

Appendix A

My name is Stuart Parker and I am the architect for the Walcot Barns application.

Firstly, I would like to thank the **Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee** for allowing this application to be reported back for further consideration.

The team is also pleased to note that officers have acknowledged that on the basis that at present the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, Policy H10 is considered to be out of date **and**, having regard to Paragraph 14 of the NPPF, planning permission should be granted unless:

- *Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.*

In this regards, your officers have concluded that:

1. The project makes a positive contribution to the wider landscape
 2. The treatment of the barn conversion is appropriate and lightly handled with minimum intervention
 3. The design approach for this site is considered appropriate and would preserve the character and appearance of the wider ANOB and the setting of this part of the Oxfordshire Way
 4. The project would not be of harm to the amenity of local residents
 5. The site is in a relatively sustainable location with pedestrian access to the town and station in addition that the proposal is for conversion to Passivhaus standard which is the highest environmental design standard in Europe.
- It is noted that Charlbury Town Council applaud this proposal to bring this building back into use
 - There are no objections raised from Oxfordshire County Council as Highways Authority

There were however 3 issues raised by the Uplands Planning Sub-Committee meeting held on 07 April which I would like to address:

- Structural Integrity
- The form and potential pollution from the rooflights
- Ecology

As you will see from the re-submission, we have taken these issues seriously and I would like to summarise our response as follows, but firstly would like to make the committee aware that the professional team for this project was selected on the basis of their experience and that they are all either local residents, or have worked within West Oxfordshire:

- OMK the structural engineers based in Woodstock were commissioned to carry out a structural survey of the fabric of the barns and to prepare a method statement for the work. This confirms that the main stone structure is sound and the means of undertaking the conversion work including the subterranean extension are widely employed in other similar projects.
- We have given a great deal of consideration to the design of the rooflights and I would like to confirm that the outer skin of the fixed glazing will be constructed using non-reflective glass. In addition, automatic blinds will operate at nightfall through a light sensor. This is well-established technology and we would suggest that this matter could be dealt with as a planning condition.
- A detailed survey to ascertain the presence of Great Crested Newts was carried out by surveyor who holds A Natural England Great Crested Newt Survey Licence on 12 May.

No evidence of the presence of Great Crested Newts was found during this survey and there is little likelihood that there will be a breeding site at Walcot Barns.

In summary I would just like to add that I am a Charlbury resident and first walked past this structure some 25 years ago, during which time, these elegant barns have moved from active agricultural use into disrepair. We have no means as a society of dealing with redundant and unlisted derelict buildings that fall into decay and many end up protected by high security fences as they become a liability for landowners, unless compatible alternative uses are found.

Prior to any design work being undertaken, I talked to many local residents and walkers and the general consensus was that these ruined barns are valued as a significant part of the landscape. As a result, we took great care to ensure that the design developed to protect these qualities and under these proposals, from a short distance Walcot Barns will remain to all intents and purposes, a ruin in the landscape.

Thank you

Appendix B

A statement delivered to Uplands Area Sub-Planning Committee on 9th June 2014

The Chequers Public House, Churchill

The Chequers is a grade 2 listed building - and as such should not have any other structure enclosing it – it stands alone. In our opinion the proposed low level wall in appearance and structure, is out of character with the building in it's rural setting, in the centre of our village, within a conservation area. (**policy BE8 applies**)

This proposed planning application is not a case of sustainability as the applicant states. It's expansion, which if passed will result in a restaurant having the potential to serve approximately 156 restaurant customers + casual drinkers with totally inadequate parking and all the potential to make an already intolerable situation worse!!!

The plans have all sorts of inaccuracies and issues, but are, in our opinion, disingenuous by not showing the closeness of the properties in Langston Close. We disagree that the nearest residence is 20 metres as stated - in fact 'The Chestnuts' boundary to The Chequers is less than 10 metres away and there are 4 other properties of a similar short distance away. A 'site visit' would confirm this

The Councils Leaflet 'Commenting on Planning Applications' clearly outlines matters to focus on which officers can take into account when making decisions. 14 residents 'objected' genuinely and honestly and covered most of the points and more besides. These are further summarised as a list of 53 items on pages 20 & 21 of today's agenda. We note with interest that a letter submitted **late (we didn't think this was allowed)** supporting the planning has been reproduced in full for this meeting. **WHY??** when 14 letters objecting to the plans were submitted to the council within the designated time have been merely summarised as bullet points!

The Chequers pub continues to 'flaunt' licensing rules. **Last night** the 'out of hours' number was called to address extremely loud amplified music emanating through the main door and open windows on 2 levels. 3 neighbours called the out of hours number – from 8pm onwards. The duty environmental officer insisted on attending, arriving at well after 10pm because he had to travel over 70 miles! – clearly not a method which is working on behalf of us **or** the council!

The officer found no customers on the upper floor, which had blaring music and only 8 in the downstairs bar area. The music continued but with the windows and door closed it became quieter. We have to endure this and many other issues on a regular basis, often beyond midnight

In 5.8 of the planning assessment it is quoted that officers are unable to control this matter through planning law. We disagree with this since our efforts using licensing or statutory nuisance powers have clearly failed. Who is going to take responsibility?

With such a large representation we find it difficult to come to terms with the case officers recommendation to grant planning permission!
We feel our concerns have not been properly addressed and disagree whole heartedly with the officers decision.

I represent the views of other concerned residents of Churchill and ask you to **reject** this application.

Thankyou

Diane Browne
Well End
Churchill

Appendix C

Summary of Submission by Martin Bradshaw

Mr Bradshaw indicated that the Sub-Committee had been recommended to approve the application on the basis that it was unable to refuse consent. He questioned this presumption and the relevance of the case law referred to in the Planning Officer's report. He indicated that the current application related to the loss of car parking spaces, not simply changes in the disposition of normal pub activities within the curtilage of the premises, and suggested that the authority had a responsibility to take account of issues of noise and disturbance that may not have been relevant in the Haringey case.

Secondly, he claimed that the current proposal leading to a reduction in parking provision contradicted a condition placed upon an earlier consent for an extension of the premises that required the provision and retention of the existing parking spaces to meet the needs of a total of 60 customers, let alone an additional 40 covers upstairs.

Mr Bradshaw expressed concern in relation to off-site amenity making reference to instances of driveways being obstructed and trespasses onto private land.

He noted that parking provision in the vicinity was in high demand and that the Council's Licensing Officers were not present late in the evening to witness events when the majority of customers did not arrive until 11:00pm.

Finally, Mr Bradshaw questioned how the proposed pergola could be considered to 'protect and enhance the conservation area'.

Appendix D

Summary of Submission by Georgina Pearman

Ms Pearman introduced herself as co-owner of the premises. She advised that the current application had been submitted as, at present, the premises only had 10 to 12 external seats to the rear and 10 to the front of the premises. During the summer, trade decreased as customers preferred to have the option of sitting outside. This trend had also been evidenced at the company's other premises.

The Chequers faced strong competition from a number of other nearby public houses with external seating areas.

Having two young children, Ms Pearman also wanted to erect a boundary wall to prevent them from running into the road.

She acknowledges the concerns expressed by local residents in relation to noise and car parking, indicating that similar concerns had been raised in relation to one of the company's other premises, the Wheatsheaf Inn in Northleach. However, once planning permission had been granted, residents found the pub to be a welcome local asset.

Ms Pearman noted that it was important for a business to have local support and recognised that inconsiderate parking was a concern. She advised that efforts would be made to control this as far as possible.

Ms Pearman indicated that her company was a responsible operator and that all its sites operated within the terms of their licence.

Uplands Planning Committee Meeting
9th June 2014
Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney (Room 1)

Presentation Notes:

- Good afternoon my name is John Lloyd and I am the publican at The White Horse and owner of the barn the subject of the application.
- My wife and I bought the property to run as a business in 2009. Despite a poor economic climate in the licensing trade and the premises being closed yet again prior to our occupation, the public house is now holding its own and is well supported by the local community.
- When we bought the property the barn was already in a very poor condition and infrequently used. However the space was let out for a nominal sum when requested to reflect the poor quality of the accommodation. Over the past few winters the building has further deteriorated to its current state.
- The barn is now shut following a structural engineers report which highlighted major defects in the building requiring immediate attention, this is to the gable wall facing the public house.
- The defects render the building structurally unsound and unsafe and, according to the engineer, dangerous.
- Of significant worry to me is that this potential danger extends not only to customers using the pub (access to the car park passes the gable wall in question and the front entrance is immediately opposite) but also to those using the road adjacent to the barn.
- Action to secure a viable future use for the building is therefore vital in terms of the public house as any limitation on use of the front entrance may also affect the pubs viability.

- With regards to the barn itself, the Insurers are no longer willing to provide public liability insurance on any event hosted in the function room until the defects are repaired.
- The estimated cost of repairs is £90k. The under utilization of the building in the past and its limited potential use, due to its shape size and other better equipped function spaces in the village, means it is not commercially viable to carry out these repairs.
- However many functions can still be hosted in the pub, for example wedding in July, funeral wake next week, music nights held twice a month in pub, the book club meetings maybe held in the pub, and the World Cup is being shown in the pub. The financial viability of the public house will improve once the barn has a new use and is no longer a burden to the pub.
- The proposed changes, whilst protecting the integrity of the building as much as possible, will improve the visual aspect immeasurably replacing a tired and now derelict building with a bespoke architect designed dwelling.
- The pub is trading well, as evidenced by the email received from the brewery dated 16 May 2014, which stated that our beer sales are almost 50% above budget year on year.
- There is no intention whatsoever to close down what is a profitable business and the development of the barn will aid the continued profitability of the business which continues to provide a beneficial community facility.

That's all I wish to say.

Thank you for your time.