

Tiddington with Albury Parish Council submission to the Planning Committee regarding P20/S0436/RM: Hartgrove, Oxford Road, Tiddington OX92LH (Item 8)

Detailed below are the comprehensive reasons for the parish council's objection to the planning application for Hartgrove, P20/S0436/RM.

Over Intensification

The parish council believe that the proposed development will result in a cramped appearance and remarkably close proximity to the existing neighbouring properties of Denby and Ambleside.

The proposed gaps are significantly less than at any other point along the Oxford Road. The planning officer states that the gaps between existing properties on the Oxford Road vary, they do, but these proposed gaps will be much smaller than those down the rest of the road.

The additional land that has been purchased by the developer, allows the front line of the new properties to be moved back in line with the other houses on the Oxford Road. The parish council would request that the planning office considers the houses to be either narrower and deeper (as per Ambleside to the left of unit 1), or rather than two detached houses, be modified to be two semi-detached homes (repositioning to allow wider gaps to the existing neighbouring properties).

The location plan of the existing road, included in the planning application, does not show all the properties to the west of Hartgrove. If you look at a plan showing the whole road you will see the width of plots and the spacing, it is clear to see the proposed spacing will not be in keeping with the existing acceptable and appropriate spacing between properties.

In addition the two proposed 3 bedroom dwellings, are much larger than the most recently built 4 bedroom and 3 bedroom properties on the Oxford Road, namely Ambleside and Foxgate.

Inadequate Access from the Slip Road

The two new properties will be accessed from the Oxford Road (A418), on to a service road, then into the driveway of the properties. All properties on the Oxford Road have their own access point from the service road onto the Oxford Road.

It should also be noted that the service road is used for visitor parking, so an access point per property is crucial to allow 24/7 access for the residents from and to their own properties.

The proposed plans show unit 2 utilising the existing Hartgrove access point onto the Oxford Road but indicates that unit 1 will jointly use the access point in front of Ambleside. The parish council believe this would be both dangerous, unworkable, and inappropriate. The

parish council would request that the planning officer states a condition to the planning application that unit 1 also has their own access point to the Oxford Road.

* * * * *

Item 10, 2A Littleworth, OX33 1TR, P19/S2814/FUL Statement from Alex Cresswell, Associate, JPPC Chartered Town Planners

As we are local people who intend to remain living on this plot we are, of course, aware and mindful of the objections that have been raised locally, and have taken great care to work with the planning department to ensure that every one of these has been satisfactorily overcome. On this point, it has taken a considerable amount of time to reach the stage of your officer recommending a positive recommendation – a number of detailed and technical studies have been provided, both upfront and during the course of the application. For the scale of development proposed the level of detail is, in our view, extensive and a demonstration of the commitment to achieve a proposal that works for all. At every stage we have looked to meet the points raised by objectors and statutory consultees and feel that the resultant development is an all-round acceptable proposal. Clearly locals have expressed reservations with what has gone before, however it is important to note that we have looked at every angle that was a concern with the site previously and found an appropriate solution, the measures of which are detailed on the submitted plans and referred to in your officers’ report. The principle of residential development in this location should be beyond question, given the sustainable and well-connected location; and, with regards to the only reasons for the previous refusal, there are no technical objections to the proposal whatsoever. On all grounds, highways, environmental, ecology and drainage, your technical experts have concluded the scheme can be delivered without any outstanding concerns. We would ask that you give considered weight to this rather than what we feel are objections from local residents that, whilst we can empathise with as change can often be resisted, have been shown to be unfounded.

One point we would however like to pick up in your report relates to the driveway and impact on neighbouring amenity. As your officer points out, it is not entirely clear why this was an issue previously. Our research indicates it related to vehicles passing the existing house and the potential for light spill from vehicles entering the side due to the gradient change. This is how we have sought to look at the issue and you will note that a suitably located wall is proposed – this provides a solid barrier to light and, rather than a fence, also has added acoustic benefits. The demarcation achieves an acceptable sub-division between the two plots and will allow the two properties to sit side by side without issue.

We are really pleased that we have been able to arrive at a position where, as the Planning Officer’s report demonstrates, any impact on the surrounding area falls well below and within the acceptable thresholds.

We hope you are able to approve this application as submitted.

Alex Cresswell

BA (Hons) MA MRTPI, Associate JPPC Chartered Town Planners

* * * * *

**Continued Objections to Application Reference P19/S2814/FUL 2a Littleworth, OX33 1TR
(Item 10) Statement from Helen Smith and Mark Robinson**

Thank you for your letter of 1 June with reference to the above. It is most unfortunate that we will be unable to address our concerns to the Planning Committee directly on 10 June. In technology terms recent times have demonstrated to most of us that this is certainly easily achievable and I would urge you most strongly to open meetings in this way in the future.

As this is not possible we would like to register our continued objections to these proposed plans.

1. Access to the site and the danger to road safety:
 - a. The access is on a blind bend on a busy road (the traffic survey averages road use and fails to take into account the fact that this is a rush hour rat run from the ring road to the M40). There is also commercial traffic going to the businesses on Littleworth yard and the car wash has resulting in increased traffic and drivers on the road confused about where to queue.
 - b. This will be exacerbated by the steepness of the driveway and a paucity of lighting (due to bats on the site). Further I have concerns that this will undermine the railway cutting bank supporting the road and any alterations to this bank i.e. the proposed removal of the hedge, will further negatively impact the local ecology.
2. Ecology: this site is an integral part of the wildlife corridor from Shotover and the railway bridge at the end of the site is a link for roosting bats to the colony in the railway tunnel at the end of Littleworth. In addition to bats we also have owls, slow worms, foxes, muntjac, kites etc. etc. Also the stream which runs through this plot is the last open water before culverting in Keydale Road.
3. Drainage: we know from bitter experience that the stream and local drainage are unable to cope with current demands on the system and we are dismayed that further investigation of the impact e.g. of surface water and rectifying the condition of the drains will not be conducted before any planning permission is granted.
4. Contaminated Land: similarly we are concerned that investigation of this known problem – just try growing things in the bits of the garden which were the railway – has been deferred until planning permission is granted. I am aware that any planning consent would be conditional on addressing and fixing this problem but this does not take into account the expense involved and how this would impact the development.
5. The site continues to be dark and cramped – the additional land acquired is small and largely un-useable due to the topology and the main source of light and view for the proposed new house would be our garden and house. The planning officer's recommendations incorrectly state that the houses on Keydale Road are all single storey as

they are in fact all dormer bungalows and both I and my neighbours have upper storey bedroom windows directly opposite this land. In addition, I have a conservatory dining room which is closer than the statutory recommendation of 25m and would be directly overlooked by the windows in the north of the proposed development.

Overall, we are concerned that 6 months of consultation over this proposal has resulted in no constructive resolution to the road safety issues and has failed to take into account the significant impact of this proposed development on the local ecology and green amenity. Further, such important decisions as the management of drainage and the issue of contaminated land have simply been deferred and there is risk involved in committing to a plan where the full scope, cost and time of the build have not been adequately assessed.

Helen Smith and Mark Robinson

This page is intentionally left blank