

## Appendix A

Uplands Committee meeting on 5th Nov, planning application ref 18/02054/FUL 41 Manor Road Bladon.

No transparent explanation so far is given for how the developer plans to treat parts of the site and the existing house. Until the developer offers a comprehensive proposal for the site Residents maintain their objections to the application and suggest it is refused or given a deadline by which an unambiguous proposal is made public.

I will argue this by focusing on one specific issue.

This development has failed to gain approval over 4 meetings. A pattern has emerged where the application is met with objections, refused and delayed. Then a new application appears with some attempt to meet those objections. However the new application contains attempts to row back on and omit other previous proposals. It is then determined as another form of overdevelopment with further objections.

There is a pattern of repeatedly going over the same ground. Whatever is advised seems to fall partly by the wayside when the applicant comes back to the next meeting, trying to get more out of the site.

5 key suggestions were minuted at the last meeting. (5.3). These addressed residents' concerns to do with safety and to retain and refurbish the existing house, the fundamental need to protect the distinctive bank/hollow way on Manor Road, and to retain the lower site/Coppice area as undeveloped land and thus achieve an appropriate scale of development.

Whilst a further attempt has now been made to meet this advice, other credible proposals in previous applications to develop 41 Manor Road have fallen away, specifically a Condition to have a binding legal Agreement between the land owner and the Local Authority to ensure that the landscaping belt fronting the A4095 as you leave/approach Bladon would be preserved as a buffer to any new development.

Also such an Condition and Agreement could apply and give certainty to basic concerns about safeguarding the bank as you enter Bladon and retaining the existing house, thus going some way to meet Residents main objections presented to the last 4 meetings.

Richard Gray

██████████ ██████████.h.

WODC Uplands Committee meeting 5<sup>th</sup> November  
2018.

This the fifth time that either the parish chairman or myself have sat here to argue the parish case for the rejection of this application.

I would like to make a comment on the statement made by the applicant at the last meeting. The parish council did not refuse to meet him. He was given two opportunities to come to present his plans to the parish council at regular parish council meetings. He did not come to either or offer any sort of explanation for his non-attendance. By contrast when we recently invited Blenheim Estate to a meeting as we had questions about a new development they were delighted and came with full documentation and drawings.

This application in all its various guises has been throughout poorly documented, equally poorly drawn and incomplete.

We have only seen one single drawing that is fit for purpose.

His latest ploy is to divide the plot into three.

The existing dwelling

The area immediately below it where he wants to build two dwellings

The area situated below that, which is to remain as undeveloped land.

The area as drawn is for two new dwellings. From the various iterations offered up. The plans show trees appearing and disappearing at will, roof lines and windows change as do presumably the heights of walls.

It encroaches on the undeveloped land by some 10feet in two different versions of the same plan. No textual explanation is offered at any point.

No explanation has been offered what the developer plans to do with the existing house.

This application should be treated as a complete document not as a sub set of the site. It must have complete overview of what is being asked for.

Until the developer offers a complete view of the site the parish council asks that either the application is refused or he is given a limited time scale to present new plans in a new application.

We would also like to have a binding legal agreement drawn up relating to the undeveloped land at the bottom

of the site so that it not at any point in the future subject to a belated planning application.

The site is adjacent to one of the three roads leading down to the A4095. It is a very narrow busy road.

The parish council concerned about access to the site and that any on street parking in Manor Road by the developer from now on is not permitted. All of his vehicles must be parked onsite at all times.

## **41 MANOR ROAD BLADON**

I BELIEVE MOST PEOPLE HERE ARE AWARE OF THIS APPLICATION. IT HAS BEEN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE SEVERAL TIMES, AND I THANK THEM FOR THEIR DILLIGENCE AND PATIENCE IN DEALING WITH THIS SENSITIVE SITE.

AT THE LAST COMMITTEE MEETING A VOTE TO REFUSE THE APPLICATION IN ITS AMENDED FORM WAS LOST AND THE FEELING WAS THAT THE PLANNING OFFICER SHOULD APPROVE THE APPLICATION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS BEING AGREED AND CONFIRMED.

AFTER THE LAST COMMITTEE MEETING I HAD A BRIEF DISCUSSION WITH SOME OF THE LOCAL RESIDENTS WHO WERE OBJECTING AND THEY REQUESTED THE PLANS BE AMENDED TO REMOVE THE PROPOSED DORMA'S TO THE PROPERTIES, AND I WAS HAPPY TO ASK MY ARCHITECT TO AMEND THE DRAWINGS AND THE UPDATED VERSION WITHOUT THE DORMA'S HAVE BEEN LODGED WITH PHIL SHAW.

I HAVE ALSO SUGGESTED THAT I WOULD BE WILLING TO HAVE REGULAR MEETINGS WITH A REPRESENTITIVE OF THE PARISH COUNCIL TO ENSURE COMMUNICATION LINES ARE OPEN AND CONCERNS CAN BE AIRED AND ADDRESSED.

MR SHAW HAS LAID OUT WHAT ARE  
COMPREHENSIVE CONDITIONS THAT I WILL HAVE  
TO ADHERE TO.

I WOULD HOWEVER LIKE TO STATE THAT I BELIEVE  
I AM THE CORRECT PERSON TO DEVELOP THIS  
SITE AS I'M LOCAL AND I UNDERSTAND THE  
SENSITIVE NATURE OF THIS SITE.

PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENTS I HAVE COMPLETED  
LOCALLY HAVE BEEN TO AN EXCELLENT STANDARD  
AND I HAVE NEVER BEEN IN DISPUTE WITH ANY  
NEIGHBOUR, AND I WOULD LIKE TO CONTINUE  
THAT RECORD.

D.H.H. L

Reference: 18/02816/S73

05 November 2018

My name is Derek Hobbs, owner of Valhalla.

I wish to clarify a number of points:

We are not requesting an amendment to increase the height of the property by 400mm - this is an error in the report (The ~~increase is by~~ 110mm; this is ~~an~~ WITHIN building tolerances. INCREASE IS

↓ ORIGINAL

DH

My wife Gill and I have lived in Stonesfield in excess of 40 years; our son was born in the village.

Whilst historic enforcement complaints have been made, no enforcement notices have ever been issued. We have always complied with any WODC requests for change and / or submitted a planning application if necessary.

We are not property developers.

However it feels we are being criticised for submitting applications, when in reality we have done nothing wrong.

The ability to submit applications and to amend an approved development, using due process as the system is set up to do (as the system allows !), is not a reason to resist valid applications.

Here today we are requesting minor material amendments, nothing more.

The property directly behind Valhalla, Number 2 Brook Lane, is owned by [REDACTED], who are both Solicitors. They have sent a 'No Objection' letter.

No immediate neighbours have objected, which demonstrates none of the proposed amendments are of concern to those properties most likely to be affected by the development.

Gill and I have never built a property before. At 60 plus we have found this project challenging.

This is our retirement property; a once in a lifetime opportunity to ensure we get this right in terms of form fit and function.

We have done everything possible to make sure this building, given time, will resemble an old Cotswold build, appropriate to the locality.

In my opinion, and with all due respect,

it is important to get the balance here.

Our proposed minor material amendments should be judged on planning merit, and on planning merit alone.

I thank you for affording me the opportunity to speak here today.

Thank you.