

TO: [planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)

## RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION 18/01482/F

Thank you for consulting Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum (MCNPF) on this application.

MCNPF wishes to **OBJECT** to this application, as it did to the previous application for this site (17/02414/F).

The neighbourhood plan has been formally submitted to Cherwell DC, and is therefore a material consideration in planning terms.

The application scheme does not comply with the following MCNP policies:

### 1. Policy PH1: Open Market Housing Schemes, which states:

*Where other policies permit such development, any new market housing should favour homes with a smaller number of bedrooms. The following mix of housing will be required for market housing unless evidence from an up to date local housing needs assessment indicates otherwise: in a development of 10 or more dwellings 23% should have 2 bedrooms, and 46% should have 3 bedrooms, with 31% having other sizes. Smaller schemes should aim for a similar ratio where possible.*

The scheme proposes six 4-bedroom houses. Application of policy PH1 would imply that of the six dwellings only 2 should be 4-bedroom, 3 should be 3-bedroom, and 1 should be 2-bedroom. Such a mix would offer more affordable homes to local people, which is a key objective of the neighbourhood plan. Evidence to support this need is contained in the Oxfordshire SHMA (table 65) and para. B123 of the CDC adopted Local Plan part 1 (and policy BCS4 which encourages negotiation on the issue of housing mix).

An alternative scheme shown by the applicants to Steeple Aston Parish Council in May 2018 had ten dwellings with an improved housing mix, a scheme considered to be preferable.

**2. Policy PD1: Development at Category A Villages**, which states that “Residential development proposals at .....Steeple Aston in the form of infilling, conversions and minor development will be supported in principle within the settlement areas established and defined in Policy Map Fig.....11.....”. The site for this application is not included in the settlement area shown on the policy map.

However, the policy goes on to state a number of criteria by which any development outside the settlement area should be judged. While this application may be deemed to satisfy these criteria, it cannot satisfy policy PD5 (below).

The applicants have, incidentally, drawn their own settlement area map in the accompanying Design and Access Statement. This conveniently includes the telephone exchange and adjacent garage workshop in the settlement area, allowing them to argue that the development is in fact “infill”. The buildings referred to stand alone, are non-residential and are not part of a continuous frontage to the road, and cannot therefore be construed as being part of the settlement area. The site is clearly not an infill site.

Continued.....

**3. Policy PD5: Building and Site Design, para. c)** which states:

*c) Proposals for minor development schemes (excluding infill and conversions) of new housing will be required to provide new or improve existing footpaths and cycle ways to ensure that new residents of all ages and mobility have safe access to village amenities such as the school, bus stops, shop and green spaces. Where new routes are proposed to meet this requirement, the development proposals shall contain full details of all associated materials and infrastructure.*

The application scheme will require pedestrians to walk in the road to access the rest of the village, which is unacceptable.

As a result of all the above, the application should be refused.

**Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum**