

David Stewart
High Rock
Hook Norton Rd
Sibford Ferris
OX15 5QW

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION – 23/01316/F

Land South of Faraday House , Woodway Road Sibford Ferris – Blue Cedar Homes Limited

CDC Planning Committee,

I was born in the village of Sidford and have seen many changes over the years all of which have helped build the character of the village into what it is today, but have also brought the village to capacity with respect to the traffic and sewerage.

As a result of the selected small additional homes that have been built over the years many people park outside the village shop, in what is already a narrow Road. They do this because the foot path and lighting are inadequate and haven't had any investment over the years as the village has grown in size. Parking outside the village shop and parking on the street effectively turns the strip of road into a single lane road which is dangerous those who do choose to walk to the shop. Congestion at peak times already brings the village to gridlock even without the extra amount of traffic predicted from the already approved additional 25 new homes at the Hook Norton Road development site. Approving another development in Sibford Ferris simply isn't sustainable.

My house is adjacent to the proposed development site and this is clearly a phase 2 style extension of the Hook Norton Rd site, with a phase 3 development site also put forward. Such development creep should not be allowed and the total development should have been reviewed as a single development, especially considering that the Hook Norton Rd development hasn't started yet and it is clearly the intention to develop both sites at the same time.

The bus service has more than halved in recent years. It is reliant on a subsidy from Warwickshire County Council, has a very limited service to Stratford and Banbury at inconvenient times and has no direct services to Hook Norton or Chipping Norton. The proposed development is unsustainable for older persons. Government advice on the location of housing for older people states that factors to consider include the proximity to good public transport, local amenities, health services and town centres. None of these apply in this instance.

The proposed development is unsustainable for older persons. Government advice on the location of housing for older people states that factors to consider include the proximity to good public transport, local amenities, health services and town centres. None of these apply in this instance.

The design itself appears ill-conceived and overdeveloped which may be driven by a need from the developer for a speedy process to meet timescales that will enable them to develop the infrastructure at the same time as the main site. The buildings are crammed in close together, have very small private amenity spaces and would appear cramped and out of character with their immediate surroundings and the quality of development in the village, which is designated as a Conservation Area. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF 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.'* The proposal is clearly **not** well-designed, does not respond to existing local character and surrounding context and should be refused.

The Sibfords are also incorrectly classified as a single Class A village, but this is already under review. Our local MP Victoria Prentis, is supportive of the re-categorization and is seeking a review on this as soon as possible. Even the planning inspector commenting on the appeal case of the Hook Norton Rd Development was sympathetic to the declassification of the Sibfords and stated that *"Given the spread of services across each settlement, it is unlikely that the development of any site around the Sibfords would readily enable access by sustainable transport modes. This is an argument against the inclusion of the Sibfords as Category A Village, but is not a matter before me in this appeal"*. Finally on this point the **CRAITLUS Report of August 2009** stated that out of all the villages "only 4 show little capability to sustainably support additional housing. Shennington, Sibford Ferris/Sibford Gower and Charlton-on-Otmoor, all perform poorly due to their location on minor roads with long travel times and distances to access key facilities.

This development is unnecessary, inappropriate, and unsustainable. The proposals are 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 Policy Framework and the National Design Guide, which is why the proposal was rejected by CDC before, refused at appeal and for the same exact reasons, should be refused again.

We urge you to:

- Move this proposal from a delegated decision to a full committee meeting immediately
- Recommend to the full committee that the application is refused for all the reasons stated above and the same reasons that it was rejected before.

Yours sincerely,
David Stewart