

Town Council's comments in respect of application 19/00086/OUT

Comments for Application Hearing 19/00086/OUT

Malcolm Berry speaking for Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council

There may be differing views on the suitability of this site for more housing – if required at all – but one thing is very clear – there is an issue with the major access being from the A44 London Road junction of Evenlode Road.

Let us consider the large number of objections – all of which make reference to the situation that exists on this road.

Even the GCC depot has issued letters to residents because their gritting lorries could not use the road.

The previous refusal to development further down the road, with the Planning Officer using objections on this issue to support that request for refusal.

The CPRE visited the site, shared objectors' views, and urged the consideration of all reasonable means by which the traffic impacts could be mitigated - whilst referring to comments from the Local Plan Inspector.

Turning to the Inspector's report to CDC in June 2018, he noted that 'Evenlode Road is heavily used for on street parking', 'vehicles can only pass in one direction for much of its length, and local residents encounter safety problems using the junction with London Road. Clearly, the provision of over 60 additional homes would increase the amount of traffic using Evenlode Road and that junction, particularly given that the Town centre and the local facilities are some distance away.'

He says the highway authority is satisfied that safe and suitable access can be provided – **I would assume that meant provision and not leaving it as it is.**

More vehicles being added at peak times will make matters worse, with the use by depot vehicles, waste collections, horse boxes and agricultural machinery, notwithstanding the movement of plant, etc. required during the building process compounding the problem. In addition, there are delay risks for emergency vehicles, and safety concerns as cyclists regularly use the route en masse.

The poor Statement of Community Involvement refers to letters issued to 142 addresses, but failed to include other roads that will be directly impacted by the additional road use. It gave lip-service to concerns raised, referring to the Transport Assessment, showing no safety concerns exist, and the very same Inspector's report I have mentioned.

That assessment also shows a distinct lack of local knowledge - with speedwalking times to reach local facilities, high regard for the single day-time operating bus service from Stockwells and noting a 45-minute cycle journey to school in Bourton-on the-Water rather than the catchment school in Chipping Camden. It says that 'sufficient gaps are provided to allow vehicles to wait and oncoming vehicles to pass' – how fortunate – and that 'on-street parking does not have a material detrimental impact on the traffic through movements'. The ATC used was nowhere near the A44 junction and only a manual one undertaken there.

The majority of new residents will drive, and the various reports and statistics do not reflect the day to day experience of moving along the Evenlode Road.

GCC Highways state that objections have been considered and GCC has offered the Town Council support in order to carry out a consultation exercise to determine whether a TRO would be a suitable tool in respect of traffic flows - but also noted the impact of restrictions displacing vehicles elsewhere on the network. This has been considered a gesture of good will and **not co-related to the application**. A meeting was held with GCC where there was understanding that an approach would be made to Bromford who own adjacent land that could mitigate the situation, which has subsequently been denied. In appreciating the raised concerns, it states '**this matter relates to inconvenience for future and local residents** as informal give-way sections are envisioned to take place'.

So everyone's concerns are merely reduced to an inconvenience; let us hope that that will not be the response to a serious accident should one occur.

My understanding is that development will be permitted where identified infrastructure needs can be met to make it acceptable. **I suggest there are needs here** and I appreciate the offer for further consultation on the Evenlode Road issues but consider them **very much related** to this development and request that this discussion on potential mitigation is held **and resolved** before the movement of any vehicles to start the site development.

There is some local acceptance of development and housing on the site, but no attempt to mitigate a known and repeatedly recorded problem that will only be exacerbated by this development is quite shameful.

I also think those considering buying the properties will think twice before doing so and consider the existing access issues to be more than a mere 'inconvenience'.

Agent's comments in respect of application
19/00086/OUT

Presentation to Planning Committee – June 2019

Good morning Madam Chairman, Members.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of this proposal.

This application was submitted following the allocation of the land in the District Council's Local Plan following adoption in August of last year, and as part of the process we made use of the Council's pre-application service. The committee report is comprehensive and confirms that the proposals are in accordance with the policies in the Local Plan.

There are though a few things I wanted to quickly address.

Firstly, I note that reference has been made by consultees to the refusal of ^{an} ~~a~~ planning ^{application} ~~permission~~ for a ^{large} caravan park some 2km further along Evenlode Road from the application site as a possible precedent with regard to highway safety. However, it is important to note that the caravan park application was not actually refused because of highway concerns, it was refused because of amenity and landscape impact matters only. The officer's comments in the delegated report for that application are clear, and I quote – "it would not be possible to substantiate an objection to the application on highway safety grounds."

Secondly, there have been some suggestions that our development will exacerbate a pre-existing issue with on street parking on Evenlode Road. This is not the case as the indicative layout illustrates that the site is perfectly capable of accommodating its own parking demands within the site itself. The Local Plan Inspector made the position of the District Council and the Local Highway Authority clear through his Final Report – i.e. both are satisfied that safe and suitable access can be provided. This has been confirmed again in the ~~officers~~ ^{committee} report and Local Highway Authority response.

The officer report goes into some detail to explain the sustainability credentials of the site and how the proposal is perfectly acceptable with regard to its ability to deliver a good layout, protect the public right of way, and deliver the right forms of affordable housing. It will provide charging facilities for electric vehicles, and it will protect ecology, trees, neighbouring amenity, landscape, and other factors. It will also provide significant infrastructure funding through CIL and S106.

Finally, the allocation of the site in the recently adopted Local Plan means that it has already been assessed with regard to its suitability for housing. In this regard, paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that the council has to approve development that accords with an up to date development plan without delay.

I therefore request that you support the recommendation and resolve to grant planning permission today.

Thank you

Public Comment for Planning Application 19/01115/OUT

Application Summary

Application number: 19/01115/OUT

Address: Land To Rear Of Ashlar, Coppers And Wyldlands Broad Campden Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6UR

Proposal: Erection of 2 no. dwellings and associated works (Outline application with all matters reserved except access)

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Hughes

Address: 1 Pool Farm Close Broad Campden Chipping Campden GL55 6WB

Comment Details

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comments

It is suggested that the adjacent development at the former swimming pool site has changed the form and aspect of this part of the village settlement because that development now extends perpendicular to the main road. However, this was a small development which was built on previously developed land where buildings had become derelict; it was not built on a greenfield site. The homes were built to depict an agriculture character with blocks arranged in a typical farm complex. The result is an **enhancement** to the landscape by developing the site of a neglected abandoned open air swimming pool with properties built in the vernacular style fitting well into the landscape of Cotswold AONB.

However, this new proposal will **not** conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty in an AONB **nor** be in keeping with the linear pattern established by properties along the road leading to the centre of Broad Campden. It certainly does **not** “round off this part of the settlement” as quoted in the Planning and Design statement, *particularly as a new access road will be necessary.*

The proposal **will mean** that the open aspect across the wild flower meadow and grassland towards the thicket on the southern boundary will be lost forever.

And the proposal **will** have an unacceptable adverse impact on my residential amenity

The owners of Ashlar, Coppers and Wyldlands will sell their back gardens to build the proposed new dwellings. The application states that the proposed new properties are set back from these existing three houses (and I quote) “*allowing ample amenity space for the existing and proposed dwellings and to prevent overlooking.*” This does not mean preventing overlooking of my property; the minimum distance between the new dwellings and the existing three properties will be 60m, **but only 10m from my home.** My house will be just 4m from their boundary.

The landscaping recommended in the Planning and Design statement solely relates to screening the existing properties of Ashlar, Coppers and Wyldlands. There is no existing vegetation or screening between the east boundary of my property and the proposed development. My home will be overlooked and my wife and I will lose our privacy and the general enjoyment of our amenity and affected by light and noise pollution. The occupants of plot 2 will overlook our front and rear gardens and see directly into our lounge and dining room. It is appreciated that the layout and landscaping is “purely indicative” but nonetheless it appears that the sellers of the site wish to retain **their** privacy and amenity to **our** personal cost and detriment. It seems that the applicants are attempting to seek approval for access to the site with a view to submitting housing proposals later, when a full application should have been made in the first instance.

It should be noted that the large area in front of our home as shown on the plan is mainly the wild flower meadow and not our garden.