MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SONNING PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 24 OCTOBER 2018 AT 6.00PM IN THE PAVILION, POUND LANE, SONNING.

<u>PRESENT</u>: Mr A Farnese (Chairman), Mr T Fisher, Mrs J Harvey, Mr P Morrison. Mrs L Bates (Clerk).

APOLOGIES: There were no apologies. The Chairman welcomed all those present.

AGENDA

- a) Present.
- b) Apologies for Absence
- c) Declaration of Interest
- d) Minutes of 29 August & 1 October 2018 to approve.
- e) Updates
- f) <u>50 Little Glebe (182578).</u> Householder application for the proposed erection of single storey detached outbuilding incorporating two roof lights. 30/10/18
- g) <u>Star Court (182612).</u> Application for full planning permission for the demolition of existing house and garage and replacement with new single dwelling with annex / garage building. 04/11/18
- h) Any matters considered urgent by the Chairman.
- i) Date of the Next Meeting.

1217. DECLARATION OF INTEREST/DISPENSATIONS.

There were no declarations of interest.

1218. MINUTES.

The Minutes of the 29 August and 1 October, having been circulated were taking as read and signed by the Chairman.

1219. UPDATES.

The Chairman said that the application for <u>York Cottage (181800)</u>, had been refused. A new application for <u>The Conifers 48 Old Bath Road (182821)</u>, had been received.

1220. <u>50 LITTLE GLEBE (182578).</u>

The Chairman summed up the proposal, which was for a granny annex for the applicant's parents and would be sited at the bottom of his garden, on the boundary with 31 and 33 Glebe Lane. There was a well prepared personal statement including reference to the parent's needs. The building would be ancillary to the main house, where cooking/washing etc. would be undertaken. The granny annex would comprise of a large living/kitchen area, a bedroom and a shower room. No fittings for the shower room or kitchen were shown so it was difficult to understand if the building was capable of being independent of the main house if required. However mains drainage, water and electricity would have to be laid to support the building. There was no access for emergency services except through the main dwelling. The building was a simple construction but there were two roof-lights in the rear facing the gardens in Glebe Lane. Light from these windows could cause light pollution and additional noise could become an issue and disturb the neighbours existing leisure amenity. Two residents from Glebe Lane had attended an earlier meeting, which unfortunately had not been quorate, but where the application had been informally discussed. Both residents had gardens backing onto the proposed development at 50 Little Glebe. The gentleman had said that the building was very close to his boundary, (.4 metre), there was a large mature apple tree in his garden and the roots were likely to be affected by the building. The lady had said that the area was fairly built up with gardens close together, she was concerned that

the building would block her light and additional noise would be generated by the use. The height was also of concern and she would have appreciated being consulted by the applicant. The lady had confirmed that she did not have any trees in her garden. Mr Bates had said that he had advised the Society, when this application had been discussed, that a small leisure building could be erected in a rear garden under permitted development. There were different regulations for a granny annex. The Society felt that neighbours should be encouraged to make comments rather than leaving it to them or the Parish Council. The Chairman said that mains services (electricity, water and drainage) would have to be connected to the granny annex and the roof-lights were a problem in that they faced the gardens in Glebe Lane. To all appearances the proposal would be capable of being independent of the main dwelling. Following discussion it was agreed to say that SPC had concerns about the above and that any permission should be conditional on the granny annex remaining ancillary to the main dwelling.

1221. STAR COURT (182612.

The Chairman said that the proposal was to demolish the existing dwelling and rebuild with an energy efficient modern dwelling. The Society had no concerns with the design but had wondered if it would be seen from the towpath. It was confirmed that it could not, the Sonning Court building dominated the view and Star Court was set back and the new build would be of low impact. The applicant had said that the existing foundations would be reused and although he intended to fell a couple of trees he intended to plant 25 new ones on the boundary with The Atrium. The new build would follow existing foundations to save costs. The Chairman was concerned that 3 bat boxes would not be sufficient but the bat survey had confirmed that, although there were many bats in the area, none rooted in the existing dwelling. Following discussion it was agreed not to object to the proposal but to say that SPC regretted the trend for demolishing perfectly good existing dwellings.

1つつつ	MATTEDE	CONCIDEDED	LIDCENT DV	THE CHAIRMAN
1///	WIALLERS	CUNNINEREL	UKUTUNI BY	IDELDAIRWAN

There were no urgent matters

1223.	<u>DATE OF THE OF THE NEXT MEETING</u> . The next planning meeting would be held
	On Monday 5 November at 6.00pm in the Pavilion.

Signed	Dated
Signed	Datea