

Thank you for the opportunity to address the committee today.

I and other residents are fully in support of the case made by your officer who recommends refusing this application. We believe this equipment is not suitable for use in a residential neighbourhood.

The industrial estate post-dates the adjacent houses. When I bought my house 30 years ago, shortly after the estate was built, I and the existing residents were reassured that the WODC planners had recognised the need to preserve our local amenity and had set in place conditions to do so.

Over the years numerous applications involving the industrial estate have come before this committee and thankfully the need to preserve the local amenity has always been upheld.

The present application is not for a small 'Expellair' style extract but for a huge, almost 7 ½ horse power industrial fan. Anyone standing in the garden of a

house near the extract is most definitely aware that their 'reasonable amenity and quiet enjoyment' has been reduced and it is the planning officers opinion that it is not proven that any remedial action will be sufficient to resolve the situation, also that the extract breaches the original conditions and that detrimental harm will undoubtedly be caused to the residential amenity.

As regards the request for the business hours to be extended to include Saturday afternoons. This company has been operating well beyond the requested hours and has already caused a nuisance on Saturday afternoons and Sundays.

Associated with these extended times is the disturbance caused by the arrival and departure of 'performance' cars. Oxford Performance Autos, as it's name suggests is involved with 'performance' cars or those wishing that their cars had more 'performance'. I have yet to hear a quiet 'performance' car and since access

to and from the industrial estate passes along the side of my garden I would like to be free of noisy cars at the weekend.

Since this is a retrospective application we are able to judge Oxford Performance Autos by their actions. They have in effect provided their own

evidence base. Only when residents objected to Planning Enforcement, were they persuaded to make this application and as pointed out by the Parish Council, they have been operating in breach of the conditions for some months and have shown a blatant disregard for both the planning conditions and the local amenities.

Were this application to be approved, then the quality of our local amenities which were demonstrably reduced by the arrival of this large and powerful extract, will continue to be impaired. It would seem strange indeed if the value placed on the quality of the local amenities today were any less than it was 30 years ago.

Thank you

Summary of Submission by Michael Ergatoudis

Mr Ergatoudis indicated that he believed the revisions that had been made were an improvement to the scheme that had already been approved. In the year since permission had been granted there had been an opportunity to review the site and identify suitable changes.

Mr Ergatoudis outlined that the proposals helped with the sustainability and commercial viability of the project. It was advised that the scale of development remained unchanged but some aspects had been relocated within the site.

In respect of the new function barn Mr Ergatoudis indicated that this investment was a reflection of the applicant's commitment to the site and would provide employment for local people. Mr Ergatoudis advised that a number of similar sites had been looked at and conference facilities, such as those proposed, were in demand and represented a good income stream.

In conclusion Mr Ergatoudis suggested that the amendments would improve the scheme and there was a local support for the development. Mr Ergatoudis requested the sub-committee to support the officer recommendation of approval.

Summary of Submission by Joe Rice

Mr Rice introduced himself and clarified that he was speaking on behalf of the Baptist Church.

Mr Rice reported that the church was fully supportive of the proposed development and outlined the planning history of the site. Mr Rice advised that the previous permission had not come to fruition and had cost a lot of time and money. As a result options for the site had been reviewed and a new application submitted.

Mr Rice indicated that the new scheme proposed 8 apartments as opposed to the previous scheme for 4 apartments and 3 houses. Mr Rice suggested that the lower cost apartment accommodation was more suitable for the location and was the type of housing in demand in Chipping Norton.

Mr Rice requested the sub-committee to support the recommendation of approval.