

Appendix A

Mr Venners introduced himself and addressed the meeting on behalf of the applicant and site owner, Mr Leslie, in the following terms:-

There are concerns that the scheme is overdevelopment of the site. We do not consider that the site is to be developed in a way that would cause any real harm.

Site visit usefully showed this- large open site

Although Woodstock is generally considered to be an historic town- even in the Conservation Area there are areas of difference. Farm End which lies adjacent to the south west of the site is a terrace of six 3-storey modern style 1970s houses. However they are little known due to their discrete siting and layout-they are not conspicuous despite their height. Given that they are a terrace of houses their gardens are roughly similar to the footprint of the houses themselves, thus repeating the characteristic of what is quite a densely built and tight knit historic town even along Manor Road (the A44). This tight knit nature actually gives the area much of its character.

The proposal here would provide 3 houses in addition to the existing house but each would have a very generous garden, quite compatible with those in the area. There is space around each dwelling such that it could not be said that they crammed in as alleged.

Care has been taken to ensure that new windows will not overlook neighbouring gardens or houses.

Trees will be retained around the site to mitigate the new houses.

However if you disagrees with my view about this we have presented revised plans

This proposal falls squarely that category of development which will be a change but will not be a harmful change. In considering all the issues the proposal will comply with all normal standards expected such as in relation to overlooking, garden sizes, parking, impact on heritage and many other things.

Given that they are mainly modern but with regard to traditional WODC design features such as stone walls. The NPPF is clear that original designs should not be stifled.

Willowbrook, Radford

4th July 2016

Planning Application 16/00342/RES (linked to 13/0321/P/OP) / Additional Representations

Statement by Jeremy Burton on behalf of the residents of Radford

As I said at the meeting on 31 May the residents of Radford accept that the Willowbrook site will be developed, but given the risk of flooding we want to make sure that things are done properly.

Therefore, we welcome the fact that the Applicant has employed an Engineering Consultant to devise a flood mitigation strategy.

However, all that he has proposed is a construction downstream of the development site. This will certainly help neighbouring Charlotte Cottage but it will do nothing to prevent water from further up the valley flowing through the site and close to Radford House during periods of high rainfall. We residents know that something has to be done upstream of the site if it and Radford House are to be properly protected from flooding.

This has been recognised by the Planning Officers, who in Paragraph 5.13 of the Agenda document dated 20 May say,

"It is considered essential that drainage works are required upstream from the site including attenuation measures to reduce discharge downstream and prevent flooding on site and the flooding of adjacent properties."

This is what led to the addition of Condition 9 which was imposed to ensure the proper provision for surface water drainage and to ensure flooding is not exacerbated in the locality.

Since this condition hasn't yet been fully met, we would ask the Committee Members not to approve this application until it includes details of the essential upstream flood mitigation measures.

We would also ask that prior to approval, the water drainage scheme and flood mitigation measures be completed before development begins rather than simply prior to the first occupation of the development. REASON: To safeguard Radford House during the development of the site.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS

As requested on 31 May I would again ask the Planning Officers and Committee members to please add two more conditions before approving this application - the reason being for the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

First, that clear conditions be imposed regarding the removal of the existing dwelling and a clear timetable be set for doing so as, surprisingly, none were imposed when outline permission was granted.

And second, that the note in the outline permission stating that '*the design and form of the dwelling and its scale and massing should read as subservient to the dwelling at Radford House*' be carried forward as a condition of this application.

Appendix C

Mr Venners introduced himself and explained that he was speaking as the applicant's agent was unable to attend.

He acknowledged the concerns expressed by local residents but indicated that, whilst they were required to address issues on the site arising from its development, it did not fall to the applicants to provide a perfect solution to other surface water drainage issues in the vicinity. The proposed drainage scheme was intended to improve the general position but the applicants were not able or required to carry out a fully comprehensive improvement scheme.

In any event, the question of surface water drainage was something of a distraction from the substance of the current reserved matters application (which sought approval of design and landscaping) as an appropriate condition addressing drainage issues had been imposed upon the outline consent.

Knowing the concerns expressed by the Council's Drainage Engineers, Mr Venners requested that, should Members feel unable to grant consent, they authorise Officers to approve the application subject to their being satisfied as to the efficacy of the proposed scheme.

In terms of the current application, Mr Venners indicated that the design conformed to the local vernacular, using local materials and simple detailing. Only a small formal garden area was proposed with a wildflower meadow reflecting the rural nature of the site.

Appendix D

Mr Bateson introduced himself and advised that he was speaking for the occupiers of 21 and 25 Tanners Lane. He acknowledged the need for more housing in the District but suggested that this site was not sustainable as there were no facilities in the immediate location. The site lay some 500 to 600 metres from shops in the town and the pedestrian route involved a steep incline that those less able would find difficult to negotiate.

The site was an open field in the AONB outside the built up area of the town on a hill top location that would be visually prominent. Development would be visually intrusive in the Burford Conservation Area.

The proposed development was more intensive than that in the immediate vicinity and, as such, would be harmful to the Conservation Area and contrary to the NPPF. The development was double the intensity of that in Tanners Lane.

Mr Bateson expressed concern with regard to potential overlooking of properties in Tanners Lane and the adequacy of the access to the site. In conclusion, he contended that the application represented a harmful overdevelopment of the site.

Tanner's Lane, Burford - Planning Committee Statement on behalf of Mr Nicholas Mills

Good Afternoon. I'm Lois Partridge from Carter Jonas in Oxford, and this afternoon I am representing the owner of the land at Tanner's Lane, Burford.

The application before you is an outline application for 6 dwellings, with all matters reserved for future determination except for access. Detailed plans of the proposed access have been provided, and in recognition of the site's location in the AONB and adjacent to the Burford Conservation Area, an indicative layout of the proposed scheme has also been provided.

During the preparation and submission of this application, we have sought to engage with the Local Planning Authority and community representatives. Prior to submission of the planning application, pre-application advice was sought from the Local Planning Authority on the principle of development of the site, and Burford Town Council was consulted on the plans. Several local residents attended this meeting. We have responded to comments and concerns received by amending the indicative layout of the outline scheme, and by increasing the provision of landscaping and planting on the site to avoid overlooking. There is a considerable distance of in excess of 44m between the backs of the proposed and the existing dwellings on Tanner's Lane; we note that officers would, as a general rule, consider a distance of 21m to be acceptable. We have also provided a public footpath linking the site to Tanner's Lane.

As set out in the Officer's report, there are no objections to the proposals before you from the Highways Authority (in relation to the proposed access arrangements), the Council's Conservation Officer (in terms of impact upon the landscape or the Conservation Area), the Council's Ecologist (in terms of the ecological impact of the proposals), or the Council's Drainage officer (in terms of flood risk and drainage matters).

Further, we would concur with the Officer's view that the proposals are in accordance with Policies H7 and OS 2 in the emerging Local Plan, which recognise Burford as an appropriate place for development, and we note that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

The proposed scheme would provide a mix of 3, 4 and 5 bed family housing, with gardens and garages, within walking and cycling distance of Burford town centre, which has a wide range of shops, services and community facilities, as well as public transport links to Oxford and Cheltenham. It is considered that the proposed density of the development represents an efficient use of the land, while taking account of the density of built form in the local area.

We understand that West Oxfordshire District Council is currently preparing Main Modifications to its emerging Local Plan, and that it is likely to have to make provision for more housing than currently planned for. We believe that this site can make a small but important contribution to meeting that housing need, in a highly sustainable location.

My client has sought to progress its planning application in the 'right way' by engaging with the Council and the Town Council and we very much hope therefore that you will recommend approval of this planning application subject to the completion of an appropriate Section 106 agreement.

Monday, 4 July 2016 :

Subject: (none)
Date: Monday, 4 July 2016 12:21:14 British Summer Time
From: Nicholas
Attachments: 02C74800-0B16-4356-9E87-AF061C39D1EC[14].png, 14C6E55B-D932-42B9-AA0E-D5F976964F16[14].png, E9C5221E-964F-4435-B7AD-14BE35232624[14].png

Good afternoon,

My name is Nicholas Johnston and I own and manage the Great Tew Estate.

First, I'd like to thank the committee for recently visiting the site and to those involved at Great Tew and the various officers at WODC who have worked in an intelligent and constructive manner on this particular application and the other associated applications over the last three years.

This application is aimed at not only securing the future of this heritage site in a manner that provides for public access to the historic walled gardens and creates employment but so it also links to ensure that several other listed buildings are also restored and removed from the possibility of being added to the listed assets at risk register.

In a time of difficulty for agriculture, a positive decision today will also provide a stepping stone to the future sustainability for the Estate with the trickle down effect being felt positively in the conservation area in and around the village and with ongoing repairs and maintenance to our other listed properties.

Whilst the scheme has been initially devised with Soho House as being the restaurant partner it could easily be another operator and this also creates a long term sustainable site on a stand alone basis.

As I said, a huge amount of work has been put into the scheme by David Hunt, who is here today to answer any specific questions, and by the various relevant officers at WODC and we would welcome the committee showing their support for their own officers conclusions that this application should be approved.

I am aware that there have been very few objections – just a single one I believe - and so I understand that the Parish Meeting at Great Tew did not feel the need to comment in support at last months Committee meeting. On the basis that there is only one 3 minute slot allocated for those in support of an application I have received the following email from the Chairman of the Parish Meeting, John Mitchinson;

The Great Tew Parish Meeting supports the New Gardens application and believes the restoration of these historic gardens and the subsequent public access to them, is a wonderful opportunity reflecting the preferred optimum use for the site. This has been previously demonstrated by the village community at the two village consultation meetings (the most recent on March 18th). Over 70 residents attended and local stakeholders presented their plans (including the Estate, the church, the cricket club and school). The response to the Estate's plans was very positive, not least because this and the other Great Tew Estate projects help support local businesses and create a variety of much needed rural employment opportunities. Great Tew, though small, has a history of welcoming enterprise and innovation. We believe the local community can only benefit from such an imaginative project and the Parish meeting would encourage the WODC Committee to give its support.'

Appendix G

Mr Tate acknowledged that it had been wrong to undertake work without first securing Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent but indicated that the work had been carried out with the best of intentions.

The existing building had been in a dreadful state of repair and there were concerns in terms of health and safety for those entering the site.

The works had been carried out to prevent the collapse or further deterioration of the building and the steel frame erected as the roof structure was compromised and had to be replaced to stabilise the building.

The building formed part of a linear group and, as such, was worthy of retention.

Appendix H

Mr Chattoe introduced himself and referred Members to the photographs and plans.

He indicated that the north west corner of the site fell within the curtilage of the frontage plots and the land to the north of 170 Main Road was formed part of the garden area.

The property to the east of 168B Main Road had a large double garage mirroring that at number 186B.

Mr Chattoe advised that the Parish Council was incorrect in its assertion that an additional opening would be created in the hedgerow and questioned their assessment of the site as an 'idyllic spot', considering it more as an overgrown paddock.

Whilst not in frequent use, the land to the south and west of the site was a driveway that would provide access to the 5m strip to the south.

To the east of the site was a long sliver of land with an impenetrable hedge.

Appendix I

Ms El-Kadoush introduced herself and explained that she had recently purchased the property and wished to extend it in a sympathetic manner employing a design that reflected the era of the original building.

The proposal would have a minimal impact and the application had been developed in close consultation with the Council's Officers.

The extension would enable the privacy lost by the extension of Orchard house to be regained and all the advice offered by Officers had been incorporated into the design.

The extension was intended to provide an additional bathroom and laundry room and not to create any additional living space. The property would remain a four bedroomed dwelling.

Ms El-Kadoush advised that she was currently living in Ascot and travelling to work in the District. The property was currently uninhabitable and the project was intended to bring it back to life as her home.

Ms El-Kadoush confirmed that she agreed to the window in the eastern elevation being obscure glazed but, as it was to serve a bathroom, whilst it could be restricted, it needed to be opening rather than fixed to allow for ventilation.

In conclusion, Ms El-Kadoush stressed that she had taken steps to address all concerns raised by her neighbours.

At short notice – because of the way this matter has been expedited – I'm here to speak for eight Diston's Lane properties adjoining the Penhurst site. We have several grounds for objection.

First, the acoustic consultants' report. A thorough job within the terms of reference, perhaps, but their conclusions are flawed because:

- (a) The height of the boundary wall has been exaggerated by a foot or more.
- (b) They've used an out-of-date plan for the location of neighbouring properties. (This error was pointed out on the previous, withdrawn application for this plant -0824/S73.) This omits new extensions so building separation distances have been exaggerated. In particular, the house Iona now has rooms extending right up to the boundary, bringing it within 10m of the proposed site for the aircon.
- (c) As regards the kitchen extract fans, the distance from No 20a has not been considered. This property wraps around behind intervening properties and has a room within 30m of the proposed fan – closer than any property actually considered in the report.
- (d) The consultants take the manufacturer's own noise output specifications at face value. Such figures must be treated with caution. Even without deliberate manipulation – think: Volkswagen emissions scandal – manufacturers' figures represent the best-case, using brand-new equipment. With age, equipment gets noisier; bearings rumble, fans rattle. Maintenance rectifies these issues belatedly, if at all.
- (e) Using BS4142, they've considered noise impact only with respect to buildings, not to gardens. Councillors might consider whether that *is* the appropriate standard to apply. This is a 24-hour source of noise and people do not spend 24 hours of the day inside their houses.

Secondly, why put noisy plant at the point of closest approach to residential properties? It seems consideration for neighbours has been the lowest priority. The chosen location is a strip of land barely 5m wide between a projecting wing of the care home and the boundary. On this huge site, the architects should find a less-intrusive location. For example, the aircon plant could be moved just round the corner of the wing and thereby dropped down over 2m into the sunken courtyard, greatly helping contain noise.

Finally, I'm bound to highlight an emerging pattern here of less-attractive features being shoe-horned in at the eleventh hour. There's the current application. Then, next month, I'll be back here arguing against a proposed smoking shelter in that same narrow strip. Separately, I've had to ask Planning Enforcement to look at the clutter of service facilities recently installed on the roof, apparently without planning consent. It's an industrial roofscape in a conservation area. So, please let's hear from the Applicant why an experienced developer failed to specify any of these features at the outset.

Jonathan Souster
34 Diston's Lane
Chipping Norton, OX7 5NR