

GORING-ON-THAMES PARISH COUNCIL

We aim to serve in the best interests of our community

Meeting held on Tuesday 2nd February 2016 at 7:30pm, THE GARDEN ROOM,
GORING VILLAGE HALL, GORING ON THAMES

MINUTES – PLANNING COMMITTEE

Present: Cllrs D Brooker, J Wills, C Hall, M Bulmer, B Hancox

C Fox, Acting Clerk Planning, approx. Approximately 30 members of the public

Plan 16/26 Apologies for absence

Cllr L Reavill

Plan 16/27 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Plan 16/28 Public Forum

Plan 16/28.1 Mr John Boler spoke in relation to item 6.1 Queens Arms. He stated he was for the proposal in that the proposed extension was the same, and had been approved already, he thought the road safety aspects had now been adhered to and the store would enhance consumer choice, negate travel to eg Woodcote and the extent of the opposition within the village had been exaggerated.

Plan 16/28.2 Mrs Gill Haigh spoke in objection to 6.1 Queens Arms. She said that yes Tesco did already have permission, but they wanted a larger store and therefore car parking spaces would be lost. She said she had visited the Co-op at Woodcote at 10.30am and there were 15 cars outside and there would be 9 spaces at the proposed Tesco (during deliveries) she added there was no legal extra parking available in the vicinity – Whitehills Green being the closest potential overflow parking, she added she was concerned about extremely large delivery lorries trying to manoeuvre in and out and turn. She was also concerned about the existing narrow pavement on the Wallingford Road. She thought the supplied traffic analysis was incorrect and a junction should now be allowed next to an existing junction. The analysis supplied had been based on a store in a completely different location.

Plan 16/28.3 Mr Tom Worthington spoke in great detail about the Highways Report in which he had picked up a large number of mistakes, anomalies and figures that did not add up etc. He said all the totals were wrong, the data in relation to pedestrians incorrect so he questioned what reliance could there then be on the rest of the data? He thought Tesco would apply formulas to numbers of cars x average spend etc then they could work out the number of pedestrians which he suspected would be a huge figure to make the store viable. He referred to the existing “tidal” flows of eg pedestrians from the station but added there would now be contraflow and the pavement made passing impossible. Ultimately he said the analysis supplied was completely flawed.

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

10

- Plan 16/28.4 Mr Rob Jones ((STIG) also spoke in relation to item 6.1 and referred to the previous applications in Dec/Jan 2014 which were refused due to Highways/safety issues by the PC and SODC.. He said a new Highways Report had been issued in the last week or so which contained serious flaws. He said the TPA said they would consult and everyone was pleased, but nothing new has been mentioned as the problems cannot be resolved particularly as the pavement cannot now be widened due to Network Rail's works. He said STIG thought there might be an 8 fold increase in cars but the TPA reports suggested 113 vehicle movements a day but they have compared to a Beefeater. They have underestimated vehicular movements (290sq m store) they have compared with a 70 sq m store. Another item omitted is the potential queuing of traffic, another is the size of the lorries – it was implied the lorries on plans would only be 8.4 m but an email supplied in evidence referred to lorries of 10.3m. He said that in Camden Tesco had been issued with £75K of parking fines which they can afford to simply pay. He finished by questioning whether their reports could be relied upon and are they credible?.
- Plan 16/28.5 Mr W Hilington spoke in relation to item 6.2 Goring Weir and was worried the previous comments would not be carried forward and urged people to write to SODC again. He said the EA had still not commented, was concerned about the aesthetics even though the control box had been relocated, he was concerned about when the sluice gates may need to rise and the view that would be blocked vertically which was not shown in the drawings, he said the screws themselves are enclosed by an acoustic cover. He was unconvinced by the claims of the electricity generation this seemed an opportunistic claim and would depend on the water levels. He urged the Committee to look at the 3 photos in the Brett Report, and thought in drought conditions the EU may alter the flows etc. He referred to the Flood Risk Assessment – adding there was now definite evidence to support climate change and additional flooding events, there could also be flooding during erection. He referred to the noise assessment – the noise had been measured on a weekday but the screws would also be running at night ambient noise should also be assessed at night. He thought it would be better the applicants find a field and erect some solar panels instead.
- Plan 16/28.6 Mrs C Turner was concerned about the visual impact, noise, the relocation of the building would obscure the view, the building would be in a flood plain and the EA was conspicuous in its absence.
- Plan 16/28.7 Mrs S Bridgeman – said she agreed with everything already said, she was also concerned over maintenance and referred to problems at Mappedurham where there was only a single screw.
- Plan 16/28.8 Mr Simon Carter – referred to the finances of the project and said that the FIT payments (Incentive for Renewal) payments had been reduced by the Government and the Abingdon scheme had been pulled.
- Plan 16/28.9 Mr John Palmer said he was pleased the visual impact at the Weir was being amended to match the effect created by Network Rail! The river was Goring's greatest asset and should be protected.

Approved _____

Date _____

Plan 16/29 To approve the minutes of the meeting of 19th January 2016

As there were some amendments still to be discussed and agreed it was decided to sign the minutes at the following meeting.

Plan 16/30 Matters Arising

-

Plan 16/31 Applications

Plan 16/31.1 P16/S0171/FUL Queens Arms, Reading Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 0ER. Change of use of premises from Class A4 (public house) use to Class A1 (retail) use along with 80 sq m rear extension

Cllr Brown said he'd had mixed feelings, he certainly didn't like the potentially fudged numbers in the traffic report but he knew some in the village were ambivalent about which way to vote, his concerns were the narrow pavement, lorry size and road safety. Cllr Hancox was concerned about the impact of traffic flows to and from the station, concerned about the lorries parking and questioned whether the store could have no parking. He referred to the NP and that other sites may be more acceptable. He thought the pavement along the Wallingford Road too narrow to allow pedestrians to pass and widening was now unlikely to Network Rail's electrification works so he was against. Cllr Wills said the Change of Use could not now be objected to, but he thought on balance more were against than for and he thought there were enough big lorries causing problems in the village already. He thought there could be four deliveries a day which would leave little time for the fencing off proposed by staff and that lorries may well go through the village too. Cllr M Bulmer was concerned about traffic, the car parking, and highways safety issues, she was also concerned the traffic reports were incorrect. Cllr Hall was unhappy about highways issues and safety, she noted the site had already been through the Appeal process, she had read the traffic statement and was shocked if there were inaccuracies within it she felt she could not therefore vote when presented with possibly incorrect information and would therefore abstain. Cllr Brooker said he had spoken with the Officer and following the Appeal it seemed Tesco could open and sell dry goods, but they want a larger store hence the application for the extension. He said they could have opened then possibly gone for permitted development. But he was concerned about the impact on the existing local shops, Goring Village itself and the fact it was in an AONB. He said the Council was trying to help traders in the village and large lorries were already an issue. He was worried about a shop at this location on a junction and that large lorries may need to go through the village. He referred to "Conditions" in the Highways Officer's report but that these were often not enforced. He was also concerned that Tescos would have a Planning Team to enable the store but then it would be moved to another team simply to make the store viable financially and this would be in terms of numbers of shoppers. He was concerned about parking – 14 spaces (but down to 10 when the lorries were unloading) would cars parking in the vicinity dangerously and on double yellow lines etc, or at Railway Cottages. He thought this was the wrong location, there were highways issues (and safety) "conditions" were often unenforceable, there may be a negative impact on the centre of the village and it was fundamentally in the wrong

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

location.

Cllrs then voted 5 for refusal and 1 abstention (Cllr Hall) to recommend the application for **REFUSAL**

Plan 16/31.2 **P15/S2946/FUL Goring on Thames Weir, Goring on Thames.** Amendment No 1 – dated 13th January 2016. Demolish part of the existing weir at Goring Lock for a distance of approximately 18m westwards of the lock island, and replace it with three Archimedes screws (3.5m in diameter each), associated housing for generators and control equipment, a 2.1m wide fish pass, a new eel pass and a new 3.0m wide flood control gate for the use of the Environment agency (as amended by plans relocating control hut adj to lock house, and as amplified by additional information, rec'd 12/01/16).

Cllr Wills said he was against for 6 reasons, the Conservation Areas, AONB, scenic view, flooding, noise impact and environmental (fisheries etc). He ran through the various policies G2, C3, C4 Con7 and Chapter 11 para 115 of the NFP and said he was disappointed there was no input from the Environment Agency. Cllr Hancox thought the proposal was all pain and no gain for the village, as none of this would benefit Goring residents as the power would be sold to the National Grid. Cllr Brown was also against the proposal and said he thought people has assumed the power would go to houses in Goring, Cllr Hall was also against and said she was concerned there was no landscape impact assessment and no professional had been consulted, there was no visual impact assessment. Cllr Brown also raised the issue of finance and noise issues and maintenance, with regard to the EA he thought there may not be many staff left due to the cuts which was why they hadn't commented yet. Cllr Bulmer said she was against and concerned about the visual impact, Cllr Brooker was concerned about the visual impact, the noise assessment which he thought implied may require further adaptations, the flood risk as the 2010 flood risk assessment was still being used but that there was no reference to the recent heavy rainfalls which in his view meant the 100 year rule no longer applied, he was concerned over the negative impact on the weirpools and if there was mechanical failure who would maintain it especially as there was no longer a lockkeeper in residence. Reasons for refusal in his view were the AONB, Conservation Area, he also noted the Abingdon project has been pulled as it was no longer financially viable.

After further discussion Cllrs voted unanimously to recommend the application for **REFUSAL**.

Plan 16/31.3 **P16/S0166/HH 3 Cleeve Park Cottages, Icknield Road, Goring on Thames, Reading, RG8 0DJ.** Installation of a lantern roof light in the existing flat roof and external decking with steps to the garden and 1 1.8m boundary fence.

Cllrs thought this was almost permitted development and could see no problems with the proposal.

Cllrs thought the proposal was acceptable and therefore voted unanimously

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

to recommend the application for **APPROVAL**.

Plan 16/31.4 **P16/S0059/HH Little Norfolk, Manor Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9ED.** Rear single storey infill extension.

Cllr Wills said he could not find the previous comments on the SODC website, however Cllrs could see no problems with the proposal and therefore voted unanimously to recommend the application for **NO STRONG VIEWS**

Plan 16/31.5 **P15/S4367/FUL South Woden, Manor Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9EB.** New House in grounds of main residence (as amended and amplified by plans accompanying email from agent received 15 January 2016).

This had only just been considered at the previous meeting and Cllrs agreed once again to recommend the application for **REFUSAL**

Plan 16/31.6 **P16/S0122/HH 76 Wallingford Road, Goring on Thames, Reading, RG8 0HN.** Loft conversion and elevational changes

Cllr Wills noted there were no comments from neighbours and Cllr Hall thought although in her view it was slightly insensitively done there was no direct impact on anyone.

Cllrs could see no problems with the proposal and therefore unanimously to recommend the application for **APPROVAL**.

Plan 16/31.7 **P16/S0088/P18 Goring and Streatley Railway Station, Goring on Thames, RG8 0ES.** Station works – extension and alterations to plate 1, 2, 3 and 4 (amendment to P14/S3755/P11 – revision to previously approved scheme) under part 18 – permitted development railway works

Cllrs voted unanimously to recommend they had **NO STRONG VIEWS** on the application.

Plan 16/32 Matters arising from those minutes not on the agenda elsewhere

There were no matters arising.

Plan 16/33 SODC Decisions

Plan 16.33.1 **P15/S4034/HH 21 Elvendon Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 0DP.** Single storey timber building for use as a garden room.

GRANTED

Plan 16/33/2 **P15/S3899/LB 1 and 2 Lybbes Cottages, Manor Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9DS.** Proposed internal alterations, with the addition of external ramps for access to both.

GRANTED

Plan 16/33.3 **P15/S3483/O Manor Road, Goring on Thames** Outline development of up

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

14

to 35 dwellings with access, garages and landscaping (as amended by drawing no 3298-104C and revising planning statement accompanying agent's email dated 8 December 2015 which increases the number of units from up to 27 to up to 35).

REFUSED

Plan 16/33/4 **P15/S3526/FUL 17 Cleeve Down, Goring on Thames, RG8 0HB.**
Erection of two semi-detached dwellings to rear of 17 Cleeve Down. (As amplified by Tree Survey and Ecological Appraisal dated 13 November 2015 and amended by drawings accompanying e-mail from agent received 23 November 2015).

GRANTED

Plan 16/33.5 **P15/S3970/HH 2, 3 & 4 Fairfield Cottages, Farm Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 0AD.** Rear two storey extension to three dwellings, with internal alterations including loft conversions. As amended by revised plans received on 08 January 2016 showing revisions to proposed dormer windows.

GRANTED

Plan 16/33.6 **P15/S3752/HH 15 Lockstile Way, Goring on Thames, Reading, Oxon, RG8 0AL.** Single storey rear extension; part single storey side extension with new roof over, new bay window to front elevation.

GRANTED

Plan 16/34 West Berkshire applications

Nothing of concern had been noted.

Plan 16/35 Correspondence

A large number of letters in relation to the Queens Arms and Weir application.

Plan 16/36 Site visits

To see schedule

Plan 16/37 Matters for further discussion

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.45 pm

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

15