

- Graham Shelton, Chairman of Northmoor Parish Council
- In the last 3½ years we have worked hard to bring a more strategic vision to the work of Northmoor Parish Council. Our Community-Led Plan (CLP), our superfast fibre to the premises broadband and our community pub are some tangible examples of our success in getting the fundamental decisions right and following them through in an integrated way
- As statutory consultees, we consider all Northmoor planning applications with particular care, and to help us to make consistent recommendations we created our own set of criteria which we always use on every application
- When we considered Northmoor Park we were aware that we have rather few brownfield sites in the village and that this was one of them
- It was immediately clear that it could not go on being a business park, as the premises (with one exception) will not pass modern requirements
- We liked the proposed plan from the start, as it was developed in consultation with the council and the neighbours and is sympathetic to their needs. It includes a small number of houses which could be accessible to those who might struggle to buy the larger homes elsewhere in the village. The need for this was very apparent from the village survey that we conducted in the preparation for our CLP
- We also liked the fact that there was some provision for small-scale rural employment to continue at the site, where virtually none would otherwise be possible, and that there would be a substantial reduction in the number of lorry movements down our narrow lanes
- This led us to vote in favour of the proposal (three votes in favour, one abstention and one absent)
- Now we come to the latest development in this application. As we plan the sustainability of our rural community, we are working hard to win grants to develop our village hall, to bring it up to modern standards, increase its utility and particularly to create a microbusiness centre utilizing our superfast fibre broadband. We see this as socially transformative, enabling more people to work in the village with fewer demands on our local roads and more time to interact with and to help and support each other

- We also believe that these small business premises will be more suited to modern business than the buildings that they potentially replace at Northmoor Park and at Park Farm
- Our ongoing Village Hall project already has some financial backing from WODC, and from other grant givers, and the proposed CIL grant in relation to this application would be a particularly welcome addition, enabling us to complete the installation of solar panels in phase 1 of our planned development of the hall
- As Chairman of Northmoor Parish Council I support this application.

Good afternoon and thank you for taking the time to visit the site.

There are a just a couple of points I wish to raise in relation to the proposal.

The desire to maintain employment premises is understood, but these need to be viable operations, seeking the right sorts of employment and in the right location. Continuing the site as it currently exists would not be viable and in our view with the single track access to the site is not now in the right location.

I acknowledge that my advisors have a different view to the Council regarding the supply of housing and the impact this should have on the consideration of applications; but this has not been the only premise upon which an application to develop the site has been submitted.

The Council's policies both as adopted and as proposed do allow employment premises to be redeveloped subject to three criteria, one of which should be met. We believe **all** those criteria have been met. The site is unviable for existing or alternative employment uses, the site is considered to be unsuitable for the same type of employment uses and that highway benefits would be made with a different use, and that substantial benefits will be achieved, not only through the reduced traffic through the village and an improvement to the visual appearance of the Conservation Area but with a proposed payment of £25,000 to the Village Hall refurbishment and works to establish a business hub. This will assist not only the proposed units but the existing high proportion of home workers in Northmoor.

In answer to a previous query regarding the ability of the site to be used for starter units, the facilities provided now are substandard, with only one toilet on site, and despite offering very low rents over a long period of time the premises have remained largely unoccupied. A viability report found that new units could not be financed based on the expected returns. Therefore an alternative form of employment as live/work units is seen to be a good solution, establishing a form of employment where a demand exists, will support village life and significantly reduces traffic. Employment uses will therefore remain on this site.

In terms of flooding concerns, the Environment Agency do not object to the scheme and the whole site lies outside Flood Zone 3, only one part of a garden area and a very small section of the access falls within flood Zone 2. Our flood engineers have confirmed that the proposals are therefore national policy compliant. Having lived on the site for the past 24 years I can confirm that the site has never flooded, even in 2007. The presence of protected species with the proposed mitigation measures is also not a concern to the Councils ecologist.

In summary the scheme provides for employment, it is offering self build (as per the desires of Government), it meets the Councils policy, it retains employment opportunities appropriate to this day and age, it has massive local support, it will assist the repairs and improvements to the Village Hall which services both residents and business, it provides its own drainage and it encourages the involvement and support of the local community. This is what rural communities need and I trust the Committee can see the merits of the submission and grant permission.

Dr. P B Tinker, Glebe House, Broadwell GL7 3QS
Statement, 14 December 2015
Presented to Planning Committee Meeting 14 December 2015

Good afternoon Gentlemen,

The considerations you listed in your website are:

- Overlooking property and loss of privacy
- Scale of development
- Design, appearance and layout
- Character of the area

1. I am the owner of the house that will be overlooked by the planned new house. This is clearly an overdevelopment of the site, and a larger site than this one is needed for this new house. A distance of 4 meters from my house is not sufficient to separate two houses of this size visually, and 6 meters is more realistic.

2. The design and appearance of the new house is totally different to mine, which is a row of attractive converted cottages, upwards of 100 years old. The new house is modern, bulky and large. It is not in character with any nearby houses, and minor additions are unlikely to help.

3. The new house is overbearing to mine, and the noise and other effects from it will be invasive. The new house will overlook my house and front garden which is used for entertaining. The proposed countermeasures may not be sufficient to prevent this oversight.
4. There are serious soil subsidence problems at the edge of my house plot, and the new house may make these more severe. (Party Wall Act 1996).
5. There will be a loss in the value of my house if the new one is built according to the present design.
6. The number of such issues is so large that the proposer might find it easier to start with a new plan.
7. The most important problem is that the plot is too small. This is a problem in Planning, but perhaps it is possible to purchase a further small part of the Chilli Pepper garden. This would then give the size and flexibility so urgently needed.

STATEMENT BY CHAIR OF BROADWELL PARISH MEETING

This application has caused widespread concern throughout the village, as evidenced by the number of objections. Residents are concerned about:

- the siting
- the scale
- and the style of the proposed building

These were not clearly set out when outline planning was agreed, and all decisions on scale and siting were reserved when outline planning was granted.

1. Siting

The main concern is that the proposed house is far too close to that of the nearest neighbour, Professor Tinker. A gap of a mere two metres is too close in terms of: privacy; structural considerations; and aesthetics. We ask that the 'footprint' of the proposed house is moved at least two more metres to the North, to create a minimum gap of four metres between the two houses.

2. Scale

Residents also feel that the scale of the house is inappropriate for the site, and inconsistent with the 'feel' of the village. We note that a similar application immediately to the South of Glebe House was turned down on appeal on the grounds that a new house of this scale was unacceptable in the village. Any opportunity to reduce the scale of the house – for example by further lowering the roof line and eaves – should be taken.

3. Style

The village is also in the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan. Although this is still in draft, we feel that the Design Code associated with it is a helpful guide to the style of the house, and we ask the applicant that full attention is paid to this. We have encouraged the applicant to consult a qualified architect with experience of traditional vernacular detail.

The committee may feel that our points can be accommodated by attaching conditions to planning consent. The conditions we would like to see are:

- a. The new property is located at least four metres away from Glebe House
- b. That the applicant employs a fully qualified architect with the necessary experience to guide on the correct vernacular details (including the detailed design and materials for the stone mullions and drip mouldings proposed for the front elevation) and to be approved by the Council's Conservation Officer, in consultation with myself and the Ward Member.

If you feel that these conditions are too extensive to apply to planning consent we ask that a decision be deferred, allowing the applicant to meet our points in consultation with your officers and in the light of ongoing discussions with myself and other residents.

Finally can I stress that the village is keen for the Chilli Pepper to reopen as a functioning village pub. If this application provides the means to do this, the village will welcome this. However the conditions of the Section 106 agreement will need close monitoring to ensure this actually happens.

Mike Hough
Chair, Broadwell Parish Meeting
14 December 2015

My name is Seth Dixon, I am the applicant for the plot in Broadwell applying to build a detached 4 bedroom home which currently has outline planning permission in place to do so.

My wife and I and our 4 daughters live just down the road in Alvescot where we have renovated a 250 year old cottage of which we love but sadly we have indeed outgrown this home. Broadwell is the next step up for us a larger home needed for my family, so when we saw this plot with outline permission to build a 4 bedroom property we of course visualised our next future home, we intend to be a huge part of Broadwell and the community, a young family who wish to enjoy the Church / Village Fetes & the local tennis club.

I have recently met with Bernard Tinker our new next door neighbour hopefully to be - who is lovely, we sat talking and getting to know one another over lunch, my intention was to show him I am not this horrible ogre he thought I might be, that I do not wish to build a monstrosity next door to him ruining this beautiful village. The Plans have been thought over & over with our architect to make the front of the property look as in keeping as possible, using Cotswold natural stones blending creams and greys to mimic the existing houses, we will use stone surrounds around the windows and a stone field slate style of roof which is perfect for the area. The rear of the property will be the same stone but will also have lots of glass to allow light to flood in, and of course so we can enjoy the open views across the fields and trees beyond.

We sympathise with Bernard Tinker as he currently has ongoing problems, movement and damage to his home, this being caused by clay shrinkage and not helped by close by vegetation that has now been removed. Bernard is currently having tests carried out to see if eventually it will settle or if he will need the corner of his house worked on, we of course would have no problem giving access to fix these issues when the time comes. As for us building near by we will do everything needed to fully protect & respect Bernard and his home.

We also met with Mike Hough from the parish council and together with Bernard and Phil Shaw we discussed potential compromise, we agreed to move the house over as much as possible and to limit the use of the main balcony to the rear, we do not and cannot however agree to downscaling the size of the property we are a large family with another daughter on the way, we need the space this property will give us which is why we decided to buy the plot in the first place.

We do not intend to build a futuristic eye sore but will actually be trying to put as many old features into the property as possible because that's what we like and have grown up with, the building will be built to age in the same way as Broadwell has so beautifully over the centuries gone by.

We hope Broadwell will welcome & support us with this project as we are just trying to live the dream in building our next cherished home, to better our future by creating a safe friendly environment that everybody wishes to have for their family...

Thank you for listening !