

**ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2016 10:00 am.**

**Present:**

<b>Councillors:</b>	Fiona Berry (Chair)	(FB)	Valerie Ross	(VR)
	Tony Cotton	(TC)		
<b>Clerk:</b>	Linda Collison	(LC)		
<b>Members of Public:</b>		8		

---

**Public Forum:**

FB explained that:

- The meeting was being recorded for the purposes of accurate minute taking and that the recording would be destroyed when the minutes for this meeting were approved (usually at the next planning meeting).
- Members of the public would be invited to speak when their application was being considered.
- Members of the public will be excluded from the Committee's deliberations regarding P15/S3932/FUL, under the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meeting) Act 1960 section 1.

Members of the public with an interest in P15/S3932/FUL made their comments and then left the meeting.

**1. Apologies:**

Apologies were received prior to the meeting from Councillor Treacher.

**2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interests :**

None

**3. Planning Applications considered:**

<b>Planning Application</b>
<b>P16/S0276/HH: Rushton House Church Lane Rotherfield Peppard RG9 5JR</b> Single storey rear extension
It was agreed unanimously that RPPC should recommend APPROVAL of this application.
<b>P16/S0408/HH: Vine Cottage Hillcrest Peppard Common</b> Variation of condition 2 - plans on application P13/S3707/HH (Erection of side extension and a detached garage to move) position of garage
It was agreed unanimously that RPPC should recommend APPROVAL of this application.
<b>P15/S4017/HH: Primrose Cottage Dog Lane Peppard Common RG9 5JY</b> Proposed single and two storey extensions. Erection of a detached garage/workshop and new terrace area (Amended)
It was agreed unanimously that RPPC should recommend APPROVAL of this application.
<b>P15/S4018/LB: Primrose Cottage Dog Lane Peppard Common RG9 5JY</b> Proposed single and two storey extensions and internal alterations. (Amended)
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 Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2016 10:00 am.**

<b>Planning Application continued.</b>
<b>P16/S0052/FUL : Daisy's at the Dog Peppard Common</b> Demolition of existing outbuildings & creation of 1 residential dwelling
It was agreed unanimously that RPPC should recommend REFUSAL of this application, as it breaches the following planning policies: CON7.2, CON6, D1, D2, D10, G2, H4.2, H4.3, H11, T1 and T2. For more details see Appendix 1.
<b>TPO 02/2016: Tree Preservation Order (TPO) at Longcote, Grange Avenue, RG9 5JP.</b> Ref P15/S4249/O
It was agreed unanimously that RPPC thank the forestry team for the comprehensive TPO that has been placed on the trees at Longcote and that they fully support the TPO becoming permanent for all the trees listed.
<i>Members of the public left the meeting. (Ref Public Bodies (Admissions to Meeting) Act 1960 s 1)</i>
<b>P15/S3932/FUL -Well Cottage, Kingwood Common, RG9 5NB</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. (amended (2))
It was agreed unanimously that, although RPPC is happier with the new layout, RPPC recommends REFUSAL of this application, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern regarding the points raised in the Highways Officer's report</li> <li>- The quality of the roadway to the site is poor, narrow and insufficient to accommodate the vehicular requirements a new property.</li> <li>- The visual splays are insufficient – these cannot be compared with the splays for Lovell House and Red House as the access for this property is nowhere as acceptable as it is for Lovell House or Red House.</li> </ul>

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

Location / Description	RPPC Decision	SODC Decision
<b>P15/S4249/O Longcote, Grange Av, Rotherfield Peppard</b> The demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with new bungalow & a part outline application for the erection of 5 new dwellings with access to be determined.	REFUSAL	REFUSAL

**5. Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan**

FB proposed and it was agreed unanimously that the response should be a summary of responses made previously and recommend that the plan should be REFUSED. The primary reason for the objection is the building of new properties on AONB land when other Non-AONB is available in the Parish. The proposed housing density on the Non-AONB SON sites within Sonning Common is un-necessarily low and likely to encourage infill or property extensions in the future.

Members also agreed that reference should be made in the response that SC-NDP have now created a new variant of the Norcroft leisure review, which includes 321 houses in Peppard (with no consultation) and states that all the leisure facilities must be provided within

**ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2016 10:00 am.**

Sonning Common, ie although they include Peppard residents in their statistics, they do not include any leisure facilities in Peppard (ie Tennis Courts, Cricket pitch, Table Tennis). Action FB.

The meeting ended at 11:15am

**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 Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2016 10:00 am.

#### Appendix 1

#### P16/S0052/FUL: Daisy's at the Dog Peppard Common Response to SODC

Rotherfield Peppard would like to clarify that:

- This site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to Common land in the rural village of Rotherfield Peppard. It is adjacent to a listed building. It is a well-known landmark.
- The main property on the site The Dog Pub ("The Dog") is a licensed premise. The gardens and all outbuildings (including those directly affected by this application) are therefore also licensed and would require a change of use and de-licensing if this is to become a residential (non-licenses) property.
- The road directly in front of the property is NOT a lay-by, but part of the (B481) highway. Although cars do park on this section of the highway occasionally, it must be kept clear for traffic to enter the Golf Course and the properties along Dog Lane.
- The applicants have made no reference or consideration for existing planning restrictions and conditions of this section of the highway –
  - o Ref: P14/S0844/FUL – Greys Green Golf Course.  
Highways conditions for (the highway must be kept clear for lorry access for 4 years to the Golf Course)
  - o Ref: P14/S2233/CC – Peppard School.  
Pathway access along the edge of the highway in front of "The Dog" for school children to walk along.
- The applicants do not appear to be aware that there is no mains sewage in the village – all properties have their own cesspits.

Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council considers that this application should be **REFUSED** as it breaches planning policies: CON7.2, CON6, D1, D2, D10, G2, H4.2, H4.3, H11, T1 and T2.

#### Details:

##### 1) Conservation Area

The site is within a Conservation area – an area where the "character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance"

- a. The proposed development is "squashed" into a small space with no space down either side and no garden just a small court yard. It is single story.  
This is out of character with the area and detracts from the appearance of the area.
- b. The proposed development would result in the main property ("The Dog") having no storage area and no parking. We are concern that an application may follow to install parking (a garage/) into the other side of the "The Dog", damaging or removing entirely the historic flint-wall again detracting from the appearance of the area.  
Therefore this is a **breach of CON7.2**
- c. The destruction of these out-buildings will adversely affect the character of the area. The redevelopment plans are unacceptable.  
Therefore this is a **breach of CON6**.

##### 2) Out of keeping with neighbouring and nearby houses

- a. The proposed development is "squashed" into a small space with no space down either side. Therefore is no access for maintenance, public services, emergencies to the rear of the property

**ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of The Planning Committee Meeting,  
held at The Sports Pavilion, Stoke Row Road, Rotherfield Peppard  
on Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2016 10:00 am.**

- b. This is an over-development of the site which is not in-keeping with the area and neighbouring houses. There is no garden, just a “court-yard”  
This application **breaches policies H4.2, H4.3, D1 and G2.**

**3) Impact on “The Dog”.**

This application is for the development of part of “The Dog” site. It is not a separate site, but the storage and parking area of The Dog. Without these facilities, there is no facility at “The Dog” for parking or storage. Access to the rear of “The Dog” is also compromised.

This is a **breach of Policy H11.**

RPPC recommends and prefers that if the owners are planning to make changes to “The Dog”, the two applications should be considered as a whole at the same time.

**4) Impact on parking provision**

- a. The proposed parking for this new-build is insufficient and dangerous as it opens directly onto the highway, a wider splay is required.
- b. There is no turning space for cars to leave in a forward direction.
- c. This application would result in “The Dog” having no parking facilities. The highway would be used. This does not take into consideration the existing planning restrictions/conditions for P14/S0844/FUL (Greys Green Golf Course) and P14/S2233/CC (Peppard School).

The garden of “The Dog” is enclosed at the front by a brick-n-flint wall with conservation merit which should not be removed or damaged.

The application therefore **breaches policy T1, T2 and D2.**

**5) Utilities:**

- a. There is no mains sewerage in the village – there is no explanation of where the cesspit/soak-away would be located. The application therefore **breaches policy D10.**
- b. There is no mains-gas in the village - the small (court yard) garden has insufficient space for an oil tank, therefore the only means of heating would be electricity.

**6) Destruction of Vegetation**

We are concerned that there is insufficient root space for the trees on the plot. A Tree Preservation Order to be requested for this site.