



Ms R Morgan
Planning Department
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
White Post Road
Bodicote
Banbury
OX15 4AA

BY EMAIL ONLY

14 December 2022

Dear Ms Morgan

22/03049/OUT – Land off Lince Lane, Kirtlington

I write with reference to the above planning application and, in particular, the (unsigned) response from the MidCherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum of 24 November 2022. In that response, four issues are raised that I deal with in turn below:

PD1 – Development at Category A Villages

It is simply disingenuous and beyond any rational interpretation to suggest that the site is not immediately adjacent to the Settlement Area, and the very fact that the author then deals with the situation that this may be the case, is indicative of an acknowledgement that to suggest the site is not immediately adjacent is without logic. The author then goes to assert that the western edge of the village would – presumably in landscape terms - be 'disrupted' by the proposals and that such would place the scheme in conflict with PD1(c) of the Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst it is accepted that the proposals would extend the western built edge of the village, that in itself does not give rise to harm in landscape terms. Indeed, as detailed in the supporting documentation, the existing 'hard' western edge of this part of the village - formed by fenced boundaries, gardens and domestic paraphernalia (lacking in significant landscaping) - would be replaced by public fronting/facing development with an extensive and deep soft landscaped buffer/edge that would provide a more filtered, soft landscaped and harmonious edge to the village. That, I suggest, would be beneficial in landscape terms and wholly consistent with PD1(c)

Jake Collinge Planning Consultancy Ltd | 5 Buttermarket Thame Oxon OX9 3EW | m 07753 502955 | e jake@jcpc.org.uk

VAT Registration no. 980 2101 50
Registered in England no. 6723139
Registered office: 24 Ripon Street, Aylesbury, Bucks, HP20 2JP

PD4 – Protection of Important Views and Vistas

It is important to recognise that the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner made a number of modifications to Policy PD4 to, in effect, facilitate qualitative judgments that allow the impacts on views to be balanced against the planning benefits of any given scheme. The benefits of this particular scheme are clearly set out in the accompanying planning documentation and, in the absence of a five-year housing simply and the 'tilted' planning balance, these benefits are significant and, I would suggest, outweigh any impacts in the context of Policy PD4. Moreover, it should be recognised that the alignment of the Public Right of Way could be diverted through the western edge of the development site with the consequence that there would be no material harm or effect on the outward views (from that realigned footpath) across open countryside.

PD5 – Building and Site Design

The author alleges that the '*proposals do not include an adequate connection to the village*' and that this places the scheme in conflict with PD5(c). The highway details submitted with the application demonstrate that the scheme would connect with the existing pedestrian network through the provision of a 2.0m high footway that would run through the site. It is not clear why the author does not consider this to be '*adequate*' since it provides the exactly the type of connection envisaged and required by the policy.

PH1 – Open Market Housing Schemes

The author asserts that the percentage mix of housing by bedroom numbers in the proposed scheme is not compliant with Policy PH1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, whilst recognising that Policy PH1 refers only to an 'indicative mix' even then that 'indicative mix' only applies to schemes of 10 dwellings or more. This part of the policy is not, therefore, relevant to the proposals. Nevertheless, it should be recognised that the proposed mix does not deviate significantly from the 'indicative mix' and, more particularly, goes beyond those requirements by including a greater range of dwelling types through the inclusion of single storey properties. To that extent, I would respectfully suggest that the mix of dwellings – by both type and size – provides appropriate balance and choice in the market place.

Accordingly, and for reasons set out, I would suggest that there is no planning foundation to the objections submitted by the Neighbourhood Plan Forum.

Yours Sincerely



Jake Collinge BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI