

# Comment for planning application 19/02796/F

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Application Number</b> | 19/02796/F  |
| <b>Location</b>           | OS Parcels 3309 And 4319 Adjoining And North Of Milton Road Adderbury   |
| <b>Proposal</b>           | Erection of sports & community pavilion with associated carpark and sport facilities (outdoor pitches and MUGA) following planning consent for change of use of agricultural land to sport/recreation and community use (18/00220/F)  |
| <b>Case Officer</b>       | Matthew Chadwick  |
| <b>Organisation</b>       |   |
| <b>Name</b>               | Richard Weyers  |
| <b>Address</b>            | Sundial House, Henge Close, Adderbury, Banbury, OX17 3GA  |
| <b>Type of Comment</b>    | Comment   |
| <b>Type</b>               | neighbour   |
| <b>Comments</b>           | <p>Dear Sir, I have the dubious honour of occupying the closest residential house to the proposed development and therefore these proposals are of intense interest to me and I am sure the other residents of Henge Close, especially those backing onto the proposed development. In general I support the proposed development, in the interests of the majority within the village who have by and large supported the idea and I was aware of the general proposal when I purchased my property in December 2018. If executed sensitively the facility could be a great asset to the community and even help to re balance the facilities available across the village now that new housing has been added on the west side of it. I do however have the following comments, some objections which I would like to be taken into account: As stated in the Adderbury Neighbourhood Plan (AD18, vi.), 'The layout and any lighting (must) have regard to the proximity of the adjoining residential and employment uses....' and 'iii. Safe pedestrian and cycle access [is] provided to the site;' 1) Parking Objection: the latest plan has 81 car parking spaces placed right up against the Henge Close houses, literally within a few feet. The Thames Valley Police report advises against low level lighting for the car park and therefore it is going to be impossible to place this parking quite so close to the Henge Close Development without contravening the Local Plan as our houses will be blighted by close proximity lighting, car lights and a considerable amount of noise and air pollution from cars parking a few feet from our houses/gardens. I suggest designing in a wider green cordon of at least 10m between the car park and the backs of the Henge Close gardens to allow additional planting (perhaps also including some unobtrusive fencing to catch balls- I don't want to be sitting in my garden wondering when I am going to be hit by a cricket ball and I don't think anyone else would relish this either!). As it stands I OBJECT to the parking perimeter being so close to the Clockmakers' Turn development. 2) I note that the Environmental Protection Report requires the provision of EV charging points- perhaps these could be sited on the Clockmakers' Turn side of the car park so that we also get the cleaner, quieter vehicles closer to us. 3) Pedestrian Access Objection: if understood correctly pedestrian access is proposed via a new path to be created along the north side of Milton Road in front of the West side of Clockmakers Turn and then via a path turning north into the car park through the current stand of trees. To quote the County Council response: "The drawings submitted with 18/00220/F and 19/00166/PREAPP both indicated that the pedestrian access route from Milton Road would be alongside the new vehicular access. However, the current Site Plan, drg. no. 7354(08)02 Rev. D shows the internal pedestrian route connecting to a private driveway within the adjacent Clockmakers' Turn development [mine!], which is not acceptable and a reason for objection. Furthermore, the route does not follow the desire line for pedestrians coming from Adderbury along Milton Road, so many would be inclined to continue on the verge after Henge Close and enter the site either through the trees or via the new vehicle junction." It goes on to say that this pathway would need to be 2m wide hardstanding which would surely require the removal of existing trees on the SE corner of the proposed development, the very trees which would provide some screening for Clockmakers' Turn. The Thames Valley Police response also highlights this as a recipe for crime, literally at my back door so of course I OBJECT to this pedestrian pathway proposal: "Its proposed position is segregated, remote and hidden from view, all of which could make users vulnerable and create opportunities for criminals"(TVP Report). This can easily be solved by having the pedestrian entrance combined with the vehicular access as these agencies recommend. 4) Traffic Management: speeding traffic on the Milton Road has been a source of much anxiety for villagers for some time. It seems to me that there is a golden opportunity to address this in an integrated way with this proposed development. Users of the new sports facility will be subjected to the same dangers of speeding vehicles</p> |

that we currently are. Can it not be a condition of approval that traffic calming measures on the Milton Road are integrated into this proposal for the safety of users of the new facility and other villagers alike? I would favour a chicane on approaching Ball & Colgrave from Milton (as works so well in Aynho) as this seems to be the most effective way of reducing speeding traffic and would safeguard pedestrians, cyclists and other responsible road users who are trying to get into and out of the sports facility. 5) Alcohol Licencing: there seem to be two bars indicated in the proposed plans which will presumably require a licence to sell alcohol. Some are also talking about hosting weddings and late night parties at what was originally presented as an improved multi sports facility for the village. There are a number of issues here: i) any noise late into the night is going to impinge on the quiet enjoyment of their properties local residents have a right to expect. ii) When the traffic analysis report itself asserts that the vast majority of users of the facility are going to be driving why would you then serve alcohol at what is supposed to be primarily a sports facility, thereby encouraging drink-driving? iii) There are several highly valued and historic pubs in the village which will surely suffer as an unintended consequence of an additional public hostelry opening. For these reasons I OBJECT to the new sports and community facility holding a licence to serve alcohol and I propose that a cafe (which the village currently doesn't have at all) replaces these proposed bars. 6) Opening hours: related to 5) above, the proposal does not state the intended opening hours of the facility. I suggest that these are set with due regard to the Adderbury Local Plan clause 18, vi stated above. I personally would interpret this to mean that the facility should close by 10pm at the latest (including at weekends) and that this should be consulted and written into the planning conditions. I repeat that if designed sensitively this facility will be a tremendous asset to the community. I believe we all want to get the balance right. Kind regards Richard Weyers & Ikhlas Osman

**Received Date**

29/01/2020 12:32:57

**Attachments**