

# Comment for planning application 21/02231/F

Application Number	21/02231/F
Location	The Stables College Farm Main Street Wendlebury Bicester OX25 2PR
Proposal	Proposed conversion of existing barn and stable block, to form new family house
Case Officer	Gavin Forrest

Organisation	
Name	Julian Pounds
Address	7 Farriers Mead, Wendlebury, Bicester, OX25 2QB
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour

Comments	<p>Our household strongly objects to this planning application for 6 very cogent reasons: 1. HEIGHT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT Just 7 years ago the original plan to build the stables included the provision for a second storey hayloft some 5.8 metres in height, but following consultations this plan was withdrawn as the height of the building was considered inappropriate for its location and therefore unlikely to be granted. A revised application was subsequently submitted for a single storey stable block of some 3.2 metres in height, which was eventually approved. The proposed conversation of the stables block to a residential dwelling is for a property reach 7.5 metres in height as its highest point. This is more than double the height of the existing stable block and virtually 2 metres higher than the original proposal for the stables which was considered an inappropriate height for the location. If the 5.8 metre height of the proposed hayloft part of the 2014 building was considered an inappropriate height nothing has changed in the building environment in intervening 7 years to change that judgement. This 2014 planning opinion is even more pertinent to this new proposed application especially when it is considered that its height will be some 2 metres higher than the original proposal which was considered inappropriate because of its height 2 RUN-OFF, FLOODING, SEWERAGE Wendlebury village is flood area and is sewerage system is at full stretch. At the moment there is substantial trenching being undertaken at the pumping station. Although my property and the proposed development are not in the flood area the run-off from our land eventually drains into Wendlebury brook. The size of the development, and one must assume some form of patio/hard landscaping around the property, in conjunction with the proposed garage block is bound to not only exacerbate the already critical flooding problems caused by run-off but also adversely impact on the water table. In prolonged bad weather, because of the difference between the ground levels of the two properties we already experience flooding from the land on which the proposed residential property is to be developed. This potential for flooding will only be increased by the proposal and any patio hard landscaping around the property. 3 RENEGING ON UNDERTAKINGS Part of the conditions of the revised planning application for the stable block being granted was that the applicant was required to give an undertaking that the grossly over-specified stable block would not be used for any residential/business purposes. In hindsight this new application suggests that the original plan was a cynical means of circumventing planning regulations. It is only 5 years since the stable block was constructed, this current application reinforces my belief that the stable block's construction was a 'Trojan horse' to bypass planning regulations. It also casts doubt over the validity of any further undertakings given by the applicant regarding future developments on the site. 4 DANGEROUS PRECEDENT Although not my area of expertise, I believe this attempt to circumvent the planning policy represents a dangerous precedent. If this development, which I believe to be outside the village envelope, were to be approved it would create a precedent for others to also build outside the village envelope and this we would see a continuing creep of housing developments which would not be infill as the current planning regulations allow. In addition, as this development is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the village, If approved, it would also create a dangerous precedent for other architecturally inappropriate developments to be erected. 5 REPACEMENT FOR STABLE BLOCK? The over-specification of the stable block is borne out by the fact that I believe the maximum number of horses present has never been more than 3, normally there appears to be only one horse and a pony on site. There also appears to be only one dog on site, therefore there was never any need such an extensive stable block including stables, kennels, feed storage and horse box garaging. My concern is that there is no current application for a new stable block to replace the existing stable block if it is converted to a residential property. Section 18 of the application indicates that there is loss of existing non-residential floor space but the section is incomplete and does not specify details. If the</p>
----------	---

original (over specified) stable block was considered essential for the well being of the animals kept by the applicant, it must be assumed that at some stage in the near future, if the change of use application is approved, there will be a further planning application for a new stable block of a similar size to the current block which will further intrude beyond the village envelope. Based on the applicants current 'form' if such an application was granted it is not inconceivable that in 5 years or so time a further planning application to be submitted to convert that stable block into a residential property. A similar situation could also well pertain to the garage block with an application for conversion to a granny flat/holiday let or even a small dwelling 6 PRIVACY/ INTRUSION The proposed redevelopment of the stable block will represent a massive intrusion into our privacy standing some 7.5 metres high and with a balcony running the full length of the east side of the upper storey it enable residents/guests to look directly into our garden paddock area where my family currently enjoy a secluded existence. In particular concern is that the activities of my grandchildren for whom we undertake child care will be directly observable. This is particularly true for our patio area where because of the difference in the levels between the two sites (our patio level is substantially lower than the applicants land) the visual intrusion is exacerbated. The application mentions that this is tree and hedge screening between the two properties, however it fails to mention that all the screening is on my property condemning me to maintaining the current status quo to maintain my privacy. The application fails to mention that the aforementioned screening is in the form of deciduous trees and there is only effective for a portion of the year. It also does not take into account that the trees screening the most intrusion-sensitive part of the garden, namely the patio area, are ash trees which unfortunately are showing signs of ash die-back and at some time in the future will have to either be substantially reduced in height or removed all together for safety reasons. It should also be noted that the lack of 'screening' and therefore visual intrusion is a two way process and could allow observation of activity in the proposed property in particular at the level of the ground floor bedrooms.

**Received Date**

28/07/2021 18:53:35

**Attachments**