

Andy Bateson

From: Danielle Tolson <danielle.tolson@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: 20 May 2022 13:37
To: Mark Gay
Cc: Kevin Underwood; Andy Bateson
Subject: Re: Planning App. 22/00959/REM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mark

I would like to clarify that a third major concern exists which may have been lost in the mix / overshadowed by the discussions with regards to the footpath & the ecological border. This is the layout within the development itself, specifically the grouping together of all the social housing in the corner immediately bordering Berry Hill Road & Last House.

I expressed this at the meeting and have reiterated these concerns, as have others, in objection to the development which has been submitted to CDC via the planning portal. For your convenience, please find the objection letter in full below. In sum, as the plan stands, this section of the development (taken from your street scene) is entirely out of character and not at all sympathetic to the existing residencies on Berry Hill Road and it impedes any social integration of the social housing residents with the other residents within the development as they are all crowded together in one small area away from the rest of the houses. Please note the final paragraph of my letter - with regards to the noise pollution your eastern boundary homes will suffer - with this in mind, I feel my suggestions as to an alternative layout could be a real benefit to Hayfield commercially while also making the development more palatable for current Berry Hill residents.



STREETSCENE B - B

Please could you ensure this matter is given due consideration along with the other 2 you have corresponded about.

Objection Letter | UPLOADED TO CDC site

18th May 2022

RE: Application 22/00959/REM

Following a residents' meeting last night with a representative from Hayfield Developments, I am writing with regards to the above application. I feel the layout of the development is somewhat flawed and lacks a certain amount of consideration for the existing residents of Berry Hill Road.

It is a puzzle why, with such a large area of land, the western border of the development is situated immediately

adjacent to Last House and the equestrian facility behind it. I feel that the development would be much more sympathetic to the neighbourhood if a strip of natural land, be this a grassed area or a thicket / wooded area is located to run along the western boundary. This is seen elsewhere in the village at Henge Close, where a field and small play park forms a border between the development and the village at large, and also at Vera Wood Close, where a small semi-wooded patch forms a border between that development and the neighbouring street.

In terms of the social / affordable housing on the site, I strongly feel the location of these properties, bunched all together into the south-western corner of the development should be urgently reconsidered.

Firstly, these properties are in no way sympathetic to the style and scale of the existing houses on Berry Hill Road. They are incredibly out of kilter with the neighbourhood. They simply just do not fit and will detract significantly from the ambience of the area.

Furthermore, the purpose of integrating social / affordable housing into commercial housing developments is to promote mixed communities. Therefore, it is counter intuitive to have the 14 social / affordable houses all grouped together. This forces a great concentration of parked cars, and a disproportionate number of people into a very small geographic footprint, while the remaining residents luxuriate in the generous space allocated to the other 26 homes. I feel that this layout fails to promote social integration. It is very sad but also very true that where there exist clumps of social housing such areas quickly become ostracised as the 'social housing part'. It fails to promote any sort of true integration into the neighbourhood and ultimately ends up as a very separate enclave within developments. It also allows housing associations to get away with not maintaining their properties to a standard in line with the private homes. This is well demonstrated in local developments where social housing is densely grouped; they very quickly become run down. A local example of this is the group of houses running up the centre of Adderbury Fields which are all ill-kempt. A truly harmonious integration works best where the affordable housing is scattered amongst the larger residencies (eg. Henge Close development at the Milton Road.)

I feel there is ample opportunity to amend the plans to this affect. I feel the eastern edge of the development would be an ideal alternative situation for some of the social housing. I also feel this would make total commercial sense for the Hayfield as that side of the development will be most blighted by the constant and very loud traffic noise from the A4260, which will surely affect the market value of the premium properties, ergo switching some of the larger homes to sit on the markedly more peaceful Berry Hill Road side of the development would actually benefit both Hayfield and the Berry Hill Road residents, and ultimately the end residents of the development, creating a win/win situation for all involved.

Yours sincerely

Danielle Tolson
Briarwood
Berry Hill Road
Adderbury
OX17 3HF

Danielle Tolson
07977 236204
danielle.tolson@hotmail.co.uk

On 20 May 2022, at 11:56, Mark Gay <mgay@hayfieldhomes.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Underwood,

Thank you for your various emails and thank you for taking the time along with other residents to attend our consultation meeting on Tuesday evening, further to our meeting immediately prior with

the Parish Council. It is apparent that the two principle areas of concern for the residents association comprise:

- The provision (and detail of) the footpath extension along Berry Hill Road; and
- The request to move the ecological corridor from adjacent the site's eastern boundary, to its western boundary.

I appreciate that other matters were discussed and are now being considered by our project team, but these would appear the two most pertinent points.

As clarified at the meeting, the principle of the delivery of a footpath extension has already been approved at the outline stage. However, now that a detailed design is available, we would be happy to set up a further meeting with the residents association and our Technical Department so that every resident to be impacted by the footpath can discuss the detailed design of the footpath with members of the Hayfield team.

Regarding the ecological corridor, as discussed, we believe that for good design, landscape and ecological reasons, this is sited in the correct location – as per the Parameters Plan which supported the outline planning application and informed the Inspectorate's consideration of the appeal. Given that at present there is a difference of opinion as to how the proposal should be progressed in this regard, I believe it would be appropriate to await further consultation responses from all other consultees prior to making a firm decision on any amendments which may be required. However, in the interim and as suggested, we will discuss this further with Mr Bateson and respond accordingly in due course. However, in any event, I did agree to review whether improvements could be made to the interface between the development and existing residents along the site's western boundary. We will continue to do so and once potential amendments have been considered following the conclusion of the current application consultation process, we will be happy to discuss these with you further.

I note your separate comments regarding planning condition requirements. Once more, once the current consultation process has concluded, we will be in a clearer position to understand whether any further information is required as suggested. Additionally, as confirmed at our meeting, we would be happy prior to the commencement of development to hold a meeting with local residents to explain the mitigation measures proposed through our CEMP, our proposed build-route and indicative timeline, and to provide an introduction to our site management team to ensure lines of direct communication are available. If following the conclusion of the current consultation process it is considered that any further updates to our CEMP are required to fulfil the obligations of condition 19, these will be duly made as appropriate.

Please do copy my colleague Katie Christou into all correspondence going forwards, as Katie is managing this application day-to-day and maybe able to provide more prompt and up-to-date responses.

I will be in touch again in due course as set out.

Kind regards,

Mark Gay MRTPI

Planning Director

T: 0121 272 8899

M: 07957 088 538

E: mgay@hayfieldhomes.co.uk

[www:hayfieldhomes.co.uk](http://www.hayfieldhomes.co.uk)

Dominion Court, 39 Station Road, Solihull B91 3RT

<image001.jpg>

The company accepts no liability for the content of this email, or for the consequences of any actions taken on the basis of the information provided, unless that information is subsequently confirmed in writing. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: Kevin Underwood <Kevin.Underwood@buckinghamgroup.co.uk>
Sent: 19 May 2022 14:29
To: Mark Gay <mgay@hayfieldhomes.co.uk>
Cc: susan@bootherwood.com; tomosborne1@live.co.uk; rogertdixon@aol.com; Anita Higham <polygonhouse@waitrose.com>; Andy Bateson <Andy.Bateson@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; PRENTIS, Victoria <victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk>; Danielle Tolson <danielle.tolson@hotmail.co.uk>; grcapstick@btinternet.com; Jason Trinder <jasontrinder@artcontracts.co.uk>; Nick Adams <nick@berryhillroad.com>; Barbara Davies <babsandhoward@gmail.com>; mauricevanwest@hotmail.com; Colin Clark <colin_clark@hotmail.com>
Subject: Planning App. 22/00959/REM

Dear Mark

Further to our meeting on 17th May 2022 please see attached email trail that took place November/December last year.

You will see that Caroline Ford who was the case officer for CDC Planning at that time has suggested that the local residents should liaise with the developer prior to their submission of the Reserved Matters application to include any proposals that we may have within their application. Hayfield Homes Construction Ltd have chosen to date to ignore her suggestion and my correspondence prior to making their detailed Reserved Matters application.

This is a breach of condition 19 of the appeal decision which requires you to liaise with local residents.

Please cease all activities on the site until this matter is properly addressed.

Thanks

Kevin Underwood.

Buckingham Group Contracting Ltd Registration No. 2181671; Buckingham Plant Hire Ltd Registration No. 542721; GeoHess Registration No. 2861968. Registered Office: Blackpit Farm, Silverstone Road, Stowe, Buckingham, MK18 5LJ. Tel. 01280 823355 Fax. 01280 812830 This e-mail is sent on behalf of the Buckingham Group of Companies and is strictly confidential and intended solely for the addressee(s). It may contain personal and confidential information and as such may be protected by the Data Protection Act 1998, and the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) 2018. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail you must: (i) not disclose, copy or distribute its contents to any other person nor use its contents in any way; (ii) contact the Buckingham Group immediately by return e-mail and then delete it from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this e-mail are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent those of any of the Buckingham Group of companies. This e-mail has been scanned for viruses but no responsibility can be accepted once this e-mail has been transmitted. You should scan the email body, and attachments (if any) for viruses.