**From:** Public Access DC Comments   
**Sent:** 14 July 2015 15:06  
**To:** Public Access DC Comments  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 15/00252/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:05 PM on 14 Jul 2015 from Mr roger dyson.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Summary** | |
| **Address:** | Land To Rear Of 2 The Villas Main Street Wendlebury Bicester OX25 2PW |
| **Proposal:** | Erection of 2 no detached houses with garages. |
| **Case Officer:** | Aitchison Raffety (Planning Consultants) |
| [Click for further information](http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications/centralDistribution.do?caseType=Application&keyVal=NJLVX6EM0KR00) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Details** | |
| **Name:** | Mr roger dyson |
| **Email:** |  |
| **Address:** | Bridge House Main Street, Wendlebury, Oxfordshire OX25 2PW |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments Details** | |
| **Commenter Type:** | Neighbour |
| **Stance:** | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | Bridge House Wendlebury Oxon OX25 2PW  14th July 2015  Dear Sir/Madam  Planning Application Number: 115/00252/F (Erection of 2no detached houses with garages)  Please find below our general comments and objections to the above proposed planning application.  General comments  1. My wife and I moved into Bridge House, Wendlebury in late 1996. We were aware that planning permission had previously been applied for and refused to build three dwellings and garages on the land behind (to the east) of Bridge House. At that time the land was a completely open field and we orally agreed at the time with the then owner of the field that we would not object to a similar or future smaller proposal, which would be planned for the top end of the field; subject to seeing the details of any such proposals.   2. However, since then a Manège (all-weather equestrian riding arena) has been introduced across the middle of this land (north to south), which has meant that any new proposals will be condensed into the area between the rear of the Bridge House plot and the new Manège. This has completely changed the impact of any development proposals on Bridge House, and we object to the current proposals as described below.  3. Is it possible to inform us of the reasons that the planning application (No. 95/00819/OUT) for the erection of three detached dwellings and garages etc was refused?  Objections  The following comments refer to the Access & Design Statement submitted by the applicant:  1. Key Design issue i) The houses are positioned in such a way as to not overlook any existing dwellings or properties  This statement is clearly innaccurate as the windows in the front elevation of Plot 1 looked directly at the rear elevation of Bridge House (merely a garden length away), where the main sitting room and conservatory are located on the ground floor and the main bedroom is located on the first floor. This would mean that users of the Plot 1 house would be directly overlooking these sensitive rooms with the subsequent total loss of privacy to the users of these rooms in Bridge House.  This loss of privacy also applies to Plot 2, where the users of the rooms at the front of Plot 2 would be able to see into the same areas as those described above for Plot 1.  2. Key Design issue iv) Point 1 Access to 2 The Villas will be lost as a result of this development thus lessening the impact of any extra traffic flow caused by the project.  Currently the occupant of 2 The Villas (applicant's father) nearly exclusively uses the hard standing at the front of 2 The Villas to park and very seldom uses the rear access. This is only used very infrequently by visitors. Therefore there will not be any discernable lessoning of the impact of the innevitable increased traffic flow resulting from this proposed development.  3. Key Design issue iv) Point 2 It is also anticipated that because the horses can now be tended for by people on the site, this will cause a reduction of vehicle movements as well. And from the "Philosophy and approach" statement: ...making it easier to tend the horses and provide permanent security  There has been only one horse kept in the field for a number of years. The owners of the horse live in St Giles Close, a few minutes walk away, and they often walk to tend to the horse. Again therefore there will not be any discernable lessoning of the impact of the innevitable increased traffic flow resulting from this proposed development. Also the applicant's father and uncle live at numbers 1 and 2 The Villas giving them a currently uninterrupted view of the stable and horse at the rear of their gardens.  4. Key Design issue vi) The mature Ash and Walnut trees on the site would be retained   The 1:500 Site Plan included in the application is innaccurate as it shows the Ash tree where the Walnut tree is, and vice versa. These trees offer a significant benefit to wildlife and the environment, and it is suggested that a preservation order is put on these trees to protect them under this development.  It seems unlikely that the construction of the proposed garage for Plot 2 will be able to take place without interference with the Walnut tree at the rear of Dunsford, Farriers Mead.   This is of particular concern as the planning permission approved for the recent adjacent (non-hotel) developments at The Red Lion Public House included a commitment to not remove or interfere with any existing trees or hedgerows, and a mature Poplar tree was chopped down and removed apparantly agoing gainst that commitment. A repeat ignoring of such a commitment on this proposed development would be unnacceptable.  The following comments refer to the Application for Planning Permission dated 15th January 2015:  1. Clause 14 ...please describe the last use of the site: The answer on the application to this question is "Agricultural".  Being a small village generally without footpaths or street lighting, permission for these two properties to be developed could set a precedent for the development of further lots of agricultural land in and around the village. This would be unwelcome and could further exacerbate the flood risk potential within the village. This would also exacerbate the growing use of the back lane/road from the Weston on the Green junction through to the Wyvale Bicester Garden Centre as a rat run for traffic to and from Bicester avoiding the A34/M40 Junction 9.  2. Clause 17 [table detailing proposed housing types and included bedrooms]  The table indicates that the proposed houses will have "2" bedrooms. However the plans submitted clearly show two four bedroom houses are proposed.  The following comments refer to the Flood Risk Assessment ref: 15-1749.07.001-Rev.  1. Page 4 of 26 includesthe statement "To the north and south [of the property] are residential properties that by their nature of their areas will not generate overland sheet flows".  Disregarding the grammer, this statement is incorrect, in as much as there are no residential properties to the north of the land permission is being sought to develop on. The land adjacent to the north is the relatively extensive garden area of the Red Lion Public House, which has recently had some banking formed at the eastern extremity of the garden area which may deflect exessive ground water into the vacinity of the houses proposed for development.  We would be grateful if you would consider the issues and objections raised in this letter and refuse permission for this proposed development.  Yours faithfully,         Roger A Dyson Elaine M Dyson |