

## NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

04 June 2014

This is information that has been received since the committee report was written. This could include additional comments or representation, new information relating to the site, changes to plans etc.

Item 6(C) – 14/02971/OUT – Dyson, Tetbury Hill, Malmesbury, SN16 0RP

Two further letters have been received. The comments, observations and objections are as follows:

### LETTER 1:

*Whilst there are no objections in principle to the expansion of the Dyson plant there are significant concerns about the robustness of the submitted Transport Assessment and the safety and capacity of the proposed roundabout immediately outside of Inglenook.*

*The Traffic assessment contains various errors and flawed assumptions, and yet even before these have been corrected the B4014/A429 roundabout junction has been modelled to operate overcapacity after development. The resultant queues at the roundabout will have a detrimental impact on the movement of vehicles using Inglenook's accesses.*

*There will be a significant increase in traffic passing Inglenook on the B4014 as a result of the proposed development (around 700 vehicles per hour during the peak periods), and also as a result of the various committed developments in the area (around 200 vehicles per hour) – this will have a detrimental impact on safety for vehicles using Inglenook's accesses.*

*No mitigation of the impact on Inglenook has been proposed as part of the proposed development, and in fact no mention of Inglenook is made within the TA.*

### HIGHWAYS OFFICER COMMENTS:

I have now reviewed the objection received from Mr & Mrs Thompson. I consider that their transport consultant has to a great extent mis-interpreted the Transport Assessment.

The Transport Assessment has attempted to identify the "very worse" case and for this reason has not totally followed the normal pattern. I am satisfied that the approach is robust. The reduction in peak hour traffic resulting from the Travel Plan does not only cover the use of alternative travel modes but also the resulting spread of arrival/departure times resulting from the introduction of flexible working arrangements. This change in journey patterns also makes the dispute over the time of the peak period of less relevance. It is also very possible that peak flows will be lower than predicted because of the flexible working arrangements.

There is nothing in the objection that changes my initial view of this application.

### LETTER 2:

Whilst we understand the need for development, please note our areas of concern:

1. Effect of the level of daylight and privacy on our property and the land adjacent to it.
2. Conservation of trees and need to safeguard the countryside. The Dyson site and fields adjacent to it are full of wildlife this should be protected

3. Concern regarding traffic and the associated pollution, noise and the impact this has on privacy, residential amenity and wildlife.

We have met with Dyson who were very helpful and explained in detail that Dyson is committed to protecting and landscaping the area, which is a great relief. However, we would like to know that safeguards are put in place to ensure that they do.

**OFFICER COMMENTS:**

The concerns raised above have been addressed within the committee report and adequate conditions, safeguards and mitigation are in place with regards to biodiversity and ecology.

**Item 6(b) 13/00958/VAR Oaksey Park Lowfield Farm Oaksey Wiltshire**

**1 Local Resident has submitted several further representations setting out objections to the proposal and assessment that has been undertaken. These are summarised as follows:-**

1. The latest report from Chesterton Humberts does not reference or assess available marketing information from Rycal in respect of an investment opportunity for change of use from holiday lets to residential (Link to Rycal website provided).
2. The properties that are the subject of this application have not been marketed on the open market since 2008.
3. The suggestion that the site at Oaksey in the Cotswolds is not a good location for holiday homes is of concern given the importance of tourism to the economy of Cotswold communities.
4. The auction of Unit 1 is not relevant as the property was advertised for sale as a residential dwelling not a holiday let and the advertisement of the auction was limited.
5. Unit 1 was withdrawn from Auction on 16<sup>th</sup> April 2014 (Link to Auction House website and sales particulars provided).
6. There is currently full occupancy of the holiday lets at the site highlighting high levels of demand.
7. The Rycal marketing that has taken place was limited in scope and extent, ineffective and undertaken by an organisation that is now defunct and was not an Estate Agency firm. Standard Estate Agency marketing approaches were not undertaken.
8. The properties have been previously marketed by Chesterton Humberts and there is therefore a conflict of interest (market brochure provided).

**OFFICER COMMENTS:-**

All of the correspondence was copied to Chesterton Humberts and Officers for consideration and response. This is summarised as follows:-

1. The Chesterton Humberts report does refer to the Rycal Marketing at page 10. This refers to marketing undertaken in 2012. The link to the Rycal website showing marketing of an investment opportunity was reviewed and but was found to be so unspecific as to details of unit, price details, dates etc as to have no value for assessment purposes.
2. As with response to point 1 the Chesterton Humberts Report at page 10 references marketing by Rycal undertaken in 2012.

- 3. This matter is addressed in the Chesterton Humberts Report, the location of the site is not considered to be well related to tourism opportunities that generate demand for Holiday Lets in this sort of location.**
- 4. The offer of properties via public auction is generally considered by Surveyors to be sound evidence of market demand. The auctions followed normal procedures for other auctions undertaken by the relevant auction house. The sales particulars provided by the Local Resident clearly identify the property as a holiday let and the subject of restrictive occupancy conditions.**
- 5. Chesterton Humberts contacted the Auction House directly and spoke to the relevant auctioneer. It was confirmed that Unit 1 was offered to the room at that public auction 16 April 2014. Further that there was no expression of interest. Subsequently it was withdrawn from auction.**
- 6. The submitted evidence which has been assessed by Chesterton Humberts also demonstrated that there was income from Holiday Let rental at the site. It is not argued by any party that the 8 units the subject of the application are not let. Given that it is now June and part of the summer holiday period, high levels of occupancy are to be expected.**
- 7. This matter is addressed in the report of Chesterton Humberts and the Officer report to Committee. The marketing undertaken is described as unconventional but did produce initial expressions of interest in 2013. These were subsequently not supported by available financing.**
- 8. This matter is addressed in the Officer Report to Committee. The relevant brochure is authored and marketing undertaken by a company called Humberts Leisure. This was a company sold by Humberts prior to the formation of Chesterton Humberts. These are therefore two wholly separate and different companies. This is confirmed by Chesterton Humberts. There is therefore no conflict of interest in this respect.**