

*Sally Austin*  
*Flora's Cottage, 1 Church Street*  
*Fifield, Oxfordshire, OX7 6HF*

---

I acknowledge and appreciate the changes made from the initial planning application but would like to raise outstanding concerns, shared also by other Fifield residents.

Jasmine Cottage is located within 150m of 12 listed buildings. Even though Fifield is not currently a conservation area we do hope that your deliberations today consider this historical setting.

The proposed extension to a small vernacular cottage includes an increase in the footprint by over 80%, a 9 meter new Roof line, 44% at double storey level and 3 double doors fully glazed.

The bulk, depth, height and design of the extension will obscure the original vernacular form of the building, <sup>and it is not</sup> ~~not~~ respecting or enhancing the intrinsic character or appearance. It will also have a detrimental impact on the setting, neighbouring properties, amenities and the natural gap, light and views between neighbouring buildings. This level of impact and harm seems to be in direct contravention to the West Oxfordshire emerging local plan and specifically CO14, and policies OS2, OS4 and H6.

Please also do consider if cumulative approvals of this nature could see our small villages becoming the equivalent of a Bollywood scene set - a facade where street scenes are conserved, but at the back the fabric and form of ancient buildings have been irreversibly altered and the character and environment eroded for our and future generations?

I do hope you decide to conserve and protect Jasmine Cottage and Fifield. If, however, you do move ahead with the proposal may I suggest a reduction in the length, and height of the extension and replacing the 3 glazed doors for a more tradition wooden door and windows. This would be more in character, likely help address the waste water issue and may improve the potential impact on my privacy and noise. I do fear that during the summer months there could be 3 open doors and a family cooking and eating breakfast, lunch and supper just meters away and directly facing my amenities.

Finally let's not ignore the local ecology. Numerous bats use the joint outbuilding, half of which would be destroyed. This destruction together with the significant increase of light at night, if 3 glazed doors are included, will impact the bats habitat protected under Policy EH2. As mentioned in that policy I would request an ecological survey be carried out prior to work starting.

Thank you for listening.

There have been more than a dozen written objections from residents to this development .

The Parish Council's own detailed consultation summarises these proposals as overcrowded and destructive. It also criticizes the Design and Access Statement highlighting inaccuracies and omissions (including levels and drainage), some to be determined later without consultation if proposals are approved today.

Objections to this application focus on 3 issues.

1 Nearby properties are all spaced well apart in large gardens yet this application introduces a semi-terraced line of buildings.

Each proposed dwelling is less than 2 metres apart whereas the existing built form on this part of Manor Road shows dwellings spaced up to 8m apart.

Proposals are therefore at odds with local Planning Practice Guidance requiring adjacent buildings and landscapes to relate to each other.

2 Being so close together the proposed development blocks open views to and from the Bladon Conservation Area, views which formed one criteria for setting it up in the first place.

A new and unrelated type of development is probably inevitable when demolishing one existing house and attempting to replace it with three new ones on the same site, a site which has been further reduced by the decision to create a separate buffer zone between the development and the main Road.

Crowding the 3 dwellings together also has the effect of leaving little or no room to screen them effectively with *garden* planting. As drawn the houses have the smallest gardens on this part of Manor Road, barely 7 metres long.

3 The application declares Manor Road's distinctive high bank will be "untouched." A "hollow way", it greatly enhances and characterises this part of Bladon, being its last remaining undeveloped gateway.

As drawn 10m of the bank is entirely lost to deliver a single way in to all three new properties. The inner grading of the bank is almost completely scooped away leaving behind a truncated narrow ridge, a sort of "bund" with hedging and planting removed.

This loss comes from of trying to squeeze in vehicle access, turning, parking and garaging space for three new dwellings on a site which is simply too small.

The present development fails to maintain or enhance the Bladon Conservation Area and will cause substantial, lasting harm to it. It clearly affects openness and established landscape, especially the distinctive high bank and is at odds with the established form of building nearby.

In doing so represents a significant overdevelopment, not outweighed by tangible public benefit, other than two additional village houses.

---

**Presentation to Uplands 03/04/18**

---

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

Tue, Apr 3, 2018 at 12:09 PM

Morning Penny.

- 1) Reaffirmation of requirement for legal agreement on undeveloped land-space.
- 2) Reaffirmation of objection to density of three houses.
- 3) Consideration by committee to levels of land within site, particularly as to drainage, and area being prone to flooding.
- 4) Consideration by committee of adequate turning spaces in car-parking areas.

To reiterate:

- A) BPC wish the legal agreement to be a condition of the planning permission.
- B) Detailed drawings be produced of the levels, and estimates of the spoil to be removed in achieving those levels.

Yours. Ian.

[Quoted text hidden]

## Appendix D

Mr Cooper thanked Members for taking the opportunity of visiting the site.

He indicated that Bladon was a special village, adjacent to a World Heritage Site and lying within both the Green Belt and a Conservation Area; a location which set a particularly high bar when considering applications for development.

The application site sat at one of the two entrances to a village that received a great many visitors during the course of the year.

Mr Cooper praised the Parish Council for the quality of their response to the consultation and concurred with their objections.

Mr Cooper stressed that Bladon was one of only two villages within the Green Belt and, in conclusion, suggested that the proposed development was over-intensive and contrary to policies BE2 (a), BE5 and NE5 of the Local Plan

Planning Committee April 18 v2 JGkr

Ladies and Gentlemen, time is short, too short make the full case for Government intent for Rural Planning, so forgive me if I seem abrupt.

The principle issue here seems to be the principle of development.

We have already highlighted to you <sup>for fra</sup> an exhaustive list of appeals, High Court, and Appeal Court cases that address this point.

Much confusion on this point is derived from the Hibbitt 2016 for Permitted Development, in which Justice Green found a limit to Permitted Development rights. This was not a judgement on the application of Full Planning.

The lead case on this now for Full Planning must be the Braintree case determined Nov 17

The application was for the erection of two detached dwellings on the site of *demolished* Agricultural buildings. I quote from Justice Lang's Judgement;

(Para 6)- **the sole ground of challenge was that the Inspector mis applied NPPF 55 by not appreciating the meaning which should be given to new isolated homes, in the countryside.**

**para 55 provides for the reuse of redundant or disused buildings-**

Granting permission J Lang concludes; (para 29,30,31)

That the Council in refusing, was seeking to add - **an impermissible gloss to NPPF 55 in order to give it a meaning not found in its wording, and not justified by its context.**

She then expressly affirms in relation to para 55,

**- the definition of previously developed land takes as its starting point that the proposed development is within the curtilage of an existing permanent structure, it follows that a new dwelling within that curtilage will not be isolated.**

The application is a significantly reduced scheme on a site in much need of renewal.

We are seeking to conform with para. 55 by re-use of existing disused buildings. We note that Officers agree (para. 5.14) that the development would result in enhancements through the removal of existing buildings, and there are no objections to the design or landscape impact.

I conclude by reminding you that there is now a volume of appeals in the past 12 months confirming the right and intention to permit reuse of existing buildings for housing in the countryside<sup>1 parish</sup> and a clear direction of travel in the form of the new NPPF consultation para 81.

In Dartford Appeal Court Case, Lewison states;

**para 23 In my view it would be quite wrong to expect the public, for whose benefit the NPPF is published, ... to have to undertake the investigation of previous iterations of government policy in order to understand the NPPF...**

**The public is in principle entitled to rely on the public document as it stands.**

In light of this, I would ask you to approve this application, presuming in favour of the sustainable reuse of this site.