

Appendix A

Mr Mathew addressed the meeting as the County Council Division representative. He urged Members to give consideration to the effect of the proposed development on existing and future residents. He suggested that Thornbury Road was unsuitable as an access both during the course of construction works and for the completed development and considered an access onto Witney Road to be a more appropriate alternative.

Mr Mathew considered that the location of the access in close proximity to Bartholomew School was inadvisable and expressed concern over the additional traffic movements that would be generated by the development on the already congested A40.

Mr Mathew also expressed concern over the impact on local air quality resulting from vehicles from the new development travelling along the B4044 to the east or through the centre of the village and Acre End Street when travelling east. Mr Mathew believed that both options were unsatisfactory. He invited Members to take account of the views expressed by the Parish Council and asked that, if the application was approved, the grade II listed bridge at Chilbridge be repaired with parapets and that measures be put in place to protect those residents living closest to the access through the erection of trellis and planting.

Lowlands Planning – 13th August 2018

Land at Thornbury Road Eynsham – 18/01009/RES

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to speak today.

Clearly this is a highly contentious application but the most important thing for the Parish Council is to see that the development is to the highest standards.

At your last meeting no less than seven of the twelve members present made critical comments with many of you describing the application as looking and feeling like a ghetto. There was much criticism of the layout, the height of the three storey units and the design. It is therefore more than a little disappointing that only three weeks later the developer comes up with what can only be described as an even worse design. True the three storey units have been made smaller but nastier and still three storey. We now have a ghetto from the 1950's.

Your own minutes record that the application was "Deferred to enable Officers to negotiate improvements to the design and layout of the site and a reduction in the height of the three storey units. Is this truly the improvement you were seeking?

Clearly, like many of you, the Parish Council and more importantly the residents who are directly impacted by this development, have not had time to digest the more than twenty documents put on line last week. Twenty six on the 6th August, one more on the 7th August and a further one on the 10th August. Whilst many of our own original objections have not been satisfied, it is clear that many residents do not even know of the existence of these new documents.

The brochure which has been placed on the planning portal, and sent to District Councillors (but not to the Parish Council), clearly shows prominent three storey buildings. I ask again, is this truly the improvement you were seeking?

We feel that spending a little time in getting this right is vitally important and getting some buy in from those impacted even more so. This appears to have been rushed through in the past weeks with the hope that it will just go under the radar.

We would ask that you yet again defer a decision on this application today and allow all parties, but most importantly local residents, an opportunity to give this the proper consideration that it deserves. It would certainly be most helpful if a further period of consultation could be agreed to allow this to happen.

Thank you for your time.

Appendix C

Mr Neal expressed disappointment at the previous deferral of the application but indicated that the applicants had taken Members' concerns on board and regarded this development as a flagship scheme.

In summary, a more contemporary approach had been taken to the three storey units which had been reduced in size by some 25%. These were of high quality and intended as landmark buildings and entrance features to the site.

The provision of public art was addressed by way of condition and key focal buildings had been updated by the introduction of a variety of design features. The scheme now incorporated a range of architectural features reflecting the local vernacular and creating visual references.

The development would also provide 50% affordable housing equating to 80 affordable units and Mr Neal invited Members to approve the scheme.

Appendix D

Ms Smith emphasised that the garage conversion and extension was ancillary to the main dwelling and not occupied as an independent dwelling. She confirmed that the ancillary accommodation did not have its own independent water, gas or electricity supply.

Ms Smith advised that she had amended the plans in an effort to address the concerns expressed by neighbours and suggested that the parking problems referred to by objectors were caused by other neighbouring residents. She considered that the objections made in relation to her application were unfair.

In conclusion, Ms Smith indicated that she did not consider the installation of a sink to enable independent occupation but simply provided for a kettle and a facility for washing up.

18/1509/FUL Kelmscott Manor – Anne Stephens, Objector

Kelmscott has 34 houses, 2 farms, a church, pub and the Manor. It is served by single track roads with no speed restrictions, no parking restrictions, no street lighting and no public transport.

Although a car park is available on Manor open days, many visitors park in the centre of the village, often on verges or obstructing access. The pedestrian route from the car park to the Manor is mainly on the carriage way. The increased traffic, and pedestrians in the road, causes considerable inconvenience to farmers & residents and will only become more of a problem with the extended opening pattern.

The lack of detail around the management of traffic & pedestrians is concerning. Disappointingly, villagers' suggestions to create a new access into the car park before entering the village, and a token system for parking, have not been followed up. The car park is often unstaffed and the applicant gives no information concerning future management of traffic & pedestrians around the entrance to the car park, or on the pedestrian route to the Manor. There are no details of the proposed electric shuttle vehicles, or the route they intend to use, or how they will impact on pedestrian safety & traffic flow.

Case document, para 5.5 states:

The current car park can only be used 3 days per week and this application seeks consent for 4 days.

However in 5.21 the opening pattern requires that, for six months of the year, the car park will be used six days a week. Surely this usage, together with wooden posts marking out bays, makes the car park a permanent structure?

18/1509/FUL Kelmscott Manor – Laura Roberts, Objector

The last time parking was assessed in 2011, the Manor were granted permission to use the field as an occasional car park for two days a week and visitor numbers were considerably less than now. Over the years, numbers have increased and we are now in excess of 21,000 per annum, already saturation point for our tiny community. I'm unsure whether anyone from Oxfordshire Highways or this Committee have visited Kelmscott on a Manor open day to assess this for themselves. Approving the current plans with unsustainable levels of visitor traffic for up to 6 days a week and 40,000 visitors a year will completely destroy our way of life.

Lack of public facilities at the car park and the prospect of a 410m walk will ensure that cars continue to park near the Manor. Similarly, are coachloads of 60 passengers, perhaps needing toilets on arrival really going to wait in a field while some sort of electric vehicle transfers them in groups to the Manor? I think not and ultimately coaches will continue to drop visitors at Manor gates. Even if a coach does offload its passengers at the car park, this is lot of people wandering the blind bends of our lanes en masse when there is nothing to ensure their safety.

The negative impact of these plans on our village, our homes and the conservation area seem to have been completely ignored in favour of dubious public benefits of mass tourism in a previously tranquil part of the County. Indeed, approval of these plans would appear to contravene planning policies T1, T6, TLC1, BE1, BE3, BE5 and NE1. I fully support conservation but I do not support the HLF conditions which rely on expansion. There are other ways to achieve conservation without sacrificing the village and its unique character. Kelmscott is special; a conservation area that should be afforded the strongest protection.

Appendix F

Mr Sensecall acknowledged the concerns expressed by the objectors but stressed that the Manor was a listed building in respect of which the owners were under a statutory duty to maintain in good order. Some parts of the property were in need of repair and the owners did not have sufficient funds to carry out this work.

Whilst lottery funding was available, this was conditional upon increased public access and education. The current proposals sought to address these requirements so as to enable the property to be maintained in good order for the benefit of future generations.

Mr Sensecall acknowledged that traffic generation was problematic but expressed the hope that the proposed car park extension would improve the position. Coaches would be able to park on the edge of the site and electric vehicles would be available for those who required transport to the Manor House. Those who were able to do so would still be expected to walk although there was no intention to provide a full footpath given the rural location.

In inviting Members to approve the application, Mr Sensecall emphasised that it enjoyed the support of Historic England and the Council's own Officers and noted that the County Council had raised no objections to the proposal.

Appendix G

Mr Hobson stated that the Council had a five year housing land supply and could therefore reject the current application as no more residential development was required. Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework was applicable and the Council could put greater weight on its emerging Local Plan. The proposal was contrary to Policy H2 of the plan and represented a loss of an existing retail and employment use.

Mr Hobson urged Members to have regard to the loss of community facilities occasioned by the proposed development contrary to the emerging plan and advised that an application had been made to designate the premises as an asset of community value. He suggested that the development would have an adverse impact on local heritage assets and was disappointed that the Sub-Committee had not chosen to carry out a formal site visit.

Mr Hobson considered that the proposals would have an adverse impact upon the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings as the height and design of the new buildings was out of keeping with existing properties.

Appendix H

Mr Sensecall noted that there were two extant consents on this site and that the application for two dwellings permitted in 2017 differed from the current application only in proposing access to the car park from the rear rather than the front of the site.

The application approved in 2016 proposed access off Blackditch of the same width as currently proposed but to the side not the centre of the site.

Mr Sensecall considered the current application to respect the Conservation Area and noted that the properties were to be located further back on the site. This would allow for additional landscaping and gardens to the rear with parking to the front of the dwellings as expected in such a location.

The current proposal offered better accommodation and access than either of the extant consents.