

## Appendix A

Planning Committee presentation re: Corner House, Church Road, Churchill,  
OX7 6NJ

Application No. 19/00920/FUL

Friday 7 October 2019

I was not going to speak again following the last Planning Committee, but after receiving a call from my architect this morning, felt compelled to do so. This will be brief!

Over the past one and a half years, we have spent a considerable amount of time and money on this project. We are now on our fourth or fifth planning officer, none of whom seem to spend much time scrutinising the plans properly. We appreciate how busy they are, but the comments from the conservation officer seem to be taken as gospel; A case in point; The current planning officer phoned my architect this morning to ask if the existing roadside stone wall was to be removed! This was only fairly recently rebuilt after being almost destroyed by four sycamore trees planted next to it by the previous owner. The plan clearly shows the position of the proposed building which is over 1.5 meters away from the wall.

We have bent over backwards to meet their ever changing demands and have twice reduced the size and position of the building.

To confirm, we will be planting a new hedge behind the roadside wall where one did not exist before and re-planting and adding to the existing village green boundary hedge.

We feel very strongly that the conservation officers comments regarding impact are totally inaccurate and highlight the chaotic and inconsistent approach of the planning department.

We believe that this is a low key, eco-friendly and fully ( disabled ) accessible traditional stone building which will have minimal impact on the village scene.

Thank you.

Peter F Dunncliffe



## Committee Speech for 7<sup>th</sup> October 2019

Planning Application Ref: 19/00991/RES

Land south of Oxford Road, Enstone

- 1) I have noted the representations made to this application for approval of RM that relate to highway safety concerns, cumulative impact on the character of Enstone and Impact upon local services.
- 2) These are matters of principle which have been satisfactorily addressed by the Planning Inspector in his appeal decision. This submission is not an application for planning permission but the submission of details relating to the:
  - Layout
  - Appearance
  - Landscaping and scale
- 3) An additional concern of objectors related to storm water drainage, and safeguarding the ground water context of the site.
- 4) These issues have been considered extensively with your officers, and offices of the LLFA. The County Council Flood Risk Engineer now has no obligations to the layout.
- 5) This development is subject to the Conditions on the OLP which includes Condition 10 – that is specifically related to hydrological and hydrological issues. Condition 10 requires adjoining properties to be protected from surface water flooding from the development. These details will be submitted to your Authority to discharge this condition.
- 6) The layout has been discussed extensively with your officers to achieve a high-quality design. Particular emphasis has been given to the frontage of Oxford Road, where the traditional stone wall is to be rebuilt and a new indigenous tree planting scheme is proposed. Tree loss to enabling the boundary to be re-built so as to afford adequate visibility from the access has been minimised.

Planning Meeting October 7<sup>th</sup>  
Swinbrook and Widford Environmental Group

Thank you for the opportunity to address the meeting.

Our group is very concerned about the local groundwater supply and the impact the development could have on The Swin brook and a local aquifer.

A perennial stream, the brook gives the village it's name and form and is a significant public asset. There is a long history of its use by villagers, some retain ancient rights to the stream. It supports threatened species: water voles, kingfishers and extremely rare native crayfish, studied by the University of Oxford. It is designated an Environmentally Sensitive Area.

Our community has been concerned about the poor condition of this highly valued asset for at least 4 years.

The site is not on mains water but takes its water from the springs which are the source of the Swinbrook. In 2015 the supply was contaminated and the water then taken from a different part of the spring. In October 2015 the stream dried up for over a month. It also dried up in 2016 and 2018.

An independent ecologist, brought in by the PC to advise on the stream, identified several issues: climate change, management, but a key factor was water extraction.

This application will significantly increase demand for water. (The proposal includes 4 new homes, provision for 100 hounds and 12 horses.) Swinbrook House recently gained permission for a very large swimming pool. These are additional demands when the stream is already compromised.

Following review by our local experts we would request that connection to mains water supply be a condition of approval, to reduce the stress on the stream and ensure a reliable, safe supply of good quality water to the new site.

We also note the comments from Oxfordshire County Council that "...the site is on a major aquifer with a high potential for pollution, therefore comments should be obtained from the Environment Agency before approval...."

We request that the Committee please recognise this requirement re the Environment Agency plus the OCC conditions for drainage and these be included in your recommendations.

Guidance from Natural England states "Limestone Rivers and streams, particularly those which flow south (and eastwards) are very important headwaters of the Thames. It is essential to manage abstraction to ensure that water remains available further downstream."

West Oxfordshire Local Plan ( 2031):

Proposals for development are only acceptable when there is no adverse impact on water bodies and groundwater resources, their quantity, quality and important ecological features

Thank you  
Michael Bloor

## **Appendix: Notes for Discussion during the Q & A Oct 7<sup>th</sup> Planning Committee Meeting**

1. The OCC drainage officer requested consultation and involvement of the Environment Agency (EA) in the mitigation of pollution risks.
  - As far as we can see the EA have not been consulted: OCC Drainage Officer Comments " .....however, the site is situated on a major Aquifer and is shown as high potential of pollutants entering the aquifer. Therefore, the Environment Agency should be consulted **and approve the proposals before any approval is given.** We have no objections to this application subject to the above condition being attached to the approval ....."
  
2. Our expert advisors on drainage and rivers have found the locations of local boreholes and geology maps (Ref: Brit Geol Survey of Boreholes) and it is clear that the following is a genuine risk of precious, pure groundwater being contaminated by all types of effluent.
  - The Cole Easdon Drainage Strategy uses soakaways going south from the new development and the geomorphology of the land would take it south west.
  - So is it possible that wash down from the hound/horse yards could go through the soakaways, into the aquifer, into the stream, into the borehole and drawn back to South Lawn supply as drinking water (and also to other possible users on the estate).
  - This aquifer is on WASP territory and they are also very concerned.
  
3. NB: the water was off at South Lawn last week due to electricity failure of the pump – properties had no water for several hours we understand
  
4. **Re a new borehole:**
  - Our concerns relate to the **fact that any new borehole into the aquifer** [to support the additional activities at South Lawn] **could draw water away from the water source that feeds the SwinBrook** close to its source up the valley.
  - We have been given no evidence from the applicant or their experts about the state of the aquifer and whether it can support the requirement without causing distress to the Swin Brook.

## Swinbrook & Widford Parish Council

### Presentation to the Uplands Planning Committee

This application has proved massively divisive within our community. Should it be approved, we would look for very, very robust mitigants against the resulting harm & nuisance.

We welcome the proposed Conditions, but we ask for additional, strong Conditions in seven areas:

1. **Accommodation:** the proposed four units fall well outside the Local Plan – this is an AONB - they are not essential. The current hunt site has only one residence. There is plenty of available housing close by, which the applicant & landowner have already stated they would use. Let's restrict it to just one on site unit. This should meet all welfare & security requirements.

This would also allay fears in our second area...

2. **Change of use:** this has been broadly cast – as rural pursuits. To provide protection against future development creep, please restrict this to hound kennels & stable yard. This is what it is.
3. **Water:** is highly, highly contentious. We have had instances of the stream & springs drying up in Swinbrook and the supply on the estate is very fragile. Some tenants can't even drink their tap water. We are especially concerned not to put even more pressure on the supply through over abstraction and ask that the applicant be formally required to connect to the water main, which is just 1200 metres away.
4. **Noise & disturbance:** the hounds will be noisy – we've heard them - particularly at feeding & exercise times. This would be a particular problem for the near neighbours on the estate - those who have felt able to speak up are almost universally opposed to the kennels and we need to protect them. We specifically ask the pack is managed so that they make no noise before 9 am.
5. **Traffic:** Swinbrook is unsuited to heavy traffic. The lane is narrow & winding, with a lot of pedestrian & cycle activity. We don't want any more heavy traffic through the village. The kennel site would be much better accessed from the north. Please make this a planning Condition.
6. **Fallen stock:** we are pleased that the applicant has said they wouldn't run a fallen stock service from the site. We don't want the traffic, the smell & the disease. In order to fully protect us – we don't want to leave it to trust – please formally ban fallen stock.
7. **Foul waste** – a hundred hounds will excrete a lot. We need to make sure the applicant gets rid of all of this waste safely and hygienically, with no impact on the environment & the neighbours. We don't know how they're planning to do this & this worries us a lot.

To sum up. Our Community is terribly, terribly divided on this. We need to build bridges & we need to be listened to. You can help — with additional Conditions – ALL valid PLANNING Conditions:

1. Accommodation
2. Change of use
3. Mains water
4. Noise
5. Traffic
6. Fallen stock
7. Waste

They would all make a big difference. Thank you.

## **Appendix E**

### **Applicant Representation – WODC – South Lawn Kennel Application**

I am Dominic White and I represent the applicant, THHK Ltd.

I would like to thank the officers for the positive recommendation, and the time taken to liaise with us in preparing the proposals.

It is clear that the proposals, including the additional information that we have put forward, are seen by your officers and technical advisors to accord with policy.

I hope it is also appreciated that where queries have been raised and/or further information has been requested we have provided this in a timely manner and to the satisfaction of the officers.

We note the objections from the Parish Council and have provided a detailed response to their comments on matters that are material to the development. We were naturally disappointed that there were objections, having engaged directly with the Parish Council early on in the process and we felt given clear explanations and responses that should have allayed any concerns; we however note that the comments reflect the divided opinion in Swinbrook. We attended one public meeting for a question and answer session and also two site meetings. Members of the Parish council and local residents also visited Chipping Norton and experienced the hounds being exercised in the locality. We also note that there are a large number of letters of support for the proposals.

The main items raised by objectors were concerns over increased traffic, noise and disturbance.

It should however be noted that when compared to the historic agricultural movements on site and the more recent livery yard operation, which this application in effect replaces, that the reality is there will be a reduction in rather than increase in traffic movements around South Lawn.

The proposed site is 1.5 miles outside the village centre and this application will have little or more likely no impact on the residents of Swinbrook.

Operationally there will be no need to access and/or leave the site via the village with horseboxes or other vehicles. We fully agree with concerns that routeing through the village is not appropriate for larger vehicles. Due to the sites proximity of the B4437 and A361 neither will it be necessary and we would be happy to accept a routeing condition if Members felt it was necessary and reasonable. I should add that the hunt does not operate any HGV vehicles.

As to disturbance and noise, the Council's Environmental Health officer visited both the proposed and existing sites and has clearly stated that he had no concerns on this front. Overall, this application ensures that both horses and hounds benefit from the highest levels of animal welfare & husbandry in a facility fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century whilst protecting established rural jobs within the West Oxfordshire District.

If there are any questions that Members would like to ask we will be happy to answer them.

Thank you.

## Appendix F

Mrs Humphry thanked Officers for their input in processing her application and offering pre-application advice which she had followed. She welcomed the comprehensive report which she considered to be a fair assessment of the proposals.

Mrs Humphry noted that there were no technical objections to the development and Officers were content with both its scale and design. The range of materials to be used had been limited as she was conscious of the position of the site within the village.

The building would present as a cottage and was primarily to be constructed using local stone. Whilst some timber was to be used in the construction, this would be largely hidden and have a minimal impact. The view from the public domain would be limited.

The use of timber was restricted to the south and east elevations and would not extend above single storey level. The larch boarding was a sustainable, natural material which would be left to weather naturally. Siberian larch had been chosen for its durability and had been used successfully elsewhere.

## Appendix G

Mr Mullett acknowledged that the existing extension did not enjoy the benefit of planning consent but indicated that it would be removed if the current application was permitted. The applicant had been surprised to learn that planning permission had not been obtained as the extension had been constructed by her father when carrying out other work to the property.

Whilst the situation was regrettable, the applicant accepted the need to regularise the position and was ready to do so either through the current application or by submitting a further application for its retention.

Mr Mullett advised that the current extension extended some 4 metres from the rear of the property and the current application proposed to increase this distance by a further 3 metres.

Mr Mullett took issue with the Conservation Officer's assessment of the impact of the development on the listed building and did not agree that this minor extension would transform the plan form of the dwelling or obscure the original structure as the original form of the dwelling would be visible through the glass construction.

The application proposed a 3 metre extension and, whilst it was difficult to see from the drawings, Mr Mullett considered that the character of the original building would remain and invited Members to concentrate on the photographs provided.

The boundary wall was to remain unchanged and the burgage plot would be unaffected. The wall of the property would not be altered beyond cutting a groove to point in the flashing to seal the extension.

The extension would not be visible from outside the site and Mr Mullett urged Members to look at the drawings and, if they thought necessary, to carry out a site visit. He noted that the Town Council had no objection to the development and advised that similar extensions had been constructed in similar locations in the town. The existing extension was of poor quality and the current application represented a significant improvement.

In conclusion, Mr Mullett indicated that this was a small extension that would result in a significant improvement in his client's quality of life. The extension would not be visible in the public domain and, by making this property more suited to modern living, provide a public benefit by making it more desirable and more likely to be maintained.