

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 5th March 2018

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.

17/03775/HHD	2 Church Street, Fifield	3
17/04161/FUL	Beaconsfield Farm, Great Tew	5

Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	17/03775/HHD
Site Address	2 Church Street Fifield Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 6HF
Date	27th February 2018
Officer	Joanna Lishman
Officer Recommendations	Provisional Approval
Parish	Fifield Parish Council
Grid Reference	423992 E 218748 N
Committee Date	5th March 2018

Application Details:

Internal and external alterations and erection of single and two storey rear extension.

Applicant Details:

Miss Ana Morales
2, Church Street
FIFIELD
OX7 6HF

Additional Representations

Email received from Sally Austin – Flora's Cottage.

I have studied the amended plans for Jasmine Cottage and whilst they are a number of improvement to the original plans, I still do have concerns and objections to the proposed plans that I would like to share with you.

1. The size of the three floor extension at the rear of the property remains out of proportion to and out of character from the original cottage and will have an overbearing impact on Flora's cottage and garden, an unbalancing effect on the 2 adjoined small cottages. The extension also continues to include three glazed double doors that will have a detrimental impact on my privacy of my office that, due to the differential in height, will have a direct view into the ground floor extension. Such doors also have a negative impact on the character of the house and would appear to be against West Oxfordshire design guide (10) on doors and windows.

I do also note that In the West Oxfordshire design guide it states;

As an overarching principle, the scale, form and character of the original property should be sympathetically reflected in any proposed changes.

Extensions or alterations that are of an inappropriate scale, or likely to obscure or significantly alter the form or character of the original property, are unlikely to be supported.

2. An elevation drawing for the basement is still not included in the revised plans and a full basement is retained as a part of the proposed plans. This is disappointing in that I had heard from Catherine Hutchins (the Parish Meeting Chairman) that the applicant, Ana Morales, had explained that she was

looking at replacing the full basement with a 'corkscrew' wine cellar to address concerns raised. The basement, as proposed, poses a considerable flood risks due to the numerous groundwater springs in the areas (as raised earlier by Lucinda Maitland Smith) - plus a considerable risk to the structural integrity of both Jasmine and Flora's Cottage - both small and old vernacular cottages lacking in foundations. I would please request that a basement impact assessment and environmental assessment both be undertaken before any decision be made.

In the Cotswolds District local plan I note:

*The geology of Cotswold District is complex and, in certain areas and circumstances, groundwater levels may be close to the surface. These areas do not necessarily correspond with the river floodplain. **Construction of underground structures in areas of high groundwater may cause a build-up of water levels on the up-gradient side of the obstruction, potentially resulting in structural and environmental problems.***

3. If the basement was replaced with a smaller corkscrew wine cellar the extension could also be made smaller (by removing the staircase) which would then allow less bulk and would help address the risk of structural and environmental problems and somewhat reduce the significant loss of light that will be experienced in the kitchen and bedroom of Old Housing (a listed building) opposite Jasmine Cottage.

In the West Oxfordshire design guide it states:

Bulky extensions that would block the outlook from, or daylight reaching, principal rooms and garden or patio areas of adjacent properties should be avoided. The position and nature of windows in relation to potential overlooking should also be carefully considered.

4. Currently there is no clarity on how the sewerage system will be managed with the proposed extension. The existing system runs along the rear of my property and Jasmine Cottage and it is not clear how this will operate with a basement being proposed for the full length of the garden. I would please request this to be clarified before any building starts.

5. The extension to Jasmine Cottage will be directly visible from Church Street with the East Elevation blocking light and views currently enjoyed not just by Old Housings but by the community of Fifield and the many visitors that enjoy the various walks that pass directly pass Jasmine Cottage.

I hope that decisions made by the Planning Committee will conserve and protect the integrity and character of Jasmine Cottage, Fifield village and this historical part of the Cotswolds AONB.

Application Number	I7/04161/FUL
Site Address	Beaconsfield Farm Great Tew Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 4JR
Date	2nd March 2018
Officer	Stephanie Eldridge
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Great Tew Parish Council
Grid Reference	440662 E 227492 N
Committee Date	5th March 2018

Application Details:

Construction of an agricultural access track on land North of Beaconsfield Farm (Retrospective).

Applicant Details:

GTBE LLP
c/o Agent

Additional Representations

Following the officers report to committee an additional four objection letters have been received raising the following points. Full versions of the representations can be viewed online.

- Loss of prime agricultural land
- Damage to areas of historical importance; in particular the Roman Villa and other archaeological features
- Works are being carried out to improve Tracey Lane so it's safer for agricultural vehicles and no justification for the new track
- Possible harmful impact on wildlife
- Results in an industrialisation of rural Oxfordshire

Following a further consultation with OCC Highways specifically focusing on the impact of agricultural traffic crossing the existing bridleway the following response was received: Agricultural traffic crossing the bridleway should pose no more of a risk than similar vehicles using the public highway. There is a safety benefit from the removal of the agricultural traffic from running the length of Tracey Lane. The agricultural traffic crossing the bridleway would not pose such harm as to warrant the refusal of the application on grounds of safety and convenience.

A supporting letter has been received from the agents, Edgars Ltd, as follows:

I write further to our recent discussions in respect of the above planning application. As discussed, it is my view that the officer's report does not fairly represent the applicant's case in respect of the development. For example, there is no discussion regarding the principle of the development, particularly in terms of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPD0) and the reasonable fall-back position. If officers do not agree with the argument sets out within the Planning Statement and reach a different conclusion, in my opinion this should be addressed in the officer report.

The report also discounts the public benefits to the safety of road users utilising Tracy Lane, on the basis that the applications for Soho Farmhouse were approved and considered in light of the unrestricted agricultural traffic associated with Beaconsfield Farm using Tracy Lane. However, there is no recognition that there has been a material change in circumstances since planning permission was granted for Soho Farmhouse in that the management and operation of Beaconsfield Farm has changed. Where previously the farm was managed by a tenant farmer the operation of the farm has now been returned to the estate and as such the farm will be operated as part of the wider estate farmland.

There is no acknowledgement that the management of Beaconsfield Farm from the agricultural hub at the Estate Office results in a significant increase in the number, nature and manoeuvrability of vehicles along Tracy Lane. Historically, all the agricultural activity was operated and managed from Beaconsfield Farm. As such, all the agricultural vehicles and machinery were stored at Beaconsfield Farm which benefits from direct access to the surrounding fields. Under the new management arrangements, there have already been conflicts between agricultural vehicles and machinery accessing the site and visitors to Soho Farmhouse along Tracy Lane.

Finally, there has been no opportunity to discuss potential mitigation measures in terms of surfacing materials and landscaping, particularly given the proposed refusal reasons.

However, Nicholas Johnston and the Great Tew Estate recognise that they should have engaged in pre-application discussions with officers and clearly secured prior approval or planning permission prior to the construction of the track. This would then have enabled the opportunities presented under the GPDO to be reviewed, the agricultural justification for the track to be understood and the concerns raised by officers regarding the alignment and landscape impact addressed. The Great Tew Estate apologise that due process was not followed in this instance.

Should the Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee resolve to refuse planning permission at the meeting on Monday 5th March 2018, I can confirm that the Great Tew Estate will immediately seek to positively engage with officers to explore how the reasons for the refusal of planning permission could be addressed through archaeological investigations, the potential realignment of the track, amendments to the surfacing material and appropriate landscaping.

I would be grateful if the letter could be presented in full in the Additional Representations Report.