

Summary of Submission by Nick Paterson-Neild

Mr Paterson-Neild introduced himself and Mr Zanre who was available to answer any questions of clarification from members.

Mr Paterson-Neild advised that the Section 106 had been signed and permission issued on the neighbouring site and this application was for 66 homes on the adjoining land. Mr Paterson-Neild highlighted the need for new homes in the district and the development would offer a range of house type including 40% affordable housing. It was suggested that the development would help to meet the shortfall in numbers in West Oxfordshire.

Mr Paterson-Neild reported that there had been extensive discussion with interested parties and issues that had arisen had been addressed. It was highlighted that an 18 hectare extension to the Country Park was included in the application.

Mr Paterson-Neild advised that a number of footpaths were to be provided, landscaping was proposed and flood/drainage assessments had been undertaken and attenuation measures included in the plans. Open space was also to be provided within the development.

Mr Paterson-Neild concluded by requesting the sub-committee to support the officer recommendations.

Dear Councillors, today you will be voting on an application that should be a straight forward decision.

This application is attempting to repair, restore and sympathetically extend a beautiful Grade II listed farmhouse, to make it fit for 21st Century living by a young family. The advantages of this application are both numerous and varied but I will focus on two aspects today, Environment and Heritage.

The application has numerous eco-improvements, many specifically combatting the difficulties in addressing the poor energy efficiency of a listed stone built property. The whole property will be heated from a log gasification boiler located in the garage which acts as a carbon-neutral heating source. Where permitted we are increasing the internal insulation and maximising opportunities for solar gain- most obviously with the glazed wall in the kitchen. There will be solar panels on the back side of the garage roof, hidden from view of the listed property but still positioned in a manner to provide a supply of renewable electricity sufficient for powering much of the property's annual demand.

Heritage improvements

This application is the product of substantial engagement with Conservation Officer, Richard Wheeler, over 9 months we made numerous adaptations to our design until the application was not just deemed acceptable but was deemed actively beneficial to the heritage of the building.

How can an application be beneficial? This building was constructed in 1724, many areas of the property are showing its age and vulnerable to decay. Some minor (e.g. re-instating original features) but some critical - the walls of the barn need significant support to prevent them falling down. This application will ensure that the property will be maintained for future generations to enjoy. Critically, it will be done so in a manner that will not adversely affect the heritage of the existing structures. For example, profile of the kitchen extension, including width, eaves and ridge height almost exactly match the profile of the existing barn. This design was not a coincidence but was a conscious decision by both our architects and Richard Wheeler regarding what form and mass of an extension was most suitable to provide a kitchen with sufficient light and space for modern family living. You should be reassured by knowing that all aspects of the proposed design have already been scrutinised- for example any reduction in ridge height would have a detrimental knock on effect to the pitch of the roof, creating profile that was not in keeping with the existing architecture and unacceptable in heritage terms.

Before I finish, I would like to briefly address our neighbours' complaints. They are of the opinion that our proposed kitchen extension will adversely overshadow their property. It is true that at certain times of day our proposal will cast a shadow over a small part of their lawn but as has been explained already by Kim Smith and Phil Shaw, due to a number of factors I believe their concerns are unwarranted, these are as follows:

1. The positioning of our respective houses, specifically our existing house being set back from theirs, means the proposed extension will not cast a shadow on their building. It does not even trigger the 45/25 degree rule set out by the BRE that acts as the guide as to whether a more detailed light survey is even appropriate.
2. The eaves height of our single storey extension is marginally higher than the allowance for permitted development for boundary walls. In any case, at many points, the existing vegetation in Harcourt House's garden greatly exceeds this height, which was evident during the site visit when the post which indicated both the extent and eaves height of the proposed extension could not be seen from the garden of Harcourt House without intervention from Phil Shaw.
3. Not only is the proposal set back from the boundary wall but the roof slopes away from their garden at a pitch that is designed specifically to be in keeping with the surrounding architecture.

The proposal has been assessed both on paper and on site by our architects, by planning consultants, the conservation officer, by the area planning manager and case officer, all of which are unanimous in their assessment that the proposal is acceptable. The case officer goes one step further and makes clear in her committee report that ...and I quote the entirety of point 6.8.

"The extension by reason of its proximity to the neighbours south western boundary will result in some additional overshadowing of the middle section of the garden, but it will not impact on either the windows or the private patio area serving that dwelling. As such, the residential amenity of Harcourt House will not be so adversely affected by the development such that a refusal of planning permission is warranted or could be sustained at appeal."

This advice taken alone should be sufficient to guide your decision today.

In conclusion, you have the opportunity to consent an application that will ensure Church Farm House's heritage and charm are maintained for future generations whilst also providing a beautiful house for a young family to join a wonderful village. I urge you to vote in line with the recommendation.

The footpath in its natural setting is a major part of North Leigh's character, enjoyed by residents and people from other areas. The Scouting community regularly walk along the footpath en-route to their camp in the woods. The proposed site is also an important part of life for the village school, being a much-valued, safe route to the church. It provides a connection with the natural world, a sense of belonging and appreciation of local history, whilst leaving the noise of traffic and 20th Century development behind. People of all ages appreciate having direct access to beautiful open countryside. Such access is rare.

The historic farmhouse and its barn provide a traditional village setting as people step off Park Road. Many comment upon the special atmosphere as the footpath leads gently towards the brow of the hill where the land drops away dramatically, revealing the wonderful vista of St. Mary's Church with its Saxon tower – ancient views hardly changed since medieval times.

The contrast in sound and atmosphere between the proposed site and the Park Road frontage is marked – this proposal would destroy the quiet rural atmosphere that exists. It is imperative that such breathing spaces are protected for the quality of life and well being of this, and future generations.

Furthermore, this is the last remaining wide “green” gap on this side of the village. It provides a view of distant hills from the road – its loss would seriously degrade the quality and semi-rural atmosphere of this part of North Leigh forever.

Park Road is dangerous during peak times. Creating a junction in this location, combined with the sizeable increase in traffic from the proposed site would add to the hazards.

Natural England has confirmed there is no specific survey data for this agricultural land. An individual survey would be needed to determine the actual grade. When managed, the land has produced good crops of hay.

As stated in the recent Appeal decision, “*The land...is important in providing a gradual transition between the built form of the settlement and the more open landscape beyond*”

This application is unsustainable, because of its impact on the site's special and unique open character and upon the quality of people's lives. When viewing the District as a whole, other sites will be more sustainable than this in terms of settlement, location, effect upon people's lives and the surrounding rural land.

Speaker: Richard Burke-Smith

LOWLANDS AREA SUB-COMMITTEE 21ST JULY 20014

Page 21 – Outline application for residential development to the north of 71-81 Park Road, North Leigh – Application 14/0529/P/OP

I am speaking today in support of this application, which was deferred at last month's meeting to enable you to visit the site.

Since the previous meeting, we have addressed the Archaeological and Ecological concerns and, hopefully, these are now not at issue. Similarly, the applicants have confirmed that they will provide 50% affordable housing, the precise mix and tenure to be agreed.

Accordingly, the outcome of this application will turn on recommended reason (1) that concerns the landscape impact of the proposed development. This aspect has been the subject of a detailed appraisal by an experienced Chartered Landscape Architect, who also considered the comments of the Appeal Inspector referred to within the Report. I emailed this assessment to you before your site visit and I hope that it was of assistance in your consideration of this matter.

The Landscape Architect concluded that the site is contained by existing development, ^{cannot be seen from the church} and that sensitively designed housing on this site would not conflict with the established pattern and character, with there also being the potential for it to strengthen the transition between the countryside and the built area by new planting and informal grouping of houses. He added that this proposal would be a sympathetically designed arrangement in keeping with the traditional development in the locality rather than an ad hoc, one off proposal, as considered by the Appeal Inspector. He also stated that the views of the site are limited and that the more expansive and attractive views from the footpath can be retained.

When there is a housing shortage, paragraph 49 of the NPPF is engaged and there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. The proposal will meet the three dimensions of sustainability set out in the NPPF as it will ensure that land of the right type is available in the right place and at the right time, with the site immediately available for housing, thereby complying with the economic role; it will meet the social role by supporting the community and providing 10 affordable dwellings as well as market housing; and will meet the environmental role by protecting and enhancing the built environment and the landscape.

The proposal will make a positive contribution to both the settlement and the housing supply and, by discussions with the relevant officers in advance of the reserved matters submission, a quality scheme will result that would represent a sustainable form of development. The recommended refusal reasons have been addressed and I respectfully request that you resolve to grant planning permission, once a Section 106 Agreement regarding affordable housing and financial contributions has been entered into and agreed.

Thank You

Andrew Miles, Dip TP MRTPI
Director
LPC (Trull) Ltd

Summary of Submission by Ken Oswin

Mr Oswin introduced himself to the sub-committee and advised that he had been a resident of Minster Lovell for over 25 years. Mr Oswin indicated that he was proud of the village and would not propose any change that would be damaging to its character or appearance.

Mr Oswin clarified that a three bay car port had been refused and that was why an application for a smaller two bay car port had been submitted. It was advised that it would be a top end oak framed/clad unit. The roof height was under 4m and hipped on all 4 sides, to reduce the impact of the application.

Mr Oswin outlined that it would be fully shielded from the adjacent neighbour by a 4m plus high Beech Fence and would be over 20m from Brize Norton Rd, considerably further than other buildings along Brize Norton Rd.

Mr Oswin confirmed that the large cherry tree in the garden would effectively mask most of the front view and it was proposed to plant further fruit trees to the lawn area immediately in front of the Car Port. This will virtually hide the car port from Brize Norton Rd.

Mr Oswin concluded by advising that if he had felt the development would be detrimental to the appearance of the house or location he would not have submitted the application. It was suggested that it would enhance the house and neighbourhood and asked members to support the officer recommendation of approval.

Appendix F

Good afternoon.

It is my professional opinion that this application is worthy of the Committees approval.

Our previous application on this site reflected the style and design of the houses in Corndell Gardens and it was rejected on grounds that it did not adequately reflect the nature of the adjacent conservation area.

This application, however, completely embraces the vernacular of Corn Street, in style, design, scale and reference to important historical features.

In fact it is based on No. 127 Corn Street, because it mostly resembles the existing houses in Corndell Gardens.

This planning officer has essentially objected on the basis of over development.

However I will show you how this proposal properly reflects the local vernacular, is of the correct scale and precedents set by planning approvals given recently by WODC.

It should also be noted that this application site is not within the conservation area.

The scale of the building and its features are entirely consistent with nearby properties on the corner of Corn Street and Corndell Gardens. The application closely matches the local vernacular and echoes many of the houses along Corn Street. The scale is also matched by properties recently approved in the Buttercross development.

The dimension of the internal ceiling heights is the minimum permitted under building regulations so cannot be any lower.

The roof has two small dormer windows and is at the same pitch as many in the conservation area, and reflects the local Witney, Oxfordshire and Cotswolds vernacular.

The frontage of each building is approximately 6 (six) meters which is comparable to many of the houses along Corn Street.

The depth of the gardens is consistent with current planning guidelines and comparable to, or better than, many of the smaller homes which have received planning approval recently.

The car parking in Corndell gardens is currently difficult and these proposals show four new car parking spaces, two for each property, entirely consistent with local planning requirements and a great improvement on the existing arrangements that require shared access along a narrow drive.

These proposals are not cramped compared to adjacent properties in the conservation area, few of which have any garden down the side. Both of these new homes do, along with car parking spaces and side access.

And as such, it is my proposal that this application beneficially reflects the nature, character, scale and design of the properties adjacent to and within the local conservation area, and precedents set by planning approvals given recently by WODC. Those of you who know Corn Street will immediately recognise the style and design incorporated into the 3D visuals supplied with the application,

... and that this application is worthy of the Committees approval.

Lowlands Planning - PC 3 Minutes, Thistle Cottage (14/0791/P/FP)

Good Afternoon.

The Thistle Cottage site close to the centre of Aston is currently a visual blight on the village which has conservation status. Thistle cottage itself has been subject to an arson attack, all the buildings are in a state of decay, the building which is proposed to become part of house 7 has collapsed into a neighbour's garden and the site's security fencing in Ham Lane has been damaged by passing farm vehicles. In short, this site is in serious need of an appropriate level of development which needs to be sympathetic to the location and the village as a whole.

With that said the Parish Council of Aston, Cote, Shifford and Chimney object to this application but within the time allowed I will concentrate on just one main issue.

There is inadequate provision for vehicle parking and movement on the site.

The Parish Council has grave concern that parking and access for existing residents of Ham Lane and Redmayes, emergency vehicles, farm vehicles, waste collection and other service vehicles will be significantly affected by overspill parking from this site. Ham Lane is extremely unsuitable for on-road parking which would significantly increase the safety risk for all vehicles and pedestrians users.

The application proposes to create 8 houses on a site of very restricted size. With the tree cover, planned hedges/gardens and the limited amount and width of roadway there will be nowhere within the site for vehicles in excess of the provided spaces per property to be parked. This will be made worse when visitors come to the site and there is no evident traditional turning circle.

The location of parking for units 1, 2 and 8 is impractical. The front doors of the properties lead out onto Ham Lane but parking for these units will be at the rear and at the furthest point from any entrance door. The occupiers would have to walk across their rear gardens and enter their properties via doors into the living rooms. It is far more likely that they would park on Ham Lane so that they can access their properties via the front door.

There is no provision for a boundary fence, wall or hedge for the front of the site. The Parish Council consider that a solid wall boundary for the front of the site will reduce the risk of residents or visitors especially to properties 1, 2 and 8 parking either fully on their front gardens or partly on their gardens and partly on Ham Lane.

The Parish Council strongly urge this sub-committee to require its planning officers to work closely with the developers to ensure a speedy and acceptable application which removes the potential for overspill parking in Ham Lane, Redmayes or indeed any other area of the village.

Thank you.

Richard Haines – Chairman of Aston, Cote, Shifford and Chimney Parish Council

Summary of Submission by Mrs Rich

Mrs Rich advised that she was Chair of a sub-committee established by the Stanton Harcourt Parish Council to work on a project for improved play facilities in the village.

Mrs Rich reported that there was a fresh determination to succeed and a large number of children would benefit. There was a lot of support for new facilities to be provided and funds had been raised towards the new equipment.

Mrs Rich clarified that a change of use had been previously approved and now there was an opportunity to provide much needed play equipment. Mrs Rich confirmed that there was five pieces of equipment, the area would be landscaped and visual amenity had been taken in to account. The equipment would be sited away from Foxborough Close and planting would be provided.

It was confirmed that there had been a lot of consultation including a public meeting. Mrs Rich emphasised there was no formal objections to the scheme and issues that had arisen during the consultation had been fully addressed.

Mrs Rich clarified that the new occupants of the former Fox Inn public house had been supportive of the proposed development.