

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SONNING PARISH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY 1 OCTOBER 2018 AT  
6.00PM IN THE PAVILION, POUND LANE, SONNING.**

**PRESENT:** Mr A Farnese (Chairman), Mr T Fisher, Mr P Morrison, Mrs J Harvey .  
Mrs L Bates (Clerk), 1 visitor.

**APOLOGIES:** Apologies were received from holiday. The Chairman welcomed all those present.

**AGENDA**

- a) Present.
- b) Apologies for Absence
- c) Declaration of Interest
- d) Minutes of 6 August 2018 to approve.
- e) Updates
- f) Reading Blue Coat School (182281). Full planning application for the partial demolition of "old Design & Technology" buildings and erection pitched roof to retained "Old Coach House" building, plus external works including the fenestration and erection of a new cycle shelter. 01/10/18
- g) Acre Field Appeal (3207467). Against WBC decision to refuse application 181082 for the proposed erection of 3 no. dwellings with new access and parking following demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage. 10/10/18
- h) 29 West Drive (181821). Full planning application for the proposed replacement dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling. 10/10/18
- i) Charfield Cottage, Charvil Lane (182453). Householder application for the proposed erection of a two storey side extension to dwelling. (15/10/18 extended due to WBC IT update).
- j) Any matters considered urgent by the Chairman.
- k) Date of the Next Meeting.

1208. DECLARATION OF INTEREST/DISPENSATIONS.

There were no declarations of interest.

1209. MINUTES.

The Minutes of the 29 August, were unavailable and would be approved at the next meeting.

1210. UPDATES.

The Chairman said that applications 19 West Drive (182127), and Neaps End 15 Old Bath Road (182217), had been approved. Application Ranmore Pound Lane (182307) for a minor amendment had been refused as it required planning permission.

1211. READING BLUE COAT SSCHOOL (182281).

The Chairman said that he knew the site well and was aware that the buildings to be demolished might contain asbestos. There was also a gully running underneath the buildings. Following discussion it was agreed to say the SPC could find no reason to refuse the application but there were concerns about the removal of existing asbestos and the gully underneath the builds.

1212. ACRE FIELD APPEAL (3207467).

The appeal was against WBC's decision to refuse the erection of three dwellings on the site. The main reason for this was that the refusal reasons had not been mentioned when pre-application advice had been sought. The Conservation officer could not support the application because:

*'the design and scale of the buildings did not preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Mention was made of the pre-application advice and that initial sketches gave rise to the concerns including*

- *Design, height, orientation and relationship of the 'barn' (Plot 1) with the proposed cottages (Plots 2 & 3).*
- *Height, scale and design details of the building forming Plots 2 & 3. The design concerns included the proposed central, 2 storey, projecting, gabled bay which was felt to be overly assertive and not reflecting the more conservative detailing that characterises neighbouring cottages.*
- *The fact that no garages/external storage were shown on the plan, only cycle/bin stores. If this site is able to accommodate three dwellings it is likely to be at the limit of what can be achieved in terms of built form without compromising its openness and transitional role. It was stressed that the likely future requirement for these additional garage buildings should also be recognised at this planning stage and the scale of the dwellings reduced to reflect the impact of these additional outbuildings.*

*Although some revisions had been made many of the concerns remained in the revised scheme. Additionally, since the pre-application discussion, an application on the adjoining site August Field had been sought (since approved) and if permitted this would raise the density of dwellings to 8 across the two sites, considerably tightening the grain and resulting in a more suburban character. These sites, together, play an important transitional role at the edge of the CA/village and both applications should be considered together so that this open character can be preserved.*

Following discussion it was agreed to inform the Planning Inspectorate that SPC fully supported WBC's decision to refuse the application, quoting the CA's comments and that the two sites should be considered together and the pressure of local roads on local roads.

1213. 29 WEST DRIVE (181821).

Mrs Harvey had discussed the proposal with the neighbours and, although they did not wish to object, they had reservations about the building work. Having endured extensive and inconsiderate building work on surrounding properties they wished to limit the impact this proposal would have. Noisy vehicles delivering at the weekend, rubble left in the front gardens and noise, dirt and dust were some of the issues they had raised. Mrs Harvey would inform them that working on Saturday afternoon and all day Sunday and Bank Holidays was not allowed under planning conditions but could only be enforced if these offences were reported to WBC at the time. Mr Hamblin said that there was a tree to the front of the property, which was on the boundary between the property and the West Drive verge (not owned by the applicant) which should be retained. The Chairman said that there were concerns about the large number of vehicles. Following discussion it was agreed to object to the demolition of the existing building, part of an unfortunate trend in West Drive, and the increase in size, which would result in more vehicles on site and additional pressure on local roads. In the event that WBC approved the proposal the applicant should be required to carry out tree protection measures on the large tree on the verge alongside the front boundary of the property and strict conditions regarding working hours and deliveries to the site.

1214. CHARFIELD COTTAGE, CHARVIL LANE (182453)..

The Chairman said that the original property had been subject to extensive alterations over the years, some less satisfactory than others, and the proposed two storey extension would result in a more balanced façade. Following discussion it was agreed to say that SPC could find no reason to refuse.

1215. MATTERS CONSIDERED URGENT BY THE CHAIRMAN.

There were no urgent matters

1216. DATE OF THE OF THE NEXT MEETING. The next planning meeting would be held  
On Wednesday 17 October at 6.00pm in the Pavilion.

Signed.....Dated.....