

GORING-ON-THAMES PARISH COUNCIL

We aim to serve in the best interests of our community

Meeting held on Tuesday 19th January 2016 at 7:30pm, Old Jubilee Fire Station,
Red Cross Road, Goring.

MINUTES – PLANNING COMMITTEE

Present: Cllrs D Brooker, J Reavill, J Wills, C Hall,

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

Plan 16/14 **Apologies for absence**

Cllr M Bulmer and Cllr Hancox

Plan 16/15 **Declarations of interest**

Cllr Brooker declared a prejudicial interest in item 6.2 P15/S4341/FUL Cariad Court (as he was a resident of Cariad Court) and Cllr Reavill in item 6.3 P16/S0004/HH 3 Nuns Acre (as he lives in Nuns Acre but doesn't know the applicant so this was not considered prejudicial), Cllr Hall declared a prejudicial interest in item 6.5 P15/S3970/HH 2, 3 & 4 Fairfield Cottages, (as she was the architect).

Plan 16/16 **Public Forum**

Plan 16/16.1 Mrs Stephanie Bridle spoke in relation to item 6.2 Cariad Court, she said she thought the design was utilitarian and the rear of the building was hard up against the trees at Cleeve Road including some mature lime trees, and an attractive yew hedge. She thought if the proposed scheme went ahead the situation would not be tolerable and the trees would need to be removed later on. She said the site was between two Conversation Areas and the design had not been thought through, she said the design currently was not for an attractive building and the proposal had a lot of glass in the roof to let in light but this could be impractical and would get covered with foliage debris etc. Mrs Bridle also said there was no Arboricultural Report supplied.

Plan 16/16.2 Ms Helen Abbott spoke in relation the same application stating she thought there was missing information, vague plans and the "tree works" had not been sufficiently explained. She thought the garage allocation of parking spaces was still wrong, she echoed the points about the trees, saying there were 2 on the western boundary and the Tree Officer had thought this unworkable on the previous application. Ms Abbott said her flat would be close to a potential living room and she was concerned about overlooking. She thought blocks 4-6 would be overlooked.

Plan 16/16.3 Mr Ron Bridle spoke in relation the same application stating his concerns over the trees and the east elevation in particular which would be unattractive, he thought TPOs should be put on some of the trees and the Yew hedge as well as some conditions.

Cllr Reavill queried whether there had been consultation between those residents putting in the application and the non-freeholders and tenants, it

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

6

was noted that 25 out of 32 residents were involved.

Plan 16/16.4 Ms Smithdale spoke in relation to the same application and said there had been a meeting at which all the freeholders etc were invited when the first application was made, and discussions ensued with the Planning Officer which were agreed to be acceptable. She said any TPO trees would not be directly affected by the building works as the foundations would not be disturbed. There may be some pruning of the Yew hedge necessary, the re-submitted application had addressed the loss of light and privacy issues. The roof would allow for guttering maintenance as the design would allow access to keep the gulleys clear. She thought some of the issues raised previously were more personal concerns and not planning issues. Lastly she stated the design was governed by the existing structural supports below, as the garage needed to be accessible.

Plan 16/16.5 Mr S McLean (of 6 Woden House) spoke in relation to item 6.1 and said this was the third time an application had been submitted in 3 years, the previous two had been withdrawn, this was for a 4 bedroomed house on a fairly small plot of a modern design which did not fit, was overbearing potentially overlooked neighbouring dwellings and took amenity space from the original house which was circa 1895 with a dutch gabling design.

He also thought the plans were unclear and had no dimensions so it was impossible to corroborate aspects of the design. In his view the application should be thrown out. He was also concerned about the driveway and highways issues and access for emergency vehicles as well as the potential location of a septic tank and for vehicles emptying the tank etc.

Plan 16/16.6 Mrs Greenspan (of Mulberry Cottage), spoke in relation to item 6.1 and said she was concerned that trees had already been removed. She said she lived in a chalet bungalow and was very concerned the proposed house would overshadow & overlook her property. She thought it was a monstrosity with 3 huge chimneys, it was out of keeping, too large and would cause loss of light as well as reducing privacy of their amenity space.

Plan 16/17 To approve the minutes of the meeting of 5th January 2016

The minutes were approved and signed.

Plan 16/18 Matters Arising

-

Plan 16/19 Applications

Cllr Brooker left the room after he amended the order of the applications so that the members of the public present didn't have to wait so long. Cllr Brown took the Chair.

Plan 16/19.1 P15/S4341/FUL Cariad Court, Cleeve Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9BT. Erect 4 dwellings over re-built garages and existing basement car park. Resubmission of P15/S1866/FUL.

Cllr Reavill thought there seemed to be mixed messages in that some residents were in favour and some against which is why he'd asked who had been consulted. Cllr Hall thought the design factor was fundamental, and

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

7

Cllr Wills had no objection to the idea in principle, but he thought the plans very poor and did not like the design, he did however think a number of the issues raised were not planning ones but he was minded to recommend for refusal.

Whilst not against the idea behind the proposed development in principle, on the basis of the extremely poor design alone Cllr Hall was against it. She thought the planning officer should be asked to submit the scheme for consultation to the SODC Design Panel. She said she understood there were constraints due to the supporting structure within the garage below, however this was not a good enough reason to justify the disparity in size between the proposed apartments with two extremely large ones of over 130m² using double span of structural grid. Working with the structural grid it was possible to design the apartments having the bulk broken down to a more appropriate domestic scale, whether traditional or modern in expression, that would be more fitting. Furthermore working with the structural grid offers the opportunity to provide six apartments, five of around 65m² plus one of 95 m². (Using the National Space Standards adopted in 2015 this was adequate to provide 2 bedroom apartments.) She also thought that whilst developments of under 10 houses officially counted as extra windfall housing, if six apartments could be accommodated, the scheme might be counted within the 105 house allocations that Goring has to find. She thought Woodcote had been able to include some smaller developments within their total housing allocation number.

Cllrs then voted unanimously to recommend the application for **REFUSAL**

Cllr Brooker resumed the Chair.

Plan 16/19.2 **P15/S4367/FUL South Woden, Manor Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 9EB.** New house in grounds of main residence.

Cllr Wills noted there had already been 6 objections, it was also noted a neighbouring house had been named The White House on the plans supplied, but was now called Ingram. Cllr Reavill thought the proposal was massive overdevelopment within an AONB. Cllr Hall agreed the proposal was unneighbourly especially for Mullberry Cottage. Cllrs noted Mullberry Cottage was a bungalow and Ingrams a single storey dwelling, Applegarth and Woden about 1.5 storeys, so there were concerns over the effect on these neighbouring dwellings. The supplied drawings hard to read, there were a number of plans with bird's eye view but there was a lack of contextual information: no street-scene style drawings to gauge the impact on neighbouring properties or from Manor Road itself. There was no topographical survey or means of comparing ridge heights etc. Cllr Reavill thought the drawings were more to impress rather inform. The site was adjacent to the Conservation Area.

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

Plan 16/19.3 **P16/S0004/HH 3 Nuns Acre, Goring on Thames, RG8 9BE.** Single storey front porch and garage extension, single storey rear extension.

Cllrs thought the proposal was acceptable and therefore voted 4 for and 1

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

8

abstention (Cllr Reavill) to recommend the application for **APPROVAL**.

Plan 16/19.4 **P16/S0016/HH Hairoun, 1 Icknield Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 0DG.**
Two storey front extension.

Cllrs voted unanimously to recommend the application for **APPROVAL**

Cllr Hall left the room.

Plan 16/19.5 **P15/S3970/HH 2, 3 & 4 Fairfield Cottages, Farm Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 0AB.** Rear two storey extension to 3 dwellings. As amended revisions to prepared dormer windows.

Cllrs discussed the revised application and agreed it was acceptable.

Cllrs voted to unanimously recommend the application for **APPROVAL**

Cllr Hall returned to the room.

Plan 16/20 Matters arising from those minutes not on the agenda elsewhere

There were no matters arising.

Plan 16/21 SODC Decisions

P15/S3831/HH The Nook, 51 Gatehampton Road, Goring on Thames, RG8 0EN. Build up gable wall loft conversion and rear extension.

GRANTED

Plan 16/22 West Berkshire applications

Nothing of concern had been noted.

Plan 16/23 Correspondence

Tree Preservation Order No 01/2016 in relation to some trees at the rear of Cleeve Park Cottages, Icknield Road, Goring, RG8 0DJ.

Noted.

Plan 16/24 Site visits

To see schedule

Plan 16/25 Matters for further discussion

-

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.20 pm

Approved _____

Date _____

David Brooker

9