



**Minutes of the Meeting of the Kidlington Parish Council Planning Committee  
Held on Zoom at 6.30pm on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021**

**Present:** Cllr Doug Williamson, Cllr David Thurling, Cllr David Betts, Cllr Chris Pack, Cllr Cheryl Foulsham, Cllr Lucy Loveridge

**Apologies:** Cllr Alan Graham

**In attendance:** Joanne Gaul, Planning Officer

**20/P008:** Declarations of Interest - None

**20/P009:** The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2021 were approved as a true record

**20/P010:** The following Planning Applications were considered:

- |    |               |   |
|----|---------------|---|
| a. | 21/02755/F    | 12 School Road  |
|    | Proposal:     | Replace 3 no first floor window's to the rear elevation. New replacement door to second front door  |
|    | KPC Response: | No Comment  |
| b. | 21/02756/LB   | 12 School Road  |
|    | Proposal:     | Install stair lift. Replace 3no first floor windows to the rear elevation. New replacement door to second front door  |
|    | KPC Response: | No Comment  |
| c. | 21/02902/F    | 166 The Moors   |
|    | Proposal:     | Demolition of existing detached garage and store. Replace with new two storeys structure to provide garage and store on ground floor with link to house with studio / gym on the first floor. |
|    | KPC Response: | No objection  |
| d. | 21/03017/F    | 94 The Moors  |
|    | proposal:     | Demolition of existing dwelling house, garage and outbuilding. Erection of 2 x 5 bed detached dwelling houses (use class C3). Car parking and alterations to access and landscaping           |
|    | KPC Response: | Kidlington Parish Council objects on the grounds of the following reasons:  |

1. Scale and context: The Design and Access Statement (D&A) refers to numerous Cherwell Local Plan policies. KPC contests the reliance on policy ESD15 since in its view, this proposal is not sensitive to context through siting and layout – quite the reverse: the scale is too massive for the site by several degrees of magnitude. The proposed buildings extend to the rear far beyond the dwellings on either side, implying that the impact on neighbours has either not been considered as required by ESD15, or else has been ignored. KPC considers that the mass of the proposed development would be oppressive to the neighbours and is out of proportion to the site, especially to its width. For this reason, we do not agree with the assertions made in paragraphs 4.3–4.6 of the D&A statement.

2. Impact on traffic: Although KPC recognises that the provision of 2 parking spaces per dwelling conforms to the OCC standard, in the context of this application, we consider it wholly inadequate. In any case, we note that the area allocated to parking does not meet the required standard, and for this reason, we consider that the application should be refused.

Furthermore, even if the parking area were to comply with the required standards, there would be no accommodation for visitor parking. Therefore, the contention in paragraph 4.18 of the D&A statement that there would be no “harm to highway safety or convenience” is clearly false. Paragraph 4.18 goes on to say that “some change would be required to the parking bay on-street and the TRO which applies to this Controlled Parking Zone.” There is no on-street parking bay, and KPC would certainly object to a change of the TRO.

3. Ecology: The application is not supported by an ecology statement. Given the proximity of the site to open countryside and the presence, among other species, of protected reptiles in the immediate vicinity, KPC considers that an ecology survey and report is essential. The D&A statement refers to policy ESD10: “a net gain in biodiversity will be sought by protecting, managing, enhancing and extending existing resources.” KPC fails to understand how this policy can be complied with in the absence of a baseline survey. Ideally, we would like to see a detailed plan of how a net gain in biodiversity is to be achieved for this site.

Finally, it has not escaped our attention that the D&A statement refers to 2 houses each with 4 bedrooms, but the application is for two houses each with 5 bedrooms.

- |    |               |   |
|----|---------------|---|
| e. | 21/03036/F    | 68 Green Road   |
|    | Proposal:     | Two storey side extension   |
|    | KPC Response: | No objection  |
| f. | 21/01827/F    | 6 Kingsway Drive  |
|    | Proposal:     | Formation of means of access and associated dropped kerb  |
|    | KPC Response: | No comment  |
| g. | 21/02847/F    | 22 Barn Close   |
|    | Proposal:     | Single Storey extension at the side and rear  |
|    | KPC Response: | No objection  |
| h. | 21/03204/F    | 147 The Moors   |
|    | Proposal:     | Porch and single storey rear extension  |
|    | KPC Response: | No objection  |
| i. | 21/03150/REM  | Oxford University Development – For Information   |
|    | Proposal:     | Reserved matters application for 18/00803/OUT – the design, layout external appearance and landscaping. It also includes the information required by conditions 4, 5 and 21 of the OPP. Submitted scheme also accords with the requirements of conditions 6,7,8,9 and 14 of the OPP |
|    | KPC Response: | No comment  |

- j. 21/03271/TPO  
Proposal: Bishops Lodge, Mill Street  
T81 Horse Chestnut - Remove epicormics growth from main stem;  
T82 Sycamore - Crown lift to 4 meters;  
T83 Yew - Crown lift to 4 meters;  
T84 Yew - Crown lift to 4 meters;  
T85 Sycamore - Crown reduce by 5 meters in height and spread to suitable growth points where available;  
T86 Beech - Remove major dead wood. Crown lift to 4 meters.  
All of these works are recommended further to a Duty of Care survey to maintain the trees in a safe and attractive condition in line with good Arboricultural practice - Subject to TPO5/1997  
KPC Response: No Objection
- k. 21/03162/TCA  
Proposal: 6 School Road  
T1- Yew. Reduce the tree by 2m to manage as a more compact specimen. Crown raise the tree to 3m above ground level and prune the branches off the adjacent roof to give 1.5-2m clearance. T2- Holm Oak. Reduce the tree by 2m and trim to maintain as a 'domed' specimen as intended T3- Paulownia. Give the tree a light prune 300mm (secateurs work) to maintain its overall spread and form T4- Paper Mulberry. Reduce the tree by 1.5m to maintain as a more compact specimen T5- Paulownia. Fire damaged tree with large cavity present. Fell the tree to near ground level. T6- Prune the overhanging Ash branches back by 2m to allow more light filtration to the adjacent conifers  
KPC Response: No Objection

Meeting closed at 18.54 pm