

# **WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Date: 18<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

### **Report of Additional Representations**



---

**WEST OXFORDSHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

## **Agenda Index**

Please note that if you are viewing this document electronically, the agenda items below have been set up as links to the relevant application for your convenience.

[I6/01851/FUL Barn at Weald Manor Farm, Weald Street, Weald](#)

[I6/01805/FUL Office 2-3, Unit 7, Nursery Road, North Leigh](#)

## Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	I6/01851/FUL
Site Address	Barn At Weald Manor Farm Weald Street Weald Bampton Oxfordshire
Date	15th July 2016
Officer	Miranda Clark
Officer Recommendations	Approve subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Bampton Parish Council
Grid Reference	431065 E 202597 N
Committee Date	18th July 2016

### Application Details:

Conversion of barn to dwelling.

### Applicant Details:

Weald Manor Trust  
Weald Manor  
Weald  
Bampton  
Oxfordshire  
OX18 2HQ

### Additional Representations

One additional letter of objection from Mrs Bailey of Sunnyside. Comments summarised as;

The difference seems to be that last year's application was for a new dwelling (taking the number of units on this site to 8 including the existing farmhouse itself), whereas the application under consideration is to convert an existing barn but the net result is the same taking the number of properties to 8 which is too many.

Prior to 2008 it was impossible to obtain permission to build even 1 property in this location. It is a conservation area and until very recently this has clearly been regarded as extremely important by WODC as they made every effort to preserve this by refusing planning.

Since 2008, as a community we have been faced with application after application not only for development immediately adjacent to this site, which started with 17 houses in 2008, but also the year before with an application for 8 properties at Glebe Farm at the bottom of the lane ( refused).

The applicant's application in 2008 for 17 houses in the farmyard was refused - coming very shortly after the 2007 flooding.

Next came an application in 2011 (11/1212/P/FP) for the disused barn/shed immediately next to the farmhouse to be converted into an holiday let. This was granted subject to a legal agreement.

That has never been pursued. I note from checking the website that it is now marked, as of October 2015, as a withdrawn application.

In 2013 application was made (13/0164/P/FP) for conversion of an outbuilding to dwelling and garage. I note that exactly the same plans submitted for that application were before the planners in the application last year. This was for a new build in the garden of the existing farmhouse It is therefore being revisited although it was refused in 2013.

Next came further applications for the development of the adjacent farmyard in 2013 for 17 houses (refused) and later in 2014 for 17 units ( 14/0973/P/FP), also refused. In addition in 2014 there was an application by Weald Farm at the bottom of the lane for conversion of 2 agricultural buildings to holiday lets ( granted).

We were then faced as a community in the early part of 2015 with a further application for 10 houses on the farmyard (15/00260/FUL) currently marked on your website as a pending decision.

The planning committee indicated that they considered 10 houses too many units but suggested that it might consider something smaller. So a further application was lodged in March 2015 for 6 houses (15/02150/FUL) which was approved much to the consternation of the Weald residents. We then had the application submitted at the end of last year (15/014152/FUL) which was withdrawn.

All of this seems to me to be an attempt to try and obtain one way or another as a many houses as possible on the farmyard and adjacent house and garden. If this application for 1 further house is allowed, we are then back up to 7 houses on this site (plus the existing farmhouse)- not that far off from the 10 which the planning committee deemed was too many. It is clear that this is the intention of the applicants, namely to achieve their target of 10 houses deemed too many in the very recent past by your planning committee. I am very concerned that to grant this is going to lead to further applications over time to increase the number of units even beyond the 10 attempted.

As I have said there are now 2 holiday lets further down to the lane so we are talking about potentially 9 dwellings that will have received planning permission in the space of 18 months. It is simply too large a number of houses for this area served by only a single track lane and in a conservation area. It will without doubt urbanise a rural backdrop.

Further, it is claimed in the supporting statement that this house is to be built for occupation by an estate manager. I fail to see why it is not possible for this person to occupy one of the 6 houses to be built on the adjacent farmyard, or the farmhouse itself (which is apparently to be improved). An extra property is not necessary.

I have raised repeatedly, along with my neighbours, in previous objections that I am concerned that any planning applications granted in Weald will simply set a precedent for further building – it would appear that I was right to be worried as the number of proposed dwellings is increasing.

It cannot be right that the planning committee made it clear at the beginning of 2015 that they considered 10 houses too dense a development for the adjacent site and yet another application is being made for a further dwelling, with I might add, an additional (approved) application (15/03900/HHD) to extend/alter/improve the farm house itself. Looking at the plans for the farmhouse it will make it a much bigger property. If this new build is granted as well it will have the effect of creating the feel of dense urbanised building on this site which detracts from the rural feel of the disused farmyard.

I am sure you recall all the arguments that have been put by the community in Weald in relation to the previous applications. The traffic level will be unsustainable and potentially dangerous. It urbanises what is a rural backwater and destroys the conservation landscape.

It is also unsustainable in the context of the other development now underway in New Road (although the Aston Road appeal was dismissed it cannot be long before a fresh application will be made and there has been today consultation for a further 180 on another site) in terms of the additional pressure on school places and other infrastructure in the village. In addition, adding to the commuting traffic problems in West Oxfordshire and in the light of rural bus services being cut.

A further property on this site is not sustainable in the light of the number for which permission has already been given. Putting it simply it is 'mission creep' on the existing permission for 6 units to ensure that numbers will be gradually 'bumped up' towards the size of development which the planning committee made plain was too large. This is unacceptable.

I would be grateful if you would please refuse this application.

Further information has been received from the agent regarding drainage. Officers are waiting comments from WODC Engineers. It is hoped that a response will be received before Monday's meeting.

Application Number	16/01805/FUL
Site Address	Office 2-3 Unit 7 Nursery Road North Leigh Business Park North Leigh Witney Oxfordshire OX29 6SW
Date	15th July 2016
Officer	Sarah De La Coze
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	North Leigh Parish Council
Grid Reference	439391 E 213041 N
Committee Date	18th July 2016

**Application Details:**

Change of use from office to two flats.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr Treloar  
C/O Agent

**Additional Representations**

Two further letters of objection were received:

Mr and Mrs Smith from 81 Park Road state:

Please note our strong objections to the proposed change of use from commercial to residential for the following reasons:

The proposal would set a precedent for loss of employment opportunities on this site and elsewhere within the village; it is essential to maintain employment opportunities locally where we can on the grounds of sustainability.

It would not help to:

- "maintain the vitality of the community" OS2
- "support the effectiveness of existing businesses" OS2

This is a distinct commercial area. It is a valuable employment site with the potential to provide employment for many years into the future. To allow change of use to residential development could set a precedent for the whole business park, which would be a great loss to the village.

"existing features of importance in the local environment are" NOT "protected or enhanced" by this proposal. BE2 (a) - Residential properties would impact on the viability of the existing businesses as a result of complaints that would inevitably arise.

The proposal would: - not "support the effectiveness of existing businesses" OS2 - "would... have a harmful impact on the amenity of existing occupants" OS2

Could easily lead to conflict between the proposed residential buildings and existing commercial buildings on the site – future residents' quality of life would be affected by the commercial activity i.e. levels of noise, general activity, vehicle movements etc.

The proposed change of use : - does not, "make provision for the safe movement of people" (future residents/people working on the business park) and their "vehicles" BE3. The A4095 and other local roads leading to major routes (A40, A44) already have serious congestion.

The proposal has not been designed to "maximise .....the use of public transport, ensure the safe movement of vehicles and minimise the impact of parked and moving vehicles on local residents, businesses and the environment." T4

In order to access local bus services, future residents would need to walk along the busy A4095 to reach the bus stops in Park Road. They would have to cross a dangerous section of Park Road to catch buses to Witney.

The proposal would: - not allow for "safe and convenient circulation of pedestrians and cyclists, both within the development and externally to nearby facilities" BE3 (a) - not provide "safe and convenient pedestrian access to support services and facilities" OS2

May lead, by degrees, to further pressure for the development of green land nearby.

New flats generally have a community amenity, a green space, around them; this proposal merely provides a tarmac apron - not conducive to a good quality of life, or in character with the rural nature of the area.

This proposal does not: - "respect the ...pattern and character of the area" BE2 (a) - "create or retain a satisfactory environment for people living in, or visiting the area" BE2 (c) - "would not be a logical complement to the existing pattern of development"

Loss of parking could be an issue for the rest of the businesses, as a substantial proportion of the existing parking would be for the two flats.

Katie and Mary Hellon from 73 Park Road state:

1. There would be loss of employment for this site and the rest of the village. Maintaining local employment opportunities are vital for a thriving community.

2. The Business Park is a district commercial area. A change of use to residential development could not set a precedent for the whole of the Business Park, which would be devastating, and such as loss for the village.
3. The residential properties would impact on existing businesses, disturbing the equilibrium of the Business Park.
4. Conflict could occur between the proposed residential property and the surrounding businesses. The commercial activity would affect any future residents quality of life including vehicle movement and general noise.
5. The change of use may also lead to further pressure to develop nearby green belt land.
6. The substantial amount of existing parking for the proposed flats may lead to shortage of parking for businesses on the Business Park.