

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 4 August 2014

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND STRATEGIC HOUSING



WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Purpose:

To consider applications for development details of which are set out in the following pages.

Recommendations:

To determine the applications in accordance with the recommendations of the Strategic Director.

The recommendations contained in the following pages are all subject to amendments in the light of observations received between the preparation of the reports etc and the date of the meeting.

List of Background Papers

All documents, including forms, plans, consultations and representations on each application, but excluding any document, which in the opinion of the 'proper officer' discloses exempt information as defined in Section 1001 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Please note that observations received after the reports in this schedule were prepared will be summarised in a document which will be published late on the last working day before the meeting and available at the meeting or from www.westoxon.gov.uk/meetings

Agenda Index

Please note that if you are viewing this document electronically, the agenda items below have been set up as links to the relevant application for your convenience.

I4/0754/P/FP Penhurst School New Street Chipping Norton	3
I4/0788/P/FP Westward Lodge 21 Shilton Road Burford.....	12
I4/0816/P/AC Golden Pheasant Hotel 91 High Street Burford	16
I4/0817/P/LB Golden Pheasant Hotel 91 High Street Burford.....	19
I4/0819/P/FP Land adjacent to Banbury Road Wootton Balk Tackley	22
I4/0833/P/FP Reeves Barn Pound Hill Charlbury	28
I4/0897/P/FP Leafield Technical Centre Langley.....	33
I4/0911/P/FP 74 Church Road Long Hanborough	39
I4/0927/P/FP Holywell Barn Asthall	45
I4/0969/P/FP Oldner House Bungalow Charlbury Road Chipping Norton	51
I4/0986/P/FP Village Hall Shipton Road Milton Under Wychwood	53

I4/0754/P/FP Penhurst School New Street Chipping Norton	
Date	28/05/2014
Officer	Abby Fettes
Officer Recommendation	Provisional approval
Parish	CHIPPING NORTON
Grid Ref:	431118,227247

APPLICATION DETAILS

Retention of John Cory House and Cottage, demolition of redundant buildings and conversion of Monks Dene to allow erection of Care Home and Assisted Living Units, access roads, car parking and ancillary works.

APPLICANT

Beechcroft Developments Ltd & Action for Children C/O Agent

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The site is a former School on the western edge of Chipping Norton. It is within the AONB and the Conservation Area. It is also adjacent to the Grade II Listed Baptist Church and the Grade I listed St Marys Church. There are residential properties in Distons Lane to the east and the recreation ground to the west. The site comprises locally listed buildings on the frontage but set back from New Street, and more modern buildings of little architectural merit to the rear. There are a number of mature trees on site.

The application seeks planning consent for the conversion of Monks Dene and erection of new units for assisted living, and the demolition of several modern buildings to facilitate the erection of a care home.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.1 Extensive history for the provision of new buildings when the site was used by the school, but none of particular relevance to this application.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Chipping Norton Town Council

“The Town Council object to the large mass of the proposed care home. In particular the three storey section. The Town Council recommend the development being a two storey build as this would not have such a strong impact on the neighbours/properties /residents and surrounding areas. The planning application does not stipulate any figures on height at all. The Town Council need to see in writing how tall this property is intended to be. The Town Council fully support the comments received from residents of Distons Lane, a copy has been sent to WODC. There is a shortage in car parking on site for this mass development. The plan does not follow the design of the neighbouring properties. Comments have been made for community car parking on this site with the developers at a recent consultation and this plan does not show that the suggestion has been taken on board at all. The north elevation facing the church to be simplified to a traditional Cotswold detail to respect the grade I listed church opposite. This is extremely relevant as it is affecting the setting of a listed building”.

2.2 OCC Single Response

Highways – “Object.”

Property – “Request £112,287 towards Day Care Facilities, Museum Resource Centre and Waste Management.”

Archaeology – “There are no archaeological constraints for this application.”

2.3 WODC Environmental Health

“No objections.”

2.4 WODC Leisure

“For a development of scale and scope taking into consideration the demographic a community facilities off site contribution should be sought to provide an outdoor gym offer which care home residents can access. To be located within the environs of the Worcester Road Playing Fields which is adjacent to the development site.

Sum sought £20,000 for provision and maintenance.”

2.5 Natural England

“Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection.

Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites.

Protected landscape.

Having reviewed the application Natural England does not wish to comment on this development proposal.

The development however, relates to the Cotswolds AONB. We therefore advise you to seek the advice of the AONB Conservation board. Their knowledge of the location and wider landscape setting of the development should help to confirm whether or not it would impact significantly on the purposes of the designation. They will also be able to advise whether the development accords with the aims and policies set out in the AONB management plan.

Protected species

We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species.

Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. The Standing Advice includes a habitat decision tree which provides advice to planners on deciding if there is a ‘reasonable likelihood’ of protected species being present. It also provides detailed advice on the protected species most often affected by development, including flow charts for individual species to enable an assessment to be made of a protected species survey and mitigation strategy.

You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence may be granted.

If you have any specific questions on aspects that are not covered by our Standing Advice for European Protected Species or have difficulty in applying it to this application please contact us at with details at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Local sites

If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g. Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.

Biodiversity enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that 'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that 'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'.

Landscape enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts."

2.6 Thames Water

"Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development."

3 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 38 neighbour letters were sent. 5 representations have been made, objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:

- A building on this scale is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area and significantly changes the skyline.

- In appearance, the building is dominated by its large roof pitches, again unsympathetic to the conservation area.
- No explicit figures are given for roof or eaves heights of *new* buildings, this leaves no accurate height specification for the various parts of the building.
- The developers do not indicate how they obtained the heights specified for *existing* buildings. No on-site survey of the adjacent properties has been made (to my knowledge).
- I therefore urge that this application *not* be granted as it stands.
- this structure is being proposed within an AONB and CA.
- The unbroken line of sheltered housing, some of it rising to three storeys, along the recreation ground boundary has a barricade-like nature that destroys the valued view of the listed St Mary's Church on the western approach to Chipping Norton.
- it is creating a lack of privacy to a number of existing properties particularly to Nos.20a and 34 Diston's Lane along with 'Iona'.
- The first-floor residential accommodation on the south elevation of the care home will overlook 20a Diston's Lane.
- Currently from our property (the old chapel) there are uninterrupted views to the church. We believe that taking into account this historical view and the conservation area, the proposed plans are of such mass that they are out of character with the direct conservation area in which we live.
- To submit plans with no height dimensions cannot surely be acceptable to yourself.
- An opportunity to provide off-street parking for the adjacent Baptist Church redevelopment has been missed.
- We require further time to cross-check the trees to be felled with the arboricultural survey recommendations.
- The proposed density could result in 157 people living on this site which is out of proportion to area.
- Concerned that demands and priorities of a commercial development may encourage developer to seek cheaper options and to underestimate impact of their development.
- Calculations for additional traffic to and from site are underestimated.
- Non car travel is unrealistic in Chipping Norton.
- Will 74 parking spaces be realistic?
- Need to minimise light pollution.
- View from recreation ground will be spoilt by unbroken line of sheltered housing.
- Trees make special contribution and need to be protected.
- Assumption that underlying geological formation is impermeable is an unsafe assumption.
- I request that conditions are considered to minimise disruption during construction for residents.
- The scheme has changed since public consultation.
- Swifts nest at Penhurst, so nest boxes should be provided.

4 APPLICANT'S CASE

4.1 Planning and consultation statement

- The proposal will result in a modest increase in traffic movements.
- Development does not raise any flood risk issues.

- Proposal will protect, maintain and enhance the conservation area.
- The proposal will have no impact on amenity of adjacent residents.
- It accords with Local Plan policy and the Design Guide.
- Proposal continues the principles of provision of care on the site.
- Proposal accords with Development Plan Policy and the NPPF.
- Based on the above it is considered to accord with policy and should be supported.

4.2 Archaeological and Heritage statement

- The implementation of the proposed development would be in accordance with the legislative requirements of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.
- The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on archaeological features or deposits.

4.3 Phase I Habitat Report

- Due to the distance between the proposed development and designated nature conservation sites in the local area it is considered highly unlikely that there will be any adverse effects on these sites as a result of these works.
- A bat survey is recommended.
- Mitigation is recommended in form of bird and bat boxes.

4.4 Bat Survey

- At this stage it is anticipated that a European Protected Species derogation licence will be required to facilitate demolition of the education/hall building and permanent modification of the roof void of Monks Dene.
- For these structures the final extent and nature of any mitigation features and agreed with Natural England at the licensing stage.

4.5 Tree Survey

- The proposed landscaping scheme will serve to reduce the impact of proposed tree removals and will improve the age and species diversity of the tree resource on site. The new planting will also increase the contribution the on site tree resource makes to the locality.
- The tree species selection within will be informed by the existing trees, and will aim to enhance biodiversity.

4.6 Flood Risk Assessment

- The proposed development would not increase the risk of fluvial flooding to the site or to surrounding areas.
- The run off from the site would also not increase as part of the development as the Surface Water Management System would maintain existing run off rates.
- The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of flood risk.

4.7 Transport Assessment

- The site is well located to encourage non car travel.

- Traffic generation from the assisted living units and care home is very low and reflects the nature and age of future residents.
- Driver and pedestrian visibility is excellent.

4.8 Design and Access Statement

- Typically the development is a mix of 2, 2 and a half and 3 storey, with 2 and 2 and a half storey elements occurring more frequently.
- The nearest amenities (supermarket, doctors and dental surgery) are all within 0.2 miles from the centre of the site.
- The existing access from New Street is maintained providing 'one way in and out' system.
- Roadways will be privately maintained, informal shared surfaces in keeping with the existing character of the site.
- Disabled access will be accommodated in the design of the dwellings and sufficiently comply with 'Access to Use of Buildings' of relevant building regulations and the Equality Act 2010.
- The main entrance to the Care Home is via a level threshold. Vehicular access to the Care Home site is to be taken via the private estate roads accessed from New Road.
- The Assisted Living Development will provide a total of 58 car parking spaces for 43 units with the remaining being give for visitor parking.
- The Care Home will have 27 car parking spaces made up of drop off space, 2 disabled bays and 24 spaces for staff, residents and visitors.
- In terms of scale and massing, Monks Dene and John Cory House remain as the dominant features on the site and all the proposed buildings will appear subservient to them.
- The Care Home is located to the rear (North East) of the site by Diston's Lane and St. Mary's Church as this offers the most level part of this sloping site.
- The building is cut into the slope of the site, both to enable garden access from each resident floor level and to minimise the impact on the existing housing to Diston's Lane. The elevational treatment reflect s the traditional materials and detailing found locally, and noted in the West Oxfordshire Design Guide. The materials will be selected to be complementary to the retirement housing and reflects the local coursed stone and slate roofs.
- The Care Home will be no taller than the existing main school building and lower than the drama studio currently abuts the boundary.
- It is proposed that both the assisted living development and the Care Home will be constructed from rough dressed local limestone acting as a foil to the ashlar cut stone on Monk's Dene.
- The roofs will be a mix of stone slates and natural slates.
- The windows will be painted timber casements, detailed with a mix of timber and stone lintels and either creasing tile or stone sills.
- There will be a wide mix of local details as per the Chipping Norton Conservation Area Appraisal, such as arrow slots or dove cotes to gables walls, protruding first floor bays a mix of gabled and hipped dormers and feature chimneys.
- The conversion of Monks Dene has been set out to be as sympathetic as possible to the historic fabric and to be as unobtrusive as possible to the exterior of the locally listed landmark structure.
- No internal alterations are proposed to either John Cory House, John Cory Cottage.

- Efficient use of land developing a design with densities in line with the local and national indicative minimum levels as well as enhancing the natural features of the site.
- Provision of an appropriate mix of housing to reflect the local demand, ranging from 1-3 bedroom properties and a Care Home.
- Provision of a safe and secure environment through the careful layout and structure of the development proposal, orientating frontages towards the streets, and footpaths and spaces to achieve natural surveillance of the public realm.
- Creation of attractive and successful outdoor spaces deigned to achieve a sense of place through the avoidance of car dominated road layouts and vehicle through routes.
- The proposed works will make significant improvements to the character and appearance of the site as a whole with the demolition of the unsympathetic existing buildings. The Assisted Living Apartments and the Care Home have been sensitively designed with due consideration to the local vernacular to produce a development that sits harmoniously both with the existing locally listed buildings and the wider context of Chipping Norton.

5 POLICY

5.1 The following local plan policies are considered to be of relevance to this application:

- BE2, BE3, BE5, BE8, BE13, NE4, NE13, H2, H7

5.2 The guidance of the NPPF is also of relevance.

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

6.1 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of the interested parties, your officers consider that the main issues are considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact on Heritage Assets
- Residential amenity
- Ecology
- Highways
- S106

Principle

6.2 The proposal seeks to convert Monks Dene to assisted living units, and remove the modern buildings associated with the school and erect further assisted living units and a care home. The care home will accommodate 53 bedrooms, dining rooms, lounges, an activity room, a hair salon, café, laundry, staff rooms/changing rooms and offices. The assisted living units will facilitate independent living but with an element of care.

6.3 The sites existing use is for a school with residential accommodation so would fall into Class C2 of the Use Classes Order. The proposed use for assisted living units,

for which residents have to have a certain level of care and sign up for a minimum care package would also fall into the same use class, as would the care home.

- 6.4 Because there is no change in use class the provisions of policy H7 do not apply. Therefore your officers consider that the principle of change from residential school to care home and accommodation for people who are in need of care is acceptable and in accordance with Local and National Policy.
- 6.5 Furthermore, the provision of accommodation for older persons is addressing the growing need for this type of accommodation within the District.

Design and impact on Heritage Assets

- 6.6 The three buildings of historic interest (they are also locally listed)– Monks Dene, John Dory House and Cottage, are to be retained but only Monks Dene is to be converted to assisted living units with very few external changes required. This is considered to help settle the scheme as a whole into the Conservation Area. There is considered to be no detrimental impact on the adjacent Baptist Church.
- 6.7 The new build elements are along the western boundary which fronts the Recreation Ground, and in the north eastern corner where the care home is proposed. The design is in a vernacular style and the application proposes the use of natural stone and slate which is in character with properties adjacent to the site. There are existing buildings along the recreation ground boundary that have little architectural merit and it is considered the proposed units could be viewed as an improvement. There is considered to be no detrimental impact on the setting of St Marys Church which is over 50m to the north of the site.
- 6.8 The scale of the proposed development has been of concern to the Town Council and local residents. The building heights range from single to three storeys across the site. Officers have considered the scheme carefully and are of the opinion that although large, the building can be accommodated without detrimental impact to the Conservation Area, or the general character of the area. Care homes are by nature large buildings, and this has been designed with a concealed flat roof to keep the scale and mass of the building as low as possible. Furthermore, the assisted living units that run along the western boundary have differing heights and roof formations to help break up the massing when viewed from the A44 coming in to Chipping Norton.
- 6.9 The proposal is considered to accord with BE2 and BE5 of the Local Plan.

Residential amenity

- 6.10 Understandably, there is much concern from the residents of Distons Lane regarding the potential impact of the care home on their amenities. The land the care home is to be dug down so the building drops down in the eastern corner. The closest two storey element is 17m from the rear of Iona and the roof will be lower than the eaves height of Iona. It has been designed so there are only 3 first floor openings on the eastern elevation which are all proposed to be obscurely glazed, so it is not considered that it will result in unacceptable levels of overlooking of Iona or 34 Distons Lane. Furthermore, it is not considered to be overbearing by virtue that ground levels are significantly lower than the properties on Distons Lane.

- 6.11 The bedrooms on the first floor of the care home that face south may have an oblique view towards the rear of 20A Distons Lane but it is not considered so harmful as to justify the refusal of planning permission.
- 6.12 The back to back distance between Monks Dene and the proposed care home is over 40m and therefore is considered there would be no harm to the amenities of future occupiers from mutual overlooking.
- 6.13 Officers consider the proposal is in accordance with policies BE2 and H2 of the Local Plan.

Ecology

- 6.14 The Local Planning Authority in exercising any of their functions, have a legal duty to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive which identifies 4 main offences for development affecting European Protected Species (EPS).
1. Deliberate capture or killing or injuring of an EPS
 2. Deliberate taking or destroying of EPS eggs
 3. Deliberate disturbance of a EPS including in particular any disturbance which is likely
 - a) to impair their ability –
 - i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young, or
 - ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or
 - b) to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.
 4. Damage or destruction of an EPS breeding site or resting place.
- 6.15 Given the above, your officers do consider that an EPS offence is likely to be committed due to bats being present on site in the hall and in Monks Dene.
- 6.16 Officers therefore have a duty to consider whether the proposal would be likely to secure a licence. To do so the proposals must meet with the three derogation tests which are:
- There are imperative reasons of overriding public interest (eg health and safety, economic or social).
 - There is no satisfactory alternative.
 - The action will have no detrimental impact upon population of the species concerned e.g because adequate compensation is being provided.
- 6.17 Although mitigation measures have been set out in the bat survey, clarification is sought from the applicants that they have considered the tests.

Highways and parking

- 6.18 As this is a redevelopment site the vehicular accesses already exist. The application proposes 74 parking spaces which is an increase in 18 from the current provision. This is considered to be appropriate given the proposed use, car ownership is likely to be low.
- 6.19 The Highway Authority raised some issues with the scheme as submitted and therefore objected initially. The applicant has amended some of the technical

drawings and officers are awaiting formal confirmation that these are now acceptable.

6.20 It is also anticipated that the County will make a contribution request for highway improvements or public transport but this has yet to be received.

6.21 An update will be given to members at committee.

SI06 requests

6.22 The following requests have been made for contributions from this scheme:

	Contribution	Towards
OCC	£103,800	Day Care Facilities
OCC	£7,872	Waste Management
OCC	£615	Museums
OCC	TBC	Highways
WODC	£20,000	Outdoor gym

6.23 Your officers consider that the request from County for Day Care Facilities is not reasonable on the grounds that those facilities will be provided on site for residents.

Conclusions

6.24 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits, subject to no objection being received from the Highway Authority, to the ecological issues being clarified, and the SI06 contributions being agreed.

RECOMMENDATION

Provisional approval.

14/0788/P/FP Westward Lodge 21 Shilton Road Burford	
Date	04/06/2014
Officer	Abby Fettes
Officer Recommendation	Refuse
Parish	BURFORD
Grid Ref:	425554,211216

APPLICATION DETAILS

Conversion of garage to dwelling.

APPLICANT

Mr & Mrs Alan McKechinie Westward Lodge, Shilton Road, Burford, Oxfordshire, OX18 4PA

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The application relates to a large plot currently occupied by a single dwelling and is located on the South side of the A40. It is outside the Conservation Area and the Cotswolds AONB.

The proposal seeks the conversion of an existing three bay garage and annexe to a three bedroom house.

The application is brought before committee as the officer recommendation differs from the Town Councils comments.

I PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.1 06/1832/P/FP Formation of first floor over exiting garage to create ancillary living accommodation Approved
- 1.2 14/0722/P/FP New dwelling and garage. Refused under delegated powers July 2014. On grounds of being sited forward of the established building line, and being contrary to policy H4.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Burford Town Council:

“No objection.”

2.2 Highway Authority:

“No objection.”

2.3 Thames Water:

“Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Water Comments

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.”

2.4 WODC Drainage

“No objection subject to condition.”

3 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 No representations received.

4 APPLICANT’S CASE

4.1 A design and access statement has been submitted in support of the application. It states that there is no further requirement for the garage so it would be put to better use as a dwelling for family members. The document can be viewed in full on line or on the application file.

5 POLICY

5.1 The following Local Plan (2011) policies are considered to be of relevance to this application:

- BE2, BE3, H2, H4

5.2 The guidance in the NPPF (2012) is also of relevance to this application.

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

6.1 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the main issues are considered to be:

- Principle of development
- Design
- Residential amenity
- Highways

Principle of development

6.2 In considering the principle of residential development officers would have regard to the provision of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan, 2011 and the guidance of the National Planning Framework (NPPF) in particular para.49 which has a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals for new residential development in Burford would have been considered in line with Policy H7 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan, 2011. Whilst this is the case the site the subject of this application is considered to sit outside of the main built up part of Burford. The site is situated to the south side of the A40 and is effectively cut off from the main part of the town. Given that this part of Burford is so distinct and cut off from Burford not only by the physical division of the road but also the character and form of development, officers are of the opinion that this area forms an outlier to Burford and as such considers that the area is an open countryside location as far as housing policy is concerned. This conclusion is also reflected in previous decisions by the District Council and has previously been supported at appeal. Furthermore the site could not be considered a sustainable location due to its separation from Burford so it is also not in accordance with para. 49 of the NPPF.

6.3 Previously the key in considering the principle of development was policy H4 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011. Policy H4 allowed for the provision of new

dwellings where they are required for a genuine agricultural or other operational need for a full time worker to live on site. The application, as submitted, has not included any supporting information to demonstrate compliance with the policy and as such officers are of the opinion that the principle of a new dwelling is not established.

- 6.4 If the proposal had been for an annexe it may have been acceptable in this location, but in your officers opinion a separate dwelling in this location cannot be supported and is contrary to local plan policies.

Design and siting

- 6.5 The development on Shilton Road is characterised by development set back from the road frontage and set within spacious plots. The proposal seeks to change what is currently a garage and annexe to the main dwelling into a separate dwelling. The siting could be considered backland and to have a separate dwelling in this location without frontage to the road is out of character with the pattern of development in the area.
- 6.6 The design is dictated by the existing building and requires only a few external changes and is not in itself harmful to the character of the area. However the separate garden area would also be an incongruous feature in this location.

Neighbourliness

- 6.7 It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its backland siting, will result in unacceptable living conditions for future occupants and the occupants of Westward Lodge, predominantly in terms of overlooking but also the incongruous front to back relationship in what would normally be considered the private amenity space of Westward Lodge.
- 6.8 The proposal is considered to be contrary to policies BE2 and H2 of the Local Plan.

Highways and parking

- 6.9 Both the application site and the existing dwelling would continue to be served by sufficient parking and manoeuvring space to serve each of the dwellings. Furthermore, the manoeuvring space would allow for vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. Given this and the vision when exiting the site officers do not consider that the proposal would have an adverse impact on highway safety within the vicinity.
- 6.10 The Local Highway Authority Area Liaison Officer has assessed the proposal from parking and safety perspectives and has not objected to the scheme. Therefore, officers do not consider that the proposed change to a separate dwelling would create undue danger within the site or that it will detract from the safety and convenience of users of the public highway.
- 6.11 The proposal is considered to accord with policy BE3.

Conclusions

- 6.12 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reasons:

- 1 That the proposed dwelling, due to its location to the rear of the Westward Lodge, would result in unacceptable living conditions in terms of overlooking for the occupants of the proposed and the existing dwellings. As such the proposal is contrary to policies BE2 and H2 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.
- 2 That the proposed site is located on the south side of the A40 and is considered to be outside of the built up area of Burford in an unsustainable location. The application submitted has not demonstrated that the proposal is for a genuine agricultural or other operational need and as such the proposal does not comply with the terms of Paragraph 49 of the NPPF or Policy H4 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

14/0816/P/AC Golden Pheasant Hotel 91 High Street Burford	
Date	04/06/2014 04/06/2014
Officer	Cheryl Morley
Officer Recommendation	Grant, subject to conditions
Parish	BURFORD
Grid Ref:	425173,212214

APPLICATION DETAILS

Erection of various illuminated and non illuminated signs.

APPLICANT

Greene King, PO Box 680, Bury St Edmunds, IP33 9GE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The site is a public house in Burford. It is located within the Conservation Area and within the Cotswold AONB. The public house is a Grade II Listed Building.

The application seeks consent for various replacement signs for the public house.

The application is brought to committee for determination as the recommendation conflicted with the Parish Councils comments.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

14/0559/P/AC and 14/0560/P/LB erection of various illuminated and non illuminated signage were previously submitted and advised to be withdrawn on the basis that the internally illuminated additional signs to the front elevation need to be omitted.

2 CONSULTATIONS

- 2.1 Burford Town Council

“Objection is raised over mounting the letters (10 in total) GREENE KING to the building which is listed. This would damage the building. There is no objection to sign K. We reiterate our original comments in that four lights at the front of the building would be sufficient. The High Street is bright enough.”

2.2 OCC Highways

“The proposal, if permitted, will not have a significant effect on highway safety or capacity of the local road network.

No objection.”

3 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Eleven properties were notified of the application and one representation has been received from the Chairman of The Burford & District Society and is summarised below:

- No illuminated hanging signage is acceptable in the Town in a conservation area.
- There is already a continuous sign at high level façade and we can find no justification for a series of low level continuous signs which would seriously detract from the fine stone façade of the building.
- Low level signage should, in our view, be restricted to either side of the main entrance to the premises.
- We are content with the proposed signage to the car park.

4 POLICY

4.1 The relevant West Oxfordshire Local Plan policies are considered to be:

BE5 Conservation Areas
BE7 Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings
BE8 Development affecting the Setting of a Listed Building
BE15 Advertisements and signs
NE4 Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

5.1 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the main issues before the scheme was amended were:

- Design and impact on the Conservation area

Design and impact on Heritage Assets

5.2 The site is a public house within the Conservation Area and AONB. It is a Grade II listed building. The proposal is seeking to replace existing pub signs with new corporate Green King branded signs. The proposal after being amended now comprises of the following signage:

Sign A – Set of individual locator fixed timber letters mounted on to timber fascia panel. (Non illuminated, front elevation)

Sign C – Double sided timber pictorial panel including 900mm header to existing bracket work. (Illuminated by LED trough lights, front elevation)

Sign D – Timber door plaque (Non illuminated, front elevation)

Sign F – This has been amended to be 4 No. warm white LED floodlights instead of 6 (front elevation)

Sign G – Timber entrance door sign (Non illuminated, rear elevation)

Sign H – Small timber car park disclaimer (Non illuminated, a wall to the rear)

Sign I – A3 Brass menu unit (Illuminated with hot cathode tubes, located at the entrance to beer garden)

Sign J – Timber post mounted entrance sign. (Illuminated by trough light, located to the rear of the site at the car park entrance)

Sign K – Double sided timber projecting panel to existing bracketwork (Non illuminated, front elevation)

- 5.3 It should be brought to your attention Sign E – The 10 letters GREENE KING sign has been omitted from the scheme, and the floodlights have been reduced to No. 4 from 6.
- 5.4 The Town Council raised concerns over the mounting letters (10 in total GREENE KING). They felt that this would damage the listed building. They also reiterate their original comments in that four flood lights at the front of the building would be sufficient. The Applicant has omitted Sign E and has reduced the number of floodlights to 4.
- 5.5 The amended scheme is now considered to accord with policies BE15, BE8 and BE5.

Highways

- 5.6 The Local Highway Authority Area Liaison Officer has assessed the proposal from parking and safety perspectives and has not objected to the scheme. Therefore, officers do not consider that the proposed development will create undue danger within the site or that it will detract from the safety and convenience of users of the public highway.
- 5.7 The proposals are considered to accord with BE15.

Conclusions

- 5.8 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to the following conditions:

- I This consent shall operate for a period of five years from the date of this notice.

REASON: By virtue of R.13 (5) of the above regulations.

- 2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans accompanying the application as modified by the revised plans deposited on 16th July 2014.

REASON: The application details have been amended by the submission of revised details.

14/0817/P/LB Golden Pheasant Hotel 91 High Street Burford	
Date	04/06/2014 04/06/2014
Officer	Cheryl Morley
Officer Recommendation	Grant, subject to conditions
Parish	BURFORD
Grid Ref:	425173,212214

APPLICATION DETAILS

Erection of various illuminated and non illuminated signs.

APPLICANT

Greene King, PO Box 680, Bury St Edmunds, IP33 9GE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The site is a public house in Burford. It is located within the Conservation Area and within the Cotswold AONB. The public house is a Grade II Listed Building.

The application seeks consent for various replacement signs for the public house.

The application is brought to committee for determination as the recommendation conflicted with the Parish Councils comments.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.1 14/0559/P/AC and 14/0560/P/LB erection of various illuminated and non illuminated signage were previously submitted and advised to be withdrawn on the basis that the internally illuminated additional signs to the front elevation need to be omitted.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.2 Burford Town Council

“Objection is raised over mounting the letters (10 in total) GREENE KING to the building which is listed. This would damage the building. There is no objection to sign K. We reiterate our original comments in that four lights at the front of the building would be sufficient. The High Street is bright enough.”

3 REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 Eleven properties were notified of the application and one representation has been received from the Chairman of The Burford & District Society and is summarised below:

- No illuminated hanging signage is acceptable in the Town in a conservation area.

- There is already a continuous sign at high level façade and we can find no justification for a series of low level continuous signs which would seriously detract from the fine stone façade of the building.
- Low level signage should, in our view, be restricted to either side of the main entrance to the premises.
- We are content with the proposed signage to the car park.

4 POLICY

4.1 The relevant West Oxfordshire Local Plan policies are considered to be:

BE5 Conservation Areas
 BE7 Alterations and Extensions to Listed Buildings
 BE8 Development affecting the Setting of a Listed Building
 BE15 Advertisements and signs

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

5.1 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the main issues before the scheme was amended were:

- Design and impact on the Conservation area and the Grade II Listed building.

Design and impact on Heritage Assets

5.2 The site is a public house within the Conservation Area and AONB. It is a Grade II listed building. The proposal is seeking to replace existing pub signs with new corporate Green King branded signs. The proposal after being amended now comprises of the following signage:

Sign A – Set of individual locator fixed timber letters mounted on to timber fascia panel. (Non illuminated, front elevation)

Sign C – Double sided timber pictorial panel including 900mm header to existing bracketwork. (Illuminated by LED trough lights, front elevation)

Sign D – Timber door plaque (Non illuminated, front elevation)

Sign F – This has been amended to be 4 No. warm white LED floodlights instead of 6 (front elevation)

Sign G – Timber entrance door sign (Non illuminated, rear elevation)

Sign H – Small timber car park disclaimer (Non illuminated, a wall to the rear)

Sign I – A3 Brass menu unit (Illuminated with hot cathode tubes, located at the entrance to beer garden)

Sign J – Timber post mounted entrance sign. (Illuminated by trough light, located to the rear of the site at the car park entrance)

Sign K – Double sided timber projecting panel to existing bracket work (Non illuminated, front elevation)

- 5.3 It should be brought to your attention Sign E – The 10 letters GREENE KING sign has been omitted from the scheme, and the floodlights have been reduced to No. 4 from 6.
- 5.4 The Town Council raised concerns over the mounting letters (10 in total GREENE KING). They felt that this would damage the listed building. They also reiterate their original comments in that four flood lights at the front of the building would be sufficient. The Applicant has omitted Sign E and has reduced the number of floodlights to 4.
- 5.5 The amended scheme is now considered to accord with policies BE15, BE7, BE8 and BE5.

Conclusions

- 5.6 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to the following conditions:

- 1 This Listed Building Consent is granted subject to the condition that the works to which it relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the consent is granted.
REASON: The time condition is imposed in order to comply with the requirements of S.18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (As amended).
- 2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans accompanying the application as modified by the revised plans deposited on 16th July 2014.
REASON: The application details have been amended by the submission of revised details.
- 3 No demolitions, stripping out, removal of structural elements, replacement of original joinery or fittings and finishes shall be carried out except where shown and noted on the approved drawings.
REASON: To preserve internal features of the Listed Building. (Policy BE7 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)
- 4 All new works and works of making good shall be carried out in materials, and detailed, to match the adjoining original fabric except where shown otherwise on the approved drawings.
REASON: To preserve the architectural integrity of the Listed Building. (Policy BE7 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)

I4/0819/P/FP Land adjacent to Banbury Road Wootton Balk Tackley	
Date	04/06/2014
Officer	Abby Fettes
Officer Recommendation	Refuse
Parish	TACKLEY
Grid Ref:	

APPLICATION DETAILS

Installation of solar farm and associated infrastructure to include photovoltaic panels, mounting frames, inverters, transformers, substations and communication building all within security fence surround. Provision of pole mounted security cameras and formation of vehicular access.

APPLICANT

Lightsource SPV 78 Ltd Level 4, 20 Old Bailey, London, EC4M 7AN.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The application seeks consent for the development of a solar farm with associated works on a parcel of land comprising 12.2 hectares of Grade 3b arable land to the west of Tackley and immediately to the east of the A4260 Banbury Road. For orientation purposes, Sturdys Castle is approximately 600m to the south of the site.

Tackley village (and Conservation Area) is just over 1km to the east and Wootton village (and Conservation Area) is over 2km to the west of the site. Akeman Street Roman Road (which is also the Oxfordshire Way in this vicinity) is 600m to the south of the site. A footpath bisects the site.

The proposal is for a 7.5w solar farm which could generate electricity for over 2000 households. The solar panels will cover approximately 4.1ha of the site and has been designed to allow for sheep grazing around the panels.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant planning history for this site.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Tackley PC

“The output of 7.5 was not the capacity as stated, it was 6.1 so this needs amending. The access track does not take into account the mature trees so this needs to be amended. The cable route has not yet been indicated and trees again will need to be taken into account. The application needs amending and resubmitting.”

2.2 OCC Single Response

Highways – *“No objection subject to conditions.”*
 Archaeology – *“No objection subject to conditions for a watching brief and written Scheme of Investigation.”*

2.3 BBOWT

“I have recently become aware of the above application and wish to submit the following comments on behalf of the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT). As a wildlife conservation charity our comments relate specifically to the protection and enhancement of the local ecology on and around the application site.

Some efforts have been made to ensure that the proposals would provide for a net gain in biodiversity, however no information has been provided on the long-term management of the species-rich grassland to be sowed, maintaining a structured sward of the field margins, or of the hedgerows existing on site and those to be newly created and therefore a long-term net gain in biodiversity is not secured as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

If the District Council are minded to permit this application then I recommend that they condition the recommendations for mitigation and enhancement as set out in the Ecological Appraisal and require that a Biodiversity Management Plan is submitted detailing further information on how the enhancements to biodiversity on site will be maintained in the long term. In particular, further information is needed on the appropriate management of the grassland to ensure it is maintained as a species-rich habitat.”

2.4 Environmental Health

“No objection.”

3 REPRESENTATIONS

One letter received from H Davies of 25 St Nicholas Road stating:

“I think that solar power is user friendly and the best source of energy for the future.”

4 APPLICANT’S CASE

4.1 Several supporting documents have been submitted with the application including

Planning, Design and Access Statement
Flood Risk Assessment
Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
Construction traffic management plan
Flood Risk Assessment
Statement of Community Involvement
Archaeological Evaluation Report and Desk Based Assessment
Construction, decommissioning and traffic management statement
Ecological appraisal

4.2 The executive summary is copied below:

- The proposal is for a 7.5MW solar farm, capable of generating enough clean electricity to power 2150 typical households.
- The solar farm would avoid 3669 tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions associated with electricity generation each year, thus reducing the carbon footprint of Tackley/Wootton. This is the equivalent to the annual emissions of 815 family cars
- The site is not located within any designated area and the development would have no significant effect on the key landscape characteristics. There would be limited visibility into the site which would be contained by the local topography and existing and proposed hedgerows/trees in the landscape. The site would be well integrated into the landscape and will improve as the mitigation planting matures.
- Additional soft landscaping and grassland enhancement would serve to provide additional hibernacula and enhance the ecological values of the site. Construction of the development would be sensitive to existing ecological interests (e.g. breeding birds) and the provision of bird and bat boxes would further increase the potential for enhancing biodiversity.
- The site is located entirely in Flood Zone 1 and the development would not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere. The construction of a solar farm would have a negligible impact upon site drainage and the provision of swales would lead to an overall reduction in surface water flow rates from the site and mitigate any increase in run-off due to the minor reduction in the overall permeable area of the site.
- The development would not affect any Listed Buildings in the vicinity or the setting of the Tackley Conservation Area. The topography of the surrounding landscape and the intervening features therein will preclude any adverse impact on their respective settings.
- A comprehensive scheme of archaeological investigation and trial trenching has been carried out based on a scheme of work agreed with the County Archaeologist. A watching brief will be carried out during construction to ensure that any archaeological interests are protected.
- The development would utilise lower grade agricultural land (Grade 3B). Sheep will be grazed under and between the rows of solar panels, which allows for a dual productive use of the site, through the generation of renewable energy and the continued agricultural use of the land.
- At the end of the solar farm's life, the site will be decommissioned, with all infrastructure removed from the site, and the site restored to its original condition for future agricultural use.
- The majority of the components of the solar farm can be recycled or reused at the end of the solar farms operational life.

5 POLICY

5.1 Officers consider the following policies to be of relevance in the determination of this application:

Policy BE2: General Development Standards
 Policy BE3: Provision for Movement and Parking
 Policy NE1: Safeguarding the Countryside
 Policy NE3: Local Landscape Character
 Policy NE12: Renewable Energy

West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment (1998)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 Planning Practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy (DCLG; July 2013)

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The proposed solar panels are to be arranged so that they have a maximum height of 1.54m and their dimensions are 1.5m x 0.995m x 0.05m. The glass surfaced panels are coated to minimise glare potential and solar flare. The panels are to be mounted on frames at an angle of 25 degrees to optimise the capture of sunlight. The frames have little impact on the ground so can easily be removed when the scheme is decommissioned.
- 6.2 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the main issues are considered to be:
- Principle of development
 - Landscape
 - Environment and Climate Change
 - Design, siting and impact on Heritage Assets
 - Ecology
 - Highways

Principle

- 6.3 Policy NE12 of the adopted Local Plan identifies the criteria whereby proposals for the provision of renewable energy will be considered. The policy states that renewable energy schemes will be permitted if there would not be an unacceptable impact upon the resources of the area; and there is not an unacceptable level of nuisance by reason of noise, safety, shadow flicker, electromagnetic interference or reflected light.
- 6.4 Subject to these provisos being met the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.5 However, in July 2013 the Government published further guidance (Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy) on the deployment of large-scale solar farms and suggests Local Planning Authorities should, amongst other criterion, be:
- encouraging the effective use of previously developed land;
 - considering the effect of the development on the landscape;
 - the need for, and impact of, security measures e.g. lighting; the potential to mitigate landscape and visual impacts and care to consider the impact on heritage assets.

- 6.6 It is also noted that the Council's existing policies do not directly consider the implications of the cumulative change to the landscape of the District by virtue of allowing a number of these forms of application. In this case it is noted that there are no similar developments within proximity that could be collectively viewed from multiple vantage points at the same time. For this reason the incremental impact is not considered to be a material consideration.

Landscape

- 6.7 The land is set in a fairly open countryside location, with the course of the Akeman Street Roman road running to the south of the site. Within the general vicinity of

the site the landscape is typified by its gentle-rolling arable land, which would be completely transformed by the proposed development. The site is bordered all around by fairly open, agricultural land with small areas of woodland. The land rises to the north.

- 6.8 The West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment describes the site and surrounds as 'Open Limestone Wolds'. The area consists of large fields with weak hedges and frequent gaps with very few trees. Notably: it is identified as having a very open and exposed character and high intervisibility. It is therefore officers' opinion that the underlying character of the area predisposes itself to being unsuitable for a proposal that has the potential to overhaul the intrinsic character of the area.
- 6.9 The development would be of a substantial scale, and due to the addition of all the required paraphernalia (including transformers and security cameras etc,) it is considered that that use would be inconsistent with the surrounding landscape which is identified in the Landscape Assessment as being particularly sensitive to development and prominent structures. In Particular, the Landscape Assessment identifies the threat of "suburbanisation" of rural settlements and road corridors.
- 6.10 Of particular concern is the impact on the footpath that runs parallel to the northern boundary of the site. This forms one of a large number of footpath routes in the area including the Oxfordshire Way, from which the site is visible. It is also visible from the A4260 and the road running north east to Tackley. The current overwhelming impression in these public viewpoints is of unspoilt rural countryside is of unspoilt rural countryside and your officers are concerned that the overtly urban character of the development proposed would harm the current unspoilt rural quality of the area. Taking into account the height of the viewpoints, officers have serious doubts that new planting could actually screen the development from all viewpoints.
- 6.11 Additionally the provision of additional landscaping to seek to limit/mitigate the adverse impact of the proposal would of itself be incongruous and limit the wide/open aspect that is currently the key characteristic of this part of the district. It is not considered that any reasonably level of landscaping could adequately preserve the rural setting of the footpath to the north of the site or view from the trig point/higher land immediately to the north east
- 6.12 For these reasons it is considered that the application fails to preserve the landscape character of the area and will introduce an incongruous industrial aspect to an otherwise open countryside, agricultural aesthetic, and will impact on the setting of a public right of way.

Environment and climate change

- 6.13 In further support of the relatively permissive nature of both Local and National Policy, Members may consider there to be over-riding and substantive benefits of this scheme that overcome the concerns addressed within this report. Given the environmentally constrained nature of much of the District – due to AONB, Woodland, World Heritage Site, SSSI and Conservation Area designations – this site may be considered to be one of the less sensitive sites within West Oxfordshire which will help to address concerns regarding carbon reduction and reducing dependence on fossil fuels.

Design and siting and impact on heritage assets

- 6.14 It is considered that any potential impact on archaeology could be mitigated against by condition and therefore the application is considered to accord with policy BE12.
- 6.15 The proposal site is considered to be set sufficiently far enough away from the Tackley and Wootton Conservation Areas that it is considered to preserve the character of the Conservation Area.
- 6.16 There will be some impact on the setting of Akeman Street, but not sufficient to justify refusal in its own right.
- 6.17 The proposal is considered to accord with Local Plan policies.

Ecology

- 6.18 The site is not affected by any major ecological constraints and therefore the development is not considered to have an impact on any habitats of ecological value or protected species. The applicants proposed that the site will also be used for the grazing of sheep. If Members are minded to permit the application it is recommend that the conditions suggested by BBOWT are attached to the consent.
- 6.19 The proposal is considered to accord with policy NE13.

Highways

- 6.20 The Local Highway Authority Area Liaison Officer has assessed the proposal from a highway safety perspective and has not objected to the scheme. Therefore, officers do not consider that the proposed development will create undue danger within the site or that it will detract from the safety and convenience of users of the public highway.
- 6.21 The proposal is considered to accord with policy BE3.

Conclusions

- 6.22 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is unacceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reason:

- I By reason of the visual impact from public footpaths and vantage points and wider landscape views, with any mitigating planting likely to artificially enclose an otherwise open natural widely visible aspect; the proposed development is considered to be harmful to the open rural character of this sensitive area of open countryside. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies BE2, NE1, NE3 and NE12 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and the provisions of the NPPF.

14/0833/P/FP Reeves Barn Pound Hill Charlbury	
Date	06/06/2014
Officer	Abby Fettes
Officer Recommendation	Grant, subject to conditions
Parish	CHARLBURY
Grid Ref:	435493,219763

APPLICATION DETAILS

Demolition of existing garage and erection of dwelling.

APPLICANT

Mr L Pratley Reeves Barn, Pound Hill, Charlbury, Oxon OX7 3QN.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The site is a garage block behind a property fronting Pound Hill in Charlbury. The site is within the Conservation Area and the Cotswolds AONB.

The application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing garage block and replacement with a two storey dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.

The application is brought before committee at the request of the Town Council.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.1 14/0402/P/FP demolition of existing garages and erection of dwelling – Withdrawn following officer concerns over design.
- 1.2 12/10/27/P/FP Demolition of barn and construction of new dwelling and garage with room over. Approved. (adjacent property Abbeywell).
- 1.3 Planning permission for the erection of two dwellings was approved under reference 05/2248/P/FP and was subsequently renewed in 2009 under reference 09/0461/P/RFP.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Charlbury Town Council

- “1. Can the letters sent by residents be given careful consideration. It is unusual that this many letters have been sent.*
- 2. Can this go to committee please as interest is considerable. A site visit should be undertaken to understand the issues involved clearly.*
- 3. We consider this to be over development of the site.*
- 4. We object to this application.”*

2.2 Highways

“Object as substandard visibility and inadequate manoeuvring space for parked cars.”

2.3 Thames Water

“Waste Comments

Legal changes under The Water Industry (Scheme for the Adoption of private sewers) Regulations 2011 mean that the sections of pipes you share with your neighbours, or are situated outside of your property boundary which connect to a public sewer are likely to have transferred to Thames Water's ownership. Should your proposed building work fall within 3 metres of these pipes we recommend you contact Thames Water to discuss their status in more detail and to determine if a building over / near to agreement is required. You can contact Thames Water on 0845 850 2777 or for more information please visit our website at www.thameswater.co.uk

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Water Comments

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.”

2.4 WODC Drainage

“No objection subject to surface water drainage condition.”

3 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 12 neighbours were notified of the application. A total of 17 letters have been received from Charlbury residents. 8 letters of support have been received and are summarised as follows:

- Proposed design has been revised in a careful way to address previous concerns.
- Impact on adjoining properties will be minimal.
- I can see no reason why the scheme should not gain consent.
- A number of developments have been granted permission.
- Will enhance the site in a very sympathetic way.
- The Dairy Court and Reeves Barn brought unused employment sites back into use.
- I strongly object to Nimbyism where unrepresentative views try to frustrate an attractive residential proposal.
- It is the same architect used by adjacent property Abbeywell which is a very attractive property.
- The proposed house and proposed materials will fit in well with surroundings.

3.2 9 letters of objection have been received and are summarised as follows:

- Fundamental matters raised on the previous application have not been addressed.
- Our previous comments of objection remain valid.
- Roof terrace will overlook and cause loss of light to The Firs, and will overlook 2 Dairy Court and Abbeywell.
- Utility door will overlook The Firs.
- Will result in over development of the site.
- The roof terrace is unnecessarily high and large and will cause disturbance to neighbours.
- Raised garden levels will result in overlooking, almost 5ft
- The design is not in keeping with the Conservation Area.
- Over development of the site with 4 dwellings is a potential highway issue and parking issues.
- Design of the building is not in keeping.
- The plans do not respect the ground levels or the dramatic impact on our property (5 Dairy Court).
- The location plans omit our windows.
- The proposed fence will be overwhelming from our garden (4m).
- No consideration for retaining walls or problems with drainage from the raised garden.
- Results in urban creep on garden land.
- Extremely concerns that we will lose our view.

3.3 Charlbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee have commented as follows:

- This proposal will be visible from various situations and we were particularly concerned about views from Burford Road.
- At the moment this plot along with The Firs and Dairy Court look bleak as many of trees have been cut down and we would like to see landscaping condition.
- Worried about glass balcony as may reflect light and draw attention to the building.

4 APPLICANT'S CASE

- 4.1 A brief Design and Access statement has been submitted in support of the application and is available to view online and on the file.

5 POLICY

- 5.1 Your officers considered that the following policies of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan, 2011 are particularly relevant:

Policy BE2 (General Development Standards);
 Policy BE3 (Provision for Movement and Parking);
 Policy BE5 (Conservation Areas);
 Policy NE4 (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty);
 Policy H2 (General Residential Development Standards); and
 Policy H7 (Service Centres).

- 5.2 In addition to the above, the National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration.

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the main issues are considered to be:

Principle of development;
Design and impact on heritage assets;
Residential amenity;
Highways and parking implications.

Principle

- 6.2 The site has historically been used as part of a larger employment site which has now been redeveloped. This site itself has been granted planning permission previously for the redevelopment for residential purposes. The site is not currently used as an employment site and has not been for some time however, officers would suggest that given the residential nature of the immediate surroundings the redevelopment of the site would provide planning benefits due to the constrained nature of the site and poor access visibility. In considering the principle of residential development officers would have regard to the provision of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan, 2011 and the guidance of the National Planning Framework (NPPF).

- 6.3 Proposals for new residential development in Charlbury would have been considered in line with Policy H7 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan, 2011. In light of the recently agreed Housing Land Position Statement, the District Council are currently in a position where we are unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Given this, in accordance with paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), proposals for housing development should be considered in the context of a 'presumption in favour' of development and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date.

- 6.4 Given this, the provision of a house on the site should be considered in the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF which states that:

where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
- *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.*

- 6.5 In light of the guidance of the NPPF, and that Charlbury is considered to be a relatively sustainable location given the range of facilities and services provided for, officers therefore consider that the principle of development is acceptable.

Design and impact on Heritage Assets

- 6.6 The proposed dwelling is of a relatively simple form and the elevations reflect the form of Reeves Barn. The dwelling is proposed to be constructed of natural stone under a slate roof. The existing garage block on site is of poor quality and is of little contribution to the character of the area. The proposed dwelling would, due to its simple design and form provides a visual link between the existing barn conversion

at Reeves Barn and the new residential development at Abbeywell and Dairy Court. The dwelling is of appropriate design and materials and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

- 6.7 In regard to the concerns about light reflecting from the proposed glass balcony, these can be addressed by conditioning non reflective glass.
- 6.8 Your officers consider the proposal to be in accordance with policies BE2, BE5 and H2 of the Local Plan.

Residential amenity

- 6.9 There are significant changes in land levels over the application site and to the residential development to the rear. The dwelling will appear as a single/one and a half storey from the front and two storey from the rear. It will be off the shared boundary with The Firs, unlike the existing garage building which has a window on the boundary.
- 6.10 The proposal includes a terraced area to the rear with 1.5m high side walls to prevent overlooking of the recently constructed properties in Dairy Court and also The Firs to the north west (which Members may recall coming before committee in November 2013 with an application to replace the existing house with a larger dwelling). Given the separation distances officers do not consider that the impact of the development would be so harmful in terms of overlooking to justify the refusal of planning permission.
- 6.11 There are two doors proposed on the north west elevation facing The Firs but it is proposed that there is a 1.8m wall along the shared boundary so it is not considered that this will introduce unacceptable levels overlooking. There are no windows facing south east towards the immediate neighbour at Abbeywell. The existing property at Reeves Barn has an open garden to the rear which has previously been compromised by the employment use. The new dwelling has minimal first floor openings on the front elevation (roof lights) which would give rise to any direct overlooking.
- 6.12 Your officers consider the proposal to be in accordance with BE2 and H2 of the Local Plan.

Highways and parking

- 6.13 Five parking spaces are shown on the layout for the new property and two remain for the existing dwelling Reeves Barn. Abbeywell has three spaces at the front of the site.
- 6.14 An objection has been received from the Highway Authority on grounds of substandard visibility onto Pound Hill, and also manoeuvring space for the spaces within the site.
- 6.15 No objection was raised to the application at Abbeywell on these grounds although it was a very similar situation, and the previous employment use is likely to have generated more traffic movements.
- 6.16 On these grounds clarification is being sought from the Highway Authority. Officers will update members in the Additional representations report or verbally at meeting.

Conclusions

- 6.17 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Provisional approval.

14/0897/P/FP Leaffield Technical Centre Langley	
Date	17/06/2014 17/06/2014
Officer	Mrs Kim Smith
Officer Recommendation	Grant, subject to conditions
Parish	LEAFIELD
Grid Ref:	430180,215462

APPLICATION DETAILS

Installation of three mechanical extraction plant. (Retrospective)

APPLICANT

Caterham FITeam, Leaffield Technical Centre, Langley, Oxfordshire, OX29 9EF

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This is a retrospective application for 2 Vacuum extractor systems installed on the north elevation of 'Building U' on the site and 1 Bin Filter Extraction system installed to the south elevation of 'Building B'.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

14/0266 – Retrospective planning application for the installation of mechanical extraction plant – Withdrawn.

2. CONSTRAINTS

The site lies within the Cotswolds AONB.

3 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Parish Council

No reply to date.

3.2 West Oxfordshire District Council- Environmental Health:

"I visited Leaffield Technical Centre (LTC) and took part in pre-application discussions about this matter in October 2013. The application seeks to use three pieces of air filtration plant that are mounted externally to site buildings. Background noise levels in the area are low and there are residential dwellings to the north and south of LTC. Noise monitoring and modelling exercises were both undertaken in 2013 by noise consultants for the applicant. These identified that significant reductions in noise emissions would be required from all

three pieces of plant. These reductions I considered, from a noise control perspective, as being demanding but achievable. The current application outlines proposed noise control works to achieve those reductions as summarised here:

2no. air filtration plants on north façade

- New noise enclosures around 3no. air fans
- New silencers on 3no. air exhaust vents
- Stiffeners on ductwork (to reduce resonance)

1no. air filtration plant on south façade

- New noise barrier around plant

Data in the application indicates these noise control measures will give the necessary reductions suggested by the applicant's noise consultants in their 2 December 2013 report. This should achieve the proposed noise condition below.

In order to provide sufficient protection to nearby residents from noise pollution I recommend the following conditions be applied:

1. The external noise level emitted from the three items of air filtration plan at the development shall not exceed the existing background noise level as assessed according to BS4142:1997 at noise-sensitive premises with all machinery operating together
2. The three items of air filtration plan at the development shall not be used outside the hours of 0600 to 2200 on Monday to Saturday inclusive."

4 REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Representations have been received from Andy Wright of Pheasant Cottage, 1 Langley and Mr Pete Warren and Rosemary Butler of 3 Langley.

4.2 Their comments are summarised as follows:

- My earlier comments still hold (those made in respect of withdrawn application 14/0266) – however to update I have not been kept awake at night recently and the level of noise from next door would appear to have dropped;
- We would ask that all the points that we raised relating to the earlier submission (14/0266), including the report from LF Acoustics Ltd, are again taken in to consideration in this application;
- We have seen the proposed noise mitigation measures as provided by IAC acoustics and would strongly suggest that a report- and or condition – as to the effectiveness of these proposed measures would be required before any decision in respect of the application is considered;
- The recent reports that the Formula 1 team has been sold to outside interests raises concerns as to the possible future activities that may take place on this site;
- We believe this adds weight to our proposal to restrict the hours of use of any outdoor plant and machinery on he site;
- We would be grateful to hear your comments on the cooling plant beside building B which is operating without the prior approval of yourselves;

- It is also noted that the application has not been advertised in the media or at the main road junction which is hard to understand when the erection of a shed (part retrospective) in Lower End Leafield does. The result being that many residents within the locality are not aware of the applications existence- the noise from this plant has been heard as far away as Shipton Under Wychwood

4.3 **Representations received in respect of planning application I4/0266 (Withdrawn) requested for inclusion by those making representations in respect of this application**

- The site is located in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where background sound levels are very low;
- A development such as the extractor fans is fine as long as noise levels are controlled and the hours of operation are fixed;
- I have been kept awake on several occasions by the noise of this extraction plant. It's not that its particularly loud, but it is persistent, it can be distinctly heard against the quiet background and it is annoying, particularly in the middle of the night and especially at the weekend;
- I have no particular objection to Caterham installing these machines, but I would like the operating hours to be specified and to ensure that the noise generated doesn't exceed the noise specified under their planning spec;
- The current level of noise seems to be exceeding the legal limits;
- Do Caterham have any written operational instructions regarding the use of these extractor fans?
- I would prefer this to be considered by the planning sub committee if possible ;
- In no way can the Leafield Technical Centre be described as a 'traditional formula I site';
- What is traditional is the quietness associated with the country side AONB;
- We believe that the three items of plant do not comply with the existing conditions of the site. We also include building U (the main workshop/s) within planning condition 15 of 0033/95:
- Our complaints regarding noise coming from the extraction installations are well known to the Council;
- We strongly object to the positioning and continued use of this plant, especially the installation described as Ketonex Cyclone 3. Situated in the very same general area, adjacent to Building B- if not slightly closer- to where the Engine Test Cells application was refused and further refused on appeal in September 2007. The closeness of this and the noise it produces is very intrusive indeed. Your ENVH officer has visited on a number of occasions with sound equipment, only to find that the noise had lessened considerably prior to his arrival;
- We note that the noise surveys (AAD) commissioned by yourselves, the recommended reduction to the levels recorded are considerable. However, there appears to be no reference to background levels, particularly those referred to in the Test Cells survey, which were from as low as 25dBa to 23dBa for evening and night time/early morning periods respectively. We do not expect that these measurements (facts) are in any way invalidated by age as their have been no changes in local circumstances, what so ever, since the earlier surveys were carried out;
- The current AAD surveys all indicate that at present the three cyclone units are likely to be the cause of complaint. No details of any mitigation measures have been recommended in the reports, which is of concern. It appears that in respect of the lower noise limit of 34dBL_{aeq}, as specified in the reports, no account for the lower evening, night time or early morning background noise

level have been considered- we assume that the noise level limit of 34dB will be the recorded level at source;

- We remain perplexed and disappointed that as from the date of the completion of the first survey, where noise problems were identified, that no action from the Council and no voluntary attempt by Caterham was made to lessen the impact of the plant noise. We are also afraid that – as specifically mentioned in the report dated 12 December 13- other sources of noise may become apparent when/if the current problems have been addressed/mitigated. I personally, up close, have heard very loud volumes of noise from plant rooms on the South side of building U, protected only by louvred door covers, and the same from cooling units in the computer room situated in the same vicinity which were completely out in the open. There was still further noise from a compressor shed also nearby;
- It is inconceivable that with their property agents the applicant is not aware of the strict conditions relating to the class use, and those concerned with the protection to residential amenity and local environment;
- It is evident that a number of the existing conditions attached to the planning permission are being breached eg Noise, traffic not using the ash track- storage of equipment outside etc;
- We have advised yourselves to make a log of instances of noise disturbance, which we have done. These notes date back to November 2011;
- Complaints with regards to the extraction cyclones were first recorded on the 7 November 2012;
- Our records show that noise disturbance has occurred at any time of day and very often through the night until the early morning;
- The claim by Caterham that they never run the offending plant after 6pm is complete nonsense;
- Plant noise of a heavy industrial nature with a high pitched humming sound , together with deeper machine noise has been, heard throughout the night on many occasions;
- In conclusion find a copy of a report summary of the AAD surveys from LF Acoustics Ltd, commissioned by ourselves. We would be grateful if the observations and advice therein would be given due consideration during the decision making process.

4.4 **Summary of LF Acoustics Ltd report in respect of AAD's acoustic survey work submitted in respect of 14/0266 (withdrawn) as requested for inclusion in the representation received from Mr Warren and Rosemary Butler**

The noise assessments have been well prepared and specify that without mitigation, noise associated with the operation of the plant would have the potential to cause complaints;

Providing the Rating Noise limit 34dB Lq is imposed on any permission granted, the level of noise generated is considered to be acceptable to minimise disturbance. This level is marginally below that which is described in BS4142 as being very low and below that which was agreed with officers previously for an earlier planning application;

What is of concern , however, is that despite the fact that the acoustic consultants acting for Leaffield Technical Centre identified that the operation of the plant would give rise to complaints back in August 2013, it does not appear that any action has been taken to reduce noise levels during this time;

What is more alarming is the fact that the retrospective application was submitted 12 months after the plant was installed and over 6 months after the initial noise assessment was carried out, with no information on mitigation measures....We would have expected to have some details of the mitigation measures proposed, or the measures having been implemented in the final report demonstrating that noise levels have been reduced to an acceptable standard.

At present it is difficult to advise whether any mitigation measures proposed would reduce noise levels to a satisfactory standard.

We would advise that if planning permission were to be granted, either there be a restriction preventing operation of the plant until mitigation measures have been completed and demonstrated that they have achieved the noise limit or a time limit of say 3 months, to complete and verify the mitigation measures.'

5 APPLICANT'S CASE

- 5.1 Substantial technical acoustic information has been received in respect of the application which is difficult to summarise in a meaningful manner. This information is however available to view on the Councils website.
- 5.2 The summary and conclusions of the acoustic assessment dated 2 December 2013 submitted as part of this application are as follows:
- 5.3 Three Cyclone dust filters have been installed without the benefit of planning permission;
- 5.4 West Oxfordshire District Council has required that a report be prepared in respect of noise from the units as it affects nearby noise sensitive properties;
- 5.5 A noise survey has been undertaken to determine levels of ambient noise and background noise in the area, with a second noise survey being undertaken to determine levels of noise generated by the three Cyclone units;
- 5.6 The background noise level for the area has been determined to be 34dB L;
- 5.7 The Council has indicated that the appropriate noise criterion with respect to noise sensitive properties is a BS4142 difference of 0dB;
- 5.8 Given the noise criterion and the background noise level in the area noise from the Cyclones should be no more than 29dBA, assuming the +5dB BS4142 acoustic feature correction applies, at any noise sensitive properties;
- 5.9 A noise model has been created in respect of the Technical Centre and immediate surrounding area and noise sources have been created for the three Cyclone units;
- 5.10 The worst case calculated noise level for the Cyclone units give rise to a +18dB BS4142 difference;
- 5.11 Noise mitigation is suggested for the three Cyclone units;
- 5.12 With noise mitigation in place it is calculated that the worst case noise level at any sensitive receiver would meet the 0Db BS4142 difference suggested by West Oxfordshire District Council;

- 5.13 The exact form of the enclosures would have to be subject of detailed design so as to ensure the operation of the units was not compromised. Specialist contractor proposals would be invited for this work;
- 5.14 The proposed mitigation is with respect to the primary sources of noise from the Cyclones. It may be that there are secondary sources which are currently not obvious but which may become obvious once the mitigation work is completed and which may then themselves require mitigation.
- 5.15 As an outcome of the above report, this application is accompanied by an acoustic design note in respect of the detailed mitigation measures to address the noise issues that have been identified following the acoustic survey work.
- 5.16 The design note concludes that subject to the following mitigation measures to control noise, the necessary reductions in respect of the closest noise sensitive receiver can be achieved:
- 5.17 Cyclone 1 and Cyclone 2 on the north façade of building 'U':
- New noise enclosures around the air fans;
 - New silencers on the air exhaust vents ;
 - Stiffeners on duct work (to reduce resonance).
- 5.18 Air filtration plant on the south façade of building 'B';
- A 5.025m high noise barrier enclosure

6 POLICY

- 6.1 The key policies for consideration in respect of this application are BE2 and BE19 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and relevant policies of the NPPF.

7 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider the main issue to.
- 7.2 The impact of noise generated from the plant on the residential properties located within the vicinity of the Technical Centre.
- 7.3 The acoustic assessment submitted with the application states background noise levels in the area are low and that there are dwellings located to the north and south of the Technical Centre. Noise modelling and monitoring exercises undertaken in 2013 have identified that given the factors listed above that significant reductions in noise emissions are required from the three pieces of plant the subject of this application.
- 7.4 The acoustic design note that has been submitted as part of this application has concluded that subject to the specific and detailed noise mitigation proposed as part of this application being undertaken in respect of each of the three pieces of plant, that the required reductions in noise levels can be achieved.
- 7.5 Bearing this in mind and given the necessity of the plant to the business operating from the land, your officers recommendation is as follows;

- 7.6 That planning permission be granted subject to conditions requiring the external noise level emitted from the air filtration plant not to exceed existing background noise level as assessed according to BS4142, precise elevational details of mitigation methods to seek to achieve the requisite reduction in noise levels being first approved by the LPA and implemented within two months of the grant of the planning permission, and the hours of operation of the plant being limited to the 'hours of opening' being cited on the application, those being between 0600 to 2200 Monday to Saturday.

Conclusions

- 7.7 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The external noise level emitted from the three items of air filtration plant hereby approved shall not exceed the existing background noise level as assessed according to BS4142:1997 at noise-sensitive premises with all machinery operating together.
REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.
- 2 The three items of air filtration plant hereby approved shall not be used outside the hours of 0600 to 2200 on Monday to Saturday inclusive nor at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.
- 3 That the mitigation works hereby approved to include the construction of the acoustic barrier around 'cyclone 3' and the acoustic enclosures and noise attenuators to 'cyclone 1' and 'cyclone 2' shall be installed and operational within two months of the date of this grant of planning permission in accordance with precise elevational details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.

14/0911/P/FP 74 Church Road Long Hanborough	
Date	19/06/2014
Officer	Abby Fettes
Officer Recommendation	Grant, subject to conditions
Parish	HANBOROUGH
Grid Ref:	441869,213799

APPLICATION DETAILS

Removal of existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings and formation of vehicular access.

APPLICANT

Mr & Mrs R Pratt, 74 Church Road, Long Hanborough, Oxfordshire, OX29 8JF

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with a pair of semi detached two storey dwellings. The site is not within the AONB or Conservation Area.

The application is brought before committee on the grounds that the officer recommendation differs from the Parish Council.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.1 13/0729/P/FP Removal of existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings and formation of vehicular access, refused at committee and dismissed at appeal.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Hanborough Parish Council

“While the Parish Council recognises the applicant’s effort to address concern about potential damage to the street scene etc, we remain unconvinced that a suitable design solution has been (or could readily be) achieved.”

2.2 Thames Water

Waste Comments

“There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Water Comments

“On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames

Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.”

2.3 Highway Authority

No comments received to date (consultation expires 24/07/14).

3 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 No representations have been received. Consultation expires 24/07/14.

4 APPLICANT'S CASE

4.1 The application is accompanied by a planning statement and an ecology report which can be viewed in full online or on the application file.

4.2 The planning statement concludes that *“the physical characteristics of the proposed scheme have been informed by a rigorous process of assessment, involvement evaluation and design and the adopted design solution specifically adheres with the pre-application advice provided by officers”*.

4.3 The ecology report concludes that a European Protected Species (bat) Licence is not considered necessary but consideration should be given to new roosting opportunities and external lighting should be avoided unless necessary for security.

5 POLICY

5.2 The following Local Plan (2011) policies are considered to be of relevance to this application:

- BE2, BE3, H2, H7, NE15

5.2 The guidance in the NPPF (2012) is also of relevance to this application.

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

6.1 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the main issues are considered to be:

- Principle
- Design
- Residential amenity
- Ecology
- Highways

Principle

6.2 Given the site's location within a service centre within the District where infilling and rounding off are supported the principle of development is considered to be supported. Indeed, the National Planning Policy Framework supports development in sustainable locations.

- 6.3 On this basis the proposal is considered to accord with Policy H7 of the Adopted Local Plan and paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

Design, character and appearance

- 6.4 The application has been the subject of extension pre application discussion to overcome officer concerns.
- 6.5 The dwellings on Church Road are different depending on which side of the road you are located. The properties to the north east are characterised by terraces of properties however, to the south west the development is characterised by detached dwellings on relatively spacious plots. With the exception of two properties, in general the properties have their ridge line running parallel with the road and form either single properties or pairs of semi-detached properties. Those two properties which are gable end onto the road are also on spacious plots.
- 6.6. The previous application (13/0729) proposed two detached properties with the gable end onto the road. The accommodation extended significantly further to the rear of the existing footprint to a total depth of 14 metres. The proposed form of those dwellings with their gable end onto the road would have resulted in a cramped and contrived appearance to the dwelling houses.
- 6.7 The revised design, is a reflection of advice given by officers. They are pair of broadly vernacular two storey dwellings with rear wings, proposed to be constructed in render and tiles. The ridge has been lowered to 8m (was previously 9m high) the depth of the building has been reduced to 7.5m and the length of the two storey projection has been reduced to 5.5m.
- 6.8 Although the volume is still very substantial and probably at the outer limits of what might be accommodated comfortably on the site, officers consider that on balance, the proposal accords with policies BE2 and H2 of the Local Plan.

Neighbourliness

- 6.9 There are two immediate neighbours, no. 76 to the south and no. 72 to the north of the application site. As no. 76 is to the south of the application site, whilst the development will be visible, it would not give rise to any significant overshadowing or loss of light implications. The two storey form will alter the outlook but will not give rise to such a harmful impact in terms of overbearingness to justify the refusal of planning permission.
- 6.10 There were previous concerns regarding the amenity of no. 72 due to loss of light from the dwelling on the boundary, however these have been overcome by the amended design.
- 6.11 For future occupiers it is considered that there is adequate private amenity space.
- 6.12 On balance the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity and is in accordance with policies BE2 and H2 of the Local Plan 2011.

Ecology

- 6.13 A survey has been submitted with the application which concludes that no evidence of protected species was found. On this basis, and further to consultation with the

Natural England, the proposed development would not be of harm to any population of protected species and would be in accordance with policy NE15 of the Local Plan and the guidance produced by Natural England.

Highways and parking

- 6.14 At the time of agenda preparation the comments from the Highway Authority had not been received. However, no objections were received on the previous application and no material changes have occurred on Church Road since that time so the recommendation is likely to be one of no objection subject to condition.
- 6.15 Members will receive an update either in the additional representations report or verbally at the committee meeting.

Conclusions

- 6.16 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2 That the development be carried out in accordance with the plans accompanying the application.
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no extension shall be constructed.
REASON: To avoid over-development in an area of high density housing. (Policy BE2 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)
- 4 The roof(s) shall be covered with plain tiles, a sample of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.
REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area. (Policy BE2 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)
- 5 The external walls shall be rendered in accordance with a sample panel which shall be laid on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences and which shall thereafter be retained on site until the development is completed.
REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area. (Policy BE2 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)
- 6 Notwithstanding details contained in the application, detailed specifications and drawings of all {{wall plinths/bases, external doors, windows (including cills and

heads), eaves/verges, ridges, chimneys and rainwater goods}} at a scale of not less than 1:20 including details of external finishes and colours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the architectural detailing of the buildings reflects the established character of the area. (Policy BE2 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)

- 7 The window and door frames shall be recessed a minimum distance of 75mm from the face of the building unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the architectural detailing of the building reflects the established character of the locality. (Policy BE of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)

- 8 That, prior to the commencement of development, a full surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the size, position and construction of the drainage scheme and results of soakage tests carried out at the site to demonstrate the infiltration rate. <Where appropriate the details shall include a management plan setting out the maintenance of the drainage asset.> The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained in accordance with the management plan thereafter.

REASON: To ensure the proper provision for surface water drainage and/ or to ensure flooding is not exacerbated in the locality (The West Oxfordshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, National Planning Policy Framework and the supporting Technical Guidance).

- 9 Bat and bird boxes shall be installed in accordance with the submitted details before occupation of the development.

REASON: To safeguard and enhance biodiversity. (Policy NE13 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011).

- 10 No materials, machinery or plant shall be stored or disposed of within the boundary of the Long Hanborough Gravel Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

REASON: (Policy NE13 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011).

NOTES TO APPLICANT

- 1 There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.
- 2 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the

design of the proposed development.

- 3 The Surface Water Drainage scheme should, where possible, incorporate Sustainable Drainage Techniques in order to ensure compliance with the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.
Where communal drainage schemes are proposed approval of the scheme will be required from Oxfordshire County Council and the scheme will need to be adopted under the Flood and Water Management Act.

I4/0927/P/FP Holywell Barn Asthall	
Date	23/06/2014
Officer	Abby Fettes
Officer Recommendation	Provisional Approval
Parish	ASTHAL
Grid Ref:	429289,211719

APPLICATION DETAILS

Conversion of barn to holiday let with associated works.

APPLICANT

Mr Anthony Lewis, Yiangou Architects Ltd, 3 Dyer House, Dyer Street, Cirencester, Glos, GL7 2PP

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The application seeks planning permission for the conversion of a former agricultural barn to a dwelling to be used as a holiday let. The application relates to a stone barn located in an isolated open countryside location and within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site is located approximately 1.2 kilometres to the east of Swinbrook and 1.15 kilometres to the north east of Asthall. The site is accessed via a network of largely single track roads.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.1 Members may recall that a recent application seeking use of the building as an unrestricted dwelling was withdrawn having been scheduled for refusal on the following grounds:
- 1.2 *That the proposed development would result in a provision of a dwelling in an undesirable unsustainable open countryside location with no access to services and facilities by means other than the private car. Furthermore, the applicant has not demonstrated that the alternative uses which would support the rural economy and would be more suitable to the rural location can be provided. The development is therefore considered contrary to Policy H10 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

2 CONSTRAINTS

- 2.1 The site lies in the AONB and Barn Owls are noted as present in the area

3 CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1. Asthall Parish:

No response to date.

3.2 OCC:

No response to date in full and rest summarised.

4 REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 None received to date. Consultation period expires 24/7/2014

5 APPLICANT'S CASE

5.1 The applicant has provided the following documents in support of their application which have the conclusions or summaries detailed below:

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment:

5.2 Overall, the Visual Effects of the proposals are generally considered to be of **negligible significance** with only **slight adverse effects** on limited and very local vantage points.

5.3 In conclusion, this LVIA finds that the very low level of change and potential harm to the AONB landscape would be balanced by the proposed landscape enhancements to the extent that there would in time be a benefit to scenic, cultural, wildlife and landscape interests, as required by the location's AONB designation.

Ecology Report:

5.4 Given the absence of any impact on the bat roost, no further surveys or mitigation measures were considered necessary, and a licence from Natural England will not be required.

5.5 This is based on the view that proposed activity is reasonably unlikely to result in an offence under Regulation 39 or 43 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations 2010, (the Habitats Regulations), which defines 'European protected species of animals'.

5.6 To compensate for the loss of the Barn Owl roost site within the main barn, an external nest box will be erected on a nearby Pedunculate Oak tree 15 metres to the southeast of the existing roost site. This will be erected before any works on the building commence.

Structural Report:

5.7 Given the age of the Barns and the probable lack of continuous maintenance, they are in reasonable structural condition. Some work is required to tie the walls of the Main Barn together at the corners, but otherwise the stonework does not require to be re-built. The roofs are also in reasonable condition, with only minor repairs being required.

5.8 The most extensive work will be to underpin the footings which, at 300mm below ground level, are too shallow. Traditional mass concrete underpinning, to a depth of 750mm will be satisfactory. This is a very straightforward process involving a limited

excavation under the external walls of the building. Each pin would be about 1m long. Care will be taken to ensure that the building walls are not destabilised by this process. On the basis of our inspection, there is every reason to suppose that the building can be successfully underpinned without the need for significant reconstruction works.

5.9 The conversion work will involve, in the Main Barn, the introduction of a first floor. This will provide sufficient lateral stability to the walls to the point where the bulge in the southern elevation will not need to be removed and reconstructed.

5.10 Design and Access Statement

- existing building makes a positive contribution to area
- principal barn is to be retained as dominant structure
- few new openings are proposed amenity space will be contained
- access will be improved
- setting will be enhanced
- roof will be reclaimed welsh slates
- glazed screens will be recessed

5.11 Planning Statement

- building is proposed as holiday let
- TLC2 and BE10 are complied with
- if left unconverted they will decay
- only a modest extension is proposed
- will make an efficient use of a traditional building and accord to policy

6 **POLICY**

6.1 It is considered that Policy TLC2 of the WOLP and the advice of the NPPF are of most relevance along with:

- BE2 (General Development Standards),
- BE3 (Provision for Movement and Parking),
- BE10 (Conversion of Unlisted Vernacular Buildings),
- NE4 (Cotswolds AONB),
- NE15 (Protected Species),
- H2 (General Residential Development Standards), and
- H10 (Conversion of Existing Buildings in the Open Countryside).

7 **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

7.1 Taking into account the representations of planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the main issues are considered to be:

- Principle;
- Impact upon the character of the AONB;
- Impact upon ecology; and
- Impact upon highway safety.

Principle

- 7.2 In considering the principle of the development officers would have regard to the provision of the West Oxfordshire local Plan 2011 and the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 7.3 In assessing the merits of this application it is clearly important to distinguish between the policy context applying to unrestricted residential dwellings and that which applies to holiday lets. By way of background a number of agents have sought to argue that policy H10 should not be used in respect of the assessment of applications for barn conversions to residential use. In particular it is argued:
- i) that the sequential test in H10 of non-residential use in priority to residential use is not reflected in paragraph 55 of the NPPF
 - ii) that the new permitted development rights that allows some barn conversions without the need for full planning consent undermines the principle of seeking to resist residential use, and that
 - iii) the current lack of a full 5 year housing land supply means that as a housing policy H10 should be considered out of date and carry no weight.
- 7.4 Your Officers have taken Counsels opinion regarding these arguments and the outcome is that it is considered that H10, and its sequential approach, can still be afforded weight in determining most such applications
- 7.5 With regards to the first argument, agents understandably focus in on paragraph 55 of the NPPF whereby barn conversions may be considered acceptable as an exception to the usual policies of restraint if they would lead to an enhancement of the setting of the building. However it is clear that the NPPF has to be read as a whole and paragraphs should not be considered in isolation to the rest of the document (as required by Paragraph 14). In that regard paragraph 28 of the NPPF exhorts planning authorities to enable enterprise in rural areas by way of conversion of existing buildings, rural diversification, supporting rural tourism and leisure and providing community facilities. These are exactly the priority uses that H10 seeks to promote and as such this part of policy H10 is still considered relevant and NPPF compliant. This viewpoint is confirmed in that H10 has been cited in 5 recent appeals as being in general conformity with the NPPF and in two of those the sequential test element has been specifically referred to by the Inspector before opining that it is NPPF compliant. The sequential argument that forms the basis of Policy H10 is therefore considered to continue to hold weight notwithstanding paragraph 55 of the NPPF.
- 7.6 With regards to the permitted development argument it is clear that the Government is seeking to be more permissive than was the case before the permitted development right was introduced and decisions should be taken with regard to that intent. That is not to state however that there is a no control retained. The permitted development right only applies in certain specified circumstances and even where it does apply is subject to a prior approval process that has a caveat that such approval may be withheld if the impact of granting consent would make it *'impractical or undesirable'* for the building to move to residential use. Such circumstances might be where the loss of employment or tourism potential or the harms of allowing residential use in terms of urbanising the countryside or unsustainable travel patterns outweigh the benefits of an approval.
- 7.7 The final point relates to the 5 year land supply issue. It is accepted that in the absence of the 5 year land supply adopted Local Plan strategic housing policies carry less weight than would otherwise be the case. There is debate as to whether policy

H10 is a strategic housing policy, but even were that to be considered the case the supply generated by the release of housing under a relaxation of this policy would not materially impact upon the housing supply position. Your officers would thus accept that in the absence of a 5 year supply the policy could be considered out of date but would argue that when taken in the round the provisions of paragraph 28 and 55 of the NPPF mean that the principles which underlie it remain NPPF compliant- as accepted by several different Inspectors in a number of recent appeal decisions.

- 7.8 The above policy context that advocates a range of uses before residential and which is supported by the advice of the NPPF sets the context for the assessment of this application. In particular policies TLC2 and BE10 support tourism use (as now proposed) over and above residential use provided inter alia that the impacts of the conversion are limited
- 7.9 Considering the specifics of this scheme your officers would note that the building is in an open countryside location. On the basis of the comments above, weight can still be applied to the requirements of Policy H10 of the Local Plan which are generally in compliance with the NPPF when considered as a whole. Your officers therefore welcome the consideration of a tourism use in advance of the previously proposed residential use. This is a use which both the Local Plan and the NPPF consider appropriate in locations such as this, particularly for their support of the rural economy (paragraph 28 of the NPPF and E4 and TLC1 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011).
- 7.10 Criteria c) and d) of policy H10 require that the building is capable of accommodating residential without major reconstruction or significant enlargement and that the building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. In your officers opinion the building does make a positive contribution to the character of the area. The application does however, propose significant underpinning works which your Conservation Officers have expressed concern regarding. The structural statement submitted however, is confident that with appropriate measure this work could be carried out without major alteration or reconstruction of the barn.
- 7.11 Your officers note that this application follows a proposal for a new unrestricted dwelling which would not be supported. TLC 2 advises that “in locations where residential development would not normally be permitted the Council will impose planning conditions or seek legal agreements restricting the building to holiday let use. Having regard to the previous application it is considered that a legal agreement would be the most appropriate mechanism to secure ongoing control over the use in this instance.

Design and impact on the AONB

- 7.12 The application proposes conversion of the barn with limited intervention to the main fabric. A lower ‘cart shed’ type element will however, be largely reconstructed with a slightly different form to that which exists now. The barn currently sits in an open landscape and reads as a barn in a prominent location. From the road serving the site, the secondary barn is not prominent. The application proposes the enclosure of the barn in a stone wall with the provision of parking and a timber shed to the front of the site. Whilst the shed will not be visible the stone wall will provide an enclosed form of development which provides for some domestication of the

immediate area. The landscape assessment submitted concludes that the impact upon the wider landscape (the AONB) will be low and that in some cases the development would provide the opportunity to provide an enhancement of the area. From the main public vantage points officers would agree that the development would not be of harm to the character and appearance of the AONB but cannot conclude that the development would lead to an enhancement of the area.

Ecology

7.13 The Local Planning Authority in exercising any of their functions, have a legal duty to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive which identifies 4 main offences for development affecting European Protected Species (EPS).

4. Deliberate capture or killing or injuring of an EPS
5. Deliberate taking or destroying of EPS eggs
6. Deliberate disturbance of a EPS including in particular any disturbance which is likely
 - a) to impair their ability –
 - i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young, or
 - ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or
 - b) to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.
4. Damage or destruction of an EPS breeding site or resting place.

7.14 The application has been submitted with an ecology report which reports the presence of barn owls and a high potential for transitory bats. They conclude that whilst there is potential for bats to using the barn as a habitat, the presence of the barn owls is likely to affect this in reality. They note that the main roost potentials for bats are to be retained as part of the scheme and that replacement owl boxes are to be provided to compensate for the loss of the roost inside the building. It also notes that no license will be required from Natural England to carry out the works.

7.15 On the basis of the submitted information, and that the development would preserve the potential of the barn to provide a habitat for bats your officers consider that the development is in line with the guidance and standing advice provided by Natural England and consider the development is in accordance with policy NE15 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

Highways and parking

7.16 Highways officers have considered the previous application and do not consider that the scheme would give rise to any highway safety concerns. Your officers would agree that the site would be served by adequate parking and that sufficient space would be provided to enable vehicles to enter and turn in a forward gear. Finally, sufficient vision can be achieved at the access point to ensure that there is no harm to other road users. Formal confirmation of this is however awaited.

Conclusions

7.17 In reaching the recommendation in the officers report your officers have had due regard to the key considerations of the application, including planning policy and the previous recommendation for refusal. In your officer's opinion, the application would cause some harm to the landscape, but would not give rise to harm to highway

safety, amenity or ecology (subject to appropriate conditions). In contrast to the recent putative refusal this scheme has a supportive policy context

- 7.18 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits subject to receipt of the views of the Parish Council and County Highways

RECOMMENDATION

Provisional Approval.

14/0969/P/FP Oldner House Bungalow Charlbury Road Chipping Norton	
Date	24/06/2014 07/07/2014
Officer	Cheryl Morley
Officer Recommendation	Grant, subject to conditions
Parish	CHIPPING NORTON
Grid Ref:	432289,225882

APPLICATION DETAILS

Temporary change of use of existing office/studio to accommodation during redevelopment of main dwelling.

APPLICANT

Mr Martin Bushnell, Oldner Hollow, Charlbury Road, Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire, OX7 5XH

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The site is a relatively isolated residential property to the south east of Chipping Norton. It is not within a Conservation Area or the Cotswolds AONB.

The application seeks planning permission for the temporary change of use of an existing office/studio to residential accommodation during the redevelopment of the main dwelling.

The application is brought before the sub committee as Chipping Norton Town Council have objected to the application.

1 PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.1 13/0632/P/FP – Erection of replacement dwelling. Planning permission was granted 10 June 2013.

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Chipping Norton Town Council

“The Town Council objected strongly to this planning application on the grounds of originally being granted permission for a garage and a log store in association with Oldner Hollow House. This has now been developed with planning consent into an office and studio with plumbing and drainage. We are now in receipt of temporary change of use into a dwelling which will set a precedent for a separate dwelling in the future. This is against policy and

wish to avoid change to the eastern approach to Chipping Norton which is also an AONB area.”

3 REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 One property was notified of the application and no representations have been received to date (Consultation deadline 31 July).

4 APPLICANT’S CASE

- 4.1 *“The redevelopment is a self build project and we originally considered asking to site a static caravan as our temporary accommodation, but once it was confirmed we could build the office/studio and encouraged to construct it to habitable standards it seemed to be obvious (and far better) alternative. The office/studio can provide a comfortable environment but quickly revert back to its intended use once the build is complete. I would also confirm that our children have left home, so the accommodation is purely for my wife, our dog and I.”*

5 POLICY

- 5.1 The relevant West Oxfordshire Local Plan policies are considered to be:

Policy BE2 – General Development Standards
Policy H2 – General Residential Development Standards
Policy H4 – Construction of new dwellings in the countryside
H14 – Residential mobile homes

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of the interested parties, your officers consider that the key considerations are:

- Principle
- Residential amenity

Principle

- 6.2 The application seeks consent for the temporary use of an existing building for residential use while the main house is redeveloped.
- 6.3 Policy H14, whilst not strictly related as it refers to temporary mobile homes, does allow for use of mobile homes whilst a new house is under construction. The use of an existing building on site for these purposes is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.4 A condition has been included in the recommendation which states that after completion of application 13/0632/P/FP to replace Oldner House Bungalow or after a timeframe of 2 years (whichever is sooner) the temporary change of use shall be discontinued and the land restored to its former condition. It has also been conditioned to be personal to Mr and Mrs Bushnell. This is to ensure that will not become a separate unit of accommodation which would be contrary to policy H4.
- 6.5 Officers consider that the temporary nature of the proposal accords with Local Plan Policy.

Residential Amenity

- 6.6 The proposed temporary change of use of the existing office/studio to accommodation during redevelopment of the main dwelling will have no adverse effect on neighbouring amenity. The existing building will not be altered from the exterior and therefore there will be no visible change to the existing building.

Conclusions

- 6.7 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The temporary living accommodation hereby permitted shall only be occupied by members of the family at the dwelling house known as Oldner House Bungalow for 2 years from the date of this permission or on completion of the dwelling permitted under application 13/0632/P/FP (whichever is sooner). At that point the use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the building restored to its former condition and use.
REASON: The use is only justified by the special and temporary need for the development.
- 2 That the development be carried out in accordance with the plans and accompanying information submitted with the application.
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

14/0986/P/FP Village Hall Shipton Road Milton Under Wychwood	
Date	04/07/2014 04/07/2014
Officer	Cheryl Morley
Officer Recommendation	Provisional approval
Parish	MILTON UNDER WYCHWOOD
Grid Ref:	426861,218244

APPLICATION DETAILS

Erection of single storey extension to create new bar area.

APPLICANT

Mr Jeff Haine, 13 Poplar Farm Close, Milton Under Wychwood, Oxon, OX7 6LX

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension to create a new bar area to the Village Hall. The application is before committee because the applicant is made by the chairman of Uplands Planning Sub Committee and Local Ward Member.

I PLANNING HISTORY

1.1 No relevant planning history

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Milton under Wychwood Parish Council

No comments received to date (Consultation deadline 4th August).

2.2 OCC Highways

No comments received to date (Consultation deadline 4th August).

3 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Twelve properties were notified of the application and no representations have been received to date (Consultation deadline 4th August).

4 APPLICANT'S CASE

4.1 The primary objectives:-

- The principle of the proposal is to improve the existing building;
- The extension of this building will not affect adversely the character of the existing building, including architectural style, scale and height;
- The plans comply where appropriate with the requirement for access, with ease of movement around the site and within the building to meet current building regulations – Part M

5 POLICY

5.1 The relevant West Oxfordshire Local Plan policies are considered to be:

Policy BE2 – General Development Standards.

Policy NE4 – Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

6 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

6.1 Taking into account the representations of the interested parties, planning policy and other material considerations, your officers consider that the key considerations of the application are:

- neighbouring amenity;
- the impact on the street scene; and
- highway safety.

Principle

6.2 The proposed development, due to its position would have no impact upon any neighbouring property. To the west side of the site there is a large 2 storey gable end building and to the east of the site there is a semi detached bungalow with vehicular access from Shipton Road. The North side of the site is located along Shipton Road which comprises of large two storey houses with gable fronted across

the road. To the South of the site are the back gardens of other dwellings separated by a 2m hedge to the boundary.

Residential Amenity

- 6.3 The single storey extension will be well screened by the 2m high hedge from the south side and therefore would not cause any adverse effects to neighbouring properties to this side. The extension would be visible from the street scene but it is considered appropriate in design and scale to the existing building and therefore would not cause any harm to the surrounding area.

Highways and parking

- 6.4 At the time of agenda preparation the comments from Highway Authority had not been received. Officers will update members at the meeting.

Conclusions

- 6.5 In light of these observations, having considered the relevant planning policies and all other material considerations, your officers consider that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits, subject to no substantive issues being raised during the publicity period.

RECOMMENDATION

Provisional Approval.