

30 June 2022

Wayne Campbell  
Principal Planning Officer  
Cherwell District Council  
Bodicote House  
OX15 4AA

**Reference: Planning Application - 22/01773/F**

**Erection of 6 one storey age restricted dwellings (55 years) for older people with access, landscaping and associated infrastructure  
Land South of Faraday House Woodway Road Sibford Ferris Blue Cedar Homes Limited**

Dear Mr Campbell,

I am writing as a local resident to strongly object to the above planning application.

I object on the grounds that the development will be:

1. Contrary to the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2013
2. Unsustainable/poor infrastructure
3. Traffic impact
4. Visual Impact

**Contrary Cherwell Local Plan 2011 - 2013**

- The village is already under over development threat from the granting of planning permission, on appeal, for 25 houses at Hook Norton Road in November 2019 when the Inspector overturned the Council's refusal. This appeal decision overlooked the relative isolation, aged infrastructure, limited capacity, lack of facilities and poor accessibility of Sibford Ferris.
- This planning already has an impact on the village, so any more development would put more pressure on existing services of which there is no guarantee it could cope with.
- The Local Plan housing quotas for rural villages in Cherwell have already been exceeded.
- Since 2014 a total of 1,062 dwellings have been identified for meeting the Local Plan Policy Villages 2 requirement of 750 dwellings therefore the requirements have already been exceeded.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, Policy Villages 2 and Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011- 2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide.

**Unstainability and infrastructure**

- I question why Sibford Gower and Sibford Ferris are treated as one Category A village in the Local Plan. They are divided by the large dip to the Sor Brook with a 60mph speed limit dividing the two villages and have separate Parish Councils/precepts. This categorisation is not a true reflection of the community, geography, topography and location of its sparse facilities.
- If the local landowner(s) had not proffered up their land, but another local village had done so, then the development would be happening elsewhere. It is therefore not about the benefits or suitability of Sibford Ferris, more about where there is land made available for monetary gain. This is certainly not the correct reason to approve any housing development.
- Already over stretched sewerage and water supply even before the additional 25 houses have been built on the Hook Norton Road site.
- Lack of decent Broadband
- Overstretched GP surgery
- Its location for older people is unsuitable, being a long walk to the only facility within the Ferris - the village sub postoffice shop
- The local GP surgery which is in a neighbouring village up a very steep hill that isn't even easy for younger fitter people.

- Lack of pavements - walking into the village/bus stop/GP involves walking along virtually unlit and poorly maintained uneven roads. This not safe for anyone.
- Lack of decent public transport
- The proposed development, designed for the ageing member of the population is totally unsustainable as they need be close to good public transport, local amenities, health services and town centres. None of which they will have at this location.

### **Traffic**

- Traffic bottlenecks especially at peak times are already an issue throughout the length of the village.
- Existing "Main" street and lack of off street parking already causes issues with traffic passing spaces as vehicles cannot drive side by side along the majority of the length of the village.
- It can be likely that an over 55's development would see another 12 years of daily commuting for the occupants, then subsequently childminding/school runs for grandchildren - contrary to any proposed low level traffic use submitted by the developers.
- Lack of decent public transport means car driving is the only option for inhabitants
- Lack of local jobs - most commuting to Banbury, Stratford, Chipping Norton and beyond means more car journeys.
- More car journeys within a rural community will result in poorer air quality.

### **4. Visual Impact**

- This development would have an adverse visual impact on the landscape, resulting from the extension of the village and encroachment of built development all the way up to Woodway Road, which has an unspoilt, rural character and well used by walkers, rider and cyclists.
- The development would be clearly visible at short and more distant range from highways and public rights of way extending out into the countryside and the Cotswolds AONB. This would harm the rural character and appearance of this attractive landscape to the west of the village.
- The designs of the proposed properties are totally at odds with the historic character of its surroundings and are not incorporating any vernacular clues from the village such as cotswold stone and ironstone in the Conservation Area. They are positioned very close together with only the smallest of private gardens.

### **Summary of Objection**

I strongly believe the proposed development to be totally unnecessary, inappropriate and unsustainable as it extends beyond the existing built-up limits of the village into the open countryside surrounding Sibford Ferris, and its layout and design fail to relate to the local character therefore harming the visual and rural amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, Policy Villages 2 and Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011- 2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide. Also Paragraph 134 of the NPPF which states: '*Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.*'

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments and objections and I finish by urging the Council to refuse this application.

Yours sincerely,

Julie Carpenter

Local resident