

Appendix A

Mr Henry explained that he lived at 1 Foxwood Lane and that the development site was to the rear of his property.

The proposed access road was narrow with a sharp bend and vehicles were unable to turn round at the end without encroaching onto his driveway. Larger lorries such as refuse collection vehicles had to reverse down the access giving rise to concerns with regard to highway safety.

Mr Henry indicated that, whilst the applicants maintained that the access was a private road under their control, Mr Henry contended that land in the vicinity of the sharp bend was in his ownership. To secure an adequate access, the applicants would need consent to utilise land in his ownership which he was not willing to permit.

Mr Henry indicated that he viewed the form of development as incongruous and out of keeping and considered that the site did not form part of Bradwell Village.

Whilst the applicants stated that there had been buildings located on the site in the past, Mr Henry indicated that these related to the previous use of the site as a hospital and had been demolished some 30 years ago.

Mr Henry felt that the proposed location for staff accommodation was inappropriate and suggested that there were other, more suitable locations off Foxwood Lane.

In conclusion, Mr Henry advised that five properties formerly used as staff accommodation had been sold off by the park some years ago.

Application Reference No: 17/00417/OUT
Application for the erection of five staff dwellings at
The Cotswold Wildlife Park
Item 1, Lowlands Planning Committee – 10th April 2017

Good afternoon

I am speaking to set out the reasons why this site has been located for the erection of the proposed staff units and then to comment on the form of development proposed.

The National Planning Policy Framework says that as an exception to normal policies of restraint, new housing can be permitted in the countryside to enable workers to live at or near their place of work. This is also contained with your policies. The officer's report appears supportive of the principle of additional staff accommodation but considers that it has not been demonstrated that this is the only possible location. There are no buildings suitable for conversion and the applicants are not aware of any potential suitable locations within the park for such accommodation to be located as they would conflict with functional arrangements, involve development in open spaces or harm the setting of a listed building.

The application site is adjacent to existing housing in Foxwood Lane and north of the caravan site, within an area of land that previously accommodated residential development. The site is not agricultural land, unlike the field to its north, but comprises tarmac and concrete hardstanding interspersed with trees well related to existing built

development. In the absence of a suitable location within the Park, it is sufficiently close for staff to live and walk or cycle to their place of work.

Turning to the form of the proposal, this is based upon the three single storey, key worker units permitted to the west of the Park. The officer's report states that the existing development is linear in form, which is not reflected in the proposal. Instead, the scheme seeks to site the units on the bases that are already there whilst retaining the trees but the applicants would be happy to amend the scheme in discussion with the officers, if considered necessary. Similarly, garden sizes could be increased and the number of parking spaces reduced, although the number shown seeks to comply with the vehicle parking standards but, in my opinion, are not all necessary due to the walking and cycling to work policy operated by CWP. In addition, further landscaping could be implemented. We do not wish the scheme to be regarded as urban and proposed a development of a style permitted and successfully developed for staff on the other side of the Park.

I would respectfully request that you consider the suitability of this site for the scale of development proposed and if you agree that it is an appropriate location adjacent to existing accommodation but are not happy with the form of development proposed, that you defer making a decision to allow for discussions to take place with the officers to formulate a mutually acceptable scheme that will also address other concerns such as passing spaces on Foxwood Lane.

Thank you.

Andrew Miles, Director, LPC(Trull) Ltd