

# Comment for planning application 19/00616/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	19/00616/OUT
<b>Location</b>	OS Parcel 9507 South Of 26 And Adjoining Fewcott Road Fritwell
<b>Proposal</b>	The erection of up to 28 dwellings and associated site access onto Fewcott Road
<b>Case Officer</b>	James Kirkham
<b>Organisation Name</b>	
<b>Address</b>	32 Fewcott Road,Fritwell,Bicester,OX27 7QA
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	see attached
<b>Received Date</b>	30/10/2019 17:59:08
<b>Attachments</b>	The following files have been uploaded:  Cala Homes Objection.pdf 

I objected to Cala Homes' original application earlier in the year and I wish to object to this new application.

I have reviewed my original objection and feel that nothing in the new application changes my view.

My reasons are as below:

- **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 and prominent protrusion of a built development into the open countryside, outside of the existing built up limits of the village. I cannot understand how this development could be seen as protecting or enhancing the natural environment.

- **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 as it will extend the current village boundary, use a greenfield site and squeeze the greenfield space between Fritwell and Fewcott/Ardley. It will make no use of brownfield space.

- **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 application plus 17 houses in construction or having had planning permission granted means the housing "quota" for Fritwell will be exceeded by nearly 70%. I would say that if CDC and their Local Plan and MCNP want residents to trust in these plans & consequently in them as organisations representing their resident's needs, they need to abide by their own stated plans. I would draw attention to National Planning Policy Framework (Feb 2019) Paragraph 29 which supports the validity of Neighbourhood Plans.

- **The Cherwell adopted plan 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. The revised plan still requires the removal of some 14 trees from the site. This in its own

right will cause undue visual intrusion into open countryside. The detailed plan that Cala has submitted is not sympathetic to the existing residents of Hodgson Close and Fewcott Road. It will overshadow, over look and be overbearing, not to mention the obvious impact it will have on the current greenfield outlook. The proposed plans from Cala still do not take into account the visual, historic and archaeological qualities of Fritwell. I note that all the pictures included on the AMD Landscape and Visual Impact report provided by Cala do not show 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 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, and to date OCC have not agreed to the extension of the 30 mile per hour limit . Cala have agreed in order to achieve the sight lines they need to "cut back" the vegetation that fronts on to Fewcott Road to make exiting the site safe. – this will only have a temporary effect as the vegetation will grow back. There is nothing in the plan to confirm how this will be maintained or that CDC have agreed to take on this maintenance. Very quickly after the initial cut back this access / exit will become dangerous, with limited visibility. I note yet again Cala have drawn the road without the bend – this will have an impact on the sight 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 significant increase in the number of cars going through the narrow roads around Fritwell. Every day people will need to use their car to travel to work, go shopping and visit family and friends.

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*