

1. I moved from Carterton to Burford Road, Brize Norton 31 years ago as a small village environment appealed.  
The first disappointment was Shilton Park ,which swallowed part of Brize Norton. The initial number of houses proposed virtually doubled. However we were told that Monahan Way would be an essential separation between Brize Norton and Carterton - Guess what!  
I am sure that council members can understand us not accepting such statements in future.  
Suggested link road ideas did not materialise and traffic increased substantially.
- 2 The Proposal under discussion, referred to as Carterton East, is using land all in Brize Norton and is not wanted by Carterton t c, Brize p c or local residents.  
The Draft Plan Consultation showed around 2 to 1 against itl.  
The Prime Minister suggested that it was wrong to “plonk” developments in villages and rural areas.  
Government guidelines suggest that housing development near airports should be avoided. An RAF base is worse than an airport due to the need to operate 24/7.  
We wanted to give you a sound bite of a Hercules C130 engine running noise but we weren’t allowed. A pity because it would have shown how intrusive it is and how sleep can be seriously disturbed.  
Noise events wake people – not average noises.  
Local employment prospects are negligible for the foreseeable future particularly if you consider all of the proposed developments in the area.  
Local doctors surgeries are at capacity and the traffic problem is a disaster.  
Flooding is of real concern and the suggested ponds, with enough rain, could overflow. Water has a habit of flowing downhill and what may be left of Brize Norton would be on the receiving end.
3. On a personal note I applied for permission to build a house in my garden which would not be visible from the Burford Road and not overlook anybody. This was rejected.  
Reasons given included “ it would spoil the character of Burford Road and further urbanise the locality to the detriment of its open and rural character”. Obviously 700, probably more, houses opposite my front garden will have no such effect.

As many of you will have read recently a planning application for 1 house in our Council leaders village of North Leigh was rejected as was an application for 20. Our leader was associated with the statement – if 1 is too many 20 definitely are.

It would appear that in my village of Brize Norton 1 is too many but 700 are absolutely fine.

The word that springs to mind is hypocrisy.

My major concerns are the inevitable destruction of Brize Norton Village, which was mentioned in the Domesday book, the lack of sufficient local employment and the inevitable increase in commuting misery none of which, in my opinion, have been properly addressed.

I would like to read some words from a colleague which I feel express the views of Many Brize Norton residents.

We thought that the practice of sacrifice to a deity was long gone. Sadly it seems not, Brize Norton is being offered up to appease the gods of growth and greed. Brize is again being expected to take the pain whilst getting little of the gain. We are constantly denied relief from the traffic generated by an ever expanding Carterton, and implementing this planning application will only make things worse. The front page story in yesterday's WG exemplifies the level of "Highway Robbery" undertaken by the OCC. As councillors you have a duty of care to the community - the people. We in Brize are people, We need your help to stop this application.

The only saving grace is your free parking policy which I hope will extend to the huge new car park that you are planning. This new car park is currently referred to as the A40 to Oxford.

## STATEMENT FROM CARTERTON TOWN COUNCIL

The following statement reflects Carterton Town Council's current and up to date view on the proposed developments to the East and West of the Town and currently lying within the Parishes of Brize Norton and Alvescot.

Firstly we would like to reiterate that we have always believed these and any other major applications for such a large number of houses to be premature in light of the delayed Local Plan.

Carterton needs a long term housing strategy. The town needs a strategy that addresses the 'houses against employment' imbalance. Housing permissions that precede sound economic strategies substantially prejudice the long-term, sustainable growth of Carterton and hinder our desire to make the town strong and prosperous with the appropriate balance of jobs, services, facilities and homes

## WITH SPECIFIC REGARD TO THE EAST

Consultation around the new Carterton Masterplan points to the East, and in particular the land between Monahan Way and Brize Norton Road adjacent to the RAF Base as the best site capable of accommodating the sort of business park sufficient to change the economic profile of Carterton. Business space in this location has the added advantages of resolving the noise, air quality and light pollution issues associated with locating housing next to RAF Brize Norton.

Notwithstanding the above, Carterton Town Council has been engaging with the District Council's Planning Officers, the Developers and their Agents and has been overwhelmed by the willingness of all to answer and address it's concerns. The Council is satisfied that there are insufficient concerns remaining to warrant any further Planning Objections providing the issue of employment land and an economic strategy for Carterton is addressed.

Some recent conversations with the planning authority have been enough to mollify our concerns. The Town Council applauds the District on its new flexible and responsive approach to employment land delivery in Carterton and will assist the policy makers in concentrating efforts on policies that allow us to attract both inward investment and help existing businesses meet their aspirations in the town.

## WITH SPECIFIC REGARD TO THE WEST

Carterton Town Council has over the past year gained a better understanding of the impact of the West Development through a combination of consultation with residents during the 2014 Local Elections, on going work on a town Masterplan and the receipt of technical information provided by both the Developers and the Planning Officers.

We feel that a decision on the West should not be made at this time and should be deferred pending a proper Transport Assessment of the Road Infrastructure around the Development. There are serious concerns about how Carterton's roads will cope with the inevitable increase in traffic. We would ask that the County Council's Highways Department conducts a feasibility study on the existing shortfalls in road infrastructure combined with the negative impact of an additional 1,000 houses without appropriate mitigation measures and improvements to the highways network.

## IN SUMMARY

The existing road infrastructure will be forced to operate above capacity amid severe cumulative effects of the two proposed developments. We feel it is reasonable of the residents of Carterton to expect safe access to and from local amenities, schools, shops, the Town Centre and their place of employment. The infrastructure is already buckling and without proper thought, these developments could tip it over the edge.

## **Appendix C**

### **Summary of Submission by Mr Squire – Brize Norton Parish Council**

Mr Squire introduced himself and advised that he wanted to demonstrate that there was a five year housing land supply and therefore weight could be given to Local Plan policies. Mr Squire suggested that the committee should not be pressured to make a decision on a speculative application due to the perception of there not being a sufficient land supply.

Mr Squire suggested that employment was a key driver for growth and business development had not featured in the Shilton Park development. It was further questioned whether the expansion of RAF Brize Norton, which had been quoted as a trigger for economic development, had indeed had the impact that was expected. Overall there had been very few new job opportunities created. Mr Squire highlighted the large percentage of people commuting out of Carterton.

Mr Squire highlighted the previous over delivery of housing against targets and together with the fact that there were close to 1500 unbuilt homes which had planning permission in Carterton this represented a 13 year housing supply. Mr Squire suggested that local councils and local people should decide where appropriate development should be sited and the application site was not suitable.

Mr Squire suggested the proposal would be overdevelopment, increase pollution due to additional car journeys. Mr Squire referred to the National Planning Policy Framework and reiterated that there was a sufficient land supply available to meet targets without the need for this development. Mr Squire indicated there was no need to build at a faster rate and the committee had a duty to protect the area and refuse the application.

You all know the arguments about the tide of numbers that is the SHMA. You know about traffic, infrastructure, sustainability, flooding and sewage.

~~The disastrous~~ question is 'Do you want Carterton to expand into Shilton, Brize Norton or Alvescot' not 'do you want Carterton to expand into other parishes?' as a consequence, these communities have competed with each other to be spared destruction. Today the finger is pointed at Brize where it will end its historic identity to be subsumed into the new town of greater Carterton. It has taken over 1,000 years for Brize to evolve and this process is to consider whether to make an irreversible change in one October afternoon.

Councillors, recognise that this proposed expansion is to follow the requirements set to us by central government and to provide development gain for Carterton. Gain at the expense of the people of Brize Norton.

It is worth saying that during May, election month, I spoke to virtually everybody in Brize and also a significant number of residents in Carterton. I didn't find anyone in favour of this application.

We need to preserve our heritage, its communities and the separate nature and identity of its rural villages. Please, turn this application down, and when they are put to you, those to the west and north as well.

This application is put to you before our District Local plan is decided – that alone should be grounds for rejection. Furthermore this location is proposed on the land set aside by HM Inspector Cookson in the 1994 local inquiry as a buffer zone to protect the separate identity of Brize Norton.

In rejecting this application we need to be practical and to ask our planning officers to change their stance from a compliance with the unsuitable instructions from above to one where a creative method could be applied to draft a framework where the whole district is improved.

To quote an old Chinese proverb: *There is better way to make roast pork than setting fire to the pigsty*

Most of you know me and those who do will know that I am passionate about my Town. I would like to reiterate to both the Planning Authority and Developers, whoever they may be, that we as the Town Council can not stand by and witness a large number of residential developments with little or no thought to providing land for employment and amenity.

We have started to undertake community engagement to capture current Issues, Aspirations and Opportunities within Carterton. The current economic climate and present experiences suggest that an incremental approach to change, firmly rooted at the local level, is most likely to help a town like ours succeed.

The aspirations for both Town and District Councillors are that Carterton becomes a prosperous town with a thriving local economy in which people want to live and work. We need a town that is resilient to challenges through robust infrastructure and decision making. A town that is inclusive and has a lively community that possesses the skills and businesses to remain competitive and generates economic opportunities to meet local employment needs. A dynamic community in which public, voluntary and business sectors work together through a robust strategy to achieve their chosen vision.

To us The Future is key – keeping hold of Carterton’s individuality whilst striving to make it a place where people want to work, live, raise families, and spend their retirement years.

All of this needs careful thought. The past and present teach us so much about what works and what doesn’t. In The Present we need to be laying down firm foundations, talking to our communities and finding out what they want and need – **we are doing that now**.

We believe that the Town, District and the County Councils, along with our other commercial and strategic partners are the architects of Carterton’s future. I as Mayor am proud to be linked with an equally passionate team who are striving to make our future safe, healthy and sustainable.

The Committee will be aware that Carterton Town Council has historically expressed its reservations about the East Development, predominantly based on our concerns regarding a lack of suitable employment land. The land proposed for this development has always been the preferred site for us for any future economic or business activity.

If the Planning Authority can assure us that suitable and sufficient alternative land can be found, we are prepared to work with all to find a resolution to meeting the future development needs of our Town.

You have all heard my general comments regarding our aspirations for Carterton. It is because of those aspirations that this Town has traditionally supported the proposed development to the West.

However, should this committee be minded to approve the East Development, there are some underlying concerns that I would like to highlight. I would just like to say to say to you

**‘too much development, too quickly’.**

Do we really suppose that 1,700 houses in one hit is going to be the incremental approach that Carterton not only wants but can sustain? I for one don't think so.

This Town's road infrastructure is inadequate for the current traffic let alone what will be generated. We would fully support the implementation of a 'Traffic Demand Management Scheme' – already identified as desirable- in order to reduce the effects of vehicle travel in and around the town.

A deferment of any decision on this application would be sensible and should be conditional on a full transport assessment being carried out.



### **Summary of Submission by Mr MacPherson – Bloor Homes**

Mr MacPherson introduced himself and advised that Bloor Homes was the largest private house builder in the country, were used to constructing large developments and were well placed to deliver the proposed scheme.

Mr MacPherson acknowledged that the development was sensitive and emphasised the importance of listening to all views. It was outlined that there had been a lot of meetings and consultation events to address issues and concerns that had been raised. Mr MacPherson suggested that all technical issues had been overcome.

In respect of transport it was clarified that Bloor had worked closely with Oxfordshire County Council and detailed modelling had been undertaken. Mr MacPherson outlined that £1.5m was included in the Section 106/278 agreements to improve transport links and access to the A40 together with a contribution for improved public transport provision. In total the agreements would deliver £10m worth of infrastructure and facilities.

Mr MacPherson clarified that the number of houses proposed had reduced from 1000 and was a genuinely mixed use application. It was emphasised that Bloor had a good record in delivering affordable housing and the development could be delivered quickly.

In conclusion Mr MacPherson thanked officers for their professionalism during development of the application and, if approved, Bloor would deliver a high quality development.

## Objectors' Summary- Why WODC should Refuse Carterton West

**Benefits- what benefits?** There's nothing new from the developer in this application. Crest claim many benefits, but some are only what is needed to serve this development and others are questionable. For example, employment land will provide up to 576 jobs if fully occupied, yet the development will generate a need for 1,550.

**Impacts.** Officers recommend refusal due to significant landscape impacts and physical separation from the town, which would weaken it at its heart. These are planning matters that cannot be resolved however much money is spent. Other matters are accepted with heavy caveats and conditions, which would have to be negotiated from a commercially weak position if this application were passed and relied upon for housing supply. For instance, Officers do not seem convinced by the Flood Risk Assessment.

The development not only attracts strong opposition, but has no public support. Tellingly, only 2 people wrote in to support it. All the surrounding local parishes and the CPRE oppose the development. We believe CTC no longer supports it, so approval would be against Localism.

The EA, OCC and Natural England have no major objections 'in principle', but have they considered all the issues? The EA has not noted that flood mitigation is based on dry ground conditions, yet saturation was found in key areas of the site. Despite this oversight and a massive 10 acres of ponds, the flood risk assessment still shows no betterment to surrounding areas, whatever the developer claims. The ponds are shallow for a wetlands feel, yet the MoD says they must be deep, with vertical, concrete sides and netted to avoid bird strike. OCC has written that the West is the worst option. Most of the recent serious accidents in the Carterton area have occurred to the south of the site on Alvescot Road, yet no mitigation is proposed. Do we want the disruption of upgrades to all major junctions in the town, when usage will still increase to 97% of junction capacity? Do we want traffic to rocket to 250%? Surely, we must keep the well-used, ancient footpath. Should a natural environment of ecological value be dug up for an access road, bridge, frontage houses and even a 5 acre pond, only to be levelled and replaced by a new manmade park?

**Policy.** Crest claims 'WODC has failed' to get a Plan in place, relying on the shortfall in the 5 year supply to justify the application. Clearly, even Crest knows that this harmful proposal wouldn't be passed in normal planning circumstances. The developer even argues for a higher target, claiming that past strong delivery rates were in fact 'woefully inadequate', to increase the pressure on the Council. The Housing Consultation showed strong public opposition to a high target. Even the overestimated SHMA permits a reduction for past over-delivery.

Like many developers, Crest is slow to actually build houses, with a land bank of 16 thousand plots and building only 11 hundred last year. That's a 15 year supply in the bag already, so will Crest build anything at all within 5 years?

If Carterton West were granted, the town would grow by more than 50%, way ahead of anywhere else in the District and equivalent to adding a satellite the size of Bampton outside the existing town. If Crest's approaches to land owners further west bear fruit, it will be more like another Chipping Norton, which would completely dominate Carterton.

Oxford wants to push some of its target on to other districts, but the most westerly point of the most westerly district is clearly not the right place for Oxford's overspill. It's not true that passing this application will save other areas- it would be a green light for other large, speculative applications elsewhere.

**Even without Carterton East, the current 4.8 year supply is only marginally short and crucially within the 5% buffer. Therefore, there's no need to bow to developer pressure- they should not be shaping our District. WODC can stand firm, retain control and continue to judge applications on planning merit alone, following Officers' sound advice to refuse Carterton West.**

WODC Development Control Committee 9 Oct 2014

### Verbal representation made by Richard Munro, Vice Chair Alvescot Parish Council

Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to address your committee. I am speaking on behalf of Alvescot Parish Council, the parish in which this development would be built. We are objecting to the application.

1. Our views are not just those of Alvescot: they are shared by all seven of the other parish councils and parish meetings in the area, most of whom have representatives here today.
2. Throughout the consultation on the Local Plan we have consistently made the case against a new settlement on Alvescot Down and it's really great that you have listened to the evidence – as well as the weight of public opinion – and explicitly rejected the proposal from the draft plan.
3. The developers will tell you – correctly – that because the Local Plan is not yet adopted little weight can be attached to it as a policy. Instead you must have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework with its presumption in favour of sustainable development, and to whether the District can secure its five-year supply of housing.
4. But all the evidence which led your Council to decide that so-called "Carterton West" is unsuitable for a large housing site remains relevant and it clearly demonstrates the unsustainability of the proposal. Much of that evidence was referred to in our written comments, summarised on page 3 of the report. Just to quote a few examples.
  - It is **economically** unsustainable, because it will undermine the development of Carterton town centre as a shopping destination.
  - It is **socially** unsustainable, because creation of a separate community will damage social cohesion.
  - It is **environmentally** unsustainable, because it will vastly increase traffic flows on unsuitable roads and will destroy not just the landscape but much of its ecology too.
5. We argue therefore that the proposal fails the test of sustainability and, as your officers' report rightly shows, the damage which it would inflict far outweighs the benefits which are claimed.

6. Someone at some stage this afternoon will inevitably call us a bunch of NIMBYs. I would say three things in reply.
7. Firstly we are not against development which is proportionate and appropriate to the setting, and which meets a demonstrable need. Alvescot accepts that it has a part to play in providing new homes both for local families and for new arrivals. But Alvescot is currently a parish of about 200 homes: adding more than five times that number is by no stretch of the imagination proportionate. Far from being appropriate to the setting, this proposal would destroy a much valued landscape, as your officers' report makes clear.
8. Secondly, it's not just Alvescot objecting. The proposal attracted 378 representations of objection from people living in Carterton and surrounding villages – and, incidentally, just two supportive comments. But in addition, throughout the consultation on the Local Plan, reasoned opposition to building a satellite community to the west of Carterton has been consistent from residents of Carterton itself as well as surrounding parishes. For example a petition to your Council in 2012 was signed by 93% of a representative sample of Carterton residents.
9. Thirdly, we are in good company. David Cameron is on record as saying that he would as soon see harm done to his own family as to see great big housing estates "plonked down" on the edge of villages against the wishes of local people. The so-called "Carterton West" proposal would be a prime example.
10. The developers, understandably, are bullish about their application. They have made much of the fact that the Local Plan has been delayed and their claim that you do not have a five-year supply of housing. Their comments have frequently been couched in terms which are scathing of WODC, though they may be more polite today. They will try and panic you both with the National Planning Policy Framework and by questioning your five-year supply. But be guided by your officers and by confidence in your own judgement.

We respectfully urge you to refuse planning permission. Thank you.

Development Control Meeting 8 October 2014

### **Alvescot development**

SHILTON is an ancient and beautiful village of both County and National importance.

It was a Saxon settlement, it has a Norman church, a number of medieval buildings and is a rare survival of a Monastic Grange.

Flooding and sewerage have become continuous challenges to the fabric of this unique village and previous progressive housing developments have put enormous pressure on drainage and sewerage systems, resulting in damage in the area.

An excessive build up of vehicles through the village has demanded that we have a weight restriction enforcement order and now a recommended, reduced speed limit.

Increased housing in our area without major consideration for our current Parish issues will only create enormous problems that no doubt we will all live to regret.

The Shill Brook valley is an area to be valued and protected by us all and is just as important to Shilton Parish residents as Shilton village itself and we welcome its inclusion in the Oxfordshire Conservation area target.

The Shill Brook Valley from Black Bourton in the south to Holwell and Signet in the North with all its wildlife is an area for us all to protect as we have a duty to improve life for ourselves. The applicants proposal for an Ecological Park will remove the protection and seriously harm this valuable site.

A natural environment rich in biodiversity delivers numerous benefits to our local communities including improved health and wellbeing, good property values and flood prevention.

So endorsing the proposal to say no to this particular development in Alvescot is essential and our duty.

Thank you

I am pleased to learn that Planning officer Phil Shaw has recommended that the development control committee reject the Carterton West Development proposal.

I have four points that I wish to make at this meeting.

### **Letter**

A letter was sent to David Cameron and WODC with the endorsement of well over 30 WODC town & parish councils.

This letter states:

“ ... Outside of existing urban centres, we favour a policy of sensible and **proportionate dispersal among communities**, with those communities empowered to identify suitable sites. ...”

If the democratic will of the people would be respected by WODC, we would have **ALL** the required housing numbers **integrated** into **ALL** of the WODC villages and towns that want new houses.

This would avoid the American problem of isolated ghetto suburbs where no one wants to live and empty desolate high streets.

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

This map found on the Oxfordshire County Council website, and endorsed by WODC, shows that not only is the Carterton West site situated in a **Shill Brook Conservation Target Area**, but it is also **ADJACENT to a Sites of Special Scientific Interest**.

The National Planning Policy Framework states:

“... Proposed development on land within or **outside** a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest ... should not normally be permitted. ... “

“... Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats ...”

**The Natural England Entry for the Carterton West site states:**

#### **“Operations likely to damage the special interest”**

- The changing of water levels and tables and water utilisation
- Drainage (including the use of mole, tile, tunnel or other artificial drains).
- Modification of the structure of watercourses (eg rivers, streams, springs, ditches, dykes, drains), including their banks and beds, as by re-alignment, re-grading, and dredging
- Management of aquatic and bank vegetation for drainage purposes
- **Storage and abstraction from existing water bodies and through**

### **boreholes**

- Infilling of ditches, drains, ponds, pools or marshes
- Extraction of minerals, including peat, sand and gravel, topsoil, subsoil and spoil
- Construction, removal or destruction of roads, tracks, walls, fences, hardstands, banks, ditches or other earthworks, or the laying, maintenance or removal of pipelines and cables, above or below ground.
- Storage of materials
- Erection of permanent or temporary structures, or the undertaking of engineering works, including drilling

### **REEMA Housing Density**

The MOD requires 542 existing houses and 200 new houses in REEMA Central in Carterton.

If WODC allocate only 200 private houses in REEMA Central, **that is a ridiculous 6 houses per acre!**

The REEMA site could easily house **well over twice this density** resulting in no need for either Carterton East OR Carterton West development.

Can someone please explain to me why this brownfield land in central Carterton is not being used for normal density housing?

I thought that judicious use of brownfield land was the housing mandate of David Cameron's coalition government!

### **Ground Water**

The developers have not tested the ground water conditions during a high water table event.

Had they bothered to consult with WODC's engineer **Laurence King** they would have discovered that the geological conditions and topographical elevations of the site are EXACTLY the same as Shilton village, which is just a few hundred yards upstream.

Every winter Shilton has excessive ground water pushing water jets several centimeters high through grassland, tarmac and manhole covers.

I have many photographs of this if anyone is interested.

If there is groundwater flooding in Shilton then there will be groundwater flooding in Carterton West.

Thank You.

Summary of Submission by Councillor David McFarlane

Mr McFarlane expressed his support for the officer report and the recommendations therein. The development would be an intrusion in to the Alvescot Downs and would have a detrimental impact on the area. Mr McFarlane suggested there were more suitable development sites elsewhere.

Mr McFarlane highlighted that the site had been rejected as part of the draft Local Plan in 2012. It was acknowledged that all wanted to see strong and vibrant communities but this would be an isolated development away from services and facilities.

Mr McFarlane outlined the large number of objections that had been submitted with only two letters of support being received and a previous survey where 93% of 1748 had indicated their objection was underlined.

In respect of flooding Mr McFarlane suggested that this was not adequately addressed in the application and that proposed flood alleviation may not ease problems further downstream. Mr McFarlane advised that some 275 properties were flooded in his ward area in 2007.

Mr McFarlane highlighted that all the neighbouring parishes were against the development however there was a need for appropriate, smaller scale affordable development in villages. Mr McFarlane reiterated concern regarding visual impact, flooding, poor connectivity and lack of infrastructure.

Mr McFarlane requested the committee to refuse the application in line with officer recommendation.



Summary of Submission by Mr Willcox – Crest Nicholson

Mr Willcox introduced himself and thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak. Mr Willcox indicated that the application would provide a high quality development to the west of Carterton.

Mr Willcox highlighted that all technical aspects had been addressed and there were no statutory objections. It was advised that a major benefit would be the development of an ecology park in the Shilbrook Valley. This would provide public access and protect a sensitive landscape area as well as integrating the site with Carterton.

Mr Willcox made reference to the refusal reasons and suggested there was an undue reliance on the Kirkham report and was somewhat contradictory as the west site had previously been identified as being preferable to other sites. Mr Willcox suggested that there was little difference to the Carterton East site that had been approved. It was acknowledged that a number of parish councils had objected but it was considered that there would be little impact on those communities.

Mr Willcox indicated that the recommendation was finely balanced and reiterated that some of the ecological information relied upon by officers was outdated. It was suggested that the development offered a number of opportunities.

Mr Willcox concluded by asking the committee to approve the application.