

### **16/00408/FUL – First floor rear extension to Merryfield, New Yatt Road, Witney**

#### **Statement to Planning Committee 23/05/2016**

Good Afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen and I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you once again today. Please forgive me for repeating my introduction to set the scene

I am Anil Dhanani, the proprietor of Merryfield and of Peverel Court Care. Merryfield provides personalised elderly care in a wonderful setting. The care is delivered by talented and compassionate people with a reputation for an uncompromising standard of care and a focus on the happiness of our residents, their families and our staff.

Merryfield has consistently been reviewed by its users as being in the top 10 Homes out of 140 in Oxfordshire, receiving a review score of 9.7/10. Indeed Peverel Court Care has this year been awarded a top twenty national care home group award. Peverel Court Care is a second generation family business established in 1986 by my Mother, a former Brighton general hospital nurse. Establishing a compassionate and caring ethos in a world of multiple occupancy bedrooms and wards, Peverel Court Care soon established a reputation for a high standard of personalised care. I personally have been at the helm since 2001 and continue to seek to set the standards with better accommodation and facilities, without losing our focus on care standards

I would like to thank those councillors who visited Merryfield last week and for the discussion at the last planning committee.

Having heard the Members concerns, we made the changes shown in the amended plans, these included the removal of the rooflights, which were considered obtrusive and their replacement with a series of narrow vertical windows. These could be of obscure glass blocks and break up the bulk of the rear elevation of the building. We believe these changes, which are a result of listening to the discussion in the last committee, significantly reduce the impact of the building and result in an acceptable design.

We are aware that Officers have suggested an altered scheme, with three dormer windows, which, if Members insist, we would be prepared to consider. However, this would result in three of the rooms facing the tall coniferous hedge and not looking over the courtyard, where most of the activity can be watched by residents.

I urge you to allow our application and enable Merryfield to continue to be a successful, secure and popular home for elderly residents of Witney.

## **FAIRACRE, 18 PARK ROAD, NORTH LEIGH PLANNING COMMITTEE PRESENTATION MAY 2016**

1. The application is a full application for 5 dwellings and follows an earlier outline approval for 5 dwellings.
2. That previous application established the principle of development on the site including the loss of employment use and also that suitable access can be achieved.
3. The site layout is broadly similar to that submitted previously.
4. Some changes and improvements were made including to improve the relationship with neighbours.
5. The garages to units 4 and 5 were moved between the units to create a larger turning area.
6. Unit 3 has been moved forward further away from the rear garden to 29 Windmill Heights. It has only 2 obscured windows in the side elevation.
7. It is noted that a previous condition required Unit 1 to be single storey to limit impacts on properties to the east at Hazeldene Close. The plot now includes part 2 storeys on the western side away from Hazeldene Close and with a 1.5 storey gable, side on to Hazeldene Close. This significantly reduces the built footprint along the boundary to properties at Hazeldene Close and no upper floor windows are proposed in the side elevation.
8. We have addressed and made further changes to Plot 1 in accordance with your officer's recommendations. These included:
  - Reducing the side gable and moving it away from the boundary by a further 2m by changing it to a single rather than double garage
  - Removing the dormer to the rear elevation and replacing with a rooflight

9. The windows in the property are sufficiently distant and arranged such not to create unacceptable levels of overlooking to Hazeldene Close.
  
10. In relation to Windmill Heights the internal accommodation of Plot 1 has been rearranged so that bathrooms with obscured glazed windows present to the west and Windmill Heights – such not to create unacceptable overlooking in this direction.
  
11. This is now considered acceptable by your officers and we note and agree with their view that the fact that the property is now in part two storeys is in itself not a reason to refuse the application – overlooking impacts have been satisfactorily addressed.
  
12. It is noted that there are no objections from the highway authority or the Council's ecologist. The site is below the Council's affordable housing threshold.
  
13. The applicant has responded to your all of your officers concerns and suggestions with regard amenity impacts and I hope that you will feel able to approve the application.

## Appendix C

Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to speak to you.

My name is Geoff Ling and I am the owner of 138 Abingdon Road and have made the current planning application for two dwellings.

I have lived in Standlake for the past 14 years and my wife has lived there for most of her life, we intend to remain in our house for the foreseeable future. Our family are now grown up and we no longer require the size of garden we currently have. This has prompted us to apply for permission for two houses in our rear garden, which may enable our children to live in the village.

We note that although the planning officer supports the proposal the Parish Council objected to our proposal and this is why we wished to speak to the meeting today.

In terms of building at the back of the building line. The extent of new buildings does not project beyond the rear of other gardens which face onto Abingdon Road and will be seen within the context of the development at the Mulberry Bush School and the trees which will remain on either side of the new access. There is not to our knowledge any other sites along the Abingdon Road that would have a similar arrangement so don't feel that this proposal would establish any precedent as the Parish council fear.

The access from Shifford Lane to the site is short in length and traffic movements along here are light and slow moving. Two more dwellings would not add significantly to this.

We have had no problems with our sewers and I understand that Thames Water do not object to these two houses being connected to the existing sewage network.

We understand and accept that more detailed information and an altered design will be required when we finalize our ideas for the site but trust that the committee can follow their officer's recommendation and approve our proposals for two houses.

Thank you

Lechlade Road, Langford, Nr Lechlade, Gloucestershire, GL7 3LA  
Headteacher: Mr Shaw Goodwin

Tel/Fax: 01367 860318

Web: [www.st-christophers.oxon.sch.uk](http://www.st-christophers.oxon.sch.uk)

Twitter: @Head3555

Email: [office.3555@st-christophers.oxon.sch.uk](mailto:office.3555@st-christophers.oxon.sch.uk)



23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016

### Planning Committee Notes

Good afternoon and thank you for allowing me to speak at this committee.

#### **Introduction**

- Shaw Goodwin, Headteacher of St. Christopher's CE Primary School in Langford.

#### **Context**

- St. Christopher's is a successful and thriving school and over the past three years, pupil numbers have been increasing.
- It is a smaller than average primary school
- We have seven year groups, from reception to year six.
- We currently have five classrooms.
- From September this year, we expect to have 147 pupils on role.

#### **Reasons for application**

- The prime reason for making the application is to continue to improve the outcomes of children in our care; not only academically but socially and emotionally.
  - For all schools The Department of Education sets a pupil capacity number based on floor space, for St. Christopher's this is 150. Whilst the DfE believes that we could have up to 150 children on role, given the current number of classrooms and year group numbers, this would lead, in September, to one class having 35 children if we were not to have an additional classroom.

35 children in one class would undoubtedly have an adverse impact on children's outcomes.

The situation has not occurred due to poor planning on the school's behalf, but a requirement for the school to accept the numbers published in its admissions policy (The policy has to be issued 1½ years before the actual point of entry). Admission numbers have historically been set to meet the capacity of 150 pupils. It should be noted that part of our admissions policy also includes support for our local infant school by taking children from them at the end of year 2.

- An additional classroom would allow us to spread the children across six classrooms and reduce the number in each class to a reasonable and acceptable level.

Valuing



Nurturing



Equipping



Achieving

- Given our points of entry, we end up with some year groups being split across different classes. Whilst the school does its utmost to mitigate any negative impacts of such splits, it does cause parents considerable stress and anxiety. Split year groups also add additional workload on teachers as each year they have to combine national curriculum expectations from multiple year groups; as the splits are not consistent each year, it is not possible to fit these requirements into a rolling programme.
  - An additional classroom would allow us to minimise the number of split year groups to one and increase the number of single year group classes to four.
- The reason for the application is not to increase pupil numbers significantly. The admissions model and future budget models we have proposed are based on having 154 children on role. Only four more than the DfE's 150.

### **Objections**

- The school is part of the community and we want to minimise the impact and disruption that the school has on the residents and local community.
- We recognise that parking can be an issue at morning drop off and at afternoon pickup and acknowledge that a small minority of parents do not always show the respect that we would expect.
- We also let the hall once a week to a community choir and understand that parking can also be an issue during their rehearsals. They are aware that if the school continued to receive valid complaints from residents, the school would have to relook at this arrangement. They have been positive in response and have started sending out someone to check on parking before rehearsals begin.
- As part of this process, we did talk to the residents, who were very supportive of the school, wanting it to thrive and do well. If only we could sort the parking issues out. At that meeting the school committed to:
  - Work with the School Council and the wider school community on safe behaviours going into & out of school.
  - Changes to our induction processes for new parents and carers to highlight traffic and parking concerns and set out our expectations.
  - Continue to encourage parents and carers to consider other forms of transport such as the school bus (where eligible), walking or cycling where practicable.
  - More regular meetings with the local community to encourage feedback and closer working.
  - Re-opening discussions with WODC & the local Police Support Officer around changes to the local environment such as road markings and other methods we could use to manage the traffic and parking better.
  - Discussions with the local Parish Council on local environment and traffic management.

### **Conclusion**

I hope you can appreciate that the additional classroom is a fundamental element in our continued drive for improvement. The application is not designed to increase pupil numbers significantly, but to reduce the number of children in each classroom, reduce the number of split year groups and increase the number of single year group classes.

Thank you for listening

Objections Planning Application 16/01021/FUL

1. Overdevelopment, Character Of The Area, Out Of Keeping.

The proposed above planning application for 2 semi detached dwellings is totally out of keeping within the existing Early road properties. There are no semi detached houses or terraced properties in Early road, or on the closes leading off Early road. There are only detached houses and bungalows with garages and reasonable sized gardens, both to the rear and frontage, to allow off road parking. Therefore the statement by the agent in the proposal is both inaccurate and misleading. New properties and infills over the years have reflected this.

Historically, a number of planning proposals have been submitted to the planning committee and have been altered to be in keeping with the area, for example I would draw your attention to planning application reference 06/01081/P/FP, proposed dwelling @ 41 Early road ( now completed) ~~located~~ opposite the proposed development. This application was to demolish an existing 3 bedroom bungalow, to be replaced with a 5 bedroom detached house. This application was rejected, as overdevelopment and scaled down to a 3 bed detached property, with a garden, garage and off road parking.

What is being proposed at the rear of 57 and 59 Woodstock road, are 2 semi detached houses with a total of 6 bedrooms, on a site that is no bigger than number 41. This would be total overdevelopment!

This planning proposal does (a) not comply with West Oxfordshire existing guidelines which states that any new development should respect and improve the quality of its surroundings, under Policy H2 of the local plan. (b) Policy H2(f) of your local plan, states that no proposals for additional dwellings, should set an undesirable precedent, which in future would be difficult to resist.

While everyone is entitled to their views, one resident of the Woodstock road, that owns the adjacent land to 59, has recorded on your website that, "should planning permission be given, then they would expect any future planning proposals, for the continuation of this infill land (over the remaining 4 plots) to be granted for a stretch of semi detached or even terraced houses! The application does not reflect the original design concept of PYE,s - the original developer. This would completely undermine the West Oxfordshire guidelines for development and set a very dangerous precedent for the future.

Previous plots have all been detached dwellings, reflecting well designed units, in keeping with the original concepts of the original development and promoting good planning guidelines.

## 2. Road Safety & Traffic Flow.

Early road has become a busy "cut through" and is also on a bus route! As this development proposal does not allow for the construction of garages and very limited off road parking, this will create even greater number of cars, blocking the pavements, which would cause difficulties and safety issues for many residents, especially for those, who use wheelchairs, prams, pushchairs etc, and for the children, who are back and forth to Woodgreen school! This would also create, narrowing of an already narrow road.

In conclusion, on behalf of many concerned residents, who have objected to this planning proposal, for 2 semi detached properties, I urge you to reject this proposal and instead consider a proposal more in keeping with the existing properties and area, namely a single detached dwelling with a garage and off road parking. Otherwise the entire character of the road and area could be radically altered as a result, if planning approval were to be given.