

With reference to Planning application **24/00613/F**

Location The Pheasant Pluckers Inn Burdrop Oxfordshire OX15 5RQ

For the attention of **Case Officer Katherine Daniels**.

I object to these proposals as they presently stand.

The original application generated some considerable controversy, and I share Roger Mallows' reservations in his submission - that the amendments proposed in this new application fail to address concerns previously raised.

For my own part, I welcome the recent consultee observation from the Sibford Gower Parish Council (**27.06.2024**) that goes some way- and for the first time since the original restrictions were established 3 times over by the Planning Inspectorate in previous judgements- that any permissions granted by CDC should be subject to the same condition established under Condition 9 in Application **16/01525/F** , and that *any proposed building must only be used in connection with and must remain ancillary to the public house*. In this, I entirely

I share the view-and the concern- expressed by Roger Mallows, that despite this, the revised plans and proposed amendments continue to seek permission for a separate self-contained property rather than for the original consent (**APP/C3105/W16/3165654**, on which it is modelled.

As he points out, the original consent specifically identified a set of 3 individual letting rooms *to serve as an annex for short-term letting directly associated with the existing public house operation*.

In mass and volume, the difference is palpable. It is noted in several other of the public comments made to the original application that there is no precedent identified for a 2-storey contemporary building immediately adjacent to what is still a non-designated historical asset located *within the designated Conservation Area* to which both the original application and now these amendments pay scant regard.

I add my name to Roger Mallows' concern that in this matter, this is a material variance that threatens the integrity of the original consent and that any judgement made by the CDC Planning committee should avoid any interpretation of the proposed building as a stand-alone self-contained property.

In our case, our own house on Burdrop Green, is situated in the oldest part of the Sibfords looking out on the recently-built and second, shepherds hut on the Blaze-Inn Saddles site (*whose existence is not acknowledged in the application plans*); and if it were to be built as proposed, we would directly face onto the full height of the proposed new-build house which will entirely overshadow the shepherds hut if it isn't moved first- and, more important to us, will entirely obscure any remaining view we presently have to the South West.

For many people in the area, having a new-build on what is presently the pub's car park evokes unsettling memories from early in 2006, just when the applicant family had taken possession of the Bishop Blaise, when two independent 'testing the water' applications were made to build on the pub's carpark, by two independent building firms. They were rejected by CDC at the time but the evident unease in this small village community to the new application and these amendments is perhaps understandable.

It remains a point of unsatisfactory ambivalence for as long as there appear to be two specific business operations: one that depends on short-term letting, and appears now to be at variance with the terms of the related permissions, and the public house which is actually open for very few months in the year and then only temporarily in the summer to host occasional fair-weather motor-cycling rallies right in the middle of the tiny hamlet of Burdrop.

I agree with Roger Mallows: the amendments have raised a number of questions which the CDC had little chance of addressing in the absence of a properly integrated business plan covering both, which the CDC appears to have been unable to secure?

I have one other concern that I share with Tony Skowronski in his submission (**21.06.2024**) with regard to the parking provisions envisaged in the proposed amendments. The road that runs up through Burdrop is steep and narrow with many bends and is routinely reduced to a single track by buses, a continual flow

of delivery vehicles and SUVs. Add to that the occasional influx of motorbikes descending on what really is a tiny hamlet.

I agree with him: access to and from the pub onto a road in these conditions can only be described as dangerous. In my opinion, this is no basis for enlarging the number of parking places that would be required.

The issues related to the area being an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a registered Conservation Area have got short shrift thus far in the CDC's deliberations, and I hope very much The Council will refuse these amendments or at the very least recommend re-consideration.

Hugh Pidgeon

4.7.24