

# Objector's Representation

Ref: 17/03909/FUL

David Mallinson, Planning Committee – Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> Jan 2018

2nd Committee hearing re Little House Planning application.

In our view, the primary concern regarding this application is that the proposed building encroaches into the turning area for the 2 houses, Meadowlands and Southfields. The sites inspection panel will have seen for themselves how necessary the turning area is. The planning condition on the 2 houses granted in 1987 stipulated that the area "...**be maintained free of obstruction at all times**". I put it to the committee, the proposed garage and garden machinery store, not only encroaches into the turning area, its main doors open onto the turning area. The very nature of the building guarantees that vehicles and garden machinery will come and go through those open doors. Are we really to believe a car will never have to be moved out of the garage and parked in order to make way for the coming and going of garden machinery...? Not only was it a stipulation of the planning consent that the area be maintained free of obstruction at all times, the sites inspection panel will have seen that any obstruction of the area would make turning infinitely more difficult if not impossible and all the more so given that the depth of the turning area will have been significantly reduced. An additional concern is that if the garage were to be built, what is at present the back entrance for the Little House, could become the primary entrance, creating ever more potential for obstruction. None of us is perfect, however good the applicant's intentions may be, as time goes by, is it not inevitable that obstructions will occur and in time will become the norm...?

If, in coming to your decision, the committee cannot guarantee that obstructing the turning area will never happen as a direct result of the building of this garage, may I respectfully suggest that you might see your way to turning down this application.

## Parish Council Representation

### **EPC Comments to CDC Planning Committee 17/04451/FUL Withy Way 10 Jan 2018**

Ebrington Parish Councillors unanimously resolved to support this application even though it marginally exceeds the increase in size of 40% allowed in Policy 22. The applicants have permission for an extension and this together with the existing house would increase the volume by 53.8% and the footprint by just 5.8%. The number of bedrooms would be the same.

We have tried to maintain a balanced community in the Parish and appreciate the District Council's efforts to maintain a stock of smaller houses, but in this case we support the increase in size for the following reasons:

1. It will be an improvement over the existing, damp, sub-standard property.
2. It would provide more off-road parking which will eliminate parking on the verge in the narrow single track lane.
3. It will meet the extensive needs of this young family with 3 children and dependent relatives who also live in the Parish.
4. It will retain this family in our vibrant community. They work here, their children go to school here and they have made a huge contribution to the life of the Parish.
5. The extensive tree planting will enhance the AONB.
6. It is supported by all the neighbours and many others in the Parish.

Whilst we are reluctant to exceed the requirement of Policy 22 we feel that this application should be an exception, particularly as CDC has in the recent past granted planning permission for replacement houses which have far exceeded the limit. For example Studio Barn, Hidcote Boyce (the replacement house is 2 $\frac{1}{3}$  times the size of the original + an extensive garage to which we objected) and another example is the enormous 'barn conversion' which replaced a tiny bungalow at the junction of Hidcote Road and Ilmington Road.

Parish Councillors strongly supported the principle of replacement and although we suggested modifications to the windows in our formal response, we ask you to please permit this application. Thank you.

# Applicant's Representation

**17/04451/FUL - Withy Way, Charingworth, GL55 6NU.**

**Caroline Warren - Applicant**

Martin Perks has outlined our planning case for you, and as you have heard, the only contentious part of our application is the 'size and scale' of our proposal.

My family and I started our journey to standing in front of you by wanting to extend our house to better accommodate our growing family of three teenage boys and increasingly dependent parents.

3 years ago we were granted planning permission to extend our existing 4 bedroom, 1 bathroom house, to 5 bedrooms and 3 bathrooms. But the structural engineer looked at the lack of foundations and ancient roof structure and shook his head. We considered underpinning and replacing the entire roof but decided the pragmatic course of action would be to replace our dwelling.

And if we were going to replace, we wanted to do it well. With an award-winning architect we put together a scheme that fits well with the surrounding buildings, houses and barn conversions, sits well in the view, being subservient to the barn conversions to the north of us, and is well screened by the large number of tall, mature trees in our large garden.

We are supported by our Parish Council, our District Councillor and our neighbours.

However, we fall in a grey area of part of the replacement dwelling policy; the policy's stated objective is to prevent the stock of small dwellings being lost in the countryside: So the nub of our application is whether you are preserving a small dwelling by refusing our application?

We already live in a largish house, in a large plot of two thirds of an acre, with 15 acres of land attached. A new house would rid us of damp, draughts, leaks and subsidence and give us room in the right places to function properly. The new home we are proposing does not depose a small house, the footprint is fractionally larger than the one we already have permission for, the volume and floor area are larger because we need more space and we reasoned that a two storey building fits better with the neighbours than a sprawling dormer bungalow that started life as a cow hovel built of stone and brick rubble and extended with bradstone and render.

A replacement dwelling allows us to properly address all of our family requirements that include our son with Down syndrome; my father with Parkinsons disease and Dementia who needs respite, and two other elderly parents; because of these family commitments I gave up full time employment and now both my husband and I work from home; I have to work at the kitchen table.

The NPPF has a core planning principle of providing the type of dwellings that people need, including in the Countryside; further, that a mix of housing should be provided including for families with children, older people, people with disabilities and people wishing to build their own homes.

And the Housing White Paper; 'Fixing Our Broken Housing Market', talks about creating housing that meets peoples future housing needs and helping the most vulnerable who need support with their housing.

I ask you to consider my family's needs when you reflect on those policies. The proposed dwelling meets our future needs as well as creating a caring and safe environment for my family and so is in accordance with both.