

-----Original Message-----

From: Mike Stewart

Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2019 3:56 AM

To: DC Support <DC.Support@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: 19/00616/OUT comments

Dear Cherwell District Council Planning,

Re: Cala Homes 19/00616/OUT Fritwell

I note the Applicant's revised application and would like to reaffirm my objection on the same grounds to those described in my email to you on 25th May 2019 as my concerns remain.

In particular:

MCNP sections PD1 sections b) and c) seek to bring sustainability and safeguard greenfield. This application does not satisfy either and I note MCNP's objection to the previous application backing up this view.

The application seeks to extend the village boundary when other infill projects remain underway which will themselves increase housing provision in appropriate numbers for a village of Fritwell's size.

The application offers nothing to address the fact that travelling to work sustainably remains very difficult here. The public transport provision in Fritwell is in no way geared to getting people to and from work locations outside the village and there is not an abundance of vacancies in the locality.

The road access proposals will now have an increased environmental impact as they describe a larger loss of hedgerow in an attempt to improve safety for road users. This attempt at mitigation seems to acknowledge the fact that traffic from the proposed development would still emerge on to a road in a potentially dangerous situation with the national speed limit in force and on a considerable bend.

It remains an outline application therefore it is still able avoid specifics and clearly fails to take this village's situation in to consideration. It is not joined-up to employment opportunities, healthcare provision or social amenities.

A neighbouring Parish Council has raised objections in respect of potential traffic generated. Fritwell Parish Council held a recent public meeting with the Applicant. My feeling was that there was strong opposition in the room. Sometimes it can be difficult to judge the level of opposition/support from the questions asked - some attendees may not be comfortable speaking in those situations and others actually do not have any questions, especially as the application appears to have not hugely changed. I would have expected FPC to have been more vocal in raising how this application is at odds with the MCNP, given they were heavily involved in its creation and encouraged us to vote in support of its adoption.

Thank you for your time,
Mike Stewart

1 East Street
Fritwell
OX277PX

On 23/05/2019 18:35, Mike Stewart wrote:

- >
- > Dear Cherwell District Council Planning,
- >
- > Re: Cala Homes outline planning application 19/00616/OUT Fritwell
- >
- > In a nutshell, I oppose it as I feel it is ill-placed, oversized and
- > holds little or no benefit for the village. It offers nothing to
- > fulfil any of the aspirational angles laid out in the MCNP and in many
- > aspects flies in the face of key recommendations such as safeguarding
- > greenfield and bringing sustainability, in particular policy PD1
- > sections b) and c).
- >
- > The number of dwellings proposed far exceeds the indicative allocation
- > (25) especially when recent construction in the village is considered.
- >
- > As an outline it seems to be able to avoid specifics and it is clear
- > it is not tailored to Fritwell village's situation at all - there is
- > no recognition that jobs are scarce locally, the house price situation
- > may necessitate both partners travelling to work by car in many cases
- > and there are not enough places to park two vehicles per property -
- > which says to me that this is simply a generic rather than a joined-up
- > proposal. Joined-up planning is the only way forward for rural
- > development in my view.
- >
- > As I understand it, Oxford's unmet housing need arises from the city
- > needing more homes for the workforce having reached the Greenbelt,
- > however I cannot see how anyone could commute from Fritwell to the
- > city in a sustainable way - we are so isolated in public transport terms.
- >
- > Obviously the Greenbelt is protected in law but there is no such
- > protection for villages.
- > I would urge you to protect the village boundary and surrounding
- > countryside to ensure Greenbelt laws designed to prevent city sprawl
- > do not inadvertently lead to exactly that happening in rural areas.
- >
- > Many thanks for your time,
- > Mike Stewart
- > Fritwell