

# EDGARS

LAND EAST OF 26 THE SLADE, CHARLBURY (18/02738/FUL)

Dear Councillors,

Thank for the opportunity to be able to address you today.

I'd like to take this opportunity to address some of the comments raised at and since the previous committee meeting. I note that you have now visited the site.

Concerns have been raised with regard to the impact on the amenity of adjoining residents, including the relationship between Plot 5 and 28 The Slade to the north of the application site.

Plot 5 is off set to no 28 with only a rear two storey projection being directly south of no 28.

An updated plan for Plot 5 has been submitted removing the upper floor window facing no 28 and replacing it with a roof light at 1.7m above internal floor level.

There are now no windows facing no 28 to create any unacceptable overlooking.

In terms of outlook I note your officers recommendation that the positioning of the new dwellings and their separation is acceptable.

Concern has been raised as to the loss of the young trees between Plot 5 and 28 the Slade. As you will have noted on site the erection of a standard 2m fence will ensure sufficient privacy between gardens.

The submitted landscaping scheme also allows for a 5-6m strip of retained and new landscaping between Plot 5 and 28 The Slade. The client has relocated trees displaced by other units on the site and will seek to move and retain the young trees between 28 The Slade where possible.

As is standard the details for this landscaping between no 28 and Plot 5 can be submitted to the Council for approval by way of a condition – this strategy is supported by your officers.

These details can also include the new landscaping on the southern boundary to continue and extend the new landscaping approved for the dwellings already under construction and help screen and soften the new dwellings in views from the south.

With regard to Highways - OCC Highways have now responded and have not objected. Whilst the visibility at the Slade complies with standards, OCC Highways have requested a marked build out in accordance with a scheme to be submitted

Such a build out was previously proposed but not conditioned when application 17/00832/FUL was approved. The client is content to provide such a build out with details to be secured by condition.

Thank you for your time.

The Old Bank  
39 Market Square  
Witney OX28 6AD

01865 731700  
enquiries@edgarslimited.co.uk  
edgarslimited.co.uk



Directors: Jayne Norris BA(Hons) MSc DipTp MRTPI, David Norris BA(Hons) MRICS AMaPS, Jon Westerman BA(Hons) DipTp MRTPI  
Associates: Laura Warden BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI, Paul Slater BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI, Dawn Brodie BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Registered in England and Wales, Company No. 4219821 VAT No. 768 4805 83

## Appendix B

### Uplands Planning Committee – 7<sup>th</sup> January 2019

#### Lioncourt / Hallam Land Management Application (18/03035/RES)

##### BSRRA Comments to the Committee

Thank you for allowing me to speak this afternoon on behalf of BSRRA. Whilst the scheme has much to commend it, I am here to ask members not to approve the application, but rather to ***defer a decision to a later date***. Quite simply, there are too many unknowns to enable an informed decision to be made.

The Planning Inspector recognised the sensitivity of the Shilton Road site and set a number of requirements by way of Planning Condition. We are particularly concerned about two aspects. They are the adequacy or otherwise of the landscaping strategy and the intention by Lioncourt to demolish the perimeter dry-stone wall.

Following an 8-day Planning Inquiry in 2016, the Inspector allowed the appeal and granted planning. However, in his report he clearly recognised the sensitivity of the application site and attached great weight to an appropriate landscaping scheme.

When referring to the Shilton Road frontage and the southern boundary buffer plantings he wrote, and I quote:

1. in para. 50 - it is crucial "how the development appears and is experienced on the ground in the established context, so as not to be alien, intrusive or incongruous"
2. in para. 58 - "I am in no doubt that the sensitive southern boundary requires not only effective screening but, crucially, carefully chosen species composition and disposition to effectively mitigate the impact of development on the site"
3. in para 62 - the buffers should "be of sufficient depth and initial stature to effectively filter views on what could otherwise appear as an unacceptably stark urban edge"
4. and in his schedule of conditions 8 "details of the "buffer planting" and "frontage planting" shall.... include provision for the planting of semi-mature trees...."

Given the nature of the location, we are concerned that members are being asked to consider this application without the benefit of the District Landscape and Forestry Officer's assessment.

For our part, we are disappointed with the landscape strategy. In particular the limited selection of species and the lack of native evergreens to add colour, vibrancy and year round leaf cover. The amount of screening along Shilton Road is also sparse compared with what Hallam Land Management readily offered at the Inquiry.

The removal of the boundary dry-stone walls is another disappointment. Once again this runs counter to what Hallam signed up to before the Inspector. Its removal will have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the development and its neighbourhood. The Planning Inspector clearly set out his expectations when he said in his Schedule of Conditions (and I quote), "The scheme shall include:.....retention, repair and rebuilding of existing natural dry stone walls...." (IR SC 7). We were surprised therefore to find the applicant had totally ignored this planning condition. We trust members will want to see how the applicant intends meeting this obligation before the matter is brought before the committee again.

Many aspects of the proposed design are pleasing and Lioncourt are to be applauded for these. I should like to assure you that as a Rule 6 party at the inquiry, we are not here to frustrate matters rather to ensure that the specific conditions of the Planning Inspector are fully respected i.e that the development fits in with the nature of its Cotswold location.

It is our view that this proposal has been put before the Committee prematurely and in advance of a critical WODC consultee's response. Mr Shaw notes the applicant is keen to press on. Well it has taken them 24 months to get this far – another month or two to properly consider the issues raised by Burford Town Council, 'Responsible Planning in Burford' and ourselves is surely not too much to ask. Rather than grant provisional approval, we ask instead that members defer a decision until everyone is in full command of the facts.

Thank you for your time.

Richard Shute,  
Chair of Burford Shilton Road Residents' Association

## Appendix C

Mr Freer, Partner at David Lock Associates and agent for the applicants, introduced himself to the meeting

He advised that the applicants had sought to develop proposals which responded carefully to the site context and that of Burford as a whole but also respect the sensitivities of residents and neighbours and reflect the pre-application meetings that have taken place.

To this end the proposals had deliberately reduced the scale and density of development below that allowed for in the outline planning permission. The areas of green space had been extended at the expense of space permitted (in outline) for elderly accommodation/care with the result that the number of assisted living units was reduced from 78 to 59 and the number of bed spaces with the care reduced from 90 to 64.

To ensure a high quality development that fits also with Burford the applicants proposed the overwhelming use of natural stone.

The application was supported by a landscaping scheme and Ecological Management Plan which made provision for the planned ecological mitigation within the landscape areas.

Mr Freer made it clear there were no proposals to demolish or remove the existing stone walls on the boundary of the site, other than for the formation of the access point.

Mr Freer advised that the applicants were heartened that the design effort in the proposals had been reflected in the positive response of officers and the lack of significant concerns from consultees in relation to the design of the proposals.

He confirmed that the applicants were happy amend the plans to address the concerns expressed by Officers and agree the amendments set out in the report. Any necessary amendments to the scheme could be controlled by condition.

In conclusion, Mr Freer indicated that the applicants believed the proposals to represent a high quality and sensitive development that fully respects both context and the existing outline permission and urged members to resolve to grant permission for the proposals.

"Alas, poor Woodstock, I knew it.... a town of most excellent fancy..... and now, how abhorred in my imagination it is!"

Hamlet. Act 5. Scene 1: with apologies to Shakespeare and Yorick!

A major distinguishing factor for Woodstock, is that it is the only town in Oxon situated adjacent to a World Heritage Site. This uniqueness deserves special consideration by local Councils because it sets Woodstock apart from all other District towns, in its needs for traffic and parking management.

Blenheim is a major commercial enterprise. Its contribution to the local economy is reiterated time and again as justification for its continued expansion, arguably now, to theme park proportions.

During the last 3 years, annual visitor numbers to Blenheim have grown relentlessly so that to date, these numbers approximate 1 million paying visitors.

168 days of extra Events are already scheduled on Blenheim's website for 2019. More are likely to be added as the year progresses.

And what of poor Woodstock residents and traders just emerging from several dreadful weeks of Blenheim's Christmas programme? The "economic benefit" justifications given by the Estate wear very thin as the traffic queues, congestion, deteriorating air quality and impossible parking situation, make life unbearable for so many of our community.

These traffic problems are not specific merely to the Christmas programme. Precisely the same considerations apply throughout the year and inevitably, to the current proposal for a pop up theatre with all the ancillary buildings and "traditional village" it entails.

Blenheim charge handsomely for every event they hold. They tell us, these charges are "finely balanced". We are told that they dare not include the charge for car parking within their ticketing price, presumably for fear it would deter punters.

Many visitors regard Woodstock as a free car park for all Blenheim's activities. Visitors to the Palace park in our town, merely to avoid the additional Event parking charge which the Estate insists upon.

The applicant's response on car parking/traffic is that they "do not think this is an issue."!

What utter nonsense! An additional 2000 people per day, 7 days a week, during the peak summer period and concurrent also with some of its other major Events, is bound to entail a significant increase in traffic volume. Woodstock cannot contain any more parking overflow on Blenheim's behalf.

Blenheim's 10 year goal, states that it aims to "triple its economic contribution" to the area. This is a grim warning for Woodstock where quality of life continues to deteriorate as a result. If this expansionism is unchecked, if this current application is permitted at all, even if only on a temporary basis, let alone without any Special Conditions being imposed on ticketing for parking, then the resultant deplorable traffic situation for Woodstock will worsen.

HOW therefore implores our Council urgently to take a stand against this current application. Please work with us. Woodstock cannot become the "Yorick", sacrificed on an altar of commercial expediency. That would be a sorry graveyard indeed for such a beautiful and historic Town.

### Planning re Rose Theatre

Thank you - I'll cover background, our thoughts on the WHS and some consultation comments.

#### **Why are we asking for this?**

Most of you are aware of our purpose, to be the lifeblood of the local economy, to enhance the lives of local people and to share and protect this place and our ten year goal to treble our contribution to the local economy. 1/3 of that contribution (c£30m) is our visitors' spend outside of Blenheim and people who stay overnight in the area contribute about 6x as much as day trippers. We therefore pursue opportunities to boost overnight visits in particular and the pop-up summer theatre is a big part of this. The theatre may drive massive contribution to the local economy – at least £5m.

We will also share a wonderful experience with local people and schools who will see Shakespeare in a special and fully accessible setting (the most accessible theatre in the area).

#### **On to the WHS**

We are proud of our stewardship of the World Heritage Site. We are in the third year of an ambitious 10 year programme to spend more than £40m on the World Heritage Site while at the same time building an investment endowment of £45m to preserve the site in perpetuity. This is a transformational time and, even in this short slot, I want to acknowledge the contribution made by this planning committee in supporting developments which build this endowment. It is never easy for you and we appreciate your support.

Sharing and protecting this site is everything to us.... But more conservation costs more money so we still need help. This venture is by the Blenheim Palace Heritage Foundation charity and the profits will entirely be spent on conservation – that is all the charity does.

The theatre runs for nine weeks then goes - but its profits leave a permanent legacy for the World Heritage Site as it funds further work we otherwise could not afford. These things go together – putting the theatre in a less prominent position would not have the same commercial success and would not fund the same level of vital work.

The site is optimal for connection of the theatre to Palace visitors (and vice versa), it is fully accessible yet screened by the tree line, it is well served by parking, it sits on Shakespeare's Way, it is on land not used for anything else. It sits to the side as you approach the Palace, visible, interesting but never competing.

It is a well thought out location.

I want to quickly pick up on one or two comments from **consultees**.

We are not seeking consent to build a 1000 space car park, sorry ICOMOS, that is current parking (which is generally free and certainly so for this). Visitor numbers will be significant over 9 weeks but we are talking about 900 a performance, around 300 cars max, the traffic impact on the area will be tiny. Nor is it true that we had no discussions with Council in advance as several in this room can testify (including discussion over sales timings).

And the suggestion that, if successful, we would want to retain the theatre as a permanent structure is comic. We want to show it to you all in the flesh and we would love to talk again about future years. But it is what it is, a pop up theatre which goes up and down, it is temporary and, we would urge you, wholly appropriate in planning terms for the very short period requested.

Thank you for your time and thought.