

## Appendix A

I have read the Planning Officer's Report and fully support his conclusions and recommendations. I will therefore keep my remarks brief.

The Guidelines for Taynton note that the appearance of the village (and here I quote) "has altered remarkably little down the centuries and the village remains a time capsule that looks today much as it must have done in the 18<sup>th</sup> century."

Those of us who are fortunate enough to live in Taynton treasure the appearance of the village and are keen to conserve it not only for ourselves but for visitors and those who pass through the village, as well as for future generations.

It is unsurprising, therefore, that many residents wish to ensure that any development respects the unique character of the village.

Coombe House is a converted barn. It lies in a sensitive location at the very heart of the village. It is surrounded by a number of listed properties and there are views across its land to the Grade II listed Church.

There were 15 objections to the applicants' original proposals of October last year and 4 letters in support. There were a further 5 objections to the revised proposals submitted in January which we are considering today. It is worth noting that of the 10 who objected to the original proposals but did not submit an objection to the revised proposals, 8 of them objected originally to aspects of the earlier design that are not much changed in the revised proposals, notably as regards the scale of the extension and the use of large sheet glazing.

It is significant that there are so many objectors, but I recognise that is not determinative of the application. The issue is whether the proposals respect the Planning Guidelines for Taynton.

On that issue, it is clear to me and others that the scale of the extension to the west would obscure the view of the Church; and the extensive glazing to the extension would be at odds with the language of the rest of the building. In these respects the proposals fail to comply with the Planning Guidelines. And it is on those grounds that the Planning Officer concludes that the application be refused. I fully support his conclusions and recommendations and would urge the Committee to do likewise.

**Application No: 16/03529/HHD**  
**Proposed Alterations to Coombe House, Taynton**  
**Item 2, Uplands Planning Committee – 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017**

Good afternoon,

Due to the discussions and revisions that have taken place, there are now only two issues with this proposal to improve the appearance of what the officer describes as a building that has been extensively altered in an unsympathetic manner long before my clients acquired it. This proposal seeks to upgrade the appearance with a number of alterations that we consider are harmonious to the building and the Conservation Area in which it is located.

The first issue concerns the height of the proposed side extension, the ridge of which will be more than 0.7m below the main roof (not 0.5m as stated in the Committee Report). This will be 1m higher than existing and will mean that the headroom in the upper part of this building will be improved. The officer's report accepts that in a design sense, this is acceptable (paragraph 5.6).

However, the concern is that the raising of the roof will result in the loss of what is alleged to be a key view of the church. I agree that the church is a landmark building within the Conservation Area but its tower will still be seen if the roof is raised as proposed. However, not so much of it will be visible when viewed from a short section of the Barrington Road opposite. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal sets out the significant views from within the Conservation Area but does not show the one that will be changed as a result of this proposal.

The tower will still be seen from the road opposite but the clock will not be seen for approximately 30-40m and the change of view from such a short section of road is, in my opinion, negligible and would not be harmed. Views of the church from other vantage points in the locality would not be affected, which diminishes the weight of this objection.

The second issue concerns the ground floor fenestration within the western section of the building. This was not a concern of the Council's architect and was not raised by the Planning Officer until recently, probably due to objections. The existing openings in this part of the building are unattractive and the approach has been to provide openings similar in scale to those found in cart sheds ancillary to larger barns. Accordingly, their design is appropriate to this location and these recessed windows will not be prominent due to the reduced level of the building and the vegetation in the foreground.

I trust that you will give consideration to these points and will agree that the proposal will not cause the harm alleged in the Committee Report but will result in an enhancement to the appearance of this building and the Conservation Area, thereby meeting the Statutory Duty.

Thank you.

## Appendix C

Mr Moffatt indicated that he had no objection to the development in principle and considered the style and scale of the proposed dwelling to be in keeping with the existing estate. However, he had concerns over the proposed access off The Slade.

His initial concern was one of highway safety. The proposed access was on a severe slope with reduced visibility. The topography of the site was such that this constituted a dangerous entrance and exit.

Mr Moffatt advised that he had been puzzled by the Highway Authority comments and had telephoned the Officer in question to discuss these in more detail. He had been advised that the assessment had been based upon the existence of a 30mph speed limit on The Slade but it had also been acknowledged that this limit was not complied with. In a survey conducted in 2016, of a total of 1,138 vehicle movements it had been established that 65% of those vehicles were travelling in excess of 30mph.

Mr Moffatt indicated that safety should be of paramount consideration and an assessment should be based upon the actual position, not on notional limits.

Secondly, Mr Moffatt expressed concern that the removal of trees on the site to create a new access would have an adverse impact on the adjacent heritage asset. He contended that a heritage impact assessment should have been made as part of the application and noted that this has not been prepared.

In conclusion, Mr Moffatt emphasised his view that the applicants should utilise the existing access.

## **Appendix D**

Mr Ramsay expressed his support for the Officer's recommendation, indicating that the principle of development had been established through the extant consent. He reminded Members that an application for four houses on the site had been refused and the applicants had now reverted to a scheme that provided seven flats.

The application was a precursor to the following proposal and had been devised following discussions with local estate agents, differing from the extant consent to provide a more saleable layout.

The scheme had been amended following discussions with Officers and highway and parking arrangements, together with the proposed elevational treatment, were in keeping with the extant consent.

The development would have no adverse impact in terms of amenity and would make provision towards the Council's housing land supply.



**West Oxfordshire Uplands Planning Committee – 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017**

**Application number – 17/00056/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. It is also worth highlighting that the scale and appearance of the proposed garage will be identical to the outbuilding recently approved on the adjoining plot to the south-west. This adjacent outbuilding was initially refused at the West Oxfordshire planning committee, but then allowed at appeal following an Inspector's assessment. We therefore consider that there are no grounds to refuse planning permission for this near identical garage on this neighbouring plot.

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.

During the consideration of this current application, your officer was sent precise details of the external materials that would be used for the proposed garage. These would match the

external materials approved by the Council for the adjacent garage, for which samples were signed off on-site. Therefore, if Members are minded to approve this application, we would request that condition 3 within your officer's report is amended to list the previously approved materials, rather than requiring the submission of fresh samples prior to any development commencing.

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)**

## Appendix F

Mr Woodell indicated that the Phone Co-op was a local success story, employing some 75 persons. The company maintained high standards and had received a number of national awards.

The company was proud of its connections with Chipping Norton and, whilst currently operating in rented premises, had been seeking to acquire its own site for some time. A year ago it had purchased the premises at 19 Market Place and, having been served with notice to quit by its current landlord, needed to find a long term solution to its accommodation needs.

Mr Woodell indicated that the company had addressed the questions raised by Officers and stressed that the presence of its workforce would bring an economic benefit to the town.

The transport statement indicated that the impact of the development in terms of traffic generation would be small and Mr Woodell contended that the concerns expressed were not valid for this small building.

In conclusion, Mr Woodell advised that, whilst he remained committed to Chipping Norton, his Board of Directors was losing patience and could decide to relocate that part of the business elsewhere.