

Comment for planning application 19/00616/OUT

Application Number	19/00616/OUT
Location	OS Parcel 9507 South Of 26 And Adjoining Fewcott Road Fritwell
Proposal	The erection of up to 28 dwellings and associated site access onto Fewcott Road
Case Officer	James Kirkham
Organisation Name	
Address	9 Hodgson Close, Fritwell, Bicester, OX27 7QB
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	Please see attached document
Received Date	30/10/2019 11:00:53
Attachments	The following files have been uploaded: response 30_Oct_19 to CDC Planning re Cala Revised Planning 19_99616_OUT.pdf

From: [REDACTED] 9 Hodgson Close, Fritwell. Date: 30th October 2019 reference Cala's revised (Outline) Planning Application 19/00616/OUT reduced from 38 to 28 houses.

Background

The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 forms the current adopted local planning policy within the Cherwell District. It was adopted by Cherwell District Council on 2th July 2015. 2.12. Section A of the Local Plan sets out the overall vision for the District during the plan period, which includes the following statement in relation to the natural environment:

"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."

2.13. There are a number of policies contained within the adopted local plan that are considered to be of specific relevance in landscape and visual terms.

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.

Policy ESD13 states:

"Opportunities will be sought to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations, through the restoration, management or enhancement of existing landscapes, features or habitats and where appropriate the creation of new ones, including the planting of woodlands, trees and hedgerows.

Development will be expected to respect and enhance local landscape character, securing appropriate mitigation where damage to local landscape character cannot be avoided.

Proposals will not be permitted if they would:

Cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside

Cause undue harm to important natural landscape features and topography

Be inconsistent with local character Impact on areas judged to have a high level of tranquillity. Harm the setting of settlements, buildings, structures or other landmark features

The Policy then sets out a number of requirements for new development proposals to meet this aspiration. Those that are relevant to this assessment are as follows:

New development proposals should be designed to deliver high quality safe, attractive, durable and healthy places to live and work in.

New development proposals should contribute positively to an area's character and identity by creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness and respecting local topography and landscape features, including skylines, valley floors, significant trees, historic boundaries, landmarks, features or views, in particular within designated landscapes, within the Cherwell Valley and within conservation areas and their settings.

New development proposals should consider the amenity of both existing and future development, including matters of privacy, outlook, natural lighting, ventilation, and indoor and outdoor space.

New development proposals should integrate and enhance green infrastructure and incorporate biodiversity enhancement features where possible (see Policy ESD10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment and Policy ESD17: Green Infrastructure

The Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan (CDC adopted as part of the Local Plan March 2019) policies should be applied to this Planning Application:

PD1: Development at Category A Villages

PD4: Protection of Important Views and Vistas

PD5: Building and Site Design
PD6: Control of Light Pollution
PD7: Designation of Local Green Spaces

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) – This sets out regularly updated guidance from Central Government

Colin Smith response 30th October 2019 reference Cala's revised (Outline) Planning Application 19/00616/OUT reduced from 38 to 28 houses:

As a continuing active participant & contributor in the life and vibrancy of the Fritwell Community, I wish to continue to lodge my objection to the above revised Outline planning application (19/00616/OUT) by Cala Homes Ltd.

I request my objections below are taken into consideration by Cherwell District Council Planning committee considering the said application as well as referring back to my 1st May 2019 submission objecting to the original 38 house planning application.

Changing the application from 38 houses to 28 makes little material changes to the vast number of local and national planning policies this development does not adhere to. I sense that a significant number of points that were raised in objection back in May 19 against the 38 Cala outline planning application remain entirely pertinent to this revised application. It also worth noting, that the comments from Matthew Parry (CDC Planning Officer) to the original Cala 34 house planning app in Oct 2016 are still relevant now for this revised application in 2019. See below & the full recommendations under Agenda Item 14 Public reports pack Thursday 27-Oct-2016 16.00 CDC Planning Committee pages 150-178. In his response in 2016 Matthew Parry references all relevant National and Local Planning and Policy documents.

The following excerpt from 2016 appears to me to be just as relevant to the current 19/00616/OUT application:

Section 7.5 Page 162 - Public reports pack Thursday 27-Oct-2016 16.00 Planning Committee – Matthew Parry CDC Planning Officer:
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.

Objections & Questions

1. **Fritwell is not a sustainable village.** In my opinion Fritwell is not a Category A village when compared to villages such as Deddington, Adderbury and Bloxham. **Fritwell has no viable public transport links** (1 bus per week to Bicester and back on a Monday – FYI: funding from OCC for this service is due to stop in early 2020), **no genuine employment opportunities and no health services.** (*Noted that Oxford NHS oppose this plan with no primary care capacity (Surgeries) in the area to support this development*). Therefore any housing development means that owning a car is the only way to connect with employment or wider services on a daily basis, which does not promote such a large development as being a sustainable one. So an estimated 56 further cars from this prospective development. Also the in-work 15 houses being constructed/completed at Covert Farm and the Old George and Dragon sites in Fritwell and not yet on the market, will likely bring a further 25 cars (which is not being accounted for) – meaning an extra 80+ cars in Fritwell. The estimate that this will cause 1 extra journey in the morning and 1 in the evening is false. People will be coming and going throughout the day. I am sure the Fewcott and Ardley would also not relish the increase in traffic movements through their village for traffic going to Bicester or to the M40 at Junction 10. (*Noted: OCC Transport response 24th Oct 19 – Travel Information Pack (TIL) – prior to first occupation a TIL 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 TIL. Reason – to encourage residents to use sustainable modes of transport as much as possible in line with the NPPF*). In my opinion, today this will be a very short document!!
2. **Site entrance on 60 mph road/blind bend.** The proposed entrance to the Cala Development is on a 60 mph road close to a blind bend. As it stands this would be an accident/fatality waiting to happen. What is the process needed to obtain the extension of a 30 mph speed limit & what are the criteria that govern this and finally how long would such a process take? I can't see this explained anywhere? Also given the need to remove all trees/vegetation along the line of sight to mitigate the bend – is there a plan for future maintenance of vegetation to ensure continued visibility? Some may view that removal of trees/hedgerows/habitat goes against a number of Planning Policies. (*Also Noted OCC Transport response 24th Oct – an obligation for Cala to enter into a S278 agreement to secure mitigation/improvement works, including:*
 - *Extension of the 30mph speed limit.*
 - *Construction of footway from site access to join existing footpath in village.*
 - *Land ownership and visibility splays.*
 - *Village entry treatment including traffic calming)*

3. **Surface Flooding.** (SuDS) Introduction of a 1.8m wide Footpath along to Fewcott Road – is it the case that in order to achieve this that the current highways drainage ditch has to be filled in? If yes what are the mitigating factors to deal with surface water that would entered the detail and avoid potential flooding to the road/ adjacent developments? If it is the case that the current drainage ditch does have to be filled in to achieve the construction of said footpath – I don't believe this is covered in the 24th Sept 2019 Glanville Flood Risk Assessment (Issue 3) Report for Cala or indeed the Anglian Water response PLN-0070079 - Planning Report 21-Oct-19?
4. **Current Local and MCNP** (Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan) (recently approved by referendum in March 2019) has in it's opening Planning Policy under Development :
 - D1 To strongly encourage the use of brownfield sites.
 - D2 To resist the loss over time of the all-important countryside between villages...
 This planning application goes against these first two objectives as well as extending the current village boundary and squeezing the greenfield space between Fritwell and Fewcott/Ardley. *(Note: I look forward to the MCNP submission in terms of their continued objection to this now revised application or not)*
5. **2011-2031 Local Plan Numbers for Rural Villages reached.** I also understand that according the Cherwell Local Plan for Rural Villages that 750 new houses were the allocated number required during the Plan Period of 2011-2031. According to reports from Local Councillors this number has already been achieved now (Oct 2019). So why is it necessary to support planning applications for large scale (relative to Village size) developments in rural villages? **I am very concerned that if CDC grants this planning application for Cala in Fritwell, it will set a precedent for other greenfield sites in the Fritwell considering planning application for relative to village size "large scale" housing development.** These Fritwell sites have similar characteristics to the Cala site which would dramatically change the nature of the village.

Other identified sites being considered by developers in Fritwell would also:

- extend the boundary of the village
 - further increase the amount of traffic through the village
 - have significant visual Impact on the surrounding countryside
 - result in a significant scale and prominent protrusion of a built-up development into open countryside in a location that cannot sustainably accommodate such development due to the very limited accessibility to employment, services and facilities (E.G Transport or Medical)
 - would cause significant harm to the natural landscape and the village's rural character, setting and relationship with the surrounding countryside.
 - add pressure to the local sewerage system
 - raise concerns about surface flooding
6. **Fritwell School intake** - There is a view amongst some Fritwell residents that this development would help sustain the Fritwell Primary School intake and whilst I actively support the local school, at best this development would be a "one-shot" boost for the school. There are no guarantees that new residents will have or want to send children of the appropriate age to the school. Also what happens in subsequent years – do we need to

continue an annual large scale house building development in the village to sustain the school intake? I have also not seen any evidence of a concern about school intake.

7. **Visual Impact statement** – Of particular concern is the effect of this proposed development on the visual impact for the village and its residents. As stated in 2016: The Cherwell adopted local plan stated: *"Proposals will not be permitted if they would cause undue visual intrusion into open countryside."*

The development is proposed on open countryside, extends the boundary of the village and is located directly next to Hodgson Close. The visual impact and change of character of the village will be significant. A loss of privacy for many residents of Hodgson Close will also be an unacceptable result.

Even with 28 houses proposed, the potential impact of light pollution, noise and privacy on existing village residents cannot be accurately assessed - in particular for those residents in Hodgson close and Fewcott Road. 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."*

8. **Fritwell Parish Council (FPC)** - it is alleged to be that case that the Chair of FPC has stated to the CDC Planning Officer for the Cala planning app: *"...The significant reduction in the number of homes being proposed by Cala seems to have reduced the opposition from residents and the only negative comments we had were from a few individuals living immediately next to the site"*. Fritwell Parish council has no empirical evidence from Fritwell residents that is indeed the case. In my opinion FPC is not fairly representing the views of Fritwell Residents.

I urge CDC Planning committee to reject this revised planning application to save Fritwell's greenfield countryside from being lost & introducing a significant increase in population & cars into a non-sustainable village location.

End of Document 30th October 2019