

Bruern Stable Yard, Bruern: 15/01910/S73
15/02077/S73

SPEAKING NOTES

Introduction

- Thank you for allowing us to address you this afternoon.
- I am Mike Taylor from CCL representing the Bruern Trust who are owners and operators of Bruern Holiday Cottages.
- Bruern have been operating holiday accommodation on the application site since 1992 and currently have **12** holiday letting units.
- **6** units are bound by a planning condition that restricts their use for holiday letting purposes. The other **6** are unfettered.

Background

- Bruern has faced continued trading difficulties in lettering self-catering holiday units over many years.
- Financial difficulties/challenges for the Business are set out in Section 5 (**p.23** of CCL report shows letting turnover and P/L for last decade).
- A significant decline in overall turnover (especially since 2008 and notably a greater decrease in 2012, 2013 and 2014).
- The audited business accounts show losses in **7 of last 10 years** with losses of **£22,000; £59,000 and £157,000** in past 3 years.
- Occupation rates average range from 79% down to 62% (average 72%) over last 6 years. I.e some units are empty for 30-40% of the time! In our view this is not tenable for long term business viability.

- Your officer's view is that the occupancy levels are a 'good rate of occupancy' but this fails to take into account the increasing costs of running the business; the fact that losses are being incurred each year and have worsened; and the changing market circumstances with declining demand for non-serviced accommodation and far greater competition and market supply over time.

Reasons for Change

- We are therefore seeking to remove the restrictions to **allow greater flexibility** to manage and use the business assets. This will allow us to:
 - protect existing employment on site (**over 30** employees)
 - continue to operate the business and make best use of all its assets in a responsive and effective way, reflecting the market conditions
 - support sustainability of the business in accordance with the NPPF (para 19) to ensure economic prosperity and job growth
- A smaller number of better performing holiday accommodation units will enhance the ability to operate a sustainable business and focus on increasing occupancy and letting revenues
- A more flexible approach would **not** lead to an adverse impact on the character, amenity or operation of the whole site which will remain actively managed and maintained by Bruern as it is now.

Residential Use

- Your officer's view is that change by removing the conditions would create new housing.
- The proposal would indeed represent a **modest** increase in residential supply in the District and in a location at Bruern where there are already residential uses in the settlement.
- There would be no change to the character of the wider site or how it is managed. The quality, character and appearance of the whole site is **essential** for Bruern to maintain.

Alternative Uses

- The individual units have not been marketed for sale for holiday let purposes as this would involve breaking the business up rather than managing and using all of the assets available. In addition, Bruern Trust that is accountable for the business overall cannot dissipate the business assets under its terms of operation.
- Bruern has **every wish to continue to operate** the holiday lettings business and to manage the whole site at a very high quality level. Non-residential uses (such as workshops, offices, or similar) would not fit with the ongoing management of the whole site and would potentially disrupt the operation of the holiday letting business.

Conclusion

- We note that there have been no objections raised against the proposal and that your officer's report indicates that there are no highways, design or residential amenity implications.
- We believe the change proposed will benefit Bruern by helping secure the long-term viability of the holiday accommodation business overall; by making best use of existing buildings in a way that is compatible with the existing use and character of the site; and by supporting this local business to continue to offer a significant level of jobs in the area.
- We respectfully ask that the Committee grant planning permission and allow the removal of the restrictive condition to ensure the business can have a greater prospect of future viability.

Mike Taylor

Director, Chilmark Consulting Ltd.

2nd November 2015

This proposed out building is very large for the site, overbearing and unsightly.

On your visit, you will have seen that the building will be on an existing hardstanding area which is raised 0.3 metres at the one end and 0.6 metres at the other, half a metre from my boundary. These raised levels are not indicated on the applicant's diagram. The average height next to my fence will be 4 metres, making the walls of the building excessively high and very long.

The building will have 42 square metres of flat roof, which is the same as the average two storey house, but there is no drainage. In a south west storm, the water will spill from the roof down my drive, making it slippery and icy in frosty weather. There should have been an environmental assessment, particularly for drainage.

The report says that the building will be obscured from the front by existing trees and by a hedge from the adjoining properties. As those of you who visited the site will have seen, there is only one tree and some low bushes at the road side end.

I put up some height poles and marker string to indicate the view of the building from my garden, and the view from the front garden of no 32. The heights of the poles were accurate and I invited the case officer to measure them, but he went away without doing so. As you will have seen, this monstrous building will overwhelm the garden of number 32 and be very unsightly from my front garden at number 32A. It will be one large mass of wooden boarding clearly visible from the road.

All this does make it detrimental to the amenities of my property at 32A and to no 32.

If the applicant wants to build this monstrous building, there is plenty of room to put it on the other side of the driveway, away from the neighbours and further up from the public road.

This very large, overbearing eyesore is not in keeping with an area of outstanding landscape value. It will also be unsightly and overbearing on neighbours. This is not a typical car port; it is a stand-alone caravan shed. There is no other similar building of this enormity in this position anywhere in Woodstock.

Please reject it.

Dr Ivor Lloyd.

2 November 2015

Comments on planning application 15/02852/HHD

Professor Simon Gregson, 17 High Street, Shipton-under-Wychwood, Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire

Thank you for the chance to comment on the proposals for development of this semi-detached house which directly adjoins my own Listed property.

I understand from the Council's website that material planning considerations include the following:

1. Scale of development
2. Design, appearance and layout
3. Overshadowing and loss of light
4. Overlooking and loss of privacy

I have serious concerns on all of these points.

Scale of development

Design, appearance and layout

Overshadowing and loss of light

My main objection is that the proposed development is much too big. To me, there is no doubt that it will have a highly detrimental impact on our Listed property and its setting.

The high-ridged element is a large and dominating mass that runs right along the side of our property. Despite requests, no drawing showing the current view from our property has been provided for comparison, and the height of the existing boundary wall is not shown on the plans. However, it is clear that the new structure will be 2-3 times higher than the existing wall and, therefore, will be totally overbearing and will dramatically overshadow the rear of our property. I can't see how the bottom third's being hidden by the existing boundary wall makes any difference to this. In my view, the building could well result in some loss of light to our ground floor dining room window.

The proposed extension extends much too far down our garden – way beyond the existing rear building line of both properties. The proposed expanse of flat roof and lantern window are out of keeping with the heritage architecture of the Conservation Area and constitute considerable over-development of the site.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

Contrary to guidance from the previous planning officer, the planned extension includes large opening windows that directly overlook our property. The applicant's agents have advised me that no-one will be able to look through these windows because they will be in a vaulted ceiling above a dining room.

However, the builders have already created a boiler room in the space above a former garage and, without consultation or consent, have replaced a small skylight with a larger opening window similar, they say, to the ones that will be placed in the vaulted ceiling above the new dining room. The new window in the boiler room directly overlooks our property's patio and garden.

I agree with Mr Kemp that, in the current plans, the windows in the dining room ceiling do not allow overlooking to our neighbouring property. However, I am very worried that, at a later date, the applicant or a future owner will proceed to insert a floor and create a room in the space above the dining room – as they have already done with the boiler room – resulting in direct overlooking of our house, patio and garden, and a further major intrusion on our privacy. Therefore, I request that, if, despite the concerns noted above, the

proposed extension is approved, this should be subject to a condition that the windows in the dining room ceiling – and also the window in the boiler room – must be removed or replaced with opaque non-opening sky-lights.

Conclusion

I have no previous experience of planning applications. However, my fellow neighbour, Mr Pettit, is a qualified surveyor and also has extensive experience in dealing with planning applications as a counsellor. In his opinion, the proposed developments are not only very large in scale but most definitely DO cause harm to the setting of my directly adjoining Listed property. Under these circumstances, I would very much appreciate it if the planning committee was able to visit the site in person so that they can make a fully-informed decision based on their own expertise and experience in these matters.

Thank you very much.

Good Afternoon,

Thanks for the opportunity to address you today, My name is Mark Hamilton and I am acting on behalf of Mrs Janet Waumsley a 71 year old widow and the owner of the property of the proposed extension.

From the very beginning of the extensions designs we were mindful of the impact on the conservation area and the properties position in relation to it's surroundings, including the adjacent listed buildings.

Our first contact with the planning department was via a pre planning application and from that point onwards we have worked at every stage of the designs with the planning officers and John Chatwin the conservation officer who's valuable guidance has resulted in the application before you.

The removal of the 2 existing derelict high apexed buildings will also enhance the view from neighbour's gardens.

All the materials used for the extension follow Planning recommendations.

The existing house stands in a very large and deep garden which makes itself available for the extension and still leaves the front of the house unaffected, save for some enhancements to windows and doors, for which we have permission. This leaves the street scene unaffected, so as not to impact on the neighbouring listed buildings and was a key

driver for the designs, considerable off street parking and a large garden remains

Most of the properties along the road benefit from very deep gardens and as a result the immediate listed building to the right has a separate double storey house built in the back garden, 2 doors to the left there is another 2 storey house built in a back garden with windows facing Janets property, and overlooking the immediate listed neighbours garden.

The design before you does not overlook any other properties accommodation or gardens and has been specifically designs not to do so.

With the sun for almost 3/4 of the day to the south of the proposed extension there will be no shadowing or loss of light to any neighbouring properties.

While it is accepted the extension is a good size Janet wants to future proof her last home to allow for sufficient accommodation on the ground floor – the building has been designed specifically with that in mind.

Janet is extremely sorry the immediate neighbours have found her plans so objectionable and we have openly, by way of meetings and emails, allowed them to communicate with us and have where possible changed plans to accommodate their wishes and we still continue do so.

While not expressed officially we do have the support of all other neighbours who are delighted that a very tired and unkempt property is being vastly improved adding value to their properties along with improvements to the general appearance of the road and Conservation Area.

The neighbouring listed buildings will in future be complemented by a property that no longer detracts in its dilapidated appearance from their heritage but which enhances the significance of those buildings.

All parties should surely encourage this

I would ask the committee to support the council professionals, supporting neighbours and Janet in approving this application.

Thank you

GA. Am again speaking at the request of the FEV, largely because as I mentioned last time, I am a recently retired PI.

And as I recall, you were advised not to give a show of hands on the first application as officers had 'heard what you said' on the principle of development - apparently not. You have I hope seen our response to the report, which I'm afraid I consider both inaccurate and seriously flawed.

The application of course has to be decided on its planning merits not on the nos of reps – but we thought you might find it useful to have a breakdown of the sources of support and opposition.

Next, let me scotch a myth. You may not yet have an up to date adopted LP but the NPPF is quite clear - there is no presumption in favour of development in an AONB even if sustainable. Issues may remain over the housing targets but considerable weight can now be attached to the locational and other criteria of your emerging plan policies. For all the reasons we've set out, these proposals do not meet any of them [but of course you still need to look at other considerations].

No-one wants to be uncharitable but the fact that YDUK is a charity with limited resources cannot carry great weight. However laudable, the care home – actually 12 flats and significant communal and catering facilities - would be a county wide provision drawing residents^{staff} and visitors from a wide area. As we've shown, it would generate far more traffic than the Applicant estimates, especially where pedestrian access to the town is so hazardous. That adds also to the obvious safety concerns so close to a main railway line and river. So this is neither a suitable, safe or sustainable location, the facility does not need to be in the AONB and should be in or next to a major centre of population.

So let's look at housing. Four years into the 20 year new plan period and you are already about 40% of the way to achieving the current housing targets for the B/C sub area. Of course there are local needs – which will be fully assessed shortly through the NP process. That is the method by which decisions should be taken on where and how the town should expand, not by allowing satellite

developments on fields well beyond the existing built up area in such a sensitive part of the AONB.

[It's said the scheme will bring environmental benefits. Really? From 25 houses, a care home and all the associated traffic and activity? Any mitigation would be dependent on the implementation of an extensive landscaping scheme and long term management.] And if you build a row of houses below, close to and on the eastern side of a belt of 25m high trees, how long will it be before some have to be felled?

So to precedent. If I had a fiver for every time I've heard developers insist that of course THEIR scheme won't create a precedent for others – but that to be consistent with other previous decisions, I really have to allow it – I could have retired even earlier! You know and I know that building here would substantially alter the c & a of the surroundings – and would soon be followed by more applications on land around the site.

And finally can I remind you – as the officer hasn't – not just of the WOLA of the area but that as recently as last year your policy officers found the site unsuitable even for detailed assessment under the SHLAA review because it is "too remote from the settlement". It hasn't moved.

Appendix F

1. To put the application into context: the application is for 25 houses while Charlbury has a total of 1500 houses
2. To put the comments into context: there were about 300 comments and Charlbury has approximately 3,000 residents, so the vast majority have not expressed a view either way.
3. This is a modest application, which will provide a number of self-build homes. I would remind members that this Council issued a press release last week confirming its support for self-build.
4. Regarding objections to building in the AONB, Charlbury is in the AONB so some building is inevitable if we are to provide homes for the people who want to live in the town. I do not want to see extended development – I would be among the first to object if more building on that side of the river were proposed
5. The YDUK facility is ground-breaking and provides much needed support. I would be proud to have this in my ward.
6. If we turn this down, we may be opening ourselves up to a much larger proposal from such as we have seen in other wards, from less scrupulous developers.

Summary of Submission by Mr Jeremy Smalley

Mr Smalley thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to speak.

Mr Smalley indicated that it was an innovative application and he was pleased to be able to represent the applicants. It was suggested that the officer report was balanced and summarised all the relevant planning issues. Mr Smalley advised that the development was sustainable and Charlbury was identified as a sustainable location.

Mr Smalley reported that a large number of sites had been considered and the application was being driven by local need. In acknowledging the site was in the AONB Mr Smalley suggested that the development was not major and the proposed landscaping would mitigate any visual harm.

Mr Smalley advised that there had been extensive public consultation and the scheme amended as a result of issues raised during that process. It was confirmed that the Heads of Terms for the S106 agreement were in place.

Mr Smalley concluded by advising that the scheme would meet a local need, there was a degree of self-build housing and it would be an innovative approach. Mr Smalley asked the sub-committee to support the scheme.

Appendix H

Text of Representation by Oliver Chapple on behalf of the Milton under Wychwood Action Group

I represent the overwhelming percentage of local people who object to this application, *over 350 of whom have registered their strong written opinion.*
The Planning Officer's report recommending approval is, in our view, flawed: it says for example:-

- "Whilst West Oxfordshire can demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, it is important to ensure a continual supply of deliverable sites", and uses this as an argument for the scheme. Well, in fact the latest figures show that even allowing for a 5% buffer, there is between a 5.6 and 7.3 year supply identified (depending on how you calculate it). It is absurd to claim that creating a buffer on top of a buffer on top of a buffer is an exceptional circumstance that justifies breaching ^{it's} the ~~NPPF~~ ^{as required by NPPF §116} direction to refuse major developments in an AONB
- It admits that Milton ranks a lowly 14th in the suitability stakes, but then claims that Milton is the best location.
- It implies that a development of less than 10% in dwellings is tolerable, but forgets that with the extra homes that the Paddocks is adding, and with other applications being considered, the total increase will be 15% and therefore presumably **unacceptable**.
- It claims that the proposed landscaping with **help** assimilate the development into the existing settlement but fails to recognise the residual defacement shown clearly by the photomontages in our published report.
- Whilst accepting that the lack of public transport implies that new residents will need cars to get to work, it seems to conclude that this is not a problem in rendering the development **unsustainable**.

- I should add that I been told today that the Wychwood School is full-up in 4 of their 8 year groups
6 months ago Sharba said "if not here then where". The answer has been partially given by the copious 5 year housing supply figures, but at that time I argued that to meet its contribution to the so called "Windfall allowance" Milton would need to come up with a mere 1 ½ new homes per year. Well – in the last 6 months alone, applications have been received for at least 8 new homes (5 years' worth in 6 months!) in locations which generally **meet** the terms of the NPPF and **are** acceptable to the local community. I am certain that this is symptomatic of how housing requirements can be met with the **support** of the local community rather than by allowing an outside, profiteering developer to foist on the area a damaging scheme under the pretence that this is somehow an essential response to a housing crisis.

I urge councillors to repeat to hear the informed of the community, to retain consistency with their views on Sharba's previous version, and to **reject comprehensively** this application.

Nov 2rd 2015

EC

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL.

PLANNING MEETING 2ND. NOVEMBER 2015.

APPLICATION NUMBER 15/03128/OUT.

PROPOSAL: Erection of up to 62 dwellings, landscaping including change of use, formation of footpath and creation of ecological enhancement area, and ancillary infrastructure and enabling works.

Planning Officer Ms. Abbey Fettes.

Town and Country Planning Act.

LOCATION Land South of High Street, Milton-under-Wychwood.

APPLICANT: Sharba Homes Ltd.

Over the past 50 years, Milton-under-Wychwood has grown into a Medium sized Village, with small pockets of development, almost all on Green fields with one notable exception of Elm Grove. The local residents have accepted all of these expansions. We have all this time lived in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. When the latest development by Sharba Homes was first talked about it met with a great deal of hostility, and a section of Residents formed M.U.W.A.G., (Milton-under-Wychwood Action Group) very well organized, and have done everything in their power to stop this development.

Villages like ours need a fresh intake of families from time to time. We have a very good Foundation, Infant and Junior School. We are served well by a Doctors Surgery, both of which would welcome new Clients. We have local employers who are unable to fill their workforce from our Village, more workers would be welcomed. I went and called on some of our Residents and asked them how they felt about having more houses. "We want and need them, I came across several households where 30 to 35 year old were renting and couldn't save very quickly to build a deposit in order to buy their own house, some were still living with Parents. Sharba Houses would bring a tier of housing that let growing families aspire to, leaving the smaller, first time buyers homes for the younger ones to buy.

Shortly before its Summer break, the Government received a report from the National Housing Federation warning that parts of rural England risk becoming "pensioner pockets", as soaring numbers of older residents move into rural areas – and younger people are being priced out and move away.

(drawn from a report for the Government from the National Housing Federation)

62 Houses is not a large number, and the majority of the Parish Council feel it would be good for the Village. At one time we had the Dr's Surgery, the Dental Practice, a Hardware shop,

a butchers, the Hairdressers, The Post Office and Stores, all in the High Street, now that did cause congestion, but it was dealt with without a fuss. The Pub was working then too.

We have a National Shortage of housing, and we are prepared to accept a few new Houses so,

I urge the West Oxford District Planning Authority to approve the Sharba Homes Application.

Thank you for listening.

Edna Naish.

Chairman Milton-under-Wychwood Parish Council.

Appendix J

When you considered the previous application for this site, you did not object to or query the officer's endorsement of:

- 1) the need for the development;
- 2) the principle of development within the AONB;
- 3) the suitability of Milton to accommodate development; and
- 4) the suitability of this site for development of this scale.

Two localised matters were however identified and we have worked closely with your officers and your appointed landscape consultant to fully address these and no new points have been raised:

In summary:

- (i) The access has been moved 18 metres west such that it no longer faces onto any existing properties.
- (ii) The number of dwellings has been reduced by 11% to accommodate additional landscape planting in key locations as agreed with your landscape consultant.

It is clearly pleasing to see that as a result of these amendments, **the Parish Council** now **support** the proposals and you have heard the reasons for this, which have taken account of not only the need and relevant policies, but specifically the views of the **whole** village, which is after all who the Parish Council are democratically elected to represent, this includes the very large majority who did not object.

Your own emerging District Plan proposes at least 800 new dwellings in this sub-area where all sustainable settlements are within AONB. Therefore delivery of virtually all of these dwellings within AONB is inevitable.

Your Council acknowledge Milton is one of the larger and most sustainable settlements - it **WILL** therefore have to play a large role in accommodating development of this scale.

The scheme will deliver 31 affordable units. Your housing officer has confirmed that the affordable need in this village alone is currently at least 70 dwellings. In a village and a District with an acute need for affordable housing, the delivery of a site which meets your affordable housing policy requirements, must be afforded significant weight. Indeed, on tonight's agenda the housing supply update confirms this very fact – without sites of this scale, the needs of the area will simply not be met,

Your own Plan tells you that this is precisely the sort of scheme that should be delivered, and that Milton (and this site in particular) is precisely where you should be delivering this much needed affordable and market housing.

I therefore urge you to follow your officer and Parish Council's fully considered support for this site, and approve this proposal.

Summary of Submission by Councillor Liz Leffman

Ms Leffman thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to speak.

Ms Leffman indicated that she supported the request of Charlbury Town Council that had been reported to members. Ms Leffman expressed concern that the application, in conjunction with the neighbouring site, meant there was a cumulative impact and questioned whether a development of ten houses would have been supported if it had been a single application.

Ms Leffman highlighted that the properties were fairly large, were remote from Charlbury and accessed via a narrow road. Ms Leffman expressed disappointment that due to its size the application did not require any affordable housing.

Sunnyside, Ditchley Road, Charlbury – Committee Speech

Address by Dawn Brodie - Savills

Thank you to Members of the Planning Committee for allowing me the opportunity to speak in support of this application on behalf of the applicant Mrs Enid Hill.

The planning application proposes four dwellings to be constructed of artificial stone under a mix of roof coverings to include blue slate and artificial stonesfield slate.

The site has come forward following approval of the adjacent site as the applicant had historically been advised that development on the site would not be supported.

Charlbury is identified as a Service Centre in the 2011 Local Plan and is considered to be one of the most sustainable settlements in the District both in the existing and emerging local plan. Providing additional dwellings in Charlbury represents sustainable development and contributes to meeting the Council's five year land supply, through a windfall site. The principle of development on the site is considered to be compliant with the NPPF and is supported by your officers.

The scheme reflects the character of development in the vicinity and the recently approved adjacent site at The Old Quarry. The same architect as for the adjacent site has been utilised to provide consistency in the design character. The scheme is acceptable in terms of the impact upon the AONB and Conservation Area.

The dwellings proposed maintain appropriate distances between existing and proposed dwellings. Furthermore, care has been paid to the relationship with the previously approved scheme on the adjacent site. The proposals are acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

The scheme will be served by off road parking in accordance with the standards set out in the Local Plan. Access will be taken for the approved access point proposed as part of the adjacent site. Highways officers have confirmed that the traffic generated would not be harmful to highway safety.

Ecology surveys identified the minimal presence of some protected species and appropriate mitigation in the form of replacement roost opportunities in the completed development will be provided. Your ecologists have confirmed acceptability of this proposal.

The Council's local plan officers have previously confirmed that the Council is utilising the affordable policy in the emerging local plan at this stage. The provision of four dwellings on this site does not trigger the affordable housing policy set out in the emerging plan as it provides less than six units and is less than 1,000 square metres in floor area. On the basis of this policy there is no requirement for affordable housing from this development site.

Overall, the scheme provides the opportunity to provide additional dwellings in a sustainable location. The development would not give rise to any material harm which would outweigh the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF.

For this reason we would respectfully ask that Members of the Sub Committee support your officers recommendation and approve this application.

Thank you.