

From: 6 March 2022 at 10:58

Subject: Attention Planning Support Team CORRECTION in Comments acknowledgement for 22/00336/F

Thank you for your acknowledgement of the comment I submitted for **Application 22/00336/F**. It enabled me to see I had made an error in my reference to the Applicant in the concluding two paragraphs. The reference should clearly have been to Brent Glattbach.

My apologies to Matthew Chadwick. I have corrected the text below, highlighted in **red**.

Dear Hugh Pidgeon,

Thank you for your email making the following comments on application number 22/00336/F:

"Regarding 22/00336/F 1 Meadow Crest Cottages, Burdrop.

I write to re-iterate my original objection to this application.

Other than the removal of the previous attempt by the applicant to add a second storey to this original and designated asset, it is the same application and raises all the concerns the original application generated. Aside from the aesthetic impact on what is a unique 18th century row of artisan cottages, it has significant limitations as a development site.

As the submission of the local parish council has already highlighted, the siting of the proposed canopy would cause run-off to fall directly onto the narrow frontage of the adjoining property. The limited drainage system that actually runs underneath the property, is shared between the two - a further complication. Indeed, any significant construction works would similarly impact on the same property. In common with all the other cottages in the row, it has no back access, which is already problematic for the provision of mains services and the maintenance of all the adjoining properties in the row; and there is no parking space in what is a narrow village lane either for any builder's vehicles, or for any additional cars.

I have attached a photograph taken today 3.3.22, which shows the approach to the surgery and 4 of the 8 cars that are already routinely parked there. On most days, every one of the available spaces is already taken. The adjacent village surgery itself already has no overspill capacity from its small car park, and vehicles seeking to access it throughout the day in increasing numbers - and that leaves aside the increasing number of delivery vehicles also seeking to access the houses at both ends of the lane.

These issues were raised in a comprehensive review submitted by Tom Plant for Oxfordshire County Council as the local Highways Authority in March 2021 in the original Planning Application 21/00565/F. I am concerned that although Matthew Chadwick will have seen this report at the time, it would appear from the Application's paperwork that no equivalent submission was sought from the Highways Department for this re-application. I cite just 3 of what I consider still to be among its most salient paragraphs:

"As a result, I am very concerned about any intensification along this stretch of the existing highway, including the intensification that would inevitably arise during the construction period alone. How does the applicant propose the development will be constructed? Where will contractors park, where will deliveries occur, what type of delivery vehicle will be required? Where will delivery

material be stored, and where will waste product be stored? From which direction will deliveries be made from, where will any vehicle greater than 3.5 tonne turn (Guide to lorry types and weights - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)), and where would any of the existing on-street parking be displaced too? "

All these questions remain unanswered in the present application.

"Based upon the above existing identified highway constraints, and the fact that a number of the dwellings here have thatched roofs, any inconvenience, even for a few hours each day, is likely to have a serious impact upon the safe operation of the highway network here, especially for the timely arrival of Oxfordshire County Council's Fire and Rescue, 8.2m x2.9m, fire tenders for example."

" I do also appreciate that the length of the network here is not overly long, but with the site context in mind, the network only will require the addition of one or two small vehicles parked along it to impede access for all highway users here. As a result of the above, the proposals are likely to result in an adverse and serious detrimental impact upon the safe operation of the highway network here during the planned construction period, in addition to impacting the immediate and wider highway network here on grounds of traffic and convenience point of view."

If **Brent Glattbach** was looking to develop a financial asset for himself based on his present ownership of the property, in my view he simply chose the wrong property and the wrong site.

The row of cottages should be preserved and retained for what it is, a significant historical feature of Burdrop as the oldest part of the original small-scale village settlement. I object very strongly to the entirety of the proposal. It is unsafe, impractical, and ill-considered. If **Mr Glattbach** had wanted to acquire a house in the village, there are a number he might have considered investing in, but this is not an investment opportunity. The proposal is entirely unviable from every perspective.

I urge the Council's planning department to reject this application.
Hugh Pidgeon, Burdrop Green, Sibford Gower, 3.3.22 07779 149 677

You also uploaded the following file
IMG_0903.pdf