

3 Henge Close,
Adderbury,
OX17 3GA
17th March 2020

Planning Department,
Cherwell District Council

Dear Matthew Chadwick,

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

Further to my previous letter of objection earlier this year please find below my additional response to the amendments.

The main car park with space for nearly 100 cars and motorbikes on the eastern boundary is still far too close to residential back gardens. The inevitable noise and pollution is a threat to the health and well-being of those of us who live on the eastern boundary of the site. All parking and vehicle movements should be located as far as possible from people's homes and I can see no reason why it could not be positioned along the southern boundary with Milton Road and the western boundary with Ball Colegrave's business premises, which are unoccupied at night.

The buffer zone between the pavilion and the homes in Henge Close directly affected by this development would then be increased and should be sensitively planted with shrubs and hedging that would not obscure sunlight but would provide a degree of privacy and security.

I quote from Sport England's consultation response dated 20/12/19 to this planning application: "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." The addition of permanent 6m high stop ball netting is unacceptable and would leave some of us feeling we are living in a prison yard! If there is no cricket pitch there is no need of any netting. At the very least it should be netting that could be raised only when essential.

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'. Please remember this.

Why has the design put the two full size football pitches in an east-west orientation? 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 patch and a junior pitch rendering this community project far more age inclusive.

Whilst, in principle, I am 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.

Page 1/2

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 with hundreds of parking spaces. I have real concerns about the viability of such a venture and the possibility of it becoming a white elephant and a 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.

A major part of the available Section 106 money has been generated by the 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 virtually all of the 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.

I consider the proposed external facings 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.

No attention has been paid to the consequences of adding a significant increase to the traffic volumes on the surrounding roads – Milton Road, Berry Hill Road and Horn Hill Road increasing risk to the local residents. The entry to the site needs to be moved closer to the Ball Colegrave entrance as the current position is too close to Wallin Road and Henge Close.

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? Is it intended to appoint a site supervisor/security person? 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? How will the site be secured? Will there be locked gates to prevent illegal entry and occupation?

I do not believe the applicant or designers have fully understood the detrimental impact the current design will impose on those of us who will have to constantly live with the consequences. As already stated, in its current form it will add unacceptable levels of noise, air and light pollution to the local residents of West Adderbury.

I trust, therefore, that you will reject this present application and its current layout and request the plans be reconsidered and redesigned.

Yours sincerely,
Jill Mayer