

Fells Lane self build consultation session Sun 5th Sept 3.00pm – 5.00pm.

26 residents and 7 non residents. In some cases no opinion was expressed so responses do not always add up to 26

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|-------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------|
| Housing Mix | The application is for 11/12 units | Stick with 11/12 units | 20 | 6 |

Text comments

Less - impact on the road/traffic

Should be driven by local needs for small or low cost houses (shared plots)

11 max

No more than 11, less if possible

Prefer less road access in this vicinity, very narrow/limited. Long building disruption

11/12 units

Should be limited to 5 houses at the edge of the BUAB. It's not appropriate to build an estate of self builds at the edge of a small village

Reduce if possible

Agree 100%

Little option here. Does "agree/disagree relate to the NPC suggestion? Is there no option to disagree with both and press still for fewer units?

There was also no scope for putting more pressure on to make the entrance to the whole site from Dog Lane. I do not think this issue has been investigated sufficiently. I feel the volume of traffic to this junction to be undesirable.

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|-------------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Size of dwellings | Developer suggests 35-40% plus 10% PDR | Request that foot print covers max of 30% of plot | 20 | 5 |

Text comments:

Depends if it's a single dwelling or ??? (low cost housing)

This maybe too restrictive

Keep developer proposal

Max 30% of plots

Does this include garages?

We agree with the developer. Want a bigger house & less garden but plot & house specific. Not everybody will so mix is OK

40% coverage seems reasonable. These are quite large plots and with a wider footprint you might encourage lower houses/single story for less able people who do not need or cannot cope with a large garden. The site is largely enclosed (unlike Quincy Meadows) so a larger spread of building will not impact unduly.

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|------------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Development Zone | A Development Zone dictates the size and position of the 'Footprint' relative to the Plot. | Ask developer to provide specific proposals | 21 | 1 |

Text comments:

When mix is agreed

No comment

This is an important point. Can plots have limits imposed to protect future development

Given the set-back, Size of dwelling, and Between Building Gaps this is sufficient control. The footprint can't go outside the constraints set by these factors. Adding too many conditions will stifle creativity to within the conception of the PC rather than the client, probably to the detriment of design.

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|-------|----------|
| Roof Height | The Developer suggests 9M total, with less on the Northern Boundary to reflect views. | Ask for 8 M maximum height | 18 | 4 |

Text comments

Would ideally like just bungalows

8m-9m not a problem

Less on Northern boundary

9m seems to be standard elsewhere

Needs to be specific to each plot

Keep developer proposal

8m max height

Agree with the developer

9 m is not unduly high given the further restrictions on the north side. Once again, the site is largely enclosed and the impact will mostly be on other houses within the site. It will not impact on the village, and could allow for striking and interesting houses (which The Fallows are not). I believe less than 9 would exclude 2½ floors

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|---------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Storey Height | The Developer suggests 2½ stories should be a max. | 2½ stories is acceptable but request 'bungalows only' on highest land plots | 19 | 6 |

Text comments :

Just 2 at Ground Level

Do not restrict location of bungalows

2 max

Plots 9,10,11 Bungalows only

Bungalows should = 1 1/2 stories maximum

On highest points single storey only

2 1/2 stories max above ground level

Single storey bungalows

May need separate height restriction for bungalows to prevent high pitch

Napton already has a mix of existing heights

Please detail/single storey buildings as Bungalows can have dormers

Here I disagree with both developer and PC. Given the high limitations and regulations governing room heights this is an unnecessary stipulation. I am conscious that 2½ means the third story is in the roof, but it is still a whole story. If the developer can fit 3 floors within the constraints, then leave it at that. (see roof pitches). If the code allows alternatives to traditionally pitched roofs, (which is should), then allowing 3 floors (even if one is within the pitch) should be the only stipulation needed.

Basements were mentioned. This is a sloping site. Normally height is measured from mean height. It might be feasible to include a lower story which is below ground level at the front but gives a nice garden room, on ground level to the rear, especially if some excavation work was done to the garden. (see final diagram z).

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Set Back | The Developer suggests 4M set back with 1½ flexibility either way. | Request min 6 M set back to allow for adequate parking and 'openness' | 17 | 5 |

Text comments

I would suggest 4m with no flexibility

Plots are not big enough for 6m set back on every plot unless houses are very small

Relates to parking, a question of how much drive/parking is available, not necessarily specifically to eg the front could be at any point on the plot

6m to the parking area

6m set back

Agree with NPC

Stipulate parking for 3/4 cars

Happy with developers proposal

Once again the plot is largely unseen from the village. Given the openness of the central area there is sufficient space between the front of one house and the front of the house opposite. Given the parking can be fitted in to one side of the property frontage, or indeed all down one side (increasing the Building Gap) I can't see any reason to restrict building forwards. As long as there is sufficient parking, (up to the client) then there is scope for a larger back garden and smaller, easier to manage front garden. Too large a front area could prove harder for some people meaning in effect two gardening/maintenance projects.

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|------------|-------|--------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------|----|---|
| Between Building Gaps | The Developer suggests 1½ metres minimum between build line & plot boundary with 3metres minimum between dwellings. | Request min of 3 m to boundary | 21 | 3 |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------|----|---|

Text comments :

3m side boundaries

Agree with NPC

Min of 3m

Happy with 2m so as not to over restrict the plots

Self build/custom build designs will result in varying gaps anyway

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|------------------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Fells Lane Buffer Zone | The Developer suggests 10m buffer zone to protect 'Fells Lane' | Request min of 15m buffer including space for extensions under permitted development rights. | 16 | 4 |

Text comments

Ridiculous! if plot size is really 23m 15 +6 = 21 = 2m wide house

But plot size may make this unworkable

May not be possible to align this (4m set back) and 15m buffer Much as I would like 15m it doesnt add up I think. Plot 10 scaled to 23m deep so with a 6m setback gives a 2m house

Agree with NPC

Need to see specific

Agree with NPC 15m! Existing tree root clearance

Depending on appropriate measurements

Happy with developer proposal

Agree but not practicable

There was much discussion about this not being viable. It does indeed take a sizable chunk off the plots down that side. However, if it was required it could be that approaching the plot in a fresh light and redefining the buildable plot within the purple boundary (see my Image A), leaving those plots on the boundary to have much larger gardens, and shifting the access road to the east.

On the face of it however it seems a bit excessive and the 10m shown on Quincey Meadows seems adequate. But given the hedge will be protected, would we actually see the development?

Has consideration been given to the hedge area being outside or inside the ownership of the plot? Will the boundaries of the plots on all sides be able to have fences built up against the hedge on the perimeter of the field, or will it be in effect be an undeveloped part of their garden? (measurements are pretty rough, taken from google, and taken to the edge of the roadway, not to the hedge or ditch.)

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|------------|-------------------------|--|-------|----------|
| Flat roofs | Should they be allowed? | Request no flat roofs. All roofs to have pitch with min 20 degrees | 13 | 4 |

Text comments :

Modern building techniques

Does this include the garages, happy with flat roofs

Flat Roof houses are not pleasant to the eye

There are other flat roofs in the village

Agree with NPC

No flat roofs

Could have a single pitch - would look ok I think

About the overall look of the site with sensitive building materials that are compatible with each other

What about ECO homes?

In my view we are being too draconian in this regard and making unnecessary restrictions with unforeseen and unwelcome consequences.

I am not sure you can legislate for “good” or “interesting” buildings. You also can’t legislate that they “fit in”, especially to the eclectic nature of the buildings in Napton.

The danger with so much constraints is that you may end up with a lot of very boring unimaginative buildings which don’t fit in to the village (Quincey Meadows), instead of some very interesting inspiring buildings which don’t fit in. The opposite side of the coin is that you get exciting houses built by individuals which *do* fit in. Also remember that the site will be largely unseen by most of the village, unless they visit.

How much of the roof would need to be pitched? Could they have a flat roof-garden over part of the house, and so if not why not all of it. Please see accompanying (very sketchy) sketches.

Fig i – shows pitched roof but has appearance of flat roof to the front.

Fig ii – shows pitched roof with parapet, has appearance of flat to the front.

Fig iii – shows pitched roof of over 20° but also incorporates a lower pitch. But it has some roof of over 20°

Fig iv – shows similar but from ground level appears pitched, but could be predominantly flat.

Fig v – shows domed/curved roof, not unknown in some Warwickshire locations.

I think we need to be more imaginative. Many striking and acceptable houses have ‘apparently’ flat roof. (Blenheim Palace)

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|------------|-------|--------------|-------|----------|
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|----|--|
| Boundary treatments. | The Developer suggests 1.2 metres maximum wall/fence/hedge height to front gardens. | Agreed 1.2 m seems reasonable | 20 | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|----|--|

Text comments :

Open plan should be acceptable

But I think they would look better open plan

Better to have open plan.

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|----------------------|---|---|-------|----------|
| Palette of Materials | Currently no restrictions other than no primary colours | NPC request a 'Palette of Materials . Roof - tile, slate or thatch. Walls – brick/ stone/rendered/weather board | 15 | 8 |

Text comments:

Allow roof solar panels

We should allow for wooden, alternative bulding materials

Except - Allow solar on roofing

Visually yes. What about ECO home materials? Solar? The materials should be energy efficiency driven

Do not dismiss kit houses - could reduce timescales of building

No double tiles. Solar tiles, roof integrated. Natural timber tiles. Any variety of a standard roof roofing of an expert

Solar panels

Solar panels must be considered

Agree with NPC

We should reflect modern energy saving and sustainability building developments

Solar should be taken into consideration

Solar Panels? Grass Roof??

Consider Solar??

Traditional houses fit in well in the village. Please do not build futuristic houses

Happy with developers proposal?? Roof - Solar?? Cells, Kit houses are very good??!!

All very traditional modern methods of construction

As was mentioned in the meeting there is a danger of restricting the possibility of new finishes and materials which develop before this process is finalized. It goes against growing trends to forbid green roofs in today's climate, and other innovations may arrive. There is also the possibility of entirely wooden structures which would have wooden shingle roofs. Once again, we are in danger of stifling creativity, in search of uniformity. These houses will not front onto the High Street. They will have little impact on the village streetscape.

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|--------------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Sustainable energy | The Developer specifies Car Charging Points, Rain Water Butts etc. | Agreed to accept SDC (and national) current standards | 19 | 1 |

Text comments :

PV !!

National Building Standards will prevail

Definitely Energy Efficiency, Disabled Access

Should ask for a Passivehaus standard of construction. Meet lifetime homes standard to futureproof them.

See Above, all solar panels

Run off water retainment tanks?

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|-----------------|---|---|-------|----------|
| Traffic/Parking | Developer proposing 5 visitor parking spaces in central area. Is this enough? | Consider losing some of proposed central green area for more parking? | 8 | 11 |

Text comments :

That is sufficient

Insist that every house have off road for at least 2-3 cars

Not sure - need to know wide the service road is. Would it be one-way system?

Allow Plots max parking

Do away with central parking & ensure individual houses have adequate parking

Do away with the central parking and have road wide enough to park on the road

Sports field next door for playing area

Is road on the development to be adopted by WCC? YES

How wide will the estate road be?

More parking will be needed

Yes to keep buildings away from Fells Lane

Very concerned about the volume of traffic/parking. Each must have adequate spaces

Communal parking causes confusion, keep it green

Green space is very important ??? gardens example

“If you build them, they will come.”

Like roads, more car parks just means more cars.

As was mentioned, a valuable parking asset will be used by the school, and or St Lawrence Close. It could be a place to park long term unused vehicles, or someone’s caravan. Or the caravan will be parked on the plot and the cars put on the island. It will need maintaining to stop it becoming overgrown. The people in the house opposite will in effect be living opposite a carpark; the option for them would be to provide for very limited parking on their plot and just park across the road. As was said in the meeting, cars will in any event park outside the relevant house. It will need a lot of visitors to result in visitor parking spilling onto Godsons Lane or St Lawrence Close. School Hill is a 2-way road, with on-street parking. Somehow, we manage to have deliveries, bin lorries, etc, maneuver along it, and the advantage is it reduces speed. The site will not be a through route. The only people will be arriving at their destination.

I would like to see no central parking, and expect parking to be supplied on each site. However, if it is a requirement could it be semipermeable surface to allow grass to grow through,

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|-----------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Visual impact a | Views towards the site should be given priority over views out to retain the visual corridor linking the upper parts of the village (through Quincy Meadow) to open countryside beyond | Consider requesting bungalows / single storey properties at top of site (see roof height above) . | 19 | 2 |

Text comments :

Agree for plots 9, 10 & 11

Bungalows will usually be required by people more likely to have access/mobility issues

One Storey

Look at specific proposals

Need to retain visual corridor across open countryside

Emphasis on Bungalows

Max height of single storey or bungalows

Inconsistent with the rest of Napton. Unreasonable restriction on self build or custom build

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|-----------------|---|--|-------|----------|
| Visual impact b | View of the rural edge of the village from Priors Marston Road will be affected | Need to protect all hedges (not just the one bordering Fells Lane). The hedge on opposite side of the site should be protected so it softens visual impact coming along Dog Lane | 22 | 1 |

Text comments :

Not sure this is a valid objection

Unless the village maintains the hedge at bleow 1-5m in perpetuity

Strongly agree

Maintenance must be considered

Protect all hedges

Agree NPC

No felling of trees

Do not destroy natural habitat

Bio diversity is very important and needs to be sustained as much as possible

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|-----------------|--|---|-------|----------|
| Visual impact c | An overly large/tall structure on the corner to Fells Lane would be an inappropriate visual intrusion. | Consider requesting bungalow/single storey in this location | 22 | 2 |

Text comments :

Agree NPC

Agree with NPC

1 1/2 storey?

| Topic area | Issue | NPC proposal | Agree | Disagree |
|------------|-------|--------------|-------|----------|
|------------|-------|--------------|-------|----------|

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|----|---|
| Completion /construction obligations | Self Build is likely to involve protracted build times. Will potentially also involve different builders operating at the same time so a Construction Management Plan is essential. | Request condition that build should be complete within 2 years of completion of sale. Detailed content of C.M.P to be agreed. NPC to have opportunity to sign off CMP before permissions are granted | 17 | 3 |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|----|---|

Text comments :

Is this legally enforceable?

2 yrs is too short, suggest 4 yrs is more reasonable

Difficult to enforce as people may want to build 50%

Agree 10%% This will help with appropriate buyers/builders

To put an end date in the build I agree. Any extensions would need to be subject to pre-approval

At Graven Hill this is in the design code

2 yrs is rather short but a time limit is necessary

Agree with NPC

Agree NPC As all self builds some restrictions need to apply to limit disruption, taking into account narrow lanes in immediate area

Please consider what the immediate residents have already endured in the past 5 yrs

I don't believe this is legally sustainable??

3 years might be more reasonable

I would like to see pressure put on contractors not to turn into or out of Fells Lane during construction periods. Much like the contractual finish date, it is unlikely to be enforceable. But much like the contractual finish date it is worth including.

Other Comments:

Living on Site - Builders living on site should not be allowed. At Graven Hill it is not permitted, put in the design code

Storage of Materials - At Graven Hill all materials have to be kept on site.

See diagrams below.





