

**Address: 5 Henge Close, Adderbury, OX17 3GA**

**REF: Planning Application 19/02796/F**

Further to my previous letter of objection to this planning application in January (I have appended to this letter for reference), please find below my additional response to the latest published amendments which include the site layout, car park lighting, roller shutters to the pavilion, MUGA fencing, ball stop fencing and additional tree and hedge planting.

As I stated in my initial comments, I am generally very supportive of a sports/recreation facilities on this parcel of land, but objected based on a few key points that I initially raised. To go further when I first received the notification of an amended plan, I viewed the new plans with a sense of optimism that the residents (adjacent to the field) concerns had been listened to. Unfortunately, having reviewed the revised plans and amendments, I have to strongly object on the basis of the additional points:

- A permanent 6-metre-high ball stop fencing / netting has been proposed right along the full length of my garden, but worst still it is within what appears to be a few meters of my property. This will not only destroy my view but give us the sense of being ‘imprisoned’ within our own back garden. The view from any upstairs windows would also be greeted with the high netting and ruin the current outlook and views of the westerly sunset in the summer months. To what extent is this truly required just for our property?? The one pitch we look onto has the goal closest to our property a significant distance away, whilst sport England in their response to the application in December states “Also the cricket wicket will not work and is not acceptable to the ECB and therefore I would recommend it should be omitted as it will not be used”. I have assumed the only reason for the ball stop fencing is due to potential cricket balls, which given the recommendation is to omit, should alleviate the need for this ball stop fencing outside of our property. I understand for the Ball Colegrave business this may be useful to prevent balls reaching cars and greenhouses, but for us it will cause more annoyance than benefits. In addition, naturally having this fencing in place will create a focal point for people to congregate / sit around, as well as encourage people to use it as a backstop for games, kicking balls against etc.

I recently looked at the similar fencing installed at the new Longford Park sports pitches and noted that correctly these run along the road length of the pitch, but importantly have not been installed on the resident’s side of the land. If they are not needed here, why should they be required directly outside somebody’s garden.

- If this ball stop fence is truly required on the resident side of the land, then I would support it stopping prior to the start of our property line. If it needs to extend across our back garden outlook, then please investigate alternative temporary fencing as a feasible compromise such as those used in football and other sporting events whilst players are warming up etc. An example being: <https://www.harrodssport.com/crowd-protection-ball-stop-system-60m-x-5m/p-bar-013>
- The car park amendments, although slightly improved, still make no sense on being positioned directly outside resident’s back gardens. The proposed hedging will take many years to develop, but also doesn’t seem to continue along the full length of all properties.
- 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. Given the seemingly number of sport events being

proposed/catered for on the site, the children of this age group will need something to keep them occupied?

- Disappointingly, I see in the revised material that a meeting has taken place with Ball Colegrave to work with them on various aspects of the original plans. I note that this has resulted in an approval comment from them, which is great – but why despite several residents and myself mentioning it in their feedback, have the applicants not met with the local residents directly being impacted?? Surely working with us to implement a working solution or explain what seem to be common objection points could go a long way to leading to a greater number of approvals to this application. It worked with Ball Colegrave, so why couldn't it with residents??!

I appreciate your time in considering these objections and happy to discuss further with the applicant should they wish.

Lee Druce  
18<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Previous Comments pasted below for reference, and still applicable:

Being a neighbouring property of the site (one of the two closest properties), and having lived around the area for 30+ years, I am generally supportive of the application and need for the sport/recreation facilities. However I do object to elements of the proposed plan which I have outlined below, as well as the lack of a clear business plan and management plan for how the site will be ran and managed in the future. Until this has clearly been communicated its difficult to understand if the site is truly going to be a viable proposition and/or an impact to neighbouring properties. My main objections to the current plan are: - Conditions to be inserted as to the times that the land and proposed community building can

be accessed/used. My understanding is that there will be bars with the idea of hosting parties, concerts etc - this will obviously have a significant impact to neighbouring properties

and business - not just in Henge Close but generally in West Adderbury. Unfortunately its a known fact that party in the park events now require additional security and fencing due to anti-social behaviour, so conditions need to be outlined in any approval for how these events

will be managed in the future. - What plans and conditions are in place to prevent illegal and

late night entrance to the car park and fields. I.e. is there a plan to install a locked gate etc.? Please refer to the Thames Valley Police feedback who back up this point - What conditions / controls / security will be in place for the site when the development is taking place (if approved) - What conditions are proposed to limit height and/or introduce maintenance for any new trees planted, in particular those that may be close to the new neighbouring properties in Henge Close, to prevent loss of light and views. - Installation and consultation towards new boundary fencing and/or hedging to neighbouring properties. Currently the parameter of the site is post and rail fencing which will prove a security risk as more people use and have access to the site - Reconsideration of the 'swale' positioning or outline plans to handle likely additional bug/pest control for neighbouring property. - Introduction of traffic control measures on Milton road and plans to adjust speed limits, traffic calming around the proposed site. I don't see any outlined in the current proposal, and given there is already significant concern in the village of speeding, it seems obvious to

include this as part of the planning with the increased traffic that will be seen in and around the site - Insurance liabilities in place for neighbouring properties from damage caused by sport use on the site - The current positioning of the car parking (and motorcycle parking) seems a very odd choice given its literally a couple of meters away from the neighbouring properties. The concerns here are obvious with increased traffic, noise and light position. Without wishing to move this burden over to the adjoining business it would make more logical sense to re-position this onto the opposite site of the field or at the very least introduce a substantial green space between any parking and neighbouring properties - In conjunction with the above point of moving the car parking to the opposite site of the field, the main entrance to the community center should face away from the neighbouring properties to encourage people to move away from properties when outside the clubhouse and moving back to their vehicles - Floodlights on the MUGA. Without seeing a comprehensive business and management plan, there doesn't appear to be an obvious need to introduce flood lighting onto a MUGA area, especially given the area of the site is generally in a low light area. This will cause unnecessary light pollution, and have a large impact to the neighbouring business as outlined in their comments. If the lights are to be installed, again it would make logical sense to move parking close by so that the vehicle parking has additional lighting to that area - Plans for the pathway into the site do not currently seem to be connected to the main vehicle entrance. As outlined in the Thames Valley police report this introduces a heightened risk/exposure to criminal activity. The plans should be re-considered to address these concerns - I would like to see the plan for how the Thames Valley police comments will be addressed as they have raised some key issues in regards to anti-social behaviour, site security and potential of increased crime. To reiterate, I'm not against the concept of sports pitches and facilities, but there are enough significant concerns raised on this application (both from neighbouring properties and local businesses / police, to warrant further discussion on the current proposed layout, design and operating mechanisms of the site. I would encourage the parish council to offer a meeting with the neighbouring Henge Close residents and business to help address the many concerns that are listed within the comments of this application and seek assurances on the future use of the clubhouse and site. Its nice to see this was done with the neighbouring business following application 18/00220/F, but unfortunately this invite was not extended to local Henge Close residents. I also note that the assurances offered to the business during this meeting was not adhered to in this planning application (as outlined in the comments from Ball Colegrave Ltd.