

# 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	10 Hodgson Close,Fritwell,Bicester,OX27 7QB
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	See attached.
Received Date	31/10/2019 20:55:08
Attachments	The following files have been uploaded:  10-00616-OUT - Revised - Response.pdf 

I am responding to the notification of the amended CALA Homes application 19/00616/OUT, highlighting that their proposal is now 'for up to 28 dwellings' and not 38 as per the previous revision (or vs. 34 in the original application). I note that previous comments submitted will be taken into account when deciding the application, which is good because the reduction to 28 does not materially impact on my objections from May.

In summary, I still object to this planning application:

**1) Proposal is still too big for the village**

Even revised to 'up to 28 dwellings' it's still not sustainable. CDC Planning Officer Matthew Parry rejected the original application 16/01594/F for 34 dwellings because it was far too big for the village, which he acknowledged is one of the smallest villages defined as Category A and is more remote than others and therefore further from amenities like additional shops and healthcare. And having lost amenities such as the two pubs and a meaningful bus service there is even less justification for a Category A status for Fritwell. In short, it isn't one.

**2) Development of this size not needed for MCNP**

The stretch objective within the MCNP for Fritwell, to support the target of 750 new houses for the planning period to 2031, was 25 dwellings (highest of all the Cat A numbers, even though it's the smallest) – however my understanding is that the 750-threshold level has already been reached so the imperative for the stretch objective has gone. There also seems to be a question mark as to whether the 15 houses - Calvert Farm (8) and George & Dragon (7) - currently under construction are part of the 25 additional, as planning permission for another 11 was mentioned in the MCNP. Clearly these numbers don't match and I wonder if there is conflation here and perhaps there is an outstanding planning permission block for 11 elsewhere. Certainly the impact numbers for the 15 do not seem to be included in any projections (e.g. traffic impact). I believe that given the acknowledged modest size of the village that the 15 should be taken into account and therefore even at the stretch objective level there should only be a need for another 10 dwellings in the planning period. And if the need for the stretch has gone there should only be the need for around another 5 dwellings. This should be both possible and in line with the MCNP objective to prioritise brownfield and in-fill development within defined settlement areas and to avoid greenfield areas and the erosion of countryside between settlements.

**3) Impact on the integrity of the village boundary**

The proposed development is in a greenfield area, outside the defined settlement area and closes the gap between Fritwell and Ardley/Fewcott, all in conflict with key tenets of the MCNP. Whether it is 28, 38 or 34 dwellings is really immaterial - the damage would be done.

4) **Transport Impact – Whole Village**

A reduction to 28 dwellings does not materially reduce the transport impact (safety/pollution) of additional properties. In the absence of public transport it will still mean something in the region of 28 to 56 peak-time return trips by car – on top of the c.30 return trips likely due to the development already in progress. Plus increased commercial traffic (Amazon deliveries etc.). So, getting ever closer to an additional 100 peak time trips – which will impact on the whole village, as the cars will be in/out from all directions. The proposed development entrance is still a blind spot at a point where the speed limit is 60 mph – an accident waiting to happen – compounded by the fact that when the extra traffic load hits the village it will face the challenge of more on-street parked cars due to already existing parking pressure. Even more danger that extra basic traffic calming won't offset.

5) **Impact on Services/Utilities**

Take the 15 dwellings already in development and seek to add another 28 and key utilities would be at breaking point e.g. sewage and broadband. And critically the new development would need to be connected to the village and it is still not clear how this would be satisfactorily achieved. The current verge is not wide enough and any impact on the draining ditch would not be advisable. And if any sensible solution could be achieved how would that then be adopted and satisfactorily maintained?

6) **Not a saviour for the Village Primary school or a guaranteed route to s106.**

Firstly, in the original application review there was no concern from Oxfordshire County Council LEA about the future viability of the school – and even if there was, then a development of 28 dwellings would not make a material difference – it might add 1 or 2 primary school children to each school year as a one-off. The future of the school is underpinned by how it also serves surrounding villages. And whilst I am making the argument as to why this development should not be approved, if it is then it would be appropriate for the village to directly benefit from any resulting s106 payments – my understanding though is that, surprisingly, they are not hypothecated on this basis and that there is every chance that the funds will go in another direction. So I hope that no-one is putting aside any concerns that they might otherwise have in the hope of a possible community windfall as they might need to get ready to be disappointed.

**Summary – In short, the reduction to 28 dwellings does not ameliorate my original concerns – at this level it is still not sustainable, not in line with MCNP and not needed to support MCNP and will have a negative impact on safety, pollution, and amenities.**