

# Comment for planning application 21/03426/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	21/03426/OUT
<b>Location</b>	Land Opposite Hanwell Fields Recreation Adj To Dukes Meadow Drive Banbury
<b>Proposal</b>	Outline planning application for up to 78 dwellings and associated open space with all matters reserved other than access
<b>Case Officer</b>	Rebekah Morgan
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Kenton Bromby
<b>Address</b>	Castle Cottage,6 Springfield,Hanwell,Banbury,OX17 1HG
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I strongly object to this planning application. The proposed site is not allocated for housing in adopted Cherwell Local Plan polices, which identify housing sites up to 2031, and is therefore premature and contrary to the development plan. Approval of the development would seriously prejudice consideration of alternative sites and preparation of the current Cherwell Local Plan Review. The site was assessed by CDC as clearly "not suitable" for development as recently as the 2018 HELAA. Site HELAA036 was described as: "Greenfield site outside the builtup limits. The site is considered to be unsuitable for development as development in this location would be prominent on the landscape, particularly when viewed from the east, on one of the highest points in the vicinity.. It would lead to the loss of greenfield land and informal recreation resource for local people which is in close proximity to the existing Hanwell Fields development. The applicant tries to diminish the above with poor arguments, for example claiming that this is not the MOST prominent section... but this is clearly missing the point and is a weak attempt to diminish clear policy! With regard to assisting Oxford with its unmet housing need, Banbury lies outside Areas of Search A and B. The proposed housing development would have seriously harmful impacts on the local area which adopted planning polices aim to prevent, namely: a) A significant urban extension of Hanwell Fields and Banbury not in the adopted Local Plan ( BSC2, ESD1). b) Piecemeal housing development in the open countryside, outside the built-up area of Banbury ( C8). c) Loss of an important, prominent landscape feature that adds to the character and identity of the area of open countryside north of Dukes Meadow Drive ( ESD13). Development of this site would set a damaging precedent for further urban development north of Dukes Meadow Drive, adversely affecting the setting and character of the surrounding villages and breaching the previously agreed defensible boundary of Dukes Meadow Drive. Adopted planning policies seek to protect the open countryside and important landscapes in conflict with this application. Development of this site would also set a damaging precedent for greater coalescence of the Banbury urban area and Hanwell village, and the gradual loss of the important strategic "gap" between Banbury and Hanwell. Adopted planning policies seek specifically to resist such coalescence ( C15). Note that Hanwell Village is a conservation area, with it's rural nature and views a key part of it's character and a critical point that CDC commit to protecting within the Conservation appraisal. The applicant has tried to argue that the site should be approved because Cherwell cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing supply as required by Government (Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF ). This is refuted by Cherwell DC in their last Annual Monitoring Report 2020 which sets out detailed explanations of the District housing supply position going forward to 2031. There is therefore no justification for approving the scheme and it would be premature to consider the site now. Future housing provision should be identified in formal updates of housing supply through the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, when for example the balance between greenfield and previously used land, as well as sustainability issues, can be considered in a comprehensive fashion. The applicant asserts that, given housing supply shortfall, Local Plan policies do not preclude potential greenfield sites from coming forward which are "sustainable in all other respects." however the proposed development is clearly not "sustainable in all other respects". Although the site is close physically to the Hanwell Fields local centre, it is located on the opposite (north) side of Dukes Meadow Drive, has never been allocated for housing, and will have a number of adverse impacts on the local area. Regarding the applicant's assertions about sustainability, the site is not sustainable in a number of significant respects, and therefore contrary to planning polices, including: a) Loss of an important and prominent landscape feature (C13, ESD13). b) Loss of important open vistas (C33, ESD13). c) Loss of informal open space for residents of Hanwell Fields (BSC11) d) Adverse impacts on the environment &amp; biodiversity (ESD10). e) Inadequate</p>

tree/woodland planting, and does not "enhance" the area (C17, ESD10). f) Adverse impacts on local road networks due to pressures on transport infrastructure and poor public transport ( TR7, SLE4, ESD1, ESD15) g) Lack of further community facilities to serve this development (R14, BSC12). The notional benefits of the proposal argued by the applicant are demonstrably outweighed by the harm associated with the development - both within the site and more significantly for the surrounding area of rural countryside. After COP26, there must surely be much more emphasis on the overall sustainability of future development if we are to combat global warming etc and create truly sustainable places to live. This can only be achieved through a robust national and local planning framework, not through piecemeal development. Conclusions I object strongly to the proposed development for the above reasons and the application should be refused. Any future additional housing provision for the Banbury area must be assessed through the Cherwell Local Plan review process so that proper consideration can be given to all the key planning issues and all potential housing sites.

**Received Date**

24/11/2021 13:48:13

**Attachments**