

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

From: Karl Grimsey

Sent: 04 November 2019 16:39

To: James Kirkham

Subject: objection to 19/00616/OUT - 28 dwellings Fewcott Road, Fritwell

Dear James Kirkham

I wish to state my opposition the 19/00616/OUT - 28 dwellings Fewcott Road, Fritwell

1 Fritwell has over the last 25yrs contributed greatly to all of Cherwell's local plans and has almost doubled the number of houses in Fritwell, at the time when the MCNP was drafted Fritwell had regular daily bus services to Bicester and Banbury, two pubs, a shop and a primary school thus labelling at Cat A village, as of now Fritwell has no regular bus services other than a single bus on a Monday morning to Bicester, no pubs, very limited, if any, employment opportunities, no health services. 2011-2031 Local Plan Numbers for Rural Villages . According to 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 in 2019?? If this developer is given permission to build excess properties on green field site, it will open the doors for other developers to seek similar developments surrounding this Village?

2 We currently have 16 new homes being built plus several more in the planning stages ALL on Brownfield sites within the Village Boundaries. Current Local and MCNP (Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan) (recently approved 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. Cala's proposed development goes directly against these two points! Fritwell has supported Cherwell's Local plans over the years, these new 16 properties that are being built support that. It should not be right that this small village should be subjected to even more properties that add nothing to the Village, benefits nobody or add anything in the Village only increases traffic in our village by another 56 cars and our carbon footprint.

3 This new Development is proposed to be build outside of Cherwell's registered Village Boundary on a green belt site with an exit and entrance to the site on to a narrow 60mph country lane . Fewcott road is a straight road until you get to the proposed entrance to this site where there is clearly a blind bend to the left thus giving limited (none) visibility to the entrance of Fritwell Village where it has signs to reduce to 30mph (see pictures below). Cala's proposal is to cut down the tress and hedges from the proposed entrance enabling clear site to the entrance of Fritwell Village - there are no details of who takes on the responsibility of maintaining this hedge row as it will obviously regrow recreating a blind view to the entrance of the Village. Over the last few months the Parish Council's speed data at this point has recorded over 5000 vehicles that are recorded going far in excess of speed limit set. This

development offers zero to traffic calming needs of the village - it only exasperates them. . This road is a narrow country lane with a speed limit of 60mph and, as yet, there are no plans from OCC Transport to change this

4 Suggestion that all new residents of this development get a copy of the Cherwell approved Travel information pack is a worthless - each resident will require a motor vehicle to get to work or to travel to the main towns of Bicester and Banbury as there is only one bus on a Monday morning that only goes to Bicester. Fritwell offers very limited employment opportunities, if any. Fritwell is a small Village compared to its neighbours, it has diminished facilities. All residents of this development including the 33% of social housing residents will have to have their own form of transport. Cala's plan shows that will be a minimum of 56 vehicles from this development (assuming residents ONLY have two cars) that will travel through the Village, Fritwell is already swamped daily with cars using Fritwell as a "rat Run" for vans, buses, lorries, tractors who want to avoid the congested Junction 10/M40 roundabouts. In the morning and afterschool there are up to 6 coaches dropping off or picking up pupils from various schools as well as many drivers leaving and coming back from work. Commuters do not have the same respect for speed within a village and many get frustrated when their rat run is congested. A possible 56 more cars is only going to increase

5 Your own Cherwell Report posted on your Planning Application -19/00616/OUT: regarding this possible development state that based on the type of houses and using your defined formula of how many residents there will be in this site project a possibility of only 6 children within the ages for Primary school. If any of these 6 have siblings over the primary school age it is likely that they will go to Upper Heyford Free School - meaning there is no guarantee that all 6 would go to Fritwell School. This means there is no real financial gain to Fritwell School nor any significant increase in attendants to the school.

6 I noted a report from your planning office Mathew Parry who wrote

Planning officer Matthew Parry: 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.

7 NHS OXFORDSHIRE CCG Letter dated 18 oct 2019: Please take this email as formal notification that OCCG object to the planning application on the basis that it will put further pressure on primary care services which support the Fritwell area. This application for 28 dwellings will increase that population by c67 people which will put direct pressure on the ability of the practices to continue to provide primary care services, without funding to support their infrastructure needs.

8 Policy ESD13 states: Proposals will not be permitted if they would: Cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside, New development proposals should consider the amenity of both existing and future development, including matters of privacy: My home, in Hodgson Close, faces this green field site, I currently enjoy this view across the landscape, a view that encouraged us to buy this house 20yrs ago, our solicitors pointed out that the bunt at the end of our garden was the official boundary of the village, a comment that was confirmed by Cherwell Council several years later. I will be very disappointed if the Cherwell Council have been misled. The Fritwell Village Conservation boundary ends at the end of my garden not halfway down a greenfield piece of land! If this plan goes ahead it shows that a two-storey house will be built directly in front of my house meaning my privacy and view will be taken away.

9 My House was built east facing with our garden leading to the boundary of the village, it was designed to have an east facing garden so we would enjoy the sunrise rising over our house thus enjoying much of the days sunshine, if this development goes ahead it proposes a two storey house will be directly in front of our garden which will cause a shadow blocking out the sun. It will also deny us the amazing view of the natural countryside that living at the boundary of the Village gives us. The potential impact of light pollution, noise and privacy contravenes my rights under the Human Rights Act 1998; "Protocol 1, Article 1 protects your right to enjoy your property peacefully

These photos clearly demonstrate the views from Gardens in Hodgson Close who's vista will be massively impacted on by this proposed development. All of these views will be taken away and replaced with two storey houses blocking this view as well an Invasion of our privacy

Lockhart Garret: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Obviously Lockhart Garret's report attempts to justify the lack of visual impact to residents of Fritwell - especially Hodgson Close. Clever photos within the

report are taken from locations to suggest there is a lack of visual impact, what they have not provided are photos from the gardens of Hodgson Close, therefore I have attached relevant images to show planners the visible impact these premises will have. It will appear that their LVIA failed to take these views in to consideration?

10 The Chair of Fritwell Parish council (FPC) suggested in the Parish Council's communications to you "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" This is nonsense and the posted comments on your website clearly shows a majority that does oppose this development. The FPC have not canvassed the Village to ask everyone's views. The FPC views are based purely on their own personal views and head count of the few that came to one of the parish meetings ignoring a large number that opposed who attended. At no time have they tried it to engage with anyone who might oppose it, nor to listen or try and understand why they want to oppose it, instead the Chair has dismissed anyone who makes reasonable argument against this proposal. The Chair does seem to think that agreeing to this proposal will magically give the Village some sort of outstanding traffic calming even though none of Cala's proposal offers or agrees to pay for any. Oddly enough, It was only a few years ago that the FPC had a complete opposite view of another development in the Village, vigorously campaigning those in the roads that would be effected to attend the relevant FPC to argue to stop it, sighting all the same reasons why it should not go ahead- too many cars through the village, not in keeping with the Cherwell local plans, not enough sewage capacity, no green credentials, lack of employment in the village etc The only possible difference between that development and this development is it is not at the end of her street as that one was. For this reason, I sadly, do not believe you should not be under any impression FPC views are in any way the views for the Village.

11 Planning Policy, Conservation and design Team CDC: The proposed development accords with policy PD1 of the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan. However, detailed consideration of the loss of open countryside, impact on the existing settlement pattern and impact on the Fritwell Conservation Area is required. The development impact on the existing services and facilities would also need to be considered.

The Council can still demonstrate a 5.2 year housing supply for the period 2019-2024 therefore there is no pressing need for additional land to be released and the merits of providing additional housing (including affordable homes) needs to be considered alongside issues such as the loss of open countryside, the impact on the existing settlement pattern, the impact on the Fritwell Conservation Area, and the requirement to

meet high design standards (Policy ESD15). The development impact on the existing services and facilities would also need to be considered.

12 Fewcott Road Bend at location of proposed site entrance: Cala continue to present their plans implying there is no bend on Fewcott Road. For Planners who have not visited Fritwell and are being guided by the plethora of documents provided by the developers - please look at pages 64 & 65 of their Lockhart Garret's LVIA - these are their own photos that

clearly demonstrate that the location of this development is on a blind bend.

I ask CDC Planning committee to reject this application for all the reasons above

It is the Councils responsibility to respect our village & countryside, please don't agree to this application just to suit developers demands, it offers no benefit to our Village, schools or employment, it offers no support to our environment, massively increases our carbon footprint, increases the use of motor vehicles and profits no one other than the developers.

Karl Grimsey
11 Hodgson Close
Fritwell
OX27 7QB