

Balliol Farm 15/01999/OUT. Objection comments Lucinda Rumsey

As a resident in Tackley for 20 years, I am here to speak for the many villagers who are alarmed and angry at this proposal to build 70 houses on Balliol Farm, a proposed development contrary to the spirit and letter of the incoming local plan.

These are some of our concerns.

Your committee has recently approved a proposal to build 26 houses in the middle of the village at Street Farm. These two applications together would increase the size of Tackley by 25%. Tackley would also be taking in one year 25% of the windfall allowance of housing for the next 15 years for the whole of this sub area. As under the draft local plan Tackley is not scheduled for any significant development, this seems an unfair burden on the village.

2. An estate of this size would have an impact on sewage, surface water and services which are already under strain in the village. Those of us who have paddled through sewage near Tackley village school know how real problems of surface water and sewage are for us, and we remain unconvinced by the proposals for dealing with this under the proposed application.

3. Those of us who live in the village also know the growing traffic problems we have, hugely underestimated by the local highways authority. More than 140 cars from the proposed development would exit on a busy corner where children wait for the school bus.

4. The developers promise that this estate would add much needed stock of small houses. Small houses are not rare in Tackley, and we have many young families in the village. I live in Nethercote Road which is mainly two bedroom cottages, and there are many similar small houses and bungalows in the village, including low cost housing. The development recently passed at Street farm will also increase low cost housing stocks.

5. The developers suggest that a railway bridge might be built partly on Balliol Farm land. This proposal is widely viewed in the village as a highly inconvenient spot for a bridge, even if building it were in the gift of the developers, which it is not. Private developers don't get to decide the siting of railway bridges.

6. The negative impact of this proposed estate on the feel and character of the village would be irreversible. The site is a hillside rising above the basin in which Tackley lies. Any development would be seen all over the village, and would directly impact the listed buildings and conservation area immediately below it and overshadow the low level bungalows in Balliol close next to it, destroying their outlook and privacy.

7. Finally, Barwood homes promise that the development would bring an improvement to wildlife and biodiversity. In our view building over a field does not enhance wildlife and biodiversity, it destroys it. If this estate were to be built we think the only increase in wildlife would be the mosquitos in the proposed balancing pond next to our gardens. The loss of green environment, the noise and light pollution would ensure that we no longer find dozens of slowworms on my neighbour's compost heap, no longer see bats flying over our gardens in the evening, and the hill of Balliol Farm bathed in sunlight would no longer be seen all over the village. That would be a great loss to Tackley. We ask you not to approve this proposal.

Tackley – Committee Notes 7th September 2015

Thank you Chair.

I would urge you to support your Officers in their recommendation to Committee. The scheme has been well conceived by my client, and they have taken considerable time to engage with the local community to understand what is required locally by any new development. This has resulted in 37 letters of support to balance those against. In my experience it's unusual to get people to take the time to write in support new development, the motivation is usually provided by objection.

In those letters of support, you will find one from a young woman in Carterton, who grew up in Tackley and is desperate to return, but can't get on the housing ladder, you will find people looking to 'downsize' who wish to stay locally, from a couple whose husband works and whose 2 children attend the local primary school who urge you to grant permission, you will find support for the affordable housing the development delivers, and for the new residents who will boost the local school numbers, and from those that see this limited growth as a way of maintaining the health of the local community so that it continues to thrive, with new customers for the shop, and public house and children for the school.

We know that some residents have concerns about the scale of the development, but since the SHLAA was produced a number of significant changes have occurred. Firstly, the site has had the benefit of developer expertise and overview, such that the previously presumed SHLAA capacity of 120 units has been reduced to only 70.

Detailed analysis of the local topography and landscape has established a maximum build height, such that the upper parts of the site remain undeveloped so there is no 'breaking of the sky line' in medium and distant views. This level of analysis was not previously available when the SHLAA findings were considered.

Detailed Heritage analysis has established the relationship between this site, the adjacent Conservation Area, and other Heritage Assets in the village, to ensure that their significance is not materially harmed. And specific local concerns about drainage capacity have been addressed through the detailed drainage strategy proposed, which will result in an overall benefit to the current position.

There are of course the 'normal' benefits that come with the grant of permission, market housing provision against a constrained supply, play space facilities, New Homes Bonus (£0.65m), future Council Tax Revenues, but specifically at Tackley there are also opportunities for development to be served by the existing rail station, and bus services, providing genuine alternatives to private car travel, especially for the 'commuter run' into Oxford, and also for enhancement to the local footpath/Bridleway network.

Members this is, as I mentioned in opening, a well-conceived and well-designed scheme, bringing a much needed boost to housing supply both locally, and as part of the District wide provision. Your officers have recommended approval and I would urge you to support them.

15/02069/FUL G Lambrick

We are trying to resolve a serious parking and traffic problem not of our making.

Our scheme respects its surroundings – it is of modest size; in keeping with the local hedged landscape and other areas taken out of cultivation to aid conservation or amenity; it has an emphasis on open grassland habitat creation. Use for parking would be limited to busiest times.

The proposed hedge and planting means only native vegetation would be visible in views across the landscape, even when in use. We reject the officer's claim that it would *detract from the landscape qualities of the area (particularly views from the south) and represent an unwarranted domestic intrusion into open countryside in the AONB.*

It would not lead to proliferation of facilities: this is the antithesis of the Trust's management approach, and would be subject to planning controls anyway.

Setting and Proximity

The officer's report does not consider all the monuments; does not show what aspects of their *heritage significance* would be harmed; or address the benefits of tackling present intrusion.

Since vehicles would not be seen in views of, from or between the monuments, and noise would be no worse, it is not clear how people's experience of the Stones' significance would be harmed.

There are no good grounds to reject Historic England's advice on this.

With respect to general proximity of vehicles to the stone circle, I sent the case officer the indicative layout options now before you, suggesting that a condition requiring agreement on the internal layout would resolve this issue. This would not alter other planning issues or raise any new ones, so I believe it offers a viable way forward.

Highways

Neither the case officer nor highways have commented on the benefits of addressing current parking issues.

Visibility splays clearly are a problem, but Warwickshire's existing lay-bys are even more seriously sub-standard for a 60mph road, as the diagrams presented show.

BOTH the scheme visibility splays AND the existing lay-by safety issues could be resolved under highways regulations with a 30 or 40mph speed limit and closing the west lay-by.

If you approve the scheme with a condition requiring resolution of the highways issues, it would help persuade the highways authority to be more proactive in addressing the current road safety issues.

With increasing visitors and regular primary school visits, we will be campaigning for this in any event. The current situation is intolerable and there is no alternative solution. I therefore urge you to help us make this scheme work.

Planning objection to change of use of Cosy cottage Distons lane

7th September 2015

Ros and Nick Richardson

We live in the Old Tannery and Cosy Cottage is in our drive.

We have summited our objections in writing identifying all the points in the application to which we disagree.

The key reason for objecting to the change of use, is the Parking in Distons Lane which is also the reason why Chipping Norton Town Council strongly object to the change of use. They fully understand the parking difficulties.

Parking is already a serious issue in Distons Lane, and this will increase with the development of the Baptist Church at the top of the lane with 8 new apartments without any parking.

Whilst Cosy cottage is a holiday let guests will only have one small car and can use the allocated space in our drive. Holiday visitors are very unlikely to have visitors and tend to be out a lot of the time.

However permanent residents are much more likely to have visitors who will be wanting to park in the Lane. This can affect us when the lane becomes congested as it makes it difficult for us to get out of our drive, and for the other residents who use our drive to turn round as Distons Lane is a no through road. This will cause problems for the **other** residents of the Lane.

Also the restrictions in the Deeds on the use of the very small Patio area will not be an issue for holiday makers but could be to permanent residents.

I Quote from the Deeds.

“This must not be used for hanging washing or any other purpose other than recreation use and to keep this area in a neat and tidy condition, not to cause any loss, damage, injury, nuisance or inconvenience to the owner of the old Tannery, (This is likely to cause) not to deposit any rubbish on Cosy Cottage or the access way or retrained land, outside

Cosy Cottage, not to block or obstruct any parts of the access way or the retained land.”

WE bought our house in good faith with very clear and restricted deeds and reassurance that the local council would be unlikely to allow the change of use because of the restrictions of the site.

The applicant has made no attempt to let Cosy Cottage as holiday accommodation, although two similar holiday lets in the lane and Church lane have high occupancy and could be let again without problems. Cosy Cottage was purchased knowing this restriction on its use; it is in the Deeds.

We **see** no reason to change the restriction on the Cottage placed on its use in 2006 and hope the committee will reject this application for the benefit of all the residents of Distons Lane.

Appendix E

Thank you Mr Chairman. We are strongly opposed to development on this site for reasons which have been articulated in over 70 letters of objection.

Many of these letters highlight the destruction of the rural approach to the village from the west, the potential loss of EU-protected species, the safety issues relating to the A4095, the strain on schools and the GP surgery. The Planning Officer's solution for the school is to redirect people to Hanborough, and, even worse, for the GP surgery to register out of the area completely. That is not responsible integration with Freeland, it is the creation of a Hanborough suburb and counter to the very idea of sustainability.

Most of us agree there is a wider housing need, but this site, which is not part of the Local Plan, is not suitable or sustainable. You are being asked today to go against the initial decision to the pre-application and decades of similar decisions made by your predecessors concerning this particular site, which incidentally is only one field away on the same road as the Pye Homes development you recently refused. If anything, the reasons for refusal, particularly concerning education and healthcare provision and the environmental damage are even more valid now.

Much as there might be a desire to build, there is more so a duty to protect the quality of village life for our children. The site forms an extremely important green punctuation that defines Freeland as a rural village as indeed highlighted by the SHLAA documents. As the council has recently argued it can readily demonstrate a five-year land supply, speculative, non-sustainable greenfield sites such as this are simply not needed.

The planning statement would have you believe that this is the only way to meet the housing needs of the village, but this is impossible because no such assessment has been done in the village for over 5 years. Moreover, according to email correspondence with the Housing Enabling Manager¹, and despite the statement in the Planning Officer's report, in fact only 1 household with a Freeland connection has registered their housing need with the Council.

The applicant gives the misleading impression that extensive consultation with the village led them to this position, whereas factual evidence suggests that the majority of residents, the Parish Council (and indeed Long Hanborough Parish Council) are against development on this site. Furthermore, the applicant's related application for 8 houses on the same site makes the same assertions and thus directly contradicts this application.

The addendum to the ecological report fails to address Professor Parker's concerns and presents false assumptions. For example, TVERC records, omitted from both reports, reveal the presence of Great Crested Newts that predates the application². It is difficult to see how the Planning Officer can accept the ecologist's report in the absence of proper scientific assessment.

Councillors, we are imploring you for consistency: Similar reasoning was used to refuse the Pye Homes proposal and another at North Leigh.

Please re-assure us the Local Plan is not meaningless, ignore the self-contradictions of the officer's report, and refuse this application, which offers no benefit to the village, only irreversible damage.

Thank you.

Appendix F

Talk by Peter C. Newell (Chairman, Freeland Parish Council)
at planning meeting for 15/02135/OUT,
Land between Wychwood House and Malvern Villas, Witney Road.

This application seeks to build houses on a much-valued greenfield site (Site 269) which currently helps to preserve the rural character of the Village of Freeland.

I would like to make 2 points:

1. The first point is to emphasize that this is an Outline application for Access and "**up to**" 29 houses. There are 14 affordable houses shown in the plan and, *it is important to note that any support that there has been in the Village centres around that affordable provision.*

However, there is no *commitment* in the application to these 29 houses and the detailed plan is described as "**illustrative**" and "**submitted for information purposes only to demonstrate it is capable of being developed in an acceptable and attractive manner**".

So there could be many fewer than 29 houses actually submitted in the Full application and fewer, if any, affordable houses. I note that the forte of the applicant is in building large expensive houses.

So I urge the Committee to be wary of the alluring plans in the current application which show 14 affordable houses all of which are merely illustrative.

In fact, a full application for this site has actually now been submitted and this shows **8 large (5 bedroom) houses - and no affordable housing.**

2. Secondly, I would like to remind the Committee that several attempts have been made to develop this site over the past 30 years: all have been refused.
In 1988 (W88/1255) 69 units - refused.
In 1992 (W91/1576) 25 units with part business use - refused.
and in 2002 (W2002/0574) 2 detached dwellings - refused.

You could argue that all of these applications were more than ten years ago and things have recently changed, but in fact in 2014 Site 269 was considered in the SHLAA for development and "**CONSIDERED NOT SUITABLE**" because there would be "**Significant detrimental impact on the rural approach to Freeland from the West**". *That is only last year!*

So what could have happened to this site since last year to allow the Officer (Catherine Tetlow) to recommend approval and side step the SHLAA so soon??

Possibly the most significant sentence in Catherine's report is this:

"Notwithstanding the SHLAA observations about the site, it is considered that in principle the site could contribute to meeting the windfall allowance for the housing sub-area".

So the recommendation is not derived from the *suitability* of the site for building and the very clear recommendation of the SHLAA against it, but about "*meeting the windfall allowance*".

While I understand the pressures imposed by our current planning climate, I earnestly ask the Committee **not to be pushed into making a thoroughly regrettable decision for the sake of expediency in trying to meet such a windfall allowance.**

Summary of Submission by Dr Huxley

**Application No. 15/02135/OUT – Land Between Wychwood House
and Malvern Villas, Witney Road, Freeland**

Dr Huxley thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to address the meeting and advised that he was representing a group of residents who were in support of the application.

Dr Huxley indicated that the development offered the opportunity for low cost housing that could help younger people stay in the village and the objections raised needed to be balanced against this. Dr Huxley referred to the SHLAA and suggested that the fleeting peripheral view should not be blocked as a result of the proposals.

Dr Huxley highlighted other benefits accruing including provision of a new bus shelter, bus services and some £227,000 of total funding for infrastructure.

In acknowledging objections to the application Dr Huxley suggested that it was difficult to get a full picture as it was not clear if the views of younger people and those supporting the application were fully reflected.

Dr Huxley concluded by indicating that the principle of development was acceptable and reiterated that the provision of affordable housing could benefit many local people.

Objections to Planning Application 15/02620/S73 | Variation of conditions 2 and 4 of application 12/1333/P/FP Condition 2 to be varied to reflect drawings as constructed. Condition 4 to be varied to include window W7 | 1 Upper Brook Hill Woodstock Oxfordshire OX20 1UA

The following are notes to which Mr Andrew Macaulay and Mrs Heloise O'Hagan will be speaking on Monday 7 September. They are both registered to speak and hereby we confirm that they are speaking on behalf of other Objectors including: Mrs Jane Davies (78 Oxford Street), Sarah Williams (72 Oxford Street), Mrs and Mr Lewis (76 Oxford Street), and Mr Paul O'Hagan (82 Oxford Street).

Notes to which the objectors will be speaking

1. Key points general to all

- This is an important matter as evidenced by Mr Hughes and Mr Shaw's decision to put it to your Uplands Committee.
- The added, un-permitted height and the "block"/flat roof design, means that the sheer bulk of the building must be considered.
- The responsibility of developers and architects when introducing a "new" design to a town with the traditions of Woodstock and bearing in mind that this building falls within a conservation area.
- Comparing the building's height to its adjacent neighbours is invalid. Height must be compared to the house it replaced.
- The design of the building as it now presents to neighbouring dwellings, now greatly exacerbated by the increase in height and bulk, is un-neighbourly, monotonous, oppressive and overbearing.
- The lack of frosted glazing on bathroom & bedroom Westerly windows hugely impacts the privacy of neighbouring houses and gardens.

2. Key points to be made by residents of the affected neighbouring dwellings

a. 80 Oxford Street

- No 80 Oxford St is now at eye level to the upper floor of 1 Upper Brook Hill, and once the building of that house had reached its full height it was immediately apparent that it was too high/higher than allowed.
- It also seems clear that all the windows, the lights, all the features and all aspects of the house were raised by the unauthorised increase in the height of the house.

- We are faced with the South-Western corner of the house, which shows the full oppressive mass of the cube. It affects our living in No 80 Oxford St on a daily basis. It is an overpowering, constant and menacing presence, blighting our every day life in the house.
 - Why should we be forced to raise a screen that would cut down our light and sight-lines, and hem us in, in order to hide the unauthorised menacing presence of the newly built house?
- b. *78 Oxford Street*
- The newly-built house is considerably higher than the house it replaced, which, with its pitched roof, stood further away from the garden of No 78.
 - The additional 70 Cubic metres of building, caused by the added height and the rectangular and flat roof design make it hugely bulky and oppressive
 - The very great importance of the gardens to those who live on Oxford Street, and particularly to those from nos. 80 - 70 Oxford Street. There are no front gardens for these houses, so the back gardens are a most important part of the properties and how we enjoy living in them.
 - The South-Western corner of the newly-built house is now looming over the 18th Century garden with its low dry stone walls (*see Image 6 below*). The unpermitted extra height and bulk, and the over-hanging/extended first floor looms threateningly and intrusively over the garden and greatly affects our previous quiet enjoyment on this private haven.
 - Even now, before the house is occupied we find ourselves pressured to use the garden much less, because of the house's over-bearing stance. We are very distressed and saddened by the harm being caused.
 - The full horror is presently masked by the builders' hut. This will soon be coming down. Please see Image 7, an elevated photograph, that shows what it will look like when the hut is gone.
- c. *76 Oxford Street*
- The unpermitted extra height of over 500cms has led to a complete loss of privacy in our small garden, a precious, much-loved and hitherto much-used space. [*See Images 4 & 5 below*]
 - We are overlooked at all times from the looming and overbearing building at 1 Upper Brook Hill.
- d. *72 Oxford Street*
- The extra height of over half a metre has led to:
- A complete loss of any sight lines other than that of the back of this grey, monotonous, overbearing building – had the building been constructed at the permitted height, these sight lines would not have lost [*see Images 1 & 2 below*]
 - A complete loss of privacy in my small garden
 - An oppressive sense of being hemmed in and overlooked at all times, whether in the garden or in any of the rooms with windows looking out on the back of the house [*see Image 3 below*]
- e. *82 Oxford Street (The Octagon House)*

Reference Frosting of Overlooking Bathroom and Bedroom windows (west facing wall). Please refer to diagram [Image 8] below confirming windows in question.

- Considering the notable increased height of the property we are now further overlooked and looked down on from Bathroom and Bedroom windows. They are within 2 meters of our property where we (including our very young children) reside. It should not be my or my wife's responsibility to be accountable for ensuring that my family has no opportunity to witness any private and intimate activities which we all know take place in the Bedroom and Bathroom, directly behind the windows. Neither should the neighbourhood be reliant on any owner (current or future), of the property protecting us from viewing these activities. To note, these are currently, full height windows providing clear and full height views of any residents / guests who use the bedroom and bathroom.
- We should not have to live our daily lives and it should not have to become part of our daily routine to protect ourselves from any potential harm caused by witnessing activities in bedrooms and bathrooms which should not be seen. We ask you to protect us from such harm.
- The Case Officer (Michael Kemp), has also listened to our concerns and has now formally requested (28 August 2015), that the applicant offers to frost the windows to which we refer due to the increased height and subsequent improved view into our property.
- We ask that you also support this request by following a rightful and decent course of action: please refuse the current planning application for this property to allow appropriate conditions to be applied to a subsequent application. This will determine the windows in discussion are permanently frosted, in perpetuity and any potential harm is minimised.

Summary of Submission by Mr Allen

Application No. 15/02620/S73 – 1 Upper Brook Hill, Woodstock

Mr Allen thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to speak and emphasised that the amendments to the scheme were minor.

Mr Allen highlighted that the development was built to a high environmental standard and there had been consultation with the council, Woodstock Town Council and neighbours. It was advised that the foundations were lower than the previous property on the site and the extra thickness of insulation installed had led to the slight increase in height.

Mr Allen clarified that two windows would be obscure glazed and have restricted opening. Mr Allen advised that the internal volume of the building was the same if not less than before and the height of the building was lower than the neighbouring property and was in fact the lowest in the area.

Mr Allen in acknowledging that there was technically a breach reiterated that the increase was minimal and was away from neighbouring properties.