

# 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>	T Sadler
<b>Address</b>	West Farm,Main Street,Hanwell,Banbury,OX17 1HL
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Comment on Planning Application: 21/03426/OUT (Outline application for up to 78 dwellings, off Dukes Meadow Drive) I object strongly to the proposed development for the following reasons. 1. Dangerous precedent of further development to the north of Banbury: The proposed development sets dangerous and damaging precedent for further development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. The proposed development: - represents extension of Hanwell Fields and Banbury that is not in adopted Local Plan (breaching the spatial policies of the adopted Local Plan); - represents destruction of an important landscape feature that adds to character and identity of the area north of Banbury; - represents development in the open countryside, outside of built-up area of Banbury; - represents the "thin end of the wedge" towards greater coalescence of the Banbury urban area and Hanwell village - eroding the important "strategic gap" between the town and village. The proposed development represents a departure from the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. There are no material considerations that indicate the Plan should not be followed. The proposed development does not represent land use in the public interest. The benefits of the proposal are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by harm associated with the development - both within the boundary of the development site and for the surrounding area. Clear reasons exist for refusing the proposed development, including the application of policies to protect development of open countryside and surrounding areas. Although the next iteration of the Cherwell Local Plan is in development, some weight should be given to the policies that will emerge based on the consultation to date. This application is premature and undermines the current Local Plan Review. As such, it could prejudice the outcome of the plan making process. 2. Further policies relevant to planning application: The applicant's Planning Statement omits additional policies that are relevant to the consideration of this application. In particular, Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (Saved Policies): TR7 Development attracting traffic on minor roads. R14 Reservation of land for community buildings in association with housing developments at Hanwell Fields, Banbury. C8 Sporadic development in the open countryside. C13 Areas of High Landscape Value. C15 Prevention of coalescence of settlements. C17 Enhancement of the urban fringe through tree and woodland planting. C33 Protection of important gaps of undeveloped land. Incomplete consideration of policies in the application: The applicant's Planning Statement lists policies that they identify as relevant but is then very selective in judging that the proposal complies with these policies. For example, although referring to adopted Policy ESD15: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment, the applicant makes no reference to how they "Limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation." This is an important consideration given the close proximity of this further housing development to Hanwell village, as it would have a serious impact on the publicly funded Hanwell Community Observatory located in the Castle grounds. Previous consideration by Planning Inspector relevant to proposed site for development: The land between Banbury and Hanwell village does not have a statutory landscape designation in the current adopted Cherwell Local Plan. However, it is relevant that an comparable protection was proposed in submission of the Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031) via the submitted Policy ESD 15 Green Boundaries to Growth*. This submission included the concept of "green buffers" to restrict development of the land between Banbury and Hanwell village (which application 21/03426/OUT proposes to develop). Whilst submitted Policy ESD 15 Green Boundaries to Growth was not adopted, the Planning Inspector did confirm the relevance of such protection of "green buffers" in citing that protecting local landscape character and vulnerable gaps between settlements to prevent coalescence could be achieved via Policy ESD13 and saved adopted Cherwell Local Plan policy C15. It is these adopted policies that must protect the land north of Dukes Meadow Drive from further development. Greater</p>

weight should be given to these material considerations of preventing coalescence between Banbury and surrounding villages. \* (<https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3896/cherwell-submission-local-plan-2006-2031-part-1.pdf>). 3. Assessment of application and related planning policies: Principle of Development: a. We note the applicant's Planning Statement is largely based on the contention that planning permission should be granted unless there are any adverse impacts of doing so (per NPPF paragraph 11(d)) as Cherwell District Council cannot demonstrate a minimum of five years' worth of housing. This applicant's statement that CDC has an estimated shortfall in housing supply across the district somewhere in the region of 828 dwellings, is not supported. b. Housing provision should be through the update of the housing supply as identified through strategic sites in the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031. Provision should not be through sporadic development. Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF should not overrule extant planning policies in this case. c. In reference to Policy BSC2 the applicant states "Whilst the Council will 'encourage the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations' it does not preclude potential greenfield opportunities from coming forward which are sustainable in all other respects." The applicant is incorrect to assert that the proposed development is "sustainable in all other respects". The Council must take account of policies relevant to this development causing the loss of open countryside. Of particular concern to me, is this planning application setting a dangerous precedent for further development north of Banbury. This is not sustainable development. Policy C15 (Prevention of coalescence of settlements) is very relevant to this consideration. d. The applicant's Planning Statement refers to the NPPF embodying a pro-development stance. However, this development northwards of Banbury represents part of the supply of a large number of new homes and significant extensions to the town. As such CDC, in assessing suitable locations for such development, should: "consider whether it is appropriate to establish Green Belt around or adjoining new developments of significant size." (ref. NPPF para 73(e)). Whilst formal Green Belt designation may not be applicable, the continuing development of open countryside north of Banbury, warrants CDC consideration of whether a suitable equivalent designation is required to restrict development. Design, Layout and Amenity e. The proposed development does not contain of additional community facilities. The previous provision of community buildings within the Hanwell Fields development was allocated at a level to serve only that site, and not further development north of Dukes Meadow Drive. This is referenced in Policy R14. Landscape and Character f. The proposed development is in open countryside - beyond the built-up limit of Banbury. Local Plan Policy C8 will apply to all new development proposals beyond the built-up limits of settlements. Local Plan Policy C8 states "Sporadic development in the countryside must be resisted if its attractive, open, rural character is to be maintained." g. With reference to Policy ESD13 'Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement' the applicant is incorrect in concluding that the development site will "Avoid any harm to the setting of settlements, buildings, structures or other landmark features; and Avoid harm to the historic value of the landscape." Visually, the site represents further development of open countryside and can be seen from Hanwell Village. More importantly, the development site is creating a precedent for further development north of Dukes Meadow Drive increasing the risk of coalescence of Banbury and Hanwell Village (reference Policy C15 Prevention of coalescence of settlements). h. The proposed development will interrupt an important vista across open countryside and should be discouraged (ref. Policy C33). Highways and Access i. Although site has access to Dukes Meadow Drive, with contest that Policy TR7 (Development attracting traffic on minor roads) is relevant due to increasing traffic on minor roads north of Banbury. There is precedent of development north of Dukes Meadow Drive (seen at the Banbury 5 site) directly causing increase in traffic through Hanwell Village, towards a level not suitable for a minor residential road. Trees j. With reference to Policy C17 (Enhancement of the urban fringe through tree and woodland planting) the planning application does not enhance the edge of Banbury. It has insufficient woodland creation on land that should be protected for providing social and environmental benefits.

**Received Date**

24/11/2021 21:32:12

**Attachments**