

Annex A

20/01592/OUT Land North East Of 51 High Street Ascott Under Wychwood
Oxfordshire.

Written submission of the Agent to be read to the meeting by a member of staff.

The applicant held a community engagement event in November 2018 that returned **overwhelming** support for the redevelopment of the barns. The event was attended by the Parish Council and Cllr Acock.

We are grateful for the Case Officer's subsequent clear pre-application advice in May 2020, advising that the principle of the development of the site is supportable.

The application is in Outline with the means of access only to be considered to the adopted highway, the High Street. We are therefore pleased to see that OCC Highways have no objection.

We are in particular pleased to note in para. 10 of the report that *"two dwellings could be comfortably accommodated on this site and would form a logical complement to the character and pattern of development in the area."*

The applicant intends to deliver a high quality scheme design. From the pre-application discussions we have received a range of very helpful comments on the design approach we could take for the two dwellings. These will be considered in progressing the Reserved Matters application.

The concerns raised by the Parish Council in para. 1.1 of the report are either not relevant to the determination of the application or have been addressed during the consideration of the application. In particular it is noted that the WODC Drainage Engineers have no objection. In fact we are pleased to see that there is no objection from any of the technical consultees.

Similarly, the concerns raised in the eight letters of objection in para. 2.1 of the report are addressed in the report.

We note the clear recommendation for approval from the Case Officer in the report and which is based on a scheme that is wholly policy-compliant.

Annex B

Land South East of Hillside, Swan Lane, Long Hanborough

Meeting notes to be read 2nd November from Mr and Mrs Dunning
ref 20/01602/FUL

If, to accommodate a house, tons of soil with trees have to be removed, and a substantial retaining wall constructed to re-support the neighbouring garden, this should surely require planning consent.

This work has already been completed without any consultation following a confusion of submitted and withdrawn part-retrospective applications with contradicting responses from Planning on what permissions are required and have been granted. The only clear approval is for the stone entrance wall and **gates**.

Please carefully consider whether it is appropriate to further allow construction of a house in a Conservation Area, struggling to fit into an inappropriately squeezed-out area, whilst trying to retain an existing shared driveway. Adversely affecting its neighbours.

The house itself

- Obscures views from the protected listed curtilage of Swan House across the AONB, being the same height as Hillside, higher and closer than any existing buildings, currently not obscuring any views. Planning has not visited Swan House to appreciate this.

- Affects the privacy and light of Swan House, overlooking the garden with an upstairs opening **window**.

- To create the required parking, the proposal removes part of the retaining wall constructed to prevent the garden of Swan House sliding onto the site.

This directly jeopardizes the safety of Swan House property which should be a concern of Planning.

From Mr & Dr Lee

Comments of Objection to be read out to Planning Committee re:
20/01602/FUL Land South East of Hillside [LSEH] proposal

2 November 2020

In a Conservation Area the requirement is to "conserve and enhance"; this development does the opposite. It is incorrect to say it is "previously developed", it was woodland until bulldozed without authorization. The Annex B

woodland's amenity value is ecological, while maintaining privacy, a rural aspect **and attractive streetscape** for Millwood End Conservation Area. The only approved hardstanding **relates to somewhere else** entirely on the applicant's land-holding.

Destroying Conservation Area woodland is unjustified. Given that:

Hanborough doesn't need more houses 339 new homes is the most in its area; a new home for every 3 existing households, higher proportionately than anywhere else. These are not selling **This site is unsuitable for a new house** It is detrimental to Swan Lane's **streetscape; it worsens views** of listed Swan House and AONB; it permanently damages wildlife and ecology. The site is small, the development out of keeping with surrounding plots, all four neighbours are **negatively affected. 20/01602/FUL contains numerous unacceptable features** The building deprives Hillside of light by being so close. Parking intrudes **on** Hillside's **privacy** and **peace** hard **against** its 3 bedrooms. Parking also likely to undermine Swan House's and Hillside's boundary walls. The building projects into **the** drive, causing visible intrusion to neighbours **as well as Swan Lane's** build-line and streetscape. This **raises safety concerns, as does** the drainage and the unauthorised retaining **wall**.

Please do not approve this deeply un-neighbourly application.

Annex C - Giles Brockbank

From: Giles Brockbank Sent: 04 October 2020 12:23 To: 'stephanie.eldridge@publicagroup.uk' <stephanie.eldridge@publicagroup.uk>; 'stephanie.eldridge@westoxon.gov.uk' <stephanie.eldridge@westoxon.gov.uk> Cc: 'jeff.haine@westoxon.gov.uk' <jeff.haine@westoxon.gov.uk> Subject: 5013380 - Shabbanoneuk, Bladon - Planning 20/01808/FUL **Importance:** High

Dear Stephanie,

I understand you're dealing with the above planning application that will be reported to the Uplands Area Planning Committee tomorrow. We have submitted objections to this application on behalf of the resident of Toad Cottage that immediately adjoins the site and have made a written submission that will be read out at committee. There are a number of fundamental points raised by us within our representations that should be taken into account tomorrow and I will not repeat these at this juncture. However, I have been through the additional information submitted in the last few days by the applicant's agent (JPPC) and would like to make the following observations and I'd be grateful if they could be brought to the attention of Councillors as the information submitted is inaccurate and misleading.

The key points I feel should be noted are as follows: -

In their first Planning Statement submitted, JPPC stated under point 2.8 that *a relatively monotonous character and building forms and architectural detailing are generally limited. It is unclear from the accompanying appraisal the rationale for the setting of the road within the CA*". This is in contrast to their latest submission where they contradict themselves by stating: *"/ note within the letter sent by Ridge consultants that there is an attempt to play on select wording from Policy OS4, in respect of enhancement of local character. The application proposals are an appropriate response to the character of the area: the dwellings are an accurate reflection of local distinctiveness and respond to the clear character of the area. As you know, the site is within the Conservation Area and, consequently, it would bring into question the Council's rationale for including Park Close if a view was taken that the existing street character is not worth preserving..."* Given this, there is clear inconsistency and inaccuracies in the comments made. The proposals either preserve the character of the area or they don't, and the conflicting comments show a lack of understanding of the site reflected in the application. As things stand, the proposals will result in overdevelopment and will have an overbearing

effect on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

2.

The additional information also states (on the final page) that: *"The proposals are informed by a topographical survey - when reference is made to this, it becomes clear that the dwellings will actually sit to a lower level than the immediate neighbours (3 Park Close and 1 Lincoln Grove)."* This is not the case. When visiting the site it is clear that the proposals will be higher than surrounding properties. The information submitted is clearly inaccurate and incorrect and calls into question the validity of this submission. I suggest at the very least the application is deferred to ensure simple matters such as ground levels are checked and reflected accurately and appropriately to accord with what is in situ.

I trust these points will be taken into consideration and brought to the attention of Members, as the **current submission as it stands is inaccurate.**

Annex D

Alex Cresswell – JPPC Chartered Town Planners

App Ref: 20/01808/FUL

Speaking as Agent in support

As your officers correctly identify, there is no objection in principle to redevelopment for additional housing on this site. The proposal is consistent with the Council's strategy for the location of new housing and, in accordance with national guidance, endeavours to make best use of land within an existing settlement whilst respecting the character of the area.

The dwellings will be two storey in height, in line with the predominant character of the area. The space about dwellings is comfortable and better than most properties on Park Close and Lincoln Grove, by providing side access and good setback at the frontage. The rear gardens are well proportioned, discrete and not overlooked.

The dwellings are an accurate reflection of local distinctiveness and respond to the clear character of the area. As you know, the site is within the Conservation Area and, consequently, it would bring into question the Council's rationale for including Park Close if a view was taken that the existing street character is not worth preserving.

Contrary to the comments of neighbours, we believe the scheme layout, whilst not loose-knit, it is compatible with the character of the area and has sufficient breathing space to avoid appearing cramped. We have gone into detail on a comparison of plot sizes and garden areas in an additional letter sent to your officers - I hope you have been able to take account of these comments. We welcome that your officers agree that the quantum and scale of development is acceptable and well related to its immediate neighbours.

Planning guidance also seeks opportunities to enhance design and provide improvements in building design and sustainability. The architects have designed a scheme which both preserves the character of the area but also enhances it by offering dwellings to a modern, sustainable construction with all parking accommodated off-street.

There is an evident need for family houses within the District, but of a scale and cost that locals can afford. The provision of three well-proportioned houses in this location will, we believe, offer a lower cost option for locals. In our view two larger dwellings - as appears to be the choice of neighbours - would be at odds with the character of the area

and, inevitably, incur a much higher cost.

the houses will be constructed by a local builder who has a track record of providing high quality housing to an exceptional build standard. Along with the addition of houses to help sustain local services (which is much needed in these testing times) the proposal will also bring economic benefits locally from employing local craftsmen and traders.

We hope that you can support this well-conceived proposal.