

Comment for planning application 21/00500/OUT

Application Number	21/00500/OUT
Location	Land North Of Railway House Station Road Hook Norton
Proposal	Erection of up to 43 new homes, access from Station Road and associated works including attenuation pond
Case Officer	Wayne Campbell
Organisation Name	Helen Foster
Address	Monivea, Burycroft Road, Hook Norton, Banbury, OX15 5PR
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Planning Strategy. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011 - 2031, adopted on 20 July 2015, has Hook Norton as a Category A village suitable for "minor development" (para C.260). According to your published "Residential Completions & Permissions at 31/03/2020 (net) (updated 15/07/2020)", from 2011 to 31 March 2020 Hook Norton had a total increase of 163 completed dwellings, or just over 5% of the total from all the villages in the district (3042 homes). In addition we have the development at Scholar's Gate which has been completing houses since this date, adding another forty odd houses. The Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031, which was made part of the development plan for the area by Cherwell District Council on 19 October 2015, contains Policy HN-H1: "To maintain a sustainable community, proposals for up to 20 dwellings may be permitted where this does not result in more than 20 dwellings being built in any one location at any time, taking into account any extant permissions." Both of this strategy documents would appear to preclude the addition of another estate development in or adjacent to the village. The numbers of houses and the demands on local facilities are well beyond those envisaged in the plans. If these documents are to have any purpose then this estate development should be refused. It should further be noted that this estate is envisaged to be on good quality farmland, and outwith the village envelope. Both of these considerations should weigh heavily in considering its rejection. Transport The transport statement is perfunctory and boilerplate. The traffic survey is ridiculous, being in the school holidays and as lockdown was ending (25-31 July 2020) It cannot be considered a reliable indicator of typical traffic volumes or speeds and to include it as such is poor. Likewise, the statement about the buses omits to mention the gaps in service and even that it goes both ways. Each of the houses will need access to at least one vehicle as there is little opportunity for employment in the village and public transport services do not meet most requirements. The parking provisions do not adequately meet these needs and parking on Station Road would be dangerous to all road and pavement users. It would also make it very difficult to charge the electric cars we will all be driving during the life of these houses. If, sadly, this estate goes ahead, consideration should be given to moving the entrance to opposite that of the Sidings with a mini roundabout for traffic calming. This might reduce speeds entering the village and reduce the number of junctions along that stretch. A pedestrian crossing for the Sidings/Grange development could form part of the 106 contribution. Energy I note that in the outline plan for the estate there is no mention of how the premises might be heated, or the provision of solar panels. However, should it be necessary to take things further, planning conditions should ensure that there is above ground space for oil tanks and boilers for each premise with access for the tanker and hose (as there is no gas in the village), all rooves pointing in a suitable direction should be fitted with solar panels, and that at a minimum one electric vehicle charging point should be provided for each premise.</p>
Received Date	19/03/2021 20:43:05
Attachments	