

## Appendix A

- The proposal does not comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it conforms with paragraph 89 of the NPPF, which permits limited infilling. Whilst the District cannot demonstrate a 5 Year Land Supply, it is noted that Local Plan policy NE5 specifically allows for infilling in Bladon.
- Notwithstanding these points, there are a series of very special circumstances which clearly outweigh any potential harm to Green Belt and therefore this proposal meets the test set in the NPPF. The Council's officer's report recognises this.
- The principle of replacing unsightly buildings with this mixed use development is supported locally. Members will be aware that the Leader of the County Council, who lives practically opposite the site, has written in support of the proposal.
- The matters raised by County Highways have been resolved and the provision of affordable homes is supported by the Council's Housing Enabling Manager. Members' attention is drawn to the Housing Manager's reference to the fact that the Council, in collaboration with the Blenheim Estate, has delivered almost 60 new affordable homes in the past four years, all for local people.
- The re-designed scheme, including Plots 1-4, is the result of collaborative working. It fully reflects Council officer input.
- The proposal will support the future maintenance of the World Heritage Site through the payment to the Blenheim Foundation of £220,000. This will contribute to the funding deficit identified in the World Heritage Site Management Plan.
- The proposal forms an attractive addition to the village, entirely in keeping with the Bladon Conservation Area. It brings with it a substantial package of other benefits, including major investment into education and local amenities. It adds significantly to the vitality of Bladon providing jobs in a settlement with very few employment opportunities. It brings important investment and revitalises Bladon, preventing it from becoming solely a commuter village.
- In summary, collaborative working between Officers and the Blenheim Estate has resulted in each of the issues previously raised being resolved to the satisfaction of officers and the outstanding matter referred to being resolved. Members are asked to grant planning permission for this sustainable development.

Thank you, we are both here to answer any questions on points of clarification

WODC Alicia Wild

1

Mr Chairman, Councillors, I'm Alicia Wild. I'm speaking for my husband and myself and for Dr and Mrs Williams of 3 Glovers Close. We live at 36 Crecy Walk. One side of our house is directly opposite the site of the proposed building while the Williams are next door to it at 3 Glovers Close. Plans, and then modified plans for the build, have already been rejected by Woodstock Town Council. About a dozen people have written independently to Town and district councils with over lapping objections. Most letters are on the Planning website. This has a plan of the area that immediately shows how very cramped, the new build would be in relation to other properties in the neighbourhood.

The idea is to demolish a double garage at the bottom of the garden of 1 Glover's Close and to extend across the garden to the boundary fence with no 3. The sides of the two storey house are built on the boundaries of the plot. This would have a tiny garden at the rear. The back of the house badly overlooks the house and garden of 3 Glovers Close. Two rows of three windows approach the apex of the high gabled roof

back and front. Space is gained on the first floor by extending it towards Princes Ride over a parking area that extends to the pavement. The building would be closer to us than the present garage is; a cluster of six high windows would look directly into our kitchen and bedrooms. No other house in the area faces a high gable end, full of windows. The scale and full height of the property would be overbearing compared with the present more open outlook.

Princes Ride is a busy road. Parents park opposite us, to walk children to and from the Primary School. Some letters show residents' concern with potential dangers resulting from building on this corner. We share these views.

To sum up we feel:

That this is an inappropriate building for the area

It invades the privacy of 3 Glovers Close and 36 Crecy Walk

It is sited at a busy traffic corner

Mr Chairman, Members of Committee, now you have seen the drawings and inspected the site you will appreciate the residents concerns - these are that the proposed wide, two storey forward extension of contrasting modern design would result in the following:

1. A substantial change to the appearance of the front elevation of Idlecombe that will destroy the match between the two dwellings of the pair, their linear form and create an imbalance in the current symmetry between them.
2. Idlecombe becoming a noticeable, prominent and incongruous element in the street scene and importantly the conservation area. The officer report contends that the extension is designed to resemble the similar forms along Burditch Bank. As you will have seen on your site visit because of its height, width, bulk and relationship to neighbouring properties this is not the case. The residents also consider that rather than just affecting the 'immediate setting' and therefore not causing a detrimental affect to the conservation area as stated in the officer report it will cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscape in this part of the conservation area.
3. A worsening of the outlook from the windows of Mount Nyssa and Lamorna to the open countryside which is a unique characteristic of this part of the conservation area.
4. An undue sense of enclosure and appear overbearing from Mount Nyssa and High Bank because of the scale and height and the blank east elevation.
5. The front rooms of Lamorna and Mount Nyssa becoming gloomier and generally less pleasant. Afternoon shadow would be cast over the front rooms and front garden of Mount Nyssa and morning shadow over the front rooms and front garden of Lamorna.
6. Further impact and harm to the residential amenities of Lamorna that will result from the conversion of Idlecombe's sitting room window to patio doors and the side entrance to the extension overlooking the main entrance and front garden of Lamorna.
7. The blocking of sight lines to and from High Bank and Mount Nyssa thereby reducing passive surveillance over the front gardens .

As a wide, two storey full height forward extension the residents consider for all the reasons put forward above that the proposal does not meet the all criteria for General Development Standards required by the Design Guide. Furthermore it will cause harm to and fail to preserve or enhance the established character and appearance of

- the host building,
- Burditch Bank,
- the conservation area
- and result in significant and unneighbourly impacts on the residential amenities and cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of Nyssa and Lamorna. In particular the loss of light is contrary to the advice in the Design Guide.

Mr Chairman and Members of Committee, the residents believe the impact of this proposal would be so dramatic that they request the application be refused for the reasons outlined

Thank you.

### Applicants submission to the Upland Area Planning Sub-committee on 5<sup>th</sup> of January 2015 – Application 14/01434/HHD

Mr Chairman, and members of the sub-committee.

As councillors will have seen this morning, the property is located on the edge of the village's Conservation Area and the immediate surrounding context is a row of unremarkable 1960s bungalows. The appearance of the proposal seeks to work with this aesthetic in a complimentary manner. The use of timber cladding helps to tie the extension to the original building. The eaves and ridge heights match the existing, helping the proposal blend in by mirroring the form of the vast majority of bungalows to the left and right.

In fact, the size and proportions of the proposed extension is in keeping with the existing forward projecting gables on 5 of the other 6 bungalows, being the same width and less depth than the gable next door – Mount Nyssa. Designed to resemble these bungalows, to quote your officers “the extension will be in keeping with the surrounding street scene and no detriment to the existing form and design”. It therefore complies with appendix 4 of the WODC design guide and is consistent with paragraph 60 of the NPPF. It is my opinion that the extension would enhance the look of the pair of semi-detached bungalows rather than detract from it.

Your officers have fully noted the concerns of the nearest residents and that they will not be materially affected in terms of loss of light or privacy. The effect on passive surveillance will be negligible, given their recessed position and the screening already caused by vegetation at High Bank and the front gable at Mount Nyssa.

As you will have seen this morning, the view from the adjacent properties is only marginally affected by the proposed extension at the edge of their panorama. This is supported by the photograph submitted by Ms. Stradling, whose front garden contains a large flowering cherry tree that obstructs a much greater proportion of her view. However, as noted by your officers and the WODC planning criteria, loss of view at a private property is not a consideration in assessing a planning application.

In light of all their 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. I respectfully request that you accept their report and grant this application.

M. Barnicoat. 05/01/2015.

### **Jon Gordon to Uplands Planning Committee 5 Jan 2015**

There is a single row of bungalows on one edge of a 10 acre field and the applicant wants to build a house on agricultural land behind the existing bungalows. He has applied with an identical plan in 2006 and 2009 and on appeal. All were refused. The same reasons were given in each case, two remain relevant to this application:

1. The proposed dwelling will extend the built form of the environment into the open countryside
2. Precedent is a significant adverse impact arising from this proposal, locally and particularly in its effect on the protection of the AONB throughout the district.

The applicant has made attempts to try and make this part of the field look as though it isn't a part of the field, by planting rows of leylandii, putting in large areas of hard standing and by extending his garden a long way into an agricultural field. Obviously hoping that someday someone would not be able to see the field for the trees. But in 2006 and 2009 the council and the inspector saw clearly that the site has an affinity with the open countryside not the built environment. This hasn't changed.

The NPPF. Regardless of whether the District meets a defensible housing target or not, a full reading of the NPPF requires that development is sustainable and that adverse impacts do not significantly outweigh benefits. The benefits of this proposal are very small, however measured, and the adverse impacts, erosion of the countryside and precedent in particular, are very significant.

The pressure to find suitable sites for new housing in the district means that it is inevitable that some houses will have to be built in areas previously protected from housing. There will be developments where significant economic and/or social benefits can be brought into the balance against the adverse impacts on protected countryside. These will be subject to the most thorough examination and stringent controls. Developments like this proposal, however, nibble away at the countryside in what seems like an innocuous fashion but bring in their train the huge weight of precedent which is often uncontrollable and whose effects are cumulative.

Because of its effect on the environment in the widest sense and the effects of precedent this is not sustainable development.

As regards the detail of the application, Mr Elkins has asked me to point out that

- The drawings are from 2009 and do not relate to the site as it is, The ownership boundaries are wrong, An existing gravel drive is not shown, Rows of Leylandii on the perimeter of the site are not shown
- The plans for the bungalow show that it will be 2m higher than other bungalows in Brook Lane.
- Access will involve driving close to the boundary on all four sides of an existing house.



**West Oxfordshire Planning Committee – 5<sup>th</sup> January 2015**

**Application number – 14/01443/FUL**

**Site address – Land adjacent to Tyne Lodge, 2 Brook Lane, Stonesfield, Witney, Oxfordshire, OX29 8PR**

Chairman, Members, good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today which I do on behalf of the landowner of the site adjacent to Tyne Lodge at Brook Lane in Stonesfield.

Naturally, I support the recommendation of your officer and so I will try to keep my comments brief.

Your officer notes that it is necessary to have regard to the provisions of the NPPF given that the Local Plan, including Policy H6, is out of date. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF, which allows for new housing in rural areas, sets a different policy context to that contained in Local Plan Policy H6. The policy position has therefore changed since the previous appeal was determined and the direction of travel is towards a more flexible approach to development adjoining the larger settlements in the district.

In terms of the proposal's merits, Stonesfield represents a sustainable location for some new development and the application site is well related to the village, being immediately adjacent to its edge. It would not therefore be an isolated form of development.

The rear boundaries of properties in this location do not form a regular and readily identifiable interface with the agricultural land beyond and the properties to the north of the site are set much further back than those to the west. The site therefore sits within a corner formed by the existing curtilages of neighbours.

The position of the site and its relationship with the existing dwellings and their gardens significantly reduces its contribution to the agricultural character of the wider landscape. Moreover, given the characteristics of this small parcel, the site does not contribute significantly to the agricultural character in this location.

The design of the chalet bungalow responds well to the local vernacular and the simple form is acceptable in design terms. Your officer has confirmed that there would be no material harm to the Cotswolds AONB or the Stonesfield Conservation Area.

The building would not be sited in close proximity to neighbouring dwellings and therefore there would not be an unacceptable impact on privacy or general amenity.

It is worth noting that this application has been submitted on behalf of a Stonesfield resident and that the chalet bungalow will be occupied by his son. The development will therefore meet a local housing need.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable. I hope that you will endorse your officer's recommendation and approve the application.

Thank you.