

## Appendix A

Mr Mathew reiterated the concerns expressed by the Parish Council as conveyed to the previous meeting. He acknowledged that the Council lacked an evidenced five year housing land supply with the consequent implications for its Local Plan but considered that the application ought not to be approved without changes. Regardless of the Council's position, Mr Mathew contended that applications ought not to be pushed through when there were obvious shortcomings.

Given that the site had been considered unacceptable in the SHELLA, Mr Mathew questioned what had changed so that this application within a Conservation Area was now deemed acceptable by Officers when, in his view, the application failed to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.

Mr Mathew also noted that the County Council had objected to the application in view of the lack of public transport. He indicated that the Council obviously had no wish to take account of local public opinion; this application, together with that recently approved on the old airfield site represented a 25% increase in the size of the village which the existing infrastructure was unable to absorb.

Mr Mathew considered the proposed pedestrian access to be unacceptable as children would have to cross the road at a particularly dangerous point to reach the local school. Further, the increased vehicular traffic generated by the development would result in chaos on the local road network and, in particular, in the vicinity of the school.

Mr Mathew questioned the impact of the proposed development on the 80 plus Listed Buildings in the vicinity and, in conclusion, advised that the Parish Council had not received a response to its request for developer contributions. The Southern by-bass site had not been properly considered and Mr Mathew stressed the need for consistency and respect for the needs of local residents.

## Appendix B

Having spoken at the previous meeting, Mr Sensecall indicated that he would not repeat the merits of the application other than to invite Members to support the Officer recommendation of approval.

In response to comments made in the report and by Mr Mathew he reminded Members of the relevance of the absence of a five year land supply and suggested that the adoption of a new Local Plan was still some time off.

In response to the suggestion that the applicants had sought to bulldoze the application through he advised that the plans had been revised following consultation. The number of units had been reduced from 60 to 40 and a large area of open space was to be retained. Officers agreed that this would protect and enhance the Conservation Area.

Mr Sensecall reminded Members that no infrastructure objections had been received. He acknowledged that there were a large number of Listed Buildings in the vicinity and that the site lay within a Conservation Area. However, Officers were satisfied that the application was acceptable as now proposed subject to appropriate conditions.

Mr Sensecall suggested that the Section 106 contributions put forward were fair and reasonable. He advised that nothing had been ruled out and the Parish Council's requests remained open for discussion. The question of a by-pass was a far larger issue and this was not something that this scheme could provide or require.

The Highway Authority had raised no technical objections; their only concern being based upon the lack of public transport. Mr Sensecall suggested that it was more likely that the bus service would be reinstated if the development was permitted than if no additional housing was allowed as the operators were more likely to respond to an increase in demand.

In conclusion, Mr Sensecall stressed that Officers considered the application to be acceptable on balance and expressed the hope that Members would support that recommendation.

### RECTORY HOMES Amended App. 16/04234/ OUT

#### NLPC Response

Rectory Homes have submitted Amended Plans to application number 16/04234/OUT based on various consultations. The main amendment is to reduce the proposed number of units from 100 to 50 and other minor concessions are made to comply with requests made by Oxfordshire County Council.

Earlier objections and compensation proposals made by North Leigh PC (30.01.2017) have been either been overlooked or not considered by either OCC or the applicant.

North Leigh Parish Council reconfirms its objections to application 16/04234/OUT as Amended on the following grounds;

1. The amended proposals are contrary to the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan which specifically excludes North Leigh as a site for additional housing.
2. The proposal ignores recently approved developments in the village which together increase the number of new houses by 116. This proposal adds a further 50 which will enlarge the village population and traffic movements by more than 25%. This puts unsustainable demands on the village infrastructure.
3. The proposals add further pressure on the village primary school which is already stretched beyond its statutory capacity.
4. The proposal ignores the recent reductions in bus services through the village claiming it is well served whereas it is poorly served.
5. The proposed ghost island on the A4095 and the proposal to decommission the layby will increase the risk of accident on this stretch by increasing additional turning movements on an A class road with high traffic volumes and speeds at peak hours.

Should the application be approved and without prejudice to our objections, the Parish Council would require the following compensation in mitigation of the social impact of the development and the added demands on the village infrastructure.

1. The onsite play areas to include to include play equipment and childrens play facilities and the existing playground adjacent to the site be upgraded, details to be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.
2. The cycle lane on the north side of the A4095 to extend from Common Road junction to Park Road junction to comply with LTP4 Cycling Strategy.
3. The decommissioned layby to be relocated to the southern verge of the A4095 opposite Common Road.
4. A roundabout junction be constructed at the site entrance to better serve the site and improve safety on this stretch of the A4095.

5. Traffic calming schemes to be provided on all village roads eg "sleeping policemen, chicanes, 20 mph restrictions etc. agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.
6. A pedestrian crossing be constructed on Windmill Road to permit safe crossing for access to the junior school.
7. The provision of bus shelters at every bus stop in the village details to be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.
8. The developer to negotiate with the landowners to release land at the entrance to the allotments on the north side of Park Road and to be gifted to the parish as a public carpark. The developer to construct hardstanding suitable for car parking on the site.

### **Land at Witney Road, North Leigh Committee Presentation**

1. My name is Jolande Bowater, a Planning Manager at Rectory Homes. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you again in respect of this application.
2. The application was first considered in July with an Officer recommendation to approve, subject to a legal agreement. However, it was deferred for a site visit, which took place last week.
3. Members were able to see the A4095 Witney Road and the location of the proposed footpath and cycle link onto Windmill Road.
4. The proposed junction onto the A4095 has been designed to a higher specification than is required by the average speeds along this road and its location allows good visibility in both directions. The junction design was agreed with the Highways Authority following a 7-day speed survey along this stretch of road. Highways Officers have no objections on traffic and highways grounds and consider the junction to be safe.
5. When the application was being prepared, both the Parish Council and the Ward Councillor supported vehicular access onto the A4095 with pedestrian and cycle access onto Windmill Road. This was in order to:
  - Minimise traffic through the village;
  - To help reduce traffic speeds along the A4095; and
  - Ensure safe and sustainable footpath and cycle links to local facilities.

The Parish Council made the same positive points about this site at a public inquiry last year.

6. You will be aware from my letter sent last week that we have agreed in principle to the requested contributions towards necessary improvements to schools, bus services, play areas and leisure provision. In addition, following a late request, we have confirmed

our agreement to providing a contribution to facilitate a cycle link along the A4095 between Park Road and Common Road.

7. This is an outline application for residential development, affordable housing, new public open space and access. The detailed design will form part of a separate Reserved Matters application.
8. I hope Members will recognise that Rectory Homes has welcomed and responded to Officers' advice at all stages. As a local developer of high quality homes, we will develop this site.
9. Also, as part of the on-going Local Plan Examination, you will be aware of the additional work that the Council needs to undertake in order to resolve the housing land supply issues faced by the District.
10. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and we hope that you can support your officer's recommendation to approve this application.

Good afternoon

I am Raymond Cole, an Associate with Edgars Limited, and I speak on behalf of the applicant and their architect in support of the proposed development.

Four Winds comprises a very small bungalow, little altered since the 1930's and therefore not well suited as a home today. It has a range of functional but mostly dilapidated outbuildings to the rear. The bungalow is a grade II listed building and in need of restoration and repair.

The applicant's architect has worked very hard and closely with officers to design the scheme that is before you today and welcomes the recommendation in the published report.

The proposal seeks to improve the living conditions of occupiers without having a detrimental effect on the fabric of the listed building. It involves:

1. Removing an inappropriately designed porch on the front gable
2. Replacing the existing rear extension with a slightly larger one separated from the main dwelling by a glazed link
3. Replacing the existing outbuildings with three single-storey buildings to provide additional bedroom accommodation, and
4. A partly subterranean garage and a studio, forming an end to the development approximately half-way down the rear of the plot and in common with adjacent properties.

My intention is to assist you with brief clarification on issues that have arisen during consultation on the application.

### 1. Use of the proposed buildings at the rear

The proposed detached buildings would be sited relatively close to the bungalow and close to one another. None of them would have their own recognisable curtilage or allocated parking spaces. They would provide ancillary accommodation only and one of the recommended conditions would prevent them from being occupied as separate dwellings. The site would remain in use as a single residence.

### 2. The character of the area

The site is not in a designated conservation area or the AONB. However, the proposed site layout and the landscape design have been developed with care and in consultation with officers to ensure that the proposals enhance the setting of the listed building, and minimise the impact on existing established trees and shrubs.

### 3. Impact on the listed building

The Conservation Officer has concluded that the proposals will result in improvements to the character and appearance of the listed building and that the site is large enough to comfortably accommodate the new buildings at the rear without causing harm to its setting.

#### 4. The impact on trees

The removal and remedial pruning of trees will be carried out in accordance with the British Standard for tree work and new planting will grow in harmony with the proposed development for future generations.

#### 5. Ecology

There are no habitats within the site considered to be of ecological value. Nevertheless, one of the recommended conditions deals with the installation of bat and bird boxes.

#### 6. Highways and access

It is recognised that Bushey Ground is a narrow single-track road with few passing places. However, the highway authority has concluded that the proposal will not lead to a significant intensification of use or a detrimental impact on the local highway network terms of safety or convenience. Additionally, one of the recommended conditions requires the submission and approval of a construction phase traffic management plan.

#### 7. Water supply and drainage

No objection has been raised to the proposed development by Thames Water in relation to the supply of water or the capacity of the mains sewer to deal with waste-water disposal.

#### 8. Flood risk

The site is in Flood Zone 1, where there is a low probability of flooding. However, one of the recommended conditions requires the submission and approval of a full surface water drainage plan, to ensure that the proposed development does not exacerbate any flooding in the locality.

#### 9. Public Right of Way

The applicant has no intention of causing an obstruction to the public right of way. A two-metre-high close-boarded fence and trellis will be erected parallel with the eastern boundary of the site to provide security and privacy for the occupiers and to protect the health and safety of users of the public right of way both during and after the construction period.

The proposed development accords with the policies of both the adopted and emerging local plans and officers have recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions.

I respectfully request that the Sub-Committee supports the officer's recommendation, and that planning permission and listed building consent be granted for this development. Thank you.



## Patchfield Barn Draft Bullets

- My name is Graham Shelton and I am Chairman of Northmoor Parish Council
- I am here to offer strong village and Parish Council support for this application.  
There are two main reasons for this:
  - the application complies with Northmoor Parish Council's own Planning Policy and Guidance
  - the Environment Agency's objections are not well grounded in fact and not consistent with local flooding knowledge
  
- This application refers to an existing building which has been on the site for many years
- What is proposed is a simple and small extension which will slightly increase the length of the building on its existing footprint. In other respects it will remain very similar. The building will be at very low risk of flooding, and therefore poses no threat to other properties
- By way of background, when I was elected to the Parish Council in 2012 we decided to conduct a Northmoor Village Survey to determine the priorities of villagers in our community. This was pivotal in enabling us to improve the Village Hall, purchase the pub for the community and install superfast fibre broadband to every property, all with the strong support of the District Council. The village survey we did has also been very helpful in guiding our views on planning.
- As a result of the survey, the Parish Council drafted and voted on a "Northmoor Parish Council Planning Policy and Guidance" document. This was ratified by the current Parish Council in 2015 and is used to guide our recommendations to you in every planning application that we consider. We did this to ensure that we are consistent in our decision-making, and especially that we are free from bias
- The Northmoor Village Survey identified that we could not and should not attempt to prevent all development in the village, but rather channel that development to enhance our community. It was identified that small-scale development of affordable housing for local families would be acceptable to the community, with preference for conversion of existing buildings, and this concept was built into our Planning Policy
  
- The proposed development exactly matches these criteria, being a very much needed small, two-bedroomed property converted from an existing barn for the use of a retired local couple with a very long family and personal connection with the village

- I would also like to point out that this is a small, not-for-profit bungalow for a local couple not a property developer's blank cheque
- Regarding the risk of flooding, the Park Farm development has set a most unfortunate precedent, and only time will tell what impact building on a site significantly flooded in 2007 will have on the fifteen properties currently being constructed there and particularly on their neighbours, including the property (built without permission to be occupied) in the middle of the worst flooded area. The Environment Agency advice here seems sadly at variance with flooding reality
- The EA acknowledges that local, on-the-ground knowledge is vital to understanding what happens in practice during flooding events. This is because their maps are based on computerized modelling. They are an abstraction from reality which is not always a good guide to what actually happens in any particular spot.
- The reality is that Patchfield Barn did not flood naturally in 2007 and is highly unlikely to flood in the next 1000 years
- I am certainly puzzled by the information that the EA puts forward. It is for others to challenge this on consistency with the EA's own utterances and on strictly technical grounds, but it is certainly not consistent with the on-the-ground reality, which is that this is a site which is very unlikely indeed to flood.
- Drawing to conclusion, I would also point out that:
  - the existing building constructed of tiles and concrete blocks most certainly is vernacular, and examples can be found all over the area renowned for its Conblock facility!
  - Is it chocolate box pretty? Its final appearance would be down to the finishes used. It is certainly a functional representative of a common type of building in the area.
  - The building is well within the parish, and a short walk or cycle both to the facilities in the centre of Northmoor and to those in the adjacent village of Standlake
- So, in the view of Northmoor Parish Council, this application is reasonable, the property is needed and it won't flood or flood others. My strong recommendation on behalf of Northmoor Parish is to grant permission, a recommendation that has been endorsed by a remarkable 56 local people who have also written in support, versus none who have sought to oppose it, and five statutory consultees who have not objected.

Graham Shelton, Chairman

## **Appendix G**

Mr Sensecall indicated that he had never had an application where, rather than objections from local residents, there was overwhelming support. He outlined the applicant's personal circumstances, explaining that they resided in a tied cottage. Having a strong local connection, they now had the opportunity to retire in their own property.

The Parish Council's planning guidance supported the application and Mr Sensecall indicated that he remained perplexed by the position adopted by the Environment Agency as their own flood risk assessment showed that the application site fell outside the flood plain. The Environment Agency's model was theoretical and work carried out by the applicant's consultants showed that the site would not flood. The Council's own land drainage engineer had raised no objection to the application subject to appropriate conditions.

Rather than being contrary to policy, Mr Sensecall suggested that Government guidance supported the application which would provide sound, convertible accommodation within the village and he called on Members to support the wishes of the local population.

## Appendix H

Good Afternoon my name is Mark Paterson

This application is misleading as it is titled Grange Farm this location stopped being a working farm in 2004 when it was sold, the Farm use is in fact a Grain Store and location for storing farm machinery away from the main farm - it's a satellite unit, it is opposite a residential location with 5 homes for many years - 10+ years

We are not against the farmer doing his job it's more where it is being proposed and the changes/impacts to our lives and the risks it presents on a badly repaired/non maintained country road.

So the original objections still stand on Traffic & Noise objections

**Burford Road** is not really fit for purpose for large farm vehicles [ which seem to get bigger & bigger each year ] & haulage vehicles. From personal experience when these vehicles are using parts of Burford Road you cannot pass without coming to a stop and edging past each other with extreme caution, sometimes having to use the verge and in places where there is no pavement moving into what should be pedestrian - add to this people walking their dogs , children walking to catch the school coaches , young children walking with their parents to the village school , joggers , increased vehicles with residents going work between 7 - 9am.

Question - What recent traffic assessment / risk assessment have been carried out by OCC Highways on Burford Road ? or do we have to wait for an accident ?

**Burford Road Residents Shared Access to the residential area** - This residential area shared drive is also used by the Farm & Haulage vehicles to get to their grain store and farm machinery.

This residential area is home to retired people , young families, people who work days & shifts, holidaymakers - why should we be subjected to noise and disturbance from as early as 7.30 am , vehicle movements , reversing beeps for example. This is a quiet residential area not a Trading Estate.

If it was granted - the 9am start time is not adhered to now and objectors have witnessed noise far earlier than 9am so how would the earlier time be policed - start time might move to 6.30am.

The council need to consider and carry out a survey to find another access to this new barn as Burford Road is not sustainable as a continued entrance to the barn facility and support the farmer with a new access not from Burford Road.