

Rachel Tibbetts

From: Matthew Chadwick
Sent: 11 March 2020 11:13
To: DC Support
Subject: FW: Planning Application 19/02796/FULL OS Parcels 3309 & 4319 adjoining LNMR

Matthew Chadwick BA(Hons) MSc
Principal Planning Officer – General Developments Planning Team
Development Management
Place and Growth Directorate
Cherwell District Council
Direct Dial: 01295 753754

Website: www.cherwell.gov.uk
Find us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil
Follow us on Twitter: @Cherwellcouncil
<https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/>

From: tom [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 March 2020 11:12
To: Matthew Chadwick <Matthew.Chadwick@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application 19/02796/FULL OS Parcels 3309 & 4319 adjoining LNMR

Planning Application 19/02796/FULL OS Parcels 3309 & 4319 adjoining LNMR

Dear Matthew,

Further to my previous letter of objection in January 2020 please find below my additional response to the latest amendments which included the site layout, car park lighting, roller shutters to the pavilion, MUGA fencing, ball stop fencing and additional tree and hedge planting.

I do not consider the offered mitigation of the residential amenity, landscape and environmental impacts sufficient to make the development acceptable. Trees and hedges as a buffer take years to mature and even then are no substitute for sensible planning. Planning is about the use of land and control of the development. This scheme fails on both counts.

Use of Land. The siting of the main car park with space for motorbikes on the eastern boundary only feet away from residential back gardens is both insensitive and unnecessary. The plan clearly states that costs have determined the location of the car park but it is at the expense of residential amenity. It is stated as a condition in the Neighbourhood plan (Policy AD18 vi New Community Facilities) "The layout and any lighting have regard to the proximity of the adjoining residential and employment uses". Although important, employment and business statements of concern (in this case Ball Colegrave) should not take precedence over residential concerns. The inevitable noise and pollution is a threat to health and should be located as far as possible from people's homes i.e. along the southern boundary with Milton Road and the western boundary with Ball Colegrave's business premises which are unoccupied at night. The development of outside facilities is clearly aimed at providing a venue for local and area-based senior football teams. There is little or no provision for the younger age groups i.e. under-12 years as well as for small children apart from a MUGA. It is claimed in the planning development that this is a 'community' development. The level of demand for badminton facilities has not been established.

The east-west orientation of the two full size football pitches means both Ball Colegrave and residents of Henge Close will be exposed to the direction of play. The Football Association and the parish council advisory committee have both recommended a north south orientation.

Relocating the car park as suggested would leave space for one full size football pitch and a junior pitch rendering this community project far more age inclusive. There is no demonstrable local need for two full size pitches as planning permission has already been granted for numerous pitches and a football stadium as part of a new development in Twyford. The English Cricket Board has rejected the pitch proposed and we consider this would be far better sited in the iconic village setting of the Lucy Plackett field. This recreation area, which was promised funding from the section 106 agreement to improve its run down facilities, now seems to have been forgotten.

Control of Development Whilst, in principle, we are not opposed to the development of sports provision, the development in question has clearly grown from the concept of a small community development to a substantial complex on the edge of the village within yards of residential housing imposing an inappropriate strain on existing and future capital as well as revenue resources. It will have a negative impact on this part of Adderbury adding substantially to traffic volumes and a deleterious impact on air, noise and light pollution.

The growth and scale of this development are concerning. The original plan for a village hall with some 30 parking spaces and a couple of football pitches has mushroomed into a full blown venue with bars, cafe, concert space, meeting rooms, a MUGA plus up to 150 parking spaces. There is the potential for even further expansion which could see a doubling of the pavilion footprint. We see little evidence of the demand for such a grandiose scheme. Spiralling costs have already led to economies on the build and design of the central pavilion. We have real concerns about the viability of such a venture and the possibility of it becoming a white elephant and drain on the public purse. The long promised robust business plan has still not materialised so no one knows how such an ambitious project can be responsibly funded.

I consider the mass of the pavilion and its constructions materials ugly and inappropriate. Dark metal shutters are more suggestive of a penal facility than a vibrant community centre. The designers' claim that the dark colour will recede into the landscape like a rural barn are hard to reconcile with their assertion that it will also make a bold statement.

There are many unanswered questions. What hours will it be open to the public? Who will use it? How will it be staffed and maintained? What will the annual maintenance costs be? Will APC's annual precept be sufficient to cover these costs? What sort of events will take place? Will it be a venue for weddings or outdoor music concerts? How will light pollution be contained? How will the site be protected from crime?

For the wider community the most serious impact of this scheme will be on the roads. Very significant increases in traffic will be generated on the already dangerous Milton road and yet no mitigation whatsoever is offered. This is despite years of campaigning by local people for traffic calming measures. All the roads serving this site, Berry Hill Rd, Horn Hill Rd, Crosshill Rd and New Rd have massive speed issues of which OCC are well aware but have failed to act on. In 2016 Adderbury Parish Council was keen to explore traffic calming options such as possible narrowing or associated humps or cushions funded by Section 106 monies but nothing has been done. And yet since then central government has lifted the cap on pooling section 106 contributions. There is a facility to change the use of existing 106 contributions provided it is within policy. The Local Government and Rating Act 1997 Section 30 allows for a contribution to be made by a Parish Council towards the expense incurred by a Highway Authority in constructing, moving or maintaining traffic calming works if in the opinion of the council the expenditure is, or will be, of benefit to the community. The Community Infrastructure Levy clearly allows planning authorities to charge a fixed rate per square metre of development to fund infrastructure to address the cumulative impact of development in an area.

A major part of the available Section 106 money has been generated by the Clockmakers' Turn (Henge Close) development with the obligation to mitigate the impact of this new housing development. "Section 106 contributions (also known as Unilateral Obligations) are required by law to mitigate the impact of your development on a local community and infrastructure" To spend the total Section 106 money to build a sporting complex of this nature and size is clearly in contradiction to the aims of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as it adds a new development requiring a new tranche of impacts requiring mitigation as stated above in this objection.

There is a perfectly legal way for this to be done but where is the will? There is none because the parish needs every penny it can lay its hands on to fund what has become an over-ambitious vanity project. The continued failure by Cherwell District Council and Adderbury Parish Council to use any Section106 monies to reduce the traffic impact of this development is an abuse of their powers and a dereliction of duty. The net result is to magnify not mitigate the associated risks and dangers to which the public is exposed.

I trust you will reject this most unsuitable development application or take effective action to mitigate its serious potential impact on the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the whole Adderbury community.

Yours faithfully

Tom Osborne
37 St Marys Road
Adderbury
OX17 3EZ

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..