

## Appendix A

We both speak on behalf of the Penhurst Liaison Group, representing the residents most affected by this development. Our concerns are specific to the Porthaven care home element of the development.

I have two points to make.

Firstly, a building on this scale is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area. In height and in horizontal extent, it vastly exceeds any existing building being demolished and significantly changes the skyline. Being adjacent to the site boundary, its bulk is oppressive with respect to 34 Diston's Lane, Iona and the churchyard. The barricading effect of the long north/south roof line and, conspicuously, the three-storey extension rising *above* the main roof, will lead to loss of daylight for the said properties – especially evening sunlight.

Secondly, the building's appearance is dominated by its large roof pitches, again unsympathetic to the conservation area. For example – as far as can be judged from the un-dimensioned drawings – the proposed building is 5.2m to the eaves on its eastern elevation. The main north/south roof line adds 4.4m to this height and the third storey extension adds a further 2.1m, not including chimneys. Top-heavy, you might say.

1. The proposed structure is considerably taller than any of the buildings it is to replace and would only be 50 metres from a Grade 1 listed Church and only 20 metres from the graveyard. We understand that English Heritage have not been notified of this application which we believe contravenes Planning Regulations. A note of this listing is contained in the Council's own 'Archaeological and Heritage Assessment'.

2. I again request that the Committee insist that the 3<sup>rd</sup> storey, which would massively dominate the skyline, be removed as recommended by Chipping Norton Town Council.

3. At present it is impossible for anyone looking at the plans or visiting the site to determine the height of the proposed structure because eaves and roof heights have not been provided. Surely, a planning application is incomplete without these dimensions. We request that any future application not only includes Datum heights at all levels but a Storey Rod or temporary structure be provided clearly showing this very important information for all to see and in addition, request that these be maintained and checked at various stages of the construction.

4. We have noted from the plans that a retaining wall is to be constructed through roots of a large protected Copper Beech tree. This will undoubtedly distress the tree and affect the privacy for residents of the Care Home and Distons Lane alike.

Thank you.

Summary of Submission by Mr Thompson

Mr Thompson introduced himself and advised that he was Managing Director of Beechcroft Developments.

Mr Thompson outlined the merits of the scheme and suggested that the development would replace buildings that were currently an eyesore. Mr Thompson advised that the scheme was attractive and provided a range of accommodation in accordance with the Local Plan and the needs of an ageing population. It was indicated that the proposals would be of a C2 which was the same as currently on the site.

Mr Thompson confirmed that there had been consultation and discussions with the local community and changes had been made to the plans to mitigate the impact on the area. Mr Thompson highlighted that the part of the development closest to Diston's Lane was single storey. It was further indicated that the height of the development did not exceed that of the current sports hall on the site and in any event conditions could be imposed to restrict the height.

Mr Thompson referred to objections from the town council regarding parking and drew attention to the fact there was no highway objections from the county council. It was further suggested that the trees on site could be preserved as part of the development.

Mr Thompson urged the sub-committee to support the officer recommendation of approval.

## Appendix C

To: West Oxfordshire District Council Planning Committee

Re: Ker family objection to Reeves Barn Planning Application 14/08333/P/FP.

There are 3 significant points of objection to the proposed application.

1. **Vehicle access**, which has been raised by Oxfordshire Highways as a cause of concern. In what is a very confined space there is already a taxi business and three dwellings, one of which is a holiday let. A fourth residence would substantially increase vehicle movements from a shared drive, further compromising road traffic safety on the brow of a steep hill where visibility is poor and where pedestrian access by school children to The Firs is required.
2. **Overdevelopment**. This would be the fourth dwelling in a confined space.
3. **Overlook from the proposed roof terrace is our principal objection**. This was the main point of contention with respect to the previous application which was withdrawn following advice from Dawn Brodie. The revised submission tinkers with minor details but has not addressed the issue of overlook. The proposed roof terrace is 4.2m high - figures supplied by the architect. This means that an average-height person standing on it has a 5.9m metre vantage point – nearly 19 feet - over The Firs, just a few feet from the boundary wall, with a direct line of sight into The Firs master bedroom, side return, and most of the garden. The proposed 1.5m high side walls are inadequate and don't prevent the above mentioned overlook.

The owners of Reeves Barn have recently acquired land so they have been able to incorporate both a garden and garden terrace into the design of the proposed dwelling. Therefore the roof terrace - the main point of this objection - is unnecessary. The Reeves Barn garden and garden terrace afford ample opportunity to enjoy the view of the surrounding countryside, without the need to create a vantage point over a neighbour's intimacy. A roof terrace would compromise the privacy of the inhabitants of The Firs in their own garden.

When this committee approved the plans for The Firs, they were conditioned on windows more than 10 metres from a neighbour's boundary being fixed shut and opaque-glazed. The Reeves Barn application includes secondary dining room windows - just two feet from the boundary - that are clear-glazed and open.

There is currently no overlook from Reeves Barn towards The Firs. The window in the existing garage referred to on page 32, paragraph 6.9 of the agenda, is part of a shed belonging to The Firs. From its existing internal-facing, closed-courtyard style, the new dwelling proposes to situate a roof terrace and 2 windows just a few feet from the shared

boundary: the resulting overlook onto The Firs is real and a source of great anxiety to our family.

If the committee is minded to accept the development, we request that the application is made conditional on the roof terrace being omitted and on the side windows being fixed shut.

## Appendix D

This is an application for a new dwelling on the site of the existing garages and storage buildings at Reeves Barn.

The site was originally granted permission for two houses in 2005 (ref 05/2248/P/FP) and a further application was submitted and subsequently built to form "Abbeywell" the adjacent new house.

The owners of Reeves Barn, who will live in this new garden house have lived in Charlbury for many years and are long-term residents, who have an interest in the whole area. The current owner and his father before him have employed many people in the dairy site since 1955

The new dwelling will consist of a low-level two-storey agricultural style building of natural stone under a slate roof with a simple single storey off shoot into the garden.

The principle structure will be parallel to Reeves Barn and will be of a similar scale yet subservient to the original house. The use of natural stone at this location enhances the site and reflects the nature of the historic farmyard that has previously occupied the site.

The remaining area of the courtyard is to be divided to create large garden and amenity area for Reeves Barn with parking and turning areas for the vehicles.

The benefits of the development are that Reeves Barn will gain a substantial garden and amenity area that had been lost through the development of the dairy operation many years ago.

The new garden for Reeves Barn will be fully enclosed with a close-boarded fence and be raised above the ground floor levels of the new house.

The new dwelling has been designed so that no openings will allow overlooking of the new Reeves Barn garden and views from the principle rooms are either, long-range views, across the valley or to the rear garden and side yard area

The garden of the new house is to be enclosed with a close-boarded fence (part of which is existing) and forms the boundary with Dairy Court. The fencing is to be extended along the South Western boundary and to be reinforced with suitable planting.

The Northern boundary is currently a simple post and rail fence, which is to be enhanced with hedging planting. We note The Kers have already planted a substantial hedge mix along the whole boundary.

The newly formed yard area adjacent to the utility rooms will be enclosed by the new fence and wall to Reeves Barn and the existing 1.8M stone wall to the Firs.

A new gently curved retaining wall faced in natural stone is to be constructed within the garden (as shown on the Block Plan). The retained area will be levelled to form a lawn, surrounded by low-level hedges, accessed from the dining and living rooms. Access to the lower garden area will be via a stepped pathway along the Northern boundary.

This new area will be slightly raised to match the adjacent property of Dairy Court but will allow the occupiers to fully use the garden for their enjoyment.

The new proposal will create a new house in a location that has the full support of the Planning Authority and that will answer all the concerns of the Highways department to ensure safe and convenient parking is created for Reeves Barn and the new garden house.

Summary of Submission by Mr Warren

Mr Warren introduced himself and advised that he had lived at Langley since 1991 and highlighted the history of the site.

Mr Warren indicated that when TWR had originally been at the site a number of conditions had been imposed. Subsequently there had been a number of applications on the site. It was emphasised that the site was B1 use and protection was needed from the noise issues emanating from the factory.

Mr Warren highlighted the large number of objections that had been submitted in respect of applications at the site. Mr Warren advised that enforcement of the breaches had been requested.

Mr Warren requested that the sub-committee refuse the application but in the event that approval was given asked if the hours could be amended as 06:00 to 22:00 six days a week was considered unacceptable. Mr Warren suggested that 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on a Saturday would be better for local residents.

Summary of Submission by Mr Bushnell

Mr Bushnell introduced himself and clarified that the additional representation regarding a caravan on the site related to a small touring unit that the family used.

Mr Bushnell advised that he had moved to the site two years ago and had gained permission to redevelop the site to provide a new dwelling. Mr Bushnell clarified that this application sought to provide somewhere to live in an existing outbuilding whilst the new property was built rather than having a large caravan or temporary building on site.

Mr Bushnell outlined that the outbuilding was only 20 metres or so from the main dwelling and would provide a base whilst he managed the redevelopment of the existing property. Mr Bushnell expressed his disappointment that objections had been made to the plans.

Mr Bushnell suggested it was a fair and reasonable proposal and urged the sub-committee to support the recommendation of approval.