

17/04153/FUL 60 West Street, Chipping Norton : Residents of Bell Yard Script

Firstly, there is an **error** in the planning report. It says the lane is very wide when actually it's **very narrow**.

Point 5.11

The report states, that the design will take in the existing boundary wall. This means that scaffolding will be required, **overhanging the lane** and **blocking access** to parking spaces and houses.

Emergency services – would be **unable to access** both the Garden Flat in the corner of the yard and No 3 Bell Yard, from Burford Lane due to the scaffolding, nor West Street due to a **very tight turning circle**.

This **contravenes** B5 Section 11 of Building Regs – stating that **Fire Engines are not allowed** to reverse more than 20 metres back along an access point. Scaffolding or any form of obstruction along Bell Lane **should not be permitted – under any circumstances**.

The current design is therefore **unacceptable**.

We lost a friend Christina, and her 10 year old son Josh, some years ago, because Fire Services **could not get to** the house due to an obstruction.

Point 1.2

The **current** design has **swapped** the store for a **garage meant for No 60 - to appease Highways**. However, there is a telegraph pole **not shown on the plans**, which sits exactly where the proposed garage would be. This pole will **block any views** for a car reversing out of the garage and **restrict access**.

It will be **impossible** for No. 60 to access the garage **without** firstly going across our private property and **totally** impossible to access the garage if our cars are in their car parking spaces.

The applicant **MUST** be aware of this but has never taken the time to talk to us.

This creation of the garage - appears to be just a tick box exercise.

Point 5.1.

Officers "opinion" that there will be **no harmful effect** on a Grade II Listed Building is untrue. There is now a You Tube clip on the planning portal showing the **harmful effect** that the Cottsway Development at the top of the lane is now having on No 1 Bell Yard after just a small amount of rainfall a few weeks ago. We have just spent £1200 **remedying** water penetration causing damp from surface water damage.

There is a **significant difference** between the opinions of officers in the planning report and what is **actually happening**.

Point 5.18.

Officers "opinion" of increased perception of overlooking is also something **quite different from reality**.

Permission was **previously declined** to extend the Bell Yard development – to avoid over development. And in 2017 the Parish Council **objected** to the **previous** application – again to avoid over development.

Even one of the people who sold land to the applicant has **objected** because she was told by the applicant that the land would **not be built on**.

In 2013, Maggie who is sitting over there and who is most negatively impacted by today's decision, bought No.2, believing that any further development would **not be permitted**.

The planning report sites that Maggie has sufficient privacy in her back garden for the development not to be an issue. But Maggie, who has restricted mobility and other health issues - uses her front garden as it is not overlooked, because her back garden is - by the Cottsway houses.

Her lounge, kitchen and front garden will have **no privacy from the new development** - and if built, she will find herself even more **isolated**.

The example given in the Design and Access statement of similar properties being built so close to each other in Chipping Norton are not like for like – they are very different. The CGI images in the Design and Access statement are not representative of a very small area.

We do not want to **continually** have to **fight retrospective planning issues** - caused by a planning application that may have ticked all the boxes on paper, but in reality was always going to **fail the local residents**.

We simply ask that you visit the site and look at the video we have produced before you make a decision.

APPLICATION REF: 17/04153/FUL – New House at rear of 60 West Street, Chipping Norton

NOTES of AGENTS REPRESENTATION

Uplands Planning Committee Meeting – 4th June 2018

Good afternoon. The applicants, Mr & Mrs Smith are building the house for themselves. There may have been some confusion over that.

They have fully engaged with the planning process. They established the principle of a new house on the site through seeking pre-application advice.

They submitted their first application for a house placed further back on the site and at a higher level up the hill. There were objections to the siting and scale from neighbours and the Town Council over the impact on the rear aspect of houses on West Street.

The case officer advised the house should be moved forward ideally to line with the recent new houses at Vernon Court. Also, that the visual scale and height be reduced. The application was withdrawn on the case officer's advice so that a further stage of re-design could be undertaken.

This was done in close consultation with the case officer over several months. The house was set forward and further down the hill. The eaves levels were lowered, and the house completely re-designed to allow a stepped roof and softer elevations to reduce visual impact. The garage was included because of highway issues raised so certainly was not a "box ticking exercise" as suggested in the objection representation earlier.

The current application is therefore a re-submission after all this discussion.

Even then, when there were still objections from neighbours and the Town Council the applicants have made further changes by setting the garage back and layout changes to remove the potential for overlooking. Our section drawings show the new house will be significantly smaller than those to the east and opposite.

As Chipping Norton evolves to provides a sustainable and vibrant place to live, it is inevitable, because of the tight knit historic fabric, that new development will have an impact.

National and local planning policy accepts this and sets parameters where minimal impact on a few is acceptable where the main issues affecting the Conservation Area and A.O.N.B. are protected in order to provide new houses.

The case officer's report shows these have been carefully considered and weighed up and that extensive changes have been made to meet community concerns as far as is reasonably possible.

It is difficult to see what more the applicants can do on this site that has already been felt appropriate for a new house. I therefore urge members to accept the officer's recommendation for approval.

Jon Llewellyn. Agent

for: The Complete Oak Home