

# Comment for planning application 22/01773/F

<b>Application Number</b>	<input type="text" value="22/01773/F"/>
<b>Location</b>	<input type="text" value="Land South of Faraday House Woodway Road Sibford Ferris"/>
<b>Proposal</b>	<input type="text" value="Erection of 6 one storey age restricted dwellings (55 years) for older people with access, landscaping and associated infrastructure - re-submission of 21/04271/F"/>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<input type="text" value="Wayne Campbell"/>
<b>Organisation Name</b>	<input type="text" value="Alison Rippon"/>
<b>Address</b>	<input type="text" value="Stone House, Backside Lane, Sibford Gower, Banbury, OX15 5RS"/>
<b>Type of Comment</b>	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
<b>Type</b>	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
<b>Comments</b>	<input type="text" value="Please see my attached letter."/>
<b>Received Date</b>	<input type="text" value="12/07/2022 20:03:30"/>
<b>Attachments</b>	The following files have been uploaded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Objection to planning application 2201773F.pdf</li></ul>

The Stone House, Backside Lane, Sibford Gower OX15 5S

11<sup>th</sup> July 2022

Dear Mr Campbell,

**Objection to planning application 22/01/773/F**

I would like to raise strong objection to the unsustainable and inappropriate development planned on agricultural land around Sibford Ferris.

The Sibfords do not have the infrastructure to sustain anything but very small-scale development. Traffic on the roads in Sibford Ferris is already often gridlocked at commuter times and the number of additional cars on the road as a result of the 25 new homes to be built and the proposed 6 retirement homes is at odds with Cherwell's stated aim to have sustainable development. Carbon dioxide levels will rise and air quality will become poorer. Additional homes will mean more people drive out of Sibford to work and to access other amenities – the lack of public transport giving no other option. Increasing traffic also gives rise to safety concerns, pavements are very limited and children and their families traveling to and from school will be at increased risk.

I do not understand the need to build additional houses in the Sibfords. These proposals go against local consultation and the targets required of Cherwell. In the Community Plan of 2012, 64% of respondents said they would be willing to see up to 10 new houses, 31% up to 20 and only 3% over 20 houses. My understanding is that 750 new dwellings were required to meet the Policy Villages 2 requirement and that 1062 have already been identified. Also, there are 8293 permissions granted for homes that haven't yet been built around Bicester, Banbury and Upper Heyford. I see no justification for developers being able to put forward land for building in rural areas on agricultural land where targets have been exceeded.

I am fearful that this is another example of creeping development and that it is only a matter of time before more building will be proposed on other plots of land put forward as part of the Local Plan review. This will have a damaging effect on the beauty of these villages and the rural community. Initially Gade Homes asked for approval for 8 Homes. This has now become 25. Considering that Blue Cedar homes have access approved what is to stop them securing planning and returning with an application for a larger number of homes?

The proposed development on the Hook Norton Road amounts to destruction of an area of natural beauty with no justification except individual profit. Looking across the valley from The Colony the second site will be more visible than the Gade Homes site as it extends further west.

I am told that the local MP, Victoria Prentice, is working with our communities to review the Class A categorisation of Sibford Ferris, Sibford Gower and Burdrop which we believe is completely inappropriate and leaves the villages vulnerable to speculative and unsustainable development.

In conclusion I urge that permission is not given for this development to proceed. It is unnecessary, unjustifiable and unsustainable. It is also 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 as well as Government guidance contained within the National Policy Framework and National Design Guide.

Yours sincerely,

Alison Rippon