

**Objection to Planning P19/S2061/FUL on 17 Stoke Row Road, Peppard Common**

From Mr & Mrs E Davison, 19 Stoke Row Road, Peppard Common, RG9 5EJ

This application is for a **tandem development** in a rural area within where no such other developments exist. It would set a poor precedent by being the first back-land development in the vicinity, allowing all sorts of intrusive development.

The current owners have put their house on the market, having sent us the **attached email** indicating that any planning permission was a speculative effort. This is a very significant point since the area designated as 'orchard' would be destroyed. The current owners are not concerned about the effect on the environment or neighbours since they have already got their house on the market.

A similar proposal made in 2010 by the same applicant was **refused on appeal**. A fresh application was made last year, but withdrawn after lack of support from the neighbours, the Parish Council and the local planning officer. Multiple other planning applications over the years have also been refused.

We strongly agree with the Parish Council's point 2 "oppressive and un-neighbourly" and point 4 "obtrusive and cause significant detriment".

- The side facing our property is within 20m of our house and overlaps our back garden by some distance (about 5m) although exact distances are difficult to gauge since the architects drawings are casual with their dimensioning. It would also have an access path along our border leading to their back door and the back of their plot (the orchard).
- Our privacy would be significantly affected and we would have to deal with the attendant noise that a new dwelling would bring. The major part of our living takes place at the rear of our house.
- The bungalow design has a log burner in it. Due to the elevation of the plot the fumes would be expelled at around our ground floor head height with the prevailing wind blowing them straight into our house. Nearly every time no.17 had a bonfire, we have had all the smoke coming into our house. We dread this, and the attendant **health issues**.
- The house, and proposed fencing along our joint boundary will impact the large hedge (which we own and maintain) along this boundary. This **fencing will not screen** the proposed build from view from any of the adjoining properties since it follows the considerable slope down the hill
- Due to its elevated position it would intrude into the **privacy** of the houses on the SW border.

There are considerable problems and **contradictory information on the plans with the driveway that raise safety concerns**.

- The latest plans say: "New 1.8m close boarded fence" on the boundary with no.15 towards the end of their garden. At the other end of their boundary near Stoke Row road, it says a "1.5m fence and associated climbing foliage alongside s-e boundary with no.15. This is because there is a restrictive covenant requiring owners to maintain this section of the boundary".
- No. 15 own the whole length of the boundary and if no. 17 put in a new close boarded fence, it will further narrow the driveway. They cannot remove the fence that is currently there so will have to take the fence posts further into the

driveway. Since the width of the drive is on the margins of dangerously narrow, especially for fire engines, this is a major issue.

- According to requirements that we could find, a minimum width between kerbs should be 3.7m for fire engine access. **The plans do not state the driveway width, nor the reduction from the supposed amendment. This appears to create a safety issue.**
- Access to Stoke Row Road from **a very narrow drive is hazardous** particularly if someone is to reverse out of it. No.15 will suffer with all the attendant noise, exhaust fumes and disruption an access road would bring on the boundary of their house and back garden. With young children, there is a significant **pollution and accident risk.**

### ***Effects on Biodiversity in a Priority Habitat***

Fragmentation of a block of back gardens that jointly form a large old orchard will have a significant impact on the biodiversity of a Priority Habitat.

The houses in Stoke Row Road have long back gardens, and slope steeply for the furthest third of their length. This third, where the new bungalow is proposed, were and still are an old established orchard from around the 1940s. Together these adjacent orchards form wildlife corridors and habitats. To take out the middle chunk of the combined orchards/back gardens will have a huge impact on the remaining fragmented neighbouring orchards. We believe that any ecology report cannot be relevant unless the whole expanse of all neighbouring parts of the orchard/back gardens is assessed.

Previous local refusals have highlighted the loss of open space of ecological value and/or harm to protected species. The proposal would be thus contrary to policies G2, C6, C8 and H4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, including advice within PPS9.

We understand from the 2018 ecology report that there are Noble Chafers in the locality, we believe that we have seen these in our garden. This species is nationally vulnerable and faces 'a very high risk of extinction'.

We also know that deer periodically take refuge under the holly tree to the rear left of our garden - next to the proposed development. There are many owls, both Tawny and Little that we hear almost nightly, it may well be that some roost in the extensive orchard of 78 Shiplake Bottom. We know for certain there are Pipistrelle bats since there is a roost in our loft.

We also see hedgehog scat on our patio and back garden. There are slowworms around, and often toads near the back left where our compost bins used to be. The ecology report also references brown eared bats.

It would be necessary for a large holly (about 40') and hazel tree that grow in the orchard of 78 Shiplake Bottom (directly behind our garden) to be radically chopped back to fit the bungalow in since it is so tight against the boundary. This could be terminal for the holly since it would have no light at all.

The same will be true for our mixed hedge along the boundary (currently under 2m high). The bungalow flat roof is approximately 3m higher than the 'front' ground level and with minimal separation from the edge of the property there will be little or no light falling on this hedge (there is no afternoon light due to the trees behind our property).

## Attachment: email 30<sup>th</sup> June 2019

Sue Nickson  
Planning update  
To: Angela Davison

Inbox - Google 30 June 2019 at 09:49



Hi Angela and Eric

Apologies for interrupting a sunny Sunday but we wanted to keep you informed as soon as possible about our new planning application.

As you will know we withdrew the last one as, despite positive pre application advice, the Planning Officer Paul Lucas finally decided not to support our application. This was following the Ecological Appraisal which deemed the end of the garden to be a traditional orchard which should not be built on.

He suggested we consider applying for planning for a single property further up the garden which is what we have now done following discussion with our architect and an independent planning consultant.

The plan which was submitted on Friday is for a two bedroomed flat roofed bungalow.

If planning consent is given we would then market the whole property with planning consent. Both the architect and the planning consultant have independently said that anyone buying the property would, no doubt, apply for a variation of the planning to move the bungalow further down the garden having rearranged the orchard area as garden.

Best wishes

Sue and Fred

This page is intentionally left blank