

## ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016 7:30pm.

### Present:

**Councillors:** Fiona Berry (Chair) (FB) Veronica Treacher (VT)  
Tony Cotton (TC)

**Clerk:** Linda Collison (LC)

**Members of Public:** 11 in total. 4 arrived after the meeting started. All left after their application of interest was concluded.

### Public Forum:

FB explained that the meeting was being recorded for the purposes of accurate minute taking and would be destroyed when the minutes for this meeting were approved (usually at the next planning meeting). FB added that the public would be invited to speak when their application was being considered and asked that the public refrain from talking at other times.

### 1. Apologies:

None.

### 2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interests :

None

### 3. Minutes of the previous meetings :

It was moved by FB and resolved unanimously that the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meetings held on Monday 11th January 2016 signed as a true record of the meeting.

### 4. Planning Applications considered:

Planning Application
<b>P15/S4249/O : Longcote Grange Avenue Rotherfield Peppard RG9 5JP</b> Hybrid planning application for a part full application for the demolition of the existing bungalow & replacement with new bungalow and a part outline application for the erection of five new dwellings with access to be determined (appearance, layout, scale and landscaping reserved)
It was agreed unanimously that RPPC should recommend REFUSAL of this application, for reasons detailed in Appendix 1. It was also agreed that a Tree Preservation Order should be requested on all trees on the site.
<b>P16/S0019/HH: 46 Shiplake Bottom Peppard Common Oxon RG9 5HN</b> Construction of two storey extension to side of existing house
Section 7 of the Planning document for P15/S4255/HH has been completed to state that there are no trees or hedges within the distance of the proposed development and that no trees or hedges will be removed. If this is the case then the Council recommends APPROVAL of the application. However the Council is unsure that this is possible and request a condition is applied to the application (should it be approved) that the front hedge is repaired/replanted in full if it is damaged in any way as part of this application. Hedges (and trees) are a characteristic feature along Shiplake Bottom which should be retained.
<b>P15/S4255/HH Hailwood 50 Shiplake Bottom Peppard Common RG9 5HN</b>
It was agreed unanimously that RPPC should recommend APPROVAL of this application

**ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016 7:30pm.

<b>Planning Application continued.</b>
<p><b>P15/S2749/HH – ROP Comilla Kingwood Common Kingwood RG9 5NB - amended</b> To demolish existing roof structure including rooms in roof and three dormer windows. Form a new first floor level including 4 bedrooms two bathrooms and a cloak room. Remove front entrance porch and replace with new enlarged two storey oak framed glazed entrance lobby</p> <p>The revised application includes a first floor window on the rear elevation which overlooks the neighbours (Well Cottage) garden. Based on this Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council considers that this amended application should be REFUSED. However at the Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 26th January the applicant confirmed that he would be prepared to remove the offending window from the application.</p>
<p><b>P15/S3932/FUL -Well Cottage, Kingwood Common, RG9 5NB - amended</b> Proposed erection of a single detached 1.5-storey dwelling house with separate single-storey garage, home office and art studio, plus formation of new access driveways</p> <p>It was agreed by a majority vote (2 to 1) that RPPC should recommend REFUSAL of this application as it is an over-development of the site which was out of keeping with the local area and that although the studio/home office had been moved further away from the hedge by 200mm, this was insufficient and suggested it should be attached to the main building.</p> <p>When this plot is compared with neighbouring Comilla or Well Cottage or Sunny Cottage they all have a large area of garden around the house, whereas on this plot with the large main house and large secondary building the percentage of the plot that is taken up with buildings is higher than the surrounding plots.</p> <p>Should the application be approved, RPPC requests that the soffit boards and barge boards throughout are in a colour that blends in with the countryside eg dark green, dark black.</p> <p align="center">-----</p> <p>Note : RPPC's previous response to this application raised concern that in this application Well Cottage is described as a 5-Bedroom dwelling, yet the planning history was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– P76/S0222 Addition of two bedrooms and one reception room - created a single story 3 bedroom house</li> <li>– P74/S0161 erection of garage for use as garage</li> </ul> <p>It was explained that in 1976 there was planning consent for the form of the building (as it is now) but since then the conversion was in the loft space and insertion of windows , which did not need planning permission; but it did require, and receive, building consent – ref B00.0676 on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2000.</p>

**5. Planning Decisions by SODC since last meeting**

<b>Location / Description</b>	<b>RPPC Decision</b>	<b>SODC Decision</b>
<p><b>P15/S3715/FUL Broadlands House 6 Stoke Row Rd</b> Erection of Two New Detached Homes and Carports, Closure of Existing Access on to Stoke Row Road and Creation of Improved Access Point to Stoke Row Road, Hard and Soft Landscaping and Associated Works</p>	REFUSAL	WITHDRAWN by applicant
<p><b>P15/S3700/HH Arundel Church Lane, RG9 5JN</b> New swimming pool with associated pool building. New tennis court and external wall.</p>	APPROVAL	APPROVAL

**ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016 7:30pm.

**6. Enforcement: To consider enforcement issues in the Parish, to include:**

<b>Location / Description</b>
<b>TPO 14S17 – 82 Shiplake Bottom</b> To provide an update following the removal of the Beech tree
Not discussed
<b>Colmore, Colmore Ln Kingwood RG9 5NA</b> Regarding refused retrospective planning application (P14/S0257/FUL) for a curved trench. Trench not yet filled back in. LC advised that a new SODC enforcement office had been appointed to this issue. Agreed to wait until the officer provides a report.
<b>Blue Cabins at Mulberry House</b> with no planning permission (SE15/538) Not discussed. Waiting until investigation period is completed. 11/02/2016.
<b>Land nr Old Sewage Works off Wyfold Ln</b> Tree felling and laying of hard core creating potential parking area for large vehicles without planning permission. It was noted that a new SODC enforcement officer had been appointed to this issue, who would be visiting the site on the 8 <sup>th</sup> February.

7. **Next planning meeting:** It was agreed that the next planning meeting should be held on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016, after the Full Council meeting.

The meeting ended at 8:45pm

**Adopted as a true and accurate record:**

**Signature** ..... **Date** .....

## ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016 7:30pm.

### Appendix 1: P15/S4249/O : Longcote Grange Avenue Rotherfield Peppard RG9 5JP Response to SODC

Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council considers that this application should be REFUSED, for the following reasons

#### 1. Principle of Development

CSR1 :Does not meet the criteria for infill development.

This application is for the development of 6 houses on a site of 0.6ha, three times the threshold of 0.2ha. Approval of this outline application on would allow the applicant to use further applications to increase the number of houses on the site.



The application site is situated on the edge of Rotherfield Peppard rather than within it. Although the applicant has drawn a line along the boundary of the site and the adjacent paddock it is not following the building line and is enclosing two green spaces which do not have any residential use.

The site is not closely surrounded by buildings as it is at the bottom of the gardens of houses in Church Lane and alongside the garden of a single dwelling which is the only building visible. The other boundaries are alongside paddocks and open land with the Dog Lane footpath and Golf Course on the other side.

The development sits behind the existing houses and forms a new complex and alignment of dwellings completely separate from any existing road layout or housing arrangement and therefore could not be said to comply with the spirit of infilling. CSS1 (iv) The layout of the proposed road allows access into 1 Grange Avenue and the paddocks at the rear of Drays Lane giving the potential for a large unplanned development in the village inconsistent with supporting villages in the district by allowing for limited amounts of housing.

G2, G3, G4, G5 This is a greenfield site on the edge of a settlement with minimal facilities and where the public transport is insufficient to support working people. It is sited in a complex of paddocks which define the rural character of the area and which need to be protected from the urbanisation of this development.

## ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016 7:30pm.

### Appendix 1, Continued 1

#### **2. The impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding AONB**

CSEN1 construction of six houses on this site will alter the quiet character of Grange Avenue and will result in an intensification of development within the countryside, extending the built area of Rotherfield Peppard into a large green field area in the AONB.

The residents of Rotherfield Peppard scored very highly in the RPPC Community Plan Survey 2011 how important the AONB is to them and wished development that detracted from its conservation and enhancement to be resisted. This application does not justify the loss of AONB land by supporting either the local economy as Sonning Common is seen as the service centre or the social wellbeing of the community as its impact is nothing but detrimental to the residents of Church Lane and Grange Avenue. This site is part of the open green space that lies to the north of the settlement and although the Countryside Officer states that there is "unlikely to be any significant ecological impacts if planning permission is granted" during the site visit by the RPPC planning committee three pheasants, a green woodpecker and a muntjac were seen. CSQ3, D1, H4 (ii), CSH2

##### Replacement house

- design out of character with the area which has dormer windows to break the front elevation.
- roof lights on front elevation are not aligned and are inconsistent with SODC Design Guide section 5.6

##### Five new houses

- poor quality design not in keeping with the character of the local area
- not consistent with the SODC Design Guide - flat roofs, no local distinctiveness, suburban design
- no variety of housing reflecting the mix in Rotherfield Peppard e.g. no semi-detached houses as is found in Church Lane and Drays Lane.
- not clear if there are any two bedroom houses that could be afforded by young families or older people wishing to downsize as requested by residents in the RPPC Community Plan Survey 2011.

#### **3. Impact on Neighbours**

H4 (iv). H4 (v) backland development

- Impact on the privacy of 1 Grange Avenue because three of the houses will overlook the back garden because they are situated at 90° to it. The fourth is situated towards the back of their garden which will impact privacy from windows at the side and front.
- Noise impact from the increase in traffic in the quiet cul-de sac as the application will increase the number of houses accessed via Grange Avenue by 40%. This will have a particular impact on number 10 which will have a new access opposite the house, and number 1 which will have roads on three sides of the property.

## ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016 7:30pm.

### Appendix 1, Continued 2

#### 4. Impact on parking provision / highway safety

H4 (iv). H4 (v)

- the access to and within the site does not appear sufficient for emergency vehicles.
- access and parking area is constrained this may cause problems for bin collection and delivery lorries

D1 there is no mains drainage, or gas supply so access is required for delivery of oil or gas and emptying of septic tanks. These are likely to block the access settlement is characterised by houses on plots with large enough front gardens so that cars can be parked off the road.

- the larger houses have no integrated garages.

D2 amount of available parking for the size of the houses is inadequate

T2 insufficient parking space in front of the houses for at least two cars to park with turning space to leave in a forward gear

#### Other considerations

CSQ2 (vi) the parish has issues of flooding on local roads and residents have problems with soakaways because of the heavy clay soil. This development will have to incorporate appropriate surface water drainage to ensure that the residents at the bottom of the hill in Grange Avenue are not impacted by local flooding.

C9 although there are no TPOs the site visit showed a number of trees that appear worthy of protection. The Tree Protection Plan needs to be reviewed by SODC to ensure that no trees with amenity or character value are removed.

- TPOs should be added to the site as it is likely that because of the size of the trees against the property size future occupants would wish to remove them to gain more light in the garden.
- there is a large area in the application that will affect the root protection area of the trees along the boundary with 1 Grange Avenue. This currently forms a screen between it and the proposed development so any deterioration in the trees would be detrimental to the amenity of that resident. Although the application states that this area would be hand dug the size seems excessive for this and is only necessary to accommodate the new roadway which is too near this boundary.

#### 5. Request for conditions etc.

- a Construction Plan is required as access for construction traffic is past the primary school situated at the top of Church Lane
- lighting restrictions to restrict the impact of external lights in particular those that spill light upwards as the local landscape is dark with no street lighting.
- construction of the access to the new houses should include improvements to the very poor road surface in Grange Avenue so that it is able to cope with the additional traffic that will aggravate the deterioration.
- contribution to the funding of the new Peppard Primary School
- contribution towards public transport to ensure the viability of the very restricted service.