

James Kirkham

---

**From:** Charlotte Watkins  
**Sent:** 07 August 2019 12:01  
**To:** James Kirkham  
**Subject:** RE: North Arms Wroxton 19/01148/F and 19/01149/LB

Hello

This bat survey is fine and the recommended mitigation and compensation is appropriate such that an EPS licence is likely to be obtained. We could condition this. In addition the mitigation for nesting birds is also appropriate and should be conditioned.

The bat void would be a necessary part of the mitigation and would not be visible from the exterior. We could ask for a plan (I couldn't read figure 2 in the report, too blurry when you zoom in) of how it would look if there are issues with heritage in terms of visual impact. I get the impression it is anyway being re-roofed? Access points are usually barely visible. I can have a chat with the conservation team if any issues with this are noted.

Suggested conditions below.

Kind regards

Charlotte

**K13 Birds: Mitigation and enhancement Strategy**

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, including any demolition and any works of site clearance, a mitigation and enhancement strategy for nesting birds, which shall include details of the location and design of nest sites to be provided in accordance with the recommendations within the Bat Surveys report, prepared by Udall-Martin Associates Ltd, dated August 2019, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to the commencement of the development, the nesting provisions shall be provided in accordance with the approved document.

[Reason KR1](#)

**K4 Bat Licence Required to Implement Permission**

Where an offence under Regulation 41 of the Habitat and Species Regulations 2010 is likely to occur in respect of the development hereby approved, no works of site clearance, demolition or construction shall take place which are likely to impact on bats until a licence to affect such species has been granted in accordance with the aforementioned Regulations and a copy thereof has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

[Reason KR1](#)

Dr Charlotte Watkins

Ecology Officer

Tel: 01295 227912

Email: [Charlotte.Watkins@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Charlotte.Watkins@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)

[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)

Office hours: Monday and Wednesday mornings

---

**From:** James Kirkham  
**Sent:** 07 August 2019 07:03  
**To:** Charlotte Watkins  
**Subject:** FW: North Arms Wroxton 19/01148/F and 19/01149/LB

Follow Us:

Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](https://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Twitter @cherwellcouncil

---

**From:** stephen brear [<mailto:mail@brearassociates.co.uk>]  
**Sent:** 05 July 2019 09:44  
**To:** James Kirkham  
**Cc:** Nicholas Baldwin  
**Subject:** North Arms Wroxton 19/01148/F and 19/01149/LB

Dear James,

I understand there was a meeting at the property yesterday, 4<sup>th</sup> July regarding the scheme. I understand there was some confusion or discussion regarding three parts of the project. I would like to clarify each point as follows:

1. It has never been proposed to remove the original timber wall in Area G/H between the bathroom and the former kitchen. It is only proposed to remove the modern plasterboard partitions. We had proposed in the pre apps to retain the timber frame but remove the laths and plaster however the current and submitted proposal is to remove the woodchip and repair the plaster to the partition. In an ideal scheme we would like to retain the timber frame but remove the plaster but you advised, in the pre app reports, that this proposal would not be supported. I have added additional notation to the drawing 2016-34/5 Revision F to clarify this.
2. In the second pre app we had proposed to remove the ceiling structure above Area G/H to expose the original roof structure above. You again advised in the second pre app that such a proposal would not be supported. This proposal is no longer part of the scheme even though we firmly believe this would make a much better solution for this area and show off the original and historic cruck frame of the roof. Our Heritage Assessment report, p44, identifies this element of the construction as a significant heritage value.
3. I have added additional notation to the drawing to require the outline of the partitioning alterations in Area I/J to be identifiable within the floorboarding.

Enclosed is revised drawing 2016-34/05F containing the additional notation. The outline of the partitioning alterations has also been identified in bolder line type to make this clearer.

If opinions have changed about items 1 and 2 then we would like to add this work back into the scheme however if opinion is still such that such proposals would not be supported then we will remain with the current proposal. It is of greater value to the community to bring this building back into use.

I trust this clarifies the points of discussion from the site meeting.

Regards

Stephen Brear  
Director