

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 21st March 2016

**REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING
AND STRATEGIC HOUSING**



**WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Purpose:

To consider applications for development details of which are set out in the following pages.

Recommendations:

To determine the applications in accordance with the recommendations of the Strategic Director. The recommendations contained in the following pages are all subject to amendments in the light of observations received between the preparation of the reports etc and the date of the meeting.

List of Background Papers

All documents, including forms, plans, consultations and representations on each application, but excluding any document, which in the opinion of the 'proper officer' discloses exempt information as defined in Section 1001 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Please note that observations received after the reports in this schedule were prepared will be summarised in a document which will be published late on the last working day before the meeting and available at the meeting or from www.westoxon.gov.uk/meetings

Application Number	Address	Page
I5/04463/OUT	<u>Land West of Brize Norton Road, Minster Lovell</u>	3
I6/00001/S73	<u>Skippett Cottage, Mount Skippett, Ramsden</u>	16
I6/00241/FUL	<u>Land at Patchfield Barn, Standlake Road, Northmoor</u>	20
I6/00314/FUL	<u>Lower Farm, Lew</u>	25
I6/00359/FUL	<u>131 Abingdon Road, Standlake</u>	31
I6/00404/FUL	<u>64 Acre End Street, Eynsham</u>	35
I6/00496/FUL	<u>Yew Tree Cottage, Lew</u>	38

Application Number	15/04463/OUT
Site Address	Land West of Brize Norton Road Minster Lovell Oxfordshire
Date	8th March 2016
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Minster Lovell
Grid Reference	431099 E 210439 N
Committee Date	21st March 2016

Application Details:

Development of 58 dwellings and creation of new access onto Brize Norton Road

Applicant Details:

Ede Homes Ltd

C/O Agent

I CONSULTATIONS

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--|
| I.1 | One Voice Consultations | Transport - No obj subject to conditions and contributions.
Archaeology- Object and require a pre determination dig due to the presence of a important archaeology nearby.
Education- require 40K to enable alterations to increase school capacity.
Fire Hydrants would also be required by condition. |
| I.2 | WODC Architect | No Comment Received. |
| I.3 | Ecologist | No objections subject to changes to the illustrative layout and conditions. |
| I.4 | MOD (Brize Norton) | No Comment Received. |
| I.5 | WODC Env Health - Lowlands | No Comment Received. |
| I.6 | Thames Water | Following initial investigation, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority look to approve the application, Thames Water would like the following 'Grampian Style' condition imposed. |
| I.7 | Parish Council | Minster Lovell is described as a Village in the Witney sub-area of the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031. Although some local facilities are available, residents naturally look to Witney and to a lesser extent, Carterton for most essential services. The Brize Norton Road's history dates back to the 1850's when the Chartist |

Land Company built properties for use as small holdings, to assist them in their aim for political reform. Some of the distinct-style properties have listed status reflecting their local and arguably national importance. There are 6 listed properties within 300 metres of the proposed development site.

Planning Inspectorate Decisions

The most recent appeals have been dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate for properties in this area.

- Appeal ref. 2194043 at 154 Brize Norton Road for the erection of two detached dwellings, garages and associated environmental works. Decision date 7 August 2013.

- Appeal ref. 2166985 at 138 Brize Norton Road for outline construction of a single dwelling and relocating existing access. Decision date 31 May 2012.

In both cases, the Planning Inspectorate specified reasons of the character and appeal of the Village as being the main issues for dismissal. Notably and relevant regarding this application are the following details from the most recent decision which is also echoed in the 2012 decision:-

"Minster Lovell is a linear village with property in facing rows running along both sides of Brize Norton Road. This reflects its history as a village laid out by the Chartist movement. Although very few of the original properties now remain in any recognisable form the pattern of individual dwellings, of many different types and style, facing the road frontage on deep plots, with the village surrounded by agricultural land, remains."

"The Council (West Oxfordshire District Council) have carried out the West Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). Minster Lovell lies in a landscape classified as the Open Limestone Wolds, in the Upper Windrush Valley character area. The assessment identifies the built-up core of the village, an area of 'rural fringe land' behind and open countryside beyond. In this assessment the site generally lies within the rural fringe and has a basically open character, distinct from both the open farmland beyond and the built-up strip closer to the road."

"Because of the rural fringe location, and its position relating to the local pattern of development, the erection of two houses on the site could not be described as 'rounding-off' within the existing built-up area. Rather, with the addition of two dwellings the site would effectively extend the built-up area towards the open countryside at the expense of the rural fringe land. Nor can the development be regarded as infilling."

"The LCA describes the Upper Windrush Valley as one with a remarkable unspoilt rural character, potentially threatened, amongst other things by the 'suburbanisation' of settlements. Building two houses on an open site at the rear of the frontage development would introduce an element of such suburbanisation to Minster Lovell and detract from the character and quality of its surroundings and not

to adversely affect the landscape that provides the setting to West Oxfordshire's villages."

"...None of these factors however, outweigh my concerns that the development would encourage an unsustainable pattern of development in West Oxfordshire, have a significantly adverse effect on the character and appearance of the local area..."

It is considered that these comments are relevant to the proposed application site and echo residents' and the Parish Council's opinions. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

1. Policy 7 - The three dimensions to sustainable development:-

Economic - The proposed site is not in the right place to consider it sustainable. The potential new residents will be required to travel, most likely by car, out of the Village to meet their employment needs. There are no details included in the application that support the local infrastructure - rather infrastructure will be eroded further by the development.

Social - The quality and standard of the proposed development is unsuitable. Some dwellings directly back onto existing resident's properties at Ripley Avenue making their living standards unacceptable. Health services would only be accessible by travelling out of the Village.

Environment - The application does not contribute to protecting or enhancing the natural, built or historic environment. Biodiversity will be reduced by the development. It is noted that protected species Grass Snakes, Yellow Rattle are present at the site and it has been reported that one or more Barn Owls visit the site every summer.

2. Policy 17 - One of the core planning principles is to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. The application is considered contrary to this policy as the design elements of the applications do not reflect local surroundings (referred to in point 4) and does not contribute to conserving or enhancing the natural environment.

3. Policy 35 - The application does not ensure that development will minimise the significant need to travel and the use of sustainable transport modes cannot be maximised. It should be noted that contrary to information contained in the application, the S2 premium Stagecoach bus service (direct link to Witney, Carterton and Oxford) stopped servicing the Brize Norton Road a year ago. The nearest bus stop for this service is located approximately 1 mile away making it unfeasible for the majority of residents to use and especially those with disabilities since the bus stops are accessed via grass verges, not tarmac footpaths. The S7 bus service operates in the area, however due to its timetable the service is considered unviable by parishioners and the Parish Council continues to liaise with Stagecoach in an effort to improve it. Furthermore, conflicts between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians will not be minimised due to access onto the already-inadequately sized Brize Norton Road. It should be noted that when two large vehicles need to pass each other, the footpath or grass verge has to be mounted so that they do not collide. Footpath user's safety is regularly compromised and the additional vehicles using the

Brize Norton Road from this development is unacceptable. The proposed road junction forms a dangerous 'T' junction and the number of vehicles are under estimated and not based on comparative information. Therefore the validity of the data is questionable.

4. Policy 47 - In 2007, the site was submitted as a proposed development site as part of the Local Development Framework. Responses were received from residents, The Society for the Protection of Minster Lovell and the Parish Council against backland development amongst other concerns.

5. In June 2014, the West Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) considered that "Development would be out of character of the predominantly linear nature of the village and would compound the piecemeal approach to the north, be poorly related to the dwellings fronting Brize Norton Road and could lead to pressure for numerous other incremental schemes" in relation to the site.

6. Policy 56 & 58 - The January 2016 Parish Council meeting was very well attended by over 60 residents to express their views regarding the application. All were against the application. Policy 56 comments that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The following specific concerns were raised by those present at the meeting:-

- Site lines - The proposed site lines will seriously compromise safe access onto the Brize Norton Road being so close to the busy entrance to the parade of shops and neighbouring properties.

Flooding - The development will increase the risk of flooding to existing and proposed properties in the area both in terms of surface water and waste water. Thames Water's letter dated 20 January 2016 (supporting documents for this application) and OCC's Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment 2011 (from application 15/01783/OUT) refers. 2 known properties in this area of the Brize Norton Road were flooded in July 2007 due to 'run-off' from the neighbouring agricultural land. WODC has undertaken minimal ditch work to help with this problem. Environment Agency flood maps were produced in 2010 that clearly illustrate the probability of flooding in this specific area of the Brize Norton Road. Whilst this information should not be used alone to consider the possible effects of flooding, the evidence has already been demonstrated in 2007. (Appendix A refers).

-Telecommunications - The application considers that "BT's apparatus could potentially be utilised to serve the site from the Brize Norton Road." It should be noted that a high percentage of existing residents throughout the Village are unable to access Fibre Optic Broadband as the cabinet at Wenrisc Drive is fully utilised (no further connections are available) and the cabinet at Windrush Farm requires connection to the infrastructure. Significant investment into the telecommunications network would therefore be required for up to date technology to be made available to new residents.

-Sustainability - Concerns were raised regarding access to St Kenelm's

Primary School and Minster Lovell Playgroup. It is noted that the Primary School's annual intake is 15 children and applications for school places exceed this number. The Playgroup operates a 2 year waiting list. Proposed development design - There are 132 private driveways on the Brize Norton Road (one driveway is directly opposite the proposed site entrance that serves 3 homes); 16+ known businesses and 6 road junctions. The application will therefore not promote a safe and accessible environment for existing or future residents given the narrowness of the road, and weight/volume of traffic already using the Brize Norton Road. Contrary to policy 58, the application does not respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings. An example of this is that the majority of the properties in the area are of a bungalow style.

- Social housing - It is understood that the proposed social housing will not directly benefit residents of Minster Lovell as it will not be 'ring-fenced' - it will be open to residents of West Oxfordshire and therefore of no direct advantage.
- Development policy - The application should be refused as it does not fall within either category of a Strategic Developments Site (SHLAA site) (the site was considered under the most recent Local Development Framework but considered unsuitable) or Windfall development (the site is already known and considered unsuitable by WODC). Policy 60 - The application does not seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness given its location and the design features raised above.

Additionally, for the reasons outlined in this response, the application is also considered contrary to the following policies of WODC's Local Plan 2031:-

- OS2 Locating Development in the right places
- T3 Public Transport, Walking and Cycling
- OS3 Prudent Use of Natural Resources
- EH1 Landscape Character
- OS4 High Quality Design
- EH5 Flood Risk
- H2 Delivery of New Homes
- WIT4 Witney Sub-Area Strategy
- T1 Sustainable Transport

Summary

- By reason of the density of development, its backland location and form of units required to deliver the number of dwellings and the impact on the frontage from works to form the access the proposed development is considered to represent an incongruous and inappropriately overly dense form of urban development that fails to take the opportunity to create a locally distinctive scheme but rather would have an undue urbanising influence harming the amenity of neighbouring dwellings and the character of the Chartist settlement at this point. There is grave concern that the proposed development will significantly harm and erode the historic character, form and linear design of this part of Minster Lovell. Additionally, in the event that the application is approved, it would set an undesirable precedent for

other sites where in equity development would be difficult to resist and where cumulatively the resultant scale of development would erode the character and environment of not only the Brize Norton Road, but the wider scope of the Village. As such the scheme is contrary in particular to policies BE2, BE4 and H6 of the WOLP, policies OS4, EH3 and H2 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF. In the absence of an agreed mitigation package it has not been demonstrated how the adverse impacts of the development will be addressed. As such the proposal is contrary to policy BE1 of the adopted plan, policy OS5 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

-Extensive crop mark features extend across the fields west of Minster Lovell. These include settlement sites, a banjo enclosure and numerous enclosures. There is also the suggestion of a cursus. In the absence of a full archaeological investigation (as opposed to a desk-based study), it has not been demonstrated that damage to buried heritage assets would not arise or for the importance of the assets to be weighed in the merits of the application. As such the proposal is contrary to policy BE13 of the WOLP, EH7 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

-By reason of the lack of a full survey and lack of adequate long term mitigation and enhancement measures, it has not been demonstrated that the proposals would not adversely affect the biodiversity and potential ecological enhancement of the site. As such the scheme is contrary to policy NE13 of the WOLP, policy OS1 and OS4 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

Please see Appendix B (Planning Obligation) in the event that the application is approved.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 Over 200 letters of objection have been received and are summarised below:

Highways

- Brize Norton Road, Minster Lovell, is too busy and too narrow to safely permit large scale development operations such as those that would result from the proposed development.
- It is unsafe for school children walking to school and those waiting for buses.
- For such a large-scale construction site Brize Norton Road would have to be widened along its whole length and the proposed new access junction to be significantly flared for visibility and access safety.
- At the moment it is difficult for an HGV skip lorry to pass a school bus coming in the opposite direction. Not so long ago a skip lorry mounted the path due to an oncoming HGV where I was walking with my dog.
- Safety for pedestrians and animals compromised.
- Minster Lovell cannot accommodate 58 dwellings and the residents/vehicles that would come.
- Access is unsafe.
- Bus services are being withdrawn.
- Pedestrian safety from increased traffic.

Local amenities

- Primary School at capacity, parents would have to drive children elsewhere.
- Village has frequent interruptions to electricity and water supplies.
- Sewers are over full causing problems throughout the village.
- Broadband does not reach parts of the Brize Norton Road. It needs updating.
- If these properties are built many others will follow and the character of the village will be no more!!!
- Pedestrian crossings and improvements to the school are required.
- Play facilities require improvement.
- Electricity, broadband and sewerage will not cope and the site floods.
- It will be a 10+ % increase in the size of the village.
- Houses will not actually be affordable.
- Quality of life will be affected.

Principle

- It does not differ significantly from previous application.
- It would be urbanising backland development.
- The access will require an original Chartist bungalow to be demolished.
- The Local Plan has already made provision for future housing elsewhere.
- The application would set precedent for further development in the village.
- The proposal conflicts with the NPPF and the Local Plan.
- It will be out of character with the linear character of the village.
- It is not sustainable development.
- Previous refusal reasons still apply and the changes are only minor.
- There has been insufficient consultation with local people.
- Development of the right scale would be acceptable but this is too much and out of character.
- Contrary to NPPF.
- Not suitable in such a rural location.
- Village started as a Chartist settlement of 78 dwellings in 1845 and these 58 will erode the remaining form and appearance.
- Local plan has controlled development and should continue to do so.
- Localism should prevail.
- SHLAA is not fit for purpose and should be investigated.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

3.1 The application is accompanied by a number of supporting documents that are available to view online.

3.2 The Planning Statement is summarised as follows:

The Council's housing land supply is currently below the required five years, so policies relating to the supply of housing (including policy H6 of the adopted Local Plan) are no longer up-to-date. The current deficit in housing provision and the contribution that the proposed development will make in helping to address it are strong material considerations in favour of

the proposal. In addition, the Council has accepted that it needs to find additional housing sites to help with Oxford City's unmet housing need. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the Framework, therefore, the proposed development needs to be considered favourably provided any adverse impacts of doing so would not "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

The proposed development offers the following benefits:

Providing a good mix of 58 high quality homes in a sustainable location to help meet the objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing identified in the Oxfordshire SHMA and to help with Oxford City's unmet housing need:

- Delivering the homes immediately to help the Council make up its short-term housing deficit;
- Providing 24 affordable homes;
- Generating additional spending power in the local economy;
- Creating jobs for a local house building company;
- Securing a substantial New Homes Bonus;
- Securing appropriate Section 106 contributions to improve local services and facilities.

These benefits need to be afforded substantial weight. To ensure they are delivered, the site is available for development now - there are no land ownership or infrastructure complications to delay delivery. The scheme is deliverable and will be developed without delay. The proposal, therefore, complies with paragraph 47 of the Framework.

A good number of small Greenfield sites in appropriate and sustainable locations such as this site will need to be developed to meet the substantial housing need (particularly the short-term housing need) identified in the SHMA and to help with Oxford City's unmet housing need. Within this context, the proposal complies with Policy H2 of the emerging Local Plan as it will provide new housing on the edge of Minster Lovell and is consistent with all of the "general principles" set out in paragraph 3) of Policy H2.

The site is visually well contained and relates very well to the existing built-up area of the village. Views into and across the site are very limited from the surrounding area, so the proposal will not have a harmful impact on the local or wider landscape. The site is not subject to any environmental or other planning designations.

Considering the Framework as a whole, giving proper weight to the substantial benefits offered by the proposed development, and given the absence of any issues which amount to an adverse impact to "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits, the planning balance has to be in favour of granting planning permission.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

BE1 Environmental and Community Infrastructure

BE2 General Development Standards

BE4 Open space within and adjoining settlements

H6 Medium-sized villages

BE13 Archaeological Assessments

OSINew Presumption in favour of sustainable development

OS4NEW High quality design
OS5NEW Supporting infrastructure
EH3NEW Public realm and green infrastructure
EH7NEW Historic Environment
H2NEW Delivery of new homes
The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The application seeks outline consent for the development of 58 dwellings and creation of new access onto Brize Norton Road.
- 5.2 A similar application (15/01783/OUT Development of 74 dwellings and creation of new access onto Brize Norton Road) was refused by committee in July 2015 on the following grounds:
- 1 By reason of the density of development, its backland location, the height and form of units required to deliver the number of dwellings and the impact on the frontage from works to form the access the proposed development is considered to represent an incongruous and inappropriate overly dense form of urban development that fails to take the opportunity to create a locally distinctive scheme but rather would have an undue urbanising influence harming the amenity of neighbouring dwellings and the character of the Chartist settlement at this point and setting a precedent for further such developments that in equity would be difficult to resist to the further detriment of the character and historic importance of the village. As such the scheme is contrary in particular to policies BE2, BE4 and H6 of the WOLP, policies OS4, EH3 and H2 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
 - 2 In the absence of an agreed mitigation package it has not been demonstrated how the adverse impacts of the development will be addressed. As such the proposal is contrary to policy BE 1 of the adopted plan, policy OS 5 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
 - 3 Extensive crop mark features extend across the fields west of Minster Lovell. These include settlement sites, a banjo enclosure and numerous enclosures. There is also the suggestion of a cursus. In the absence of a full archaeological investigation it has not been demonstrated that damage to buried heritage assets would not arise or for the importance of the assets to be weighed in the merits of the application. As such the proposal is contrary to policy BE13 of the WOLP, EH7 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
 - 4 By reason of the lack of survey at appropriate time of year and lack of adequate long term mitigation and enhancement measures it has not been demonstrated that the proposals would not adversely affect the biodiversity and potential ecological enhancement of the site. As such the scheme is contrary to policy NE13 of the WOLP, policy OS1 and Os4 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
- 5.3 Members are advised that it may be useful to review that report on line as it sets the context for the assessment of this application.

Background Information

- 5.4 In that a very similar proposal failed to secure consent in July last year and Planning circumstances are broadly similar this report is framed to assess whether the refusal reasons have been overcome and whether there are additional or alternative planning circumstances that mean the planning balance weighs differently now as opposed to when last considered. In that context, taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Principle

- 5.5 As Members will recall in the context of the determination of the last application the site has been looked at in successive local plans and as part of the appeal process. Inspectors have opined that it would not form a natural extension to the village but would appear as a further incremental addition to unsatisfactory piecemeal development that would set a precedent for other similar sites to the detriment of the historic character of the settlement. It has also been considered as part of the SHLAA but rejected as "development would be out of character with the predominantly linear nature of the village and would compound the piecemeal approach to the north, be poorly related to the dwellings fronting Brize Norton Road and could lead to pressure for numerous other incremental schemes". Whilst these decisions pre date the NPPF they clearly set a context for the extent and level of concern regarding development of this site.
- 5.6 That having been stated the village is one of the more sustainable settlements in the District, being sited on a good bus route between the two largest settlements and with a good range of local services and facilities. Both the adopted and emerging plan identify it as potentially suitable for some development provided that a series of criteria aimed at reducing the harms arising are not caused. That having been stated the policies of the adopted plan are increasingly out of date and were framed in advance of the publication of the NPPF. The adopted plan is however the starting point for consideration of the application. The emerging plan policies now have some more weight in that the LPI commenced in December of last year. However the policies do not as yet have full weight but are useful as an indication of the direction of travel. Whilst the scheme does not accord to the terms of adopted Housing policy Members will be aware that substantial windfall development will be required to come forward to meet the housing needs of the area, that the policies in the emerging plan are framed more liberally to enable a greater delivery of housing and this site could clearly contribute to that delivery. As such the strategic principle of further development of this scale within or adjoining the village is not considered to be unacceptable.
- 5.7 The agent is asserting that in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply that, to accord to the provisions of the NPPF, planning permission should be granted unless there are significant and demonstrable harms, that policies are out of date or not of full weight, that there is a need to meet Oxford City's unmet housing need and that in combination these factors add weight to a recommendation to approve the scheme. Your Officers do not accept this argument. Essentially the Local Plan Inspector has indicated that the Councils former target of 525 units per year is not justified by some of the arguments set out in the LPI but that a figure of less than the full SHMA figure of 660 may be justified if the Council were to commission further work. He puts the need as lying between 525 and 660 and the supply side has a figure that falls within this range. As such the LPA MAY have a supply, but equally if the eventual figure exceeds the supply it may not. It is not possible to be determinative until such time as the work invited by the

Inspector (and that is now underway) has been concluded -along with any consideration of increased supply arising from the recent call for sites. Thus Officers would advise that the fact that the LPA may not be in a position to demonstrate a 5 year land supply should clearly be given considerable weight in the determination of the application but that as it cannot be demonstrated at this point that we do not have a 5 yhls (and it may be that there is in fact such a supply) that the full weight of the so called tilted balance is not necessarily invoked at this stage. Thus if the scheme is a good quality sustainable development then it should secure planning permission even where there are some policy objections. Conversely if it is a poor scheme permission should be refused. Notwithstanding this even were the tilted balance in place your officers consider that , as set out below, there are still significant and demonstrable harms such that refusal would still be justified even though the principle of some additional development in/adjoining the settlement is not precluded by emerging policy.

Design and Impact on Heritage Assets

- 5.8 Members will recall when the last application was considered, that Officers had considerable concerns that the number of units (then 74) the density of development, the height and the form all combined to create a development that would have been very harmful to the low density Chartist origins of the settlement, the characteristic plot spacings, the linear plot depth, the sense of openness beyond the frontage and the setting of the listed Chartist bungalows in the vicinity of the site. The applicant has sought to address some of these concerns.
- 5.9 Specifically the number of units has been reduced slightly which has enabled the deletion of the extensive use of terraced forms and a much greater preponderance of detached and semi-detached units. The open space, whilst reduced in extent, has been concentrated on the land to the rear of the existing frontage properties to seek to maintain some sense of openness. Boundary walls would be introduced to the frontage units to replicate the use of that material in the vicinity. The broadly linear form is also more indicative of the prevailing 'Minster' character. All these are better than the originally tabled illustrative scheme. Additionally the other key layout change is that a planting buffer to the neighbours to the north has been introduced, but as this sits between gardens it will have very little positive impact on character.
- 5.10 The changes made have gone some way to addressing Officers concerns that the previous scheme had failed to heed the advice of paragraph 58 of the NPPF to design locally distinctive development. Officers do however retain concerns that the very thin landscape belt and building line illustrated to the rear of the site will serve to add to the visual impact of the ribbon of development as it abuts the open countryside to the west. Similarly the extent of landscaping to the frontage is not yet meaningful enough to properly preserve the setting of the frontage listed buildings. Whilst the harm created is considered less than substantial in NPPF paragraph 133 terms, the less than substantial harm is not considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal(which are largely restricted to those as would apply to any such development or mitigation of the harms caused by the scheme) . As such these elements remain as concerns.
- 5.11 Additionally the County Archaeologist is retaining his concerns regarding the potential impact on important archaeology in the vicinity of the site and requires a pre determination dig to be undertaken to satisfy himself that no buried heritage assets will be adversely affected. Were members minded to approve the scheme then it might be possible to consider the application in principle and if that is considered acceptable to defer further consideration pending the dig being undertaken such that any findings could be taken into account before a final decision. However at the point of agenda preparation this remains as a key issue with the scheme.

Highway

- 5.12 Notwithstanding that Highway issues have historically been associated with potential schemes on this site OCC did not object to the last application on highway grounds and do not object to this one subject to conditions and contributions. As such Officers would not recommend a highway based refusal reason even though there are a number of highway concerns cited by respondents.

Residential Amenities

- 5.13 The impact on residential amenity was not a key issue cited in the last refusal reasons and the revised scheme, introducing a landscape buffer means that whilst existing residents will lose their currently unobstructed outlook across the site the impact on residential amenity is not such as would justify refusal in your officer's assessment.

Mitigation Package

- 5.14 The applicants are proposing 40% affordable housing which would accord to emerging policy in this settlement but there is at this point no agreed mitigation package in place to ensure that all the key measures are delivered and that the scheme retains its viability. This matter is capable of being overcome but this refusal reason is needed in the event that the application is refused and appealed to ensure that it is properly addressed as part of the appeal process.

Ecology

- 5.15 The final refusal reason last time related to ecology. Further ecological surveys have identified that reptiles are the key species that needs to be taken into account but the scheme as designed has not done so. However with the reduced density it would be possible to frame a condition to ensure suitable habitat were created in the new scheme and so this element is no longer cited as a refusal reason.

Conclusion

- 5.16 This application is a revised version of one that has already been found unacceptable and is now at appeal. In your officers assessment the applicants have made efforts to narrow the differences between the parties and in that regard the ecology refusal reason is capable of being addressed by condition and the bland and very uncharacteristic form of the initial scheme has been replaced with a slightly less dense and more bespoke design that picks up on some of the features of the village.
- 5.17 However one of the key characteristics of Minster is its linear form and where development in depth has occurred in the past this has been highly damaging to the Chartist origins of the settlement. This scheme has sought to address this matter but not yet in a form that officers could support. Additionally the extent of built form is such that further changes would be required to reduce landscape impact (and to meet ecological requirements) and were this site developed by way of an application it would be highly difficult to resist all the remaining undeveloped land south of the site coming forward. The impact on what appears to be potentially significant archaeology is wholly unknown and there is no agreed mitigation in place to ensure that the housing, educational etc impacts are addressed. These are considered to be significant and demonstrable harms that even were there to be no 5 year housing land supply

(which is not necessarily the current position) officers would be recommending refusal. As such, and notwithstanding that the scheme has improved, refusal is recommended.

6 REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 1 By reason of the density of the development, its backland location and the impact on the frontage from the works to create the access the proposed development is considered to represent an uncharacteristic form of development that would urbanise this part of the settlement to the detriment of the character and setting of the Chartist settlement/buildings at this point and setting a precedent for further such developments that in equity it would be difficult to resist to the further detriment of the character and historic importance of the village and contrary to policies BE2 BE4 and H6 of the adopted WOLP, policies OS4 EH3 and H2 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
- 2 In the absence of an agreed mitigation package it has not been demonstrated how the adverse impacts of the development will be addressed. As such the proposal is contrary to policy BE1 of the adopted WOLP, policy OS5 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.
- 3 Extensive crop mark features extend across the fields west of Minster Lovell. These include settlement sites, a banjo enclosure and numerous other enclosures along with the suggestion of a cursus. In the absence of a full archaeological dig it has not been demonstrated that damage to buried heritage assets would not arise or for the importance of the assets to be weighed in the merits of the application. As such the proposal is contrary to BE13 of the WOLP, EH7 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

Application Number	16/00001/S73
Site Address	Skippett Cottage Mount Skippett Ramsden Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 3AP
Date	8th March 2016
Officer	Stephanie Eldridge
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Ramsden
Grid Reference	435222 E 215755 N
Committee Date	21st March 2016

Application Details:

Non compliance with condition 2 of planning permission 15/01014/HHD to allow use of reconstituted stone to east facing wall. (Retrospective)

Applicant Details:

Ms Jude Douglass
Skippett Cottage
Ramsden
Oxfordshire
OX7 3AP
United Kingdom

I CONSULTATIONS

- 1.1 Parish Council Parish Council is of the view that the conditions of the original planning permission should be adhered to.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 One objection letter has been received from Helen Pennant-Rea, at The Skippett, Mount Skippett, Ramsden. The full representation can be accessed on the council's website. The key issues raised are in respect of:
- Background - breach of planning control established in October 2015 and officers confirmed an application for non-compliance with the condition would be required for any changes.
 - The impact on the character of Pond Lane/Mount Skippett - the buildings in the hamlet surrounding Skippett Pond and the lane are built of natural stone.
 - The impact on the area surrounding Skippett Pond- historic hamlet is in a sensitive and highly visible rural location.
 - The field south of the site is protected because of its historic ridge and furrow landscape.
 - Skippett Pond itself is 'one of Ramsden's great attractions'
 - In such a historically interesting location the materials used for an extension should match the local buildings.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

A full copy of the applicants supporting statement can be accessed on the council's website. The key points raised are:

- Cost - the east facing wall is not visible from the road and can only be seen from The Skippett. The cost of constructing the largely hidden wall in natural stone would be approximately £10,000 - £12,000.
- Long standing architectural practice- it's an established architectural practice to expend more money on the front facades of buildings where they are visible and to use cheaper, more basic designs and materials on the sides that are only visible to a few. Many properties in Witney and Ramsden are constructed in this way.
- Precedence - In the neighbouring property, The Skippett, two garages were given consent to be built in natural stone but the west facing wall has been constructed of rendered breeze block. This can be viewed from the garden of Skippett Cottage and the lane.
- Impact of the wall on the surrounding area- impact is very small as the wall can hardly be seen from any direction.
- Impact on the neighbour - only one neighbour (The Skippett) will be directly affected by this change and impact will be minimal.
- Vast majority of the elevation is obscured by the 2m high stone wall and existing trellises that extend above the garden wall to a height of about 2 ft dividing Skippett Cottage and The Skippett. Only 4ft of the elevation is visible from The Skippett and can only be seen from one small area of the neighbour's garden.
- The reconstituted stone used is not too dissimilar in shape to the stone used on the garages at the front of The Skippett and is in fact a better colour match to the random stone used elsewhere.
- Context- Many concessions have already been made to minimise the impact of the extension on the neighbour including the removal of a window in the east facing wall to restore privacy to the neighbour's garden.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

BE2 General Development Standards

The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 This application is for non-compliance with condition 2 of planning permission 15/01014/HHD to allow the use of reconstituted stone on the east facing wall of the approved extension instead of natural stone as conditioned on the original consent to match the existing dwelling. The application is retrospective and the wall has already been constructed using the reconstituted stone. The rest of the extension has been constructed using the natural stone as per the condition on the approval. The site does not sit within the Ramsden Conservation area, or the Cotswold AONB. There are no listed buildings in the surrounding area.

Background Information

- 5.2 Consent for the two storey extension to the dwelling known as Skippett Cottage was originally granted under Planning Application ref 06/1351/P/FP. Works had commenced on this development when a full application was submitted in 2015 to seek approval for amendments to

this scheme (ref 15/01014/HHD). This application was approved partly on the basis of the precedent that was set by the earlier consent and that there was an improved relationship with the neighbouring property, The Skippett, due to the alterations to the boundary walling and the removal of the openings on the east facing elevation. Condition 3 on this consent remained as 'The external walls of the extension shall be constructed of natural stone of the same type, colour and texture and laid in the same manner as the stone used in the existing building. REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area'.

- 5.3 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Impact on visual amenity and character of the area

- 5.4 In terms of visual amenity, the principal impact of the use of reconstituted stone on the east elevation would be on the neighbour's private view and not on the wider street scene. A site visit confirmed that there are only glimpsed views of the east facing elevation from the lane. Additionally, there is a 2m stone boundary wall that sits adjacent to the elevation leaving, approximately, only the top 4 ft visible in these glimpsed views you get from the street scene. Furthermore, there is established planting that exists which projects above the 2m wall that screens much of the east elevation from view. Given the distance of the east facing wall from the lane, and the screening mentioned above, it is difficult to establish that an alternative material has been used on this one elevation.
- 5.5 The view of the wall from the neighbour's garden is more prominent, however only the top section of the wall can be seen from certain points in the garden and you do not see the two different materials used in the same plain so do not read them together. Therefore, officers are of the opinion that this change does not cause demonstrable, significant harm to the visual amenity of the neighbour's outlook.
- 5.6 Although natural stone has been used frequently in the area the site does not sit within the Ramsden Conservation area or the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Additionally, it does not affect any listed buildings. Although Skippett Pond is an interesting historic feature in the Hamlet, officers are of the opinion that no adverse harm is caused to the character of the area due to the lack of visibility and distinguishability of the materials used to construct the elevation in question.

Conclusion

- 5.7 Given the above, officers are of the opinion that it cannot be demonstrated that the use of reconstituted stone would result in significant enough harm to the visual amenity and character of the area that it would be expedient for the council to require the use of an alternative material. Therefore, the application is recommended for approval. If members are minded to refuse the application, on the basis that the retrospective development does adversely affect the visual amenity and character of the area, then consideration will need to be given to the expediency of taking formal enforcement action to remedy the breach.

6 CONDITION

- I Other than the detailed changes approved in the application the development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the plans, conditions and discharged details comprised in the enabling consent and any subsequent variations thereto.

REASON: The proposal is an amendment to the scheme already approved (15/01014/HHD).

Application Number	16/00241/FUL
Site Address	Land at Patchfield Barn Standlake Road Northmoor Oxfordshire
Date	8th March 2016
Officer	Miranda Clark
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Northmoor
Grid Reference	441344 E 202852 N
Committee Date	21st March 2016

Application Details:

Conversion and extension of 'Patchfield Barn' to provide a single dwelling.

Applicant Details:

Mr & Mrs Barry Sparrowhawk
C/O Agent

I CONSULTATIONS

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|--|
| I.1 | OCC Highways | The proposal, if permitted, will not have a significant detrimental effect (in terms of highway safety and convenience) on the local road network.

No objection |
| I.2 | WODC Architect | No Comment Received. |
| I.3 | WODC Drainage Engineers | No Comment Received. |
| I.4 | Ecologist | If all the above recommended mitigation are implemented, the development will not cause any harm to bats, birds or priority habitats and therefore the policy and guidance requirements of Policies in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan, the NPPF (including section 11) and the NPPG are met. Condition requested. |
| I.5 | Environment Agency | We object in principle to this application because the proposed development falls into a flood risk vulnerability category that is inappropriate to the Flood Zone in which the application site is located. We recommend that the application should be refused planning permission on this basis.
The submitted FRA fails to clearly explain the proposed flood compensation solution. Instead, two options have been presented - one being level for level compensation, the other being voids. If our in principle objection was overcome then we need clarification as to which option would be implemented. Any flood mitigation must clearly show that flood risk would not be increased on or off site. |

1.6 WODC Planning Policy No Comment Received.
Manager

1.7 Parish Council The Council gave its unanimous support for this Application.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 Over 40 supporting comments have been received. All of the comments can be viewed on line. Comments (summarised) include:

- Mr & Mrs Sparrowhawk have been linked with this village for a very long time and they have my support in this application which will clearly meet not only their needs, but the needs of family members who rely on them for their support.
- As neighbours to the proposed development we would have no objection to the development as we feel that the overall impact on the area would be positive.
- I think the addition of the extension plus the work to the existing barn would make a definite positive impact on the look of the site.
- This seems a logical and sensible use of an existing building.
- The family has long connections with Northmoor including dependents living in the parish, surely this is the type of resident that should be encouraged.
- Barry was born in Northmoor and his family has been part of the parish for over 200 years. He has also worked in the local area all his working life. This is a great chance for a local person to make his own home back in the village.
- I feel that it is important, where possible, to let local residents to remain in the village. You have passed three small estates in Northmoor recently, which I also support, however to allow the village to remain a broad spectrum community I feel that the new developments in Northmoor would be out of Mr Sparrowhawks financial means. The proposed house is set away from the road and in an unobtrusive position.
- We should support anyone wanting to stay living within their local community - particularly during their retirement years.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

A Planning, Design and Access Statement has been submitted with the application. The full version can be viewed on line, or obtained from officers. The conclusion of the Statement has been summarised as:

- Northmoor is a sustainable location where new residential development has been permitted.
- The Council does not have a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. This brings in to play paragraphs 49 and 14 in the NPPF. In light of the widely acknowledged lack of five-year housing supply of deliverable housing sites in the West Oxfordshire District, the policies for the supply of housing should be considered out-of-date and the application determined in accordance with a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policies of otherwise constraint should be set aside.
- The conversion and extension of Patchfield Barn, as proposed, accords with Government policy as set in paragraph 55 of the NPPF.
- Mr and Mrs Sparrowhawk have a personal, social need for a home in Northmoor, which is material to the consideration of this application.

- Having regard to the foregoing, the planning balance in this case lies squarely with a decision to approve this planning application.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

BE2 General Development Standards

BE10 Conversion of Unlisted Vernacular Buildings

H2 General residential development standards

H10 Conversion of existing buildings to residential use in the countryside and

OS4NEW High quality design

BE3 Provision for Movement and Parking

T1NEW Sustainable transport

NE15 Protected Species

EH2NEW Biodiversity

OS2NEW Locating development in the right places

The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The application is to be heard before the Committee as the Parish Council are in support of the proposal.

Background Information

- There is no recent planning history for the existing building.
- The existing building is located outside of Northmoor's Conservation Area and is not Listed. It is however, located within Flood Zone 3b.
- The proposal is for the conversion and extension of the existing building to form a dwelling.

- 5.2 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Principle

- 5.3 Officers consider that the starting point of assessing the application is to determine whether the existing building is suitable for conversion. Policy BE10 of the Adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan states that the building should be vernacular - traditionally built in form and appearance. It states "ensuring the appropriate conversion of these buildings will prolong their life and the important contribution they make to the history of a settlement or the wider landscape." There are no policies for the conversion of non-vernacular buildings as these types of buildings are not traditional to the area and most do not contribute to the landscape.
- 5.4 The building subject to the application is of modern construction with breeze block walls and a tiled roof. Your officers are of the opinion that the building is not vernacular and does not make an important contribution to the locality. As such officers consider that the proposal does not comply with this policy. Although the applicant will be improving the appearance of the building by proposing to use timber cladding etc, it is the existing building which should be assessed initially.

- 5.5 A further conversion policy to consider is Policy H10. This policy discusses the conversion of existing buildings to residential use in the countryside and small villages. Northmoor is categorised as a small village, and due to the location of the building, officers are of the opinion that the site falls outside of the main built up area of the village. However the requirements of this policy are the same. Conversion of a building to a dwelling will only be permitted in the following circumstances and where retention of the building meets overall sustainability objectives:
- 5.6 The building is not suitable or reasonably capable of the re-use for employment purposes, recreational or community uses, visitor facilities or tourist accommodation, and it is demonstrated that its retention can only be secured through its conversion to residential use, or that there is an essential operational or social need for a dwelling in accordance with Policy H4. In addition to this, the building should be of a substantial construction and capable of accommodating residential use without major reconstruction or significant enlargement, and the building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
- 5.7 Officers consider that the proposal does not comply with this policy.
- 5.8 The applicants state that Northmoor is a sustainable location.
- 5.9 In a recent appeal decision to the west of the application site, near the Dun Cow, (Land South West of the Dun Cow, Standlake Road, Northmoor (15/00532/FUL) the Inspector stated:
- 5.10 However, to promote sustainable development in rural areas, paragraph 55 of the Framework advises that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. It is likely that future occupiers of the new dwelling would support the local pub, church and village hall in Northmoor, and the services and facilities in Standlake. However, and in the absence of evidence to demonstrate otherwise, I find that the contribution one new dwelling would make to the vitality of the rural community and local economy would be unlikely to be discernible. The social and economic benefits of an additional dwelling in this location, including the contribution that would be made to the supply of housing in the area and the employment that would be provided during the building of the property would be limited.
- 5.11 Given the limited services within Northmoor, and having regard to the local highway network with no pavements or street lighting, there would be a high probability that the future occupiers of the new dwelling would have a high dependency on the private car to access services and facilities in nearby towns and villages. Having regard to the limited range of services in Standlake, once in their cars, the potential for travelling further afield to access basic services would be enhanced.
- 5.12 Whilst I accept that the Framework recognises that sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas, I find that future occupiers of the new dwelling would be highly dependent on private transport to access their basic day to day needs, including places of employment and education. For those without access to private transport, the services and facilities in nearby towns and villages would not be accessible. The bus service through the village is infrequent and would be unlikely to prove attractive or convenient as an alternative mode of transport. I therefore find that the scheme would conflict with the social and environmental roles of sustainability.

- 5.13 In view of the above, your officers are of the opinion that the existing building does not fall within the criteria of Policy BE10 which enables the conversion of appropriate vernacular buildings and as such cannot support the proposal in principle.
- 5.14 Objections have also been received from the Environment Agency. According to the EA, the site sits within Flood Zone 3b (the functional flood plain) as the site is within 1 in 20 year flood extent. The application will increase the vulnerability of the use from less to more vulnerable. The advice from National Planning Policy is that development should be directed to areas of low risk from flooding and that this use is more sensitive to flooding than the existing use. It is therefore considered to be unacceptable on flooding grounds.

Siting, Design and Form

- 5.15 As well as the proposed conversion, the applicants also wish to extend the building to form the required level of accommodation. The building will also have timber cladding on a red brick plinth which officers consider would improve the appearance of the modern structure. However this does not overcome the policy constraints stated above.

Highway

- 5.16 OCC Highways have raised no objections to the proposal.

Residential Amenities

- 5.17 Due to the location of the building within a field and opposite existing dwellings, officers do not consider that a loss of residential amenities will result to the existing or proposed occupiers.

Conclusion

- 5.18 Having regard to all of the neighbour comments and the case made by the applicant, officers have great sympathy with the applicants, however having referred to all of the relevant policies officers are unable to support this proposal.

6 REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 1 It is considered that by reason of the modern non vernacular design, form and materials of the existing barn, that the barn is not suitable for conversion and does not make a positive contribution to the wider landscape. Rather it is the creation of a new dwelling in an unsustainable location. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies BE10 and H10 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan, and Policy E3 of the Emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031.
- 2 It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the LPA that alternative lower risk flooding sites have been investigated for residential occupation and as such, as the application site which lies within Flood Zone 3b, is contrary to the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF, and the Sequential Test.

Application Number	16/00314/FUL
Site Address	Lower Farm Lew Bampton Oxfordshire OX18 2BB
Date	8th March 2016
Officer	Kim Smith
Officer Recommendations	Approve subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Lew
Grid Reference	433237 E 206314 N
Committee Date	21st March 2016

Application Details:

Change of use and associated operations to convert existing buildings to five holiday lets. (Part retrospective)

Applicant Details:

Mr S. Palmer
Lower Farm,
Road to Lower Farm
Lew
Bampton
Oxfordshire
OX18 2BB

I CONSULTATIONS

- 1.1 Parish Council The Parish Council wishes to object to this application.
- We feel that a development of this size is totally out of keeping with the very small village of Lew.
- 1.2 OCC Highways The proposal, if permitted, will not have a significant detrimental effect (in terms of highway safety and convenience) on the local road network.
- No objection.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

Objection

- 2.1 Mr Morgan Thomas of 1 Hill View Yelford Rd, Lew has written and commented as follows:

- We used to live in the quiet rural hamlet of Lew, now we live next to a 'holiday park', which used to be a farm (Lower Farm) and now it is called The Cotswold Manor. It already provides accommodation for 78 people and now if this planning goes through another 50 plus.

- We have narrow country lanes with no footpaths and even now it's dangerous trying to walk pets and children, with all the other influx of traffic this will bring it'll be impossible, especially on change over days. Also we have speeding taxis and coaches up and down, some of them in the early hours of the morning - we need a speed limit!!
- I do not understand in the application how they can say the car park will only be extended for 5 cars when they want to have another 26 bedrooms. One of the holiday lets sleeps 20 and we've seen 12 plus cars in the car park!!
- How much bigger are you going to allow this to be????

Support

2.2 Mr Bernard de Petrucci of The Lord Kitchener Lew Road Curbridge has commented as follows:

- The Cotswold Manor Estate provides a great service bringing visitors to the area and I know that they are very diligent in controlling any disturbance to neighbours.
- I wholeheartedly support the application.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

The applicants design and Access statement concludes as follows:

- 'The proposed works will make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and meets the requirements of the NPPF for diversification of redundant buildings.
- This development is in accordance with the Local Plan policies E2, E3 and E4. It will assist with local tourism and provide a suitable new uses for the buildings.
- The existing form and design of the buildings positively contribute to the character of the area and are capable of conversion to the proposed use without necessitating alteration(s) or extension(s) which would harm the form of the original building and do not remove features of architectural or nature conservation interest; The buildings are suitably located for the scale and type of the proposed use, having regard to the level of accessibility to settlements, facilities and services and impact on the character and amenity of the area.
- The site will be developed in a sensitive manner appropriate for such a location.'
- The applicant has confirmed that he is willing to enter into a legal agreement which restricts the use of the converted buildings to holiday lets limited to a maximum of four week occupations by any one party. The obligation will also require the submission of an annual return detailing those staying in the units.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

OS2NEW Locating development in the right places

BE3 Provision for Movement and Parking

TLC2 Use of Existing Buildings

E4NEW Sustainable tourism

The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 This application is part retrospective and has been submitted following an enforcement investigation in to alleged breaches of planning control on the site.

Background Information

- 5.2 The application is seeking to regularise works that have been carried out on site without the requisite planning permissions and in addition proposes works to convert a number of existing buildings on the land to holiday lets.
- 5.3 The applicant has historically contended that the retrospective conversions the subject of this application are lawful as dwellings by reason of the time that has passed since they were substantially completed. Officers did not accept that position and sought to broker a compromise whereby the units could be retained but under a greater degree of control.
- 5.4 The proposal relates to five existing barns/buildings located at Lower Farm Lew. Three of the barns (two of which are of single storey vernacular design) have already been converted to dwellings used as holiday lets without planning permission and two of the holiday let conversions are prospective. The two prospective conversions are in respect of a stone built garage and an agricultural building erected as agricultural permitted development in association with the applicant's smallholding.
- 5.5 The applicant has agreed to enter in to a legal agreement if planning permission is granted for the holiday let uses to ensure that the holiday let use remains in perpetuity (or until such time as the legal agreement is formally amended). Such an agreement will ensure that the residential uses in this open countryside location remain for holiday let use only and cannot through the passage of time become lawful as unfettered housing.
- 5.6 The applicant has been successfully operating a holiday let business from Lower Farm for a number of years.
- 5.7 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Principle

- 5.8 This part retrospective application needs to be considered in the context of the positively worded tourism policy TLC2 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan and policy E4 of the emerging Local Plan 2031. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF is also of relevance in respect of development proposals supporting a prosperous rural economy.
- 5.9 Having regard to the adopted policy TLC2 and the guidance contained in paragraph 28 of the NPPF the principle of re-use of the range of buildings located at Lower Farm, Lew for visitor accommodation is considered acceptable in principle.

Siting, Design and Form

- 5.10 The retrospective and prospective works to the buildings on the site are considered by officers to respect both the character and the setting of the buildings in accordance with policy TLC2. Conditions are recommended in respect of materials, architectural details and hard and soft landscaping to ensure that the character and setting of the group of converted buildings are respected.

Highways

- 5.11 County Highways has raised no objections to the application and there is adequate parking and manoeuvring within the confines of the site to provide for the five holiday let uses.

Residential Amenities

- 5.12 Policy TLC2 positively supports the conversion of existing buildings for visitor accommodation subject to the scale of the proposals not generating a level of activity that would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area or the reasonable amenities of adjoining dwellings.
- 5.13 In this regard Officers consider that the level of activity associated with five holiday lets will not be so excessive as to result in unacceptable levels of harm by way of noise and disturbance to the reasonable amenities of residential occupiers living in the area, given the separation from third party properties.

Conclusion

- 5.14 Given the ongoing breach of planning control at Lower Farm and the alleged long time frames associated with the breaches, Officers welcome this application which seeks to regularise, in part, the use of three retrospective residential conversions for local and national policy compliant holiday let uses which will help support the local rural economy.
- 5.15 In light of the above, the application is recommended for conditional approval, subject to the applicant entering in to a legal agreement that the residential conversions are fettered for use as holiday lets only as unfettered residential use would not be policy compliant given the unsustainable open countryside location.
- 5.16 Bearing in mind that some of the development has occurred a separate enforcement report in respect of the breaches is attached to this Schedule as an agenda item in order to ensure control should the legal agreement not be signed.

6 CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

- 3 Notwithstanding details contained in the application, detailed specifications and drawings of all dormer windows, windows and doors for Barn B and Barn C as identified on Site and Block Plan drawing no SP/1553- 05 B at a scale of not less than 1:20 including details of external finishes and colours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that architectural feature is commissioned/erected on site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To ensure the architectural detailing of the buildings reflects the established character of the area.
- 4 Before above ground building work commences on Barn C and Barn B as identified on Site and Block Plan drawing no. SP/1553- 05B a schedule of materials (including samples) to be used in the elevations of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in the approved materials.
REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no alterations, extensions including alterations to the roofs of the buildings, outbuildings or means of enclosure other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be constructed.
REASON: Control is needed in the interests of visual amenity.
- 6 Details of the design and specification of all means of enclosure to the garden areas serving the holiday lets shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved means of enclosure shall be constructed before first occupation of Barn B and Barn C.
REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and because details were not contained in the application.
- 7 That a scheme for the landscaping of the site, including the retention of any existing trees and shrubs and planting of additional trees and shrubs, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall be implemented as approved within 12 months of the commencement of the approved development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme. In the event of any of the trees or shrubs so planted dying or being seriously damaged or destroyed within 5 years of the completion of the development, a new tree or shrub of equivalent number and species, shall be planted as a replacement and thereafter properly maintained.
REASON: To ensure the safeguarding of the character and landscape of the area during and post development.
- 8 Barn B and Barn C shall be occupied until the vehicular accesses, driveways, car and cycle parking spaces, turning areas and parking courts that serve that dwelling has been constructed, laid out, surfaced, lit and drained in accordance with details that have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: In the interests of road safety.

- 9 Bat and bird boxes shall be installed in accordance with details including phasing that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.
REASON: To safeguard and enhance biodiversity.

NOTE TO APPLICANT

- I This permission is subject to a legal agreement which fetters the dwellings for holiday let use only the occupation of which is limited to holiday tenancies not to exceed 4 weeks (in each case) and no person shall occupy the accommodation in consecutive tenancy periods.

Application Number	16/00359/FUL
Site Address	131 Abingdon Road Standlake Witney Oxfordshire OX29 7QN
Date	8th March 2016
Officer	Cheryl Morley
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Standlake
Grid Reference	439198 E 202958 N
Committee Date	21st March 2016

Application Details:

Change of use of land to form part of the garden of 131 Abingdon Road.

Applicant Details:

Mr Leigh Kendall
131 Abingdon Road
Standlake
Oxfordshire
OX29 7QN

1 CONSULTATIONS

1.1 Parish Council No objection.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 One letter of representation has been received and is summarised below:

Mr Shaw - 127 Abingdon Road

2.2 We have no objection to the proposal for change of use to a garden, but would wish to know what type of boundary is envisaged between our property and the garden / field at 131 in order that our view across towards the hedge is line is not obscured.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

3.1 131 Abingdon Road was permitted as an infill dwelling besides Fletchers Farm in 2011 (application reference: 11/0456/P/FP). Planning permission has subsequently been granted for the following developments within the original grounds of Fletchers Farm:

- Conversion of a barn to a dwelling and erection of a detached garage (application no. 12/0269/P/FP) - permitted in April 2012 (now no. 137).
- Erection of two detached houses to replace Fletcher's Farm (application no. 12/1420/P/FP) - permitted in November 2012 (now nos. 133 and 135).

- Erection of two detached houses on land to the south-east of no. 137 (application no. 13/1485/P/FP) - allowed on appeal in June 2014.
- These houses have recently been completed and are nos. 141 and 143.
- Erection of a house on the south-east side of no.137 (application no. 15/02730/FUL) - permitted in September 2015. This has yet to be built and will be no. 139.
- The gardens of the above new dwellings extend as far as the established hedgerow and mature trees along the north-east boundary of the original garden of Fletcher's Farm. The land the subject of the current application also extends to the north-east as far as the same hedgerow and trees, so the current proposal simply means that all of the gardens will extend the same length to the same established landscape features.
- The application site previously comprised part of the garden of Fletcher's Farm and an application for a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development to establish this was submitted in August 2015 (application no. 15/03002/CLE). The application, however, had to be withdrawn as the Council considered there was insufficient evidence to establish the garden use of the land as a matter of law.
- This planning application, therefore, has been submitted as an alternative way of establishing the use of the land as garden for 131 Abingdon Road.
- The application site is well enclosed by mature hedgerows and trees along the north-east and north-west boundaries. As the site is well enclosed and as it previously formed part of the extensive grounds of Fletcher's Farm, the site does not relate to the character of the wider landscape to the north. The proposal, therefore, will not have a harmful impact on the local landscape. In addition, the only public right of way in the vicinity of the site is public footpath 360/5 which lies further to the north and north-west.
- As the site is very well screened by the existing mature planting along the northeast and north-west boundaries, the proposed garden use of the site will not harm the visual amenity of the area either.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

BE2 General Development Standards

BE4 Open space within and adjoining settlements

EH3NEW Public realm and green infrastructure

OS2NEW Locating development in the right places

EH1NEW Landscape character

The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The application relates to a parcel of land located to the rear of 4 properties located along Abingdon Road. The proposed site is in ownership of 131 Abingdon Road which was formally part of Fletchers Farm.

- 5.2 The application seeks planning permission for the change of use of the paddock to domestic garden situated within no areas of designated control.

Background Information

- 5.3 A certificate of lawfulness application for the existing use was recently submitted to the local authority to seek to regularise the use of the land as domestic garden. However, the applicant could not provide adequate evidence that the use had always been domestic and therefore the application was withdrawn. Officers therefore consider that the site in question must be considered as agricultural land that was associated with Fletchers Farm originally, and not domestic.
- 5.4 The area of land proposed to become domestic garden is 0.1 hectares.
- 5.5 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Impact on the open countryside
Impact on neighbouring amenity

Principle

- 5.6 It should be noted, as mentioned above that the site is considered to be agricultural land. Officers consider that the change of use by reason of its extent and location represents a significant enclosure of the land and as such will not retain the open and attractive agricultural character and appearance of the surrounding landscape.

Siting, Design and Form

- 5.7 The proposed location for an extended garden is considered unacceptable in terms of the relationship the site has with the existing open countryside. The amount of land (0.1Ha) that is being proposed to be domestic garden is of a scale that officers consider to be inappropriate. The current dwelling already has the benefit of a substantial garden area and an extension of this level is considered to be unacceptable/unnecessarily given the visual harms.
- 5.8 Officers also consider there to be potential impacts to neighbouring properties if the change of use were permitted, through the allowance of domestic garden uses in such a vast area. These uses could involve garden paraphernalia and outbuildings being located a large distance away from the existing host dwelling and in close proximity to either the neighbouring properties fronting Abingdon Road. The domestic items into an area of current paddock land which will cause a detrimental visual impact to the surrounding prominent open countryside.

Conclusion

- 5.9 There are significant concerns in regards to the proposed change of use. The original site Fletchers Farm has been demolished and redeveloped into housing with this parcel of paddock land remaining. Officers consider that the original site has reached the capacity for domestic development and the remaining agricultural land should remain in situ to reduce any further encroachments or additional visual impact into the surrounding open countryside.

- 5.10 Officers also consider the extent of land being proposed to become domestic garden could set an undesirable precedent for the further loss of surrounding open countryside.
- 5.11 The development line along Abingdon Road has been extremely established over the past couple of years and the proposed site of this size and scale would not complement the existing linear form.
- 5.12 The applicant has not provided any justification as to why a garden extension of this size is required.
- 5.13 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is unacceptable on its planning merits and therefore should be refused.

6 REASON FOR REFUSAL

- I The change of use of the land from agricultural paddock to domestic garden by reason of its extent and location and will not conserve the natural beauty of the landscape and would cause potential impacts to surrounding neighbouring properties amenities due to the proposed domestic use. The proposed change of use would represent significant encroachment into, agricultural land, which would erode the character, visual appearance and distinctiveness of the landscape and open countryside in this location. It could also set a precedent of which could cause the loss of a significantly larger area of open countryside to the rear of the existing development line along Abingdon Road. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies BE2 and BE4 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and policies EH3, OS2 and EH1 of the emerging Local Plan 2031 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Application Number	16/00404/FUL
Site Address	64 Acre End Street Eynsham Witney Oxfordshire OX29 4PD
Date	8th March 2016
Officer	Miranda Clark
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Eynsham
Grid Reference	443060 E 209297 N
Committee Date	21st March 2016

Application Details:

Installation of A/C Condensers at Low Level to the Rear Elevation. Change of colour of shop front from black to white. New Shop Front

Applicant Details:

Mrs Gilda Owen
Sapphire Court
Walsgrave Triangle
Coventry
Warwickshire
CV2 2TX
United Kingdom

I CONSULTATIONS

- 1.1 Parish Council Consent for the air conditioning condensers should only be granted subject to an environmental impact report on the noise generated from the units, produced to the satisfaction of the environment officer.

This building is in the Conservation Area and has one of the very few remaining traditional shopfronts in the village. Consent to a new shopfront should be conditional on compliance with WODC Design Guide 2015, part 17. The priority should be on restoration of the existing rather than replacement, particularly in respect of the pilasters and existing consoles (which do not appear on either the existing or proposed design drawing submitted).

The Parish Council also objects to the insertion of the proposed single glass panes. The current divided window arrangement should be retained or the Applicant should seek to recover the original window style to complement the retained traditional shopfront.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 No letters have been received at the time of writing.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

There is no supporting statement accompanying the application.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

BE2 General Development Standards

BE5 Conservation Areas

BE14 Shop Fronts

EH7NEW Historic Environment

The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The application is to be heard before the Committee as the Parish Council have objected to the proposal.

Background Information

- The application site is located within the Conservation Area and is currently a commercial retail unit for Lloyds Pharmacy.
- A previous application for the same proposal was withdrawn after officers had concerns regarding the design of the proposed shop front in terms of it not reflecting the usual traditional design.
- An application for advertisement consent was approved for a hanging sign only, the other signs which had been applied for did not require consent, this included a white fascia sign and an internally hanging sign.

- 5.2 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Principle

- 5.3 Replacement shop fronts are acceptable in principle. Policy BE14 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 is the most relevant. New shop fronts should respect the whole elevation, retain and repair any existing historic features in the shop front and so forth.

Siting, Design and Form

- 5.4 Officers consider that although the design of the shop front has improved slightly from the previous application, there are still some concerns relating to the traditional detailing, such as the cornice.
- 5.5 Officers have suggested a condition to request for these details to be submitted, and are waiting for the agent to agree with this condition. At the time of writing no response has been received. Your officers will update Members verbally at the meeting.

Highway

- 5.6 Officers consider that highway safety issues will not be adversely affected by the development.

Residential Amenities

- 5.7 The application is also proposing air conditioning units. As these are the same as the previous application, your EH officers have no objection in terms of noise and disturbance issues.

Conclusion

- 5.8 Although officers consider that the principle of a shop front is acceptable, further details are required. It is anticipated that a response will be received from the agent prior to the meeting, where your officers will be able to verbally update Members.

6 CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.
- 3 Notwithstanding details contained in the application, detailed specifications and drawings of taller flanking pilasters, (nearer to the height of the stallriser); the pilasters fluted, and topped with some sort of capital or corbel, and a projecting cornice (probably lead-topped) at a scale of not less than 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that architectural feature is commissioned/erected on site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To ensure the architectural detailing of the buildings reflects the established character of the area.

Application Number	I6/00496/FUL
Site Address	Yew Tree Cottage Lew Bampton Oxfordshire OX18 2BB
Date	8th March 2016
Officer	Kim Smith
Officer Recommendations	Approve subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Lew
Grid Reference	433205 E 206504 N
Committee Date	21st March 2016

Application Details:

The change of use of a building to be used either as an ancillary residential annex to House B or as a holiday let and associated internal and external alterations; the conversion of a vehicle storage garage to ancillary residential accommodation and associated internal and external alterations; the erection of a vehicle storage garage; and changes to access (part retrospective)

Applicant Details:

Mr S. Palmer
Lower Farm
Lew
Bampton
Oxfordshire
OX18 2BB

I CONSULTATIONS

- I.1 Parish Council No reply at the time of writing.
No reply at the time of writing.
- I.2 WODC Env Health - Lowlands No comment.
- I.3 WODC Drainage Engineers No reply at the time of writing.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

- 2.1 No representations received at the time of writing.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

- 3.1 The application is accompanied by a Design and Access statement which in a précised form advises the following:

- 3.2 By way of introduction the three buildings that are subject to this application form part of the Yew Tree Cottage land holding. They were and are ancillary outbuildings to the principal residential dwellinghouse at the land holding.
- 3.3 In respect of Barn F - this building has been used as ancillary residential accommodation to the principal dwellinghouse for a number of years. The application seeks permission to carry on that use or, in the alternative, for the use of the building to be used as a self-contained and independent holiday-let. The application also seeks retrospective permission for the erection of the conservatory on the west elevation and associated internal changes. The use of this building as a holiday let will be controlled by way of a unilateral planning obligation under s.106.
- 3.4 In respect of Garage A - this building was formerly a vehicle storage garage serving the principal dwellinghouse on the site. It was converted some years ago to a home-office, plus a bedroom a small bathroom and a laundry/linen room, and used as ancillary residential accommodation. Planning permission is sought for this use to continue. However we should mention that this application is made without prejudice to the view that (as a matter of law) planning permission is not in fact required. We make this assertion because the conversion from one type of ancillary accommodation (vehicle storage) to another type of ancillary accommodation (residential annex) is not a material change of use requiring planning permission. This element of the proposal is therefore only included for completeness.
- 3.5 In respect of Garage B - retrospective planning permission is sought for the erection of this building which is and will be used as a vehicle storage garage.
- 3.6 In respect of the access - the buildings the subject of this application can be accessed either directly from Yelford Road or via short driveway running to the south of principal dwelling on the site and connecting with the main driveway which connects the buildings at Lower Farm. It is proposed that the access from the parking area directly onto Yelford Road will be closed as part of this application and a fence erected. This will mean that vehicles using the parking area between the three buildings will use the accessway to the south of the principal dwelling. This parking area will be extended to accommodate the vehicles.

Planning history

- 3.7 Barn F was approved under planning permission bearing the Council's ref. no. 02/0717 for a building for the storage of agricultural machinery and tools used in association with the principal dwelling on the site. Condition no. 3 of Planning Permission W2002/0717 allowed the building to be used for purposes ancillary to the main dwelling. Planning advice received from the Council bearing ref. no. AA61.54/DM dated 12/8/08 stated that 'the building can be used for living accommodation provided it remains ancillary to the main dwelling'.
- 3.8 Garage A was converted from a vehicle storage garage to a home-office/hobby room/bathroom by the previous owner of Yew Tree Cottage sometime prior to 2010. It has since that time been used as a residential annex to the principal dwelling on the land.
- 3.9 Garage B was erected in the summer of 2015. The owner (the applicant) considered that it was erected pursuant to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, specifically Schedule 2 Part 1 Class E of that Order. Express (and retrospective) planning permission is now sought for the retention of this building and again this application is made without prejudice to the view that such permission is not in fact required.

Assessment

- 3.10 'The proposed use and associated alterations make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and meets the requirements of the NPPF for diversification of redundant buildings.
- 3.11 The development is in accordance with the Local Plan policies E2, E3 and E4. It will assist with local tourism and provide a suitable new use for the buildings.
- 3.12 The existing form and design of the buildings positively contribute to the character of the area and are capable of conversion to the proposed uses without necessitating any further alteration(s) or extension(s) which could harm the form of the original building. No features of architectural or nature conservation interest will be harmed; The buildings are suitably located for the scale and type of the proposed use, having regard to the level of accessibility to settlements, facilities and services and impact on the character and amenity of the area.'

4 PLANNING POLICIES

BE2 General Development Standards

BE3 Provision for Movement and Parking

TLC2 Use of Existing Buildings

E4NEW Sustainable tourism

SH2 New Development in Town and Local Centres

The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 This application is seeking to regularise a number of breaches of planning control that have been identified on the land which include the following:

Change of use of a former barn to a dwelling and the erection of a conservatory;

Conversion of a garage to an independent living unit;

Erection of a Garage.

- 5.2 The applicant is of the opinion that a number of the breaches that have been cited by officers are in fact either 'permitted development' or do not require planning permission. Notwithstanding this opinion this application is seeking to address all of the concerns that officers have raised.

Background Information

Planning History

- 5.3 Planning permission was granted under 02/0717 for a building to store agricultural machinery and tools. This building has subsequently been converted to a dwelling and extended by way of a conservatory.
- 5.4 A further building on the site was originally constructed as a garage. This has subsequently been converted to an office and independent living unit.

- 5.5 In 2015 a further garage building was erected on the land without the benefit of planning permission. The applicant maintains that this building is 'permitted development'.
- 5.6 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Principle

- 5.7 The conversion of the former barn to a holiday let needs to be considered in the context of the positively worded tourism policy TLC2 and paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Having regard to this policy context the principle of re-use of this building for visitor accommodation is considered acceptable in principle.
- 5.8 The use of the former garage as accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling on the land is also considered acceptable in principle.
- 5.9 The erection of a garage on the land to serve the existing dwelling and the proposed holiday let is also acceptable in principle subject to other development management considerations which include scale, design, siting and materials.

Siting, Design and Form

- 5.10 The external alterations to the former barn, including the erection of the conservatory, are considered acceptable in design terms.
- 5.11 The alterations to the former garage are also considered acceptable given the residential context of the site.
- 5.12 The newly erected garage building in terms of its scale, design, siting and materials is considered acceptable in that it respects the existing built form on the land.

Highway

- 5.13 At the time of writing the highway consultation response remains outstanding but given that an existing access is to be used and that there appears to be adequate parking and manoeuvring space to serve the development, officers do not anticipate that OCC highways will object to the proposals.

Residential Amenities

- 5.14 The residential amenity of the existing dwelling and other dwellings within the vicinity of the site will not be adversely affected by these part retrospective proposals for the land.

Conclusion

- 5.16 In light of the above planning assessment the application is recommended for conditional approval subject to the applicant entering in to a legal agreement that the converted barn is fettered by a holiday let use or for purposes ancillary to the principal dwelling on the land. An

unfettered residential use would not be policy compliant given the unsustainable open countryside location.

- 5.17 In addition to the above a condition has been attached to ensure that former garage building is only occupied for purposes ancillary to the principal dwelling on the land.

6 CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.
- 3 Garage A identified on plan no. SP/1553-13B shall be used as accommodation ancillary to the existing dwelling on the land and shall not be occupied as a separate dwelling.
REASON: The accommodation is on a site where residential development would not normally be permitted.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no alterations, extensions, outbuildings or means of enclosure other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be constructed.
REASON: Control is needed in the interests of visual amenity.
- 5 Within one month of the date of the consent a plan indicating the positions, design, materials, type and timing of provision of boundary treatment to be erected to serve the development shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.
REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
- 6 Notwithstanding any indication contained in the application, a detailed schedule of all hard surface materials for the construction of the access road, parking and manoeuvring areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within one month of the date of this consent. The hard surfaces shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.
REASON: To safeguard the character and landscape of the area.

NOTE TO APPLICANT

- 1 This permission is subject to a legal agreement which fetters the converted Barn F for ancillary use or as a holiday let use, the occupation of which is limited to holiday tenancies not to exceed 4 weeks (in each case) and no person shall occupy the accommodation in consecutive tenancy periods.