

CD.6972/c - Parish Council Representation

15/02907/FUL – building plot on site of 6/7 Fyfield Cottages – to build one detached dwelling and garage with accommodation above

Chairman,

My name is Pete McHugh, I address the Committee in my capacity as Chairman of Eastleach Parish Council and as a resident of Fyfield.

There are 24 dwellings in Fyfield, at the Parish Council Meeting that followed this application, I had to extend the amount of Public speaking time to allow the many that attended to express their concerns to the PC.

Eastleach has not seen a "New Build" in more than two decades. Unsustainability, no transport connections and nearby shops as far as 4 miles away.

The Committee will be aware of two previous applications for development on this site were refused due to access.

CD.6972/A – erection of one detached cottage – REFUSED 11.04.1988

CD.6972/B – erection of a pair of three bedroom cottages – REFUSED 15.03.2001

Since the last applications Fyfield has changed, the community has developed with larger farm traffic passing through between the two farms that surround the hamlet. Indeed had the Visibility Assessment taken place in late summer, a very different picture would have emerged with large Farm machinery, trailers, and combine harvesters.

Chairman, the specific complaint from the parishioners is lane itself. Halfway down the lane is the BT exchange that services the area. BT vehicles require access to this site, there is a layby allocated for BT personnel. Home owners resort to leaving their vehicles in the layby at night due to lack of personal parking or the impractical nature of reversing out of the lane into the Fyfield/Southrop road. The Councils own waste contractor has to reverse into the lane as there is no turning provision. All this demonstrates the narrowness of the lane.

The next obstacle is the "pinch point" in the lane towards the proposed development site. It's barely passable by car and congestion occurs when the farmer /local land owners require access to grazing land at the lanes end. At this point, it is merely a dirt track. To grant permission for the construction of a dwelling at this point of the lane provokes questions about the feasibility for construction vehicles, deliveries of materials, and general disruption for locals which seems to have escaped the applicant's attention. Many of the current residents only have street parking and there is a real problem when access is required by oil tankers, refuse collection vehicles, or emergency vehicle access.

Finally Chairman, I would address the plans for the dwelling itself. It's arguable that this doesn't have any impact at addressing a local housing need due to its size and similar styled garage applications have been refused as not being in keeping. The site was sold by the previous owner as a "Garden Plot" rather than a "Development Opportunity", any application for use otherwise goes against any previous refusal by CDC.

In summary Chairman, the local community and Parish Council objects to the application and welcomes support of Councillor Theodoulou requests for a local site meeting so that all these observations can be seen first-hand.

Pete McHugh
Chairman
Eastleach Parish Council

To CDC Planning Dept
Trinity Road
Cirencester

Ref Planning Application 15/02907/FUL

Sirs. I would like, if possible to speak at the Planning Committee Meeting on the 11th May regarding the above application.

From 4 Fyfield
Lechlade
GL7 3NT
5th May 2016

I wish to object on the following grounds:

1 That this development does not concur with the provision of the development plan in force in the area in which this application site is located and is neither a first time buyer occupancy or social housing and on these grounds alone it should be rejected.

2 Sustainability. This is single lane is already running at full capacity regarding the amount of traffic now using it, with many of the residents using two or even three vehicles per cottage in a lane that was only ever meant to take farm traffic, pony and cart and the one car per farm worker. There is a "pinch point" between 4 and 5 and Honeysuckle Cottage where the cottages open onto the lane. Residents here frequently have to move their cars to allow farm machinery, delivery and service traffic through. As a resident of 40 years I have seen the occupancy of the lane grow from 5 occupied cottages to 9 properties and traffic movements increase beyond recognition, and, although the lane may appear tranquil on some days there is a constant flow of delivery and service vehicles on a lane that has only been resurface once in 40 years and finishes at [NO 5. The size of vehicles has also increased with service lorries and farm machinery more than doubled in size over the past 20 years.

Access to the site. The official lane finishes at no 5 and access to Field Cottage (opposite the site in question) and the fields beyond is by agreement and usage. This is only a soft dirt track and there seems to be some unclarity as to the ownership and use etc of this piece of track, it cannot be regarded as "Lane" due to its make up..

4 Access onto the lane from the top road. The Highways Department Survey were a total farce, the 1st one being vandalised ~~within 48 hours for some obscure reason~~, and the 2nd one taking place for a short space of time on a Saturday when there was no farm traffic, no delivery services and no school run, not a normal days movements, try getting out on a day during the harvest and it is different altogether with continual grain lorries, tractors and combines a constant flow.

5 History, previous planning applications have been rejected on this site for the access reason, nothing regarding access has change other than the increased volume of usage on this lane making that situation worse rather than better. A "New Build" on this site would be totally out of keeping in a very historic settlement containing old barns and farm cottages.

6 History 2 So many other (Local) people were advised by your department that planning permission would never be given on that piece of land. Can you now go back on that decision?

7. Biodiversity. This area has now become home to ~~vires~~ and a wide variety of birds and ~~butterflies~~, and other wild life.

This Planning application is opportunist and should be rejected as such and for the reasons I have listed.

And we now have to go through this whole procedure yet again, for the new application.

yours respectfully,

CD. 6972/c -
Objector's Representation

