

Appendix A

Mr Beames indicated that, whilst the proposed development was not within the parish of Witney being located in the neighbouring parish of Ducklington, it would be a focal point at the gateway to the town. Accordingly, the Town Council considered that it was important that the design and architecture should be in keeping with local buildings.

Whilst initial proposals had seen the building set back and given an open view, the Town Council welcomed the revised design which was now slightly enclosed.

Mr Beames reiterated the concerns expressed with regard to the access arrangements and expressed concern that drivers could use the access road to attempt to overtake stationary vehicles and find themselves facing oncoming traffic. Appropriate measures would need to be put in place to ensure that such difficulties did not arise.

As the emerging Local Plan envisaged further growth for Witney, Mr Beames questioned why there had been a reduction in the number of bed spaces when the site was capable of accommodating more.

Chairman, Councillors, thank you for allowing me to address you today.

Also, thank you to your Officers for the work they have put into this application resulting in a balanced report recommending permit subject to conditions and legal agreement pertaining community arts and highway contributions.

I note you have all been issued with a briefing note from my client, Hinton Group which highlights the key aspects of this development.

The visual background to this site is defined by A40 highway infrastructure, enclosing the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. Further, existing commercial development including a petrol filling station, retail units and the Oxford Witney Hotel are situated adjacent to the roundabout – combined, all features diminish the sense of openness of the site.

Notwithstanding the site's character, we have considerably reduced the original scheme from 72 to 37 beds. This has resulted in an improved scale and layout design – enhancing parking and highway visibility, landscaping; whilst also respecting and seeking to improve on-site biodiversity and hydrology. Changes have also been made to the detailed design, such that the materials proposed would now reflect the local area.

Officers consider the design and form to be acceptable and note that substantial harm would not arise.

The NPPF strongly advocates the need to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to support businesses and the economic benefits of this development should not be discounted. This development will provide 19 new full and part time roles and, through tourist spending, facilitate greater expenditure helping to support Witney's existing attraction as a tourist and business destination.

We are encouraged by Witney Town Council's strong support for the development, noting that a new hotel here will support the town.

The identified benefits are important considerations that weigh strongly in favour of this sustainable development.

Councillors, we respectfully ask that the scheme be supported, in line with your Officers recommendation.

Thank you.

9 July: Planning Committee

I live at 22 High Street. For clarification, these comments are my own, and I speak only on my own behalf.

While I understand the applicants' wish to build a house for their retirement, and am pleased the design is ecologically sound, I strongly feel that they could have compromised regarding its location and access so as to reduce its adverse effect.

The impact of the proposed house, especially that the passageway that runs between nos. 22 and 24 would become their only access to it, would be severe. My garden wall is less than a metre from what would be the western wall of the planned house. The right of way passageway is narrow, and because it is higher than part of my land, those walking along it see directly into my sitting room, kitchen and garden.

Currently the passageway is used for occasional rear garden access by nos. 16-22, e.g. for tree felling and for garden waste removal, and for removal of bins by no. 24. Changing this limited use to it being the only entranceway to the new house means the passageway will be in constant use by the applicants, their visitors, delivery men, postmen and so on – with all the implications for security that implies. Creating a path internal to their western wall from their side door to a back door to the new house, as I discussed with the applicants, would have meant the passageway retained its current level of use. But they did not include this in their application.

The house will rise around 5.5 metres and cast shade over my back garden for half the day in the spring, a major growing period, and autumn, both periods when the garden is fully in use. This overbearing could have been avoided if, as pointed out to the applicants, the house's northern wall was in line with the stone shed at the

bottom of no 22. My back garden is south-facing and largely sunny (not shady as the applicant suggests): this would not be the case if this application went ahead.

The proposed site is in a conservation area and adjacent to an AMS site. As the planning officer observed, Policy EH7 states that with any build in such locations potential harm must be overridden by public benefit: as one building for personal use this proposal does not seem to meet this requirement. While there have been other buildings south of the street line, none has the difficulties of access, overbears on adjacent owners' properties to such an extent, as it is so tight on the site, nor affects protected land.

As it stands, the building and its access *will be* impactful on protected land, intrusive for neighbouring properties and create an additional security risk – as the site visit last week will have made clear – and I urge refusal. Re-siting the house, reducing its width and/or creating an internal path to it would lessen its effects on neighbouring properties and allow us all to continue their enjoyment.

If the Council *is* minded to grant this application, I would request the following conditions:

- the applicants' offer to raise my drystone garden wall at their expense, an offer for which I am grateful;
- brick paving and low level lighting of the passageway, as discussed
- and, to deter use by non-right of way holders, reinstatement of a lockable gate to the High Street (to which 16 -24 would, as in the past, have keys).

Thank you for your time.

Jaqueline Mitchell

Text of spoken submission to the WODC, Lowlands planning committee on 9th July 2018 by Clementine and Graham Bannell (applicants) in support of the planning proposal Application Number: 17/03959/FUL, Address: 24 High Street, Eynsham, Witney, Oxfordshire OX29 4HB

Thank you for making the site visit – we hope it was helpful to you.

We would like to briefly address the concept of harm, as harm is said to be the main problem with this project and we just don't see it that way.

We have tried very hard to achieve as harmless a result as possible, as follows:

We commissioned a detailed archaeological dig which established that there are no medieval Abbey remains on the site and subsequently agreed our foundations design with Historic England to ensure there is no harm to the Roman ditch that was discovered.

We have deliberately not urbanised the edge of the village further by not proposing any new roads, garaging or parking at the rear. The building will look like a small barn conversion on the edge of a village.

In line with the recently created development pattern in adjacent gardens, our proposed dwelling is deliberately sited north of the wall that is thought of as the village boundary. Our separate holding of agricultural land to the south (the setting of the scheduled ancient monument) is entirely preserved without intrusion of any kind.

We have revised the design, in consultation with neighbours and the WODC conservation officer, as follows:

- We reduced the massing and ridge height.
This lowered ridge height preserves neighbours' views from their upper windows and there are no views to lose on the ground floors due to the existing, enclosed nature of the garden areas.
- We also set back the gables from the walls so the house, as viewed by our neighbours, presents as a small building on the other side of existing, high boundary walls.
- In recognition that usage of our pedestrian access way will increase a little, we have offered to provide and fund mitigating works to our neighbour's boundary that will protect her from existing and future usage of this established right of way.

The result will be a new dwelling that preserves the rear garden of No. 24 and provides a private, south facing garden for the new house, not overlooked by any neighbour. Likewise - the new dwelling does not overlook any neighbours' house or garden.

Finally, as has been widely acknowledged, our proposal is a modest, eco friendly, low carbon design which, in time, could be self sufficient in power due to its south facing orientation and collection of solar energy and rainfall. The project is very sustainable both in design and location - shops, facilities and public transport are metres away, ideal for our retirement.

Any change has an impact but we feel ours is minimal.

We are happy to take questions.

Minster Lovell Parish Council Verbal Objections to 18/00544/FUL

Jonathan Stowell – Parish Councillor 09/07/18

Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen – Good Afternoon.....again. You can rest assured, I am not going to deliver the same speech as last month. Instead I just want to remind you, before you consider this application, of the salient objections that we have as the Parish Council.

First, we don't need more houses in Minster Lovell. We've got 124 new houses going up in the village already, the majority of which will be expensive homes. We do not need another 10 costly houses that will bring nothing to the community except additional stress on traffic and parking, the environment and our limited resources such as the primary school. It would seem that the wider district doesn't need these houses either in the light of the imminent Local Plan.

Second, these proposed houses represent classic 'creep' onto the historical backland that provides such a valuable buffer between the built environment of our linear Village and the open countryside beyond. The developers are always dangling their bags of gold over this backland and there have been three attempts in recent memory to propose development which your Committee has had the good sense to reject. In each case your judgement has been backed by the Government Inspectors at Appeal stage, who have clearly expressed their concerns about preserving the linearity of the village and the dangerous precedent that any backland approval would provide.

Third, I'll repeat the point about precedent. It won't have escaped your sharp eyes that the layout of this proposal contains a spur road that runs right up to the southern boundary of the plot. How convenient for the future!

Fourth, The impact of the traffic movements (more than 40 a day) engendered by this development on the Brize Norton Road is significant and cumulative coming, as it does, on top of the traffic from the 124 new homes already approved. Moreover, the siting of the development entry – practically opposite Wenrisc Drive - could not be more dangerous. The Primary School and the 'cut through' that Wenrisc Drive will provide for the 124 new homes will make the junction with the Brize Norton Road a very busy place at peak times. Creating a 'staggered' 4-way junction makes no sense at all and is potentially extremely hazardous.

Fifth, the risk of contamination from the scrapyards heritage of the proposed site. It seem just plain wrong to us in the Village that know the history of this site to

even contemplate a proposal for residential development before there is cast iron evidence that the site is either not polluted, or has been effectively cleaned.

So there you have it. On these grounds we urge you to reject this proposal for backland development as you have consistently rejected previous proposals. We don't need the extra housing; you don't need the housing – particularly on such an unsuitable piece of land that has never been put forward for development in any version of the Local Plan – past or present.

That's all I have to say on behalf of the Parish. Thank you for listening to me.

Committee Speech in relation to Item No. 3

I8/00544/FUL

- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Case Officer – Catherin Tetlow
- Address: 39 Brize Norton Road
- Minster Lovell Witney, Oxfordshire
- Applicant Details: Meadowgate Homes, C/O Agent.
- Case Officer – Catherine Tetlow
- Redevelopment of coach parking yard to residential development of 10 dwellings
- Mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings

Introduction

Good afternoon, I am speaking today on behalf of Meadowgate Homes, the applicants.

The officer, after consideration of all of the planning issues, has made a recommendation to approve the application and the use of this previously developed site for ten dwellings.

No objections have been raised in respect of conservation, environmental health or archaeology.

Additional information was requested by Oxfordshire county council in respect of highway matters and drainage.

In response, we have addressed both matters with the submission of additional information to the council and the consultees to satisfy their requests. The consultees have since updated their response to state no objection;

The Parish Council and war Councillor both made objections to the proposal. We maintain our view that this previously developed site is suitable to accommodate the proposal for the following reasons:

The application is advanced by a local developer who has strong links with the local area. The applicant is keen to deliver high quality development which reflects and contributes to the character of its setting.

The redevelopment of the site would accord with the principle of bringing forward previously developed land for residential development, one of the core planning principles as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the vision set out in the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan.

The development has been demonstrated to be sustainable. The presumption in favour of sustainable development at paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework is enacted.

The presumption is also enacted by virtue of paragraph 49 and the fact that the council are unable to demonstrate a 5 year HLS. The development plan housing supply policies are therefore out of date.

The scheme would make a small but notable contribution to widening the housing stock that is available in Minster Lovell, and would make a provision of family-sized dwellings. The provision of such homes will help to address identified demographic challenges within the town by providing accommodation options for people of working age and their families.

The proposed development represents a sustainable form of development in both use of land and the contribution the proposed accommodation would make to the sustainability and future vitality of the Minster Lovell community.

The proposed development is in accordance with National Planning Policy and guidance on housing delivery, sustainable development and the protection and enhancement of the landscape. It meets the tests of the Framework set out at paragraph 14 in respect of sustainable development and, as such, the application should be approved without delay.

- 1) The proposal will redevelop a parcel of previously developed land of low environmental value.
- 2) Development of high quality design that is more appropriate in scale, design and layout to the surroundings.
- 3) Approximately 15 jobs created during construction.
- 4) The erection of ten dwellings will deliver numerous economic benefits through the New Homes Bonus payment and benefits associated with construction which will help support local services.
- 5) The creation of gardens and a landscaping scheme around the site will have a net ecological benefit.

Conclusion

With reference to planning policy and other material considerations, there are no significant and demonstrable adverse impacts that would arise from the proposed development. The 'planning balance' is therefore weighed positively in weight of the proposal with reference to the benefits summarised above and set out within this statement, and planning permission should therefore be granted.

Appendix G

Mr Rees welcomed the Officer's thorough report and emphasised that:-

- The detail of the reserved matters application complied with the outline consent
- The site was identified for development in both the emerging Local Plan and the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan
- There had been no objections to the proposals from Officers or the County Council
- The application offered 50% affordable housing and would provide the early delivery of 80 affordable units
- An additional £1.9million of developer contributions would be secured through the scheme

Mr Rees stressed that this was an important site for the developers as evidenced by the high quality scheme before Members. The applicants had met with existing local residents and sought to take their views into account. The layout had been amended to give a greater separation distance between new and existing properties in Willows edge and a 'no dig' condition agreed in relation to the parking area adjoining the boundary in response to concerns raised with regard to the potential loss of trees.