

Bramley Parish CouncilPlanning Application comments and decisions - April 2020

AM – Cllr Alan Munday, MB – Cllr Malcolm Bell, EC – Cllr Liz Capel, CF – Cllr Chris Flooks (Chair)

	Application	Comments	Decision and proposed response
1.	<p>20/00319/FUL - Land At Silchester Road Silchester Road Bramley - AMENDED</p> <p>Erection of 13 no.dwellings, associated access, parking, landscaping and amenity space</p>	<p>AM - I can only re-iterate previous objections about the need for and suitability of a development in this part of the village, which continues to be totally unacceptable and not in keeping with the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>MB - Highways objection remains, onto a busy road and on a bend.</p> <p>Whilst Thames water say no objection other than permission to have water going into the sewerage system, the sewerage infrastructure capacity remains with flooding downstream. The Thames Water report as regards the incapacity to deal with 200 houses on Minchens Lane remains with the model as regards the infrastructure upgrades required not being available until 2021. This housing estate will add to the sewerage Flooding problem and the incapacity of the sewage system cannot be ignored. Waiting meeting with BDBC to discuss the incapacity of the system.</p> <p>The loss of the views into and out of the Conservation area will be lost and the view into the manor house on Vyne Road will be impaired.</p> <p>Whilst Bungalows are acceptable, the number of 1 bed and 2 bed accommodation has been adequately met within the 315 houses built in bramley over the past years with no improvement in the infrastructure. The target market for these houses in older people, but the estate is far too distant from the inadequate infrastructure, shop, on the east side of the rail crossing.</p> <p>EC – Same objections as before. Entrance dangerous on the bend. Lots of traffic during rush hour, noisy.</p> <p>CF – As per MBs comments</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>All previous objections to this application remain. In particular, the Parish Council would like to re-iterate the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Highways – the proposed entrance to the site is on a dangerous bend of Silchester Road, at a very busy point. <input type="checkbox"/> The PC notes that Thames Water has raised no objection. However, the sewerage system downstream is already not coping well with the current load, and these problems will only grow as more properties come online. The PC has previously submitted a Thames Water report with proposals for improvement, which Thames Water has acknowledged needs to be reviewed. The PC is awaiting a meeting with BDBC officers and Thames Water to discuss. <input type="checkbox"/> The loss of the views into and out of the Conservation area will be lost and the view into the Manor House on Vyne Road will be impaired. <input type="checkbox"/> The number of 1 and 2 bed units has been adequately met within the 315 houses currently being built in Bramley (which are approaching completion). There has been no improvement in the infrastructure. <input type="checkbox"/> The target market for these units is older people; however, the site is on the edge of the village, outside the SPB, and far too

			<p>distant from local services such as the shop and the railway station.</p> <p><i>In addition, I plan to submit my beefed-up version on the Conservation Area concerns, referencing the Goddards Farm planning appeal decision.</i></p>
2.	<p>20/00740/FUL - Qps House The Street Bramley Conversion of ground floor from tanning salon (sui generis) and retail (A1) to 2 no. one bedroom flats and retail (A1)</p>	<p>AM - Objections due to size of units and practicality of operating a retail unit in a room that size with inadequate facilities. There are many objections that we have previously discussed on the proposal at this site, and they remain, for example the need for more residential units, removal of retail / commercial facilities, lack of parking, etc. Additionally, the inclusion of the proposed double doors at the front of the retail unit will dramatically alter the appearance of the building and not in keeping with the rest of the building</p> <p>MB - Again, whilst only two single flats, there are 14 single bed flats from the conversion of the barn in Minchens Court. More housing with the loss of commercial building is not required in Bramley. Again, lack of infrastructure in all aspects. Cars will be backing onto a busy road but only 50 metre from the rail crossing.</p> <p>EC – Declaring an interest as very near where I live and parking overspill may be an issue to Pheabens Field and my household.</p> <p>Concerned that the retail unit is far too small and just included to fulfil planning criteria from previous unsuccessful application – a mere token gesture.</p> <p>Previous home to 3 other small local businesses, causing little impact on surrounding area with parking or noise. Two of the three were told to leave by QPS owners so it could be developed into full residential use.</p> <p>With 3 new developments already being build (not all fully completed) we have more than enough residential dwellings.</p> <p>Before the previous application had been decided a lot of work had already been carried out at the address, but presumptuous of them.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Objections to previous applications for residential units at this site still stand, for example the lack of need for more residential units, removal of retail / commercial facilities, lack of parking, etc.</p> <p>Whilst this is for just 2 single bed flats, there are 14 single bed flats already approved from the conversion of the barn in Minchens Court. Together with the other housing currently being built in Bramley, more housing with the loss of commercial units is not required.</p> <p>The proposed retail unit is very small, and appears to be included purely to meet the planning conditions resulting from the previous unsuccessful application – Cllrs felt that this was included as a token gesture.</p> <p>The applicant states that work has not begun at the site. However, there have been several skips of building remains removed from the site in the last few months together with deliveries of building materials, which would indicate that work has indeed commenced, despite the lack of planning approval.</p> <p>Finally, there are concerns about the parking provision. The area of Bramley around the railway station already suffers with a large number of commuters parking in side roads for the day, at the expense of residents parking. The previous businesses at the property were run with an appointment system and parking was not an issue. This may well not be the case if it becomes residential.</p>

		<p>Concerned that there would be a lack of available parking for the number of dwellings and not enough on-site parking for the small retail unit. There is no available parking during the day and very little in the evening for residents due to the large numbers of commuters parking here.</p> <p>I have a general concern that the parking of vehicles for the 'new' QPS building will have an impact on the surrounding residential roads. Residents frequently have to park in other roads and the number of cars parked in the roads by commuters in the day makes them inaccessible for locals/residents to use/park. The previous businesses in QPS house very rarely had an impact as used by locals and ran on mostly on an appointment basis.</p> <p>CF - As a village with approx 2000 dwellings Bramley is woefully short of retail opportunities. This site is the only unused one near the centre of the village and to allow it to be converted to yet more flats would be a severe mistake. The inclusion of "retail" in this plan is insulting as the area is no bigger than a broom cupboard. Despite the applicant stating that work has not started there have been several skips of building remains removed from the site in the last few months together with deliveries of building materials. We, as a village, have more than enough small housing units with more being completed all the time. We have already lost a business unit at Minchens Court in exchange for tiny flats.</p> <p>I feel we should be cautious in using the parking situation as an objection as it would apply equally to an all retail outcome.</p>	
3.	<p>20/00811/HSE - 6 Tudor Close Bramley Erection of rear extension to garage, two dormer windows to front elevation of garage and conversion of roofspace to additional living accommodation</p>	<p>AM - The extension does not seem to be taking up any more space towards neighbouring property boundaries, but does appear to be of significant size that might impact the light and privacy of the neighbour. I am unaware of previous application and any objections, so would be guided by other parish councillors on proposed objections or acceptance.</p> <p>MB - Only basis for objection would be the shading and the close proximity to the neighbour house causing shading of patio as per Churchlands</p>	<p>Objection The proposed extension is of significant size, and has close proximity to the neighbour's property (similar to rejected applications for number 6 Churchlands). First floor windows will overlook the neighbouring garden, and it is likely that the extension will shade a portion of the neighbouring property.</p>

		<p>EC – No comments.</p> <p>CF - Very bulky extension almost on the boundary and first floor windows will overlook neighbouring garden.</p>	
4.	<p>20/00803/RET - Welling Cottage Sherfield Road Bramley</p> <p>Erection of single storey side extension to form store</p>	<p>AM - No objections from me</p> <p>MB - No objection</p> <p>EC – All ok. Been up a while if I am correct and not attracted complaints even though a bit close to neighbour boundary.</p> <p>CF – No objection</p>	No objection
5.	<p>20/00812/HSE - 6 Kirby Drive Bramley Tadley</p> <p>Erection of single storey front/side extension and porch</p>	<p>AM - No objections from me</p> <p>MB - No Objection</p> <p>EC – All ok.</p> <p>CF – No objection</p>	No objection
6.	<p>20/00822/HSE - 4 Oakmead Bramley</p> <p>Erection of single storey rear extension</p>	<p>AM - No objections from me</p> <p>MB - No objection</p> <p>EC – No objections</p> <p>CF – No objection</p>	No objection
7.	<p>20/00879/LDPO - 6 Yew Tree Close Bramley</p> <p>Certificate of lawfulness for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to replace existing conservatory</p>	<p>AM - No objections from me.</p> <p>MB - No objections</p> <p>EC – No objections.</p> <p>CF – No objection</p>	No objection