

SIBFORD FERRIS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Meeting held Tuesday, 30 August 2016 at 7.45pm in the Sports Hall Classroom, Sibford School

Present: Cllrs Tim Huckvale (Chair), Ginny Bennett and Adrian Lamb; Clerk; Mr N Quinn of Yiangou Architects; one member of the public

1. Declarations of Interest: None
2. The minutes of the last meeting, 15 August, were agreed and signed by the Chair.
3. 16/01563/F Demolition of an existing dwelling and a range of large-scale equestrian buildings and the erection of a replacement dwelling including associated works and landscaping (resubmission 15/0193/F) at Muddle Barn Farm, Colony Road, Sibford Gower.

The architect for the proposed buildings, Mr Neil Quinn, gave a short representation in support of the application, explaining that the proposed house had been reduced in size from the previous application and its siting had been altered to reduce its impact on the landscape. He also advised that the proposed size would not represent a significant increase in size above the theoretical floor plan of the existing property should all permitted development rights¹ be taken up, and pointed out that some of the existing equestrian buildings would be used for other purposes so there would be a net development reduction in outbuildings.

Decision: it was agreed that the height of the proposed dwelling, being three storeys against the existing two, would still make it highly visible to the east and from the valley due to its siting on a hill and that it would still be out of keeping with the dwellings around it. This development would affect the visual amenity of residents of Sibford Ferris.

The parish council would therefore object to the application.

Mr Quinn was thanked for attending and left the meeting.

4. 16/01552/F Variation of condition no. 5 (Noise Management Plan) of Application 14/0172/F at Swalcliffe Park Equestrian, Park Lane, Swalcliffe.

The applicant wished to increase the permitted noise level to 55Db from 45Db and remove the requirement to measure noise levels at specified properties.

It was found that some of the information provided on noise level measurement lacked clarity and there was no consensus between the two surveys available for public reading, as they produced differing results. It was therefore not possible for the parish council to make a decision based on technical data. However, it was agreed that the parish council would not like noise levels to increase above their present level, for the sake of those affected on events days within the parish.

For the protection of the interests of residents, the parish council would therefore object to the application.

The member of the public left following this item.

¹ Permitted development does not include increased height.

5. 16/01609/TP T2 Ash – Crown thin 20%, lift crown, remove lowest 6 branches less than 50mm diameter – subject to TPO 22/2011 at Penn House, 9 Walford Road.

This application was considered in conjunction with 16/00212/TCA T1 Beech, as above but not subject to TPO.

It was agreed there were no objections but the Clerk was asked to comment on the screening role of trees to the north of Walford Road properties.

6. 16/01525/F Erection of a two-storey cottage with 2 en-suite bedrooms, kitchen, dining and lounge facilities. Permission also required for the siting of a garden shed at the Pheasant Pluckers Inn, Burdrop.

It was agreed there was no objection to the siting of a garden shed.

However, because the erection of a cottage would impact the visual amenity of the residents of Sibford Ferris, for the following reasons it was agreed to object to this part of the application:

- The proposed cottage would be considerably higher than the public house and ancillary buildings directly adjacent to it.
- The cottage would remove parking spaces for the public house and could affect its viability.
- Part of an existing stone boundary wall would be demolished. The wall was considered to be a feature and part of the street scene.
- The details of the finish of the cottage were not included on the plans and the dimensions were not visible. However, from the information available, it was agreed the design did not sit well with the vernacular and would be highly visible.
- The cottage would be accessed across land not in the ownership of the applicant, according to the Land Registry document used in the application.

7. Any Other Business

There was none.

The meeting closed at 9.05pm.