

# Comment for planning application 23/01316/F

<b>Application Number</b>	23/01316/F
<b>Location</b>	Land South of Faraday House Woodway Road Sibford Ferris
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of 5 two storey age restricted dwellings (55 years) for older people with access, landscaping and associated infrastructure
<b>Case Officer</b>	Saffron Loasby
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Jane Meyler
<b>Address</b>	West Town Cottage, Woodway Road, Sibford Ferris, Banbury, OX15 5RF
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Development Management Cherwell District Council Bodicote House Bodicote Banbury</p> <p>Oxfordshire OX15 4AA</p> <p>Your Ref: 23/01316/F</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>PLANNING APPLICATION - 23/01316/F</p> <p>Erection of 5 two storey age restricted dwellings (55 years) for older people with access, landscaping and associated infrastructure - Land South of Faraday House, Woodway Road, Sibford Ferris (Application No. 23/01316/F)</p> <p>I write as a resident of Sibford Ferris, to strongly object to the above planning application.</p> <p>GENERAL PLANNING PROCESS</p> <p>On a general point, I ask you the question, why are developers allowed to put land forward for development in rural areas on good agricultural land where targets have already been exceeded and the homes have already been built? I am incredulous of the suggestion of planning permission in areas such as the Sibfords, as the targets have already been exceeded. I understand this application is contrary to Cherwell Local Plan 2011 - 2031, as since 2014 a total of 1062 dwellings have been identified to meet the Policy Villages 2 requirement of 750 dwellings, and any further permissions are more than this target.</p> <p>Additionally, I understand there are 8293 permissions granted for homes, not yet built in Bicester, Banbury and Upper Heyford.</p> <p>HOOK NORTON ROAD DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>As you will be aware the village is under threat from creeping development following the granting of planning permission on appeal for 25 houses at Hook Norton Road in November 2019. Shockingly the Inspector overturned the Council's refusal of this application, and the appeal decision overlooked the relative isolation, aged infrastructure, limited capacity, lack of facilities and poor accessibility of Sibford Ferris.</p>

I am concerned the appeal at Hook Norton Road is perceived by developers as an opportunity to seek further development, thereby damaging the rural nature, character and attractive qualities of our historic village and its beautiful surroundings on the edge of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The planning application is clearly a phase 2 style extension of the Hook Norton Rd site, with a phase 3 development site also put forward as part of the Local Plan review.

It is very surprising to me the village was not informed of this fact at the outset. The Hook Norton Road development started with an approval for 8 homes and is now 25 homes with 9 affordable /rental properties..

#### THE SPECIFIC PLANNING APPLICATION

More specifically, the proposed development fails to respond to local character, landscape and surrounding context and should be refused as harming the visual and rural amenities of the area.

The proposal is 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 Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide.

As the Inspector stated in March 2023 on the recent appeal:

'Well-designed places do not need to copy their surroundings in every way but the design and layout of proposed housing would result in an overly built-up and visually incongruous development, that fails to integrate with its context and surroundings for all the reasons indicated. The development would not be high quality harming the character and appearance of the area, including the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Accordingly, there would be conflict with Policy ESD 15 of the LPP1 and Policy C28 of the LP.'

Despite the changes to the design and layout of the proposal, the Action Group considers that the same or similar criticisms and concerns should be applied to the current application, which would harm the rural character and appearance of the area contrary to the Development Plan policies aimed at ensuring that development is of high quality, which complements, protects and enhances the district, including the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE

I feel strongly about the impact of further development within the village, for which the existing infrastructure is unsustainable. I understand the current sewerage system is at full capacity, and as yet has not been taken into consideration. Similarly, the water pressure within the village is limited. Many houses along the village are without off road parking, and there are frequent traffic bottlenecks, during term time, as there are two schools within the villages. Further village facilities are limited, for example; public transport and the doctors surgery. As stated in CRAITLUS Report August 2009 "Of 33 Villages only 4 show little capability to sustainably support additional housing. Shennington, Sibford Ferris/Sibford Gower and Charlton-on-Otmoor perform poorly due to their location on minor roads with long travel times and distances to access key facilities.

The increased usage of facilities in the villages, will have an impact on the local pollution, and therefore climate change, harming the environment. The District Council has declared a Climate Change Emergency, but none of these environmental objectives can be achieved by approving further development.

In summary;

1. Contrary to Policies BSC1 and Policy Villages 1 and 2 of the Local Plan Part 1;
2. Harmful to the character and appearance of the area including the intrinsic character

and beauty of the countryside, contrary to Policy ESD 15 of the Local Plan Part 1 and Policy C28 of the Local Plan 1996; and

3. Damaging to the residential amenities of adjacent properties contrary to Policy C31 of the Local Plan 1996, Policy ESD15 of the Local Plan Part 1, advice in the NPPF and the National Design Guide, 2021.

In conclusion this is a poorly conceived scheme on an unsuitable site in an unsustainable location that should be refused. For all these reasons I urge the Council to refuse this application.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Meyler  
Sibford Ferris

**Received Date**

05/06/2023 13:11:07

**Attachments**