

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 29th March 2016

Report of Additional Representations



**WEST OXFORDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Agenda Index

Please note that if you are viewing this document electronically, the agenda items below have been set up as links to the relevant application for your convenience.

I6/00233/FUL

[18 Sandford Park, Charlbury](#)

3

Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	I6/00233/FUL
Site Address	18 Sandford Park Charlbury Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 3TH
Date	23rd March 2016
Officer	Michael Kemp
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Charlbury Parish Council
Grid Reference	436131 E 219346 N
Committee Date	29th March 2016

Application Details:

New dwelling adjacent to 18 Sandford Park with new vehicle access

Applicant Details:

Ms B Gorton
18 Sandford Park
Charlbury
Oxfordshire
OX7 3TH

Additional Representations

Consultation comments have been made by the Councils Tree and Landscape officer in relation to this application.

- It would be advised that the applicants provide a tree survey to clearly identify and trees affected by the works. The information should follow the recommendations in the BS and include an Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
- The impact of the development on trees adjoining the site will need to be taken into account – both in terms of root protection and the desirability of the large trees oversailing the proposed dwelling – shading, nuisance, safety implications.

Charlbury Town Council reiterated their objections to the amended plans and state that their original comments still stand.

Charlbury Conservation Area Committee made the following comments:

The Committee was not wholly resistant to the idea of a new house on the proposed site although the loss of part of the open landscaping which was such an important feature of the estate would be a matter for regret. But members were strongly of the view that any such addition could only be acceptable if it followed the design philosophy of Sandford Park's existing layout – a fine and characteristic example of 1960s planning by a respected local architect of the time. The proposed dwelling did not meet this criterion in terms of its access, relationship to the other houses, height and bulk, design and materials, enclosure and parking arrangements. A serious rethink was needed which demonstrated a better understanding of the special character of Sandford Park (including its parking and access arrangements) and the importance of its contribution to the Conservation Area when viewed from the well-used public footpath along its foot.

Members noted the absence of a plan of the existing landscape and planting which should be a key starting point for any proposal to build on this site.

Dr Fortescue made the following comments in relation to the amended plans:

The revisions made to the proposal for a new house adjacent to 18 Sandford Park since my previous comments do not meet with the objections made there except in relatively small part. The basic plan is still for a two-storey house quite out of keeping with the other houses on this uniquely cohesive estate with its open park plan and linked one-storey houses. The roof style and especially the addition of a stair turret are quite out of keeping, as is the plan to use plain render on two of the walls and for the windows to be narrow and quite unlike those of the existing houses. The change of plan from a wooden to a chain mail fence does not solve the problem of maintaining continuity in the open plan spirit of the estate at all. In short, the proposal still goes counter to the covenant excluding the building of new dwellinghouses on the estate. There would nevertheless doubtless have been room for compromise if there had been prior dialogue with other residents of the estate. It is difficult to understand why this was not the case.

Ms Brander made the following comments:

The site plan appears to have built in assumptions that an area of land which currently is the responsibility of the owner of no. 18 becomes nobody's responsibility. This is the land with screening plants and shrubs adjacent to the stream. The owner of no. 18 currently has responsibility for this land and should retain responsibility.

Jean Flint of 5 Hill Close reiterated her previous objections to the proposals:

- The building would be within 1 metre of the boundary fence of 5 Hill Close and 11 metres from the ground floor windows of the living areas of this property.
- The north side of the house would cause permanent overshadowing.
- There would be overlooking into the first and ground floor windows.
- It would not be her responsibility if the tree in overhanging where the foundations are planned to fall on the said property.
- Something smaller should be built.

Mr Harrison raised a number of objections which are summarised:

- The properties in Hill Close are 3 storeys and not 4 storeys and the scale of the dwelling should be reviewed in light of this.
- The height has been reduced by one metre however the development would still appear overbearing and would result in overshadowing.
- There is no recommendation for opaque glass to be installed in 3 of the north facing windows.
- The use of render in the north elevation is inappropriate and out of keeping with the character of Sandford Park.
- The distances mentioned in the report are disputed. The distance between 6 Hill Close and the proposed dwelling is 14 metres and there is a distance of 3 metres between the property and the boundary of 6 Hill Close.
- The amended plans omit any detail of the trees located to the north of the proposed dwelling. Concerns were raised about the development affecting the root structure of the trees.
- It is unclear from the report whether permission has been granted by Thames Water for the development.

Mr Belshaw made the following comments:

The revised plans do not at all meet the basic objection that this proposal is totally out of sympathy with the overall design of Sandford Park. A rendered two story building fenced around on an open plan fenceless area of bungalows will stick out like a sore thumb. By siting a garage to the south of the proposed building, the footprint for the house is right up to the northern boundary and too close to mature trees in the gardens of Hill Close. Although The Slade is a 30mph restricted route virtually every vehicle travelling north triggers the speed exception indicator as it comes over the brow of the hill. Some drivers then brake and some do not.