

17 August 2015 10:32

## Planning Application 99 - 101 Burford Road

Speaking on behalf of 4,6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 Cotswold Way.

Since the last planning meeting a site visit has now taken place and hopefully those present at that meeting can agree with the comments of the residents and the council's own planning officer at the previous planning meeting: Namely:

- The proposed development is fundamentally removing the privacy of the residents in Cotswold Way with the second story window in Plot 2 looking directly down into the bedrooms in 8 and 10 and 12 Cotswold Way and
- Temporary buildings (such as garden sheds) and foliage should not be considered permanent solutions for screening purposes as these can be removed or die back, and
- The proposed development is fundamentally overbearing in nature and not in keeping with the local environment. The ridge height of the new buildings is actually greater than everything that surrounds it including the Wilsons own dwelling.
- The development does not comply with planning policy BE2 which states new buildings should respect and where possible improve the character of its surroundings.
- The development does not comply with planning policy H2 which states new buildings should not create unacceptable living conditions for existing residents, including loss of privacy.

It should be noted that none of the objections raised against this application and lodged on the councils planning portal actually disputed the objective to develop this site and in most cases encouraged the developers to build single story bungalows that would

- Not overlook the existing residents
- Not be overbearing in nature
- And would be consistent with the local environment

It would seem logical there is a suitable compromise in this proposed development. All parties objectives in this instance could be satisfied by building single story bungalows

- The council meets its objective of building new houses in the area as part of its new dwellings development targets whilst complying with guidelines BE2 and H2.
- The Wilsons meet their stated objective of developing this site so that they do not have to consider its upkeep and maintenance in future years.
- The residents retain their existing privacy and are not faced with overbearing dwellings looming over their properties.

We hope that all parties consider this to be a reasonable solution

We are signing this to let you know that we are letting no 8 and no 10 Cotswold Way represent us by letter and to speak at the committee meeting for us on 17<sup>th</sup> august 2015, about the proposed chalet bungalows at 99-101 Burford Road. Ref no 15/01860/ful.

Mrs M. Chested 4 Cotswold Way  
MRS. M. Smith 6 Cotswold Way.  
Mr R Fox 12 Cotswold way  
Miss K Ettwell 14 Cotswold Way  
Mr. C. Jones. 10 Cotswold way  
Mr. A. Major 8 Cotswold way

### 99-101 Burford Road, Carterton

Following last month's deferral, Mr and Mrs Wilson would like to thank Members of the Committee for their time in visiting the application site and hope that it proved useful in understanding the proposals.

As I mentioned last time the proposed development is considered to have the following benefits:

- It would allow Mr and Mrs Wilson to stay in their home of 43 years, which has been specially adapted for Mrs Wilson's mobility needs.
- Remove the use of a builders yard from what is predominantly a residential area; and
- Deliver much needed high quality housing in a sympathetic manner.

It is however understood that Officers have concerns in relation to perceived overlooking and plot 2 having an overbearing impact on Cotswold Way, which my clients would like to address.

Following advice provided by Officers during a previously withdrawn application, the layout of the proposed development was revised in order to achieve the suggested 21 metre separation distance and to provide the dormer window instead of roof-lights in the interests of future occupier amenity.

Evidence provided with the application in the form sightline drawings illustrate that due to existing trees, outbuildings and the positioning of windows that opportunities for overlooking would be minimal.

Since the last meeting Mr and Mrs Wilson have given this matter some further thought and if considered appropriate by the Committee, without prejudice, they would welcome conditions to secure that the dormer window be obscurely glazed, with possible additional Velux style windows for light; and additional landscaped screening on the northern boundary to provide further comfort.

The area immediately surrounding the application site consists of dwelling houses all of sizes, shapes and importantly heights, so it is not uncommon for bungalows to be sited adjacent to housing and for the taller buildings to form the backdrop to lower ones.

In this case due to bungalows being located to the north and west and two storey properties to the south and east, chalet style bungalows were deemed to be the most appropriate solution to achieve a sympathetic transition across the site.

The difference in height between the proposed properties and the bungalows on Cotswold Way at ridge height is 2.43 metres so when taking into account the separation distances this would not be overbearing or intrusive.

In terms of impact upon the character of the area, DPDS submitted a street scene view from Cotswold Way, which demonstrates that the impact of the additional dwellings would be minimal.

To conclude, the proposed dwellings are considered to represent an acceptable form of development, which accords with both local and national planning policy.

They will bring benefit to the local area through the removal of the construction yard, as well as delivering much-needed high-quality housing.

They will also allow Mr and Mrs Wilson a sympathetic way of subdividing their large land holding that is currently unmanageable and for them to remain in their family home, in which they have lived for over 40 years.

If appropriate I will be happy to answer any questions otherwise it is hoped that members will look favourably on his application through the grant of planning permission.

Thank you Chairman.

Mr Chairman,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to summarize the objections of North Leigh residents to this planning application.

Residents have been **shocked and bewildered** by the grossly inappropriate scale of the opportunist development plans submitted by Gladman.

North Leigh residents overwhelmingly oppose these plans. Some simple statistics give a measure of this:

- 253 North Leigh residents have submitted objections to the WODC web site. There is one comment in support. That's about 12% of the entire population who have objected. If you discount residents of New Yatt and East End, children, and non-home owners, that represents a very high level of active dissent.
- North Leigh Parish Council objects strongly to the plans. Their objections are comprehensive, and provide a good representation of the concerns that have been raised by residents.
- 86 people (about 5% of the total population) attended a special meeting at North Leigh Memorial Hall convened at short notice by the Parish Council on 9<sup>th</sup> July at which sentiments were strongly opposed to the plans. *And today you will see a good number of residents have turned out to attend this meeting.*
- The Hands Off North Leigh Facebook page has been liked by 289 people *(to the end of July)*
- The Handsoffnorthleigh.com website had 419 visits in the month of July
- If you drive through North Leigh you will see that many houses are displaying "Hand off North Leigh" protest banners.

In the last few years, North Leigh has delivered its share of new housing, within the constraints of the WODC local plan. In the coming years, we recognise that North Leigh will have to accept further housing expansion, as specified in the democratically based WODC local housing plan.

However, the proposals submitted by Gladman are on a scale that is **far in excess** of what is has been planned by WODC. Moreover, Gladman has submitted proposals that draw conclusions about the safety of traffic, the landscape impact and sustainability that are **completely at variance** with the views of local residents, the Parish Council and the WODC local plan.

The proposals produced by Gladman are **consistently inaccurate** in their assessment the landscape impact, traffic safety and sustainability of the development. This is not surprising, since Gladman has paid their consultants to produce the proposals and to come up with the conclusions they require..

Residents of North Leigh are **totally united** in their resolve to fight this **outrageous proposal**.

North Leigh residents resoundingly reject Gladman's proposal as being ugly, unsustainable, unsafe, unfair, of a grossly inappropriate scale, and based on flawed evidence and arguments. The proposals would have serious negative impacts on the enjoyment of the landscape by residents, they would overload congested village roads, and put pedestrians in increased danger.

Mr Chairman, I urge you to lend the appropriate weight to these serious objections in your decision on this proposal.

## **Appendix D**

Mr Beames advised that the Town Council had expressed its support for this scheme, recognising the need for the provision of affordable housing for first time buyers in the town.

He acknowledged that the site was located on the outskirts of the town but considered that it was suitable for either commercial or residential use. Whilst in the ownership of the previous landowner the use of the site had been largely ancillary to existing residential property on the corner of Downs Road and consent for commercial/industrial use was a more recent development.

In conclusion, Mr Beames made reference to the request for developer contributions made by the Town Council as set out at paragraph 1.18 of the report

## Appendix E

Presentation to Planning Committee

West Oxfordshire district Council

17<sup>th</sup> of August 2015

(Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity to speak on this item.)

In response to the officer's report, I wish to highlight the fundamental benefits of this application, and to assure members of the Committee that approving this scheme would be a very good thing.

- the scheme provides for up to 51 homes of different types of housing, all of which would be made available on a first-time buyer discount price basis, and marketed to local working families and people, in line with current Government objectives.;
- The submitted technical documents and assessments prepared in support of the application confirm that there is no fundamental environmental issue that prevents granting of outline consent. All identified matters, can be dealt with by condition. We will of course be happy to enter into discussions about off-site obligations and contributions as part of a S106 legal agreement.
- The scheme would sit comfortably on the south side of Burford Road - The proposed density, layout, and building scale, is wholly appropriate given the context set by large buildings to the South. Like other residential properties on Burford Road, the ensuing community however, will benefit from the close proximity to the countryside and the links into Witney, the key aspects to which the scheme would be associated.
- Impacts from existing industrial uses can be reduced through measures that have already been incorporated in the illustrative layout submitted in the application. These include opportunities for buffer strips, and the layout of buildings which ensures adequate distances between homes and noise generating uses.
- There are no objections to this application, which has found support from the Town Council and residents who wish for their own 'achievable' home.
- The loss of the site to employment potential must be placed in context of the following facts :
  - The site is constrained by the presence of three existing houses that have discouraged industrial users from previously accommodating the site. The site has been marketed for eight years and no one has taken up the opportunity to provide new jobs.
  - The recently published property register identifies over 38,000 sqm of commercial floorspace available, whilst there are extensive areas of underdeveloped commercial land waiting to be brought forward.
  - Whilst employments needs have critically to be met, in this context, there is a much greater pressure on the district to find land for housing.

Finally, I would like to refer to the continuing debate about housing provision, currently being rehearsed through the review of the district local plan. Major housing schemes in countryside areas have proven to be controversial whilst the local plan inspector has recently indicated that the authority runs the risk of having its plan to be found 'unsound' because of insufficient housing provision.

Whatever the outcome of that debate, this local authority should recognise the opportunity that this application site offers in providing for local housing need, and for contributing significantly towards housing supply targets, in a manner that is supported by the local community.

The benefits have been recognised by the Council's own housing enabling officer, who in commenting on the application and meeting affordable housing demand, stated that 'it would be imprudent to miss this opportunity'.