

YOUR REF ●
OUR REF ●
DATE ●

CH/lm/4827
12th March 2021

Polly Hughes
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Polly

Re: APP/C3105/W/20/3263029

Thank you for issuing the third-party correspondence for the appeal referenced above. Our comments relate to the statement made by Cherwell District Council and we wish to provide the following case and information. We would refer the Officer back to the Grounds for Appeal submitted by Roger Coy Partnership about the comments made by Cherwell District Council, especially paragraph 2.2 (Please refer to paragraph 6.1 of the Grounds for Appeal) and paragraph 2.3 (6.2 of GFA).

2.4 In respect of the development approved under 20/01767/F the Council remains of the opinion that the siting of the approved garage is far more sympathetic to the context requiring less alteration of the existing landform (whereas the appeal proposal requires significant excavation works being set into the natural slope of the site) and would be less visually intrusive benefiting to a far greater extent from screening of the new dwelling and being set in a lower position (approximately 1.5m lower) within the site.

We would advise that the case officer wrongly states that the approved garage would be set 'in a lower position (approximately 1.5m lower) within the site', to confirm, both garages have the same FFL and ridge height. They have been assessed by the LVIA in both locations and benefit greatly from the screening effect of the new dwelling. The garage will be set into the natural slope of the site, being less intrusive than that approved.

2.5 The Appellant suggests (GoAS para. 6.6) that the proposed garage approved under 20/01767/F blocks the principal elevation of the dwelling; no such concerns were raised by the Appellant at the time of the application and the approved garage is in the position as applied for; the Council assumes that the relationship between the garage and dwelling was considered acceptable by the Appellant as this was what was applied for.

This was never an ideal solution for the applicant, as the dwelling relies on the natural lighting provided by the areas in front of the dwelling. It would also cover the highly designed and specified front elevation. The landscaping would also be maintained to a low level, allowing the openings to enjoy open aspect and light. Also, it was considered at every planning aspect that the applicant's hand was directed to this position by the Officer, with no option or negotiation available.

Continued.....



**ROGER COY
PARTNERSHIP**

• ARCHITECTURAL •
• TOWN PLANNING •
• INTERIORS • AGRICULTURAL •
• SURVEYORS •



Chartered Institute of
Architectural Technologists

RIBA 

Chartered Practice

Roger Coy Partnership
is the trading name of
Roger Coy Partnership Limited
Company Number 8569981

Registered Office
BRICKNELLS BARN
32 LIME AVENUE
EYDON • DAVENTRY
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE
NN11 3PG
TELEPHONE (01327) 260585
FACSIMILE (01327) 262353
enquiries@rogercoy.co.uk
www.rogercoy.co.uk

Directors:
Roger Coy, Brian Russell,
Phillippa Scarisbrick Miller

VAT REGISTRATION No 581 8419 40

2.6 The Council submits that the siting of the garage and associated hardstanding approved under 20/01767/F provides a more appropriate location, a more convenient access from the parking area to the dwelling, and also improved security through the degree of surveillance that would be had from the main dwelling. Whilst the Council remains of the view that the scale of the garage it approved could be considered excessive for a residential property, given its relationship to the new dwelling, with its design cues taking reference from its agricultural past, the Council is also the view that the approved scheme presents a layout more akin to a more traditional farmstead where an arrangement of barns (potentially sometimes of a larger scale than typical residential garaging, as is the case in the approved scheme) might be seen in such rural locations.

We would argue that the scale of the buildings on site are beyond that of a traditional farmyard and more contemporary in scale and design; being able to accommodate larger modern machinery and vehicles. Therefore, a more modern farm would be laid out in a manner that is more open, allowing turning and easy, safe access to the buildings.

3.3 The Council considers that by virtue of its inappropriate scale, design and siting within the rural landscape, the proposed garage, associated hardstanding and expansion of residential land use, from that previously approved under the original consent, would fail to reflect or reinforce local distinctiveness or the rural context, intruding out into the open countryside; causing significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Cherwell District Council have not demonstrated again through this process that the scheme would cause harm to the countryside, with the LVIA instructed by the applicant scrutinising the proposal, we feel that this argument falls short, as it is contrary to the outcome of the LVIA.

3.4 The Council further submits that, if the appeal were to be allowed, given that the Council has already resolved to grant planning permission (20/01767/F) for a garage on the site, permission would exist for two very substantial ancillary buildings on the site, intensifying the residential use and built form of the site and exacerbating the demonstrable harm previously identified.

In this instance we would be willing to agree to the revoking of the approved application should this appeal be allowed by the Planning Inspector.

We trust that the above points respond directly to those made by Cherwell District Council and that the Inspector takes these on board in determining the outcome.

Yours sincerely



Charlene Hurd
Planning Assistant