

# Comment for planning application 20/01891/F

<b>Application Number</b>	20/01891/F
<b>Location</b>	Land North East Of Fringford Study Centre Adjoining Rectory Lane Fringford OX27 8DD
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of a 4 bedroom detached dwelling with garage and access
<b>Case Officer</b>	George Smith
<b>Organisation Name</b>	John Galuszka
<b>Address</b>	Ashford House, Little Paddock, Fringford, Bicester, OX27 8EJ
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Dear Sir / Madam <a href="https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Planning/Display/20/01891/F">https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Planning/Display/20/01891/F</a> I am writing to object to the application for a four bedroom house and garage on the area of land between Rectory Lane and Farriers Close. An application was submitted for the same site on 5th May 2010 and rejected after appeal. There remain compelling grounds for rejecting this new application. 1. Unnecessary removal of a sound tree under a TPO 2. Overlooking nearby properties 3. Loss of amenity value 4. Vehicular hazard The original application was rejected on appeal because of an archeological requirement and the extensive loss of trees allowing access to the site from Farriers Close. Whilst the new access is proposed from Rectory Lane this poses a further set of problems. 1. The application requires the removal of a mature and sound sycamore tree - identified in the arboricultural report of Mr Welby as T1. He grades it in his report as being of low quality but contradicts himself by reporting it as: "T1 Fair overall physiological condition but reduced structural condition due to tight main stem union. Ivy on stem - suggested duration 20 years" This places the tree at least in the moderate category and hence should not be removed. In fact it is an attractive tree which stands well on the plot and is a feature along that part of the lane. It should not be removed and hence the proposed building should not be built as the plans require its removal. 2. The proposed property is on a site raised by 2/3 metre above Rectory Lane and hence overlooks Pringle Cottage on the other side of Rectory Lane. Referring to the property as a cottage or a one and a half storey building doesn't alter the fact that the first floor window height will overlook that and other nearby lower properties. 3. In the Planning Statement (by an unidentified author) the following is written: 4.22 Development proposals in villages should also respect the historic settlement pattern of the village and this is covered in Policy C27. 4.23 Policy C33 will seek to retain any undeveloped gap of land which is important in preserving the character of a loose-knit settlement structure or in maintaining the proper setting for a listed building or in preserving a view or feature of recognised amenity or historical value. The destruction of an attractive stone wall, removal of a mature hedgerow to the rear and potential loss of a mature sycamore does not constitute retaining character of that part of the lane. The planning inspector in rejecting the appeal in 2010 noted "The combination of the loss of the trees, which form an attractive copse and the introduction of a dwelling on this elevated site, would alter its character and appearance and that of the street scene to a significantly harmful degree, particularly when viewed from Rectory Lane." Whilst the trees bordering Farriers Close are not to be removed the general comments remain completely accurate. 4. It has been acknowledged by the architect (and others) that the access along Rectory Lane is modest: "Rectory Lane is a narrow single-track dead-end lane constructed of tarmac." The lane provides access to approximately 24 dwellings beyond the proposed building and also requires access for the large (and rising) number of delivery vehicles to and from those houses. As has been noted in other letters of objection the access from the proposed dwelling directly next to the exit of Farriers Close also provides an unwelcome and unnecessary risk. Whilst the architect may believe a bus into Bicester is an option the fact that the service closed over a year ago means the dwelling will realistically require two cars and present a hazard to others along the lane. The required slope "ramp" is such that this presents an increased hazard in poor weather and snow. Negotiating Rectory Lane in winter which has a much shallower incline is already a particular hazard. Whilst I strongly support the building of new homes, I believe this site is inappropriate and I hope you will reject this application. Yours faithfully Dr John A Galuszka</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	19/08/2020 10:32:19
<b>Attachments</b>	