

# **WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

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

**Date: 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017**

### **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.

17/00281/OUT	Land East of Monkwood, Pink Hill Lane, Eynsham.....	3
17/01114/FUL	Land on Stanton Harcourt Road, Old Station Way.....	6
17/01193/FUL 17/01194/LBC	Masonic Hall, 20 Church Green, Witney.....	7
17/01318/FUL	Glebe Cottage, Lew Road, Curbridge.....	11

## Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	17/00281/OUT
Site Address	Land East Of Monkwood Pink Hill Lane Eynsham Oxfordshire
Date	31st May 2017
Officer	Catherine Tetlow
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Eynsham Parish Council
Grid Reference	443233 E 208681 N
Committee Date	12th June 2017

### Application Details:

Residential development of 52 dwellings (means of access only).

### Applicant Details:

Mr E Costello  
Denham House  
Village Road  
Denham  
UB9 5BN  
Uxbridge

### Additional Representations

#### OCC Highways

**Objection** on the grounds that Oxfordshire County Council has not been provided with evidence that the current owner of the land consisting of Pinkhill Lane south of the existing highway boundary would be prepared to offer it for adoption as highway with full public vehicular access rights maintainable at public expense.

#### Key issues:

- 1) Lack of evidence that the stretch of Pinkhill Lane south of the existing highway boundary can be adopted as highway with full public vehicular rights of access.
- 2) The rights of existing bridleway users will need to be protected if the bridleway was improved by the applicant to allow for public or private vehicular rights
- 3) A full drainage strategy is required (see the section on planning conditions).
- 4) A financial contribution is required to improve bus stop facilities in Eynsham High Street.
- 5) An agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act is required to enable the applicant to install off-site highways works to connect residents of the proposed development to the existing footway network in Eynsham.

#### Rights across Third Party Land and the proposed Status of Pinkhill Lane (south of the existing highway boundary)

The proposed development is located to the east of and would need to be accessed from Pinkhill Lane. The highway boundary on Pinkhill Lane is located immediately south of the gated entrance to a plot known as

“Linden.” South of this, Pinkhill Lane is a bridleway (206/1) and is maintained by Oxfordshire County Council to the standards required for a bridleway in southerly direction until it reaches Pinkhill Farm. There appears to be private vehicular access rights to 8 residential properties and one commercial property along it. However, I have not seen documentary evidence of these rights of access.

Because of the number of dwellings proposed in this development, Pinkhill Lane would need to be built up to the appropriate standards at which it could be maintained as a highway with full public vehicular access rights. This would mean that Pinkhill Lane would have to have a carriageway width of 5.5m, a footway of 2m in width, and a service strip of 0.8m in width. On 31 May 2017 I received a letter from the applicant’s Consultant stating that the applicant intends to do this. They argue that the relevant stretch of Pinkhill Lane is unregistered land, and that the Local Highway Authority can adopt the bridleway under S38 of the Highways Act 1980. Simultaneously, the applicant has stated that they intend to apply for an order under Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act to stop the bridleway up and convert it to a highway with full public vehicular access rights.

I have obtained legal advice from a colleague on this issue, and have been informed that the existing bridleway may only be converted to a highway with full public vehicular rights by means of the owner(s) of the way dedicating the track, plus land either side of it required for widening and maintenance margins. In order to agree to such dedication the Local Highway Authority will require satisfactory evidence of ownership that is registered title or, for unregistered land, good paper title. I have not received evidence of title yet so uphold the Local Highway’s original objection on these grounds.

In addition, were this stretch of Pinkhill Lane to be upgraded to that of a highway with full public vehicular access rights, the rights of existing equestrian users would need to be protected. I have been advised by Oxfordshire County Council that a separate track would need to be provided for equestrian users and that it would not be suitable for them to share the new carriageway with motor vehicles.

#### Bringing Pinkhill Lane up to an Adoptable Standard

In the last iteration of the application the applicant demonstrated in Drawings K1617-01-013-A and K1617-01-014-A demonstrated that they might be able to widen Pinkhill Lane to include a 5.5m carriageway (narrowing to 4.8m at certain pinch-points), a footway on its eastern side of 2m in width, and a service strip on the western side of 0.8m in width.

The applicant would need the bridleway owner’s permission to complete these works, and might also need the permission of the owners of the verges that front the properties with individual accesses on to this stretch of Pinkhill Lane (these might or might not be different from the owner of the bridleway itself). I have not seen evidence that they have done this so uphold my objection on these grounds.

#### Access to the development and the Development and Visibility Splays

The applicant proposes visibility splays of 2.4m x 70m in both directions along Pinkhill Lane. Although they do not appear to have carried out 85th percentile wet weather speed surveys along Pinkhill Lane to inform these, I think these splays are achievable for the likely design speed of Pinkhill Lane and they exceed the standards set out in Manual for Streets.

#### Drainage Strategy

The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment that contains a chapter on drainage. However, when submitting a full Drainage Strategy, the applicant needs to cover the points mentioned in the section on drainage within planning conditions section of this document.

#### Forward Visibility around the bend on Pinkhill Lane to the North of the Site

Pinkhill Lane is a private road from a point immediately south of the access to the plot of land containing the property known as “Linden.” Although some of this bend is existing public highway, this development, should it come forward, will result in an intensification of use of this stretch of Pinkhill Lane. Therefore, the applicant should complete 85th percentile average AADT wet weather speed surveys at an appropriate point on Pinkhill Lane to demonstrate that appropriate forward visibility can be achieved in accordance

with paragraph 6.9 of Oxfordshire County Council's Residential Roads Design Guide which can be accessed at: <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/transport-development-control-tdc>.

#### Transport Assessment – Future Impact of the Development on the B4449/Oxford Road/B4044 Roundabout

The applicant has provided me with Technical Note 2. This has included, as requested an amended trip generation and distribution forecasts, with committed development and TEMPRO rates, as requested in my response of 28 April 2017. Therefore, I have no more comments to make on this issue.

#### Financial Contribution towards Bus Stop Improvements in the Centre of Eynsham

The Transport Assessment states that the nearest bus stops are at Oakfields Industrial Estate on Stanton Harcourt Road and on Station Road. Both sets of stops are no longer served by a bus service and unlikely to be in the medium term because of lack of commercial viability. Consequently, the walking distance from the development site to the nearest bus stops on Eynsham High Street is substantially in excess (approximately 850m from the centroid of the site) of the recommended 400m walking distance and therefore sub-optimal and at the cusp of what would be considered acceptable.

The stops on Eynsham High Street are served by the S1 service which provides three buses per hour between Witney and Oxford via Eynsham. Because of the comparatively long walk to these stops, it is necessary to improve the quality of the bus stop infrastructure to make the service as attractive as possible to residents. Therefore the applicant needs to make a financial contribution of £20,204.00 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act to improve the existing timetabling arrangements at and hardstanding areas at the bus stops to make them more accessible. This is calculated at a rate of £388.50 per dwelling which is a standard rate applied across Oxfordshire.

#### Offsite Highway Works to provide pedestrian access to Eynsham village

The nearest pedestrian access to the development is across the B4449 (east) (see attached photograph below) which is 6.8m east of the B4449(east)/Stanton Harcourt Road/Station Road roundabout and within a 40mph speed limit:

The applicant has shown that they might be able to provide a footway of 2m in width to link it to the existing footway leading from Pinkhill Lane to Eynsham Village, and would also need to install proper dropped kerbs with tactile paving at this crossing point on either side of the B4449 (east) via an agreement to carry out works on the highway under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.

In the light of this advice Reason for Refusal 4 in the Officer report is to be amended as follows:

*The applicant has not demonstrated that the necessary improvements to Pinkhill Lane in terms of carriageway width, [provision for horses](#) and pedestrian footway are feasible in construction terms, or that they have control over the private lane that would allow the necessary improvement works to be carried out. The Highway Authority would not be able to adopt the estate road if it crosses third party land. It has not been demonstrated that there would be safe forward visibility around the bend in the road where Pinkhill Lane joins the spur off the B4449, west of Old Level Crossing. ~~The transport assessment is not robust in taking account of future cumulative impact movements on the B4449/B4044 roundabout.~~ On the basis of these shortcomings, the applicant has not demonstrated that they can achieve safe and suitable access for all people and that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the operation of the local highway network. The proposal is therefore unacceptable in highways terms and contrary to West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies BE3 and T2, emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 Policies T1 and T3, and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF, in particular 17, 32, 34, and 69.*

#### **WODC Ecology:**

No objection is raised subject to conditions.

Application Number	17/01114/FUL
Site Address	Land On Stanton Harcourt Road Old Station Way Eynsham Oxfordshire
Date	31st May 2017
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Approve subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Eynsham Parish Council
Grid Reference	442771 E 208819 N
Committee Date	12th June 2017

**Application Details:**

Construction of new two storey research and development building, in connection with previously approved manufacturing campus (16/02369/FUL) creation of wild flower meadow and diversion of public footpath

**Applicant Details:**

Polar Technology Management Group Ltd  
Penrose House  
67 Hightown Road  
Banbury  
Oxon  
OX19 9BE

**Additional Representations**

Eynsham Parish Council

Eynsham Parish Council continues to support the development and expansion of the Polar Technology group in Eynsham. It had reservations with regard to the development as proposed in application 16/02369/FUL. The Parish Council objects to this amended application.

The proposed amendments by the Applicant are not for the benefit of the Applicant's expansion of its business but clearly to facilitate the proposals by West Oxfordshire District Council for a western link road extending from the A40 to the B4449 Stanton Harcourt Road. This is contrary to the provisions of the emerging Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan, which expresses a strong preference against a road link and associated development, south of the Chil Brook.

Previous plans for expansion of the Polar site were within an area of several general industrial and employment buildings, contained within a specific industrial zone with an extension of that zone to the south-west, away from the village.

The latest proposal pushes up towards the village. Combined with the development flowing from a link road to the B4449, the Polar site would become part of an urbanized expansion of the southern edge of the village and flood plain, which has important amenity and conservation value, contrary to BE4 and the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

Notwithstanding the link road appearing to be the basis for this amended application, the Applicant fails to address many of the traffic and transport objections raised by both the Parish

Council and OCC Highways to application 16/02369/FUL which would also apply if the site were to become part of a link road.

This amended application also fails to respond to any of the Parish Council's concerns expressed in its reply to 16/02369/FUL, particularly that the FRA does not consider the possibility of increased flooding downstream, contrary to NPPF, para 100.

If the LPA consents to this application Eynsham Parish Council reserves the right to claim a s106 developer contribution in respect of this development.

Application Number	17/01193/FUL and 17/01194/LBC
Site Address	Masonic Hall 20 Church Green Witney Oxfordshire OX28 4AW
Date	31st May 2017
Officer	Miranda Clark
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Witney Parish Council
Grid Reference	435568 E 209422 N
Committee Date	12th June 2017

**Application Details:**

Alterations, refurbishment and new rear extension to improve facilities to the Witney Masonic Centre.

**Applicant Details:**

Witney Masonic Centre Ltd  
Masonic Hall  
20 Church Green  
Witney  
Oxfordshire  
OX28 4AW

**Additional Representations**

Amended Plans have been submitted showing a reduction in the scale of the extension by 2m, lowered overall height and lining up the eaves of the extension, and replaced windows with roof lights. Plans have also been submitted showing the location of the retrospective noticeboard.

Applicant's Case

A letter has been received from the applicants which has been summarised as;

The Centre is primarily a Masonic Centre and will continue to be used as such for the benefit of the members.

The amended proposed extension as requested continues in the desire to improve the features of this Historic Building, by removing an unsightly lean-to and metal Fire Escape and improving the overall facade. Returning it to be more in keeping with the original period and surrounding properties, also to improve the facilities available to all within the building and the introduction of proper Disabled Facilities.

The Building and Area at the rear are already used for Social and Community Based activities as well as Masonic. There are a number of rooms which are used on a part time bases by local groups ranging in all ages and by the residents of Witney, such as the Children's Book Club, Children's Saltbox Music, Irish Dancing, Line Dancing, Boxing, Zumba, Hoopla Keep Fit, Weddings, amongst others, as is the case with most Church, Town, and Village Halls.

At present these vital services to the Community are restricted when a Masonic meeting is held, the proposed extension would mean that this did not happen, which we are sure should be welcomed by all.

There is sufficient parking at the rear of the Centre to accommodate all the activities held and the extension would not cause the loss of a number of parking spaces as all the available area has not been utilised, we don't have any resident staff requiring parking facilities.

There is at present an unused area of Garden at rear which is overgrown, which we intended to change into a Memorial Garden.

Having a secondary access to the Building from the car park would reduce the number of people using the alley way and existing fire door which would considerable reduce the impact on our neighbours. This would further be advanced by the fact there would be three doors between the main hall and the car park, the proposed extension will comply with modern insulation and sound proofing Regulations. We already have a sound limiter installed at the premises which we will see whether it can be improved on with modern technology.

It is our intention to make the premises a No Smoking Area.

We have instructed our agent to remove all the side windows on the 1st Floor of the New Build on the South Elevation and amend the application to include Conservation Roof Lights.

The two upper windows on the Car Park Elevation are to be made shorter but wider to be more balanced.

Can we also confirm that all other side windows and upper floor windows will be of non-clear glass.

It is understood that we should have asked for permission to fix a Notice Board to the outside of the Building, we apologise for this and seek retrospect approval, removal of unsightly signs in the windows and the installation of a beautifully constructed Notice Board we thought would have been welcomed by residents. Picture attached.

It is also our intention to install a Defibrillator in a convenient place on the outside of the Building for Community use.

#### Consultation Response

OCC Highways - The application seeks the internal alterations to the existing building together with an extension to the rear.

The extension comprises toilets and reception area on two floors. Given the town centre location the proposal, if permitted, will not have a significant detrimental impact ( in terms of highway safety and convenience ) on the adjacent highway network

No objection

#### Further Representations

Emails have been received from neighbours concerned at not being notified of the amended plans and wishing the application to be deferred from Monday's Committee meeting. Also further comments received regarding the officer's planning assessment section which have been summarised below. It is understood that these emails have also been sent to Members of the Lowlands Planning Sub-Committee.



However we do wish to comment on the Planning Assessment submitted by officers of the Council, and in particular on paragraph 5.4, which discusses the proposal in relation to Policy WIT1 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

Policy WIT1 is clear: "The change of use of existing premises to shopping/commercial use or any further intensification of existing shopping/commercial use will not be permitted...." Then there is provision for an exception to this general embargo on commercial intensification: "...where the proposed use would be incidental to the primary permitted use of the building (e.g. working from home)" We have put these last three words in italics, because they were omitted from the summary of Policy WIT1 given in paragraph 5.4, and we think they provide a vital indication of how the exception clause was meant to be used.

Why did the authors of the Local Plan add the phrase "(e.g. working from home)" to the exception clause? To us the answer seems clear. They wanted to ensure that the clause was used for modest, domestic-scale projects posing no threat to the residential character of the area, such as a small single-storey office extension in the back garden of a family home, and not as a loophole through which to squeeze projects contrary to the central thrust of the policy against further commercialisation.

Application No 17/01193/FUL is not about an individual homeowner working away in his garden shed. At nearly nine metres high and over ten metres long, its sheer scale places it far beyond the intended scope of the exception clause. The Design and Access Statement sets out its central purpose as "to widen its use for social and commercial use", and the scale of the proposed new facilities shows there is nothing modest or domestic-scale about their commercial ambitions, whatever Policy WIT1 may say. Paragraph 5.4 goes on to describe the main use of the Witney Masonic Centre as a "public hall". Surely not. The main use of the Witney Masonic Centre is as a Masonic Centre. It is a private institution with limited company status. Its commercial activities are just that: commercial activities.

It was identified by the Town Council that a commercial limited company, not an institution was the applicant and as such the usage of the building for D1 was questioned. Having reviewed the D1 condition myself it states that to use the venue as a dancehall it should be D2, something that is very common at the venue. With the business looking to increase commercial operations I would have to agree with the Town Council that a review of the conditions should be undertaken as it is not clear.

At time of writing we have not seen any amended plans, neither have you received all your consultation responses, in the circumstances should this application not be deferred? The objections to this application cover a number of points some of which may, or may not now be valid? I find it incomprehensible that you are approving a scheme that no one has had the opportunity to comment on, ordinarily should this not have been submitted to the Council and the Committee as a revised application allowing everyone the opportunity to consider and comment.

In principle you have stated that improving the venue is acceptable, we would not disagree, however this is not just an improvement of the space, this is doubling the commercial size of the venue. As such, this increased activity which is detailed in the applicants design and access statement clearly states the alterations are to "widen its use for social and commercial use". This is completely at odds with your comments that "the proposed use of the extension will be incidental to the main use of the building as a public hall". The current commercial space will be over doubled, can you consider this incidental? From the Councils own guidelines "incidental" could be classed as someone working from home, doubling a venue's commercial capacity surely cannot be classed as Incidental! I would also like to point out that WIT1 stipulates that any "loss of privacy will not be supported", a main entrance to a venue, I think this is a major loss of privacy. Unless I have misunderstood I strongly disagree with your comments, this application in the form we have read is clearly contrary to WIT1 A2.3.1, 3.4.2 WIT3 and OS4.

Noise is one of our main concerns, currently we have an acceptable balance where the hall is used infrequently for weekend and evening events. On the occasions where the fire door is open the noise from the venue is excessive, however as it is infrequent it is bearable. Now the venue wants to open the hall up with double doors to the car park and with a potential increase in events this would clearly effect ours, and our neighbours living conditions as all our gardens surround the proposed development. Sadly, there is no planning condition stipulated at all external doors should be auto closing, such a condition would help with the noise. The lack of any conditions set out in your approval recommendation shows the lack of consideration the applicant and the Council have given to ours, and our neighbours living conditions, this is contrary to WIT1 3.4.2 and OS4.

I fail to understand the relevance of your comment “they would not require permission to place a door in a listed building”, it would not be possible to relocate a door without alterations to the fabric of this building, and it is this building we are talking about so I find such comments irrelevant. You went on to comment “However the owner of the Hall could request that if users of the hall wanted to smoke, to arrange for them to use the front as occurs now”. We understand your intention but it would have had more weight if you had stated that it should be a planning condition that no smoking is allowed in the car park. As I am sure you will appreciate all our gardens adjoin the car park and two of our properties are within 5 meters of the proposed entrance, we do not want to be subjected to passive smoking and this further underpins our concerns that our living conditions will be undermined by this application should it be approved, without such conditions this is again contrary to OS4.

We agree, extending a listed building should be allowed, subject to design, scale and impact to residential amenities. Currently the scale of this development has been objected to by the Residents, The Town Council, West Oxfordshire District Council Architect and the listed building officer have all questioned its size, as such I think we are all in agreement it is too big. In addition, it can clearly be shown that this development would impact all the immediate neighbours with the current plans as the Council have sought changes. I would also draw your attention to our own planning application where we were not allowed to cross the existing building line, why is this rule not being enforced for this application? We have yet to see the amended plans but would welcome the opportunity to comment prior to any decision.

We have not seen the amended plans so we are unable to comment, however on the submitted plans the extension is clearly detrimental to the appearance of a listed building. Also the listed building office has highlighted “I think it is a great pity that they are not retaining at least some double-height space in the area of the courtyard infill, as the resultant forms are architecturally dull” Hopefully these comments will have greater weight with the committee.

Again, we have not been privy to the revised materials, but should this application be given any consideration we would like the same material conditions that applied to our listed property, natural quarried reclaimed stone for the walls and matching reclaimed Cotswold stone roof tiles. I really do want to re-draw your attention to the Policies we have referred, WIT1, A2.3.1, 3.4.2, WIT3 and OS4.

These policies clearly state that any development should not harm the use or enjoyment of land and buildings nearby, including living conditions in residential properties or have any loss of privacy. You as the planning officer have clearly made a decision based on your own opinion without any consideration or consultation with the immediate surrounding residents that these policies are irrelevant and such a development would be in no way detrimental. The residents and the Town Council are all of the same opinion that WIT 1 A2.3.1, 3.4.2, WIT3 and OS4 would clearly be applicable to this application and if you had taken the time to consult with the residents we could be working towards finding an amicable solution to all, as opposed to spending time writing objections based on planning law.

As I am sure you are aware we have made every effort to engage with the Council and the Masonic Centre to find a compromise that will work for everyone, the Council should be supporting such an approach considering their own policies and the development being in a conservation area with listed properties

adjoining both sides. We have had an email from the Chairman of the Masonic Centre to say he is calling an emergency meeting and stated "It goes without saying that we want to work with our neighbours and want to try and achieve the modernisation of the centre without causing any animosity".

We all want to work to find an acceptable solution so venue's like this are maintained, but this must be balanced with resident's privacy and home environment under the current application that we have seen and based on planning law there should be no doubt that the application should be refused.

Application Number	17/01318/FUL
Site Address	Glebe Cottage Lew Road Curbridge Witney Oxfordshire OX29 7PD
Date	31st May 2017
Officer	Kim Smith
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Curbridge Parish Council
Grid Reference	432949 E 207865 N
Committee Date	12th June 2017

**Application Details:**

Construction of four detached dwellings and formation of vehicular access.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr Stuart Hay  
C/o Agent

**Additional Representations**

**Parish Council**

The Parish Council feel that this fresh Application for this site is still an overdevelopment, eroding green spaces in a rural location within Curbridge. Should the application be approved in principle, we think that a layout of the proposed dwellings would be better suited along the edge with the road, rather than forming a cul de sac within the green area.

**Mr Julian Wade** of Duttons Farm, Lew Road, Curbridge has commented as follows:

Our understanding is that all planning applications should be considered in context of the National Planning Policy Framework which makes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. By sustainable it is intended that all developments should encourage the use of public transport and the need to reduce the need to travel by car. Curbridge is not a location which could be considered sustainable by any measure.

We would like to bring to your attention the WODC planning guidelines. It is clear that this application is submitted without the consideration of many of the guidelines to include:-

BE4 -Open space with in and Adjoining Settlement  
H2 - General residential development standards  
Overlooking surrounding properties  
Loss of privacy and natural light loss to surrounding properties  
By reason of its siting and mass this represents an un-neighbourly form of development  
NE8/NE9/N11 - Risk of Flooding/Surface Water/Water Quality

We note this planning application does not supply a supported flood risk assessment in favour to develop the land neither does it supply a flood consequence report which clearly demonstrates a lack of due diligence and consideration to the community and those living in the direct area.

The proposed area of planning floods during heavy rain fall and over the winter months. The proposed application will increase the flood risk which will severely affect local property and the livestock which use the agricultural land and paddocks directly behind the development with such infill.

NE1/NE2 - Safe guarding the Countryside & Countryside around Witney and Carterton

There is no provision to address this planning guideline in any way  
The proposed application bears little change to that of the refused application 16/01973/FUL in its sheer development mass, despite it being 1 dwelling smaller. The application bears no consideration to either the National Planning Policy Framework or the WODC Planning Guidelines.

The consequences to developing this land poses catastrophic consequences to the neighbouring properties, animals and agricultural land and also to the Village itself.

Mr and Mrs R Clifton of Glebe Cottage have commented on the application. In a précised form the points that they have made are as follows:

Before buying the property we were assured from the landowner that a revised development application would be considerably smaller, maybe one or two houses and that no dwellings would be sited beyond the garage building line of Glebe Cottage. Plot 3 is directly opposite Glebe Cottage. The net result is that there is no difference in land mass than the refused application 16/01973/FUL.

If approved plots 3 and 4 would destroy an open area which makes a huge contribution to Glebe Cottage in its visual amenity.

The positioning of plots3 and 4 will result in the cottage being overdowed then be overshadowed by the large 2 story new dwellings.

The proposed development by reason of its size, depth ,width, height and massing would have an unacceptably adverse impact on Glebe Cottage by way of overlooking, loss of privacy and visually overbearing impact.

Glebe cottage has had permission granted for a first floor balcony which is now in place and which will directly overlook plot 3.

The development would overbear on Glebe Cottage.

Glebe Cottage sits 8 to 10 feet below road level and is prone to flooding as it is the natural low point.

Significant works have been carried out to prevent flooding including the building of a trench around the property. In addition and most importantly , there are a number of underground soakaways currently in

place taking run off water to the surrounding open land, to drain and protect the property from flood. These would be rendered useless with the proposed development in such close proximity. In addition given the size of the development and the amount of hard standing, Glebe Cottage will be left to flood during the winter months.

The inclusion of such a large estate will risk flooding to Glebe Cottage in the winter from surface water.

Glebe Cottage operates on a septic tank for its sewage. With plot 3 in its proposed position the septic tank becomes the subject of a risk of flooding. In the event, Glebe Cottage, Plot 3 and the surrounding area will be exposed to raw sewage.

The development would ruin the rural character of the area and significantly damages the outdoor recreational values.

I refer to planning policy H11 and see that the proposed planning application , as an un-identified site is unable to meet any of the H11 requirements set out in our planning policy.