

Weald Manor Farm Planning Application 14/0973/P/FP

WODC Planning Sub-Committee Review - 20th October 2014

Thank you for taking the time to visit the proposed site in Weald - we are confident that you will now understand its remote and rural location - and therefore the complete unsustainability of the proposed development.

This is my second time speaking on behalf of Weald residents, so I will be brief and only focus on key points relating to the project's location.

Firstly, the pedestrian routes into Bampton. You will now know that the proposed site is over a mile from Bampton school, and that it is impossible to build a pathway to the end of Weald Street at the Clanfield Road junction – as the road is too narrow. If you had time, you will also know that the applicant's suggested alternative route along Primrose Lane would be via an unlit and unpaved single-track chicken farm footpath and footbridge which are impassable for much of the winter. Importantly, neither of these links are detailed on any highways maps.

Secondly, you will now have seen first-hand that the proposed housing and concrete apron do not just extend beyond the existing farm building footprint but encroach many acres into the adjoining fields as well.

Thirdly, now understanding the rural nature of the site, it will be clear to you the dangerous precedent that your approval of this application would set for the 4 to 5 other remote farm developments being considered in Bampton, not to mention elsewhere in the area.

Fourthly, as you may already be aware, the Council's case against the Aston Road developer's appeal relies heavily on the site's location at the edge of the Bampton Conservation Area. And therefore you will also recognise the huge contradiction in your approving this even more rural development which is within the Bampton Conservation Area.

Lastly, scale. This proposed development is huge and out of all proportion to its surroundings and the number of houses in the immediate area.

We have also now read the points of clarification contained in the applicant's more recent submissions. They are minor - to say the least. We have listened to the many reasons clearly given by your own Planning Officer in opposition to this application. They are very major, to say the least. Just like Bampton Parish Council and the many other Bampton residents opposing this application, we cannot see why there is any reason for you to ignore his clear advice - and your rejection of this completely unsustainable and unjustifiable application for a second time would be appreciated.

Thank you again for your time and attention.

Application no. 14/0973/P/FP

Mike Gilbert's comments on behalf of the applicants

Sustainability

The site is 800m from the centre of Bampton - the same distance as the 160 houses permitted at New Road. The site is far from isolated from Bampton - visually connected by the built development along the east side of Weald Street.

Site is partly previously developed land.

Conservation Area

A very high quality scheme - design, materials, and landscaping.

Heritage Statement submitted with the application is not mentioned in the Committee report. The Statement explains the public benefits offered by the proposal and that para. 134 of NPPF requires these benefits to be weighed against the impact on the CA - that's the correct test.

Landscape impact

The site is very well screened by existing tree planting and the roadside hedgerow. Additional planting can be carried out along the SW boundary if required.

Drainage

SW - The large storage pond beside the site has plenty of capacity to meet the drainage needs of the development.

FW - Self-contained biodisc sewage treatment plant will be provided on the site.

Highway safety

County Highways raise no objections.

Archaeology

A pre-determination field evaluation can be carried out between a resolution to grant permission and completion of the S106 agreement.

Therefore - there are no fundamental objections if Committee is persuaded by the public benefits offered by the proposal.

19th October 2014

Meeting of Lowlands Planning Committee 20th October 2014
Weald Manor Farm, Bampton
Ref: 14/0973/P/FP

Comments by Michael Pelham for the Owners of the site.

1. The scheme is for a unique development of seventeen new cottages for **rent** to local people in Bampton. It is **not a conventional 'for profit'** development.
2. The Council's Head of Housing has identified an ongoing need for more affordable housing in Bampton over and above those covered by the recent **outline** planning permission granted in respect of the land off New Road, Bampton. Nine of our cottages will be let on an **affordable** basis and would have **full** planning permission.
3. Rental income from the remaining eight 'Trust' cottages will be spent on the essential restoration works to the Grade II* listed Weald Manor, details of which were provided to the previous meeting. We are very happy for this to be monitored by regular open book assessments which can be a condition contained in the Section 106 Agreement.
4. Stephen Whipp, tenant of the only commercial premises on the site, has accepted relocation of his furniture upholstery business to other improved premises owned by the Colville Trusts at White Owl Farm, Bampton. We take our responsibilities as landlords seriously, understand the needs of his business, and appreciate our association. He has been a long term tenant whom we use and value.
5. Our proposals for the Section 106 Agreement will also provide the following benefits:
 - A new public footpath on the owners land & along Weald Street to the Clanfield Road.
 - A private biodisc sewage treatment plant to process all sewage, etc. from the site which will be available for this development thus eliminating any delay which might occur.
 - The removal of overhead low voltage power lines from Weald Street and the site.

Appendix C

THE ORCHARD, CHURCH ROAD, NORTH LEIGH – 14/1061/P/FP

PROPOSED DETACHED DWELLING and FORMATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS AND CAR PORT TO SERVE EXISTING DWELLING

SUPPORTING STATEMENT by Applicant's Agent – Roy Wilkinson of Stanhope Wilkinson Associates

1. In my previous supporting statement a month ago, I pointed out the main changes that had been made to the proposals since the refusal of Planning Permission earlier in the year.
2. In summary, these were that the proposed dwelling is 35% less in floor area and 1.6 metres less in height. It has a footprint of only 76 sq metres and occupies only 16% of the site area, the remaining 84% being open landscaped space around the dwelling. In fact it has been reduced to a very modest 2 bedroom dwelling with only 1 bedroom at first floor, and that is partly within the roof space.
3. The detailed site survey shows that the highest part of the proposed roof is 2.2m lower than the ridge on no. 14 Bridewell Close that backs onto the site, and 3.5m lower than that on no. 12. So I emphasized that the impact on the adjacent houses is really very minimal indeed, and it will not overlook any gardens or houses whatsoever.
4. Also, by reason of its siting within the plot and digging it into the sloping site, the impact on the rural aspect of Church Road will also be very minimal, as much of it will be completely obscured by the existing boundary fence, hedging and other trees and shrubs.
5. Regarding the proposed **new** access at the top end of the site, it has not been objected to by Highways and I have carried out a further check myself on the sightlines, and only a very small proportion (to the right on exit) is over the neighbour's front garden hedge. The rest of the sightlines in both directions will be over Highways verges or over land under the control of the applicant.
6. The access at the bottom end of the site which has caused most concern is, as you know, an existing access serving the garage and car port for the 4 bedroom house at The Orchard. It has been in use as such for about 35 years. The intention is that it will serve the proposed new dwelling, which has only 2 bedrooms, but will have a much larger

forecourt to improve manoeuvrability. As I said before, turning movements will **not** increase as claimed but are far more likely to **decrease**.

7. Although the access has not been objected to by County Highways, the applicant is very willing to accept as a Condition of any permission that a convex mirror is mounted on a post directly opposite the exit to ensure clear vision, subject of course to Highway's approval. Alternatively, the existing boundary fence line and hedge to the right, as you exit, could be moved into the site a little to improve the current visibility.
8. I hope you will follow your Officers' recommendations and approve this modest and carefully considered proposal.

Roy Wilkinson

20 October 2014

Land between 2 Elms Road and the Elms, Yarnton Road, Cassington.

Summary of comments from Mr Oliver Taylor:-

- This site was in the Green Belt;
- Questioned whether the proposal constituted an appropriate development? It was inappropriate for the Green Belt;
- The gap between buildings was 180m;
- The site was adjacent to the Conservation Area;
- Loss of space was detrimental to the character and setting of the Conservation Area;
- There would be an adverse impact on trees on the site;
- The site was also in a flood risk area.

Appendix E

Three minute talk – Lowlands Sub-Committee Monday 20th October 2014

Planning Application Number 14/1171/P/FP on 24 Common Road, North Leigh

I am Frank Skipwith and am representing the residents of Nos. 22, 26, 26A and 26B Common Road.

You have now visited the site which is the subject of the current application. By walking down the drive you will have noticed the width of the road, the lack of pedestrian path, the lack of ability for cars to pass and the absence of any vehicle turning provision.

You will have also identified the amount of hedgerow and trees that are to be lost to yet more close boarded fencing, leading to the destruction of this established environment for wildlife. Today, with greater awareness and understanding of the importance of environmental considerations, the continued erosion of our natural habitats for wildlife is no longer a consideration we can afford to disregard. Remember, if there is no home for nature, there will be no nature.

You will also now appreciate the adverse effect this development will have, not only on the privacy of homes along

Common Road, but also the houses adjacent to the site. It would be extensively overbearing. It would overlook all adjacent properties, destroying any privacy currently afforded.

You will now understand why we have objected to the claim that this site is possibly being considered as either “infill” or “rounding off”. Clearly it is neither of these. It is, in fact, a blatant attempt at additional “backland” development.

I’m sure you will now appreciate why Local Planning has already twice refused permission to allow development on this site. The reasons given for these earlier refusals clearly remain unchanged.

We urge you to take into consideration all the objections to this development delivered by 11 representations and come to the right decision to refuse planning and save North Leigh from the unwelcome invasion of urbanisation into the rural setting of our village. Please do not let that happen here.

Lowlands Committee Meeting 20.10.14

In Support of Planning Application No 14/1171/P/FP

Land to the rear of 24, Common Road, North Leigh, OX29 6RA

Erection of detached dwelling and garage with associated works

I have spoken before at the last meeting in September when this application was deferred to enable Members to visit the site. I will not repeat everything I said before or what has been written since to clarify matters.

However, I would just like to add, so that there is no doubt, that this proposed dwelling has been designed to be under 180sq m and is 1 and a half storeys high. It is about the same size as 26a, a fraction larger than 26 which also has a detached double garage. It is not significantly larger than 26b which also has a detached garage. These 3 houses all have 4 bedrooms.

Plus this dwelling will be built in materials to match those 3 houses. They are all individual in style yet complement each other and this proposal will add to this to round off and finish the development.

Now that you have seen the site, you can appreciate that the only part of the hedge to be removed is purely to create the new access and that there will still be a mature, extensive hedge to protect privacy and the environment.

You have seen for yourselves that there is ample room for parking and turning vehicles on site so that they can travel forwards up the access road onto Common Road and yet there is still room for a front garden where new, healthy trees could be replanted to replace the old fruit trees which will need to be removed.

In assessing the objections to this proposal, and leaving out 26a and 26b for the time being, the common concerns which other members of the public have raised appear to carry no relevance in planning law terms and can be satisfactorily addressed as follows:

- 7 objected to loss of trees and wildlife – covered by proposed planning conditions
- 2 objected to the urbanisation of North Leigh – 1 house at the edge of the village on a large – 180ft long – private, well screened plot

- 7 were concerned with surface water drainage – addressed by planning conditions
- 4 were concerned with sewerage disposal – Civil Engineer plan and building control
- 2 believed that 2 houses were being proposed and not 1
- 1 was concerned with the loss of views from their long back garden, when their house will not be in sight
- 2 were concerned by loss of light to 26b when the proposed house will neither overlook nor overshadow
- 2 were concerned by the disturbance caused by the builders. Apart from the creation of the actual access, the plot is large enough to accommodate all the trades during the build.
- 3 commented on the planning history and backland development. The actual planning application which was turned down and then dismissed by the Appeal Officer was because of loss of residential amenity to 26 (since demolished) and in part to 28 and not because it was backland development. That's why the 3 houses were built in the first place.

This leaves the comments from 26a and 26b which are numerous and include many inaccurate and irrelevant comments. The applicant believes that both the WODC Planning Office and their Architect have addressed these.

Thank You

Karin Hyatt