

Planning Application 16/01525/F : 'Erection of a two-storey cottage with 2 en-suite bedrooms, kitchen, dining and lounge facilities. Permission is also required for the siting of a garden shed - The Pheasant Pluckers Inn Burdrop Banbury OX15 5RQ

I wish to object to this planning application for the following reasons:

1. I enclose a **Copy below** of my concerns raised in my submission to 09/01275/F . Nothing has changed apart from we are now 6 years further on and still without the Bishop Blaize /Pheasant Plucker pub open as a **Public House!**
2. The applicant has knowingly applied for planning permission for a 2 bed Cottage on an A4 site which has an asset of Community Value order registered on it knowing that no change of use from Pub use is permissible with the ACV registered and that he is deliberately wasting CDC's and our 538 supporters time.
3. The indirect question submitted with the application 09/01275/F for planning permission for a shed **should be retrospective** and submitted in detail in a separate planning application.
4. I note that the applicant has submitted further documentation in respect of the viability issues surrounding the Bishop Blaize /Pheasant Plucker public house, he has not however made any comment about the reasons for not taking one of at least 4 genuine offers made for the Bishop Blaize early on this year when it was on the market for sale with Sidney Philips, all of the would be purchasers thought with the **correct management** the Bishop Blaize was a very viable pub indeed.
5. I would also remind the Planning Officers of the comments of the Planning Inspectorates planning inspector at the Public Appeal hearing at Bodicote House when she stated that " the Bishop Blaize would probably **never be a viable public house** while under the management of the current owners **Mr & Mrs Noquet.**" and she obviously had good reasons taken from the evidence produced at the hearing for making the statement.
6. The Bishop Blaize /Pheasant Plucker pub has apparently been open on average 3 hours a week since its recent "re opening" as a dining and event house, NOT as a Public House and never going to be viable on those operating times.
7. Regarding Mr Noquets further statement that Mrs Noquet has a full time job to pay the mortgage on the pub, WHERE then would Mr & Mrs Noquet find the money to build a two bed roomed cottage costing in excess of £250,000 (far more than their current mortgage)
8. Mr. & Mrs Noquet still have the opportunity to sell the Bishop Blaize to the offeree's thereby paying off her mortgage.
9. Mr Noquet described the current holiday let as a redundant barn (not needed for storage) when he applied for planning permission for its conversion, the council officer overseeing the application stated that there was plenty of storage area elsewhere in the Public House! So a shed is not necessary in any event on his and the planning officers statements. I would also remind the planning officers that the existing shed is in a conservation area, next to a grade 2 listed house and also in an area of outstanding natural beauty

Please refuse the application and the **request re the SHED**

Richard Butt, College Barn Farm, Sibford Gower, Banbury, Oxfordshire, OX15 5RY

Copy below:

For the attention of Shona King Cherwell District Council

Letter of support for the planning application 09/01275/F with reservations.

Date 14th October 2009

Subject to the following amendments/corrections being made I would support the application 09/01275/F

1. The proposed development is ugly and bears no architectural merit particularly as it is located in a conservation area it does not preserve or enhance the conservation area as required by local planning. The proposed development needs to match the existing front part of the Bishops Blaize as near as is possible in materials and design.
2. The bar appears to have been removed from the plans submitted .Surely the Bishop Blaize cannot be opened as a pub without one? Without the bar The Bishop Blaize cannot function as a pub.
3. The development in the Car park looks to be 2 to 3 metres higher than the existing pub roof. (the plans are so poor it is difficult to ascertain the true height) The roof line to be aesthetically acceptable should be no higher than that of the existing building.
4. The planned development removes 3 or 4 parking places from the Bishop Blaize car park and creates a need for 4 more spaces. (that is without designated spaces for the disabled/handicapped) There is also another parking space needed for the existing permission re the restaurant, a total of 9 extra car parking spaces are therefore needed. When the Bishop Blaize had competent management the car park was filled and overflowing on to adjoining roads on a regular basis.
5. The existing storage space on G. Noquets calculation is reduced by 25% by the conversion of the barn to a bedroom. Where are the beer barrels etc going to be stored? An underground cellar would probably be acceptable.
6. There does not appear to be a provision in the plans for a screened central heating fuel tank or refuse bin area.
7. The application states that there are NO BATS at the Bishop Blaize! I have personally seen them at the BB for around the last 44 years. To avoid disturbing a protected species a bat survey is therefore necessary .(before any planning consent is considered)
8. An access to bedroom two, three, and four is through bedroom one, I am sure that any occupant of bedroom one would probably not be too happy about this, I would also assume that it is contravening Health and safety rules.
9. The barn (to be bedroom 1) currently forms part of a licensed premises, I cannot find a change of use application anywhere on the Cherwell Planning Portal from A4 to C1 for the barn. I would object to this application if the applicant seeks a change of use from A4 to C1.

Subject to the aforementioned amendments/corrections as points 1-9 I would support the application. If the amendments/corrections are not made I would object to the application.

Richard Butt

