

3rd March 2014

The revised plans that have been submitted show little change to the original plans. This in turn means that there is little change as to the effects caused by the proposed plans. Although the revised 'Design and Access' Statement is more accurate to the actual proposal, the proposed plan does NOT satisfy all the concerns raised by the adjacent neighbour.

The statement refers to the 'small additional' building to be rebuilt 'on approximately the same footprint', with the existing building 'moderately increased'. If you look at the length of the current single storey building to the rear of the property and then look at the extension length of the proposed plan you will see that the length of this wall, which is parallel to the land of No5, will be increased by just over 80%. The statement of design and access is therefore confusing and potentially misleading.

So the effects of this proposed plan remain the same as the original plan.

The primary effect will be the loss of light. The path is the only access from No5 to its garden and this will be overshadowed with a huge loss of light onto it. There will also be a loss of light into the courtyard and kitchen of No5 throughout the majority of the day.

The secondary effect of this considerable reduction of light will be that it creates an overbearing dark tunnel effect to this path.

The third effect of this loss of light onto the path is a cause for concern about the safe use of this path. When using this path to access the garden it has multiple steps, is narrow and has a downwards gradient and so obstructing its light will be a hazard to its use at particular times of the day.

The revised plan has caused confusion as to the intention of what is proposed for the Summer House. In the original plans it appears to show an extension to the front of the Summer House. This again would cause similar concern with regards to the natural light being blocked to the lower half of the access path. However, in the revised plan there appears to be no plans drawn up for the extension of the Summer House. Except that if you look at the Site Plan (1:200), the Block Plan (1:500) and the Proposed Location Plan (1:1250) it clearly shows an extension to the front of the Summer House. What is the intention of the plan for the Summer House? Will it be replaced to the same dimensions or extended?

In conclusion to this objection, it appears that very little has changed to satisfy the concerns that were made about the original plan. Three key effects caused by the proposed plans have been highlighted and there is also confusion as to the intent of the applicant's plan for the Summer House.

Ms. Gloria Booth therefore strongly objects to the revised plans of No3 Church Street as she feels that her concerns have been overlooked and not addressed and the effects of such a plan would cause considerable hindrance to her wellbeing of living at No5 Church Street.

## Appendix B

I4/0007/P/FP

Summary of submission by Christian Rhodes

- We have worked to amend the design in line with the planning officer's recommendations.
- The proposed alterations and single storey extension would offer a much needed opportunity to improve the condition of our home. The development would provide new dining and living space as well as the opportunity to fully enjoy the benefits of our rear garden.
- The proposed extension is modest in size and scale and projects away from both neighbouring properties by a distance of some 7 and 8 metres respectively. The majority of the proposed extension would be obscured from view by an existing boundary fence on one side and an existing 2.5m hedge in the other. The proposed design increases privacy to both neighbouring properties and would not extend any higher than the existing structure.
- The current rear conservatory was rebuilt some 27 years ago and is now in need of urgent rebuilt. We are currently unable to inhabit this space due to its poor condition. The structure leaks both rainwater following bad weather and also heat energy due to the inadequate single pane glazing. It also poses a security risk.
- The summerhouse at the end of the garden falls within permitted development and we were advised to remove it from this planning application by the planning officer.

### ADDRESS TO WODC UPLANDS PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE 3/3/14

Although I am a town councillor in Woodstock I speak today rather in my capacity as a long standing resident of the area, having lived in Stonesfield and Woodstock for most of the time since 1966. For many years I have been a regular customer at Harriet's Tea Rooms and am friendly with the owners, Paul and Judy Jones, their two grown up children and their staff for whom Paul and Judy have always been caring employers. It is therefore somewhat painful for me to stand before you today and oppose their plans to convert their retail operation to residential use - but that is what I must do.

It is absolutely not defensible for the officer considering this application to say that such change of use will not detract from the vitality of Woodstock town centre because there are alternative places to purchase food and drinks. Yes, of course there are, but Harriet's is distinguished not only by its historic charm as a typically English tea room but also by its exceptionally prime location in the very centre of the High St.

The crucial point which seems to have been overlooked by the officer is that it doesn't have to continue as a cake shop and tea room. The premises nearly opposite formerly occupied by the Viva Sacs ladies dress shop have attracted the interest of no less than three separate business concerns. The same would, I am sure, apply to Harriet's. If you agree to this change of use you will be ripping out a piece of the heart of Woodstock's retail operation which has declined so significantly since I first moved into the area in 1966. Policy SH5 is indeed therefore very relevant.

Just to emphasise the point we have in the last few years lost our butcher's shop, our fishmonger and greengrocer, our electrical retailer, our hardware shop, our shoe shop and men's outfitters unless you can afford to pay around £500 a time for a men's suit at the Cotswold Tailor

You have recently helped us resist this erosion of Woodstock's retail wellbeing by not accepting change of use of all of the former butcher's premises in the High Street to residential so please be completely consistent and save the vibrancy of our High Street, the vitality of our town centre, the very heartbeat of Woodstock by declining this application.

**20 High Street Woodstock**  
**Planning application 14/0056/P/FP**  
**Listed building consent application 14/0057/P/LB**

My name is Peter Roberts and I am speaking on behalf of the applicants, Paul and Judi Jones, whose home for the last 18 years has been the property under discussion. During that time they have run a tea shop on the ground floor and lived on the first and second floors.

1. This property, called Ye Anciente House, has been a private house from the early 17th century right up until the latter part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century when the front of the ground floor became a hairdresser and a wool shop. The proposal will return to the building to the purpose for which it was built.
2. This proposal does not seek to withdraw the town's sole tea serving facility. There are 16 other tea serving establishments in the town, all in a central location and many of them also in historic buildings.
3. Paul and Judi Jones are very proud of their Grade 2 star listed building. It is considered the proposal to remove the late 20<sup>th</sup> century ground floor bay window, which is of little architectural merit, and re-instate the original sash windows seen on old photographs of the house, will considerably enhance the appearance of this important historic building.  
This proposal is supported by the planning officer, the conservation officer and English Heritage.
4. Paul and Judi Jones love their house, have raised their children there and, after a life time's work, now wish to spend their retirement years in their family home.