

Planning Application 22/00998/F

This new planning application has been made following rejection of the original planning application 20/01891/F. All of the original objections are still relevant and the only thing that has occurred since the rejection is that the proposers organised an 'archaeological dig'. The process undertaken reiterates many of the concerns raised in the original objection in relation to the way that the build would happen:-

1. The potential builders arrived with heavy duty digging machinery and proceeded to dig a big trench with little regard to the protected trees in the copse. This is therefore likely to set a precedent to the approach with even bigger equipment for any potential build. The chances of root damage or direct damage to the trees would seem to be very high rendering any protection order worthless.
2. The dig was performed before the archaeologist arrived, so does anyone really know what was uncovered as part of this dig?
3. Was one trench enough in terms of understanding the archaeological significance of this site?



In addition to the above all of the original concerns over safety, aesthetics, flooding and general traffic and parking issues remain.

Planning Application 20/01891/F

In addition to the objections to any award of the planning permission regarding the long-term effects of this application there are a number of short-term objections which will apply to the building process of the new property:-

1. It is difficult to envisage the area not becoming more dangerous in an already congested and narrow area with builders using numerous vehicles including larger operating equipment. What will be done to prevent the parking of these vehicles not only on Rectory Lane but on Farriers Close which is not only a Private Road but has significant Road Safety issues when vehicles are parked on the road.
2. There are a number of inconsistencies in the planning application including horticultural planning and the provision of services such as Foul Sewage and whilst there may be a set of words which suggest the main horticultural and aesthetics of the area will be preserved it is difficult to see how these will be adhered to and more importantly how they could be remedied in the case of a breach. In recent years when two properties were built outside of the planning scope on Main Street, a solution was accepted which required the planning permission to be amended; what will stop this happening again once the character and appearance of the land has been irrevocably changed .
3. As for the provision of services; the application refers to drawing 2550/04 for the provision of these from Farriers Close (under the root systems of the Trees covered by TPO?). There is no obvious reference to these services on said document. Water, Sewage, Electricity, Gas or Oil provision not really covered at all.

Planning applications have been refused in the past due to the Tree Preservation Orders and the archaeological status of the site and there appears to be no real change in the situation here other than the fact that one of the trees under the original TPO 11/97 has already been lost despite the 'maintenance' of the area over the years. The copse has indeed lost some of the smaller additional trees and bushes not covered by the TPO over the years during this 'maintenance'.

Maintenance of the aesthetic nature of the copse area is key for the villagers of Fringford and clearly more so for those in the immediate vicinity and it is again difficult to see if this dwelling was allowed to be built how damage would not occur by the builders and whoever bought the property:-

1. There is no reference to the dry-stone wall at what would be the entrance to the new property which would have to be removed in part or full. In addition to the aesthetic appearance what will the impact be on the Root Protection Area for the largest of the trees at the front of the property which is depicted as a small tree on the drawings
2. Much is made of the ability to retain the 3 metre hedges and the fencing around the property (again on drawings of the front elevation these hedges have been removed), but this would form the 'back-garden' of the new property. Will the new owners be forced to leave these in place or would they be entitled to replace this with a more traditional and secure 6 foot fence, which would *'detract to a significant and harmful degree to the character and appearance of the street scene'* as highlighted by the previous appeal processes
3. What will stop the new owners from removing the trees that border Farriers Close in the future? These trees which the proposal states 'will flourish in the new environment' will create a dark garden and stop light in an area of the dwelling that is presumably intended as a potential seating area given it will have patio doors leading to the Family Room.

4. Despite not being fully addressed in previous applications refusals the parking and traffic situation has to be addressed in Rectory Lane. The building of another 4 bedroom house with the potential for more than two cars in the household combined with visitors will mean the volume of cars will be increased further. With only two parking spaces this will mean that cars will park either on Rectory Lane or Farriers Close. Farriers Close is a Private Road which is already abused with inconsiderate and dangerous parking obscuring views in a tight turning area. It is not a question of volume of traffic, it is a question of parking that obscures the view required for safe driving.

The copse area, which is on a higher elevation to Rectory Lane provides natural drainage to the area but there has been occasion when significant rain fall has breached Pringle Cottage. Is it really believed that the building of this property with the proposed 'soakaway' will improve the situation.

In summary this application should be refused because:

1. No change has been offered to further understand the archaeological significance
2. Albeit a change of approach has been taken by the builder there still remains the issue of prejudice to the life of the trees
3. The visual appearance of the Copse will be undermined
4. The Road Safety will be further compromised.