

## James Kirkham

---

**From:** russell crow <russell@fernhillstates.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 22 April 2021 22:52  
**To:** James Kirkham  
**Subject:** 21/00922/OUT - Foxden Way, Great Bourton  
**Attachments:** Leaflet pg 1.JPG; Leaflet pg 2.JPG; Fernhill YouGov report.pdf

Dear James,

I hope you are keeping well.

There are a few matters which we wished to pick up with you in relation to the application for 9 entry-level dwellings at Foxden Way, Great Bourton; I have left you a voicemail and would welcome the opportunity to discuss our planning application with you.

It will probably come as no surprise to you when you see the consistency in wording of the vast majority of the objections, however for your information please see attached a leaflet which has been distributed throughout the village coaching people on how to make a "valid planning objection".

Unfortunately, the person who has produced the leaflet has made a few errors in understanding our planning case and there are other points that we thought it would be helpful to clarify as the errors have filtered through into a large number of responses:

1. They incorrectly refer to our proposals as a rural exception site and thus have erroneously sought to critique our needs case against the requirements of Policy Villages 3. Whilst we consider that we have evidenced a very strong needs case for the local area, Paragraph 71 of the NPPF considers the provision of entry-level homes on a District-wide basis and it is against this requirement that the application should be assessed;
2. They refer to us being contrary to the Local Plan, as set out in our Planning Statement the fact that the Local Plan pre-dates the introduction of entry-level sites means that the Local Plan is out of date in this regard, and the material consideration provided by NPPF Paragraph 71 outweighs any perceived conflict with the Local Plan;
3. There is no evidence to justify their comment that our proposals would "significantly increase" traffic. Our Highways submissions utilise TRICS data to estimate movements from the site using an approved methodology; and
4. Parking is not a detailed matter for this stage of our proposals and any detailed submissions would comply with the Council's requirements in this regard.

We note also that the Brooks of Great Bourton House have submitted a detailed response to the application and appeared alongside us at the Bourtons Parish Council meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> April. On page 2 of the letter the Brooks contend that the adjacent appeal on the Stonelea site "fundamentally undermines" our case, and we respond to two points in this regard:

- The Brooks' criticism firstly relates to the fact that the Inspector found that the appeal site at Stonelea was physically connected to the village and had a defined boundary – which one would quite expect on the edge of a village. Paragraph 71 of the NPPF requires sites to be adjacent to existing settlements and thus this merely serves to reiterate that in terms of the relationship to the settlement the application site is located where the Government envisages entry-level homes should be delivered; and

- secondly the Brooks refer to the Council's reason for refusal for the initial Stonelea application referring to the site being a "valued landscape" – a viewpoint that the Inspector did not confirm. For clarity, we would not consider the application site does not have any demonstrable physical attributes that would lead to it being considered a valued landscape in terms of the NPPF. The Brooks go on to suggest that if the site was considered to be a valued landscape then in accordance with paragraph 170(a) of the NPPF then the support for entry-level homes is "displaced". The NPPF is however clear that the assets of particular importance in the NPPF that should not be compromised though the delivery of entry-level homes are those listed in footnote 6 of the NPPF, which does not include valued landscapes. Footnote 34 of the NPPF is clear and specific in this regard.

Further to the above we attach a YouGov report which objectively and independently demonstrates that there is a significant public appetite for schemes such as the one currently before you for consideration. It is very clear from the survey results that the local public in the District at large supports overwhelmingly exactly this type of development.

We note the contents of the submissions from Chapel Cottage. Included in this response are some rather bewildering and potentially slanderous remarks about us progressing this application under a "convenient assumed name" and a suggestion that there is a "special arrangement" between the Council and Fernhill Estates that makes it more likely that this application will be consented. Both remarks, whilst ridiculous, are both slanderous and dangerous if left on the Council's website unanswered. We would ask that the Council invite the resident to withdraw this submission and resubmit an appropriate and justified response to the application that does not feature such absurd and unsubstantiated statements.

As you will no doubt be aware, it is the Government's stated intention that entry-level sites are going to morph into First Homes sites in the near future and have suggested that a Written Ministerial Statement will soon be issued to ensure First Homes are delivered (<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system/outcome/government-response-to-the-first-homes-proposals-in-changes-to-the-current-planning-system>).

Given that the Council has no record of delivering entry-level sites and that the 2020 AMR confirms that no affordable housing was delivered on rural exception sites in 2019/20 this is a real opportunity for the Council to be at the forefront of delivering this new type of affordable housing.

We would ask that this email and the attachments be added to the application webpage.

Kind regards,

**Russell Crow**  
**Planning Director**

T: 07815 151316

E: [russell@fernhillstates.co.uk](mailto:russell@fernhillstates.co.uk)

W: [www.fernhillstates.co.uk](http://www.fernhillstates.co.uk)



# FERNHILL

---

# ESTATES

The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential, and is intended exclusively for the addressee. The views expressed may not be official policy, but the personal views of the originator.

If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, dissemination or use of this communication is not authorised.

If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by using your reply facility in your e-mail software.