

Hello. I'm Mark Gay and I represent Hayfield Homes, the applicant. This brownfield site is allocated for residential development in the newly adopted Local Plan and benefits from an extant outline planning approval – establishing the principle of development.

This application comprises extremely high-quality development. The site's world war two airfield legacy is preserved by the retention of five former airfield buildings, either proposed for community uses or residential and ancillary uses to ensure both public benefit and their long-term retention. Three blast shelters and an air raid shelter will be retained within the vast open space to be provided, with the former airfield taxiway being transformed into the northern extent of a landscaped 'heritage trail' proposed throughout the site, with information boards being provided alongside all retained buildings and structures. The historic use of the site will be instantly recognisable upon entrance, with the immediate new-build street-scene comprising single storey development to reflect the airfield's character.

Whilst this application proposes a greater quantum of development than previously proposed, this increase includes dwellings within retained buildings previously not proposed for residential conversion, 6 new-build bungalows (with 9 being provided upon the site overall), whilst an appropriately balanced housing mix ensures that the developable area of the site remains consistent with the prior outline consent. Traffic movements will remain comparable through the residential conversion of buildings previously proposed for a more traffic intensive use.

The overall design of the scheme has been informed by the local community. At a well-attended public consultation event, residents voted overwhelmingly in favour of a traditional elevational approach. Circa 60% of attendees rated our overall proposals as either 'excellent' or 'good', whilst circa 70% considered our re-use of the former airfield buildings to also be

either 'excellent' or 'good'. The Council's Conservation Officer also informed the design of the scheme, with brick and render materials being used to reflect the character of the airfield, whilst some stone properties have been included where there is a more proximate relationship with the village core.

The public open space upon the site proposes to incorporate a series of swales and an attractive balancing pond, as well as a memorial to the former servicemen of RAF Stanton Harcourt. The layout of the site respects existing residential amenity, provides a view cone to landmark village buildings and appropriately stands off from the geological SSSI as required by Natural England. The east-west public right of way through the site is respected, whilst new village footpath links are proposed to both the north-east and west of the site. New ecological habitats are proposed within both substantially retained areas of vegetation and new landscape features, whilst the site access accords with the visibility design standards previously approved through the outline application and includes off-site footpath and crossing enhancements.

Overall, this application will ensure the high-quality and heritage sensitive redevelopment of an allocated, brownfield site. I therefore politely request that Members resolve to approve this application accordingly.

LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY 8 October 2018

RE: 18/02103FUL, Land adjacent to 24 Bakers Piece, Witney

Good afternoon everyone.

I was asked by a group of residents to inform this Committee that we object to this or any other development of any kind on this land.

The latest history for this land is: a Withdrawal of plans, Refusal by West Oxfordshire District Council and an Appeal Dismissal by The Planning Inspectorate and now this plan. All this started two and a half years ago.

We understood that after the Appeal was dismissed the next step was to challenge the dismissal.

The plan is for a two bedroom house that is much bigger than the three bedroom houses in Bakers Piece. This house would not get anyone on the property ladder and will end up as another rental property. There is no housing shortage in our immediate area.

The plans are not to scale or distorted in some way. The “supposedly” existing vehicle access is not where the plans show it to be. In the 28 years I have lived in Bakers Piece there has never been any access to the garden of 70 West End, until the Historic Boundary Wall was partially knocked down because it was going to be cleared and then the wall would be repaired. This happened over 14 months ago and no attempt has been made to tidy the site or repair the wall.

The wall at the end of Bakers Piece, although not listed, is actually the boundary wall of the Witney and Cogges Conservation Area. This means this land is in the Conservation Area. We were upset to see the damage done to this historic wall. We thought it should be preserved for future generations.

Our lovely market town is already choking with development after development in any parcel of land that can be found.

If the proposed development is approved the total concept of the conservation area would be blown out of the water. It would set precedence for other inappropriate developments, encroaching ever more on these precious historic areas.

We do not want any infilling or rounding off in our neighbourhood as it is already an over saturated small area. Any development on this land would be garden grabbing, harm the character and appearance of the Conservation area, the listed properties and the amenities of adjoining residents.

We do not think it has been demonstrated that the reasons for the West Oxfordshire District Council’s refusal and the Planning Inspectorate’s dismissal have been resolved. In fact, we do not think they can ever be resolved.

Councillors, please do not allow this development to go ahead.

Thank you,

Maria Desbrow

Statement to WODC Planning Committee

This site of less than 2 acres is fully enclosed by landscaping and hardly visible from any direction. For very many years we have treated it as our garden and planted in excess of 100 trees, 100m of hedging and numerous shrubs. It also has an area for wild flowers. We use the land every day for walking our dogs.

In October 2016 my Advisers consulted with your officers on the 10 dwelling proposal on this land which was subsequently denied on appeal. However in these discussions your officers suggested a four dwelling scheme may be acceptable and a draft proposal was submitted which was favourably received. (show drg of WW proposal)

It comes as a surprise therefore that our proposal for one dwelling in line with the previous discussions is now deemed unacceptable.

Why?

Is it adoption of the LDF ? The new policies are

EH1 – As the site is fully enclosed our proposal does not impact the intrinsic character of the natural landscape

OS1 – we are close to the town centre and local transport and very sustainable,

OS2 – we are on the edge of a main service centre and form a logical compliment to the existing development at 17 Corbett Road and do not have a harmful effect on the amenity of existing occupants

CA3 – Through good husbandry we have enhanced the Shill Valley. Because of the enclosed nature of the site this proposal is not affecting the character and setting of the town

5 year supply of housing. The LDF allows for 238 windfall sites and also promotes custom self-build which in our case will include good disabled access as my wife has ever increasing mobility problems.

So for all these reasons therefore I do not believe adoption of the LDF is the reason.

Is it the Inspectors appeal report where the two main issues were

1. **Urban sprawl** caused by 10 dwellings but our new proposal of just one dwelling about 100m from a similar approved dwelling at 17 Corbett Road and the same distance from Corbett Road and Shill Brook is clearly not.
2. **The loss of mature landscaping** caused by the new access road. However our new proposal overcomes this by using an existing access which is 12 feet wide and 24 feet from the curb and requires no removal of mature landscaping.

I cannot therefore believe the appeal report is the reason the officers have changed their position.

Policies which were if force before adoption of the LDF must have allowed development of this scale on this site otherwise why would your officers suggest it? So these cannot be reasons for rejection.

In my view therefore the favourable consideration by your officers of our proposals of Nov 2016 should still hold good and that our submission for just one dwelling for our own use is given approval.

Thank you Chair and Cllrs for the opportunity to speak