

Appendix A

16/01423/FUL Public speaking on the 'Conversion of Westfield House from a vacant former nursery school into 4 apartments with access and car parking (Amended.)' at Westfield House Bampton Road Aston Bampton Oxfordshire OX18 2BU

Good afternoon Councillors,

I am grateful for the Officer's recommendation for approval. I hope you will agree with your Officer that the application will have a positive impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Westfield House closed as a children's nursery in August 2015.

The application comes before you because, despite the application being amended as requested by Officers, and now only relates to the conversion of Westfield House into four flats, the Parish Council nevertheless maintain their original objection.

The objection is that the Parish Council "*would like to see this entire site retained for potential employment purposes (of any business class)*". The Parish Council advise that the entire site should be retained for employment purposes in order to provide employment opportunities for a substantial amount of 70+ houses that have been permitted elsewhere in the village, and in which no employment uses have been provided.

It does appear quite odd that the Parish would resist the conversion of Westfield House into four flats on the basis that it should be used to increase employment opportunities in the village to cater for a planning permission given for 70+ houses on another site.

In any event a letter from the selling agents for Westfield House accompanies the application and details the efforts to sell Westfield House since May 2015 for non-residential uses. No offers to purchase have been received of any kind over almost 18 months, including for business use.

Westfield House was historically used as four flats and the children's nursery that occupied the site closed over a year ago now. In this case if you did decide to go against the Officer's recommendation to grant planning permission, then the Parish Council's aspirations for an employment use of the site would not be realised in any event. Westfield House would simply continue to remain unused.

I hope you will agree that this is a good opportunity to make use of an empty building in a way that will provide four flats for smaller households in the village. To my mind this would be an attractive addition to this part of the village on the opposite side of the road from the popular Aston Potteries.

Thank you.

PLANNING COMMITTEE PRESENTATION NOVEMBER 2015**ON BEHALF OF MR HAWTON, OBJECTOR**

I have been asked by Professor Keith Hawton to address the Committee on his behalf in objecting to the proposed development at Little Gidding. Mr Hawton is the owner and occupier of Old Farm, which is located immediately to the south-east of, and shares a common boundary with, the application site.

Mr Hawton would like to stress that the proposed amendments to the front of the house, including the level ridgeline, reduced ridge height and the use of slate roofing tiles, will greatly improve the appearance of the dwelling in comparison to the earlier design proposals. However, the rear aspects of the design are still cause for significant concern regarding the likely adverse impact on Mr Hawton's residential amenity.

In comparison to Mr Hawton's property, the application site is set on a higher ground level and considerably further back in the plot. Because the proposed building extends several metres beyond the rear elevation of Mr Hawton's house, the proposals will be unduly overbearing. This particularly applies to the box-like extended structure of the main bedroom, which is a primary cause of concern. This element of the proposals will create a blank side elevation which, in conjunction with the height and length of the building in comparison to Old Farm and its close proximity to the shared boundary, will have an undue overbearing impact on Mr Hawton's property and private outdoor space. If this element of the proposal could be removed or redesigned to reduce its perceived bulk and overbearing impact, Mr Hawton's concerns would largely be addressed.

It is therefore hoped that Members will refuse the application on this basis.

Chair, thank you very much for this opportunity to speak.

My name is Mai Jarvis and I am the owner and applicant.

My husband and I moved to South Leigh just over one year ago, as we love the location and were keen to involve ourselves in the community.

Little Gidding is a dated 1960 bungalow in serious need of modernisation. It is rather out of character with its two story neighbours in both shape and style and detracts from the location.

We wish to develop our house into a beautiful family home we can enjoy for years to come. Our neighbours have over the years enjoyed the opportunity to extend and improve their homes and we wish to do the same.

Over the last 10 months, we have worked closely with the local planning authority to develop the current scheme. We have held several meetings with them to develop our plans to ensure they are acceptable in terms of design, respect our neighbours and the setting. We are therefore very pleased to have received their full support for the proposal.

We have very carefully considered our neighbours and have held several meetings with them to discuss our proposal. We have taken on board their reservations and significantly altered our design in response. We now have a suitable scheme, which carefully considers its neighbours and its location in the village, and we believe the design will significantly improve the built environment.

We hope you will approve the application before you, so we can change what is a rundown bungalow in to our dream family home.

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE 19TH SEPTEMBER 2016

16/02102/FUL – STONELEA FARM, BRIZE NORTON, CARTERTON, OXON, OX18 3PA

Good afternoon.

I want to start by expressing our gratitude for hearing this application again and for the constructive comments made at the meeting a month ago.

You will all be aware, through your experience, at how much work, time and capital goes into establishing and growing a farm business, and without going over old ground, you are aware that officers are content that we have a proven and justified business case for hard working and diligent applicants.

Furthermore, we have now amended the situation of the proposed welling within the site, AND, keeping the proposal within the red line area, we have been able to obtain the minimum separation distance of 100m from the boundary of adjoining land, so that if mineral workings were ever to occur there, there would be no sterilisation caused by this proposed dwelling according to current separation distance requirements.

Indeed OCC Minerals have confirmed through their consultation that the application accords with all relevant planning policy and they have no objection to the proposal.

Mrs Clark in her report has also confirmed that there is no landscaping objection, and is recommending approval today. We would also like to express our thanks to her for all the work she has put into getting this application here today.

We are happy with the proposed conditions and understand their requirements, which if approved, we will duly seek to discharge.

Today you have the opportunity of changing a family's life vastly for the better. The years of tireless hard work in establishing this pig breeding business, something that requires exceptional stockmanship, have led us to this point, and now is the time to show your support for the applicants and their family. Approval will ensure the good work can be continued and improved upon so that the business can continue to grow and remain successful for many years to come.

Thank you for your time and understanding.

Lowlands Committee Meeting, Monday 19 September 2016, 2:00 pm
RE: 16/02183/FUL with Amended Block Plan, adjacent to 24 Bakers Piece

I speak on behalf of those who feel their objections are seen as petty and refute the comments sent to and made by the case officer that prompted an irrational and premature recommendation to approve.

Someone has been consulting with and advising the developer as everything seems to be in his favour. None of us are au fait with planning matters or jargon and no one has given us advice.

Pre-application on October 2013 – OCC Highways comment “existing access via 70 West End, not seen as viable; archway too narrow, access wide enough for only one vehicle, manoeuvring in and out is difficult. It would pose a safety problem to pedestrians crossing the pavement on the West End”.

Bakers Piece mirrors this and does NOT have a pedestrian pavement. Does our safety not matter?

Latest comment by OCC Highways is only concerned with highway safety and convenience on the adjacent highway network. No mention of personal safety!

Photographic evidence and objection comments submitted explain that Bakers Piece cannot cope with any more traffic.

The wall at the end of Bakers Piece seen as insignificant is the Boundary Wall for the Cogges & Witney Conservation Area. The “unkempt, derelict eyesore that needs to be found a use” belonged to 70 West End, Grade II Listed Building (English Heritage ID: 398413). The developer retained ownership of this “landlocked” plot when he sold the house because he “intended” to build on it by partially demolishing the “insignificant” wall to gain access via Bakers Piece. Did someone tell him this was okay?

The wall is an important and integral part of our neighbourhood providing privacy, safety and so far a crime free environment.

The Original Plan was WITHDRAWN prior to decision. The Amended Block Plan showing additional parking does not address any of the concerns expressed in the objections.

Some residents do not have access to the internet. The untimely and woefully inadequate notification by WODC to the residents makes us wonder if someone did not want us to know what was going on and catch us unaware.

Excerpt from the Witney & Cogges Conservation Area Appraisal and Enhancement, April 2013, Page 71 – 3.4.2

“Within the Conservation Area, extensions will not be allowed to fill private gardens or create sub-standard living conditions. Similarly, extensions which lead to a loss of daylight to neighbouring dwellings or create problems of loss of privacy will not be supported.”

The proposed development is WORSE as it is a complete new build.

The proposed houses would sit in a solid row, blocking views into and out of the West End. Residents in the West End would have houses built literally in their back gardens and at a higher elevation.

How can this not be considered an imposition on their privacy?

Residents in Farmers Close will be surrounded by more houses in an already hectic estate.

The residents have made their neighbourhood sustainable and do not want this or any development infilling, rounding off or chiming in.

We have gone through 6 months of stress.

Please do not allow this or any development to go ahead. It will change the very nature of our neighbourhood. It will erode not enhance Bakers Piece, Farmers Close and West End.

Thank you!

Ms Maria Jessica Desbrow

Appendix F

My name is **Brian Cade**; I am a local builder and the applicant.

The residents have just mentioned they have had 95 objections. However **please note** that 39 are from the same person and there are **multiple** objections from the few others. It is a though the residents have thrown in as many objections as they can, to give it more weight.

The reason this application has come before this committee is because the Witney Town Council has made, just, the objection. "Insufficient parking based on the Local Plan BE3"

I have also listened, to this local concern, and have increased the parking. So each house has 2 parking spaces with an additional 2 provided for use by Bakers Piece.

Highways opinion:

I have visited the site on two occasions since my original consultation response.

I have read and noted the comments from objectors however I would not agree that the proposal, if permitted, would cause such harm in terms of highway safety and convenience that would warrant the refusal of a planning permission.

The proposal, if permitted, will not have a significant detrimental impact (in terms of highway safety and convenience) on the adjacent highway network.

I agree with the residents that this is a **lovely place to live**; surly we should take any opportunity to provide more houses in lovely locations like this next to existing services.

The building of these houses, of course, will cause some disruption, but I will do my best to minimize this as I did with the works at 70 West End. **I did not receive a single complaint**. Its like road works they are inconvenient at the time but when they are finished most people are happy.

In summary this is a high quality scheme in sustainable location that conforms to planning policies and local plans and is supported by this planning department, County Highways and WODC own architect.

Architects Opinion: I don't think that the principle of this is too problematic from our point of view - this is a fairly nondescript piece of ground, hemmed in by development of various forms, and there does appear to be sufficient space here for the proposed development, of three dwellings. The design is clean, tending towards contemporary, the proportions are fine, the massing is generally traditional - and it all chimes in with the existing adjacent modern development. So, there are no obvious objections from our point of view.

Appendix G

Mr Shaw made reference to the letter he had sent to Members and confirmed that his objection was not to the principle of development but to the detail of the current application.

He indicated that the site lay within open countryside and he considered it illogical for the development to be placed close to a neighbouring property when it could easily be located further away.

Mr Shaw considered that the proposed 2 ½ to 3 storey building would result in a loss of amenity, blocking light and views from a playroom and kitchen window although he believed that a building that adhered to the footprint of the existing property would be acceptable.

As his property had been constructed using natural stone, Mr Shaw requested that the current application be conditioned to require the use of natural material.

In conclusion, Mr Shaw suggested that there was still a discrepancy in terms of the distance between his and the proposed new dwelling in the revised drawings submitted.

Presentation to Lowlands Planning Committee on September 19, 2016

Re : Objection to Planning Application 16/02668/FUL – 2 houses rear of 57/59 Woodstock Road.

1. This application is a resubmission of Planning Application no. 16/01021/FUL which was refused by the Lowlands Planning Committee on the 23 May 2016 and relating to “overdevelopment”, “semi-detached form”, “layout”, “proximity to side boundaries” and “cramped parking arrangements”.
2. The letter accompanying the current application states that the scheme has been reviewed to address the specified refusal reasons. It is my opinion that the application does not address any of the above reasons for refusal.
3. The changes in the scheme include the relocation of the front door of unit 32B to the side of the unit, revised off-street parking via driveways to each plot and a grassed area plus a dividing hedge in front of the houses. These changes do not disguise the fact that it is still a pair of semi-detached houses.
4. There are differences between several of the site plans showing the position of the units on the plot and the relationship of the units to No 32. Also, the Design Statement is incorrect in several respects, for example the statements made in paragraphs 2 & 4. Indeed I feel these discrepancies and inaccuracies together with the Planning Officers comments in paras. 5.4 and 5.6 are very misleading. Importantly, the units have been relocated much further back from the highway. This will take the rear building line of the units approx. 3.5 metres past the rear of number 32 building line. This will have the effect of placing a visible brick wall within .75 metres of the boundary of number 32 at a height of 7.3 metres at the highest point and 5.6 metres at the lowest point of the West elevation in full view of the conservatory at no.32. Thus by virtue of its position and design this may contravene the “45-degree code”, which many Local Authority’s often apply in their assessment of planning applications.

5. The creation of in-line parking as opposed to side-by-side parking is still cramped and will make the traffic movement into and out of the units doubly exaggerated especially if any vehicle closest to the units needs to be used. Early Road is a typical 1960's/1970's low density development by Pye's of a mixture of detached houses and bungalows all with garages. Over the years the estate has matured aesthetically and any infill sites left after the original development was finished have been sympathetically developed with similar detached units.

6. Thus, the application still remains contrary to those policies BE2 & H2 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and also policies OS2, OS4 & H2 of the "Emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan". In fact, if this scheme is approved it may well create an undesirable precedent in respect of the remaining adjacent undeveloped areas of land which front onto Early Road (see Policy H2(f) of the Local Plan).

7. There are no objections in principle to the development of this site in Planning and design terms provided if it is done sympathetically and accords with the policies and principles as set out in the Local Plan. Indeed the majority of the other objectors make this same point – that is to say a detached house with a garage.

8. In conclusion, there have been 23 objections to this application from many concerned residents of Early Road. I therefore urge you to reject this proposal in its current form along the same reasons given for the original application in May 2016 – otherwise the whole character of the Early Road development will be radically altered as a result.