

Planning Committee, SODC, Wednesday 19 August 2020

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

P20/S1588/FUL

253 Greys Road, Henley

Statement on behalf of Mrs M Brohm and Mrs E King

With regards too the meeting too be held on the 12 Aug. Unfortunately both Mrs E King and Ms M Brohm are unable too attend said meeting.

I Mrs Christine Hopkins am writing their concerns on their behalf in the belief these concerns will be read at the meeting.

Let me start with the fact that this development will have a significant impact on both Mrs Kings property and Ms Brohm's . And their planning objects remain the same, They are saddened that the issue of road safety has not been significantly addressed. However their greatest concern at this time is the boundary line of trees at the bottom of 253 Greys Road.

This is described as a lapsed hedge, it is a hedge that has been until recently been over 40ft high.Its i now slightly lower.

This so called hedge has been the subject do many years of bad feeling with the owners ,and their neibourghs, and we feel history maybe repeating its self.

These trees are causing much damage too the property of Mrs E King. the roots have grown over 20ft into her garden. They have moved many paving slabs, making them unsafe to walk on. May I add at this point Mrs king is 94 and has too walk with an aid.

The roots have split the lining of the pound on at least four occasions. and they have now broken the bricks and mortar of the pond. The pond houses protected amphibians .

Pallentine homes are aware of this damage both currently on Mrs king property but potentially to their new properties , and have placed the site of the new builds as far from the trees as possible to reduce root damage.

The height of the trees had removed sky from both Ms Brohm's and Mrs king property.

The greenery of the trees is limited, with mainly a view of telegraph pole like trees dead wood and easy access between gardens meaning very poor security which impacts Mrs kings home insurance.

I could go on endlessly about the problems these trees cause. we cannot do anything about it as to cut the roots may cause instability too the trees. we cannot put a fence up as the tree trunks have grown over the boundary.

Palestine Homes representative was invited to view the problem from Ms Brohm's garden as the trees are so close to her house. Unfortunately he did not accept the invite.

Both neighbours have a shed or garage under these trees and have repeatedly paid for new roofs.

The view of the trees from 253 Greys Road is acceptable, and it appears Palestine would like to keep the trees for aesthetic purposes. We feel this is unacceptable as there is a two-sided view, ours is unpleasant. As Mrs King's daughter I suggested the removal of some or all of the trees. Then a fence and new less invasive trees put in place. As has been agreed on neighbouring properties, following the removal of trees that were not causing a negative impact but rather enhancing privacy. Both Ms Brohm and Mrs King feel there has been a lack of respect from Palestine Homes on this matter.

They also feel the planning committee should not grant permission until there is some clarity to their intentions for these boundary trees. They would also like to see a covenant in place to ensure this situation never rises again.

Yours faithfully

Mrs M Brohm

Mrs E King

Statement from Greg Walters

Hi

This is my written statement re the proposed development on plot 253 Greys Road Henley.

> 1. Impact on character and appearance of the area.

> 6.8 of the officer's report states "the proposed development would be of a similar density to existing built form within the area". We do not believe this to be true: Greys Road has a natural dividing line, namely the roundabout that connects Greys Road to Wootton Road. Eastwards from this point (including plot 245 as referenced in the officer's report), there is a tremendous variety and density of housing (terraced, bungalows, apartments, single family homes). However, westwards from the Wootton roundabout there are only single family homes, all of which are on generous plots. 2 precedents only exist where a house has been demolished and new housing built (plots 255 and 267) in this long section of Greys Road. In both these cases two houses, not three, were built on the site of the demolished building. Both the original 255 and 267 plots were larger than 253 where it is proposed to cram in three homes.

This would be completely out of character with the area and would undoubtedly impact on the character and appearance of the area.

>

> 2. Impact on the amenity of neighbours

> A) Loss of light

> At 255A, we have only one east facing window in our main living room. The proposed development would mean we would have an approx 8 metre high brick wall approx 2.5 metres from our window, blocking virtually all of our morning light.

> Additionally the approximately 7 metre high building would extend approximately 1.5 metres beyond our rear wall blocking considerable light to our east facing bi-fold doors in our kitchen/ dining room (a single storey projection from our rear wall).

> B) Privacy

> We disagree with the officers conclusion in 6.20 that the rear facing windows on the proposed development on plot 3 would not allow clear or easy views of the neighbours patio area: not only would it provide line of sight to our patio area, it would also provide line of sight through our east facing bi fold doors into our kitchen / dining room. Equally the proposed two rear facing second floor windows would allow line of sight through the glass roof of our kitchen/ dining room as well as the patio area.

>

> In conclusion, we believe the proposed development will have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area, and will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours by obstructing daylight and intruding on privacy. We urge you not to grant planning permission. We would have no objection to a development of two homes that addressed the privacy / light issues raised.

>

> Thankyou

> Greg Walters, owner 255A Greys road.

>

P19/S2503/O Haseley End, Rectory Road, Great Haseley

Statement from Carol and Stewart Greenhow

Following our conversation the other day in which I explained, I was unable to participate in the online meeting regarding the planning application for Haseley End ,

I appreciate the opportunity to again reiterate my objections to this application, which in my opinion is abhorrent in its selfishness and greed.

We live directly opposite this site and our lives will be seriously affected not only in the long term but during the construction process. My husband is a night shift worker who has to sleep during the day, my children will be trying to study for important exams whilst endless construction traffic and earth moving equipment is literally feet away.

Could the Planning Officer tell me exactly when the site visits were made. It would be interesting ,as clearly the officer has not seen how busy this road can be at certain times. How can the officer approve the building on this scale which will encourage a minimum of six cars ,let alone guests in an already congested area.?

There needs to be a very clear Construction Traffic Management Plan to explain how they deal with the following points

Access to the site-no vehicles blocking the road.

Workers parking area- there is no public transport in the village. Where will they park?

Environmental impact of large machinery and lorries

Removal of waste from area- no mess on roads

Are these going to be scheduled ?

As we are all aware that the site is located on the old village pond, any foundations will be affected by the wet dampened soil . The method of construction needs to be considered before permission is granted. If piling is required it should be suggested that neighbouring cottages and houses are fitted with vibration sensors to monitor the piling at the builders cost.

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPa

dOnce again , to clarify, we are not opposed to a new construction which is appropriate in size and with the appearance of the village but object to this on the grounds it is oversized and inappropriate for this location.

Yours

Carol & Stewart Greenhow (6 Rectory Road)

Statement from Emma and Jonny Coode

Dear Planning Team,

I am writing in response to your letter regarding the planning meeting on 12 August 2020. I should like to register to speak but am concerned that our unreliable connection sometimes means that we are unable to connect to virtual meetings. Therefore my statement follows below:

My husband and I are devastated that the Officer intends to grant approval for this wholly inappropriate scheme. Our house will be badly affected in several ways, which we have made very clear throughout the process. The three new houses will directly face our bedroom and sitting room, destroying the privacy and peace for which we bought our house. Greatly increased noise, along with extra cars along what is a very narrow and dangerous stretch of road, will be disastrous. At present parking is a real issue in the village; what are your suggestions for where delivery drivers, workers and visitors will park safely and considerately? This does not appear to have been thought through at all. The stress, worry and anxiety this situation is causing to us and our neighbours is unacceptable as it is a direct result of an insensitive and inappropriate proposal in what is an old, beautiful and very tranquil area of the village. It is the responsibility of the Council to balance the need for housing with the duty of preserving and protecting existing communities from the misery of ill-thought out and damaging new building schemes. Should the planning be granted the Council will clearly have failed in this duty and I urge the Officer to reconsider.

Yours faithfully

Emma and Jonny Coode

5 Rectory Road

Thank you for your kind reply. This morning some new information came to my attention so I should like to add a note to my statement please:

I have discovered that the existing single storey house on the proposed site was built on a large pond. The unstable ground meant that the builders were only able to construct a single story house. Significant pile driving and associated preparation to build 3 two storey houses on the pond will require very large equipment and hugely noisy and disruptive groundworks. I am sure that both the planning department and the developer are aware of this; therefore please could you clarify the plans going forward. I am also deeply concerned about the real possibility of significant vibration which has the potential to cause damage to the adjacent Listed properties, namely Clematis and Rose Cottages as well as 5 and 6 Rectory Road.

Yours faithfully,

Emma and Jonny Coode

5 Rectory Road

Statement by Capt Richard M St J Sheehan

Ladies and Gentlemen,

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION P19/S2503/O (HASELEY END) ON BEHALF OF WALNUT TREE COTTAGE AND 8 MILL LANE, GREAT HASELEY

I apologise for not being able to address the meeting in person, I very much hope you will take the time to read out the following objection. The planning application in question has received strong objections, from the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), the Haseley Parish Council and all affected local residents, on the grounds of:

- Overdevelopment - replacing 1, small, discreet dwelling with 3 much larger
- Adverse affect on the character of the area
- Adverse impact on a Conservation Area
- Adversely impacting the setting of listed buildings
- Overlooking of existing properties
- Unsustainable and unacceptable increase in traffic generation

I would like to emphasise the last point on traffic generation - the junction of Mill Lane and Rectory Road already suffers from congestion, with local residents having now taken up all available parking possible without posing a danger to traffic on Rectory Road. Even so, current access to Mill Lane by emergency vehicles is likely to be severely hampered. Whilst the proposed plan allocates parking, I believe it underestimates the requirement at six spaces. In this day and age even a one bed house needs two spaces and a three bed house considerably more; with two three

bed houses and a one bed house the number of vehicles will certainly be more than the spaces provided and will overflow onto the surrounding verges.

Taking all this into consideration I believe the following planning policies are of relevance.

- POLICY C4 - Development which would damage the attractive landscape setting of the settlements of the district will not be permitted
- POLICY CON5 - Development which would adversely affect the setting of a listed building will be refused
- POLICY CON7 - Planning permission will not be granted for development which would harm the character or appearance of a conservation area
- POLICY D2 - Vehicle parking should be provided in a discreet and sensitive manner
- POLICY G2 - The districts, countryside, settlements and environmental resources will be protected from adverse developments
- POLICY G3 - Development that would give rise to a significant increase in traffic generation in isolated rural locations will not be permitted
- POLICY D2 - Encouraging sustainable and high-quality development

The existing building at Haseley End was built in the 1960s on the site of the village pond, prior to the designation of listed building status to the surrounding cottages and Conservation Area status to the surrounding area. The above planning policies were put in place to subsequently prevent such things from happening again. Whilst I do not expect the village pond to be replaced, the substitution of a fairly small and discreet bungalow with a row of terraced houses is just adding insult to injury and I would urge the council to pay heed particularly to policies C4, CON5 and CON7. The Conservation Officer has concluded that the proposed development would cause less-than-substantial harm to the surrounding heritage assets; this means it will still cause harm! Surely the proposal can be modified so that it causes no harm and would be more acceptable to local residents. On the Block Plans (dated 2020-05-21) if the scale of the development were reduced to Plot 1+2 or 2+3, not only would the visual impact decrease but it would also, at a stroke, solve the issue around parking and congestion, since the number of parking spaces would be adequate for the reduced size of the property. Furthermore, if the building height was lowered to that of 5+6 Rectory Road then that would also decrease the visual impact.

On a personal note, the proposed development seems to be an instance of blatant opportunistic profiteering by someone who does not and has not (as far as I'm aware) lived in the village and who does not care too much for the impact that such a

development would have. I would therefore urge the council to reject this application, or at the least to return it to be re-worked into a more acceptable plan.

Thank you for your time,

Yours sincerely,

Capt Richard M St J Sheehan MRCVS

Walnut Tree Cottage

Mill Lane

Great Haseley

OX44 7JU

P20/S0245/FUL Terence House, Holton

COMMENTS OF HOLTON PARISH COUNCIL

Throughout the convoluted planning history of this site (17 applications with multiple amendments over a period of 9 years) Holton Parish Council has consistently objected to the inappropriate proposals for large scale and overbearing buildings which would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining properties.

The extant permissions relating to this site are:

- P16/S1463/FUL relating solely to the pool building (Building B), and
- P14/S0338/FUL relating to the residential building (Building A). The element of this permission regarding Building B was superseded by P16/S1463/FUL above.

The significant part of the scheme was Building A being the residential dwelling which greatly impacted Holton Cottage, Diamond Cottage and Jubilee Cottage as it was sited directly behind those properties. The extant permission relating to Building A is P14/S0338/FUL and Drawing 1/6 12/1/2014 attached to that application shows without any doubt the relationship of the building to the three cottages listed above. The ridge height was shown as 4 metres which was less than a metre above the ridge of the outbuildings in the rear gardens of the three cottages.

The ridge height of the proposed dwelling is more than 5.3 metres. We are given only the eaves height at 5.3 metres so the ridge will be higher. The proposed building is therefore significantly (32.5%) higher than the extant.

The extant permissions are described as the fall-back position. However we draw your attention to the Planning Statement attached to P16/S4039/FUL which attempted to alter the position, level and elevations of Building A. Amid the ramblings in this statement the applicant made it clear that it would be impossible to construct Building A in accordance with the extant permission because the depth of the

excavation required to meet the levels in relation to adjoining properties would render it uninhabitable. That applicant subsequently submitted multiple applications, without success, to alter the size and level of Building A as he was unable to construct the permitted building and ended up selling the site because he was unable to implement the permission. This cannot be described as a fall-back position.

In conclusion the principle of residential development on this site may have been established but the height and size of the development are the critical factors in this case. To illustrate the fact that it is too high and overlooking adjoining properties, it is proposed to make all the windows on the first floor obscure glazed. What sort of residential dwelling has obscure glass in its bedrooms? Apart from poor design this should not be necessary as it should be possible to design a dwelling of a scale which is more appropriate to its location.

Holton Parish Council

9th August 2020

P19/S3206/FUL Comus, Howbery Lane, near Nuffield

Statement from the Applicant, Mr Trotman

During the course of our application, we have attended Parish council meetings , discussed at length with senior planning officer Paul Lucas, viewed the various comments for forestry, and taken into account other objections . Any concerns raised during this application process have been mitigated. subject to the above the local authorities have recommended this application for approval

The areas of concern were we have listed below

1. We aligned the proposed house with the newly built garage block of Elderberry Cottage to provides privacy to both parties .
 2. We lowered our proposal to 4.86m at its closest point to Elderberry cottage going to 6.2m at its highest part. Making this new proposal lower than the 2017 approval of 6.75m
 3. Taking into account the points on impact made by the Parish and the Countryside officer, our proposal has been positioned 10.8 metres from the front boundary giving far less impact to the foot path and bridleway, compared to the 2017 approval which is not only taller but is set much closer to the foot path and bridleway , at its closest point it is only 2 metres .
-

4. So far as materials are concerned . Having taken advice from the planning officer and our agent, plus attended Parish Council meetings where samples of various timber cladding were shown and seemingly supported , we truly felt we had made the changes that took account of the various opinions and changed materials that blended in better with the woodland setting , This we agreed made our exterior softer.

5. The main ongoing objection that seemed to come through from the Parish Council and some local residents , is that there a dislike of contemporary buildings, which we feel is unreasonable , due to the fact , the site already has the 2017 approval of a contemporary building further the NPPF should not discourage appropriate innovation or change and further promote high level of sustainability. We feel our applications meets this criteria'

P19/S2914/FUL 25 Windmill Road and Pearce Court, Thame

NO STATEMENTS
