

From: Colin Smith, 9 Hodgson Close, Fritwell. Date: 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019 reference Cala (Outline) Planning Application 19/00616/OUT

As an active participant & contributor in the life and vibrancy of the Fritwell Community, I wish to lodge my objection to the above Outline planning application (19/00616/OUT) by Cala Homes (Chiltern) Ltd. Below I raise 11 points that I would request are taken into consideration by Cherwell District Council Planning committee considering the said application.

I also wish to report what I consider to be as a number of in-accuracies/questions arising from the Cala supporting documents uploaded to the planning web page associated with 19/00616/OUT.

### Objections

1. Sustainability 1 – I like a number of Fritwell residents feel that 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), no genuine employment opportunities and no health services. 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. I am sure the Fewcott and Ardley would also not relish the increase in traffic movements through their village.
2. Current Local and MCNP (Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan) plans (recently approved by referendum in March 2019) suggest that Fritwell (as a so say Cat A village) should have a quota of 25 houses during the plan period up to 2031 (Sections 6.8, 7.11). There is no mention in any associated Cala documents that references the 15 houses that are currently nearing completion in Fritwell at the Calvert Farm site (8) and those in build at the old George and Dragon Pub site (7) – which would be 60% of Fritwell's quota and both are brownfield sites. If CDC and their Local Plan and MCNP want residents to feel any sort of trust in these plans & them as organisations' so say representing their resident's needs, then simply allowing developers to ride rough-shot over these plans will bring them into disrepute. As Cala states in 6.2.1 09411222 "The site is not itself discussed or otherwise identified in the "made" Neighbourhood Plan."
3. Planning Policy - According to the MCNP Objectives, under Development we have:
  - 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.

In reality there is little change in the overall impact of this Cala 2019 Planning Application to Fritwell versus the 2016 Cala application for 34 houses (which they (Cala) pulled prior to the October 2016 CDC Planning Meeting). Much of Matthew Parry's (CDC Planning Officer) summary at that time remains valid for this application. 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. Not being an expert in these matters, I can't offer a judgement if they all remain relevant or not? I trust that CDC Planning

will however be able to determine that during this planning review. The following excerpt from 2016 appears to me to be 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.

4. Sustainability 2 – There is a view amongst some Fritwell residents that this development would help sustain the Fritwell School intake and whilst I actively support the local school, at best this development would be a “one-shot” boost for the school. What happens in subsequent years – do we need to continue building 40(?) houses per annum in the village to sustain the school intake?
5. Sustainability 3 – Local Shop and Post Office. There is a legitimate question that if this planning permission was granted & houses were developed whether the shop and post office would continue to operate?
6. Sustainability 4 – It should be noted that Fritwell has not had a Pub since July 2016 & looks un-likely to regain one – again a further missing amenity against a Cat A status for the village and the need or ability to bear housing development quota. In fact the Kings Head is currently subject to a dispute about a change of use to a residential property by the owner/CDC.
7. Sustainability 5 – There are major concerns by Fritwell residents about sewage/flooding in the village due to capacity issues with the Fritwell Sewage plant, which have been experienced over the last several years. Forge Place has been most affected. This matter has been raised a number of times to Fritwell Parish Council meetings who have found Anglian Water to be un-responsive & difficult to liaise with. This Cala Planning application for the

development of 38 houses needs to have Anglian Water respond prior to a decision being taken by CDC planning to ensure that in their expert opinion flooding will not occur if such a development of 38 houses were to go ahead and if it does arise who has the (action and cost) responsibility to address such an issue?

8. Cala Transparency - A concern that only Outline Planning application for 38 houses is sought which as I understand means that if granted the types/number of bedrooms/materials/height and layout of the properties can be determined at a later stage, meaning that the application lacks transparency to the residents of Fritwell as to the final development make-up and a lack of true partnership by Cala with the village.
9. In their (Cala) supporting document 09411222\_Planning statement that Fritwell Parish Council (FPC) supports this application. However that status needs to be re-confirmed by FPC for this Outline Planning application.
10. 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. (Cala's current plans will likely result in a high density of housing backing directly onto existing properties – although against this 19/00616/OUT it is an unknown as Outline Planning permission is only sought)

With 38 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."*

11. It is noted that CDC Planning are aware of the potential negative impact of “large” scale (relative the size of the village) (>10 houses) developments have on villages by their recent rejection of planning for 50 (then 50 on appeal, then 25 on appeal) at Finmere and 12 at Fringford. A further 38 houses in Fritwell would equate to more than a 15% increase in the number of properties in the village – which is a huge increase in pressure on local infrastructure.

Concerns over the accuracy/relevance of content in the Associated Cala documents loaded onto the web page for this Cala Outline planning application (19/00616/OUT)

- a. Much is made of “boosting the supply of high quality houses” in Cala 09411222\_Planning statement – 6.4, 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 as stated in National Planning Policy Framework & Policy Villages 2 of the Local Plan – but I would request CDC Planning determine if this is relevant against their current assessment of their house build needs in the district – being built and planned to be built to meet the needs of the Local Plan and against the recently approved MCNP?

- b. 09411222\_Planning statement - In 2.2 it is stated there is a public house. As per point 4 above, since July 2016 there has and continues to be no public house provision in Fritwell. In fact the Kings Head is currently subject to a dispute about a change of use to a residential property by the owner/CDC. So this statement promotes a false view of village amenities.
- c. There is no statement in document 09411222 that Public Transport Provision in Fritwell since 2016 equates to 1 bus per week to Bicester providing a 3 hour window for participants to carry out their business before it returns to Fritwell – unless you want to stay for a week in Bicester?
- d. There is also an inaccurate statement in Document 09411230\_Transport Statement Section 3.6.3: The bus goes from Bicester to Souldern (not Banbury). The summary in 3.8.1 in said document *“In summary, it has been shown that the site location benefits from access to a range of sustainable modes of travel within Fritwell village, including travel by public transport, offering a convenient alternative to single occupancy car journeys”* is clearly setting a very false picture. In fact car journeys (besides walking into the village or cycling for pleasure) are the only effective way to move in and out of the village for any wider service/health provision or business reasons. With 38 new homes and an estimated 71 cars this will be significant increase in traffic.
- e. Cala document 09411225\_Design\_Assessment\_Stmt\_DS.01 also falsely states Public House and just mention bus stops & falsely states Bus provision to Bicester and Banbury under “Local Facilities” Page 8.
- f. Vehicular/Road access (09411230\_Transport Statement) – I have major concerns over the revised Fewcott Road Access to the proposed site. The 60 mph single carriageway Fewcott road prior to the 30 mph limit gives rise to a number of speed limit breakers all the way down to the junction with East Street. This is backed up by FPC automated Speed monitoring. With no change to shifting the 30mph much further towards the village of Fewcott then the entrance to the proposed development will be an accident waiting to happen.
- g. Estimate of Transport Movements. (09411230\_Transport Statement) Section 5.2.5 - 27/28 two way vehicular trips for 38 homes during peak periods. Is this seen as accurate when there is an estimate of 71 more cars (parking spaces)? There is no impact assessment and estimate of movements during the rest of the day in regard of the overall effect.
- h. Parking Provision. (09411230\_Transport Statement) Section 4.6.3. With 71 allocated parking spaces but only 6 unallocated spaces for visitors – I think this will be inadequate and lead to a number of parking issues like parking on pavements.

End of Document