

**17/00710/FUL** I had the idea for Hidden House when looking at the steeply sloped end of the garden which has been looked after by owners of the bungalow on the land above, now replaced now by the new build. It was very difficult to maintain.

Realised that IF I could dig out the bank and build in a small dwelling I would be able to extend the garden for No 1 over it so creating an extra house while gaining more useful garden on which to plant shrubs and fruit trees. The house will be substantially Hidden as a result and be a very efficient "Eco house".

It will also be a contemporary design, while using traditional Ashlar cladding as detailed in the report. The officers say that it creates "an attractive frontage onto Brook Hill which would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area". It was also compliant in principle with both the Existing and Emerging plan.

We responded to queries from the planner that covered amount of light in the Courtyard and size of the space and increased the area to that of recent comparable houses.

The banking was reduced in height and remodelled to allow more light in and then 3D pictures were provided to show the amount of light that falls onto the house. The 10ft long skylight and 9 x 13 ft large window to the main open plan living area, means that it benefits from afternoon and evening sunlight. The Skylight is to be frosted by agreement.

Parking was a main query in the area. The Town Council have written in to say that there will be a loss of 3 spaces on the road, which is not the case. However, there are two open and free standing parking spots off road, as part of this house development. **OCC Highways had no objection therefore. NO** parking on the road is required although there will be an entrance for a car width only, which will be to the right of the plot. It will not be possible to park close to the house as the opening in the fence will prevent that.

Most importantly, as my house is most likely to be affected, I will reinstate evergreen laurel and other planting as part of the landscaping plan to be agreed with officers. Thank you and I hope you approve of this carefully thought out, and innovative Eco design that will also enhance the area.

**17/00830/FUL**

**Demolition and Conversion of barns to three dwellings**

**Fourwinds, Burford Road, Shipton-Under-Wychwood, OX7 6DL**

Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am the applicant and landowner for the application before you and I am seeking full planning permission to convert a number of existing barns at Four Winds Farm to residential accommodation.

The buildings subject of this application date from a post War Dairy Unit and are redundant for modern agriculture. They were put here at a time which required farmers all over the country to rise to the challenge of feeding not just this country, but much of Europe as well. These buildings are as much a part of our heritage as Victorian model farm buildings, and as such deserve as much opportunity to be preserved.

To preserve something of their past however requires them to have a future. We have made a number of attempts to utilise them, most specifically as boarding kennels, but to date have failed to proceed, primarily due to resistance from neighbours. We were due to resubmit that application, when the opportunity that we now see encapsulated in para 55 of the NPPF opened up.

para. 55 of the national framework allows new dwellings to be provided in more isolated locations where development involves the reuse of redundant or disused buildings. I am proposing to sensitively convert a number of the barns to form three residential units. The barns have had a full structural survey which considers them to be suitable for conversion and significant alterations are not required.

I will address briefly the objections that the Officer has raised.

First; the sustainability argument, principally revolving round transport issues and remoteness.

I do not believe this is a valid objection, busses do stop outside our house, but, notwithstanding this, Whilst a full planning application is required in this case, this is due to its AONB landscape designation and it is clear from guidance that the transport

sustainability test does not apply and I know of at least two appeals in the District where Inspectors have made it clear that National policy **does** support the re-use of disused buildings in isolated areas, the latest being Lower Riding Farm, North Leigh, allowed at appeal on 31<sup>st</sup> May.

In regard to the second and third objections, I submit that these are subjective on the part of the Officer. The officer suggests that the proposal – does not reflect the current built form, I contest this. We have worked with the current built form, and I want this to be a visionary inspirational example of what the next generation of conversions can achieve. The scheme has been sympathetically designed to use existing footprint. External works and alterations would be minimal and the proposed design reflects the modern characteristics of the agricultural units. The development would result in a **44% reduction** of existing building.

Not only is the development screened by trees, it is located on the side of the A361, which, is characterised by sporadic housing alongside the road, starting from Hickman's yard, then within a mile including Shipton Downs Farm, and 4 other properties.

We have been careful to ensure that the scheme only has a beneficial impact on the AONB and I think that is clear through the visuals that have been circulated.

The officer has questioned the determination of our red line - this was to encompass the silver shed 'eyesore', in the western end of our yard which many of you will know is conspicuous as you drive up the hill and which we propose to remove.

There are no technical objections to the proposed development from statutory consultees. **It is also significant that we have no objections from neighbours for this proposal.**

I am strongly of the view that the scheme presented will deliver the best solution for the site and that it reuses redundant buildings, utilising an existing resource with limited future other than dilapidation, providing **us with a home** of character and quality, and will assure the future quality of the landscape.

I therefore believe that contrary to the Officers recommendation we have demonstrated Compliance with Para 55. I hope therefore that you will be able to support the proposals.

Thank you for listening and for your time.

## Appendix C

Good afternoon and thank you, Mr Chair and learn'd members of the committee

I am Mike Hughes from 24 The Slade, I am here again to object to this proposal, on grounds of being overlooked, and it being overbearing and destroying our outlook.

The applicant continues to bend important details to suit their case. I have recent photographs here of the landowner taking measurements right in to my garden, leaning over my boundary with his tape, and yet again they have ignored our ground floor extension. They'll continue to assert opinions on the distances without sharing the perspective from my house, a perspective critical to both your and the inspectors judgement previously.

With this, the singular new drawing provided by the agent is a selectively 2 dimensional view of a complex 3d topography, indicating the height of existing buildings and terrain but notably missing their proposed house height, and also missing are updated elevations of their proposal, and a site layout which might show if plot 2 still has a detached garage, or how the changes to windows might affect other residents, or indeed how many new trees are proposed as it has seemingly increased to two rows?

Meanwhile a 3 panel 6ft fence has already been erected where the proposed boundary might be, standing lonely in the middle of the AONB field - actually proving that it won't provide privacy screening for our bedrooms from their ground floor windows. This is because:

- The land slopes down The Slade as well as down towards our houses and a new house will take the highest point.
- Building regulations require a damp proof course at least 15cm above ground level, on top of a layer of air bricks, then a screed, and layers of a finished floor - we estimate this puts the finished floor height at 50cm over ground level at that edge
- Therefore someone stood in the lounge of Plot 2 in front of the full height glazed doors, or at their kitchen window will look right over the fence and down into our bedroom windows!

These fence panels also provide a visual reference of how overbearing these properties would be - if I visualise buildings some 4 or 5 times taller than these panels, it indicates how hemmed in we'll be by this development, as our house sits in a trench as noted previously by the committee, with a busy B-road at the front, and this steep hill rising at the back.

This development will dominate our property, towering high above us, looming over on the higher ground. While I have no expectation of a view, this development would dominate our outlook - we will no longer be able to see the sky from the ground floor without pressing our faces against windows and looking near vertically up!

The planning inspector previously concluded "At present there is no built form on the site and, given the topography, its introduction ... would not merely change the view but have an enclosing and confining effect on the occupiers of Nos 24 and 26" going on to say "it would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 24 and 26, with regard to privacy and outlook". The cursory adjustment to their revised proposal fails to address our privacy concerns, and remains damaging to our outlook, being taller and standing at the highest point.

The increased height even of a 1 storey development standing some 4m higher than our ground floor will be overbearing, let alone a 1.5 storey one.

This conflicts with BE2 and H2 of the 2011 Plan, and H2 and OS2 of the emerging document. This gives cause why you must refuse permission today. Thank you.



- Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address the Planning Committee;
- My name is Jon Westerman. I am an Associate Director at Edgars Limited and I am speaking on behalf of the applicants;
- On the basis that Edgars limited addressed the Committee when this application was presented to the May and June meetings, I don't intend taking too much of your time;
- The application was deferred from the June Committee due to concerns regarding perceived overlooking from the first floor windows and the private amenity space of plots 1 and 2;
- The deferral of the application has enabled changes to be made to the scheme to address these concerns.
- Amended plans have been submitted which re-configure the first floor accommodation of plots 1 and 2.
- The first floor windows to the rear of plots 1 and 2 now all serve bathrooms.
- In terms of the private amenity space – it is proposed that a 1.8 metre boundary fence will form the rear boundary of plots 1 and 2.
- The boundary fence will provide a physical barrier to views;
- The separation distance from the rear face of the dwellings will be in excess of 47 metres;
- A section has been submitted demonstrating the benefit of the fence;
- A temporary fence was also erected on site to allow your officers to assess the benefit of the fence;
- The fence and changing levels will restrict the view of a person six feet tall to above the eaves level of the properties fronting The Slade – specifically above the dormer window height.
- The fence will be softened by landscaping – this could be secured through condition.
- I note your officers recommendation is one of approval - thank you for your time.

**Edgars Limited Oxford**  
The Old Bank, 39 Market Square, Witney, Oxfordshire, OX28 6AD  
T. 01865 731 700 E. enquiries@edgarslimited.co.uk W. www.edgarslimited.co.uk

**Planning Consultants, Chartered Surveyors**

Directors: Jayne Norris BA(Hons) MSc DipTp MRTPI, David Norris BA(Hons) MRICS AMaPS  
Associate Director: Jon Westerman BA(Hons) DipTp MRTPI  
Associates: Laura Warden BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI, Paul Slater BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Registered in England and Wales, Company No. 4219821 VAT No, 768 4805 83



### Chadlington

#### Speech to committee

Good afternoon

Having worked within the public sector as a Chartered Landscape Architect I have assessed applications for development within AONB's and in my professional opinion consider this site to have the capacity to accommodate a development of the scale and layout proposed.

My reasons for this are as follows:

- This is a sensitively designed layout comprising three dwellings. The proposed dwellings are well spaced and located such that a view corridor is maintained to the surrounding countryside from Chipping Norton Road
- The proposal is entirely in keeping with the nature and scale of linear development along this road and within the village
- The proposal does not extend into open countryside beyond the extents of the existing settlement.
- As demonstrated by the photographic evidence provided in the landscape assessment the character of the aonb would remain relatively unaffected by the development. In general, the proposal would be barely visible from sensitive viewpoints and where visible would be of an appropriate scale and seen in association with the built form of the settlement and neighbouring properties.
- The site is not the only area within the settlement where one can gain an appreciation of the surrounding rural countryside character. Elsewhere within the village and along Chipping Norton Road there are frequent views of the surrounding countryside afforded between properties. There is also an area of publicly accessible land to the south that affords open panoramic views of the surrounding countryside.
- The site itself is not open to the public and has no PROW crossing it and vegetation has matured over time to heavily filter and restrict views from the road which negates the reason for keeping the site undeveloped.

*I also made comment whilst giving the speech about the choice of photos by the Council, as they were taken from within the site where there is no public access and are therefore not representative of views experienced by the public from the road.*

I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not detract from an appreciation of the wider countryside setting of the settlement, nor harm landscape character and the special qualities of the AONB and that this development is sensitively laid out and entirely in keeping with its context.

I recommend committee support this application.

Thank you

## Appendix F

My name is Kin Man 1 from 147 Main Road Long Hanborough where I live with my wife and 2 young children.

My neighbors at 145 have built a single storey extension where this development overshadows & obscures an unreasonable amount of natural light in my living room by an amount that far exceeds local planning policy allowances. This has affected an essential amenity in the enjoyment of our home, see fig 1 & 2. The overshadowing is to our only living room window. Photo taken in Dec-2016 at 1pm when the extension was only partially complete.

A number of factors contributed to this, including the incorrect positioning of my house in relation to the extension is drawn 1.75 metres too far forward than in reality. The final outcome was made even worse due to the extension exceeding the size shown on the approved plans. The building is now both higher in height by 40cm as per the measurements from Jane Fray in an email (close to what I measure) in Feb-2016. The eaves also project more than they should and are thicker than the consented design and obscures even more light than would have been the case if the consented plan had been followed, see fig 3. The extent to the increased size of the eaves has tripled from what it should be as shown in red.

Turning to the present retrospective application, errors and mistakes in the application drawings persist. The submitted plans do not represent the as built extension. Its not that they are simply misleading, they contain grossly incorrect information. If I provide you with 1 of the many examples see fig 3 where the architecture labels a 45 degree line that apparently 'completely misses the extension'. by the architecture which apparently completely misses the extension. When measuring this, this is not a 45 Degree line and I now drawn a true 45 degree line in red for your reference. Whilst the officer's do acknowledge a degree of inaccuracy, it fails to identify this in the report to the committee the extent and instead uses the architecture's measurements in the drawings as reference (25cm vs 40cm that I measure)

When reviewing the conclusion on the report to the committee, officers have determined on site that the 'as built development is not so harmful that it warrants a refusal of the application'. Whilst I acknowledge the opinion of the case officers, as my personal home I highly disagree with this. Due to the volume or errors in this application which the officers have based their recommendation and quoted measurements, I feel is misleading to the committee. I therefore invite the committee to take an onsite assessment yourselves to see the unsatisfactory living conditions this extension has on our living area.

To summarise The loss of light has severely impacted our enjoyment of our home. The proposed extension absolutely **does not** meet with local planning policy H2 & BE2 and of H6 OS2 of 2031 local plan as shown by my photos by way of overshadowing and dominance. I ask you to review this application, to protect my protect the interests of the public but also to maintain confidence in the planning system within the community, in line with local policy. Approval would further contribute an undesirable precedence within planning in West Oxfordshire for poorly designed, unconsented and neighborly variations to approved plans. The recommendation on the report is not based any planning merit but that the extension is built and that they feel the additional height and width is not so harmful. Every application must be assess on its own planning merits. This Application has no merit and so I ask you to vote against it.

Thank you for your time