

# Reasons to Reject the Hook Norton Road Planning Application 18/01894/OUT

## **1) The proposal contravenes Policy Villages 1**

Policy Villages 1 states that proposals for residential development are acceptable in Category A villages only if they are Minor Development, Infilling and Conversions and providing they are within the built-up limits of the village. This proposal is not a minor development and is classified by the Oxfordshire County Council as a major development and this proposal is not within the built-up limits of the village. Therefore the proposed development contravenes Policy Villages 1 on two counts. Policy Villages 2 of the Local Plan Part 1 is the most relevant policy for the assessment of this proposal.

## **2) The proposal contravenes Policy Villages 2 because the quota for housing has already been met**

Policy Villages 2 outlines that 750 homes will be delivered at Category A villages over the Plan period to 2031. This quota has been met. The sustainable housing growth strategy inherent in the Local Plan Part 1 would be compromised by exceeding this figure, causing excessive or unbalanced growth too early in the Plan period, which is the principal objective of the strategy.

## **3) The proposal is not in accordance with Policy BSC 2**

The Policy BSC 2 states: *'Housing development in Cherwell will be expected to make effective and efficient use of land'*. This proposal is neither on brownfield land nor in a sustainable location. The density of the proposal is also so low that it conflicts with the policy in that it is not an efficient use of land. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004*, decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, there are no material considerations to indicate a decision should be made in accordance with anything other than the Development Plan (Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1) and the proposal clearly conflicts with the principal policy – Policy Villages 2.

## **4) The Application goes against the Sibford's Community Plan**

The District Council is able to demonstrate 5.4 years' housing land supply (July 2018) when Oxfordshire Authorities need only demonstrate a 3-year housing land supply following the Written Ministerial Statement on Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire (HLWS924). Therefore, there is no pressing need for a major development in this location or at this time. There is also no desire from the local community either. In the Sibford's Community Plan (2012), 64% of people said they would be willing to envisage up to 10 new houses, 31% up to 20 and only 3% over 20 houses.

**This proposal would clearly be against the wishes of the local community and the local Parish Councils' both of which have written to Bob Neville completely rejecting the proposal.**

**Please note;** The site has been subject to a previous resolution to grant planning permission for **eight dwellings**, (six affordable local needs dwellings and two market dwellings) categorised as a "rural exception site" 14/00962/OUT

That application was withdrawn before any planning permission was granted as the necessary s106 agreement to secure the affordable housing in perpetuity was not completed. As Lord Steyn noted in the House of Lords' discussion of the case *R v London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham and Others, Ex P Burkett and Another [2002] UKHL 23*:

***'Until the actual grant of planning permission the resolution has no legal effect.'***

Furthermore, the previous scheme was significantly different to the current proposal. The scale of the proposed development in comparison to the size of Sibford Ferris is disproportionate, in sustainability, physical and new housing terms. The village only has approximately 476 inhabitants (Census, 2011), so increasing such a small village by 25 no. dwellings would mean a 13% increase, which is disproportionate and unsustainable.

## **5. Sustainability concerns**

Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower were amalgamated and considered together to form one Category A Settlement, for the purposes of Policy Villages 1.

Whilst the Category A settlements are considered to be the more sustainable villages, there is a wide disparity between the services, facilities, accessibility and other sustainability characteristics of say Adderbury, Bloxham and Deddington as opposed to the Sibfords yet they are all grouped as Category A settlements. Even considered together, the Sibfords are not considered to be suitable or capable of absorbing:

- the growth produced by the 25 no. dwellings currently under consideration;
- any further development that would follow if an undesirable precedent was created by the approval of the current proposal; **(Please see the point about setting precedent below)**
- windfall development that may come forward within the built-up limits of the villages.

**Both Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower have limited capacity to sustain a major development, lack of facilities and poor accessibility.**

The majority of services in the locality are in Sibford Gower (see Appendix 2 in David Lock's report on the CDc website). It is unlikely that Sibford Gower will be accessed on foot, due to the lack of continuous public footpaths along the route between the

villages, the distance and uneven topography. Therefore, the potential residents of the new development would most likely drive to reach the Nursery, Primary School, Public House, Village Hall, Church, Quaker meeting house and the GP Surgery in Burdrop.

Land and partners suggest that 80% of traffic will turn right out of the development towards Hook Norton, clearly this is not correct. As well as the above points, Banbury train station and the M40 at Gaydon will also be accessed by driving through the villages.

### **Allowing this development clearly could set a precedent for more development**

It is clear that this development – confirmed by the Illustrative Masterplan with its link to the adjacent, smaller field which may be ‘suitable’ for development - would provide the access necessary to bring this adjacent site forward. The proposal would not only have a significant impact on this part of the village in itself but is also more than likely to lead to further undesirable development, if approved, as not only physical access would be facilitated but a precedent for more development on adjoining land would be established, which would be very difficult for the Council to resist if it approved this scheme. It should also be noted that the site forms part of a much larger agricultural field, with no sub-division or boundaries, except a sparse hedgerow along Hook Norton Road. If the principle was established for development in this location, there is the risk that further development could ensue to the south towards Hook Norton.

A full report by David Lock Associates, representing the Sibford Action Group, can be read on the Cherwell district council website. Or feel free to email [thesibfordactiongroup@gmail.com](mailto:thesibfordactiongroup@gmail.com) for more information.

**We, The Sibford Action Group, supported by 76 villagers who have written letters of objection and both the Sibford Ferris and Sibford Gower parish councils who have stated their objections, strongly object to the planning application 18/01894/OUT for the development of 25 houses on Hook Norton Road, Sibford Ferris, and recommend that it should be rejected.**

# Sibford Action Group Committee

---

**John Perriss,**

West Town House, Woodway Road, Sibford Ferris, Oxfordshire, OX15 5RF

**Helen-Louise Pearce,**

Hook Norton Rd, Sibford Ferris, Oxfordshire, OX15 5QR

**Robin Grimston,**

Elm Farm, Sibford Ferris, Oxon, OX16 5AA

**Brenda Vandamme,**

Partway house, Swalcliffe, OX155HA

**Andrew and Clare Evans,**

Faraday House, Woodway Rd, Sibford Ferris, Oxon, OX15 5RF

**David Long,**

Mulberry House, Sibford Ferris, Oxon, OX15 5RE

**Stewart and Katherine Roussel,**

Bramley House, Stewart's Court, Sibford Ferris, Oxon, OX155QX