

Objection APP/C3105/W/W23/3329834

I strongly object to the Appeal by Blue Cedar Homes, Land South of Faraday House, Woodway Road, Sibford Ferris. Ref: APP/C3105/W/W23/3329834

The site lies outside the built up area of Sibford Ferris in an attractive landscape and in a prominent position on a greenfield site that can be viewed from the Cotswold AONB, about a mile distant. This development threatens the character of the village and its beautiful surroundings. Indeed an similar appeal on this site for 6 no. dwellings was already dismissed in March 2023.

Sibford Ferris is one of the least sustainable locations in the Cherwell District. The proposed development lies outside the built up area of Sibford Ferris and therefore is ineligible as a development under Policy Villages 1. Policy Villages 2 allows development of more than 10 houses outside the built up area of the village. This development being less than 10 houses is ineligible under Policy Villages 2. The recent Finmere appeal confirmed that the cap of 750 houses to be built under Policy Villages 2 in the period to 2031 has already been reached.

The draft Cherwell Local Plan Review to 2040, which is now out for consultation, has downgraded Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower to be defined as “small villages”. We applaud this proposal as our narrow roads (some of which are less than 4 metres in width and without pavements) are a great concern for road safety and our struggling infrastructure is already overloaded and yet to deal with the reality of the impact of 25 new homes being constructed on the Hook Norton Road. Bus services are infrequent and this location is not environmentally sustainable with a 7 mile drive to the nearest town.

Cherwell District Council can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply and therefore the harm caused to the character of the village will far outweigh the gains in housing stock. Its access road, siting of dwellings in close proximity to existing properties and quiet, private gardens would have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities and outlook of neighbouring properties, which ought to be protected.

I therefore strongly object to the proposal as it is:

- Contrary to Policies BSC1 and Policy Villages 1 and 2 of the Local Plan Part 1 and harmful to the district’s housing strategy in the Local Plan Part 1

- Harmful to the character and appearance of the area including the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, contrary to Policy ESD 15 of the Local Plan Part 1 and Policy C28 of the Local Plan 1996; and
- Damaging to the residential amenities of adjacent properties contrary to Policy C31 of the Local Plan 1996, Policy ESD15 of the Local Plan Part 1, advice in the NPPF and the National Design Guide, 2021.

This proposed development breaches the Policy rules and is in an unsustainable location. It is also the latest in a series of residential development proposals in this discrete part of Sibford Ferris, beyond the built-up limits of the small village and in open countryside, that is threatening the character of the village and its beautiful surroundings.

I strongly object to the appeal proposal, which is unnecessary, contrary to the district's spatial and rural housing strategy, outside the village, unsustainable, harmful to the character and appearance of this part of the village/open countryside and detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties for all the reasons stated above.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the Development Plan. With no other material considerations that outweigh the harm that would be caused, we respectfully request that the Inspector dismisses the appeal in accordance with Section 38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004* and Section 70(2) of the *Town and Country Planning Act, 1990*. This is to uphold the primacy of the development plan, the principles of sustainable development in the NPPF and CLPP1, help address climate change and protect this small, attractive village from further harmful development until the *Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040* comes into effect and this village is rightfully re-categorised to a small village and protected accordingly.

For all of these reasons I request that the appeal be dismissed.
Stewart Roussel