

Appendix A

Mr Yaxley indicated that he wished to comment upon the planning assessment on his own behalf and on behalf of the occupant of Floras Cottage. Whilst the planning assessment described the proposal as a modest extension, Mr Yaxley disagreed, indicating that the application represented an 85% increase in the footprint of the existing property.

Whilst paragraph 5.9 of the Officer's report stated that the proposed extension to the rear of the property would have minimal visibility in the streetscene, Mr Yaxley indicated that, whilst there might be limited visibility from Church Street, the alleyway in which the property was located provided light and views of the street.

The roofline of the eastern elevation would have a height of some 9m and the narrowness of the alleyway meant that the properties were only some 6m apart. If single and two storey extensions were permitted this would result in a change of view and loss of light to the kitchen and perhaps the bedroom of the neighbouring property.

Mr Yaxley contended that it was not true to say that the development would have no harm by way of its impact upon the church and his own property.

In conclusion, Mr Yaxley advised that the windows referred to at paragraph 5.11 of the report were in fact three glazed doors which he considered would have a detrimental impact upon the privacy of neighbours.



01285 643644

info@plan-a-planning.co.uk

www.plan-a-planning.co.uk

Speech to Planning Committee – 5th March 2018

Re: 17/03775/HHD – Jasmine Cottage, Fifield

Thank you Chair,

I am Andrew Pywell, a Chartered Town Planning Consultant with almost 30 years' experience, and I am here today to represent the applicant in support of their proposals for alterations and extensions to Jasmine Cottage.

The property is currently in a poor state and requires a substantial investment in order to renovate and keep it in good order. The objective has therefore been to bring the property up to modern day standards, whilst also providing the necessary space in which to bring up a family, and both the applicants and their architect, have worked closely with your officers to achieve this objective whilst also ensuring that the character of the area is preserved.

The owner of Garden Cottage, which lies next to the proposed extension, has been very supportive throughout the course of the application, although other local residents have made the applicant feel most unwelcome. Nevertheless, based on their comprehensive assessment of all relevant material planning considerations, your officer's report concludes with a recommendation for approval and, whilst it now falls to the Committee to determine the application, I should like to take this opportunity to highlight the following key points:-

- The ongoing dialogue between the Council's officers and the applicant has led to a series of amendments including:-
 - retention of the existing Church Street elevation, ensuring the existing character and appearance of the cottage is preserved;
 - a reduction in the scale and extent of the proposed rear extensions. These are now entirely subservient, and the small two-storey element will barely be visible in the streetscene; and
 - omission of the proposed basement level in light of concerns raised with regard to drainage issues;

- Whilst Jasmine Cottage is not listed nor does it fall within a conservation area, your officers have carefully considered the impact of the proposals upon other listed buildings nearby, and clearly concluded that they will cause no substantive harm.
- Concerns raised by the occupier of the adjoining Flora's Cottage have also been carefully considered by your officers. These primarily relate to the size and scale of the proposed rear extensions on residential amenity, and the intervisibility between their garden office and the ground floor windows of the proposed extension. However, when considering these concerns, it is important that Members take full account of those material considerations referred to in the officer's report. In particular,
 - the majority of the proposed extensions are single storey in scale and, whilst visible from the neighbouring property, are sufficiently separated to ensure no overbearing impact or overshadowing will occur; and
 - use of permitted development rights would allow the erection of a single-storey outbuilding with identically positioned windows to those which feature as part of the proposed extension – in addition to which, the proposals do not increase the level of intervisibility that could otherwise be achieved by simply standing within the existing rear courtyard.

Finally, as Members will be aware, all planning applications must be determined in accordance with Development Plan policy unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Accordingly, I would urge the Committee to endorse the officer's conclusion that the proposed development is acceptable on its planning merits and, when taking into consideration all relevant policy and material planning considerations, should be approved.

Appendix C

Dr Felici indicated that he was speaking on his own behalf and on that of a number of other local residents who had raised objections to the application.

He reminded Members that this was the third application on the site, the previous two having been withdrawn by the applicant in the absence of support from the Council's Officers.

The current application turned the barn through 90degrees and reduced its length by only 1m, not 4m as stated in the report.

Dr Felici contended that the proposed building was unsuitable for livestock and stated that the existing hardstanding had been used for the parking of commercial vehicles for periods of up to two weeks at a time.

Local residents had obtained Counsel's Opinion that questioned the legitimacy of considering the site as agricultural land, suggesting that it should rather be viewed as land ancillary to the residential use with a degree of agricultural activity. In consequence, the proposed development would be inappropriate.

Secondly, Dr Felici stated that Counsel had advised that the proposed development would result in some harm given the site's location within the AONB and close to the Conservation Area. Given that the application offered no public benefit, paragraph 134 of the NPPF was applicable and gave rise to grounds for refusal.

Hanborough Parish Council's spoken comments on Planning Application 18/00038/FUL

On 20th February 2018, the applicant submitted a Design and Access Statement saying the proposed barn, "*will be used to store hay/straw, livestock, feed and agricultural machinery used for maintaining the field.*" This was presumably prompted by the Parish Council's observation that sheep, the original justification for having a barn, had not been mentioned prior to the belated statement. Sheep were mentioned in the previous application but, after Kernon Countryside Consultants' objection on the grounds that the barn was not adequately ventilated for livestock, sheep were subsequently dropped from the current application. Now the sheep are back, with no mention of whether the barn is suitably designed to accommodate them.

The applicant claims that, "the proposed structure will be in keeping with this type of agricultural use and setting." However, according to Sacha White QC, in advice also dated 20th February 2018, the applicant's proposed site for a barn should be considered as part of the same planning unit as the applicant's residential dwelling; i.e. Willow View. Hence, Mr White argues, introducing a barn would be "*an ancillary agricultural activity*" incidental to the main, residential purpose of the planning unit as a whole. This incongruity means, in Mr White's expert opinion, that allowing a barn would not be "*appropriate and acceptable*" in principle. Reverting to my own words, the barn would stand out like a sore thumb.

The Parish Council is of the opinion that building this barn in the proposed location would cause harm to significant views into and out of the Millwood End Conservation Area and would be a blight on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, within which the relevant field lies. The applicant's habit of parking his commercial vehicles next to the site suggests an existing lack of concern for protecting those views. Judging by the drawings that accompany the application, there is no promise that the barn would have the benefit of any redeeming architectural merit.

On the contrary, the Parish Council's assessment of the proposed barn is that it would cause unmitigated harm, albeit "*less than substantial harm*" as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 134. This level of harm "*should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal,*" according to the NPPF. We cannot identify a single public benefit and find the barn unacceptable in principle; therefore, we respectfully ask for the application to be refused.

Niels Chapman, on behalf of Hanborough Parish Council, 5th March 2018.

Uplands Planning Committee 5 March 2018

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

As the principle supporting this development has been established by the outline permission granted by this Sub-Committee, my client's application focusses upon those reserved matters, namely appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

This application adheres closely to the principles set out by the outline planning application and ensures the delivery of a range of public benefits including 26 new homes, 50% of which will be affordable, parking provision increased above that shown at the outline stage and new pedestrian and cycle connections that will benefit residents of the new development and the wider village.

The proposal ensures that the development will integrate well in its central village setting. It features a range of house types and sizes and has been refined through pre-application discussion to create a layout that your Officers consider is sensitive to the site's location within Tackley's Conservation Area. It also provides a good balance of built form, garden areas, landscaping, access roads and parking and your Officers are content that there will be no unacceptable amenity issues affecting neighbours. The scheme features traditional building forms using materials that are in keeping with those found locally and that will also achieve a high quality finish.

Further to the discussions referenced in your Officer's Report regarding the trees along the site's south-western boundary, my client understands

that the Parish Council no longer wishes to see any tree removal or replanting in this area. Therefore, my client has agreed with the Parish Council to proceed with the landscaping plans submitted with this application, which retains these trees and in turn comply with the tree removal plan that forms part of the outline approval.

Thames Water have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity in the foul drainage network to accommodate the development, matters relating to surface water drainage are secured by a condition of the outline application and there are no objections from other statutory consultees.

There has also been no objections from members of the public; the one public comment on the application made requests in relation to the future management of construction traffic which will be addressed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan, again to be secured by a condition.

In conclusion, this application for reserved matters is in close compliance with the principles established by the outline scheme and has been developed in consultation with your Officers. Deanfield Homes is committed to bringing the site forward in a timely manner and is looking forward to creating an attractive and high quality development. As such, I hope you will be minded to endorse your officer's recommendation and vote in favour of delegating approval.

Thank you Chair.

BEACONSFIELD FARM ROAD

Thank you chairman for the opportunity to speak.

My name is Louise Steele, I am from Framptons Town Planning Consultants.

I am speaking on behalf of an informal group of residents from the surrounding villages, including Hamish Laing, Rupert Rittson-Thomas, Dr Catherine Wills, Nick and Kerry Rees, Sara Cunningham, Mikey and Ginny Elliot, Carol Geare, Alice Clark, George Irvine and Susan Rees.

They have engaged my firm because they have long held concerns about how the Great Tew Estate conducts its affairs through the planning system.

In this application, the applicant is seeking **retrospective** planning permission for an **unauthorised** access.

My clients are concerned that the landowner is not following the correct planning processes, which shows a lack of respect for local residents, the local planning authority including committee members and the planning system in general and must be firmly opposed.

Turning to the officers recommended reasons for refusal these are wholeheartedly supported by the residents for the following reasons:

Reason 1 (Urbanisation)

It is agreed that the road results in an urbanisation of the countryside. The road and fence has an incongruous appearance and is an unattractive scar on the agricultural landscape.

If as requested by County highways, the road is partially tarmaced this would have a further urbanising impact.

Reason 2 (Heritage)

It is agreed that the applicant has not demonstrated **any** public benefits which would outweigh the harm to the setting of the many nearby heritage assets including the Grade II Listed Great Tew Park and Gardens, the Grade II listed buildings at Beaconsfield Farm and most importantly the Roman Villa Scheduled Ancient Monument.

There are simply no public benefits to the scheme and the planning application documents do not present a convincing argument as to the need for the road.

Reason 3 (Archaeology)

Again, residents agree with this reason for refusal. It is noted that the Council's Archaeology officer has '**significant concerns** relating to the current situation'.

It is agreed that the lack of archaeology monitoring and survey work by the applicant is a serious concern.

Local residents are also concerned about the loss of 2 hectares of Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural Land, as confirmed by the Natural England Maps 2010, and the impact on the safety of users of the bridleway that crosses the road.

Therefore in addition to the officer's reasons for refusal I respectfully invite members of the committee to consider two additional reasons for refusal:

First, the site is identified as being Grades 2 and 3 under the Agricultural Land Classification, the proposed development would result in a loss of this best and most versatile agricultural land, contrary to policies NE1 of the adopted development plan and OS3 of the emerging development plan and paragraph 112 of the NPPF.

Second, the detrimental impact of the safety of the users of the bridleway, as such the application is contrary to policies TLC8 of the adopted development plan and EH3 of the emerging plan.

In summary, I respectfully request that the committee **refuse** planning permission as per the enforcement officer's recommendation.

Statement by Dr John Jones 30 Manor Road OX20 1RY

I assume that everyone has studied the many written submissions, which set out a wide range of objections; I see no point repeating what I took great trouble to set out clearly in my own two submissions.

I will make just two points:-

A. There is a fundamental inconsistency concerning the high grass bank between the Application Form, which is the definitive document before the Committee, and the Site Layout Plan, which is only a Supporting Document.

The Application Form Sect. 9 says the existing high grass bank will be "retained" (and the Design and Access Statement Sect. 3.5 bullet 4 says it will be "untouched") but the Site Layout Plan shows 30% of it removed altogether.

The high grass bank is of considerable aesthetic importance in a conservation area, as many have pointed out. If its destruction is allowed by whoever actually owns it (which is not the Applicant) there will be obstructive chaos and mess, at a narrow point on a steep road almost exactly opposite to the exit from numbers 30 and 28. This will last for 18 months, which will affect everybody living in Manor Road, waste collection vehicles ,deliveries, and heavy working forestry and reservoir vehicles .

B. The site is a complex one, and if there has been no Site Visit then I submit that there should be one if the Application is not rejected today. The importance of the bank, the many complications associated with the gradient of the site and the road, and the completely unnecessary proposal to create a pathway which nobody will use, would then become obvious.


5
3
—
2018

Uplands submission 05/03/18

1 message

Ian King <bpcian63@gmail.com>
To: Penny Aldridge <bpcpenny17@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 5, 2018 at 12:17 PM

I wish to present three matters this afternoon.

Firstly BPC are encouraged by subsection 5.13 of the Planning Assessment that a legal agreement will be sought to ensure that the undeveloped open landscape space is retained.

Secondly we are concerned as to the density of three houses being built on the site, plus its overbearing effect on #39.

Thirdly, we seek clarification as to the ownership of the bank, which is being developed under the plans, and the lack of consideration in the plans for the utility pole which exists on the bank.

Ian King
Chair Bladon Parish Council.

Appendix I

Mr Cooper suggested that a site visit was necessary as it was not possible to appreciate the change in levels across the site and the impact that the proposed development would have upon the surrounding properties.

Whilst Members may well have passed the junction of Manor Road it was unlikely that many had cause to pass the application site. Mr Cooper advised that the site was within a Conservation Area adjacent to Blenheim Palace and encouraged Members to visit the site for this reason.

Mr Cooper also took issue with the observations of the County Council's Footpaths Officer and, in conclusion, cautioned that construction traffic would have a significant impact upon this steep, narrow section of highway.

Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words in support of my application to demolish 1 dwelling and replace this with 3 new 4 bedroom detached properties, so a net increase of 2 properties.

Currently on the site at 41 Manor road Bladon is a 3 bedroom detached property, originally built in the 1930s. It is not an attractive house, poorly designed and not suitable to be updated or revamped, to suit modern living.

When I first became involved with this site I had a pre-app with WODC to replace the existing property with 4 new 4 bedroom detached properties. Although this option was explored, and an application was made, we realised reasonably quickly, that because of the sensitivity of the site, it was not appropriate, and we withdrew the application.

Subsequently I have had 4 more pre-apps with the WODC planning department, and worked very closely with the planning officers to devise and design a scheme that respects the nature and position of the site, as it sits on the conservation area to the edge of Bladon.

The planning officers have been very conscientious and have taken into consideration the concerns from Neighbours and the Parish Council. I have reduced the number of properties on the application from 4 to 3 ensuring the Copse at the bottom of the site is retained as a natural screen to the houses. Therefore reducing the useable area of the site by almost 30%

The planning officers were keen to keep almost all the bank, which surrounds the site, for privacy and as a natural habitat supporting wildlife, and wild flowers. The Ecology report has recommended the retention of hedges and trees. That has in the main been respected.

I know that development for neighbours isn't always seen as a positive, but the planning officers and my team have worked extremely hard, to produce a scheme that will fit the site in a positive manner, and once completed will be an asset to the village bringing much needed homes to the county.

I wish to thank the planning officers for their wisdom, experience, and patience to ensure we arrive at a solution for the site, which has everyone getting something and nobody getting nothing. I recommend the scheme to the Council officers, as even as today the government are applying more pressure, on planning officers to allow more homes. It may be the case that if this plan is not approved, then in 12 months another developer could apply for more houses on the site, and the planners may be able to do little to prevent this.

Thank you for your time