

Additional notes on late representations – Long Hanborough 15/03797/OUT

Further representations have been reported in the additional representations document circulated to Members and there have also been others received since that report was completed.

Agent

The agent has sent a letter dated 19th February which I understand has been circulated to Members. This seeks to respond to the comments of Hanborough Action Group who submitted a lengthy analysis of the application.

A further letter has been received from the agent dated 25th February which refers to matters arising from the Officer report to Committee. Within this is reference to a landscape rebuttal document written by the applicant's landscape consultant.

The landscape consultant draws the following conclusions:

- 1) Mitigation in the form of high quality design that is attractive in appearance is not necessarily harmful and there is scope to reduce any perceived impacts through reserved matters. The proposed linear open space and experience of footpath users is not necessarily unpleasant.
- 2) The site is not considered to be a valued landscape and it has no landscape designation apportioned with no harm arising.
- 3) Any significance of the gap in development and linkage between landscape north and south of Main Road through the gap has not been explained or evidenced.
- 4) Further development would not be out of keeping in the context of the industrial are and development on Main Road.

The agent's letter refers to correspondence they have had with Historic England on a pre-application basis and have provided a copy of a letter from Historic England dated 6th August 2015. This states that the proposals would not directly affect any highly graded heritage assets or their setting and therefore they would not be consulted on any forthcoming application. This is merely a statement in relation to the proximity of higher grade heritage assets and the need for the local authority to consult Historic England on an application. It does not seek to comment on the merits of the scheme or potential harm to heritage assets. Ultimately, harm to setting is a matter to be assessed by the decision maker and the assessment of your Officers is set out in the Officer report.

The agent continues to advance the presence of Hanborough Station, and potential improvements to it, as having a key bearing on the assessment of the application. In their recent letters, much is made of a presentation by Great Western Railway on proposed improvements to the North Cotswold Line which was given on 12th February.

Officers have received a copy of the slides presented at this event and **GWR** have written to the Council separately on 26th February. They support the developer's recognition of the need for expansion and improvement of facilities at Hanborough. They state that they have been working

with partners to develop a longer term vision for both the services on the North Cotswolds line and the management of Hanborough Station.

The following comment is important and I quote "Whilst only aspirational at this stage it demonstrates what the industry believes is achievable and necessary in terms of meeting suppressed and future demand for rail travel in West Oxfordshire".

Committed improvements as noted by GWR are service frequency increases and trains with increased seating capacity, additional cycle parking and an increase in parking capacity of 45 spaces subject to planning permission.

Other future plans beyond 2019 (the end of the current franchise) are not committed or funded at the current time.

This supports rather than undermines Officer observations in the report to Committee.

Railfuture

This is a voluntary organisation campaigning for improved rail services.

They wish to note that there is strong support from stakeholders for substantial investment at Hanborough.

They hope that the application is approved.

Stagecoach

A further letter from Stagecoach has been received dated 25th February.

They wish to clarify that the vast majority of journeys on the 233 service are run commercially without subsidy from OCC or any other third party. Thus they would be keen to avoid any party drawing the conclusion that this service is either to be withdrawn or likely to be withdrawn.

Stagecoach remains committed to maintaining at least an hourly service in Long Hanborough. This would be the case irrespective of any further development being consented in the village.

Other reps

A petition has been received this morning under a covering letter dated 26th February from a Mr Craig Padfield of Woodlands Rd, Witney. Mr Padfield states that he is a commuter at Hanborough.

The letter supports rail improvements at Hanborough and along the North Cotswold Line, but expresses disappointment that the planning application is recommended for refusal and disputes the harm identified by Officers. He suggests that the scheme will deliver significant benefits including affordable housing in a sustainable location, land for rail infrastructure, and encourage use of the 233 bus service. He also notes that should the application be refused the losers will be the travelling public and council taxpayers who will have to pay for a public inquiry.

The petition contains 268 names who signed under the following statement:

“We the undersigned residents of West Oxfordshire feel that the Council needs to make more improvements to the area’s infrastructure when it allows housing development.

With this in mind we support the application where the 120 homes will have 60 affordable properties and land will be provided for station improvements and a 400 space car park. Hanborough Station is a growing transport hub for Witney and surrounding villages. The bus company has already said service frequency could be improved to link with train times.

We urge the Uplands Planning Sub-Committee to support this application.”

Mr Nigel Rose of Chipping Norton – He is keen to see significant improvements to the line’s infrastructure and services. By providing land for additional car parking adjacent to Hanborough station this housing proposal would greatly facilitate such improvements in partnership with the rail industry. Passenger numbers are increasing and there is significant demand. The recent presentation by GWR is referred to. If the application is approved there will be sufficient time to submit the necessary applications for station improvements in parallel with a reserved matters application. During a recent conversation with the Transport Minister, she was very supportive of such improvements. Support was similarly expressed by David Cameron. The 233 bus service brings passengers from far afield. No doubt the new residents of Witney will want to use the train. There can be no more sustainable housing sites than one adjacent to a railway station. Contributions from the development will benefit a wide range area of West Oxfordshire. If this application is refused, less sustainable sites will have to be granted

Ann Dunridge of Carterton – Welcomes urgency to making improvements to the North Cotswold Line. With Witney and Carterton not having their own railway stations, Hanborough station has a big catchment. A car park is long overdue. David Cameron is supportive of improvements to the railway. The housing scheme proposed is supported.

David Crowley of Witney - Supports the application. Refusal would throw out a planning application which will provide land for improvements to the railway supported by WODC and the Prime Minister. Adequately resourced and frequently scheduled public transport will be used in preference to private motor transport. The opportunity to provide a station car park should not be dismissed.

Jamie Wotherspoon of Witney – Supports the application. Three trains an hour would be a major incentive for people to use the station. There is definitely a strong case for more parking at Hanborough. It makes sense to improve the North Cotswold Line. Congestion on local roads has become a real problem.

Robin Shuckburgh of Bampton – Supports the application. If there were 3 trains an hour many people would limit their road journeys and use Hanborough. With regard to the GWR vision, Planning Officers are having difficulty seeing the vision. It is the duty and responsibility of WODC to support applications like this.

Kathy Kirk of Long Hanborough – Objects on the grounds of highway safety and flooding in this location. Apart from being near the station, what advantage to village life would this satellite settlement accomplish? She would very much appreciate refusal of the application.

Sharone Parnes (Woodstock Town Councillor) – Objects on the following grounds:

(1) It is foreseeable that the proposed access onto the A4095 will increase danger of road traffic collisions, and during times of significant precipitation the road in the immediate vicinity is known to be already dangerously vulnerable to flooding as evinced by photographs submitted in other representations. Moreover, the proposals will create of a pinch-point adjacent to its location (which is located nearly mid-way between Woodstock and Witney).

(2) Realistically any benefits in, or attraction of, enhanced bus or rail services would be suitable only for a comparatively very limited proportion of commuters, and other transport movements travelling between Woodstock and Witney and/or Woodstock and Eynsham, whereas for the overwhelming majority of road users along those routes the limitations of bus and train services (ie, in timings, destinations, costs or amenities) prevent viable alternatives to automobile or lorry transport. Therefore any purported mitigation of public transport would at best benefit a limited proportion (small fraction) of road users, whilst disproportionately contributing to adverse effects on safety and time-consumption for the rest.

(3) The proposed development site is too detached from the village and the proposals amount to an unjustifiable patch of awkward urbanization of the countryside. The proposed development is not characteristic of the surroundings of Long Hanborough and it undermines the site's existing pre-application features which comprise an integral component of the Woodstock-Eynsham Sub-Area's semi-rural atmosphere and quality of life as enjoyed by residents and visitors alike.

(4) Harms and dangers outweigh any benefits of the proposals.

(5) The Planning Officer's thoroughly considered Recommendation of REFUSAL is very widely, soundly and justifiably supported - including on planning grounds.

Application to Construct up to 120 Homes and Class D1 Building

Main Road, Long Hanborough

15/03797/OUT

I would like to begin by congratulating the officers who have produced such a comprehensive report.

This is the fourth large scale housing development application in less than two years, in addition to an associated application for a new school playing field and an ongoing planning appeal. Inevitably residents are wondering when the siege of Hanborough will end but remain determined to fight for a sustainable, balanced community. Once again there are over 150 individually written letters of objection with 14 letters expressing support, none originating from Hanborough or the immediate surrounding area.

Most of the letters in support mention the prospect of improved rail services and an enlarged car park. The applicants have raised expectations but their lack of confidence in the actual delivery is indicated by the amendment removing reference to the car park.

You will by now be familiar with the issues, the A4095, the surgery and the school and I will therefore not concentrate on generalities, simply highlight specifics relevant to this application.

Reading between the lines, your officers share our concerns over the capacity of the A4095 and the proposed site access. Once again OCC have not objected. Consequently the officer's report contains verbatim comments from OCC Highways and the reasons for refusal do not include highways issues. Paragraph 5.34 discusses the site access point which many residents consider unsafe, being close to the hump back railway bridge. It states "it is worth noting that if the junction were built, vehicle speeds in the vicinity are likely to be reduced," certainly a novel approach to road safety, constructing a junction that people realise is dangerous prompting them to slow down.

The applicant's original intention was that the class D1 building would replace the existing surgery. However the practice partners have objected to their proposal as the distance from the village centre would make access difficult for patients without transport.

The school is oversubscribed, as are many in the surrounding villages. It needs to be expanded but the applicant has failed to come forward with any proposals, simply offering to discuss the issue at a later date.

In addressing site issues, your officers rightly stress its sensitive location, an open area of rolling countryside, close to an AONB, Pinsley Wood, Burleigh Wood and Blenheim Park. If built, a well-used public footpath would become a walk through a housing estate.

Being some distance from the village centre, this estate will not comfortably integrate with the rest of the village.

The illustrative masterplan is in stark contrast to the existing strip developed settlement. Its suburban nature, the potential addition of a large car park and the major modifications required to the A4095 all contribute to the application's urbanising effect.

The site has already been assessed as unsuitable, please support you officer's recommendation to refuse on the basis of the reasons given with an additional reason based upon the surgery's letter of objection.

Spoken Presentation on behalf of Hanborough Parish Council regarding Planning Application No. **15/03797/OUT**, for 120 dwellings on land south east of Pinsley Farm.

The Parish Council objects to this planning application because its disadvantages outweigh its benefits. The magnitude of the proposed development is out of proportion with the village and would make excessive demands on infrastructure capacity without offering any realistic means of enhancing provision. Indeed, the economic, social and environmental benefits presented as being attached to the development, and supposed to mitigate against infrastructure limitations, are largely aspirational, undeliverable or beyond the scope of reasonable obligations. Examples are to be found in relation to purported benefits for the railway station, for a health centre and for improving travel by road.

GWR has an ambition to run two trains per hour to Worcester and three trains per hour to Oxford, with estimated costs of £275M. To help facilitate this distant vision, the applicant has offered land for a new station building, a footbridge and car parking; it would lie idle, since money for these developments has not been assigned to Hanborough Station. The doctors are not in a financial position to avail themselves of land either, as their objection letter explains. As for improving travel by road, Stagecoach have not guaranteed that financial contributions would be sufficient to maintain existing bus services, let alone improve them. Roadworks to improve traffic flow around Hanborough's mini-roundabout are not feasible.

The Parish Council finds it hard to understand the Highways Authority's judgement that the junction of the site access road with the A4095 is acceptable, since it is adjacent to a hump-backed bridge that restricts visibility and is a traffic pinch point. Saying, "*Further safety audits will be required if planning permission is granted,*" is too little too late. Nor is it reassuring that Highways admit that, "*where junctions are operating close to or over capacity*" (as in the centre of Hanborough) "*prediction of the likely impact of traffic increases by traffic models is known to be less robust.*"

The applicant has apparently misunderstood the primary school capacity situation. There is no room for the 37 children that would be expected from 120 houses, which is why the County School Places Planning Manager has objected. Space for a third new classroom, along with the other "viability and deliverability" issues mentioned, cannot be secured through "appropriate conditions or agreements;" there is no prospect of infrastructure being delivered "in a timely fashion," so this application fails to satisfy NPPF paragraphs 176 and 177.

For these reasons and those set out by officers, we respectfully suggest that it should be refused.

Appendix C

Mr Ross indicated that the Council was faced with a need for additional market and affordable housing to meet the requirements of the emerging local plan and would therefore need to release greenfield sites for development. The application would provide up to 60 affordable homes in a development of 120 properties which could be sold at a discounted rate.

The development would support public transport improvements in both bus and rail services and provide land for additional car parking to serve the station. Mr Ross confirmed that the amendment of the description of development by the deletion of reference to the proposed station car park was not at the applicant's request and did not indicate a lack of confidence in its delivery as suggested by the first speaker.

Mr Ross stated that Long Hanborough was a key transport node and noted that rail passenger numbers had increased from 104,000 in 2004 to 240,000 in 2014 with the expectation of a further increase of 20% to 30% over the next five years.

GWR had stated its intention to pursue further service improvements and Long Hanborough served as a strategic park and ride.

The development was achievable and necessary and could be delivered within the next three years.

Mr Ross suggested that development of this site was logical and noted that it was not within the AONB, nor was it subject to any other environmental designations; any heritage impact would be negligible.

Mr Ross contended that development in this location would be logical and sustainable and invited Members to approve development on what was a sustainable and unrestricted site.

Committee presentation by Martin Armstrong

Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee 29th February 2016

Thornycroft, Woodstock Road Charlbury, reference 15/03542/FUL

- 1 Thank you Chair and Members for taking the trouble to visit the site last Thursday morning and viewing it from the neighbouring property. Members could see how close to that boundary the proposed house was. The wide expanse of glazing at first floor will directly overlook the conservatory and private garden of the neighbours. Your officers intend to require a 1.8 metre high panel fence on the boundary. However, the fencing would be less than 2 metres away from the bedroom windows reducing light and outlook to completely unacceptable levels. Simply put, the house is too close to the boundary and this will leave the neighbours with excessive overlooking or the occupants of the house with unacceptable light and outlook. Either way this is a conundrum of residential amenity that is impossible to resolve.
- 2 Members also viewed the site from Woodstock Road and were able to note the proposed access lies on a blind bend and downhill stretch of the road. To provide the vision splay it will be necessary to remove all of the stretch of mature boundary hedge.
- 3 Our main concern with the application is the principle of a new house in this location. The Council has twice refused permission for new houses here and an appeal has been successfully dismissed. Members have been sent copies of an OS map and a hard copy of this was available at the site visit. Written on the map is the exact wording taken from the Inspectors report into the dismissed appeal where he analyses the built up area of Charlbury in relation to the site. He stated that the built-up area ends at Stonesfield Lane, only followed by a 'scattering of low density residential development' (his words) terminating at Thornycroft. The application site is beyond Thornycroft. We draw particular attention to these important Council and Inspector decisions because although over 20 years old,

they serve to demonstrate the critical point that the site lies outside the built-up area. Although the policies have changed, the policy objectives have not. One can infill and round off sites within settlements but one cannot build outside them. Nothing has changed on the ground since those decisions because no new houses have been built.

- 4 If you approve this application you will be going against the successive, consistent, decisions of your predecessors and a planning Inspector. These are important material considerations for this application because they show that the site lies outside the built-up area. The public has a reasonable expectation that like decisions are made in a like manner to preserve the credibility of the planning system and prevent harmful precedents being set.

- 5 The proposal before you is for a new house in an unsustainable location outside the built up area of Charlbury, contrary to local and national policy. It is so close to the boundary to be unneighbourly through overlooking or will provide inadequate levels of light and outlook within the new building. Its location close to the edge of the village and conservation area, combined with its stark modern design and removal of mature hedging will erode the character and appearance of the Conservation Area without justification and will set an undesirable precedent that could be repeated. We ask the Committee to refuse the application for the reasons given. Thank you Chair.

Appendix E

The proposed new dwelling is actively kept separate from the common boundary by almost a good 2 metres. The separation then between the proposed new dwelling and the neighbouring property is over 18 metres. This long distance of building to building separation is good and acceptable in terms of protecting the amenity of existing and future occupants. Within this relationship, there are no visible windows that rise above the common boundary fence in any event.

The previous appeal at the application site, in 1992, was found to be contrary to the Rural Areas Review Local Plan. That plan is now out of date and there has since been a material change in the planning circumstances and the context of this site. The current proposal is in accordance with the relevant adopted Local Plan policies and the emerging Local Plan policies as endorsed by your officer in her recommendation for approval.

In addition, that appeal was dismissed on highways grounds in regards to access. This has been overcome as the access has been moved, utilising the existing field access. The County Council has no objection whatsoever on any highway related grounds.

The proposed scheme has also been carefully designed so as not to cause harm to the character of the Conservation Area or AONB. We have worked with your officers throughout the process, from the pre-application stage and have continued to amend the scheme making sure it followed the advice of your officers. The result of this iterative process has secured the unequivocal support of the case officer and the conservation officer.

There are in fact no objections from any statutory consultees, including the parish council.

In light of all you have heard, I trust that you will be minded to support your officers clear recommendation to approve this application.

Good Afternoon ,

Thank you for taking the time to visit our purposed self build plot.

I have lived in the village all my life, and I would hope for the rest of my life.

I want to have the opportunity to raise my two young daughters as they are the third generation of Langford's to live in Enstone. A village we care deeply about.

They are the future generation of Enstone , we teach them importance of traditions , local community spirit and know how much they love where they live.

It will also bring peace of mind to my parents as they get older to have close family near by.

The house has been designed to compliment chapel lane.

It's a self build house, build from locally sourced materials , with the help of local tradesman.

Access has been brought up a couple of times.

The access has been there for 200 years, it does not affect the footpath in anyway what so ever .

And with the drainage running through the entrance it would eradicate the surface water running off the lane, and flooding the footpath.

The highways are fully supportive of this application.

If we cant build here then we would have to move out of the area, which would be a great shame, as my 3 year old daughter goes to the local pre-school as did I .

Our currant home is a one bedroom annex and we now have outgrown this, now that our children are running about.

We cannot afford to buy in the village or within the local area due to ridiculously steep house prices.

We would be devastated to leave our family network , friends in the village , and local community. I understand policies have been put in place to help with situations like this,

I hope that you support us so may provide our children with a much needed family home.

Marcus Langford

Good Afternoon

My name is Andrew Hennell and I am the joint owner of 18-20 Market Place Woodstock and have run an antiques business from the property since 1996 although I live some distance away on the Sussex/Surrey borders.

I have a passion for early furniture and have placed many pieces into museums and private collections some of which have been published.

Over the past 7 years the antiques trade has been badly affected and in decline partly because of a difficult economic climate coupled with changing furnishing requirements.

The rear of my shop has an ongoing problem of water ingress and damp making it impossible to keep the furniture dry and free from mould - even when the heating is on all day the atmosphere in this space is cold and musty making it totally unsuitable as a retail space. I have as a result reduced my level of stock therefore no longer require this showroom to the rear.

A Structural Engineer has concluded the stability of the structure to the rear is now seriously in doubt.

I wish to continue to run my business from the shop in a lesser but more manageable retail space with a reduction of stock - plus to live on site which is the driver for my planning application with the house at the rear becoming my own home - which will be a self-build.

The proposed one-bedroom flat will be a self-contained small unit of accommodation with a separate access via Angel Yard.

The proposed scheme has evolved as a result of careful collaboration and has been negotiated over a significant period of time with your officers and I am most grateful for their helpful input.

After your visit on Thursday - a small change to the rear elevation is proposed – replacing the timber boarding with stone. We have also reduced the size of the first floor window to the rear to take account of our neighbour's objections.

The demolition works are largely to the building erected in the mid-1990s - as the planning history highlights - and the extension to the rear yard replicates the footprint of a previous structure.

I fully intend to reuse materials and to create a high quality scheme that enhances the conservation area and the rear of this listed building - making clear reference to the functional status of this part of the site and the previous use of brick.

There have been a number of legal issues raised by third parties regarding the ownership of our building – our right of access over Angel Yard and the construction of new window openings - these are all civil issues rather than planning ones - but nonetheless my legal advisors assure me that the correct rights and permissions are in place to carry out the works as proposed.

I trust that having seen the site - you feel able to support your officer's recommendation of approval - but if I can help by answering any questions I would be happy to do so.

Thank you.

10 Chipping Norton Road, Application number 16/00002/HHD

Planning Committee Meeting, West Oxfordshire District Council, Woodgreen Offices, 29 February 2016

Points in support of the application

The National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 60, states that,

Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

This is not a case of a radical departure in design but seems to be matter very small details raised only by the Planning Officer. There has been only one objection, considered not to raise any material planning issues.

The application site, while in the AONB, is not in a conservation area and the village has a very wide diversity of buildings in terms of size, style and period.

It is very clear from the submission that the proposal does uses the language of the local vernacular to reinforce local distinctiveness:

- The materials proposed are the same as existing
- The design uses only single and double pitched roofs, gable ends and casement windows

Looking at images of the area, it is also clear that all of the features of the proposal that have been criticised are in fact part of the local vernacular:

- Asymmetrical features
- 'Wrap-around' or intersecting volumes
- Repeated gable features

The proposal would not be overly dominant because it has been deliberately designed to be subservient:

- Lower roof ridge
- Set back from frontage
- Same roof pitch and gable size

The proposed extension would only be visible from very few places. The views where it would be most visible - from the back - are characterised by a significant mix and 'clutter' of features.

Taking all these points into account, the proposed extension would not result in any harm to the immediate area or the village as a whole. Rather it would contribute positively to the richness and diversity of the village that gives it its identity and distinctiveness.

For these reasons the proposal is in conformity with Policies BE2 and H2 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 as well as the NPPF and so should be granted consent.

Dr. Karl Kropf, Director, Built Form Resource
Oxford Centre for Innovation
New Road
Oxford, OX1 1BY
01865 261456



Asymmetrical elements, 'wrap-around' intersecting volumes and a mix of gables are typical of the area



Near views of the extension would be limited and building would enhance the character of the lane



The proposed extension would not be visible from the street front except in a passing glimpse



The extension would not be out of place in the mixed character to the rear of Chipping Norton Road



The proposed extension would not be harmful to the character of the village

