

Appendix A

My name is Jonathan Ede and I am Managing Director of Ede Homes, the applicant, a subsidiary of Builders Ede.

We are a family owned and managed business that has been building predominantly in Oxfordshire for the past 55 years. Our head office is in Witney, my wife and I live in Eynsham. My son who has recently joined the business lives in Woodstock and my two daughters live and work in Witney, one as a GP and other a teacher. So we are a local company that are fans of West Oxfordshire.

We have built hundreds of houses in many villages and towns throughout WODC as well as shops, offices and even Witney Four Pillars Hotel and are proud of what we have achieved.

My father purchased this land some 40 years ago and planted the belt of trees we are now seeking to protect. We were approached by WODC some 5 years ago as they had identified this site to the Town Council as their preferred site in Charlbury for affordable housing. We built 15 properties for SOHA which were for both rental and shared equity and they were well received by all.

We subsequently had further discussions with both councils about building on the remainder of the site but keeping the trees and this led to the previous application being submitted almost a year ago. We held an exhibition in the Town Council offices and met with many local people and the only issue was one of traffic movements on Little Lees and although the County Council highways department raised no objections and the application was recommended for approval it was of no great surprise that members deferred the application and asked us to look at the alternative access from Lees Heights. This we did and suggested a good old British compromise to the planning officer and the Town Council that we served half the houses from Lees Heights and half from Little Lees which they agreed.

What came as a complete shock was that despite having done what we were asked to do by members and spent several months and many thousands of pounds in having revised consultants reports and getting widespread support this application was deferred at your last meeting so we could look again for a third time at the layout to see if we could somehow mix up the affordable housing and the open market housing.

This I find surprising and somewhat disrespectful to those people needing affordable housing by suggesting that they should be treated differently and not be allowed to live next to each other but be specially hidden away amongst open market houses. This probably explains why it is not planning policy. The 15 adjacent houses we built previously are affordable and they are not hidden away and were proposed by WODC. They worked out well so we see no reason why we should not build another 9 as proposed for affordable and 2 for open market.

In discussions with the Town Council at the outset they expressed concern that many youngsters in Charlbury could not afford to buy on the open market but had insufficient points to qualify for a shared equity purchase through the housing association. Many have to continue living with their parents and as a father I can see why this may not be ideal, so we sympathise with the idea and would like to help by offering at least some of them at a discounted price for first time buyers. We have done it before and have ensured by the 106 agreement that the discount endures for all time to subsequent purchasers.

Obviously it is up to WODC to decide what tenure the affordable housing should be but given the government now seems to be on board with the idea I would hope we can have those discussions with both councils sooner rather than later and that you can approve this application.

Could I finish by thanking the officer for such a complete report which really makes my few words seem superfluous.

Thank you.

Appendix B

I would like to begin by paying tribute to the Hanborough Action Group and all the objectors who have written in about the proposed housing developments and associated projects in Long Hanborough. They care so much about the village and the community.

Their attitude is in stark contrast to that shown by the applicants.

The application is for full consent and in its original form it was simply proposed to develop a grass playing field surrounded by a wire mesh fence with a shed for equipment storage. No intention of providing toilet facilities, access to drinking water and although they identified a route for disabled access they failed to research its feasibility – in particular the need for dropped kerbs. It was left to objectors to point out these omissions and the applicant subsequently amended the application, but provided little by way of detail, especially important given the application was for full consent. In their comments OCC failed to identify the lack of dropped kerbs and if permission had been granted then the council tax payer would have had to foot the bill to correct the error.

The applicant also stated that only one teacher is required to supervise the transfer of a class of small children along public roads from the main school site to the proposed playing field. Our information is that it would require at least three staff.

Obviously little thought was put into their original application and it is no wonder that the applicants' oft-stated protestations of wishing to work with the community are treated with such scepticism.

We still have two major concerns:

The first is the impact this proposal will have on our children's education.

- Think of the time out of the school day and the required resources to organise children to leave the main school site and walk to the new playing field.
- The strategy behind this application is to release existing play areas on the main school site so that classrooms can be constructed to meet increased demand consequent on their Long Hanborough development. The school's capacity will be increased but the play area on the main school site reduced. Where will children run around and play at break times? What about the capacity of the school's communal facilities?

Secondly, the proposal is to build a large wire mesh enclosure jutting out into the open countryside between Kents Bank and Pinsley Wood, an ancient woodland, one of the few remaining parts of the Wychwood Forrest and a county wildlife site. Kents Bank, a recent development of affordable homes, has been sensitively designed to have an open aspect. This will be destroyed and views from various parts of Long Hanborough towards Pinsley Wood lost. Walking from Church Hanborough to Long Hanborough on the public footpath, the wire mesh compound will be an undoubted eyesore.

In common with their other schemes, the developers have given little thought to its impact on residents and heaven knows where we would be without HAG and all the other objectors.

I realise that the final decision has been taken out of your hands.

What I ask that you vote to endorse the officers report and recommendation to refuse and your views consequently minuted.

**Spoken presentation on behalf of Hanborough Parish Council
regarding Application No. 15/03341/FUL**

The Parish Council agrees with District officers and an overwhelming majority of residents that creating a sports field in the location proposed by the applicant would have a highly detrimental impact on the local environment. The area in question, alongside a scenic right of way known as the Coffin Path, has a view of Pinsley Wood to the south-east and Church Hanborough spire to the south. Spoiling it would contravene WODC's emerging policy EH1, which is designed to protect this kind of natural environment, "*its landscape, cultural and historic value, tranquillity, geology, countryside, soil and biodiversity.*"

The mitigation measures offered by the applicant, a hedge "*if this is considered necessary*" and moving some clumps of turf, soil and seeds, are little more than token gestures. They neither avoid harm to the enjoyment of the land, as required by emerging policy OS4, nor rescue a habitat of biodiversity value. Tranquillity would be dispelled and human enjoyment spoiled by the whistles and cries that emanate from any sports field; vulnerable animal species are unlikely to endure a second upheaval so soon after being disturbed by the building of Kents Bank.

The Parish Council does not agree with County education officers, who fail to object to the impact the proposed development would have upon local schoolchildren and staff. Much of the grassed play area on the school site would have to be sacrificed, in order to build new classrooms, in return for gaining the sports field. The new field is referred to as "*a replacement*" for the existing grassed play area on the school site; however, it soon becomes clear that although bigger, the sports field could not afford like-for-like usage due to its being a quarter of a kilometre away.

This arrangement would mean that children were only taken to the pitch for "*formal sports*" and that they would have far less grass to play on whilst back at school, since much of what is there now would have been built upon. The existing grassed play area is barely adequate for 200 pupils during breaks and dinner times, so the Parish Council does not understand the County's relaxed stance regarding the prospect of a far smaller area with 50 extra pupils.

Paragraph 74 of the NPPF stipulates that existing sports and recreational land should not be built on unless "*the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.*" Application No. 15/03341/FUL fails to comply because the field would not be in a suitable location and therefore it could not replace the grassed area currently enjoyed throughout the school day.

The Parish Council therefore respectfully asks for the application to be refused on the latter grounds as well as because of its negative environmental impact.

Planning Application 15/03734/FUL
Self-build house on Bull Hill, Chadlington

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to speak to you.

We have lived locally for 26 years, both having a local business and our children educated at The Cotswold School.

This project represents 10 years of house-hunting and it is **imperative to us** that we get on with our neighbours as we are building a **lifelong home**.

We chose our architect carefully and have spent 5 months in planning and design to demolish the existing rendered bungalow, 5 outbuildings and polytunnel, replacing all with a sensitive 4 bed, 1½ storey dwelling designed to enhance this aspect of Bull Hill.

We've talked to neighbours about **all** their concerns - demonstrated by their supporting letters.

We'd like to address the '**on balance**' refusal recommendation based on 3 main areas of impact:

Scale, massing, design & form:

- the proposed dwelling only forms 10% of the ½ acre, leaving 90% of existing garden for more biodiversity
- our plans include a downstairs bed & bathroom for infirmity, plus a Cat6 connected home office which, for **energy efficiency**, is incorporated into the house
- the dwelling is 1½ storeys high, between 5.2 and 7.3m, and no higher than the neighbours
- we've made huge efforts to blend with local surroundings; design ideas drawn from agricultural buildings and little glazing in the front. Materials will be natural, muted and harmonise with local Cotswold vernacular.
- the various elements - differing roof heights, staggered frontage, all away from the boundaries - ensure the building does not look overwhelming

Proposed garage:

- until cleared, this site was dense vegetation, severely restricting light to neighbours
- given the mixture of building lines on Bull Hill - a predominance of which immediately abut the road - the garage, at a lower height than the main dwelling, reinforces the street pattern
- **Crucially**, on consulting neighbours we found parking is **the big problem** on Bull Hill so we agreed to transfer a strip of land to Eden Cottage to widen their drive so they can park on their property rather than in front of ours, which causes problems for Mrs Hoffman opposite, and for passing farm vehicles etc.

The overlooking issue:

- we cannot agree that any N facing windows overlook neighbours, it is simply too far away and with intervening features
- we note there have been no objections from the neighbours

Glazing:

- the rear has fabulous views, hence the glazing, which is overhung by 1m of verandah, and faces NW, so the sun will have set before falling directly on the glazing

- the rear of the house is shielded by trees & more native planting will be carried out
- until removed, an ugly polytunnel was the predominant feature in the AONB

Considering the planning officer's refusal was made 'on balance', that there have been NO objections from the Parish Council and we have only had support from our neighbours, we hope the committee will re-assess the proposal.

Thank you for listening.