



THE OLD MANOR HOUSE, SCHOOL LANE, LITTLE MINSTER  
(APPLICATION 18/03670/FUL).

Good afternoon Councillors

Thank you for the opportunity to address you today.

I would like to use this time to provide further clarification on the rationale for and the design justification of the proposed residential annexe.

**In terms of need**

The applicants are an elderly couple who have lived in The Old Manor House for much of their lives. Indeed, the manor has been owned by the family since 1945 when Mr Feilden's father, who was born at Cokethorpe, purchased the property.

As such, the applicants have a very strong attachment to the house and its charming grounds and they wish to keep the property in the family for future generations.

However, over the past few years, the main house has become increasingly challenging for the applicants to manage and they are therefore seeking to downsize into a smaller residential annexe.

The main house will be handed down to their son and his large family – including three grandchildren – who would make better use of the building.

In this capacity, the proposal will enable the applicants to remain within the curtilage of their long-time home while living close to their immediate family.

**With regard to the principle and location of the annexe**

The proposal has been subject to a lengthy pre-application process whereby the requirement for and the location of the annexe has been discussed with your officers.

Through this process, the location of the annexe was guided to the south-eastern garden area within the residential curtilage of the main house, thereby ensuring a functional and ancillary relationship between the annexe and the house.

In this respect, the proposal comprises ancillary accommodation as supported by Policy H2 of the Local Plan.



In accordance with this policy, the applicants are happy to accept a condition that will restrict the occupation of the annexe as ancillary to the main house.

**In relation to the scale and size of the annexe**

The proposal has been designed and modified in accordance with pre-application advice to achieve a low-lying and subservient form, being a well-proportioned one-and-a-half storey building that is set into the land.

As noted by your officers, this design is modest and harmonises with the character and appearance of The Old Manor.

In addition, the annexe provides sufficient space to enable live-in care should it become necessary. As such, the modest-scale building thus reflects the applicants' current and future needs.

**To conclude, the principle, location and design of the annexe has been guided through the pre-application process and is supported by your officers.**

In addition, I note there have been no objections from the technical consultees in relation to:

- The preservation of the listed buildings and the wider conservation area;
- The retention and enhancement of trees and biodiversity;
- The provision of safe and suitable access; and
- The provision of adequate drainage.

The applicants are grateful for the positive position and recommendation of officers. We hope you can support their recommendation to approve this application.

Thank you for your time.

## **Jonathan Stowell : 126 dwellings on Burford Road west of Minster Lovell**

Good afternoon Mr Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen and welcome to another round in the saga of this development. As most of you know, this is, by Minster Lovell standards, a big development that adds around 25% to the size of our Village. However, most of the Village has come to accept its inevitability, albeit grudgingly in many cases. But there remains one issue that is outstanding and provoking a great deal of anguish, and that is the impact of two-story housing overlooking the bungalows in Whitehall Close on the eastern boundary of the development.

The developers will tell you that they have made adjustments to mitigate the effects of this, such as ensuring a 30 metre distance back-to-back with the existing properties, a two metre fence along the boundary, and in their latest plan, a 600 mm or 2 foot reduction in the height of the earth platform on which the new houses will be built.

The fact remains, however, that none of these measures significantly removes the overlook that results from having two-story houses backing onto bungalows. For one reason or another Whitehall residents believed that the development would incorporate bungalows along the eastern boundary. It doesn't, and this has provoked widespread anger and opposition, along with attempts to get the developers to change their minds about the boundary dwellings.

At the last meeting of the Lowlands Planning Committee it was agreed that the application should be deferred to allow for further, and hopefully meaningful, discussions to be held between the developers, residents and the Parish Council. Only one meeting has taken place – last Tuesday – when the Parish Council was informed that the proposal would be coming back to the Committee today. At that meeting, the developer offered the 600 mm/ 24 inch reduction in platform height.

The Parish Council feel strongly that this is not a meaningful change in relation to the overall problem of overlook, and that there has not been sufficient time for proper discussions between the parties concerned.

Re-submitting the application with such speed after just one meeting that resolved nothing, seems to the Parish Council to smack of undue haste. For that reason we urge the Planning Committee to respect the objectives of the last deferment and continue with another month's delay so that we can achieve some proper discussion and hopefully a resolution to the overlook problem.

Thank you ladies and gentlemen

## Appendix B

### Submission by Councillor Hill

Councillor Hill thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak and advised that she was addressing them on behalf of the Parish Council and concerned residents. She queried what had gone wrong with the communication between the developer and the Parish Council.

Due to the issues relating to the bungalows being located on the eastern boundary, the application was deferred at the last meeting to allow further discussions to take place. However, due to the Easter holidays and local elections there had been very little time for constructive conversations to occur. The Parish Council had hoped to secure the talents of an independent specialist and felt that the application coming forward at this meeting was a sign that it was being railroaded through the system. The developer seemed to have little sympathy for the concerns being raised and she asked members to consider allowing more time for the talks to take place.

## Appendix C

Submission by Mike Robinson obo agents

Mr Robinson addressed Members on behalf of the agents, and the applicant, Bovis Homes. He advised that they had had time to consider the comments raised and had agreed to move the proposed dwellings further from the eastern boundary, increase the fence height, introduce further landscaping and had altered a number of the levels across the site.

He referred to the 30m condition on the outline consent and reminded Members that the applicant would be in breach of that condition if any changes were made now. The parameter plans had been agreed at outline stage and funds for the footpath offered. In his professional opinion, there were no planning reasons to refuse the scheme and the development would deliver a sustainable, well landscape addition to the area.

## Appendix D

Submission by Becky Tilton

I am the applicant and am here with my father Gary. We have always lived in Carterton and when we purchased this site it was in a poor condition. We have cleared the site and the building work has been undertaken by my brothers. We would like to make the most of the space available.

With regard to the officers statement of 'significant overlooking' we would like to state that we have always had good relationships and communication with our neighbours. We have put up higher fences and replaced a wall for our neighbours where necessary and want to put back the green gardens. The two mature trees on the site are in full leaf and are definitely not dying. During the summer months these will block any view to Folder Avenue and the property is within the guidelines.

## Appendix E

### Submission by Laura Roberts and Julia Stobie

Laura Roberts:

I am a Kelmscott resident and feel it is important that appropriate conditions and a management plan are maintained. If the condition is removed, visitors will continue to park in the village to avoid walking. We have had problems with parked cars in the past causing obstructions and this application is likely to see the parking problems increase. The verges have been damaged and coaches will have to negotiate a blind bend. We would like the applicant to consider relocating the entrance to just outside the village.

Julia Stobie:

I too am a resident and want the manor to be a safe place to be enjoyed by all. The management plan provided does not answer our questions and there is a lack of information contained in it. With regard to visitor and traffic management, there is no evidence of the tactics to be used to smooth visitor numbers across the summer months. Is the car park sufficient to deal with the number of visitors? If the condition is removed, how will the manor manage the traffic? If the car park is full, what plans are there in place & where would the cars be directed to? More questions need to be asked of the management plan.

## Appendix F

### Submission by Nicky Brook of Carter Jonas

Ms Brook advised that the applicant was seeking to discharge conditions and were not seeking unrestricted use of the car park. She felt that the management plan was another matter – the manor only had a responsibility to visitors and staff, not to other visitors to the village. She did not feel that the movements of pedestrians in the village were relevant to this application.

She referred Members to paragraph 5.10 of the report and stated that volunteers would not be present on site when the manor was closed.

The manor had operated successfully for many decades and the plans had been through detailed consultation with the village. The applicant felt that they had delivered what the residents asked for. With regard to additional opening times, Ms Brook advised that they were hoping to open for an extra day per week across the year.