



**Minutes of the Meeting of the Kidlington Parish Council Planning Committee
Held on Zoom at 5.30pm on Thursday 10 March 2022**

Present: Cllr Alan Graham, Cllr Doug Williamson, Cllr David Thurling, Cllr David Betts
Cllr Lucy Loveridge, Cllr Chris Pack

Apologies: None

In attendance: Joanne Gaul, Planning Officer

20/P008: Declarations of Interest - None

20/P009: The minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2022 were approved as a true record

20/P010: The following Planning Applications were considered:

- a) 22/00496/NMA Bury House, 55 Church Street
Proposal: Non-material amendment to 21/01217/F – addition of windows to gables and store
KPC Response: no comment

- b) 22/00425/F 7 Churchill Road
Proposal: Demolition of existing single level dwelling – Class C3 (a) – and erection of 4 no flats in single, 1.5 level building – class C3 (a)
KPC Response: Kidlington Parish Council objects on the following grounds:
 - 1. The parking provision associated with this development is insufficient, especially when considering that two of the flats are effectively showing three bedrooms (or equivalent). There are already substantial parking problems in this area of Churchill Road with overflow from Oxford Road business uses as well as associated with the residential properties in Churchill Road. The loss of on street parking associated with the provision of a substantive dropped kerb is a further detriment to the existing parking problems in the area.
 - 2. The development increases substantially the footprint of the existing dwelling with the impact of the proposed flats detrimental to the amenity of the adjoining properties
 - 3. The proposed development is out of character with the other properties in Churchill Road.
 - 4. The development on the road frontage, bringing forward the building line will change the character in the context of other housing in Churchill Road.
 - 5, The proposed screening to adjoining properties is inappropriate and an adequate alternative means of a fencing screen should be provided.

- c) 22/00427/F 42 White Way
 Proposal: Side extension of 1st floor
 KPC Response: no objection
- d) 22/00444/DISC 43 Cherwell Avenue
 Proposal: partial discharge of condition 3 (brick colour) of 20/00576/F
 KPC Response: no comment
- e) 22/00421/F 70 Benmead road
 Proposal: Two storey rear and single storey rear/front extensions (resubmission of 21/03953/F)
 KPC Response: no objection
- f) 22/00457/F 100 oxford Road
 Proposal: Single storey rear extension
 KPC Response: no objection
- g) 22/00502/F 26 Maple Avenue
 Proposal: Proposed demolition of existing of garage and erection of single storey side extension
 KPC Response: no objection
- h) 22/00539/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. (Resubmission of 21/03017/f)
 KPC Response: Kidlington Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:
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.

- i) 22/00528/F 89 Maple Avenue
Proposal: Proposed single storey front, side and rear extensions with associated internal and external works
KPC Response: no objection

- j) 22/0542/F 26 Crown Road
Proposal: Single storey rear extensions and connect house with existing outbuilding
KPC Response: no objection

- k) 22/00598/ADV Marshall Oxford
Proposal: Replacing Nissan Motors current signage with their identity
KPC Response: no comment

- l) 22/00597/F 79 Hazel Crescent
Proposal: Single storey front and rear infill extensions, conversion of existing single storey flat roof rear extension to pitched roof and associated internal and external works
KPC Response: no objection

Meeting Closed at 17.47