

**Minutes of a Hybrid Extra Ordinary Meeting of Stanford Dingley Parish Council held on
Tuesday 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm from the Club Room, Stanford Dingley.**

Present in the Club Room: Cllr. H. Fullerton (Chairman); Cllr. E. Hanrahan; Cllr. C. Dent; Cllr. A. Bucknell; Cllr. C. Plank; Mrs. H. Pratt (Clerk); Two members of the public.

Present virtually: Eighteen members of the public.

1 Apologies.

There were no apologies of absence.

2 Declaration of Interests.

2.1 Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items.

There were no declarations of interest in any agenda items.

2.2 Updates to the Register of Interests.

There were no updates to the Register of Interests.

3 Planning.

3.1 Planning applications on which SDPC has been consulted:

3.1.1 21/03162/FULD - Ivinghoe.

Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with a new dwelling and landscape enhancements.

The meeting was **closed** for members of the public to speak.

The applicant commented that the application is for a replacement dwelling and not a new dwelling. The existing dwelling is already prominent in the landscape. The proposed new dwelling is a modern, contemporary, vibrant design which will bring enhancements to the landscape, is designed with modern living in mind and will meet with modern standards. This application is different to the previous application in that the mass of the building is repositioned and reorientated on the site, there is a reduction in glazing, the garage is detached and there is a revised lighting plan. WBC determined in the last application that a dwelling of this size is acceptable on the site. The dwelling takes up 12% of the footprint of the site. Planting enhancements will be made to contribute to the site and harmonise with the local landscape.

All members of the public were given the opportunity to speak. In summary, everyone was of the opinion that the application itself was of a very high standard, however the opinions of the actual proposal were divided.

The following is a summary of the points made by parishioners both in support and objecting to the proposal:

- The site is not within the conservation area nor in the middle of the village.
- A traditional building would have a higher roof.
- The existing bungalow is an eyesore.
- The design deserves serious consideration.
- It is compared to Coach House Barn in Frilsham which is very prominent.
- It is not in keeping with Stanford Dingley.
- The site is now very prominent; it wasn't prior to the site being cleared of trees and hedgerows.
- The modifications since the last application are minor.
- Does the redevelopment of a small bungalow on this site open up other similar sites for redevelopment?
- The existing bungalow is preferred to the proposed dwelling.
- The proposed design is preferable to the existing bungalow.

- The proposed dwelling is not sufficiently part of the form of the landscape; something more sympathetic to the landscape would be better.
- The utility room has no external door.
- The building will be on show at one of the entrances to Stanford Dingley and there's a wish to see something really brilliant.
- The proposed dwelling is a viewing platform (with stunning views). The views of the dwelling should be as good as the views from the dwelling.
- This is not the right design for the plot or in Stanford Dingley.
- The dwelling will be too obvious from the road.
- Lots of the design is very interesting, but this is not the right place.
- The volume is a massive increase on the existing bungalow.

After parishioners made their comments, the applicant commented that nothing on the site had been worth preserving. The utility room has no door, because the dwelling has been embedded more into the hill.

The meeting was **reopened**.

Cllr. Fullerton commented that the comments made by parishioners had been very balanced, but there appeared to be more objection than support for the proposal.

Cllr. Bucknell commented that she is generally very supportive of planning, and is not against redevelopment of the site. Without landscaping, the proposal will be very prominent and a distraction. The proposed landscaping is being used to balance the size and bulk of the proposal, but is very transient.

Cllr. Dent commented on the increased prominence from the road and that the reduction in glazing will starker the building. The proposal is a very modern cubist design in a very prominent position in the parish. He noted that the increase at 2nd floor level goes from 0.72m² to 138m². There has been insufficient change since the last application to alter the case officer's refusal.

Cllr. Hanrahan commented that the plans and design were of high quality and the mix of materials did represent traditional rural shades and textures. The landscaping has to form part of the application; one cannot be judged without the other. The village cannot be preserved in aspic. He raised concerns about the outdoor lighting positioning.

Cllr. Plank raised concerns about the size of the build, but acknowledged that other small bungalows and houses had been massively extended.

Cllr. Fullerton commented that people are wrong to say that the bungalow is bad. The site is on one of the main entrances to the village and is very prominent in the whole valley. The parish councillors have to consider the parish in the long term. Whilst he doesn't object to flat roofs, they must be in the right places. Stanford Dingley has a Design Statement, but there is nothing in the proposal which acknowledges it.

Two councillors offered no objection to the application and three councillors offered objection, therefore BPC **objects** to this application.

Members of the parish were asked to submit their comments to WBC, whether they were in support or against the application.

4 **Date of next meeting:**

SDPC: Monday 7th March 2022 at 7.30pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.35pm.

Signed:

Date: