

## Didcot Town Council

---



### Planning and Development Committee Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020 at 7:30pm Online at Zoom.us (or via your device app).

#### **PRESENT:**

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

Officers: G Langton (Planning & Environment Officer)

Others: Dr N Hards  
Cllr P Davies (non-committee member)

#### **Public Participation**

**Dr N Hards** addressed the Committee on the subject of planning proposal P20/S2959/FUL. He informed the Committee that he had submitted a detailed objection to the proposal to the District Council and had provided a copy to the members of this Committee. Dr N Hards confirmed that he lived next door to the property identified in the proposal.

He outlined his reasons for objection to the Committee, which were:

The site was not suitable for a block of apartments. The pavement in the area was narrow and on one side of the road only in places. There were no suitable crossing places near the property to allow residents to walk to the centre of the town or its other amenities, so was not sustainable if the resident had no car available. The proposer had only included 10 car parking spaces for 8 flats. He considered 8 flats to result in over 10 cars being owned by the residents and more when visitors were taken into account. He noted that the developer had sought to compare the site with one that had a similar development on Park Road. Park Road benefits from full-width pavements on both sides and is a reasonable walk or cycle ride from the centre of town. He did not consider there to be any comparison between the two locations.

The proposed building would be too tall, significantly taller than the neighbouring properties, many of which were single storey or single storey with converted loft space. Further, the layout of the property would mean that windows and doors would overlook number 184. Both points were considered unneighbourly.

The area in front of the property which used to be on the site was under water

during the July 2007 floods. Nearby homes were flooded. Sewage escaped from septic tanks. There was no full report on flood risk submitted. The proposal was within 20 metres of at least two watercourses, which was not acknowledged by the applicant. The proposed drainage solution by the developer had been soakaways, which Dr Hards noted would not work, the soil in the area being dense clay which was all but impermeable. Surface water would therefore have to be directed to the existing drains or water courses, which could easily become overwhelmed by the storm and foul water from such a substantial block of dwellings. He noted that the land had permission for two 4-bedroom houses but considered 8 apartments to be likely to produce more waste water than two family homes.

Cllr Dearlove asked if the property was in a flood zone identified on the Environment Agency maps?

Dr Hards replied saying it was not, having been downgraded in previous years.

Cllr Dearlove thanked Dr Hards for addressing the Committee.

**Cllr P Davies** addressed the Committee on two points on the agenda.

Regarding the FCC proposed development north west of the town, 'Radcot Green', he urged the Committee to keep the requirements of LTN1/20 and Oxfordshire County Council with regards to non-vehicular transport.

Regarding proposal P20/S1968/HH, he noted that when the Ladygrove estate was developed, the various developers included the garages as a parking space, so any removal of garages would result in further on road parking being required by the residents of the property.

Cllr Dearlove thanked Cllr Davies for addressing the Committee, noting that the 'Radcot Green' proposal was not for consideration as it was not yet a formal proposal but that the Committee recognised the importance of LTN1/20.

#### **87. To receive apologies.**

No member submitted their apologies.

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

No member declared a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda. Cllrs Macdonald, Siggers, Walsh and Dearlove all declared they knew Dr N Hards, the neighbour of the plot considered at 8(e) P20/S2959/FUL.

Cllr Durman declared he lived on St Hilda's close, the road where 8(d) P20/S3029/HH was situated.

#### **89. To approve the draft minutes of the meeting held online at Zoom.us on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2020.**

The Officer noted that Cllr Hards had contacted him to request the recorded minute at Public Participation referred to her as Cllr Hards rather than as the Mayor as she had addressed the Committee as a Councillor, not the Mayor.

Cllr Giesberg noted a transposition on page A14 and proposed changing the paragraph from:

*Cllr Macdonald noted that Cllr Rouane had recently reported to the Council that SODC has a Housing Land Supply of 5.35 years based on the current plan, which remains in place until the emerging Local Plan is adopted, which evidences 9.15 years.*

To:

*Cllr Macdonald noted that Cllr Rouane had recently reported to the Council that SODC has a Housing Land Supply of 9.15 years based on the current plan, which remains in place until the emerging Local Plan is adopted, which evidences 5.35 years.*

Cllr Dearlove proposed, Cllr Macdonald seconded and it was RESOLVED to approve the minutes as a true and accurate record with the above amendments. All agreed.

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

Meeting	Progress	Next Steps	Responsible
26 <sup>th</sup> August 2020	Responses submitted as agreed	n/a	n/a

No member had a question regarding the minutes or the progress of any item.

**91. To note plans for 'Radcot Green', Sutton Courtenay at FCC Environment Site. ([Appendix 1](#)).**

The Committee noted the plans.

**92. To receive a report from members following the meeting with OCC Officers regarding the HIF1 plans.**

Cllr Dearlove reported that four members had attended a meeting with OCC (Cllr Dearlove, Cllr Macdonald, Cllr Durman and Cllr Davies) along with the Planning & Environment Officer. He reported that the cost was estimated at £234 million, with £218 million being provided by central government and the remainder from the County Council. He noted that the Committee had considered the proposals as part of a consultation exercise and the Officers from OCC had brought revised plans to present to the members. OCC had aligned with the recommendations of LTN1/20 where possible but acknowledged that this had not been possible along all parts of the route. Cllr Davies had requested cycle routes be aligned for easier use of road crossings and other similar junctions. He noted that the design included access to the Thames path and other footpaths and cycle routes along the length of the road.

Cllr Macdonald noted that the aspects that would affect Didcot the most would be the widening of the A4130 and the 'science bridge'. The A4130 would become a dual carriageway, with a drainage swale along the centre. The design of the bridge itself would be utilitarian, with no underpasses because of financial constraints. She reported that OCC were aware that the perimeter road would have to be competed to Hadden Hill to gain the most benefit from the improved infrastructure.

**93. To consider a request from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council to establish a line of communication and to liaise on planning matters.**

Cllr Dearlove proposed, Cllr Giesberg seconded and it was **RESOLVED** to work more closely with neighbouring parishes by inviting members to meet with this Committee immediately prior to scheduled meetings and discuss matters of joint interest. All members agreed.

**94. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**Proposals for Comment**

<b>South Oxfordshire District Council</b>			
<b>a)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b><u><a href="#">P20/S2850/HH</a></u></b>	<b>95 Park Road Didcot OX11 8QT</b>
Proposal	Demolish existing conservatory and rear extension. Form two, two storey extensions.		
Response date	12 <sup>th</sup> September 2020 – extended to 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2020		
Agreed response	<p>Cllr Walsh proposed, Cllr Macdonald seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to <b>object</b> to the proposal. 4 voted for, 2 against and 1 abstained. The Committee considered that the proposed extension would represent an unneighbourly increase in the scale and bulk of this property. This would result in a loss of light for the neighbouring property to the north, bringing the extended building significantly closer to number 97.</p> <p>The proposed extensions do not continue the current roof or building lines of the existing property and would result in a property that was out of proportion to others in the vicinity.</p>		
<p>It was proposed by Cllr Macdonald, seconded by Cllr Dearlove and <b>RESOLVED</b> to consider item 8(e) at this point on the agenda. All agreed.</p>			
<b>e)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b><u><a href="#">P20/S2959/FUL</a></u></b>	<b>186 Abingdon Road Didcot OX11 9BP</b>
Proposal	Erection of a detached two-storey building comprising eight apartments (four 1-bedroom and four 2-bedroom) with access, parking and amenity space		
Response date	19 <sup>th</sup> September 2020		
Agreed response	<p>Cllr Mallows proposed, Cllr Walsh seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to <b>object</b> to the proposal. All members agreed. The Committee considered that the proposal was unsuitable for the immediate area. It was too large, being significantly larger than all other buildings proximate to it. The parking was too limited for the likely number of vehicles the apartment block's residents would own. This was compounded by the relative remoteness of the setting, with limited safe pedestrian and cycle links to the town and its amenities. It was noted that there are no amenities such as shops or other services within walking distance. Furthermore, the access to the parking is narrow.</p> <p>The proximity to the neighbouring property raises concerns that the adjacent proposed apartments would overlook the property. The design of the apartments themselves raised concerns over the levels of light that would come into some of the apartments, so leaving them dark.</p>		

		Finally, the Committee was concerned that the drainage solutions for the site had not been fully explored. The local drainage ditches were known to fill and overtop in periods of heavy rain being on a clay subsoil. For the same reason, the soakaway drains suggested for water runoff would not be sufficiently effective. For foul and sewerage drainage, a block of eight apartments would put more pressure on the infrastructure that the previously proposed two four-bedroom houses.
<b>b)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<a href="#">P20/S2763/FUL</a> <b>Former Natwest Bank 124 Broadway Didcot OX11 8AD</b>
	<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of a part single part two-storey roof infill extension with rear roof dormer to create additional residential accommodation
	<b>Response date</b>	11 <sup>th</sup> September 2020 – extended to 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
	<b>Agreed response</b>	<p>Cllr Macdonald proposed, Cllr Siggers seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to <b>object</b> to this proposal. 6 members were in favour and 1 against. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>c)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<a href="#">P20/S1968/HH</a> <b>14 Yealm Close Didcot Oxon OX11 7XD</b>
	<b>Proposal</b>	Conversion of garage into additional living space. Change front elevation from a garage door to a brick wall and window in keeping with the property.
	<b>Response date</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> September 2020 - extended to 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
	<b>Agreed response</b>	Cllr Dearlove proposed, Cllr Giesberg seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit a <b>comment</b> . All members agreed. 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.
<b>d)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<a href="#">P20/S3029/HH</a> <b>11 St Hildas Close Didcot OX11 9UU</b>
	<b>Proposal</b>	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. 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 & DIY tools. 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. There will be no external alterations to the front of the building and therefore no impact on the street frontage.
	Response date	15 <sup>th</sup> September 2020 - extended to 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
	Agreed response	Cllr Dearlove proposed, Cllr Durman seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objection</b> to this proposal. All members agreed.
<b>f)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b><u><a href="#">P20/S2687/FUL</a></u>      <b>Didcot Baptist Church 43 Wantage Road Didcot OX11 0BS</b></b>
	Proposal	Demolition of two wooden utility sheds. Erection of a prefabricated metal insulated cabin (6m x 2m x 2.4m high) on a new concrete base, to be laid at the rear of an existing brick-built hall at Didcot Baptist Church, within and adjacent to the present church southern boundary fence. The addition of a further window in the said hall, facing the proposed cabin.
	Response date	18 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
	Agreed response	Cllr Dearlove proposed, Cllr Macdonald seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objection</b> to this proposal. 6 members agreed and 1 abstained.
<b>g)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b><u><a href="#">P20/S3106/HH</a></u>      <b>28 Saxons Way Didcot OX11 9RA</b></b>
	Proposal	Proposed demolition of the existing conservatory, ground floor rear Extension.
	Response date	29 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
	Agreed response	Cllr Dearlove proposed, Cllr Durman seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>no objection</b> to this proposal. All members agreed.
<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b>		
<b>h)</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b><u><a href="#">12.6.189/JaC</a></u>      <b>Collett (Didcot Industrial Park)</b></b>
	Proposal	To consider OCC plans to introduce No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) in Collett on both sides of the road, from a point 67 metres south of its junction with Hawksworth southwards for 145 metres. ( <a href="#">Appendix 2</a> ).
	Response date	25 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
	Agreed response	Cllr Dearlove proposed, Cllr Macdonald seconded and it was <b>RESOLVED</b> to submit <b>comment</b> for this proposal. All members agreed. The Committee welcomed the plans to install double-yellow line parking restrictions in the area but were concerned that if the restrictions were not enforced, then there would be little change.

## 95. APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT

The Committee noted the below listed proposals.

A)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S2827/LDP</a>	<b>4 Sutherland Beck Didcot OX11 7FF</b>
	Proposal	Certificate of Lawful use to demolish existing conservatory and erect a single storey extension to rear of existing dwelling house.	
B)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S2783/LDP</a>	<b>19 Penpont Water Didcot OX11 7LR</b>
	Proposal	Certificate of Lawful use for the installation of a new first floor dormer window to the rear elevation.	
B)	Application	<a href="#">P20/S2869/N5E</a>	<b>Unit 7 Hawksworth D IDCOT OX11 7HR</b>
	Proposal	Change of use from light industrial unit into a leisure facility.	

## 96. PLANNING RESPONSES TO NOTE

The Committee noted that it had considered the proposal by email and agreed that it had no further comment to make.

A)	Application	<a href="#">P19/S4416/RM</a>	<b>Former Didcot A Power Station Purchas Road Didcot</b>
	Proposal	Reserved Matters application following Outline approval P19/S1967/FUL for the Construction of link road and the realignment of Purchas Road.(as amended by plans and information received 23 March 2020, 15 June 2020 and 18 August 2020). (Mixed use redevelopment comprising up to 400 dwellings (C3), 110,000ms of Class B2/B8 units, 25,000m2 of Class B1 units, 13,000m2 Class A1 units (includes 1,500m2 convenience food store), 150 bed Class C1 hotel and 500m2 of Class A3/A4 pub/restaurant, including link road, related open space, landscaping and drainage infrastructure, together with reservation of land for link road and Science Bridge. Cross boundary application Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire. As amended by Updated EA and Master Plan213042-PL-03 Rev G.)	
	Outcome	Four members of the Committee responded by email to say they did not see any reason to revise the Committee's most recent comment, given the nature of the amendment.	

## 97. APPLICATIONS APPROVED

The Committee noted the below listed approvals.

### South Oxfordshire

Didcot Town Council's recommendation	Planning Application Number	Proposal and Address
<p>Objection on grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Distance of the proposed annexe dwelling from the road, approximately 80m, would cause access problems for emergency personnel. The proposed structure is close to the surrounding fences on 3 sides, restricting access should it be required.</li> <li>- Single access/egress from the annexe. No separate fire exit is included.</li> <li>- Concern that the proposal was not for an annexe, but for a separate self-contained dwelling.</li> <li>- Unneighbourly. As above, it is close to the surrounding fences on three sides. As shown by 3D view 2 submitted, the structure would be higher than the current fence tops. It would be visible from many gardens away.</li> <li>- Access for maintenance is a cause for concern. Again, being close to the fence borders on</li> </ul>	<p><b>P20/S1708/HH</b></p>	<p><b>70 Norreys Road Didcot OX11 0AN</b> Proposed outbuilding for use as a self-contained annex. To comprise a bedroom, kitchen / living room, WC and shower room for use by elderly relatives when visiting.</p>

Agenda items 11 to 14  
Applications Approved, Refused, Withdrawn and Referred

3 sides, the sides and rear would be hard to access for the purposes of maintenance.		
No objections	<b>P20/S2056/FUL</b>	<b>26 Manor Road Didcot OX11 7JY</b> New barn-style dwelling together with associated access, garden and other related works.
No objections	<b>P20/S2020/HH</b>	<b>3 Pixton Close Didcot OX11 0BX</b> First floor rear extension creating a new bedroom. Demolish existing garage and erect a new timber framed storeroom to rear of garden area. New porch to front elevation.
No objections	<b>P20/S2284/HH</b>	<b>58 Edinburgh Drive Didcot OX11 7HU</b> Infill of existing ground floor entrance door with new WC. Highway crossover extended and boundary wall adapted.
Comment that the Council expect that the applicant would be responsible for the relocation of the lamppost to reduce the possibility of vehicle collision.	<b>P20/S1664/HH</b>	<b>8 Meadow Way Didcot OX11 0AU</b> Extended dropped kerb
No objections	<b>P20/S2188/HH</b>	<b>37 Wheatfields Didcot OX11 0BQ</b> Timber framed summerhouse in rear garden
No objections	<b>P20/S2216/HH</b>	<b>29 Edinburgh Drive Didcot OX11 7HS</b> Demolition of outbuildings. Erection of new two storey side and single storey rear extensions. Drop kerb to highway to facilitate new parking space to be created.

## 98. APPLICATIONS REFUSED

The Committee noted the below listed refusals.

### South Oxfordshire

Didcot Town Council's recommendation	Planning Application Number	Address
Objection on grounds of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic &amp; Highway safety</li> <li>- Amenity considerations</li> <li>- Previous Planning decisions</li> <li>- Parking spaces</li> </ul>	<b>P20/S0365/FUL</b>	<b>Land off Brasenose Road and Freeman Road Didcot Oxfordshire. OX11 7BP</b> Proposed construction of four terraced three-storey dwellings and one detached two-storey dwelling. (As amended by revised Ownership Certificate B received 20 April 2020).

## 99. APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

The Committee noted the below listed withdrawals.

### South Oxfordshire

Didcot Town Council's recommendation	Planning Application Number	Proposal and Address
Objection on grounds of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic &amp; Highway safety</li> <li>- Amenity considerations</li> <li>- Previous Planning decisions</li> <li>- Parking spaces</li> </ul>	<b>P20/S0369/FUL</b>	<b>Land off Brasenose Road and Freeman Road Didcot Oxfordshire</b> Proposed construction of three two-storey detached dwellings. (As amended by revised Ownership Certificate B received 20 April 2020)

**100. APPLICATIONS REFERRED**

**The Committee noted that no applications had been referred.**

**South Oxfordshire District Council**

<b>Didcot Town Council's recommendation</b>	<b>Planning Application Number</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>South Oxfordshire District Council Officer's recommendation</b>
None			

The meeting closed at 20:50.

Signed: .....

Dated: .....