

Mr A C Jones

19/02902/FUL

Shading and loss of light

In the last year there have been 189 Objections to building flats on this site, all from people living in Long Hanborough, interestingly out of all the people supporting the development only 9 actually live in Long Hanborough.

There have now been four amendments to the building of flats on this site, each time the footprint increases encroaching ever closer to the boundary of Abelwood road, from originally over 20mts away down to 12mts to 9mts and now under 8 Mts. Flat 9 is 7.4mts high and would have an overbearing impact on the properties in Abelwood road putting their gardens and conservatories in shade during winter months.

From 9.30am -11.30am the garden room windows of no 15 and the conservatory of No 11 Abelwood Road would be almost 100% in shade for approximately 90 mins each.

From 12.30pm -2.30pm the conservatory of No 7 and the windows to the lounge of No 5 Abelwood Road would be almost 100% in shade as well for approximately 90mins each.

The Shading Analysis model fails, as it does not look in detail at the shading of these five south facing properties in Abelwood during the winter months. However when it is analysed hour by hour it not only shows all five gardens are put in shade every day in mid winter, it also shows the shadow of flat No 9 moving across the conservatories and garden rooms reaching 2.4 Mts high at 2 hours either side of noon on the winter solstice.

If this development were to go ahead flat No 9 would tower over these properties putting their gardens and conservatories in shade during the mid winter months with **substantial loss of light**. These properties have had full winter sunlight for 54 years, several of the residents have all lived there for 54 years, I find this to be totally unacceptable.

Flat No 9 has no windows only high level Velux's, leaving no alternative fire escape route who would ever want to buy this flat! The surrounding neighbours are fearful that windows threatening their privacy will be installed at a later date.

The small car park only shows 11 spaces whereas 12 spaces would be required to comply with 9 flats as two are disabled spaces. With only one guest space we are concerned it will lead to double parking and with little room to turn around this could quite easily lead to visitors forced to reverse back out across the pavement on to the main road.

There is also grave concern as with 9 flats there will be many delivery vans etc obstructing the view of the pedestrian crossing where the school children cross twice a day.

There are currently 27 one bed properties for sale in Witney under £230,000 and several more one bed properties in the pipe line on other developments in our village.

With a national shortage of bungalows and 7 flats already built wouldn't this be an opportunity to redress the balance and build two new bungalows which is no doubt what the vast majority of our village community would wish, however if flats were to win the day I feel that the offending flat No 9 is one flat to many.

A C Jones

Planning Reference 19/02902/FUL: Nos 2 and 4 Witney Road Long Hanborough

Statement for Uplands planning sub-committee meeting Monday July 6th

From Reverend Dr Richard Armitage and Mrs Heather Armitage No 6, Witney Road

Subsequent to our previous objections:

This development would be 3 units deep.

Other similar developments, including 39, Witney Road are one only unit deep.

This depth would set a precedent for similar developments in villages.

The height from ground level appears to have grown from 7:07 metres to **approximately** 7.4 metres.

What does approximately mean, is the height being allowed to increase?

It would not meet Policy H6 : WODC Local Plan.

- Replace an existing dwelling '*on a 1:1 basis*' – this development is on a 4.5 for one basis
- It would not be '*of a reasonable scale relative to the original building*'
- Nor '*in keeping with the character of surrounding properties*': a bungalow, the Recreation Hall and the conservation area cottages

It would:

- Be only 5 metres from the rear east facing windows and 4 metres from the garden of No 6 Witney Road
- Afford an overbearing view of Units 5 and 9 from No 6 Witney Road , the fence is 1.83 metres high, lower than 2 metres
- Have a major impact on the amenity, living conditions and quality of life of No 6

The proposed silver birch trees would be:

- Less than 1 metre from the walls and foundations of No 6
- Less than 0.5 metres from the sewer drain
- Grow to severely shade the east facing solar panels of No 6

Hanborough Parish Council objection to Application 19/02902/FUL

For Uplands Planning Committee Meeting, 6 July 2020

On a site not even comfortable for two small bungalows, the applicant would, following their demolition, crowd in a block of nine flats. This is not residential infilling but overpacking, bad design, and construction in the wrong place.

The proposed building would have serious impacts on all four sides of its setting: on houses to the left and rear, on the community Recreation Hall to the right, and on the A4095 to the front. Houses to the left and rear would be overlooked, significantly depriving them of light, harming living conditions and severely reducing their existing amenities; all generations use the Recreation Hall from early morning until late evening for community activities. The visibility of east facing windows of the proposed building violates the safety and privacy of those using the Hall for these uses.

Access to and from the site, crossing a pavement that is a designated pedestrian-cyclist path, is directly onto the A4095, which is heavily congested for long periods at rush-hour; immediately opposite a bus-stop used for school buses; next to a much-used pelican-crossing; and next to the access to the adjacent and regularly used Recreation Hall carpark. If refuse collection does not take place within the site, for which, however, there is no turning area for the trucks, trucks would delay traffic by parking on the A4095 to collect community bins from within the site.

Because two designated disabled parking bays are allocated, insufficient parking spaces, 11 and not 12, have been provided. This does not satisfy the NPPF's requirement of efficient and safe delivery of goods and access by service and emergency vehicles.

The building would create an overbearing structure totally out of keeping with the streetscape, its height dominating 6 Witney Road and the Recreation Hall, and out of line with the adjacent row of detached houses, which are all set back behind deep front gardens.

Four of the nine proposed flats are located in restricted dimensions under the eaves of the building, and seemingly not offering sufficient space for useable or walkable floor height. Flat 9 only has four sky velux roof windows, two of which are small.

HPC is puzzled why the application, which is not for the conversion of an existing house with an attic, but for a new building includes dwellings that may not satisfy the NPPF requirement for high standards of amenity for occupants. Some of the dwellings are unlikely to meet the requirements of housing associations.

HPC urges WODC to refuse permission for this dense development. Even if there is a market for one-bedroom flats in Hanborough, which recent new developments probably satisfy, that should not permit the building of dwellings that has such an unacceptable impact on the amenities and safety of the neighbourhood.

Speech:

Hello, my name is Luke Carter, I am the applicant and the developer of this site. We first met just a year ago when 39 Witney Road Long Hanborough was brought up in front of the committee for 7 flats which was approved after a site visit. We bought this site you are looking at today at the same time as 39 Witney Road, after getting positive feedback from a pre-app to do a similar thing, the site has been with the planning team for over 18 months and has been through a rigorous planning process.

What we are trying to achieve is very simple, we want to give local people a choice of being able to afford to live in a village that otherwise does not cater for them. Our mission is to build small flats/houses that are incredibly well built, beautiful to look at and built to the highest standards. This is NOT being provided by larger developers and I always believed and now have evidence to show that they are in great demand: in under 8 months we have built and nearly finished 39 Witney rd and to date sold 5 of the 7 units off plan on the development, such is the demand for 1 bed units.

The average house price according to Zoopla in Long Hanborough is £447,000 this does not allow downsizers or first-time buyers the opportunity to live here, this must change. Our demand is clearly shown and has been documented by Murry Burnett the head of strategic planning at WODC, saying that over 50% of those on "Homeseeker Plus" in Long Hanborough are looking for 1 bed units. Estate agents tell us they have over 200 applicants looking for 1 bed homes, and no stock to sell to them.

Predominantly our buyers are over 60 and are single females. We have one first time buyer and one investment property. Which means that we have increased the stock of smaller properties available to locals for rent. We are filling a need that is clearly there and not being satisfied by other larger developers. We already have 5 registered people who want to buy flats in the development that is in front of you now, this is helped by its proximity to the centre of Long Hanborough. These are predominantly local people who have family in the village or surrounding villages and are looking to downsize but do not want to live in a retirement village. When I first stood in front of you, I sincerely thought the majority of the flats would be sold to First time buyers, I have to say I completely underestimated the demand for those who were downsizing and therefore freeing up larger stock for families moving to the area.

This is a middle ground; not a retirement village or a youth centre but well built, attractive buildings that are finished impeccably. They can and will become little communities within communities. There is already a community spirit in our first development.

We have owned this site for 18 months and we believe that we have satisfied all the requirements that have been asked from us in planning terms, relating to size, shape, form, design, and have carried out extensive studies and redesigns to make sure that no neighbour is adversely affected in any way INCLUDING the SHADOWING of all gardens. We would therefore like to ask for your support to help us bring more small scale, traditionally built, first time buyer and downsizer homes to Long Hanborough to satisfy the demand and fulfil community needs.

I thank you for your time and would like to extend an invitation to invite any councillors that would like to see our work to feel free and get in contact, I would love to show you around our current project.

BURFORD TOWN COUNCIL

Submission to Uplands Planning Committee re Application No: 20/00307/FUL Extension of Guildenford Car Park, Burford

My name is John White and I'm the Mayor of Burford so this submission is made on behalf of Burford Town Council.

It's difficult to know where to start. Perhaps the best point of departure is WODC's own car parking strategy which firmly concludes that Burford needs and deserves 200 extra car parking spaces. That has never been acted upon by WODC, no doubt for good and sufficient reasons principally involving finance, so BTC has taken the initiative, found a site and lodged this application. And your permanent officials throw up their hands in horror and say "A car park, we can't have a car park in Burford" and trot out a number of reasons. But it is merely an extension of your own car park! None of the reasons for refusal put forward this time were deemed worthy of being taken into account when you built your car park. The Church was there, all the listed buildings were there, nothing has changed except the trees have grown and offer better screening.

My word allowance does not permit my dealing with all the reasons for refusal but I must deal with two. The first is the so called flood risk. Yes, the extension, if built, will be in a flood plain. So is your car park. It floods a couple of times a year and drains away the next day. So what? It is not a housing development. The flood "risk" is only that a few visitors may get their feet wet because they've forgotten their wellies. The drainage of your car park is not perfect but, given the technological advances made since your car park was built, the extension will drain far more efficiently. The second reason for refusal I should deal with is the suggestion by English Heritage that there would be harm to the significance of the Church (not an allegation that the Church itself has made – please note) and we have not demonstrated that such harm is justified. We contend that there will be no harm, certainly none has been created by your own car park, and in any event the view is from private land and will only be seen by trespassers, the odd poacher and romantically inclined couples.

2.

But it is the accusation that we have not justified any harm there may be that cuts to the quick. The application was prepared and lodged long before Covid-19 and lockdown the combined effect of which has devastated Burford High Street. We now have 12 empty shops, likely to rise to 15. The High Street must be regenerated to restore the tourist economy of Burford and its contribution to the tourist economy of West Oxfordshire, second only to Woodstock and Blenheim. That means more visitors, therefore more cars, therefore more parking spaces. We urge you to grant the application.

John White – Mayor of Burford

July 2020

**Planning Committee Address, Farm Camp, Soho Farmhouse, Great Tew
Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee July 6th 2020**

Application reference 20/00905/FUL

As the applicant we are aware that there has been an objection made by Enstone Parish Council to the proposed camp site at Soho Farmhouse. We understand that there is some concern about the creation of a carpark on agricultural land. It appears that there has been some misunderstanding with regards to this matter, as there is currently no carpark at the camp site and the application does not propose the formation of a car park. Unfortunately, we were not able to attend the Parish's meeting to clarify this.

The camp site has 15 bell tents and has been operating at full capacity since the summer of 2016 under a camping licence exemption certificate. During this time the traffic associated with the camp site and the cumulative impact of traffic from Soho Farmhouse on the local road network has been fully counted and considered not only by independent transport consultants PFA Consulting Ltd, but also by OCC Transport Development Control Officers and WODC. Given the shared access and parking arrangements for the entire site, it was not possible to remove the campsite traffic from other traffic visiting the site for the purposes of those assessments.

Critically, in relation to this application (and those preceding it), those impacts have been found to be acceptable in terms of what the NPPF says in paragraphs 108 and 109 with regard to transport, in particular:

"Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. (para 109)."

We note that OCC Highways has reviewed the application and have raised no objection, confirming: *"The proposal, if permitted, will not have a significant detrimental impact (in terms of highway safety and convenience) on the adjacent highway network."*

We also note the specific comment from Enstone Parish Council about how peaceful the roads have been over the course of the last few months. As members will no doubt be aware, since the Government implemented a full statutory lockdown on March 23rd, all roads in the UK have experienced significantly less traffic and all of us using the roads for daily exercise have greatly enjoyed this. Now that places of work, schools and non-essential shops have re-opened the amount of traffic on the roads is inevitably increasing towards the levels experienced prior to lockdown.

Whilst the re-opening of the hospitality sector on July 4th will result in a further marginal increase in traffic movements on the roads everywhere, this has no bearing on the merits of this application. The traffic movements associated with Soho Farmhouse, including those movements

associated with the camp site have already been considered fully and have been found to be acceptable on highways and traffic grounds.

All things being considered, the camp site will have no additional impact on the local road network and suitable measures are already in place to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel. The volume of vehicle movements accessing the site will not change as a result of this proposal and has been found to be acceptable previously and not to cause undue detriment on the local road network.

Statement to be read to Members of the Uplands Planning Committee at the Meeting on Monday 6 July 2020

Reference Planning Application 20/00991/FUL

Objector: Alan Vickers owner of property (Kelcot) adjacent to the site under consideration on the Western side and representing all households with properties along the Western side.

This application **goes completely against the requirement of Policy EH10** that a development should “not harm views within, into or out of the Conservation Area”. As with all previous applications, **this latest application does not consider at all the impact from the Western Side of the site**. There are no photographs or drawings by the applicant or the Planning Department showing how Policy EH10 would be broken.

In fact it is easily demonstrated that the effect of the building on Plot 2 would be enormously damaging and would completely destroy the visual amenity from the West. Please see the two photographs provided.

This site has been the subject of planning creep (admitted by the Head of Planning in 2019).

The extant permission is for two single storey buildings, of which Plot 2, ie the building closest to the Western Side, is 108 m² out of a total of 306 m².

The application in 2019, which was recommended for rejection by the Planning Department and which was then emphatically rejected, was for two large separate houses totalling 492 m². The dwelling on Plot 2 was 246 m².

This latest application, although it is illogically being recommended for acceptance, is far worse. The house on Plot 2 has now been increased to a very substantial 266 m² and is pushed into the very centre of the Conservation Area and close to the Western boundary destroying the visual amenity and bringing vehicles, noise and pollution into what is a peaceful, natural reserve. The objection by the WODC Drainage Engineering Department does not seem to have been addressed.

The Campaign for the Protection of Rural England has said, *“The landscape impact from the west has not been considered, but with the loss of green space on that side,*

the effect will be significantpast planning history has identified this site as sensitive with regard to the setting of the Conservation area”.

It is very distressing for us to face the possibility of the illegal damage proposed by this application. This part of our precious conservation area is crucial to our joy of living in Shipton. Both our Parish Council and our District Councillor have objected. Please continue to give it the proper level of protection to which it is legally entitled as a Conservation Area in an AONB by again rejecting this application. Thank you.

Mike Gilbert Planning

62 Broadmarsh Lane Freeland Witney OX29 8QR

Tel: 07974 294463 mg.planning@btinternet.com

UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

6th July 2020

Land North of Gas Lane and Ascott Road

Shipton-under-Wychwood

20/00991/FUL

Comments made on behalf of the applicant

The officer report sets out the planning issues very clearly - particularly the fact that the principle of developing the site with two dwellings is established by the extant permission.

Working with your officers, we have addressed the reasons for the previous refusal with a much smaller unit on Plot 1, set some 6 metres further back from Ascott Road, and the larger unit on Plot 2 taking advantage of its greater space and the natural gradient across the site. As a result, we have been able to include substantially enhanced landscaping along the roadside and eastern boundaries, in addition to the retained "natural habitat" at the rear of the site. This all allows the two dwellings to sit comfortably within the site thanks to a substantially reduced footprint compared to the previously approved scheme.

Everyone agrees that the site is sensitive - edge of the village, Conservation Area and AONB. It is a site which warrants a better scheme than the extant permission for two squat bungalows. This scheme has been designed specifically for the site and includes traditional, simple building forms enhanced by the use of natural Cotswold stone, appropriate decorative detailing, and a mix of one-and-a-half and single storey elements. As a result, the officer report concludes that *"...by virtue of its siting, design, scale and form, the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area."*

Some objectors have referred to "mission creep". This is absolutely not the case. The applicant just wants to build a better scheme. If planning permission is granted, this scheme WILL be built.

The other issues raised by the objectors are dealt with in the officer report. No issues are raised by the objectors to justify withholding planning permission. The Parish Council made comments but raised no objection to the previous refused application but, without giving any reasons, says it objects to this amended and improved scheme. This is an inconsistent position which we find difficult to understand.

There are no ecology objections, and the retention of the rear part of the site as a natural habitat will be secured through a unilateral undertaking - exactly as per the approved scheme.

We have worked hard with your officers through the Council's formal pre-application advice process to design a scheme which is the best solution for this site. The officer recommendation to grant planning permission supports our strongly held view that what is now proposed is better and far more appropriate than either the extant planning permission or the previously refused scheme.

We hope you will agree and support this proposal.

[431 words]