

## Appendix A

I have asked to speak to this committee so that I can represent the views of the Parish of Enstone, which strongly objects to the proposed development. These views are detailed in 34 individual letters of objection and were also discussed in detail at a meeting of the Parish council on the 15th of September, attended by approximately 30 residents. I would like to emphasise that the members of the Parish are not against development in Enstone full stop, but are of the opinion that the proposed site is not an appropriate one for development. Our principal objection is that the site is an important rural gap between the separate settlements of Church Enstone and Neat Enstone. Development on even a portion of the valley separating the two settlements would set a precedent that would inevitably lead to the eventual urbanisation of the valley and would ultimately result in amalgamation of Church and Neat Enstone into a single conurbation. This would significantly degrade the character of Enstone that makes such an attractive place to live. In particular, the current public footpath that runs through the site affords fine views of the rural setting and these views would be lost to the development. We note that although this outline application is for significantly fewer houses than the original withdrawn application, the land-area to be developed is almost exactly the same. We also note that the style of development is not in keeping with the existing housing in the immediate vicinity and we question whether a development consisting solely of large family houses and no affordable housing is appropriate for this location. We also are of the view that the applicants have not paid due regard to the fact that the site is wholly within the Glyme and Dorn conservation target area. Development on such a site must INCREASE the biodiversity of the CTA and the proposed Habitat Management Plan is inadequate, as noted by the WODC Biodiversity Officer.

Finally, we would like to emphasise that development of this site is not supported by current planning policy because it does not constitute 'rounding off' of existing housing and would cause significant harm to the immediate landscape setting. These points are made in both the planning policy officer's report and in Michael Kemp's report in which he recommends refusal.

**Uplands Planning Committee 3 October 2016**

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

The Committee will be aware of the need to deliver additional housing in sustainable locations across West Oxfordshire and your officers consider that Enstone is such a location.

In considering the application before you, the report makes it clear that the proposal is acceptable in principle and that there are no technical, highway, neighbour amenity, drainage, archaeological or ecological concerns.

I would like to draw members' attention to paragraph 1.13 of your officer's report which states that the Parish Council's objection is only on two grounds, capacity of the primary school and concern regarding sewage capacity. OCC have no objection to the proposal on education grounds and similarly Thames Water have no objection in relation to foul drainage.

Your officers also acknowledge that the site is not prominent in wider views; the site of course is not in the AONB or a Conservation Area and is not subject to any landscape designation. The issue appears to be a single one, relating to the potential impact on the character of the immediate landscape setting of the site, and in particular how this would be experienced when walking the footpath that crosses it.

Any development, in any location, will change the character of the site and its immediate setting. The question is whether in this instance it is a harmful change.

The footpath referred to is within the village and not open countryside. The experience of walking along it currently comprises a short walk of just over 200m across a field overlooked by residential development on three sides on a route between two major roads, the B4030 to the north and the A44 to the south. The proposal retains this route on its current alignment but the applicant is also willing to either divert it or provide a new footpath around the landscaped edge of the new development should it be desired. This would give walkers much the same experience as at present; this being one of walking a short distance with short-range views of an enclosed valley to the south and east whilst being overlooked by housing.

The proposal would not extend the existing settlement edge as it is sited on the land between the property to the south and the existing cottages fronting Bicester Road to the north. The density of the scheme is lower than that seen on the opposite side of The Drive. The proposal has been designed sensitively based on farm outbuilding and barn types arranged around small courtyards similar in character to those seen close by and across the district. Therefore the applicant does not consider the scheme would be harmful or appear incongruous.

As with all applications, in coming to a decision there is a balancing exercise to be undertaken. In this case it is whether the limited landscape impact would 'significantly and demonstrably' outweigh the benefits of providing attractively designed village houses in a sustainable location in the context of a recognised and clear shortfall of housing supply in the district.

As such, Members, I hope you will be minded to vote in favour of the scheme and approve the application.

Thank you Chair.

## **Appendix C**

### **Points to make on officer report to committee**

**Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2016**

**Thornycroft, Woodstock Road Charlbury, reference 16/01866/FUL**

- 1 Thank you Chairman and Members. I am objecting on behalf of Mr & Mrs Kirk who live at the neighbouring property, Whitson. This application is nearly identical to one refused by you earlier in the year, after a site visit, as being harmful to the surrounding Charlbury Conservation Area and resulting in unacceptable living conditions.
- 2 Given the refusal reason, it is difficult to imagine how another identical proposal on this site could ever overcome the reason for refusal even with significant changes in design, scale and location. In actual fact the design and scale are identical, save for some minor alterations to windows and moving the house just 1 metre further from the boundary with Whitson.
- 3 The report does refer to the historic and recent refusals of planning permission for a house at this site, but does not explain that this recent refusal is a material consideration to which significant weight should be given when assessing a near identical proposal made so soon afterwards.
- 4 The report states that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply. Even with this change in position on housing delivery, the test in paragraph 14 of the NPPF is that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The report has not carried out this balancing act and has not weighed the clearly identified harm in the previous refusal reason against the benefit of one new dwelling.

- 5 Instead, the report focusses on the slight repositioning of the house, suggesting that this movement will overcome the harm to the living conditions of both the future occupants and those of the neighbouring property, Whitson. In fact, given the negligible movement of 1 metre, the new house will still be very close to the boundary and the occupants will look out of their windows at a timber fence. That change represents little improvement to living conditions.
- 6 Of much greater importance in your determination of this application is the impact upon the conservation area which was the aspect of this proposal that members were most concerned about last time. The report fails to mention that the proposed house is the same design in an almost identical location and therefore its impact on the existing loose-knit pattern of development and the character and appearance of the Charlbury Conservation Area will be exactly the same. Members are not being given any logical reason why their previous decision should be overturned just a few months later.
- 7 Members will be familiar with the established principle within planning caselaw and government guidance that planning decisions need to be consistent and that the public has a reasonable expectation that like proposals are made in a like manner to preserve the credibility of the planning system and prevent harmful precedents from being set. We simply ask that you do that and maintain your well-founded and recent objection to this repeat application by refusing it for the same reasons as last time.
- 8 Thank you chair and Members.

## Appendix D

Mr Mellor advised that the scheme had been revised since it was last considered by the Sub-Committee. The proposed dwelling had been moved further away from the neighbouring property, Whitson, and some facing windows had been removed whilst others had been reduced in size, to make proposal more neighbour friendly;

The Council's Officers did not consider the current scheme to be unneighbourly, and in fact didn't consider previous scheme to be unneighbourly either;

The scheme had also been amended in terms of re-siting of garage to protect the mature oak tree on the site and the Council's Tree Officer was content with the application.

The Overall form and design of the scheme had been discussed through from pre-application stage with the Council's Conservation Architect and agreed from there;

Officers considered the proposal to be a "logical complement to the existing scale and pattern of development" and were of the view that the proposal caused no harm to the character and setting of this part of conservation area;

The report made it clear that both existing and proposed housing policies support new housing in Charlbury.

In conclusion, Mr Mellor noted that Officers had supported the previous application and were supporting the application currently under consideration, expressing the hope that Members would approve the application.

## Appendix E

Planning Application- 16/02470- 31 Brook Hill, Woodstock

---

We object to this planning application for the following reasons.

On the detailed plan, the minimum interior height specification of 2.7 metres is a requirement and not a height specification.

The Planning Officer has stated that the height will be 3 metres. But any height above this number would meet the requirement. A maximum height of 3 metres would need to be mandated on the applicant.

The hard standing is raised some 0.5 metres at the north end. This would make the building some 3.5 metres right against our boundary and with its barn-like structure, it would look very unsightly.

On the site plan, the proposed building is shown as almost behind the front line of number 32 Brook Hill. In reality, it will be almost wholly in front of the front line of the house, as seen on the aerial photograph I submitted to the Planning Officer and yourselves this morning. It is also shown much further from the house than where it will be actually. Surely the Council cannot accept an application with such misleading information.

The structure would therefore be a very imposing building clearly, visible from our front garden at 32A and it would overshadow the front garden of no 32 Brook Hill. It would be detrimental to the amenities of their front garden.

As you will have also seen in the pictures we submitted, the building will look very unsightly right in front of our house and it will considerably devalue the amenities of the area.

This is not in keeping with the Policies BE2 and H2. BE2 states that the proposal should be well designed and respect the existing scale, pattern and character of the surrounding area. There are no other wooden barn-like structures in the front gardens of houses in Brook Hill or the surrounding area. They are made from either brick or Cotswold stone.

The building does not accord with paragraph 64 of the NPPF.

It is a very poor design that fails particularly to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of this area of outstanding landscape value.

A large wooden barn-like structure will be very detrimental to this area and very unneighbourly to us and to the other local residents.

The building in the application is out of keeping with this area and it does not conform to planning policies.

We ask you to reject it.

Dr Ivor Lloyd.

## Appendix F

Mr Longworth acknowledged that there was a long planning history on the site. and that it had been before the Sub-Committee on a number of occasions.

He advised that, the previous year, the original land owners fulfilled their long standing publicly stated intention to sell the public house to a user. This commitment had been honoured and The Quart Pot had been re-opened as The Hare.

The residual land which was originally part of the car park had been retained by the original land owners, but as yet on his advice had not been fenced off, and Mr Longworth advised the proposals before Members provided The Hare with 7 parking spaces.

Mr Longworth noted that the current application, submitted by a new applicant, had a recommendation for approval following a series of negotiations and meetings with the Council's Officers. However, some late queries had been raised about retained parking provision and parking standards, for The Hare.

The Council had previously accepted that 7 parking spaces is the correct parking standard for the public house, as noted on p11 of the WODC appeal statement for applications 14/0364/P/FP and 14/0229/P/FP. Compared to previous applications, the quantum of additional development on the site had been significantly reduced, manoeuvring increased, and the access drive widened (the issues which the Planning Inspector raised concern about). During their purchase of The Hare, the purchasers considered that 7 spaces are sufficient to ensure viability of the public house.

Reviewing all previous planning applications on this site, it was clear that no assessment of the original parking provision on the site has ever been made, by previous applicants, WODC or OCC Highways.

Mr Longworth indicated that the Brewhouse/ store, had been removed due to vandalism and advised that site, as a maximum, could only accommodate 9- 10 parking spaces, without obstructing the access or doorways. However, as the parking bays were not marked out, the likely capacity was significantly less.

The parking survey accompanying the application and the note below from OCC Highways, whose officer's had undertaken drive-bys on a number of occasions, made it clear that any that any overspill, would not impact on the local road network.

In conclusion, Mr Longworth advised that OCC had reconfirmed they had no have objection to the planning application on parking grounds.