

Minutes
Berrick Salome Parish Council
9th Jun, 2016

An Extraordinary Meeting of the Berrick Salome Parish Council was held in the Village Hall, Berrick Salome, on Thursday 9th Jun, 2016 to consider the Planning Application ([P16/S1388/HH](#)) for Cases Court, Berrick Salome.

Present:

Hannah Bradley [HB](Vice-chair) – who chaired the meeting
Craig Tribe [CT] (Treasurer)
Steve Rhodes [SR] Councillor
Chris Cussens [CC] (Clerk)

Nigel and Jane Nixon, who have made the application
Michael Tebbot [MT], their architect
11 parishioners

1. Apologies received

Ian Glyn, David Bridgland, Douglas Taylor, Jeanne Underwood, Chris and Anne Kilduff, Dennis Cooper

2. Presentation of the Application

This was provided by the architect, Michael Tebbot. Details are available from the SODC website as follows:-

- [Application Form](#)
- [Elevations and plans](#)
- [Floor and Elevations](#)
- [Design and Access Statement](#)

3. Summary of Responses received by the Parish Council

| Response type | No of Responses |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Strong Objection | 3 |
| Some Objections | 1 |
| Some Concerns | 3 |
| Neutral | 1 |
| No Objection | 3 |

4. Additional Comments from the Parish Council

4.1. CT asked where the new access to the property would be. MT explained that it would be moved approximately 20 metres towards the triangle to provide safer ingress and exit; in doing this, no tree clearance would be necessary. In response to a question, no highway survey has been carried out.

It was pointed out that the new access point was not shown on the plans published on the SODC website and the council were being asked to accept this point purely on a verbal statement, which was unacceptable. MT stated that this information has been filed with SODC and OCC as part of the application, even though the website does not show this.

The Parish Council were requested to ask SODC for clarity on this point.

5. Comments from Parishioners in attendance

5.1. Guy Slocombe

5.1.1. In isolation, the development has merit, but we do need to look at it in the context of its location.

The PC should look at the conditions which prevailed at the time the bungalows were built in the 1970s. GS will accept the decision of the PC and SODC, but is concerned that acceptance of the application will set a precedent for further double storey buildings within the triangle; it is vital that consideration of the application should take this into account.

- 5.1.2. I wonder whether there may have been an element of kite flying in the application, in that a larger development might have been applied for than may have been required, with the intent of securing approval for a smaller but acceptable scheme. If that is the case, we should see what the acceptable scheme is.
- 5.1.3. In conclusion, I would happily support the decision of the PC and the local planning authority.
- 5.1.4. MT responded to point 5.1.3 above by emphasising that 'form follows function' and that to do otherwise may well produce an abomination. It will not happen.
- 5.2. Jim Whitworth
- 5.2.1. The application states "There is no relevant planning history on this application site." This is odd, in that there is considerable relevant planning history. In 1973, as was relevant at that time for conservation areas, it was stated that there should be no conversion of any roof void and this condition was expected to apply in perpetuity.
- 5.2.2. If permission were granted and subsequently the existing foundations were not approved for current building regulations to support the increased loading that the additional storey caused, might a demolition and rebuild of the existing site be necessary?
MT reported that (a) Nigel Nixon is a well respected structural engineer and (b) they have commissioned an independent structural assessment, who reported that the foundations would be more than adequate to support the application.
- 5.2.3. I disagree with the comment from GS that the subjective measure of the structure has merit.
- 5.2.4. The current view from Allnutts (essentially foliage and sky plus a portion of the roof of Cases Court) would be significantly blocked by the new development. Allnutts is a building of significant historic value.
- 5.2.5. Would the development of a new block, centred at the heart of the village work? It would directly abut a conservation area, which extends across the road from Allnutts and Graces Farm.
- 5.2.6. If permission is given for this development, then the very considerable step taken in the original planning permission of preventing structure in the roof void in perpetuity will have been effectively cancelled out. Then any future Secretary of State will be unable to turn down any applications from the other two bungalows for building in the roof void.
- 5.2.7. I personally believe that were we talking about a planning application to demolish Cases Court and its replacement by a two or one and a half storey building of architectural merit, which is of merit to the environment and historical buildings and of merit to the village, I'm sure we would all support it. But we are not. We are talking about imposing a big structure on historic buildings which were the foundation of this village. I have already objected to the application and object to it again today. If necessary, I will personally take this objection to the Secretary of State and will do everything in my power to stop it.
- 5.3. Ellie Cross
- 5.3.1. There is a building of one and a half storeys in Roke, which can be looked at to get some idea of possibilities. Details from Ellie.
- 5.3.2. People need to be able to expand to accommodate their growing families and people from outside the area.
- 5.4. David Langston
- 5.4.1. I'm concerned about the mass of the building, which could be overwhelming, especially as it would sit prominently in the centre of the village. HB said that we had received similar comments from elsewhere, all of which the PC would consider.
- 5.4.2. Could the difference in ridge height between a one and a half storey building and a two storey building please be clarified? MT said that was difficult to generalise and depended on the design of the options.
- 5.5. Dennis Cooper. As requested, the following was read out by HB:-
I am recording the Wallingford Talking Newspaper tonight and therefore cannot be at the meeting. As one of the original purchasers of the site, I thought this might be useful.
The plot was purchased from Mr. Anthony Hoddinot of Graces Farm in the early spring of 1975, with planning permission for two houses already granted. During the application for three houses, objections were raised from the inhabitants of Wellers Close who considered their view would be inhibited by the new proposal; no objection was raised by the vender. As a consequence of those objections, planning was granted for three bungalows. The view of our properties from Wellers Close is now obstructed by

the planting which has taken place over the following years.

We have no practical objection to the proposed development at Cases Court, as we don't believe it will really affect us, although we are unsure of its final appearance. This is a new application and should be treated as such, with the present planting being considered.

6. Views of Parish Councillors

6.1. CT.

6.1.1. The occupants of Graces Farm and Allnutts make valid points.

6.1.2. There could be a self-interest from the other two bungalows in the triangle; one raised no objection and the other didn't reply. Acceptance of the application could enable them to apply for another storey in the future.

6.1.3. It appears that not all information from SODC has been made available to us.

6.2. SR

6.2.1. I live relatively close to Cases Court and from a personal perspective am neutral to the application. But in representing our parishioners, I have to take account of their views, especially those who live closer.

6.2.2. I'm also concerned about the opportunity for the other two bungalows to raise their height should the application be accepted.

7. Decision

7.1. CT started off being fairly neutral, but having heard all the arguments now votes for rejection. He would like to emphasise that the Parish Council don't themselves have the power to turn down an application – only give their recommendation to SODC.

7.2. SR also started out neutral, but having heard all the arguments, would now favour rejection.

7.3. HB agrees with the above councillors and given the need to support the views of parishioners, especially those living close to the application, HB supports rejection.

Conclusion: The Parish Council will recommend to SODC that the application be refused.

SignedChairman

Date