

## **KIRTLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL**

8<sup>th</sup> November 2023

Ms Jeanette Davey, Planning Officer  
Cherwell District Council  
Bodicote House, Bodicote  
Banbury  
Oxfordshire, OX15 4AA.

Dear Jeanette Davey,

**Re. 23/02338/O – Land West of Oxford Close and North of Corner Farm, Station Road, Kirtlington**  
*Outline permission for the erection of 15 detached and semi-detached single and two storey dwellings (including affordable housing)*

Kirtlington Parish Council (KPC) objected to the previous application for this site (23/03049/OUT, that was withdrawn on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2023) which was for up to 8 dwellings, and continues to object to the development of this site.

KPC considers any development at Corner Farm would lead to harm to the village, and whilst revision to the scheme to add social housing is welcomed, this should not be at the expense of housing density. Doubling the number of houses within the same application boundary has led to the extra houses being crammed in, side by side into the previous layout, with residents' car parking now inconveniently located in a line, bumper to bumper. The housing density proposed is now too high and out of keeping with adjacent development. Bike sheds have been added, to comply with OCC requirements, but these have been inconveniently located at the far ends of gardens, where they compound the problem of enclosing the existing PRoW.

### **Summary of objections**

#### **Breach of long established existing settlement pattern**

- 1) Once development goes beyond this clearly defined settlement edge, precedent will have been set for further development extending up to the golf course boundary.
- 2) The proposed development would break the historic north to south line of the western boundary of the village as defined by the former historic route of Woodstock Way, now Footpath 270/10/30.
- 3) The intent for planned expansion is evident given the current layout of dwellings on one side of the road only. Applications for larger schemes have already been made and turned down at appeal and KPC does not wish to see a return of the previous inappropriate applications for very large-scale developments from national developers.

#### **Unsatisfactory vehicular access**

- 4) KPC has always voiced concerns regarding the access to this site. It is evident that adequate sight lines cannot be achieved, due to the sharp bend in the road and the gradients on the approach to the proposed access, and this could not be remedied without major interventions, such as considerable lifting of road levels around the proposed junction.

- 5) Traffic through the village has increased significantly in recent years, so the access arrangement that was previously supported by OCC is unlikely to be satisfactory now, as the same conditions do not now exist. Although reduced speed limits have been introduced through the village, these would need to be extended if this access were approved

#### **Unsatisfactory pedestrian access**

- 6) A surfaced pedestrian access to the proposed site access does not currently exist, and the space available to construct the required 60m length of footway connection within the existing highway verge is extremely constrained to meet required standards.
- 7) The existing PRoW appears to have been excluded from the red line boundary, therefore if it is to be retained on its current route (adjacent to the site's eastern boundary), it would be trapped between rear garden fences, which would adversely affect walkers' amenity and would be contrary to 'Secure by Design' guidance.
- 8) At the northern end of Footpath 270/10/30 where it joins Hatch Way, there is insufficient land available to make the connection DDA compliant.

#### **Significant landscape and visual impacts**

- 9) The site is on high ground, comprising open countryside on the upper edge of the Cherwell Valley. The site is prominently visible upon entering the village from the south on the A4095, and in agreement with the inspector at the 2015 appeal, the site "makes an important contribution to the pleasant rural setting of the southern part of Kirtlington".
- 10) The adverse visual impact on users of the PRoW immediately adjacent to the site have not been considered.

#### **Poor integration with the village**

- 11) Located at the extreme south-western end of the village, adjacent to open countryside on three sides, integration with the rest of the village would be challenging with the potential for the development to form an isolated enclave.

#### **Shortcomings of an outline application**

- 12) The outline application lacks the level of detail to satisfy what most people need to know, such as what the houses will look like, the quality of building materials to be used, etc. Whilst a housing mix has been proposed, it is indicative, and could be controlled at the Reserved Matters Application (RMA) stage.
- 13) If permission were granted, KPC wishes to be fully informed and engaged in the RMA, as this has not been the case in the past.

#### **Sustainability**

- 14) Kirtlington no longer has a shop or Post Office, and there is the likelihood that the reduced 24 bus service connecting the village to Oxford will terminate in March 2025. This calls into question the proposed categorisation of Kirtlington as one of the 11 larger villages in the emerging Local Plan.
- 15) The foul sewage system within Kirtlington is not fit for purpose, with serious failings occurring on a regular basis. Any additions to the system could not be contemplated without major investments in upgrading the pipework through the village. This comment applies to any proposed developments within the village.