

**Planning Application: Land South of William Buckland Way,
Stonesfield**

Representation from Richard Morris representing Sustainable Stonesfield

My name is Richard Morris, I'm the chair of Sustainable Stonesfield
representing over 200 concerned residents.

When the Charity Farm development of 37 houses was approved in 2015 there was no indication that this was Phase 1 and that Phase 2 would follow.

The reserved matters for the Charity Farm approval stated any development to the south expressly requires authorized permission. The reason – ‘control is needed to protect the special character of the Cotswolds AONB.’

This Planning Committee understood the need to protect the AONB in 2015.

The NPPF says that where development is concerned, land of lesser environmental value should be preferred. Land outside the AONB should be chosen over land within it, because by definition, the land in the AONB has a higher environmental value.

It's now 2018 and the emerging Local Plan is nearly signed off. The Inspector has said there is no requirement to build any houses in the Charlbury/Burford sub area, which includes Stonesfield. WODC can meet its five-year housing supply without building in the AONB.

Some might argue that there are exceptional circumstances to permit building in the AONB, citing the need for affordable housing. Two major building developments have just been completed in Stonesfield, totaling 50 houses. **18 of these are categorized as 'affordable'.** In addition two rural exception sites each of 8 affordable houses have been built in the recent past. You cannot accuse Stonesfield of being NIMBYs.

Friends of West Oxfordshire Cotswolds and Sustainable Stonesfield have shown that the Homeseeker Plus housing figures for the Charlbury/Burford sub area do not provide accurate data of real housing need.

Affordable housing in Stonesfield should be for people with a local connection – family or local employment. The recently built affordable houses in Stonesfield are well in excess of the registered people having a village connection – currently shown as 3.

The Officers report states; ***The village benefits from a range of services ...*** which makes Stonesfield sound like a self-sufficient community – **it isn't**. The report fails to say there are minimal employment opportunities and no health services. People have to commute to places of work. The single bus service **between Chipping Norton and Oxford doesn't meet the needs of most workers** so they commute using private cars. In the report, Ian Hudspeth has raised an objection due to road safety risks, particularly at the A44 junction, should further development occur in Stonesfield.

WODC sustainability policies state that building should be in locations where people can walk, cycle or take public transport to places of work, education, health services etc.. Building more houses in Stonesfield will increase the **volume of private car usage and therefore not meet WODC's sustainability** policies.

I encourage the Councillors to reject this planning application, which is not in accordance with either the previous or the emerging Local Plans.

Richard Morris

Chair Sustainable Stonesfield

6 August 2018

Land South of William Buckland Way, Stonesfield

Planning Committee Address – on behalf of Pye Homes Ltd

6 August 2018

Good afternoon Chairman and Members of Planning Committee

The planning application before you provides a number of overriding benefits that outweigh the perceived harm that has been identified by your Officers in the Committee Report.

Firstly, the proposal has the opportunity to provide a high quality development that will deliver a soft landscaped edge to the south eastern approach to the village.

The scheme layout addresses concern over the highly visible nature of existing development within the village when approaching from Combe. A significant area of soft landscaping is proposed along the southern boundary of the site that can not only mitigate this long standing issue for the village and for the AONB, but also of the proposed development.

We have ensured through the scheme's design that the footprint of the proposed new homes does not extend beyond the line of existing built development on Combe Road.

The scheme has been reduced in terms of the overall number of new homes in light of extensive discussions with Officers and full consideration of the comments that have been received on the planning application over a number of rounds of consultation.

This has been over an extensive period of liaison with Officers and a careful and thorough review of all comments received at various stages of consultation on the application. This has led to design change recommendations that we have taken fully on board.

The development will provide a mix of housing that is needed within the District and the Cotswold AONB - 50% of the new homes will be affordable which represents a significant benefit.

The Local Plan Inspector's letter issued to the Council in January 2018 is very clear in that:

'there is not a national policy embargo on new housing in AONB's'

'the AONB in West Oxfordshire already has a significant population and it is generally common ground that some new housing in the AONB is appropriate to the area's communities thrive and remain sustainable in the long term'

The Inspector goes on to state that:

'There is also evidence that there are specific affordable housing needs in the AONB and I recognise that the most feasible way of delivering this may, in some circumstances, be as part of market housing schemes of a moderate'.

The true affordable housing need for the District as identified with the 2014 SHMA will not be met by the emerging Local Plan and this scheme, fully in line with the Inspector's recommendations in his January letter, can provide affordable housing where there is a dire need.

We consider that this scheme provides development in a location that is both highly sustainable and entirely appropriate in the context of its location.

At every step in the process we have designed a landscape led scheme that reflects the character and quality of the village of Stonesfield.

As you would expect, we do not agree with your Officer's recommendation within the Committee report.

We consider that given the titled planning balance is engaged there is no harm that arises from this scheme that outweighs its significant benefits.

We therefore urge you to recommend this application for approval.

Thank you

Response to the Report for the Uplands Planning Committee – August 6th 2018

Report by Martyn Ward. Owner of No 36 Grove Road.

Further to my last comments on the planning application for No34 Grove Road Bladon, I wish to present some additional views and supporting narrative for consideration by Councillors at their Committee meeting on the 6th August 2018.

Having read through the report from the Planning Department again, it is extremely disappointing that the views expressed by the Parish Council and the direct neighbours have not been presented. During the consultation process, numerous concerns have been raised about the scale, the materials and the suitability of the proposal, however, many have either been ignored or dismissed by the Planning Department in their most recent report to Councillors.

The report as presented fails to adequately describe the true scale of the concerns raised and the strength of local feeling about the proposed redevelopment.

Whilst all parties welcome the redevelopment of the site as it is currently an 'eyesore' in what is a fabulous village, the proposal as it stands will have a substantial, long lasting and material impact on the surrounding neighbours during and long after its construction.

Looking at the Planning Department report – the following comments are submitted:

5.2. Extract from the report 'The application has been amended to address concerns'. This is a misrepresentation of the actual position. What is probably a more accurate statement is that the concerns raised directly by the Planning Department have been addressed. The concerns raised by the Parish Council and the direct neighbours have most definitely not been fully addressed.

Specifically:

- One of the main objections raised has been over the scale of the proposed redevelopment. Although the Planning Department has stated that the proposal has been reduced by 16m², they have not provided the 'as is' size and the 'to be size' for comparison in the report. It is therefore difficult for Councillors to see the proposed change in scale or to adequately assess the impact.
- Concerns have been consistently raised about the access during the construction phase as the plot is very narrow and does not have the right to use the private driveway that runs alongside the plot. Access to and from the site will be problematic and dangerous on such a busy road (A4074). The Parish Council has asked for a construction management plan, however, that has not been provided despite several requests

5.4. Policy H2 clearly states that dwellings cannot be materially larger than existing premises.

Two main points in response to this:

- The applicant purchased a single storey bungalow and is now proposing to demolish it and build a substantial two storey house in its place. If that is not a material change, then perhaps the Planning Department could describe what is considered to be a material change.
- The floor plan far exceeds the existing building and is being extended in virtually all directions. There is a material change in height that will directly affect the properties at No36 (most significantly) and at No 32. There is also a material change in floor plan.

Therefore, the narrative as set out in the report is misleading.

5.5. This paragraph reinforces the point made in 5.4 about a material change in scale not being permitted. If changing a single storey bungalow to a two storey house is not considered to be a material change by the Planning Department, then there is a question about the value of the planning principle. If that was held to be the case then in the view of the author, this would set a dangerous precedent and erode the authority of the Councillors in future decisions.

5.6. The opening sentence in this paragraph clearly acknowledges that the building will be larger than the existing building. The second sentence, unfortunately does not make sense or is at best unclear. It suggests that because of the design and site constraints, refusal of the proposal cannot be justified. However, the design and the site constraints in the views of the Parish Council and the direct neighbours that have commented make this proposal completely unsupportable due to scale and site constraints? The narrative in the final paragraph in 5.6 misrepresents the true scale of the proposed building.

5.9 The feedback from the Parish Council and the direct neighbours strongly opposes the views of the Planning Officer but this has not been reflected anywhere in the report.

5.10. The feedback from the Parish Council and the direct neighbours strongly opposes the views of the Planning Officer but this has not been reflected anywhere in the report.

5.12. The feedback from the Parish Council and the direct neighbours strongly opposes the views of the Planning Officer but this has not been reflected anywhere in the report.

5.13. The feedback from the Parish Council and the direct neighbours strongly opposes the views of the Planning Officer but this has not been reflected anywhere in the report.

5.14. As the owner of No 36 Grove Road, I strongly disagree with the views of the Planning Department as presented. The reference to 'uninhabitable rooms' completely dismisses or ignores the impact on natural light within the property and the overbearing nature of such a change in the scale of the building. It is completely unacceptable for the Planning Department to present such subjective comments to

Councillors without actually visiting the site and speaking to myself as the owner of No 36 directly. Changing the height of the building and extending the property to the rear will have a direct and material impact to my home which the Planning Department will not be able to see unless they attend site and see for themselves. It is disappointing that at no point has anyone from the Planning Department tried to contact me to discuss this given the scale of the changes proposed. I also strongly disagree that the proposed building is not being built near to a boundary and invite Councillors to my home to see for themselves the impact that this proposal will have.

5.15. If the proposed design is allowed to proceed as is, then the window to the rear of the new dwelling will overlook the only remaining private space in the rear garden at No36. I accept the point that is made by the Planning Officer that some overlooking is inevitable and has to be accepted, however the Planning Department has not presented this clearly in their report to Councillors.

As stated in the introduction of this report, the Parish Council and the direct neighbours are all supportive of its redevelopment. However, the proposal as it stands is considered excessive for the size of the plot and the Planning Department report does not provide a sufficiently balanced or objective view for consideration by Councillors.

Photographs are included in the next couple of pages to provide Councillors with an existing view so that they are better able to assess the impact of the proposed scheme.

Photo 1 – View from the ground floor hallway at No 36 Grove Road. The proposed wall and new roof would significantly reduce the natural light into the ground floor and be completely overbearing.



Photo 2 – Existing view from the utility room at No 36 Grove Road. Again the proposed dwelling would reduce the natural light, be overbearing and overlook the only private space in the garden.



Photo 3 – The existing view from the upstairs landing at No 36 Grove Road. The proposed extension to the rear, the substantial change in height and the new roof will

reduce significantly the amount of natural light. Although the Planning Department have used the criteria of 'uninhabitable rooms', that fails to recognise the impact of the reduction of light in the hallway and the habitable rooms downstairs. This particular window provides a major source of natural light into the property.





Ian King <bpcian63@gmail.com>

Presentation at Uplands 06/08/18. #34 Grove Road.

1 message

Ian King <bpcian63@gmail.com>

Mon, Aug 6, 2018 at 11:44 AM

To: Penny Aldridge <bpcpenny17@gmail.com>

Hi Penny.

BPC wish that consideration be given to three matters:

- 1) The unique design of the property with living conditions on the top floor, and bedrooms on the ground floor, leading to a possible overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- 2) Given the age of the existing property, there may be possibly of asbestos in the building.
- 3) Reconsideration be given to hedging rather than fencing, which is the primary means of landscaping in that part of Bladen.

Overall BPC would suggest a site visit by the Uplands committee prior to a decision taken on the planning permission for the site.

Yours, Ian.