

**WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Date: 4<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

**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.

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page</b>
17/00889/FUL	1 Police House, Hixet Wood, Charlbury	3
17/02381/FUL	The Great Tew Estate, New Road, Great Tew	5

## Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	I7/00889/FUL
Site Address	I Police House Hixet Wood Charlbury Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 3SA
Date	31st August 2017
Officer	Michael Kemp
Officer Recommendations	Approve subject to Legal Agreement
Parish	Charlbury Parish Council
Grid Reference	435819 E 219330 N
Committee Date	4th September 2017

**Application Details:**

Demolition of existing Police House and adjacent garages. Erection of 8 cottages with access from Hixet Wood.

**Applicant Details:**

Mr Nathan Craker  
Apollo House  
Mercury Park  
Woodburn Green  
HP10 0HH

**Additional Representations**

A letter has been received from Friends of the Evenlode Valley dated 31<sup>st</sup> August 2017, the letter reads:

In our representations on this application we have referred to the need to demonstrably apply great weight to the conservation of the AONB and the Conservation Area, having made this point at some length in a letter to WODC in July 2016 (attached). After an unsuccessful attempt to raise this point at the last committee, and reviewed the revised officer report, we would like to again highlight this policy and law and refer committee to points contained in that letter next week.

Since July 2016 we have been made aware of the interplay between the requirement to give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets in para 132 of the NPPF and the test in para 134 which makes the NPPF more clearly consistent with the overriding statutory obligation than previously understood.

A letter has been received from Mrs Bessemer-Clark, which reads as follows:

I have now had the opportunity of looking at the report to the Planning Committee for September 4th. There are a number of matters that show some inaccuracy particularly in relation to conservation considerations, but my main concern is still the matter of the effect of traffic on the local streets. I attach photos of the problems caused by large lorries entering Sheep Street, and a copy of correspondence I have had with Will Marshall, who I understand was the Highways Officer dealing with this matter. Copies of this correspondence have also been sent to Members of the Planning Committee. You will note Mr. Marshall says:

*As stated, the applicant proposes eight dwellings, which will not, in my professional opinion, add significant numbers of vehicular trips to the local road network at the AM and PM weekday peak times. Although I have no existing traffic data for Hixet Wood, there is an average of 57 trips in the AM peak and 46 at the PM peak on Fishers Lane, and 99 at the AM peak and 79 at the PM peak on Market Street, just north of Sheep Street. Therefore, a development of this kind, in the worst case scenario, will add 5-8 trips in the AM peak and 5-8 in the PM peak to a local road network that is already lightly trafficked.*

We wonder what was the basis for his assumption of 5 - 8 extra journeys. I myself on Friday counted 15 cars coming down Sheep Street between 5.0 p.m. and 5.15 p.m. i.e one a minute. Furthermore, while he refers to the eventual increase in traffic, we are more immediately concerned with the traffic that will be generated by the building of these properties. It is noted that the two roads which will be the most severely affected are Sheep Street and Hixet Wood, for which Mr. Marshall **has no data.** Giving peak period data on Market Street because it is north of Sheep Street rather indicates he is unaware of the road configuration: Market Street runs one way in one direction, Sheep Street runs one way in a different direction. You will see by my attached photos the sort of chaos that exists when heavy lorries, guided by Sat Nav, come down Sheep Street.

Indeed, are you aware of the complicated traffic flow at the junction of Sheep Street (one way) Fishers' Lane (one way) and Hixet Wood (both ways up and down but narrow pinch points. Matters are made worse by the fact that the double yellow lines on Sheep street are, in the most part, completely obliterated, so frequently cars are parked illegally. We measured the width of the road in Sheep Street, and with a saloon car (1.65m) and Land Rover(1.83m) parked legally opposite each other there was precisely 1.61 m between them. So people park on the pavements which mean buggies, trolleys, etc. cannot use the pavement, and people walk, dangerously, in the middle of the road. We also query whether Sheep Street and Hixet Wood satisfy the current adopted Highway requirements being applied to the development access road/shared space of minimum carriageway width of 4.8 m and 6 m where there is no pavement. **It must surely be prudent, before voting on this planning application, for a Traffic Management Plan to be presented before a decision is taken..**

In fact, I note in your report of the meeting, Mr Bishop suggested that the impact of traffic generation on the existing highway network (and in particular Hixet Wood) should also be addressed and clarification sought from the Highway Authority.

I would also remark that your Planning Report seems to ignore the items identified in Paragraph 2.7: including the fact that there is a need for Affordable Houses in Charlbury, not developers' new build houses. And on a personal note, your Para 5.36 states that regarding my property, *Spring Cottage, the orientation of the dwellings would be offset in relation to neighbouring Spring Cottage, therefore overlooking of the rear curtilage area of this property would not be direct. There would additionally be a separation distance in excess of 12 metres between the rear elevation of plots 7 and 8 and the rear curtilage area of this property, which officers consider would be adequate to avoid the amenity of this property being significantly compromised by overlooking, particularly as the proposed dwellings would be sited at a lower topography.* This is incorrect - unlike Myrtle and Camellia Cottage which will face a wall, there will be a window overlooking not only my garden, but also my studio, where I work, which is the nearest building to the development and less than the specified distance from the new houses. I personally will be thrice inconvenienced by both the building disturbance, loss of privacy, and the increased builders traffic in Sheep Street.

I should add that despite a follow up note, as of today I have had no further reply from Mr. Marshall concerning the second letter I sent him.

Application Number	17/02381/FUL
Site Address	The Great Tew Estate New Road Great Tew Oxfordshire OX7 4AH
Date	31st August 2017
Officer	Kim Smith
Officer Recommendations	provisional Approval
Parish	Great Tew Parish Council
Grid Reference	439650 E 228971 N
Committee Date	4th September 2017

### Application Details:

Temporary change of use for a maximum period of 13 weeks for a mobile film studio (Class B1) with associated ancillary facilities, equipment and storage.

### Applicant Details:

Mrs Karen Hudson  
Studio 4, Power Road Studios  
114 Power Road  
London  
W4 5PY

### Additional Representations

A total of 11 letters of objection have been received in relation to this planning application, the key points of objection relate predominantly to traffic generation and are summarised below:

- The number of production staff has been underestimated by the applicant.
- The proposals would result in an increase in traffic which would be of detriment to pedestrians and other road users.
- Concerns are raised regarding an increase in traffic using Ledwell Road as well as increased traffic volumes through local villages.
- The development will result in significant noise generation, disruption and disturbance.

A letter of objection has also been received from Westcote Barton Parish meeting raising concerns over traffic generation and management. The points raised are summarised below:

- Objection is due to the lack of a full and acceptable Traffic Management Plan
- The requirement for a full Traffic Management Plan should not be dealt with by way of condition
- The applicant makes reference to the Traffic Plan used for the Cornbury Festival but there are no specifics submitted and the parking arrangements, duration and potential demographic/composition of the audience is very different.
- The Parish Council ask that the Traffic Plan considers a list of specific traffic related requirements and considerations, and that the Parish councils/meetings of Westcote Barton, Sandford St Martin & Ledwell, Steeple Barton and Duns Tew are consulted on the submitted traffic plan as part of its approval process.
- Willing to support the applicant with any local knowledge or support that they require.