

Witney Road Application

Over 600 people have written individual letters of objection with over 94% of those letters identifying traffic on the A4095 as their predominant concern. Letters originating from Long Hanborough and the immediate surrounding villages also expressed concerns regarding the site, the surgery and school.

The original application contained factual errors and incorrect assumptions which the applicants have sought to ignore. Since its submission they have aggressively stated their perceived rights under the NPPF and disputed that WODC could demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Somewhat belatedly they have begun to consider local issues but their proposals are often impractical, vague and couched in caveats.

So, issue by issue,

Parking at the railway station. The applicant originally said it operated at 45% capacity whereas it is full most weekdays. They are now considering leasing land to add 44 spaces.

The surgery. They originally stated that there was the potential to increase the number of patients per full time GP but patients would have to travel to Eynsham. It is now suggested that a new, larger surgery be built. Local concerns are that moving it to the edge of the village will make access difficult for those without transport. An estimated 500 plus vehicle movements per day will put even more traffic on the A4095.

Regarding the school, the original assumption that it could be expanded onto the playing field was incorrect. The applicant now proposes that a new playing field off the main school site could be constructed, releasing land on the school site for an extension. The ability to deliver this solution is by no means certain and letters have questioned its practicality.

The applicants will tell you that they have listened to the community.

No they have not, all these issues were raised and recorded at the applicant's public consultation event but they chose to ignore them, and try to drive their way through on the back of the NPPF.

There are two issues they are powerless to solve.

The first is traffic on the A4095. OCC Highways initially objected but have been persuaded to withdraw their objection. The decision is shrouded in mystery and Hanborough Parish Council's transport consultant identified errors in the analysis.

We all know the A4095 is extremely busy through Long Hanborough during rush hours with lines of slow moving traffic.

Second, the site has been judged unsuitable for development during the process to produce the emerging local plan. It also contravenes H7 of the 2011 plan. Concerns about ribbon development, coalescence and precedence for further encroachment into open countryside are shared by Hanborough PC, Freeland PC and your officers.

You are being asked to agree the principle of building up to 169 homes and possibly a health centre on this site for little by way of firm deliverable commitments. It is socially unsustainable and I request that you follow officer's recommendations and refuse this application.

Speech on behalf of Hanborough Parish Council re: 14/1102/P/OP

WODC's 2014 SHLAA describes the Church Road site proposed by Corpus Christi College (CCC) as follows: "*Sustainable location for development. Reduced scale of development likely to be acceptable in landscape terms. Current school capacity issues would need to be resolved before development could proceed.*" Hanborough Parish Council (HPC) agrees with this description, but 64 dwellings cannot be described as "reduced scale" by our standards.

We asked for the number to be nearer 40 dwellings, so as to limit the inevitable increase in traffic to a level that would not deter parents from using the back entrance to the school (via the Pavilion car park) when transporting their children by car.

40 dwellings would fit in the western half of the site, extending the line of housing along Church Road to the same depth as the adjacent housing to the north (and thus achieving compliance with re-codified policy H2, formerly H7). This would also be more acceptable in landscape terms, in respect of keeping the built environment a reasonable distance from Pinsley Wood (a remnant of Wychwood Forest) to the east.

CCC is offering 1.8 hectares of land for recreational or educational purposes. For the reason just explained, this must be the eastern portion of the site. If 20+ pre-school children were moved here from the primary school site, it would be logical to assume that about 15 primary-age children (those expected to occupy the proposed new dwellings) could take their place.

In practice, the logistics are complicated. The school's current accommodation for Foundation Stage pupils is a temporary building near the end of its life. It is not suitable for attaching another modular classroom and would need to be demolished to make way for two new classrooms, if children from new houses on Church Road (plus future children from 50 houses worth of "windfall" developments) are to be accommodated.

Should Uplands Planning Committee be minded to grant planning permission, we should wish to see a legally binding obligation for the landowner to pass on all undertakings to whomsoever might buy the land in order to develop it. We should also like to ask if affordable housing on the site could be offered first to those with a connection to Hanborough, as per rural exception sites?

Funding for the playgroup's relocation and the school's expansion is still not completely certain, the number of dwellings has not been scaled down enough to reduce traffic significantly, and development will go further back than adjacent housing on Church Road. For these reasons, HPC believes its objection remains valid.

Draft Presentation for Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee

Good afternoon. My name is John Harrison. I am Bursar of Corpus Christi College at Oxford University. The College owns the application site and has undertaken the planning promotion of the site.

I wish to thank Mr Shaw for a very comprehensive report which addresses the relevant issues and which recommends approval, together with setting out the likely requirements for the Section 106 planning obligation and the planning conditions which would be required for the application.

The College has a long history and it will be celebrating its 500th anniversary in 2017. I should add, I expect the College to also be around in 500 years time. The reason I refer to the longevity of the College is that it is very proud of its reputation which includes a commitment to academic excellence in an environment that is both ancient and beautiful. The proceeds from the sale of this site will contribute to the continuing success of Corpus Christi College in the long term.

The need to protect the reputation of the College has guided our actions to date, such as working closely with key stakeholders such as your officers and County officers. The need to protect our reputation will also guide our actions in the future to ensure that, together, we create an attractive housing development which complements Long Hanborough and provides a range of planning benefits such as 50% affordable housing. According to Ffiona MacEwan of the District Council, there is currently a need for about 165 affordable homes in Long Hanborough, of which the majority required are one and two bed dwellings.

In response to concerns raised by the stakeholders, we have reduced the number of dwellings from 68 to 64 and we have offered to fund the re-location of the existing pre-school facility to the application site in order to release land to increase the capacity of the primary school.

We have also offered 1.8 hectares of land on the eastern part of the application to the County Council which could be used as open space to help facilitate a land swap with the Parish Council and Playing Fields Association to extend the existing primary school to the south. As an alternative, this land could be used for a new primary school by the County Council in the longer term.

Other Section 106 financial contributions include funding for the provision of improved cycle parking at Hanborough Railway Station to encourage more local people to cycle to the station rather than drive.

I confirm that the proposals are both viable and deliverable. I also confirm that the College cares deeply about its long standing relationship with Long Hanborough and we will ensure that the new housing proposed will be in character with existing development.

Church Road Development

In the applicant's original submission they described Long Hanborough, its facilities and services but failed to advance any proposals to mitigate any adverse impacts this development would have on local infrastructure and demand for those services other than vague references to section 106 monies.

In the intervening four months, little progress has been made.

The original transport study of the A4095 was based on a 7 day traffic survey that included part of a week in which there was a bank holiday, when traffic would be lighter than normal. Nothing has been done to address this concern.

The capacity problems of the surgery have, likewise, not been addressed and it is estimated that this development could add around 50 patients per GP.

There has recently been an amendment to the application, with two changes:

- FIRST, a reduction in the maximum number of homes to 64. This is a move in the right direction but is not enough to mitigate the development's significant impact, increasing the number of houses in Long Hanborough by around 7%.
- SECONDLY, the "Safeguarding" of 1.8 hectares of land for open space or educational purposes, including its development. The word "safeguarding" is conveniently vague, who will own it? for how long will it be safeguarded? is it transferrable? who maintains the land? Even if OCC wanted to build a new school, the funds are unlikely to be available.

One other change that does not feature explicitly in the title of the planning application is "a proposal to provide a building circa 60m² which has the potential [*to provide accommodation*] for a pre-school play group." This is not a firm commitment to relocate the playgroup thus allowing the school to be enlarged, although the officer's report indicates that the position may have moved on in the last few days.

The construction of a new playgroup building on this site and enlarging the school would require planning consent and the prospect of traffic entering and exiting onto the narrow Church Road would need to be considered. The extra traffic resulting from the relocation of the playgroup would be a significant

addition to the peak traffic flow of 50 trips per hour predicted to be generated by the development using the initial optimistic data set, BUT OF COURSE THIS HAS NOT BEEN MODELLED. It is conceivable that this traffic flow could double, yet you are being asked to agree access.

Thus the playgroup offering and new school classrooms, although attractive, require far more work.

Long Hanborough has a record of sustained growth through small developments throughout the village. It has seen around 55 homes either consented or constructed in the last two years, including 42 affordable homes, a pace that the existing community can absorb.

This site is suitable for housing, but not 64 dwellings.

All that has happened in the last four months amount to vague commitments and late representations. Please refuse this application on the basis of objective CO1 and core policies OS1 and 2.

Speech on behalf of Hanborough Parish Council re: 14/1234/P/OP

WODC's 2014 SHLAA says that development should not be allowed on this site because it would harm the landscape setting of the parish, erode the separate identities of Long Hanborough and Freeland, and detract from the nearby conservation area. This decision remains consistent with (Policy H7) one of the key principles that underpin West Oxfordshire's *Local Plan*.

The site is well over a mile from Hanborough Railway Station. Placing bus stops nearby would not conjure up more frequent bus services, which Stagecoach say are *"still very marginal in terms of their viability."* Pye's offer of Section 106 money has produced *"no firm conclusions;"* hence the vague statement in their newsletter about *"a contribution of £181,000 towards public transport improvements."*

Paragraph 66 of the NPPF says applicants are *"expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community."* Pye has gone through the motions, but flouts WODC's first core objective, which requires *"new development, services and facilities of an appropriate scale and type in locations which will help improve the quality of life of local communities and where the need to travel, particularly by car, can be minimised."*

Pye's agents have persistently denied that the development would add significantly to congestion on the A4095 despite admitting, in a *Technical Note* dated 30th October 2014, that 169 houses would generate *"4% of total flows on the network."* When Mode Transport said, *"possibly over 5% with the consequent knock-on effects on queues and delays,"* Pye's agents wrote* *"there is no guidance which suggests that a 'severe' impact is in any way linked to proportional impact;"* inadvertently negating Highways' Principal Engineer's reason for withdrawing his objection.

In a *Technical Addendum* dated 29th January 2014, Pye's agents also deny that a relocated and enlarged GP practice would attract further traffic in the morning peak period, despite admitting *"there would be an inbound vehicle movement every 2 minutes and an outbound vehicle movement every 4 minutes."* They argue that most of these car trips to the doctor already occur with the surgery in its present location. That is almost certainly not true, as many patients are likely to change their behaviour when faced with a greater distance to travel.

WODC's key principle of *"provision of supporting infrastructure,"* Policy H7 is misconceived in the applicant's proposals: resources for the wider transport network would hardly mitigate local traffic problems; a displaced surgery would not mitigate difficulty in accessing healthcare; a remote games field would not mitigate disruption to the way the primary school operates and a secure pathway to it would block public access to adjacent play and recreation facilities.

Pye has not found viable solutions to the problems identified by Hanborough Parish Council and others, because its proposals are incompatible with the environmental and social precepts of sustainable development. I respectfully ask that you refuse the application.

Hanborough Parish Council, 2nd March 2015

*Letter to WODC Planning Officer (HW) 17th February 2015

Summary of submission by Mr J Ashton

In his submission, Mr Ashton emphasised the efforts that had been made to overcome objections to the scheme as originally submitted as detailed in the statement and incorporated into the Planning Officer's report.

He drew attention to the proposed allocation of land for a doctor's surgery and made reference to the discussions held between the developers and the education authority regarding contributions towards the expansion of the primary school and the provision of additional playing fields.

Mr Ashton noted that Long Hanborough was one of the few settlements in the District with a station with regular train services making it a sustainable settlement with a real alternative to using the car.

Uplands Planning Committee Meeting – Notes

Ref planning application 14/01627/FUL

Steve Roberts – 6 Shipton Road Milton Under Wychood

Most of the houses in the triangle of land formed by this part of Shipton Road and Green Lane were originally built back in the 1920's. Since then quite a bit of development has taken place. Many of the semi-detached houses have had extensions and a number of new houses have been built between the original semi's as infill. However all this development has maintained the historic building line, with the new properties all facing onto the road with gardens at the rear.

This application promises to change almost 100 years of tradition with a new dwelling being proposed in the back garden of a semi-detached house. This will fundamentally change the character of this part of Milton and encourage further "urbanisation" of what is after all a Cotswold village in an AONB. The situation with Frog Cottage is completely different as this is at the end of the row of houses on Green Lane, has its own private access and originally faced onto open fields. To use that as precedent is I believe completely mistaken.

We are told our privacy will not be impacted as there's a 2m high fence proposed around the new building. Perhaps this is a magic fence that will make the house invisible? Obviously a new dwelling being built so close to existing houses will have an impact on noise and privacy. In addition it would seem that a number of mature, native trees and shrubs will need to be removed to accommodate the development, further affecting the character of this part of Milton.

I have some sympathy with officials who are having to work with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seems to be in essence a developer's charter. However local politicians have a duty to stand up to Central Government and say when enough is enough. If we let developments like this go ahead, small though they might be individually, before long we'll have lost all the green space and gardens in our villages to development. That surely cannot be a good or sustainable outcome?

I urge the committee to refuse this application.

Good afternoon, I am David Robinson from Hillmark Homes, the prospective developer of the proposed new dwelling.

We have been working hard with your Officer for a number of months with a view to reaching a suitable solution for a dwelling on this land. Having addressed a number of initial concerns, our belief is that we have now achieved that.

The new home relates well to other houses in the immediate vicinity, and the site layout is respectful of the need for privacy of both the near neighbours and the proposed house itself, using position and orientation to maintain privacy for the new and existing properties.

The bungalow would be provided with genuinely useable, private external space which properly relates to the interior, and which is well positioned to benefit from the sun path.

We are exploring heat pump technology in tandem with efficient underfloor heating to minimise CO2 emissions and maximise internal comfort conditions.

The layout of the house is driven entirely by site constraints and Lifetime Homes, it is not a standard house type shoehorned to fit the site.

The Lifetime Homes aspect of our proposal does not obviously manifest itself in our application, and for those not familiar with this, the aim is to ensure that a home is accessible and inclusive for people of all ages.

Lifetime Homes are ordinary homes designed to incorporate up to 16 Design Criteria which add to the comfort and convenience of the home, and which support the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life. The bungalow would therefore appeal to the widest possible audience, and by maximising flexibility in use is an inherently sustainable design.

The design criteria address areas such as circulation, accessibility of switches and handles to doors and windows, circulation in bathrooms, bedrooms and living space, size of openings, and goes some way beyond existing standard design requirements.

Furthermore, by providing an additional modest 3 bedroom bungalow, and also retaining the existing 3 bedroom home rather than creating a large 5 bedroom house, we believe we are improving the mix of available property, which will appeal to, and be affordable by, more people.

As members you will probably be aware that there are a limited number of bungalows which are developed, and with an ageing society this form of housing is becoming increasingly attractive, and allied to the Lifetime Homes criteria which provides flexibility for a wide range of people over a longer time frame, we believe our proposed solution gives real choice to potential occupiers.

I hope you have found this helpful and that you are able to support this application.

14/01884/FUL Land south and east of Walterbush Road, Chipping Norton

The Town Council are very much in favour of this development, even though it will encroach on land which is part of the AONB which is regrettable but at the moment probably inevitable. I am given to understand that development of this land has actually been on the cards for many years, as being a natural extension to the estate in Walterbush Road and the plans in front of us should certainly tidy up that edge of Town.

We fully realise that Chipping Norton being the third largest settlement in West Oxfordshire will have to, and should have to, shoulder some development in the near future however we do have several real problems with any expansion 1) Traffic and pollution through the middle of Town and 2) Parking - and both in a Town which was originally designed for the horse and cart !

The Town Council have discussed this project on and off with the developers for some time now - the original outline plans were rejected as there was no access to the A361 Burford Road which would have put intolerable pressure on Walterbush Road, Hailey Road and Churchill Road (even with the then proposed smaller development) but this new access to the A361 should allow traffic heading for Burford / Witney and even Oxford (using back routes) to avoid the centre of Town.

Most of our worries and objections have been alleviated by discussions with the developers and with WODC however we are still left with one item which we consider to be very important. It is hoped the land on the other side of the A361 known as Greystones will have a changed face in the near future, with our intentions being a) to remove the current scout hut and have a new one constructed behind the Bowls Club allowing us to put some more hardstanding/parking for cars between Greystones House and the Rifle Range - thereby taking pressure off the parking problem that is there at the moment and we also hope to construct a Skate Park alongside the Chippy Swifts Football area ie developing the area for more recreational activities. With these developments in mind and given the fact that **this** new development (probably with a substantial number of children living there) will hopefully encourage more of the population to participate in Bowls/Rugby/Football and board skating etc we have to make sure there is a safe pedestrian crossing over the A361 and also that the 30 mph speed limit is moved past the Rugby Club i.e. about 100 metres towards Burford - and if both of those items are covered then we, CNTC, wholly approve of this scheme.

In addition to the above the fact that Chipping Norton Football Club gets a new lease of life and a new clubhouse and the possibility to make further improvements to the recreational amenities in

Given by Councillor Mike Tysoe Mayor of Chipping Norton

14/01884/FUL Land south and east of Walterbush Road, Chipping Norton

town in addition to those changes we have done so recently, also add to the overall positive opinion of the Town Council.

I would like to place on record how much Chipping Norton Town Council have appreciated the time and effort that the developers have given to enable us all to get this far and we hope for a successful conclusion,

Given by Councillor Mike Tysoe Mayor of Chipping Norton

**Land south and east of Walterbush Road, Chipping Norton
(14/01884/FUL)**

Speech to Committee

Good afternoon/evening

I am Jonathan Porter from Barton Willmore. I am the planning consultant for the application and am speaking on behalf of the joint applicants, Archstone and Bellway Homes.

The application site has long been identified as an opportunity to deliver a substantial number of new homes for the Town while enhancing visually the edge of the Town in this location. This has most recently been confirmed by the Council's Housing Strategy paper and the draft Pre-Submission Local Plan which refer to the site being a preferred location for new homes.

This full planning application is the culmination of some 5 years of promotion through the Local Plan and pre-application consultation. This has included engagement with the District, the Cotswold AONB Board and the Town Council and two public exhibitions.

We have also involved Chipping Norton Football Club to understand their current difficulties and requirements for a new modern clubhouse.

This considerate approach has resulted in the AONB Board confirming that it has no objection to the proposed development of the application site and receiving the support of the Town Council.

The Town Council and AONB Board have recognised the constraints of providing sustainable growth at Chipping Norton and agree that the application site is an appropriate location which can deliver the following important wider benefits for the Town:

- It will contribute significantly to providing much needed market and affordable housing in a sustainable location;
- It will deliver a new clubhouse for Chipping Norton Football Club;
- It will provide a new green edge and low density housing with structural landscaping enhancing the visual appearance of this edge of Chipping Norton which is at present is acknowledged to be poor; and
- It will incorporate a new pedestrian and cycle route between Walterbush Road and the Burford road/Greystones, significantly improving recreational opportunities in the area.

14/02014/HHD

Redrobe House, 9 Church street, C/N

The roads of Church Street and Distons Lane, being two of the oldest and narrowest streets in Chipping Norton, have some of the oldest properties in town whose gardens create a very peaceful and quiet residential area enjoyed by all. Even during the Mop Fair noise is hardly audible.

My property will be affected more than others as about 15 metres (50 feet) of my boundary will be in very close proximity to the pool and the surrounding paved area - my garden office is the closest building being only about 30 feet away from our wall and indeed our bedroom at the north east end of our house is a similar distance away.

Our new neighbours Mr and Mrs Bell have moved in during the last year and by their own admission are only part-timers and are probably not aware of the amount of time all the neighbours spend in their gardens when weather permits and the noise of splashing and the pump will detract from our enjoyment of what is currently a haven of peace and quiet - I know from previous experience how noisy a pool in the garden is!

Apart from the proximity to my garden I also have problems with exactly what they are going to build - the footprint of gym building is a little bigger than my office with the addition of 2 1.5 x 1.5 metre areas for loo and pump. When I applied for planning permission I was told that plumbing was not allowed in case it became a dwelling - the same should be said here. They say that this vast pool which is nearly 50 feet long being close to and parallel to our mutual boundary is for exercise only and that the noise will be minimal BUT that is all very well until they sell the property to a family with children. I would like to suggest that there are two 25 metre pools in Chippy which they could use and get even more exercise without disturbing their neighbours but if they really want to exercise in their own garden perhaps a 13 foot swimspa close to their house would be a better alternative.

My wife and I are also very worried about the bad condition of their garden wall which actually stops their garden falling into ours - the wall varying in height above our garden from 6 to 9 feet over a length of about 30 feet (the high part) is of varying condition along its length and the

disturbance of a large hole being dug just the other side will probably have some negative affect on the wall.

So to sum up:-

This does not fit in with the age and history of the area of town.

It will create noise which will affect the quiet enjoyment that we and our neighbours currently have in our gardens including the peace I have in my office which is the closest building to the pool.

The area will overlook our garden quite considerably i.e. people lounging by the pool etc etc and will destroy any privacy we have enjoyed for the last 16 years and

There is a real danger of the boundary wall collapsing and damaging my property

And A NOISE IMPACT ON THE CHURCH DURING FUNERALS / WEDDINGS / SUNDAY SERVICES & OTHER CIVIC EVENTS.

The Town Council have also registered similar strong objections.

If you approve the basic principle of this application then please insist that they move it close to their house where it will not disturb or overlook us so much.