

I wish to object to the revised planning application for 28 houses recently submitted by Cala Homes. My reasons remain as previously stated. I cannot see that these revised plans have overcome the following planning protocols.

Policy PSD1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy BSC10 - Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provisions

Policy ESD7 - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs)

Policy ESD10 - Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment

Policy ESD13 - Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement

Policy ESD15 - The Character of the Built and Historic Environment

Policy ESD17 - Green Infrastructure.

BSC1 – Village1, Village 2

Policy C8 of the local Cherwell Plan

Policy C7 – Harm to the natural landscape

The Adopted Cherwell Local Plan states that “We will cherish protect and enhance our distinctive natural and built environment and our rich historic heritage. Cherwell will maintain its rural character where its landscapes, its vast range of natural and built heritage and its market towns define its distinctiveness.” It also states "the type of development for category A villages within the built-up limits of villages will be considered to be suitable for minor development in addition to infilling."

The proposed development would result in a significant scale and prominent protrusion of a built development into the open countryside in a location that cannot sustainably accommodate such development due to the very limited accessibility to employment, services and facilities. It would also cause significant harm to the natural landscape and the village's rural character, setting and relationship with the surrounding countryside.

Additionally, MCNP Objectives – Development state: D1 to strongly encourage the use of brownfield sites and D2 to resist the loss over time of the all-important countryside between villages. This planning application goes against these two objectives it will extend the current village boundary, use a greenfield site and squeeze the greenfield space between Fritwell and Fewcott/Ardley.

Current Local and MCNP (Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan) plans suggest that Fritwell should have an indicative quota of 25 houses during the plan period up to 2031 (Sections 6.8, 7.11 this along with currently 17 houses in construction or having had planning permission granted this development will considerably exceed the housing “quota” for Fritwell. I would reiterate again that if CDC and their Local Plan and MCNP want residents to trust in these plans & them as organisations’ representing their resident’s needs, then simply allowing developers to ride rough-shot over these plans will bring them into disrepute. I would draw attention to National Planning Policy Framework (Feb 2019) Paragraph 29 which supports the validity of Neighbourhood Plans.

I have concerns about the access to this development. The access will open on to a road that has a speed limit of 60 miles per hour, whilst I acknowledge that OCC transport have not objected to the development, they have not agreed to the extension of the 30 mile per hour limit either. Cala have agreed in order to achieve the sight lines need to “cut back” the vegetation that fronts on to Fewcott

Road to make exiting the site safe. – Vegetation of this kind will consistently grow, yet there is nothing in the plan to confirm how this will be maintained or that CDC have agreed to take on the this maintenance, within a very short space of time this access will become dangerous, and I note yet again Cala have drawn the road without the bend – this will have an impact on the slight lines for access/exit for this development. I have also noted that OCC Transport have requested that if Planning Permission is granted the Developer must issue each resident with Travel Information Pack prior to first occupation, and that a Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The first residents of each dwelling shall be provided with a copy of the approved Travel Information Pack. The reason for this pack is to encourage residents to use sustainable modes of transport as much as possible in line with the NPPF. With one bus service a week into Bicester, regardless of what pack is issued the only mode of reasonable transport will be the car. This needs to be taken into account by the planning committee. Granting this development will mean a minimum of 56 more cars going through the narrow roads around Fritwell. At the recent Parish Council meeting data of speeding and usage of Fewcott Road was recorded in excess of 5000 occasions of speeding on Fewcott Road.

Again, in this application Cala are stating they will construct a pathway along Fewcott Road to join the development to the existing pathway on Fewcott Road. I still believe that the current verge will not be wide enough to construct a pathway that will accommodate buggies, prams & wheelchairs. In order to do this, they will need fill in the current drainage ditch adding to the flood problems of this site. It is noted in this latest plan Cala include their intent to use the existing PRoW to connect the development to the centre village, OCC state that the path would need to be surfaced, again there is nothing in the Cala plan on how this would be maintained as tarmac cannot be used.

I would now like to consider the visual impact that this development will have on Fewcott Road and Hodgson Close and residents, the current unspoilt countryside again I refer to the Cherwell adopted plan which states: "Proposals will not be permitted if they would cause undue visual intrusion into open countryside." This development will do exactly that if it is allowed to proceed.

In their submission Cala state *"the proposed development can be accommodated within the setting of the site without resulting in significant long term adverse impacts in respect of character of the site or its immediate context or its wider landscape setting"* The revised plan still requires the removal of some 14 trees from the site, - I cannot reconcile this to the planning statement above Whilst this is an Outline planning permission application – something that greatly concerns me, the detailed plan that Cala has submitted is not very sympathetic to the existing residents of Hodgson Close and Fewcott Road. It will overshadow, overlook and be overbearing, not to mention the impact it will have on the current greenfield outlook. The proposed plans from Cala still do not I believe take into account the visual, historic and archaeological qualities of Fritwell. This development will be very visible from the conservation area of Fritwell. It is noted that all the pictures included on the AMD Landscape and Visual Impact report provided by Cala none showed the impact on the residents of Fewcott Road and Hodgson Close. The style and types of housing being proposed does not sit well in its proposed environment. For some residents this may even contravene their rights under the Human Rights Act 1998; "Protocol 1, Article 1 protects your right to enjoy your property peacefully."

I would also like to challenge assertions made in the AMD Landscape and Visual Impact report: It states: "The revised application boundary incorporates an additional strip of land to the west of the Site access adjoining Fewcott Road. This additional land parcel is occupied by rough grassland and scrub in the west, and a number of small sheds, hutches and containers in the east" – this strip of

land had been well kept as an allotment until the planning application forced the user to leave it untended as they were no longer able to rent the land from OCC. Cala are responsible for the untended look of this strip of land, I can confirm I would much rather look at scrubland which houses much wildlife than further housing that will drive the wildlife away! The land has in the 15 years I have lived here always been a combination of grazed land and paddocks for horses. I do not see the deterioration that Cala claim in the site.

Finally, I wish to bring the planning committees attention to the report by Planning officer Matthew Parry dated - Public reports pack Thursday 27-Oct-2016 when he stated:

*Fritwell is one of the smallest villages defined within Category A. It also features few services and facilities with just a single village shop, primary school and village hall. It offers no genuine employment opportunities and no health facilities. Since the time of the adoption of the CLP 2031 Part 1 it now features no public houses and is no longer served by bus (\* actually now 1 bus per week). Unlike some other Category A settlements, it is also relatively remote from larger villages that can provide such services/facilities and is some distance from the higher order services provided at Banbury and Bicester. In short, new residential development will be almost entirely dependent on daily use of the private car for travel outside the village. Having regard to the criteria set out in Policy Villages 2 that requires consideration of the site's location to services and facilities, the scheme does not score at all well relative to many other Category A settlements. Officers are therefore concerned that the village is not sufficiently environmentally sustainable to accommodate new housing of the scale proposed particularly bearing in mind recent planning permissions on sites within the village for over 20 new dwellings. There have been claims from the applicant and indeed Fritwell Parish Council that new housing would help to sustain the village primary school which has seen a loss of pupils to the new Heyford Free School. Whilst there is evidence that this has been the case there is no suggestion whatsoever from Oxfordshire County Council (local education authority) that there are concerns about the future viability of the school. In any event, as many hundreds of new homes continue to be built and occupied at Heyford the capacity of its Free School to accommodate pupils from elsewhere will diminish thus reducing its intake from outlying villages. The applicant has also claimed that the new housing would help support the village shop but there is no evidence to suggest that either the existing shop is at risk of closure due to non-viability or that the new housing would genuinely make a difference to its viability*

This statement has further been supported by the comments submitted by the NHS Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning group.

I would urge the planning committee to reject this application and save our countryside from creeping urbanisation.