

CHOLSEY PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

Meeting	Wednesday 18 th April 2018 at 7.30pm in the Pavilion, Station Road, Cholsey
Chair	M. Gray
Attendees	P. Jenkins, M. Dyer-Lynch, I. Neill, P. Turner, V. Artenne, V. Bolt, J. Adelson, P. Ramsay and M. Kaposy.
Apologies	P. Taylor and R. Whitfield

223	<p>To hear questions or comments from members of the public about planning issues (max 15 mins).</p> <p>The previous owner of The Old Bake House reported her concerns about the plans for the house. She feels that the plans are substantial and inappropriate for the listed building. However, she does feel that the removal of the render has improved the appearance of the building.</p> <p>Mr Raynor who has been researching the history of the village believes that the plans are not sympathetic to the history of the building. He also expressed concerns that the widening of the entrance could lead to the loss of an on street parking space.</p>																																						
224	<p>To receive Declarations of Interest for any planning applications</p> <p>Cllr Gray declared a personal interest in the planning application P18/S0710/HH and P18/S0711/LB as he is a neighbour and took no part in the discussion.</p>																																						
225	<p>To consider Planning Applications as at 11th April 2018:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;">P18/S0710/HH</td> <td>The Old Bake House, Ilges Lane</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P18/S0711/LB</td> <td>1. Replacement and extension of existing kitchen structure (built in 1985), including extension of existing cloakroom and addition of a porch to easterly side of house.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amended</td> <td>Mr Jenkins took council through the application. Concerns were raised that the plans are not in keeping with the listed building. It was also noted that the 1985 extension was part of the 1986 listing of the building and should therefore not be removed. It was agreed that the need to protect listed buildings needs to be balanced with the need to improve buildings for modern living but alterations should be sympathetic. Mr Jenkins proposed refusal.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Ramsay</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2. Replacement of two existing first floor windows and addition of one first floor window, one sun tunnel and two roof lights.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>There were no objections though it was agreed overlooking windows should be opaque glass.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mrs Bolt</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>3. Realignment of existing red brick garden wall and additional walling. To accommodate a hard standing for parking.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>The work has already been started and it was considered that this was a retrospective application rather than an amendment. Council had no objections to the realignment of the wall but would like to see as many original bricks reused as possible. Concerns were raised about the hard standing being sympathetic to the setting of the building. Mr Jenkins proposed approval.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mrs Bolt</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> </table>	P18/S0710/HH	The Old Bake House, Ilges Lane	P18/S0711/LB	1. Replacement and extension of existing kitchen structure (built in 1985), including extension of existing cloakroom and addition of a porch to easterly side of house.	Amended	Mr Jenkins took council through the application. Concerns were raised that the plans are not in keeping with the listed building. It was also noted that the 1985 extension was part of the 1986 listing of the building and should therefore not be removed. It was agreed that the need to protect listed buildings needs to be balanced with the need to improve buildings for modern living but alterations should be sympathetic. Mr Jenkins proposed refusal.		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Ramsay</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mr Ramsay	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention		2. Replacement of two existing first floor windows and addition of one first floor window, one sun tunnel and two roof lights.		There were no objections though it was agreed overlooking windows should be opaque glass.		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mrs Bolt</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mrs Bolt	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention		3. Realignment of existing red brick garden wall and additional walling. To accommodate a hard standing for parking.		The work has already been started and it was considered that this was a retrospective application rather than an amendment. Council had no objections to the realignment of the wall but would like to see as many original bricks reused as possible. Concerns were raised about the hard standing being sympathetic to the setting of the building. Mr Jenkins proposed approval.		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mrs Bolt</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mrs Bolt	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention
P18/S0710/HH	The Old Bake House, Ilges Lane																																						
P18/S0711/LB	1. Replacement and extension of existing kitchen structure (built in 1985), including extension of existing cloakroom and addition of a porch to easterly side of house.																																						
Amended	Mr Jenkins took council through the application. Concerns were raised that the plans are not in keeping with the listed building. It was also noted that the 1985 extension was part of the 1986 listing of the building and should therefore not be removed. It was agreed that the need to protect listed buildings needs to be balanced with the need to improve buildings for modern living but alterations should be sympathetic. Mr Jenkins proposed refusal.																																						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Ramsay</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mr Ramsay	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention																																
Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mr Ramsay	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention																																		
	2. Replacement of two existing first floor windows and addition of one first floor window, one sun tunnel and two roof lights.																																						
	There were no objections though it was agreed overlooking windows should be opaque glass.																																						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mrs Bolt</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mrs Bolt	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention																																
Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mrs Bolt	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention																																		
	3. Realignment of existing red brick garden wall and additional walling. To accommodate a hard standing for parking.																																						
	The work has already been started and it was considered that this was a retrospective application rather than an amendment. Council had no objections to the realignment of the wall but would like to see as many original bricks reused as possible. Concerns were raised about the hard standing being sympathetic to the setting of the building. Mr Jenkins proposed approval.																																						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Proposed</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mr Jenkins</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Seconded</td> <td style="width: 20%;">Mrs Bolt</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Carried</td> <td style="width: 30%;">9 in favour 1 Abstention</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mrs Bolt	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention																																
Proposed	Mr Jenkins	Seconded	Mrs Bolt	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention																																		

CHOLSEY PARISH COUNCIL

		<p>4. Reinstatement of original garden gate with automation, plus new gate posts and new pedestrian gate to match original. (as amended by drawing no. OP1001A and OP1002A to include new hard standing for parking received on 27 March 2018) Concerns were raised about the potential loss of an on road parking space. Mrs Bolt proposed No Strong Views on condition that there was no loss of a parking space.</p>					
		Proposed	Mr Bolt	Seconded	Mr Jenkins	Carried	9 in favour 1 Abstention
226	<p>To note planning decisions received: P17/S2330/FUL Cholsey Cricket Club – Storage Shed – Approved P18/S0365/HH Mulberry House – Single storey side extension - Approved P18/S0464/LDP5 Queens Road – Dormer - Approved</p>						
227	<p>Items for Report It was agreed to pay £60 for defibrillator training at the Annual Parish Meeting. It was noted that the Maintenance Person has been signed off work due to an injury. It was agreed to obtain more gravel for the car park.</p>						