

18/03244/OUT | Residential development of up to 8 dwellings and associated infrastructure works | Land South Of The Hollies New Yatt Lane New Yatt Oxfordshire7

- Policy OS2 of the Local Plan supports development in small villages such as New Yatt subject to it being appropriate for a rural location and respecting the intrinsic character of the area. The site is on the edge of the village but adjacent to existing residential development and would therefore round off the village. The NPPF recognises that development in one village can help support services in nearby settlements. The policy importantly recognises that further site allocations can be made through Neighbourhood Plans.
- Policy H2 supports residential development in smaller villages which have been allocated within an adopted (made) Neighbourhood Plan. The site was put forward within the Neighbourhood Plan by the local community and included within the submission version of the Plan. Local people want to see small scale developments within the NP area that reflect the form, scale and pattern of the settlement. The New Yatt site was considered to achieve these aims. The site was subsequently recommended to be deleted by the Examiner along with another site however it is our view that the Examiner went beyond his remit and that the site can be brought forward for development without detriment to the intrinsic character

of New Yatt in accordance with policy OS2. The Neighbourhood Plan area is now without any allocated residential development sites.

- The NPPF confirms that Neighbourhood planning should give communities the power to develop a vision for their area. There is local support for this site as it was one of 2 sites included within the submission Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan Group and the Parish Council supported the proposal.
- The application is in outline only and technical matters can be dealt with during a future reserved matters submission.
- Government guidance and your adopted Local Plan envisage local communities being able to decide where development should be located. This site is one such example which has local support and the site has been promoted in a Neighbourhood Plan submission. We therefore urge members to recognise the desire of the local community and notwithstanding the erroneous comments made by the Examiner which we believe go beyond their normal role in this process planning permission should be granted.

Appendix B

A presentation to the WODC Lowlands Planning Committee – 12th August 2019

Agenda Item 4 – 2nd Application – 19/00684/FUL – ‘Manor Bungalow’, 41B High Street, Standlake

I speak today on behalf of immediate neighbours in Standlake High Street who oppose this development.

Contrary to your Officer’s recommendation, I urge this Committee either to refuse planning permission or at very least defer determination until after a Members site visit.

An initial development proposal for 5 houses on the plot was opposed on grounds of over-development of a backland site that would have extended the built form of the village in an alien fashion into open countryside, contrary to adopted Local Plan policies OS2, OS4, H2 and H6. OCC highways also stated that the access and pedestrian visibility at the footpath crossing were both substandard and could not be safely intensified, contrary to what are now adopted Local Plan policies T1, T2 and T3.

Although only 4 houses are now proposed to replace the single bungalow, development would still extend 10m further back and across more than 40m of undeveloped and partially treed landscape in a backland location that is still totally alien to the linear form of this village and its existing character. The access remains sub-standard with no safe pedestrian visibility at the driveway junction with the footpath. To improve visibility, it is suggested that walls either side can be lowered but one of those is attached to the listed Standlake Manor House and the house and its associated walls are important characteristics to this part of the village character and appearance. No assessment has been made in the Committee report to the heritage harm that would result, contrary to adopted Local Plan policies EH9 and EH11 and Section 6, para.190 of the NPPF.

Your report suggests at para.5.5 that the site is within Standlake village, but in large part it simply is not, so four houses to replace one would neither be a proportionate scale nor of a complementary form, contrary to policy OS2.

With far more vehicle movements passing close to the side of Standlake Manor and with a reduction in height of one of its listed boundary walls, the suggestion at para.5.10 that development would have no adverse impact on the heritage importance of the listed asset is plain wrong. It would be harmful to some degree, contrary to Local plan policies EH9 and EH11 and paras.194 and 196 of the NPPF.

Backland development at this scale would be alien to the established pattern of development, contrary to Plan policies OS2, OS4, H2, H4 and H6. On top of all of these reasons, the Committee will recall how problematic surface and foul water drainage is in this village and three extra homes will only exacerbate existing problems, contrary to Plan policy EH7 (something ignored in your report).

For all of these reasons, I urge Committee Members to refuse planning permission; thank you.

Standlake Parish Council Objections

Read by Samantha Garrett

12 August 2019

The Parish council sees no material difference to the previous application except that there is one less dwelling and our objections **then**, still apply as follows:

The proposal is contrary to the Local Plan 2031 Policy H2; specifically because:

- There is no essential operational or specific local need for this development
- It is not of demonstrable benefit to the community
- It does not form a logical complement to the existing scale and pattern of development and character of the area. In particular, it impinges on the immediate surroundings of a much-valued listed historic building - Standlake Manor
- The proposal constitutes overdevelopment of the site

Under the Local plan a development should:

- Not involve the loss of an area of open space or any other feature that makes an important contribution to the character or appearance of the area;

And it should

- Be of a proportionate and appropriate scale to its context **having regard to the potential cumulative impact of development in the locality;**

This is an extremely important point as allowing this development to proceed will open the floodgates for other developers wanting to build on farmland and back gardens behind the High Street. Once one developer is allowed to do this then a precedent will be set. This will change the character of our village forever.

If this goes ahead, there will need to be a permanent seat at these meetings for a Standlake Parish Councillor trying to halt proposed back filling developments in our village.

Highways

The vehicle access, while adequate for a single dwelling, is neither safe nor of sufficient width for the proposed number of dwellings and predicted traffic volume.

Kevin Batchelor, the Area Liaison Officer for Oxfordshire County Council has said:

It has **not** been demonstrated that the relocation and access works are a viable and possible proposal – and it should be refused.

Four large houses would mean a significant increase in the number of cars pulling out straight into the path of other road users, including cyclists and pedestrians.

Also **two** trees will need to be cut down on the High Street to allow access - a major impact on the High Street and the way it looks and it would appear that **at least 4** trees will have to be removed within the development.

Historic Importance

The Manor House itself is a magnificent grade 2 listed building, that must be protected not just for now but for future generations and this development will damage the setting for one of the most important buildings in our village.

There is no report from the Conservation officer regarding the significant building and the work proposed to one of the listed walls.

No due weight has been given to the listed building and the impact such a development will have.

Morphology

These buildings will be set back 10 metres beyond the existing building line encroaching into undeveloped green field site.

In addition they spread 41 metres beyond the existing width of the current house at a juxtaposition to the existing form.

This is not in keeping with the village character or morphology of the High Street.

Exceptional Circumstances?

This planning application does not meet local planning principles under proposed 'windfall' development as it does not meet specific local need or benefit the community. The houses will not fill any particular need for example social housing or for first time buyers.

So what exactly are the exceptional circumstances to allow this development?

Flooding and sewerage

Four more dwellings to add to the already overworked sewage system in Standlake . It may seem four houses will not make a difference but if this application succeeds it will lead to many many more houses being built behind the High Street.

The sewage system capacity in Standlake is already exceeding the limit stated by Thames Water in 2014.

Landscape

Standlake seems to be prime for developers wanting to build on farmland and gardens behind the High street. If this application is successful then the floodgates will open and more and more applications will land up on your desks. Standlake will lose its character and neighbourliness. The roads will become heavy with traffic, the

sewers will not cope and there will be a massive impact on our eco system on pollution, our environment, wildlife and biodiversity through the loss of green and open spaces.

For all the reasons mentioned, Standlake Parish Council strongly object to this application.

Read by
Samantha Garrett
3 High Street
Standlake OX29 7R

Mike Gilbert Planning

62 Broadmarsh Lane Freeland Witney OX29 8QR

Tel: 07974 294463 mg.planning@btinternet.com

Notes for Committee - 19/0684/FUL

This is a small-scale development of 4 houses which makes good use of an already developed site on the edge of Standlake. It follows the withdrawal of a scheme for 5 houses earlier this year which extended further to the SE, away from the edge of the village.

The current proposal has been submitted following advice from your officers. It is smaller scale than the withdrawn scheme and is contained by the extent of existing development on the site (i.e. Manor Bungalow) to the SE and by a belt of mature trees to the NE. It makes good use of the site without extending into undeveloped land and will provide 4 high quality new homes.

As set out in the officer report, there will be no harmful impact on neighbours or the setting of Standlake Manor. Simplifying the building designs and providing safe pedestrian visibility at the access have been discussed with your officers and resolved. And an ecological appraisal (bats and newts) was submitted last week.

We've worked together with the landowner and your officers to come up with a scheme which we think works very well - it respects the site and its surroundings. It is hoped, therefore, that you can agree the officer recommendation and grant planning permission.

8th July 2019

Including transcript for update at Committee meeting on 12th August 2019

Ref: WODC Planning Meeting with respect to building proposal for 9a West End.

Summary:

We have a number of concerns with respect to the proposed extension at 9a West End. There are two main reasons for these concerns:

1. Consistency with the property being in a conservation area according to section BE5 of the WODC Planning Checklist and
2. Protection of our own amenity at 7 West End and an imposition on the benefit enjoyed from the physical external (and in fact, internal) space that is part of our home. The proposed extension will cause significant erosion of the visual amenity and character in our property which is adjoining the proposed build which we believe is contrary to section BE4(a) from the WODC Planning Checklist.

Detail:

1. We question whether the proposed flat roof is consistent with the property being in a conservation area.
 1. It is visible from upstairs windows in several of the surrounding properties.
 2. It is the second flat roof to be built in the property's relatively small grounds. It should be pointed out that, as far as we are aware, the first was built without any planning permission at all.
2. According to the Residential Amenity section of the Planning Portal PPS7, the "Amenity of all residents is protected from all 'Unneighbourly' extensions as these can cause problems of...Dominance." Annex A of this document refers to the feeling of being "Hemmed in". There are several reasons why the proposed build would cause us to have a loss of amenity in this way:
 1. Our property, 7 West End, is already surrounded by high other properties. The open space to the South (where the build is proposed)

is the only open space enjoyed by our garden. Loss of this openness creates an environment completely dominated by buildings on all sides. This is especially true as the proposal includes what is currently just a garden wall as the back wall of the build thus creating an environment where we are virtually completely hemmed in by others' properties.

2. The gutter to the build will actually be in space belonging to our property and will be within head height of an average sized woman. This will mean that there will be areas in our own garden where we are unable to stand.
3. We already have the gutters of three other properties that are overhanging our space. Even with the best intentions of our neighbours, it is our space that is impacted by the required maintenance of these gutters. It is us that first notice that work needs to be done, it is our space that is first affected by water leakage, it is us that needs to notify the neighbours that maintenance work needs to be done. Further to this, there is no external access to these gutters so all maintenance work needs to be accessed through our house. This is an imposition on our amenity in and of itself, especially as we have young children and need to arrange to be around for maintenance workers to get access. In practice, to avoid this exceptional inconvenience, it has been the case that we have had the gutters cleaned and fixed ourselves on occasion. In our experience, cleaning the gutters is required at least once a year so we already have to go through this process once every four months on average. The proposed build will increase this frequency to once every three months.

The upshot of all of these things is that there is an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of outlook and amenity to our property which we understand to be contrary to policies OS4 and H6 in the WODC Local Planning Policies 3031.

Update for decision meeting on 12/08/2019:

1. The Planning Committee visited our property on Friday 9th August 2019 to experience the sense of enclosure for themselves. Although it may not have been evident to them, it took a lot of effort to ensure that someone was available to let them through the house into the back garden at the correct time. This is true every time that we need to allow gutter repair for a neighbouring property (as mentioned above).
2. There was a degree of speculation with respect to the amount that neighbouring properties' gutters need maintenance. In the last month since the previous Committee meeting, we have noticed two leaks on a neighbour's gutter. One we have had repaired at

our own expense and the other we are still trying to organise for our neighbour to arrange the required maintenance (at a time that doesn't overly inconvenience us in allowing access).

Appendix F

Councillor Morris thanked Members for visiting the site and Officers for securing the amendments to the guttering to avoid overhanging.

However, he still had some concern over arrangements for future maintenance as he considered that, notwithstanding the Officers' advice that it was not a planning issue, he considered that the requirement to access the neighbouring property to carry out work would give rise to a loss of residential amenity.

Taylor Wimpy Application - 19/008/RES Land east of Mt Owen Road, Bampton

12th August 2019 Lowlands Area Planning Sub-committee

Roger Preston on behalf of Society for the Protection of Bampton

The 25 documents submitted 3 working days ago show many amendments and it has obviously been impossible to produce a response and circulate it to the committee members within 2 days.

For items such as handling surface water, the developer has indicated that they would like the whole system to be adopted. This latest proposal (version 5) does not appear on any drawing other than the drainage one and on that shows inconsistencies between the pond sizes as shown on the drawing and their accompanying text, shows a cellular storage tank where landscape drawings indicate trees, etc.

We therefore would like to see this application deferred until adequate time has been given to consider these amendments and in particular the situation with respect to Thames Water. The excellent report by Mr Bennett from OCC as LLFA does indicate considerable uncertainty exists over certain aspects of this latest proposal and its ability to meet the requirements for possible adoption, hence a long list of conditions to be satisfied before construction commences. We would prefer to know that a working solution is possible before full permission is granted and this need not delay the eventual construction.

Mr Trevor Milne Day then stated there were four main matters of concern to the members of the Society for the Protection of Bampton that did not appear to have been considered by the Applicant in consultation with the Planners namely the risk of flooding not just on the proposed estate but elsewhere, access to the site which would be better from Aston Road, lack of onsite parking putting further pressure on Mount Owen Road, and design and appearance which did not reflect a traditional Cotswold village.

Appendix H

Councillor Mills indicated that an additional 160 homes would have a significant impact upon the village. He questioned why the developers proposed to name the estate Aston Grove, suggesting that this would result in confusion given that it was located in Bampton, not Aston.

He acknowledged that the principle of development had been accepted and the objective now was to do all that was possible to ensure that the development was as good as it could be.

In addition to the various issues had been raised in other representations, Councillor Mills questioned arrangements for cycle storage and considered that the scheme could be better.

He cautioned Members of the Sub-Committee not to underestimate the feeling in the village with regard to potential flooding and emphasised that the floods in 2007 had been due to surface water flooding.

Councillor Mills drew attention to the concerns expressed by residents and sought an assurance that the development would not give rise to an increased flood risk in Aston. He also questioned who would be responsible for the future maintenance of the drainage system.

Councillor Mills stressed the importance of a robust and effective construction management plan, making reference to the difficulties experienced during construction work at Thornbury Road in Eynsham where there had been poor communication on the part of the developers.

Councillor Mills considered that it was important for the new properties to be integrated into the village and asked how quickly it would be built out. He stressed the importance of safe pedestrian routes and, in conclusion, questioned why access from Aston Road was not viable, suggesting that it may simply be a matter of cost.

Aston Road / Mount Owen Road, Bampton Committee Speech

19/00875/RES

Reserved Matters application for the construction of 160 dwellings and provision of public open space with associated infrastructure and earthworks, pursuant to outline planning permission 16/03415/OUT

Chair, Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to address you this afternoon.

I would firstly like to thank your officer's for bringing this proposal to committee with a recommendation for approval, following its robust consideration through the application process.

This of course follows the decision of this committee to grant outline consent in March 2017. That outline permission set out a range of agreed parameters; that have subsequently been considered in this reserved matters application and approved the access in detail.

The proposals will deliver 160 new homes, including 64 affordable homes. These homes will provide a mixture of housing types of one to five bedroom homes.

We have worked closely with your officers and consultees during the application determination process which has led to the proposals before you today. This has included amendments to the scheme, in particular in respect of design and increasing the proportion of stone used to meet the aspirations of your officers. The committee report confirms these to be acceptable.

Whilst the level of parking proposed is in excess of OCC standards, as confirmed by your officers, this is considered to be an appropriate approach in this location and seeks to address the concerns of local residents. All other matters raised by OCC can be addressed via appropriately worded conditions.

We are aware of local concerns regarding construction access to the site. Whilst this matter is subject of a separate discharge of conditions application currently under consideration by your officers, we would highlight that Taylor Wimpey have sought to respond to these concerns through the proposed use of the existing farm gate access from Aston Road, rather than accessing from Mount Owen Road.

Similarly we are aware of the concerns raised in respect of drainage. Aidy Hicks from Taylor Wimpey will provide you with more detail on this.

The drainage proposals utilise the existing drainage ditches around the site. A pumping station is required to discharge most of the surface water because of the site's flat topography and the shallow invert levels of these ditches.

The drainage proposals utilise a combination of sewers, basins, crates and swales to attenuate over and above the 1:100-year storm event, plus the additional 40% required for climate change. The design provides a total storage volume of 2500m³.

Both basins set above the groundwater table. The underground crates will be sealed with an impermeable membrane to prevent any groundwater ingress.

Discharge rates will be controlled so that they do not exceed the existing greenfield run-off rate.

The foul drainage also utilises a pumped system to take waste flows off site and discharge into the existing Thames Water network in Mount Owen Road.

The SW proposals have been reviewed through the design process by the Lead Local Flood Authority, and we will continue to work with them through the condition discharge process. Similarly, both surface water and foul water proposals have been designed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption and have now been submitted to Thames Water for their approval.

In summary, your officers have recommended the proposals for approval. The design, layout and landscaping scheme are considered appropriate and there would be no material harm in terms of privacy and amenity.

Accordingly we would ask members to approve the application in accordance with your officer's recommendation. Taylor Wimpey are committed to the early delivery of the site and look forward to delivering these proposals.

Thank you.

Appendix J

Mr Crocker explained that he had recently taken over the licence of the premises and was exploring ways in which to increase the offer in order to make the business more viable.

The existing kitchen at the premises was too small to be used effectively and the pizza shack had been installed as an experiment to assess demand.

Provision of the pizza shack and oven had been well received by local residents and he was now in discussion with the brewery with a view to carrying out building work at the premises in order to provide an enlarged kitchen more suited to commercial requirements

This comment is made on behalf of the PCC of St Peter's Church Cassington from the Churchwarden.

St Peter's Cassington is a highly significant Grade I Listed church, built by the Normans at the time of Henry I, and about to celebrate its 900th anniversary in just a couple of years time. A comprehensive Statement of Significance is available.

This planning proposal 19/01391/FUL and 19/01392/LBC relates to work that has already been carried out. The development adjoins the southern boundary wall of St Peter's churchyard, which is effectively a party wall, and it is the closest building to the church, only a few metres away from the east end.

It is regrettable that this development, at the heart of a conservation area, went ahead without any apparent involvement from conservation or heritage specialists. We also believe that a new sewer was laid to the development, and if so was any archaeological inspection of the trench work required and carried out?

In its consideration of this proposal, the PCC of St Peter's church would therefore expect WODC to provide assurance and confirmation that all the works that were done with this development have met all regulations and requirements, and that the development does not cause detriment to the church's unique historic and cultural value. The PCC also seeks assurance that the work has been carried out without any increase in risk of damage to the church in the unfortunate event of a fire spreading from this development to the church building.

Appendix L

Mr Semple advised that the initial consent had been granted in 1997 and was subject to 17 conditions. His clients had wished to seek a variation of condition 5 but, following pre-application discussions with the Council's Officers, it had been thought better to consolidate the amendment within a new application.

Mr Semple explained that the applicants wished to expand their operation to include additional gasses and new products to serve the emerging science triangle. He stressed that no objections had been received from the technical consultees and the concerns expressed by the Parish Council had been addressed by Officers at paragraph 5.6 of the report and through condition 4.

He noted that reference to 'air' related to oxygen and confirmed that his clients were happy to comply with the proposed conditions.

Finally, Mr Semple confirmed that the applicants would be happy to comply with the Parish Council's request to paint the fencing green.

Appendix L

Mr Semple advised that the initial consent had been granted in 1997 and was subject to 17 conditions. His clients had wished to seek a variation of condition 5 but, following pre-application discussions with the Council's Officers, it had been thought better to consolidate the amendment within a new application.

Mr Semple explained that the applicants wished to expand their operation to include additional gasses and new products to serve the emerging science triangle. He stressed that no objections had been received from the technical consultees and the concerns expressed by the Parish Council had been addressed by Officers at paragraph 5.6 of the report and through condition 4.

He noted that reference to 'air' related to oxygen and confirmed that his clients were happy to comply with the proposed conditions.

Finally, Mr Semple confirmed that the applicants would be happy to comply with the Parish Council's request to paint the fencing green.