

ADDENDUM PLANNING STATEMENT

in respect of the

Erection of 5 two storey age restricted dwellings (55 years) for older people

with access, landscape and associated infrastructure

Land to the east of Woodway Road,

Sibford Ferris, Oxfordshire

1. This report has been prepared in support of a detailed planning application for the: -

**Erection of five 2 storey age restricted dwellings (55 years) for older people
with access, landscape and associated infrastructure**

On land to the east of Woodway Road, Sibford Ferris, Oxfordshire

2. This statement should be read in conjunction with a range of other supporting reports which include: -

- Design and Access Statement by BBA;
- Report on Need by Contact Consulting;
- Landscape and Visual Technical Note Report by Pegasus Group;
- Transport Statement Letter by Pegasus Group;
- Drainage Strategy Technical Note by Pegasus Group;
- Heritage Statement by Heritage Places Limited;
- Archaeological Evaluation by Red River Archaeology;
- Archaeological Evaluation Approach by Bristol & Bath Heritage Consultancy Limited;
- Geophysical Survey Report by SUMO Geophysics Limited;
- Phase 1 Desk Study and Phase 2a Preliminary Ground Investigation by Geo Consulting Engineering Limited;
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Tyler Grange;

- Ecological Appraisal & Addendum by Malford Environmental Consulting; and
- Sustainability Appraisal by D2 Planning Limited.

3. The application has been submitted following an appeal on a scheme for 6 one storey age restricted dwellings (55 years), which was dismissed on 9th March 2023 on the application site. The Inspector dismissed the appeal purely in respect of the design of the proposed dwellings. He stated: -

“...Paragraph 126 of the Framework states that the creation of a high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. The proposal would fall considerably short of this requirement by failing to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. As such, the LPP1 and LP policy conflicts based on design are significant and overriding. There would be conflict with the development plan taken as a whole.”

4. The application has been submitted in order to overcome the appeal Inspector’s concerns. The application now proposes a two storey development which is in keeping with the Inspector’s comments at paragraph 13 where he stated: -

“In summary, there is a variety of building design but nevertheless, the village is characterised by traditional two storey dwelling form and design, steep roof pitches, iron-stone type facing materials, a linear pattern of development focussed on the two main streets, walled boundary treatments and extensive landscaping. Such qualities give the village a distinctive and attractive rural identity. The landscaped context of the village further ensures that it is subservient to the wider countryside with little visible urban intrusion.”

5. The submitted plans and Design & Access Statement demonstrates how the proposed development now follows the comments made by the appeal Inspector to overcome his concerns. Essentially that the proposed properties are two storey with steep roofs. The materials include stone type facing materials, the layout is a lower pattern of development along the proposed access road and there are boundary wall

treatments and extensive landscaping. Accordingly, the proposals fall ‘square’ with the Inspector’s conclusions and are in keeping with the design of the recently approved residential development to the south.

6. Tuning to other issues: -

- i. There is no dispute that there is an acknowledged need for the types of properties being proposed in this application. Indeed, the appeal Inspector stated: - (paragraph 23)

“The bungalows would be designed to be adaptable for elderly persons under the Building Regulations and would contribute to the range of provision for aging population within the district. The proposal would comply with LPP1 Policy BSC 4 which indicates new residential development should provide a mix of homes to meet current and expected future requirements in the interests of meeting housing need and creating socially mixed and inclusive communities. Based on a needs report³, there is an accepted need for retirement properties in the area, with the Council’s Strategic Housing Officer supporting the proposal. Development would result in greater provision of retirement housing stock, choice for older people, a sense of community and security for the new residents, and support of independent living with additional help and support.”

These proposals are still for a retirement age restricted residential development for which there is an acknowledged and accepted need which is not being met (see Need Report).

- ii. With regards to the relevant planning policy context, the Inspector stated at paragraphs 7-9 that: -

“The LPP1’s housing strategy seeks to deliver growth in accordance with principles of national policy, including the provision of sustainable economic development. Delivery of housing is through the redevelopment of strategic development sites, including previously developed sites and urban extension, in larger settlements and villages.

LPP1 Policy Villages 1 categorises villages taking into account factors, for example, population size, services and facilities, accessibility to urban area, footpaths and cycleway provision. Such categorisation guides the consideration of small-scale proposals for residential development within the built-up limits of settlements to sustainably contribute towards meeting the housing requirements identified in LPP1 Policy BSC 1. Under LPP1 Policy Villages 1, residential development within the built-up limits of Category A (Service Centres), including Sibford Ferris/Sibford Gower, will be considered for minor development, infilling and conversion. Under Policy H18 of the Cherwell Local Plan (LP) 1996, only certain types of development requiring rural locations outside of built-up limits are permissive.

However, LPP1 Policy Villages 2 indicates a delivery target of 750 dwellings for Category A (Service Centres) during the plan period, in addition to the windfall allowance under LPP1 Policy BSC 1. This has been exceeded and it is not a ceiling prohibiting further housing development. LPP1 Policy Villages 2 further indicates that sites will be identified through the preparation of the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2), Neighbourhood Plans (NP) where applicable, and the determination of applications for planning permission. No sites have been identified under a LPP2 or NP or for Sibford Ferris, developed through planning permission. For these reasons, the requirements of LPP1 Policy Villages 2 takes precedence over LP Policy H18 in this instance. Such a view does not conflict with the Inspector's view on the neighbouring site, where it was stated that there would be no conflict with this policy in relation to the proposal considered there."

This policy conclusion is still applicable to the current proposals.

- iii. Indeed the proposals comply with Policy Village 1 in that Sibford Ferris is identified as a Category A settlement which is capable of accommodating development of the scale proposed. This was accepted by the appeal Inspector.

- iv. Furthermore with regards to Policy Village 2, as stated no sites have been identified in any Local Plan Part 2 or Neighbourhood Plan. The proposals comply with all of the criteria in Policy Village 2 as follows: -
- The land is not of high environmental value.
 - It is accepted by the Planning Authority and the appeal Inspector that there would be no significant impact on heritage or wildlife assets.
 - The current proposals would assist in enhancing the built environment with a scheme which reflects the local vernacular.
 - The loss of agricultural land was not an issue which the appeal Inspector considered was problematic.
 - The vehicular access already has planning permission. The Highway Authority has no objection to the proposals.
 - The appeal Inspector confirmed that the site was satisfactorily located to services and facilities.
 - The site is deliverable now and could be developed within the next 3 years.
 - The site would be developed within the next 5 years.
 - The site lies within Flood Zone 1 where residential development is acceptable.
- v. The site has been identified by the Council in their Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment 2015, as being acceptable in principle for residential development. The site represents a logical extension of the settlement to clearly defined and defensible boundaries. This is a material consideration identified by the appeal Inspector in paragraph 25 of his decision letter.
- vi. There are no transport or sustainability objections to development on the application site. The appeal Inspector dealt with these issues at paragraphs 20 and 21, as follows: -
- “The appellant’s Transport Statement contains a convenience store with post office within Sibford Ferris which would be within a reasonable walking distance of the site, under 15 minutes. A public house, surgery and village hall are within 20 minutes walking**

distance in Burdrop. A bus stop is about 8 minutes away which offers services to nearby settlements on 2-3 hourly frequency. There are some footways within the vicinity, including in the proposed and neighbouring appeal development scheme, to access the facilities at Sibford Ferris, and along Hook Norton Road. There are further public house and church facilities in Sibford Gower.

Pedestrian access to facilities and services in the nearby villages is more difficult due to topography but given its rural nature, the Service Centre has a reasonable range of facilities and services. Urban areas will always have a greater range of services and facilities, and better accessibility to them, due to their size, when compared to rural areas. Furthermore, Sibford Ferris/Sibford Gower is a Category Service Centre under LPP1, which is categorised as a settlement having a level of services and facilities capable of accommodating further development. For these reasons, resident's accessibility to services and facilities would not be a reason to refuse the proposal in this instance."

- vii. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which is a suitable location for residential development.
- viii. There are no surface water or foul drainage objections to the proposals.
- ix. There are no objections to the proposals based on impact on heritage or non heritage assets.

Conclusions

- 7. These proposals seek to overcome the appeal Inspector's objections regarding the design of the proposed scheme. The current proposals now provide for two storey dwellings which are more in keeping with the local vernacular. The proposals are still restricted to elderly persons use for which there is an acknowledged and accepted need which is not being met by any other proposals. Sibford Ferris is recognised as a sustainable settlement for this form of development and the site represents a logical rounding off of the settlement to clearly defined and defensible boundaries. There are no technical or environmental issues which would prohibit development on the site. These proposals are therefore in compliance with adopted

policy and there are a range of material considerations in favour of permission being granted namely, that there is an acknowledged need for retirement properties to be provided.