

Comment for planning application 21/00922/OUT

Application Number	21/00922/OUT
Location	Land West Of Foxden Way Great Bourton OX17 1QY
Proposal	OUTLINE Planning Application for up to 9 entry-level affordable houses - all matters reserved save for access
Case Officer	James Kirkham

Organisation Name	Hilary and Peter Morse
Address	East Ridge,Main Street,Great Bourton,Banbury,OX17 1QW
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour

Comments

We are writing to object to this planning application for 9 houses on a plot off Foxden Way, Great Bourton, for two main reasons; i) The application is not in line with the Council's Local Plan, paragraph C250 of which commits the Council to deliver housing at villages where local shops, services and job opportunities are available and accessible or where access to nearby towns would be sustainable in transport terms and which identifies Great Bourton as a Category B village where minor development, infilling or conversion is allowed. The proposal must be considered as minor development, in which case the size of the development, level of service provision and appropriate scale of development are relevant factors. In addition the applicant is arguing that the site should be considered as an entry-level exception site suitable for first-time buyers. His arguments are, however, based on a number of wrong or poorly evidence assumptions. Contrary to the applicant's transport report, there are very limited facilities and services in the villages of Great and Little Bourton; these amount to two pubs and two village halls. There are no local employment opportunities, no shops, and no leisure facilities beyond the playgrounds, with the village halls being used for very few activities largely for older residents; there is not even a mother and toddler group. One bus each way twice a week is simply not enough to provide for travel to work, transport to nurseries and school, shopping and leisure, and the conclusion that 'the site is readily available by a variety of modes of transport that have the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car' is simply wrong. In practice, it is likely that every house in the development will need two cars; even a stay at home parent will need a car to get to schools, nurseries, doctors etc, and a household without adequate private transport will risk social isolation. Although it is just about possible to walk to the limited facilities and services in Cropredy, there is a steep hill which is difficult for pushchairs and those with limited mobility. In addition, any trip into Banbury without a car for leisure or shopping purposes would mean a taxi round trip costing a minimum of 15. Travel, by car or other means, would amount to a substantial additional cost for a household seeking affordable housing, and could well deter potential purchasers of affordable housing; we understand that social housing provided at Garners Field was difficult to let for these reasons. The applicant has provided no credible evidence of local demand for affordable housing on this site; although there are local people on the Council's housing register, that does not necessarily translate to them wishing to purchase 'entry-level' housing here. Indeed some comments provided in support of the proposal from people looking for affordable housing are from outside of the district area, let alone the local area. There are other sites around Banbury which are more accessible and more suitable for the provision of affordable housing. Although the application, at nine houses, sits carefully under the limit for minor development, we would ask that the Council takes into account the cumulative nature of recent development in the village. Garners Field was a relatively large development compared to the size of the village, extending it to the west. The applicant's other development of three houses to the south of School Lane, the two houses approved at Stonelea, the current proposal for nine houses and whatever is to be proposed on the applicant's adjoining site which is shown in the plans submitted, amount to a substantial development to the south of the village and will change its character. We do not, therefore believe the application is in line with Council policy, including C250 referred to above. ii) The development will lead to substantial additional traffic which will have a detrimental effect on the village. We strongly dispute the figures provided in the Hub Transport report on extra vehicle movements. As explained above, it is likely that each house will have two cars, making a minimum of 18 vehicle movements in and out each day. In addition, there will be deliveries, including as a result of the recent increase in online shopping. These will feed out into Foxden Way. As a number of other consultees have noted, this is a single carriageway road much used by people from both villages for recreation,

including walking, running, cycling and horseriding as well as for local farm vehicles. As there is no footpath along Southam Road from Great to Little Bourton it is the only safe route for anyone who wishes to walk or cycle into Banbury; and as the only level and currently relatively quiet road locally it is valued by those local residents who are older or have mobility problems, including those who use mobility scooters. The additional traffic generated by the proposal will have an adverse effect on all these residents' amenity. We notice also that the transport report envisages some traffic proceeding via School Lane. School Lane is particularly narrow between South Close and Tag End, such that it is not possible in the stretch behind our house, which backs on to School Lane, for vehicles to safely pass pedestrians ('informal passing points...in the form of driveway entries' are not an appropriate solution to this issue). The lane is used by schoolchildren disembarking from the school bus by The Bell. This section of the road is also in poor repair, with the County Council filling potholes in at least once a year. Any additional traffic along this road is likely to exacerbate these problems to the detriment of residents. Finally, we would support the comments on drainage submitted by Brian Cannon. There have been considerable drainage problems arising from the applicants' existing site. For these reasons we would ask that you refuse this application.

Received Date

18/04/2021 14:45:26

Attachments