

- I am the owner of Farley Corner, The Ridings and have not been invited to participate in the consultation process for this application.
- This is a greenfield site within the **Cotswolds AONB** and is the proposal not compliant with the **definition of infilling and rounding off, contrary to adopted Policy H6.**
- Consideration against a **relaxed Policy H6 and draft Policies OS2 and H2 raise concerns** regarding whether the **benefits are sufficient to overcome the adverse impact of greenfield site development.**
- The proposal for 13 dwellings is not in **accordance with SHLAA site assessment for 10 home frontage development.**
- The lack of onsite affordable housing is contrary to adopted local plan policy **H11 and emerging plan policy H3.** It is not convincing that alternative benefits proposed justify such an exception that is **discordant with locally agreed planning policy.** The proposed cemetery location is unsuitable given restricted vehicle access and limited parking capacity.
- Given the immediate proximity to a Public Bridleway this development will have a **significant adverse impact on the local community,** reducing public amenity and recreational opportunities, **contrary to paragraph 64 of the NPPF.**
- As outlined by **Oxfordshire County Council,** I strongly reinforce their objection on the basis of unclear or deficient **transport and highways plans.** **The proposed road layout and will generate a hazardous junction** and the applicant has as yet provide a **viable plan** for public footpath access to public transportation services.

## **OBJECTIONS TO THE 2 PROPOSED ACCESS ROADS FOR THE 13 HOUSES BEING BUILT BY EMPIRE HOMES**

---

I am speaking on behalf of those who live in the 6 private dwellings which front the S side of Farley Lane. We argue that the access road to the estate should come off The Ridings. We believe that the way the estate is divided into 2 distinct "zones", each with its own access road, understandably reflects the preference of the landowner's family who will live in the E side of the estate with effectively, their own access road. (One access road from The Ridings would not afford the same degree of privacy to the 4 detached properties which will house members of the Ball family.)

*Dr Bartington's views and have further points to add. OCC Traffic + Highways have already objected to the access and transportation proposals for the site.*

### **1. Parking Problems**

If the proposed access roads onto Farley Lane go ahead, we foresee major parking problems. Existing on-street parking in FL makes 2 way traffic impossible, requiring vehicles to weave in and out of stationary cars, and already hinders visibility between Wootton End and Bishops Meadow. Introducing 2 more access roads, in between WE & BM and the driveway into Greville House, will intensify both problems.

### **Potential for road traffic accidents due to Increase in traffic on FL**

Long-base lorries carrying huge steel girders to Witney Welders back up Farley Lane every week; tractors and other agricultural vehicles go up to the farm; lorries and trailers visit the Classic Car workshop and horse-boxes are often seen going to the livery stables. We are extremely concerned about the potential for road traffic accidents and even deaths caused by a big increase in traffic – if the FL access proposals go ahead. There are 46 parking spaces demarcated on the estate plan, more than 3 cars per household. The 13 homes will also require the usual service & emergency vehicles, bin lorries, on-line shopping deliveries and visitors including motor-bikes and push bikes, all using FL.

### **Potential hazard to people and animals**

Farley Lane becomes a farm track, then a **bridle way**, and is popular with dog-walkers. With the 2 proposed new access roads, we envisage that the horses and riders, the walkers and dog-walkers, the families and mothers with push chairs will have to compete with vehicles trying to turn in and out of the new estate in addition to those turning into/out of Wootton End, Bishops Meadow or Greville House as well as visitors/deliveries to the business premises in FL. **Accidents affecting people and animals are inevitable.**

### **Problems with cemetery design, parking and access already flagged**

Documents submitted to WODC Planning Committee object to access via FL, favouring a way in via The Ridings. With regard to the new village cemetery, which the Balls have offered, WODC have reminded the builder that The Ridings will need a curb and pavement for those walking to the cemetery, adequate passing places for any traffic using The Ridings, a more substantial car park for cemetery visitors and adequate turning spaces. We respectfully suggest that Mr O'Brien also rethinks access to the estate, bringing the access road in off The Ridings, via the NW corner. Once the cemetery is in use, Stonesfield residents will be very glad of the improvements made to The Ridings. Many would not be able to walk from the church to the cemetery which is a considerable walking distance so an adequate car park will be necessary.



## Planning proposal for 18 Sandford Park, Charlbury

I am resident at No. 14 and speak on behalf of a number of residents of Sandford Park and Hill Close.

- We appreciate the need for more housing and we recognise there is space on the site for a new house or extension.
- We want to work with Beverly to create a suitable house and think together we can create something better.
- If we can't do this – we will reluctantly have to enforce the covenant. This will probably mean no house is ever built.

### **This is because..**

- Our estate is a well preserved mid-century development by an award winning architect.
- It was designed on a series of principles which have been respected over the last 50 years
  - Shared access via footpaths
  - Single-storey, linked, split-level bungalows with large horizontal windows
  - Shared parking at the top of the estate
  - And crucially – no barriers or fences so we meet and enjoy each others company
- We ask that the committee reject this application as it does not follow these principles
- The residents of Hill Close will have their privacy invaded by the two storey proposed house which will be within 14 metres rather than the recommended 23 metres. No consideration has been given to mature trees in the gardens of 5 & 6 Hill Close
- **We will work** with Beverly and her architect to develop:
  - A single storey, linked house in keeping with the rest of the estate – substantially reducing the overlook of Hill Close.
  - The car parking block extended at the top of the estate – avoiding the need for new access onto the busy Slade road and felling of several trees.
  - A house that respects the principle of unfenced open gardens and shared pedestrian access.

**In summary** – please reject this proposal so that something more suitable can be developed

## Appendix D

Mrs Harrison expressed concern regarding the potential overlooking and consequent loss of privacy for residents of properties in Hill Close. She contended that the proposed development would be over-bearing, having a negative impact upon adjacent homes and gardens.

Mrs Harrison also expressed her concern over the loss of trees on the site and the disturbance caused by vehicle headlights to residents of properties in the vicinity of the proposed access.

## Appendix E

Ms Leffman indicated that she would not usually attend the Sub-Committee to comment on an application for a single dwelling but had decided to do so on this occasion having regard to the special character of the Sandford Park estate. Whilst she considered that development of a single dwelling on the site would be acceptable, Ms Leffman suggested that any development should be in the style of the existing dwellings, linked to No. 18.

The current proposal did not reflect the design features of the existing development.

In addition, Ms Leffman expressed concern over the proposed access onto The Slade which she considered would be hazardous. In conclusion, Ms Leffman suggested that the site should be preserved in its current form and expressed her belief that a suitable alternative design could be acceptable.

WODC Uplands Planning Committee - Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> March 16

18 Sandford Park – Proposed new house in rear garden

**Peter Smith Architect** - Mr Chairman – Committee members.

I was asked by my client to design a small, modernist, eco friendly house in the land to the rear of her existing property with independent access from the adjoining road – The Slade.

The design is a small two storey, two bedroom house with the living area on the upper floor and an adjoining garage.

*(The plan is to sell the existing house and my client wishes to move into the new one as it will be and more efficient for a single person.)*

I submitted a pre-application advice and received a favourable response and then with some refinement submitted a full application.

In my view the proposed new building will have minimal impact on Sandford Park due to the location of the site behind and to the rear of the existing property and the low ground level – in fact the only part visible from the central area of Sandford Park will part of the roof, which will be detailed to match and upper part of the west elevation.

Hill Close will have a clear view of the rear of the new building and after discussions with the planning department we agreed to alter the mono pitch roof design to a more conventional double pitch reducing the height of the north facing rear wall towards Hill Close by some 2m

I am of the opinion that this modest building will sit comfortable in this rear area of Sandford Park with little impact on the surrounding houses many of which have already had substantial extension added.

**Thank you**

J M Gordon Notes for application 16/0328/FUL 29 March 2016

The proposed garage/workshop/office is very large building a long way outside the building line on land protected by the AONB

It's nearly 3/4 the size of the house and 30m outside the building line.

The applicant said at Parish Council that there is no such thing as a building line.

But the building line was central to the arguments to permit the second bungalow.

So much so that the applicant even cut 5m off the garden of his existing house so that the new bungalow would fall within the non-existing building line.

Similarly, he would like you to think that there is no such thing as open countryside. Apparently, all you have to do is put up a 2m high wooden fence and it just disappears.

The applicant says that he just wants to build a large building in his garden and he has the right to do so. Does he?

These are a couple of quotes from expert legal opinion. As is often the case, true expertise has the ability to simplify and you don't have to be a lawyer to understand what it says:

The 'curtilage' (or the 'residential curtilage') of a property does not represent a use of land for planning purposes.

You cannot change the use of land to use 'as residential curtilage'.

So, the applicants 'garden' is, and remains, agricultural land within the AONB.

But the argument is even simpler than that.



After permission was granted for the second bungalow, I wrote to the Chairman of this committee asking that the conditions to be applied to the permission be clear and unequivocal,

and phrased in such a way that it is clear that the application would not have been passed without the conditions.

I'm glad to say that Condition 9. of the permission put in place by this committee is clear and unequivocal. it says:

*Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, extensions or **outbuildings** shall be installed or constructed other than those expressly authorised by this permission.*

Condition 9 is a very explicit and substantial condition which specifically overrides the normal rules applying to permitted development on this land, including outbuildings.

I think the committee is right and within their rights to prioritise the protection of the AONB over ancillary development like this.

I ask the committee to support the conditions which have been put in place to protect this location. I ask you reject *this* application and to remind the applicant that *no* outbuildings will be permitted on this site.



**West Oxfordshire Uplands Planning Committee – 29<sup>th</sup> March 2016**

**Application number – 16/00328/FUL**

**Site address – Land east of Tyne Lodge, Brook Lane, Stonesfield**

Chairman, Members, good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today which I do on behalf of the applicant, Derek Hobbs.

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

Firstly, I would like to confirm that the proposed garage will only be used for purposes ancillary to the approved residential dwelling. It has never been the applicant's intention to use the garage for commercial or non-residential purposes and we are happy with the case officer's suggestion to impose a planning condition which will ensure that the garage is used for ancillary purposes only.

The proposed garage will be subordinate in scale to the approved dwelling by virtue of having a lower ridge height, lower eaves and a smaller foot print. Pre-application advice regarding the proposed garage was sought from the Council in December and a reduction in the roof height was the only amendment that was suggested by the case officer. The ridge height was subsequently reduced by one metre prior to the application being submitted. We therefore feel that we have responded to the Council's initial concerns and that the proposal is now of an appropriate scale and design.

Your officers do not object to the siting of the proposed garage and do not consider that the garage would be incongruous in the immediate context. Furthermore, your officers do not consider that the garage would appear unduly prominent in the landscape or cause harm to the special character of the Cotswolds AONB.

Finally, a generous gap has been retained between the proposed garage and the nearest neighbouring properties to ensure that the amenities of local residents would not be harmed.



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

Thank you.

**Simon Handy (Strutt & Parker)**