the proposed closeness of the living room in the proposed flats from her master bedroom, this would be approx. 15 metres but she said the South Oxfordshire Design Guide suggests this should be 25m. She still had concerns over trees, the yew hedge and also that this latest proposal was for 2 large dwellings and this was not indicated in the NP. She thought the design should be in keeping and that this would possibly set a precedent if allowed to go ahead.

Ms Amanda Smithdale spoke in relation to item 6.2 Cariad Court. She said they had withdrawn the previous application and appointed a Tree expert (who was an ex SODC Tree Officer). She said both Officers had agreed on

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

46

principle that with a smaller scale development there should be no grounds for objection. She said there had been a consultation at the site, mentioned a green roof to the south and east which would manage leaf fall etc. She said the Structural Engineer's report indicated it was possible to reduce the number of flats to 2 and this would not have an impact. She said the Tree Report had just been submitted and the conclusions were some tree pruning would need to be carried out and a condition should be issued. Ms Smithdale added the proposal would not result in loss of habitat/aged trees/woodland and in fact a couple of trees would be removed and then replaced and she had tried to address all these issues. She said the Officer would stipulate materials etc, she thought this new application had addressed all the previous concerns, regarding privacy they had tried not to impose on the existing flats and she requested the Committee re-consider and approve the application.

Mr Carl Bunting spoke in relation to item 6.2 Cariad Court (he lived in flat 19) and said he had only just been consulted and was concerned about the close proximity of the proposed new flats to the existing dwellings.

Ms Smithdale said pointed out the developers were limited by the structure beneath. Mr Bunting said he was in favour in principle but was not in support of the current design.

Plan 16/51 To approve the minutes of the meeting of 21st June 2016.

The minutes were approved and signed.

Plan 16/52 Matters Arising

The Planning Clerk confirmed an email had been sent in relation to Enforcement Action at Pips Barn, Gatehampton Road. The Clerk confirmed she will be updating the Planning Decision schedule.

Plan 16/53 Applications

Plan 16/53.1 **P16/S1200/FUL River Gardens, The Ridgeway Path, Thames Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9BJ.** Single storey timber outbuilding for use as extra storage (as amended and supported by revised plans and agent letter received on 22 June 2016).

Cllr Wills queried why a storage shed type building needed outside drainage and so many windows, he also thought the plans were of poor quality. It was noted that on SODC's website there were two responses one for and one against. Cllr Hall pointed out however there was now a second objection. After further discussion due to the inadequate plans and unclear purpose of the building as previously Cllrs voted unanimously to recommend the application for REFUSAL.

Cllr Hancox left the room.

Plan 16/53.2 **P16/S2145/FUL Cariad Court, Cleeve Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9ES.** Erection of two dwellings over re-built garages and existing basement car park.

Cllr Wills said he still did not think the design was acceptable and the 2 flats were now far too large. Cllr Hall suggested the applicants/Officer had still

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

not sought the advice of the Design Review Panel and thought this was an example of a scheme that would have benefitted. She thought reducing the scheme to just 2 flats created dwellings that are inappropriately large for the site, and the nature of the existing adjacent flats. She commented that it was a lost opportunity and that if the concept can be designed in such a way to satisfy the site parameters then, with further careful thought, it should also be possible to provide more, smaller dwellings and that this would be much more desirable.

Cllr Hall added the planning rules were in the process of being changed (following a Judicial Review) in relation to the mandatory number of social houses that have to be provided within a housing scheme. Formerly this had been 40% of dwelling if 3 or more dwellings are proposed. She questioned whether this had also influenced the reduction, in this third application, to just two dwellings. However she added the threshold has recently been increased so that no social housing has to be provided in schemes of less than 10 dwellings, so giving further weight to the desire for the scheme being looked at again more imaginatively to provide more dwellings.

Cllr Hall said she was pleased the parameters had been thrashed out in regard to the trees. She commented that the most essential parameter for the existing proposal was the requirement for a distance of around 25 metres between the windows of habitable rooms to different dwellings facing each other (reference to SODC Design Guide). She said she had personal experience of a reduced distance of around 13 metres between windows and blank walls being accepted for volume housebuilding, however she thought in this instance the proposal does not look onto a blank wall but the existing windows to habitable rooms of the existing flats. Cllr Hall said she assumed the strangely shaped projecting windows, were an attempt to circumvent this important parameter, however she thought windows arranged such as would be unpleasant for the future occupants of the proposed flats.

On responding to questions Mr Bunting said he thought there could be a better design. Cllr Hall suggested there were many design options to provide internal natural light, (one idea might be glazed atriums perhaps.) Again she suggested the Case Officer lacked the necessary design qualifications and clout, would be well advised to make use of the SODC's Design Review Panel in assessing the design opportunities.

Cllr Wills said he was not against in principle and didn't think the property would be visible from the road.

Cllr M Bulmer was not keen on the design either.

Cllrs then voted unanimously to recommend the application for REFUSAL.

Cllr Hancox returned to the room.

Plan 16/54 Matters arising from those minutes not on the agenda elsewhere

There were no matters arising.

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

Plan 16/55 SODC Decisions

Plan 16/55.1 **P15/S4015/FUL Bromsgrove, Croft Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9ES.**
Resubmission of P15/S1717/FUL (erection of a detached dwelling and garage) to widen existing driveway to allow for two separate driveways set back from the road. Replace front boundary wall and the proposed new railing/wall being on the east boundary. As amended by drawing nos P-S01X-C and P001 rev G.

GRANTED

Plan 16/56 West Berkshire applications

Nothing had been noted of concern.

Plan 16/57 Correspondence

Letter from SODC in relation to the Hearing in relation to the proposed 35 houses at Manor Road,

Cllr Hall is down to attend.

Plan 16/58 Site visits

To see schedule

Plan 16/59 Matters for further discussion

There were not matters for further discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.00 pm

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

49