

Stewart Roussel
Bramley House
Stewarts Court
Hook Norton RD
Sibford Ferris
OX15 5QX

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION – 23/01316/F

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

CDC Planning Committee,

I we write as a local resident to strongly object to the above planning application because:

- A similar scheme for 6 one storey houses was rejected by the CDC recently and changing this to 5 two storey houses does nothing to address the fundamental reasons as to why the previous applications were rejected.
- The previous application was also refused at appeal and refused at appeal as the proposal to develop this parcel of land would conflict with the development plan
- Housing Targets in Rural Villages have been met and CDC have a 5 year land supply;
- Unsustainable;
- Generate extra traffic on unsuitable roads;
- Harmful to the landscape; and
- Of poor condensed layout and design, which will extend much further than the design plan indicated and is clearly an extension of the Hook Norton Rd development site.

Extract from Appeal Findings

“The adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole”

*“There are no material considerations of sufficient weight or importance that determine that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Under section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the decision should be taken in accordance with the development plan and planning permission refused. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, and there are no material considerations to outweigh that finding. **Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.**”*

Changing the application from 6 one storey houses to 5 two storey houses does nothing to these fundamental reasons for refusal.

Land Supply - Extract from Cherwell District Council Housing Land Supply Statement February 2023

“Calculation of Cherwell’s five year housing land supply 41. Using the standard method local housing need figure as the requirement and the projected supply for the period 2022-27, the five-year housing land supply calculation for the district is set out below. 42. The five-year housing land supply position in the district excluding the Partial Review area is 5.4 years”

Housing Targets in Cat A rural villages have already been exceeded

No new permissions in rural areas are needed as the targets have already been exceeded, therefore the application is Contrary to Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031.

Since 2014 a total of 1062 dwellings have been identified to meet the Policy Villages 2 requirement for 750. Any further permissions granted will be a material exceedance of this target.

Permissions granted are more than adequate to meet growth plans

There are 8293 permissions granted for homes which haven’t been built yet around Bicester, Banbury and Upper Heyford. This highlights the contentious issue of land banking, which the MP for Wantage and Didcott call out in a Parliamentary debate this month asking why when there are over a million approved planning permissions in the country, do local councils still recommend for approval proposed developments on prime agricultural land in rural areas”

Why are developers allowed to put land forward for development in rural areas where targets have already been exceeded and the homes have already been built? This is an opportunity for the Cherwell District Council to live up to it’s “donought” policy of developing Banbury, Bicester and Upper Heyford and avoiding developments in the most unsustainable rural villages.

This – and other proposals that are threatened to follow – clearly undermine the Local Plan housing strategy of directing most growth to Banbury and Bicester, where there is access to shops, services, jobs and other facilities and opportunities to travel other than by the car. This strategy helps avoid commuting, congestion, pollution, climate change and harming the environment. The District Council has declared a Climate Change Emergency, but none of these environmental objectives will be achieved by allowing the proposed development with 2 car spaces per home (because we need to drive everywhere from Sibford Ferris). This is a poorly conceived scheme on an unsuitable site in an unsustainable location and should be refused.

sparse facilities. Sibford Ferris only has a small shop. The few public amenities there are lie in Sibford Gower and Burdrop, only accessed by narrow roads with poor, incomplete footpaths, limited lighting and congestion caused by parked cars. The two villages are separated by a deep valley (Sib Brook) and have poor accessibility for anyone, let alone older persons, without a car.

The bus service has more than halved in recent years. It is reliant on 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 especially as the 25 new homes on the adjacent land has not been built yet. 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.

Class A categorization is already under review with both communities and our local MP Victoria Prentis, being supportive of the re-categorization which has already been proposed as part of the local plan review to make Sibford Ferris a small village. At present it has 148 homes and 30 more is an inappropriate increase, considering that these 5 extend from the first 25 but were not accounted for in relation to affordable housing.

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** “Of 33 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.

The local road infrastructure is insufficient to cope with more traffic

Occupants of the proposed development, being older, less mobile and less likely to walk or cycle, will be highly reliant on the use of private cars. This would lead to extra traffic using an access opposite the main entrance to Sibford Friends School, which is already busy at peak times, due to a lack of pavements and narrow roads, where in places it is difficult for two vehicles to safely pass each other. Therefore, the site is not an appropriate location for the development proposed, would result in an increase in private vehicular usage, lead to extra traffic and environmental harm.

Unsafe Site Construction Traffic

In the deed of transfer between the land owners and the Developers, clause 15 ensures that the owners of the proposed site are guaranteed access across the Hook Norton Rd development site. This will mean that there could be:

- Two lots of site traffic entering the site opposite the main entrance to Sibford Friends School (further supporting the fact that this is one large development, simply presented to CDC under two separate applications)
- The potential for site traffic to be moving through the Hook Norton Rd development site after the homes have been completed and families are living in them (Surely there are safety concerns associated with this)

Landscape Impact

- The proposed development will adversely affect the local character of the village and the outlook over the ANOB.
- The second site will be more visible than the Hook Norton Rd site as it extends further West.

Landscape Impact

The proposal would lead to two storey compact homes, built on greenfield, agricultural land beyond the building line of Hook Norton Rd development to the south, into the attractive countryside surrounding the village. This would have an adverse visual impact on the landscape, resulting from the extension of the village and encroachment of built development all the way up to Woodway Road, which has an unspoilt, rural character. The development would be clearly visible at short and more distant range from highways and public rights of way extending out into the countryside and the Cotswolds AONB. This would harm the rural character and appearance of this attractive landscape to the west of the village.

Design

The proposed homes overlook five other local properties which sit around them, and the homes themselves are sited close together with little thought for overall layout and impact on surrounding residents.

The proposed houses 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 designed as an extension to the Deanfield Homes site and if you stand on the field you will see that the homes will extend further than indicated, by the developer.

The proposal is to all intents and purposes is an open market housing, fettered only by the not particularly demanding requirement for the occupiers to be 55 years of age.

This development is unnecessary, inappropriate and unsustainable.

In summary, 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.

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

Yours sincerely,
Stewart Roussel