

## Minutes

### Planning and Development Committee Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2020 at 7:30pm



#### PRESENT:

Councillors: A Dearlove (Chair)  
D Macdonald  
P Siggers  
P Giesberg  
M Walsh  
J Durman

Officers: G Langton (Planning & Environment Officer)  
J Wheeler (Town Clerk)

Others: J Basey (Didcot resident)  
P Churchward (Didcot resident)  
Councillor E Hards (non-Committee member)  
Councillor A Hudson (non-Committee member)  
Councillor D Rouane (non-Committee member)  
Lee McCandless (ALDI)  
Chris Towers (Mercian Developments / ALDI)  
Theo Dennison (MPC)

**Lee McCandless**, the property director for ADLI UK address the Committee advising it that ADLI proposed to erect a second store close to Didcot on the Didcot Road in Harwell. The site was identified as a brownfield site (currently Zulu Farm). The proposed store would be approx. 20% bigger than the current one in east Didcot, at 1350sqm, would provide shoppers with 110 parking spaces (including blue badge and parent/child). Additionally, at first 4 EV charge points would be offered, but the base infrastructure for 20 would be installed. The site had been chosen to extent ALDI's offer to the residents of Didcot and the surrounding villages and would be ideally placed to serve further development at Valley Park. He summarised the benefits as follows:

- Improved food store offer
- Reduced travel through town for shopping
- Up to 40 jobs for local people

- A high quality, sustainable building with electric vehicle charging points
- 110 car parking spaces, including designated blue badge bays, parent & child parking
- Use of brownfield site
- Retained and improved landscaping

### Proposed site location



### Proposed layout



Councillor Walsh asked for clarity on the time frames for the build and if there were plans to close the current store?

C Towers confirmed that the plan was to seek preapplication advice from Oxfordshire County Council and the District Council in due course. Much depended

on the response to the preapplication, but the intention was to submit a full planning proposal in 2021 with a view to opening the store in 2022.

LMcC confirmed that there were no plans to close the current store but to add the proposed location as a second store serving the area.

Councillor Dearlove asked if the planned store was the same size as the current one?

LMcC confirmed it was approx.. 20% larger, though the extra size was largely taken up with wider aisles to enable a more free-flowing experience for customers.

### **Public Participation**

**J Basey addressed** the Committee reporting her concerns with and strong opposition to the proposal for an HMO on Barnes Road (P20/S3014/FUL). She noted that the property had already received permission to be a 6-bedroom HMO earlier in the summer and that the developer had continued the work to extend to accommodate 9-bedrooms prior to submitting this proposal. In her view tis breached planning regulations and she had reported the matter, SODC had confirmed that they would only investigate once this proposal had been determined.

JB was further concerned that the proposal had space for only 4 cars but that the HMO could house up to 18 people and they may all have cars or similar vehicles. She considered this to be likely to cause a dangerous parking situation in Barnes and adjacent roads. This concern was heightened by the use of the road for cycling proficiency training by the local school.

**P Churchward addressed** the Committee echoing JB's points and reporting that residents of the HMO were causing a local nuisance by smoking outside the property and by leaning out of the windows, the building being a no-smoking residence.

**Councillor Hudson** also echoed the comments made by the residents. He also noted that the property was close to two road junctions, which would mean there were no local on-street parking facilities.

**Councillor Hards** notified the Committee that South Oxfordshire District Council had a policy regarding HMOs in its Local Plan 2011 (policy H11), which was to be carried forward into the emerging Local Plan (as policy H17).

Councillor Dearlove thanked the members of the public and Councillors for their contributions.

#### **101. To receive apologies.**

Councillor Mallows tendered her apologies.

#### **102. To receive declarations of interest.**

No member declared a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda.

**103. To approve the draft minutes of the meeting held online at Zoom.us on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020.**

Councillor Dearlove noted that there was a typographical error in the minutes at paragraph 2 of Dr Hards' address to the Council, where the word 'an' had been substituted for the word 'and'.

Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Macdonald seconded and it was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes with the typographical amendment noted above. All members agreed. The minutes would be signed by the Chair in due course.

**104. Questions on the minutes as to the progress of any item (progress report).**

Meeting	Progress	Next Steps	Responsible
16.09.2020	Responses submitted as resolved	N/A	N/A
16.09.2020	Meetings arranged for working party to respond to the Government White Paper Consultation, "Planning for the Future".	Receive the recommended response for noting.	Working Group.

No member had a question regarding the minutes or the progress of any item. Councillor Dearlove reported that he had requested the District Councillors call the determination of the proposal at 186 Abingdon Road (P20/S2959/FUL) before the SODC Planning Committee for determination.

**105. To note the minutes of Traffic Advisory Group meeting held on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2020.**

The Committee noted the minutes.

Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Macdonald seconded and it was **RESOLVED** to receive the minutes and to include plans for a consultation on Civil Parking Enforcement to be included on the agenda for the scheduled meeting to be held on the 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

**106. To receive an update from the Government White Paper Consultation, "Planning for the Future" working group.**

Councillor Dearlove reported that the first meeting had been held, with two further planned to draft the Council's response to the white paper consultation.

**107. To note registration of an existing commercial address.  
Kumon, Unit 1D Market Place, DIDCOT OX11 7LE**

The Committee noted the registration.

## 108. To consider responding to the SODC Local Plan Main Modifications Consultation (attached report).

Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Macdonald seconded and it was **RESOLVED** to postpone consideration of this item until the scheduled 28<sup>th</sup> October meeting of this Committee.

## 109. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### Proposals for Comment

South Oxfordshire District Council	
a) Application	<a href="#">P20/S3014/FUL</a> 16 Barnes Road Didcot OX11 8JL
Proposal	Change of use from a 6-bed HMO (use-class C4) to a 9-bed Sui Generis HMO. Fenestration alterations.
Response date	1 <sup>st</sup> October 2020 – extension approved to 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2020
Agreed response	<p>Councillor Macdonald proposed, Councillor Walsh seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED to object</b> to the proposal on the following grounds (all members agreed):</p> <p><b>Traffic generation, parking and highway safety.</b> The developer had planned only 4 on-site parking spaces for the proposed 9-bedroom HMO. All nine bedrooms were sized to accommodate a double bed and therefore could reasonably be assumed to accommodate two people. The total number of occupants would therefore be up to eighteen, each of whom could have a car. The proposer has therefore proposed to convert a family home into an HMO that could have up to eighteen cars associated with it, not including visitors. There is insufficient parking for the nine bedrooms on site, meaning that extra cars would overspill onto the road. The property was located close to two road junctions, limiting the available kerb-side parking close to the property. There is no consideration for parking dedicated to those with limited mobility.</p> <p>The Council is aware that the local school uses this stretch of highway for cycling proficiency training and is concerned that increased traffic and parking would have an adverse impact on the safety of the children undertaking this training.</p> <p>The proposer indicates that “A bike store would also be provided in the property’s rear garden, with through access to the streetscene without entering the property” (para 5.18, PLANNING, DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT). No indication of the number of cycles to be stored is written. SODC Local Plan 2011, appendix 5 notes the minimal standards to be 1 per 1 bed plus space for visitors.</p> <p><b>Amenity considerations.</b> The Council was concerned that the extensions to the property and the number of likely occupants amounted to an over-development of the area. Being an HMO, the bedrooms are more regularly occupied than in a family home, meaning they overlook the neighbouring and adjacent properties more regularly. The HMO has been let as a no-smoking property, but the current residents are all smokers. A large number of adults smoking outside the property or by leaning out of windows would significantly increase the air pollution in the immediate vicinity. A large number of adults would also increase the noise</p>

associated with the property, with lifestyles that do not blend well with the suburban family environment.

The proposed HMO is an extensively extended family home, considerably increasing the scale and bulk of an already substantial property.

The significant increase in residents would produce commensurate increase in waste generation. This would include household waste and recycling, foul water and drainage.

**Contrary to the South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan 2011 (2006).** Retained policy H11 from the SODC Local Plan 2011 (adopted 2006) states:

*The sub-division of dwellings and conversions to multiple occupation will be permitted within the built-up area of settlements provided that the development:*

- (i) would not harm the amenity of the occupants of nearby properties;*
- (ii) is appropriate in terms of the size of the property and the proposed internal layout, access, private amenity space and car parking provision;*
- (iii) would not adversely affect the character of the building or the surrounding residential area; and*
- (iv) would not result in environmental or highway objections.*

*Paragraph 5.53 of the Plan further clarifies that:*

“... subdivision and conversion to multiple occupation will not be permitted if it would result in access problems, overdevelopment, lack of garden space, lack of car parking space and a general alteration to the character of the property and the residential character of the area, either on its own or cumulatively. The introduction of large areas of hard surfaces for car parking in gardens will be resisted where it would be detrimental to the character of the area.”

The Council believes that the proposal would harm the amenity of the occupants, as stated above.

The Council believes that the proposal is inappropriate in terms of its size, scale and bulk.

The Council believes that the proposal to replace a family home with a very large HMO would significantly affect the character of the area.

The Council believes that the probable increase in cars would necessarily negatively affect parking. Indeed, it notes that the OCC Highways Officer concluded that there would be no objections providing the developer adhered to four conditions. The Council notes that two are to be in place prior to the first occupation of the property.

The Council understands that a proposal must be considered on the evidence presented in the application. In this case it is aware that the property was being advertised with nine rooms to rent, prior to the determination of the proposal. Indeed anecdotally it appears that only one of the nine rooms is yet to be occupied, thus demonstrating that the work to convert the family home to a nine-bedroom HMO was in fact already complete, significantly in advance of the permission being granted or refused by the District Council.

The Council understands that local residents have brought this to the attention of the SODC Planning Enforcement Team but have been told that whilst the proposal is yet to be determined, no further action would be taken. The Council considers this to be a regrettably missed opportunity to halt the continuing, indeed virtually complete conversion of the property to a large HMO.

Councillor Dearlove stated his intention to request the ward District Councillor call the matter before the SODC Planning Committee for determination, noting that members of the public would also be able to address that Committee.

		Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Macdonald seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit a case to the SODC Planning Enforcement Team. All members agreed)
<b>b)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<a href="#">P20/S3104/HH</a> 5 Haydon Road Didcot Oxon OX11 7JB
	<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing extension: erection of a single storey rear extension.
	<b>Response date</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> October 2020 – extension approved to 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2020
	<b>Agreed response</b>	Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Siggers seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objections</b> to the application. All members agreed.
<b>c)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<a href="#">P20/S3310/HH</a> 4 Mowbray Road Didcot OX11 8SS
	<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing conservatory, construction of new single storey rear extension with associated internal alterations. Alterations to existing outbuilding. Revision to approval P19/S3267/HH due to location of a Lateral Drain.
	<b>Agreed response</b>	Councillor Macdonald proposed, Councillor Siggers seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objections</b> to the application. Four members agreed, one abstained.
	<b>Response date</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> October 2020 – extension requested to 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2020
<b>d)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<a href="#">P20/S2255/FUL</a> 47 Lynmouth Road Didcot OX11 8PW Amendment 1
	<b>Proposal</b>	New Dwelling (As amended by Drawing PL01 Rev B altering the garden sizes of the existing and proposed dwelling)  <u>DTC previous response:</u> The Council objects to the proposal on grounds of: <i>Over-development:</i> The Committee notes that the properties along Lynmouth Road were designed and built as 3-bedroom dwellings rather than 2-bedroom, as indicated in the proposal paperwork. This is relevant as a 3-bedroom dwelling requires more amenity space than a two-bedroom one, 100m <sup>2</sup> rather than 50m <sup>2</sup> . This concern is compounded in the case of number 45, which has already been significantly extended. The Council is concerned that the property would lack the required amenity space, and remains uninformed as the proposer did not indicate the space for that property in the application. <i>Unneighbourly:</i> the street scene on Glebe Road would be negatively impacted. Currently a relatively narrow access to the garage would be widened. Cars would continue to be parked but this area would become the property's front garden, with the potential to change the aesthetic that garden's provide. <i>Highways and parking:</i> The proposal would remove the parking for number 47. Whilst it includes the possibility of including parking at the front of the existing

		property, the property is adjacent to the junction and amended parking could cause safety and access issues.
	<b>Response date</b>	Original date: 5 <sup>th</sup> October 2020  Extended to: 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2020
	<b>Agreed response</b>	<p>Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Macdonald seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to <b>object</b> to the application for the following reasons (all members agreed):</p> <p>The Council re-iterated its previous objections, considering them to remain valid, as follows:</p> <p><b>Over-development:</b> <i>The Committee notes that the properties along Lynmouth Road were designed and built as 3-bedroom dwellings rather than 2-bedroom, as indicated in the proposal paperwork. This is relevant as a 3-bedroom dwelling requires more amenity space than a two-bedroom one, 100m2 rather than 50m2. This concern is compounded in the case of number 45, which has already been significantly extended. The Council is concerned that the property would lack the required amenity space, and remains uninformed as the proposer did not indicate the space for that property in the application.</i></p> <p><b>Unneighbourly:</b> <i>the street scene on Glebe Road would be negatively impacted. Currently a relatively narrow access to the garage would be widened. Cars would continue to be parked but this area would become the property's front garden, with the potential to change the aesthetic that garden's provide.</i></p> <p><b>Highways and parking:</b> <i>The proposal would remove the parking for number 47. Whilst it includes the possibility of including parking at the front of the existing property, the property is adjacent to the junction and amended parking could cause safety and access issues.</i></p> <p>Further, having reviewed the amended proposal, the Council considers that the provision of cycle parking does not comply with policy T2 of the South Oxfordshire district Council Local Plan 2011, where note (d) associated with Appendix 5 (Parking Standards) states "All cycle parking facilities to be secure and located in convenient positions." (SODC Local Plan p265).</p>
<b>e)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<p><a href="#">P20/S2763/FUL</a>      Former Natwest Bank 124 Broadway Didcot OX11 8AD</p>
	<b>Amended Proposal</b>	<p>Amendment: No. 1 - dated 24th September 2020 Erection of a part single part two-storey roof infill extension with rear roof dormer to create additional residential accommodation. (as amplified by email from agent dated 24 September 2020 in relation to Town Council's objections).</p>
	<b>Response date</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> October 2020



	Agreed response	<p>Councillor Macdonald proposed, Councillor Siggers seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to <b>object</b> to the application for the following reasons (all members agreed):</p> <p>The Council believed that no material changes had been made to the proposal and agreed to re-submit its previous objections:</p> <p><i>The Committee considered that the two extra storeys would put greater pressure on the limited amenity space that the developments affords. Flat 2, for example would only have windows at the bottom of a 3-storey high light well which is far from acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>There is no space to park cars at the property or in the immediate local area. Occupiers may well have cars and this needs to be considered. There is virtually no outdoor amenity space. The Committee recognises that there are two parks within a 20-minute walk but would point out that many uses an outdoor amenity space at one's dwelling is put to cannot be done in a park – you can't hang your washing out in a park, for example. The plans show space for 3 bicycles. Six flats 1-bedroom flats with no parking could be expected to attract more than three bicycles.</i></p> <p><i>The access to the flats was narrow on the ground floor already and is narrower still as the storeys rise. There is no clear demonstration of how people with limited mobility could be expected to access the upper floors.</i></p> <p><i>There was no space for bin storage, with the originally proposed 3 flats, the solution of keeping the bins on the street could have been suitable but for 6 flats it is not. Secure bin storage with access to the street should be a requirement to ensure the development does not have a negative impact on public health.</i></p>	
f)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S3336/HH</a>	52 Ottery Way Didcot OX11 7UG
	Proposal	Part single/two storey rear extension	
	Response date	21 <sup>st</sup> October 2020	
	Agreed response	Councillor Macdonald proposed, Councillor Siggers seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objection</b> . All members agreed.	
g)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S3222/FUL</a>	50 Bluebell Lane Didcot OX11 6GN
	Proposal	Change of use of land from drainage to residential, whilst retaining drainage function (ditch). Install covered decking area over drainage ditch and remove fence between house and rear boundary. Erection of fence on raise platform. Repositioning of access gate for ditch maintenance.	

Response date	22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2020	
Agreed response	Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Siggers seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objection</b> but to make comments as follows (all members agreed):  Concern was noted that the accessibility of the drainage ditch that was to be covered over would be minimal, with an opening of 1mx2m to access the resulting <72cm high ditch. Access would be required for the land-owner to exercise their riparian duties to maintain the 7m+ ditch length under the decking to allow for effective drainage. Covering a ditch would allow for more debris to build up undetected than if it remained open – ‘out of sight, out of mind’ – again not supporting the drainage function of the ditch. Finally, the collection of debris could encourage rats and other pests, detrimental to public health.	
h) Application	<a href="#">P20/S3410/HH</a>	26 Portway Didcot OX11 0BE
Proposal	Single storey extension at the front.	
Response date	22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2020	
Agreed response	Councillor Walsh proposed, Councillor Giesberg seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objections</b> to the application. All members agreed.	
i) Application	<a href="#">P20/S2915/HH</a>	22 Portway Didcot OX11 0BE
Proposal	Small single storey extension to the front and conversion of garage (storage)	
Response date	22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2020	
Agreed response	Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Macdonald seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objections</b> to the application. All members agreed.	
j) Application	<a href="#">P20/S3414/HH</a>	28 Portway Didcot OX11 0BE
Proposal	Single storey extension at the front.	
Response date	22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2020	
Agreed response	Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Siggers seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objections</b> to the application. All members agreed.	

## 110. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT

The Committee noted the below listed applications.

A)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S3323/LDP</a>	29 Sorrel Crescent Didcot OX11 6HQ
	Proposal	Certificate of Lawful use for a single storey rear conservatory extension.	
B)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S3029/HH</a>	11 St Hilda's Close Didcot OX11 9UU
	Proposal	<p>For information only. Amendment: No. 1 - dated 24th September 2020 Conversion of the rear section of the garage of 11 St Hilda's Close into a home office, without compliance with condition 4 of planning permission P92/W0066/RM. The office space would be ancillary to the dwelling and provide a suitable office space for personal use and home working if necessary.</p> <p>The floor area of the office will be 300 x 283cm leaving 340 x 265cm for the storing of general waste bin, recycling and garden waste bins, bicycle and gardening &amp; DIY tools.</p> <p>The garage is no longer used for parking cars as it is quite narrow and not suitable for modern cars. The property has two parking spaces on the driveway and there will be no effect on the public road .</p> <p>There will be no external alterations to the front of the building and therefore no impact on the street frontage. (as amended by plan RFP-1424-WW-B1-00-A-0000-B which amends the site plan excluding highway land)</p>	
B)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S3320/LDP</a>	86 Oxford Crescent DIDCOT Oxon OX11 7AX
	Proposal	New fence	

## 111. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted that no appeals had been submitted.

## 112. APPLICATIONS APPROVED

The Committee noted the below listed approvals.

Didcot Town Council's recommendation	Planning Application Number	Proposal and Address
Support with comment that the proposed extension would add usable space to	P20/S2598/HH	17 Wheatfields Didcot OX11 0BQ Proposed ground floor rear extension

the dwelling.		
No strong views	P20/S2626/HH	9 Kynaston Road Didcot OX11 8HE Two-storey rear extension. Conservatory. Front porch extension.
No objections	P20/S2528/HH	37 Edwin Road Didcot OX11 8LQ Single storey rear and two storey side extension.
No strong views	P20/S2601/HH	10 Buckingham Close Didcot OX11 8TX Erection of single storey rear extension and first floor side extension.
No objections	P20/S2148/HH	38 Kynaston Road Didcot OX11 8HD Proposed two storey rear extension to dwelling and new garage
No objections	P20/S0658/HH	16 Bowness Avenue Didcot OX11 8NG Erection of orangery to the rear. (As amended by drawing received 14 September 2020, moving the side wall of the proposed extension away from the neighbouring boundary)
No strong views	P20/S2507/HH	56 Roding Way Didcot OX11 7RQ Renewal of previous planning permission (ref:P16/S4108/HH) for a 2 storey side extension to add increased living accommodation and a bedroom on the first floor.
No strong views.	P20/S2682/FUL	Unit C2 Bizspace Didcot Didcot Enterprize Centre Hawksworth OX11 7PH Change of use to Taxi Office.
Most recent response was to not add to previous responses as response date was short.	P19/S4416/RM	Former Didcot A Power Station Purchas Road Didcot
Support: Pitched roofs improve the street scene.	P20/S2420/HH	Remove concrete flat roof on garage, replace with pitched roof.

		24 Fairacres Road DIDCOT Oxon OX11 8QG
Support: Pitched roofs improve the street scene.	P20/S2419/HH	Remove concrete flat roof on garage, replace with pitched roof. 26 Fairacres Road DIDCOT Oxon OX11 8QG
Ho objections. However, the Committee considered that whilst garages formed part of the parking spaces allotted to each dwelling, they were invariably too small to fit a vehicle so the loss of a garage would have no extra effect on parking problems in the immediate area.	P20/S1968/HH	Conversion of garage into additional living space (as amended by drwng no.003A to correct naming error received on 23 September 2020) 14 Yealm Close Didcot Oxon OX11 7XD

### 113. APPLICATIONS REFUSED

The Committee noted the below listed refusals.

<b>Didcot Town Council's recommendation</b>	<b>Planning Application Number</b>	<b>Proposal and Address</b>
<p>The Council objects to the proposal identified above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed dwelling would be too close to the trees, which were subject to tree protection orders. The Committee noted concern that a new occupier of the proposed property would wish to modify the trees to improve the light to their garden and into the house. The Committee noted that the submitted tree root protection zone diagram demonstrated that the proposed property would be built over the protected root zone.</li> <li>• The Committee was also concerned that the vehicular access to the property was narrow. There would not be sufficient parking for residents and visitors in what is an already congested area for parking.</li> </ul>	P20/S2483/FUL	<p>12 Norreys Close Didcot OX11 0AS</p> <p>Construction of new detached two bedroom house</p>

### 114. APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

The Committee noted the below listed withdrawals.

Didcot Town Council's recommendation	Planning Application Number	Proposal and Address
No response – application was for permitted change.	P20/S2869/N5E	Unit 7 Hawksworth DIDCOT OX11 7HR Change of use from light industrial unit into a leisure facility.

## 115. APPLICATIONS REFERRED

The Committee noted that no applications had been referred.

## 116. To consider the Committee's budget for FY 2021-22 (attached report).

Following Councillor Dearlove's proposal, the Committee agreed to consider this item at the end of the meeting.

Councillor Dearlove proposed, Councillor Macdonald seconded and it was **RESOLVED** to consider the detail of the FY 2021-22 budget lines listed below, totalling £13,000 at a future meeting before presentation to the Finance and General Purposes Committee, then on to Full Council for approval, all members agreed.

Heading	Amount	For
Traffic surveys	£1,000	The Traffic Advisory Group has received a budget for conducting traffic surveys in the past, currently coded as 1272.
Printing & publicity of planning applications	£1,500	SODC no longer print planning applications. Following the change to the District Council's processes in response to the Covid-19 restrictions, paper copies of planning applications have not been produced since March 2020. In a letter sent to all towns and parishes in April 2020, Adrian Duffield stated that the DC intended <i>"to continue with this practice for the long-term as it is more environmentally friendly, supports our council's aims of becoming carbon neutral, and it has helped to reduce costs"</i> . The Town Council may therefore have to print copies should members of the public visit the Civic Hall to view the application in hard copy. Members of the public still ask to see hard copies at the Town Council offices. The Town Council is only able to print to a maximum of A3 size. The Committee considers that larger formats would be

		<p>required if and when face to face meetings return and/or to provide to members of the public to review at the Council Offices.</p> <p>Broader planning activities such as the Gateway redevelopment or extensions of Didcot to the extent of its parish boundaries could be considered to require the Council to engage directly with residents, remotely or face to face (when circumstances allow). Publicity would be required to ensure the fullest possible engagement.</p>
Public Consultations	£3,000	<p>The Traffic Advisory Group has agreed to progress plans for the consultation of local residents with regard to civil parking enforcement. Other consultation exercises may be forthcoming for large planning consultations and other development activity, such as detail of section 106 and section 38 agreements. Venues may need to be rented</p>
Professional fees	£5,000	<p>The Town Council may need specialist help when considering applications, for example Hydrologists can be engaged to provide specialist advice regarding flooding or waterlogging of land. The Town Council could benefit financially from a well-managed engagement with developers and the principle authorities. It is becoming more common practice for developers / District Councils to offer the management and maintenance of public open space, play areas, allotments (for example) to smaller authorities, along with some funding. To ensure the best outcome, even with the standard formula applied by the District Councils of £X per square metre, the instruction of a solicitor is advised to ensure the agreement drafted is to the best benefit of the smaller authority. A local Parish Council secured a S106 contribution in this way of in excess of £240,000 with an outlay of less than £1,000.</p> <p>The possible ALDI site just west of the Town in Harwell Parish could, for example, be seen as having an effect on the facilities of the own but infrastructure money would not be forthcoming without professional involvement, it would all be presented to Harwell Parish, though the store would be understood to be in Didcot.</p>
Signage	£2,500	<p>The Council has no road and limited other signage at present. The Royal British Legion has will be required to manage the Remembrance Day parades in future years and will need to</p>

		purchase or hire the required signage. The Council may wish to erect signs to assist with traffic calming for other works and events on its land also need similarly supporting.
Total	£13,000	

The meeting closed at 21:03

Signed: ..... Dated: .....