

ADDRESS TO LOWLANDS PLANNING COMMITTEE
160 HOUSES OFF NEW ROAD, BAMPTON

I sat here 2 months ago to speak against the application to build 127 houses off Aston Road Bampton. The application was refused by yourselves nem con. I am now very anxious to speak against this application for 160 houses off New Road Bampton as I believe that if it is granted the previous applicants will appeal successfully with dire consequences for Bampton but also the whole of West Oxfordshire.

To my mind the whole tenor of the Planning Officer's report seems less of a plan, more a panic response to the St Albans District Council case. If you adopt the argument of the Planning Officer you will end up having to pass application after application until you have made up the 5 year housing supply total. The process will depend on the timing of the application before this Committee only and the legacy it will leave through out West Oxfordshire let alone Bampton will be dreadful. ~~Para-~~ 6.30 is an appalling capitulation. AND IT IS ALL UNNECESSARY.

Why do we need to adopt as stated in para 6.28 DCLG statistical projections for households which projections make no allowance for local planning, environmental, social or economic issues? Let's wait for SHMA which is purpose designed and the allocation decided following it. This should take into account the failed A40. Also I believe a groundswell is building to soften the worst aspects of NPPF and in particular to highlight in the social aspect of the definition of sustainability the importance of community life.

The St Albans case is not all bad news. Para 31 of the Court of Appeal judgement:

There seemed to be some suggestion by Hunston (they were the developers) in the course of argument that a local planning authority, which did not produce a local plan as rapidly as it should, would only have itself to blame if the objectively-assessed housing need figures produced a shortfall and led to permission being granted on protected land, such as Green Belt, when that would not have happened otherwise. That is not a proper approach. Planning decisions are ones to be arrived at in the public interest, balancing all the relevant factors and are not to be used as some form of sanction on local councils. It is the community which may suffer from a bad decision, not just the local council or its officers. Hear! Hear!

Turning now to consider Bampton and this application specifically. I find it very hard to understand the argument of the Planning Officer in para 6.50. It must be common ground that the last Inspector to review the sustainability or otherwise of Bampton gave a very strong guide it was not a sustainable site for large-scale development. I have heard no-one in Bampton argue as the Officer suggests that there should be no development in Bampton. I agree with the Officer that the thrust of the NPPF is to boost housing supply but only through sustainable development. There is not the slightest suggestion in the whole NPPF that houses can and should be built which are not sustainable, quite the reverse. Sustainability or lack of it in Bampton has not changed since the Inspector reported, if anything it has got worse.

Flooding is a prime concern. It is treated far too light-heartedly. Councillors and officers need to be reminded that nearly two hundred houses flooded in Bampton in 2007 with financial consequences that exist to-day in the insurance market. It is hubristic in the extreme to believe that man-made constructs will not go wrong in the face once in a hundred year events which appear to occur rather biblically every seven years.

In the case of the Aston Road development the Officer reported in para 7.73 "The scale of the development is considered likely to prove difficult to assimilate and is likely to give rise to unsustainable travel patterns." How come that two months later the same does not apply for an estate 30% greater in size. It makes no sense.

Neither does the recommendation to grant permission to-day. Please refuse it for the sake of the people of Bampton who do not want it.

Appendix B

Address to Planning Committee re Planning Application 13/1465/P/OP New Road - Feb 17 2014

Thank you for allowing Bampton Parish Council to put its point of view. We have consulted widely and are confident our remarks represent the majority view in the village.

We remain opposed to the New Road application on the grounds that such a large development will completely change the nature of the village and is not sustainable in a number of key areas. It is contrary to the core principle of the NPPF, going beyond the limits of the built up area of Bampton into open countryside, extending the boundary of the village. The introduction of houses, access roads and associated domestic paraphernalia will urbanise the site and erode the rural character and environment of this part of Bampton.

Further, the NPPF only supports sustainable economic growth - there are no local industries and no prospect of new jobs in Bampton. We maintain that this development will bring little if any economic benefit to the village.

Other local infrastructure is also under pressure. The school does not have enough places, nor does the surgery.

As for housing need, our surveys and enquiries have demonstrated that there is limited need for social housing when considering only those who have a need *and* a connection to Bampton (i.e. Bampton's own affordable housing survey, undertaken in 2012, showed only 23 people wanted housing in Bampton.

Flooding is also a very real issue. The developers suggested plans for attenuation ponds and bund do not include how these would be maintained. The Parish Council has no resources to do so and if the bund failed, Bampton would flood yet again.

The Parish Council therefore asks the Committee defer their decision until after a site visit. This will allow the Members to see for themselves how the development will affect the open countryside, flood risk, the local narrow road structure and the heart of the village, where the main services are located and parking is at a premium.

On the last point, we are surprised at the developers' Travel Plan section (4.19) and wonder how cycle storage, a discount for walking clothes, publicity and a 4 week bus pass for new residents will help. The fact is most people will drive, even if they are wearing discounted walking clothes.

As for the 106 provisions - it should be noted that such money will not necessarily be targeted at Bampton itself. For example, how will Bampton benefit from the £22,000 for police cameras or the £40,000 earmarked for Oxfordshire libraries in general? Left to Oxfordshire County Council, Bampton would have no library, as all of its funding comes from donations and the Parish Council. This also applies to the Post Office - so the facilities mentioned in the plan are by no means assured.

New Road has repeatedly been identified as NOT suitable for new houses. The last local plan inspector said as much, commenting that Bampton was unsuitable for further development. He went on to say it 'flies in the face of all the evidence presented to the enquiry about the sustainability of Bampton.' Nothing has changed since then.

Not only has the site never been designated in any plan but it was specifically dismissed by Local Plan Inspectors in 1997 and again in 2006. WODC's own draft Local Plan 2011 identified land on the fringes as 'generally unsuitable for new housing'. Again, nothing has changed.

We are puzzled how the arguments that prevailed against Aston Road being accepted seem to count for nothing when it comes to New Road - which is just a few hundred yards away. In our view, all large developments in Bampton are similarly unsustainable and we are further concerned that if this is granted it will set a precedent so that the Aston Road application for 127 houses will also be accepted.

The Parish Council is not against development. It recognises the need for new houses. What it does oppose is large developments like this.

Appendix C

Chair – thank you for the opportunity to address the committee.

My name is Steve Louth.

I am chartered town planner and I am here today to represent Richborough Estates

Firstly I would like to thank officer's for their hard work and assistance for the last 8 month and we are really pleased to receive a recommendation of approval.

The officer's report deals with some of the key issues such as the housing land supply and the status of the SHMA which I won't go into here, but we would like to take the opportunity to talk you through how we have arrived at the layout plan in front of you.

The application is in outline form for up to 160 dwellings with all matters other than access reserved for subsequent approval. Notwithstanding this, the layout plan reflects the extensive consultation which been undertaken with officers both pre and post submission of the application.

As a direct result of the consultation process - a number of changes have made been made. For example

1. The overall number of units has been reduced, we have incorporated bungalows and we have lengthened the gardens along the western boundary to safeguard the amenity of existing residents,
2. We have incorporated a pedestrian link at the rear of the site to provide direct and safe access to Bampton C of E Primary School,
3. We have revised the masterplan to show the retention of the hedgerow to New Road
4. And from highway perspective on-street parking has been made throughout the site to ensure that there is no overspill onto New Road and no obstruction for refuse vehicle.

There are many other examples, but the point I am really trying to make is that we are not the kind of developer to submit an application without speaking to - and listening to - those that are impacted by the development.

In terms of the comments raised about the impact of development on the character of the area, detailed design matters will be assessed at reserved matters stage, however, we have sought to

minimise the density of development on site - particularly around the periphery to create a soft landscape edge.

We have significantly overprovided POS and we have limited development to just 2 storeys in height. The site is located outside the boundary of the Conservation Area and will therefore not impact on the core of the village or the setting of any listed buildings.

If you agree that some growth is required in Bampton, then we consider it to be a logical rounding off the village and this was certainly reflected in the Council's most recent Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

In terms of local infrastructure, we are pleased to confirm that that key items such as the classroom extension at the Primary school (which itself is a product of ongoing negotiations with those directly impacted by the development), improvements to the local bus service (which is currently under threat) and the extensive surface water mitigation measures as set out in the FRA will be implemented prior to the commencement of development on site.

With regard to flood risk, the site is located in flood zone 1 - outside of the defined floodplain - however, we are aware of recent flood events, not to mention the on-going problems throughout the UK at the moment.

Our proposal seeks to reduce surface water run-off and this will be achieved through the creation of a swale and over-sized attenuation basin which you will see adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

Furthermore, on the request of your officer's, we have also agreed to reinstate the ditches beyond the boundary of the application site and create a bund to the north of the village, therefore providing significant flood risk betterment for the wider area.

Both the Environment Agency and Engineers at the District Council have reviewed the proposals and, subject to detailed design matters are supportive of the measures proposed.

Stuart Nelmes is here with me today, our flood risk consultant from BWB along with Mike Jones from Richborough Estates, so if there are any points of clarification sought then we would be happy to expand on this issue.

Thank you

14/0016/P/FP Marriotts Stadium, Downs Road, Curbridge

Summary of Submission By Mr Geoff Holmes

Mr Holmes advised that the application had been submitted as the prospective users of the stadium, London Welsh, required a ground capable of accommodating 10,000 persons, 6,000 of whom would be seated, to comply with the Rugby Union Professional Game Board requirements for the 2014/2015 season commencing in September.

The Club had to be in a position to show the Board that it was in a position to put the necessary arrangements in place by the end of February hence the timescale for determination of the application was tight.

In recognition of the concerns expressed in relation to traffic management and car parking, the applicants had submitted a detailed traffic management statement prepared in consultation with the Highway Authority and were happy to provide any further information necessary.

A spectator capacity of 10,000 could be accommodated and Mr Holmes confirmed that the applicants were willing to meet the costs associated with making a Traffic Regulation Order to prohibit parking on Downs Road on match days. However, given the time constraints, he requested that this requirement be specified by way of a condition rather than a unilateral legal agreement.

Appendix E

14/0005/P/RM Beaumont House, Eynsham Road, Sutton

Summary of Submission By Mr Michael Orr

Mr Orr invited Members to support the Officer recommendation of conditional approval. He advised that the development was to consist of 10 dwellings; a terrace of three and seven detached properties.

The application followed the principles set down in the outline consent and provided ample green space and a footpath link through the site. The proposals had been developed in consultation with the Council's Officers in order to create a layout compatible to the outline application.

It was proposed that traditional, high quality materials would be employed in the construction and the garages were to be set-back so as to minimise their impact upon the street scene.

Appendix F

Lowlands Planning Committee – 17th February 2014-02-17 Planning Application 14/0071/P/F/FP - Land adjacent to Glebe Cottage.

The government now wants us to plan for our retirement, not only paying into our pension pot, but making major decisions on”

How we want to live out our retirement years;
Where we live; and
How we are going to look after ourselves,

not necessity when we are ill, but when we start to ache a bit, when we slow down, when our mobility decreases. Who will get the shopping for us, clean the house, who will we have a cup of coffee or a meal with, (without having to specifically arrange it) and how are we going to stay on top of the maintenance and heating cost of our large family home, that we now rattle around in.

As an older person, it might be that you live in a rural environment, and everyone is telling you that it is best to move to town where you can walk to the shops; but actually I want to stay in the country, where I have lived all my life, in a calm and peaceful environment

You might also be told, that it will be best if you go and live on a larger development with people around you, a mix of age groups, it will be good for you, keep you young – but actually I don't want to live in a busy, noise family orientated environment.

You might have your family around you, as my client does, so you think I don't have to worry about being looked after as I age, my family will do it for me, but that's not how my client wants to live his life.

My client has asked himself these questions, and come to decision on how he wishes to live out his older years. If he were to move from his large family home, there are no other housing type that would match his expectations, it would be very difficult to remain in the countryside, where he has lived for almost all his life.

The development in front of you today will provide 4 homes within a lovely setting specifically for 4 couples or single people over the age of 60. The Communal hub provides an area for the community to come together, to cook, watch a film, or organise for themselves preventative care such as, monthly chiropody, physio, doctors visits.

Unlike co-housing where residents share communal facilities such as the kitchen, and will often cook and eat together, in this unique setting, homeowners are able to live completely independently of each other; the amount of interaction will be up to each individual person.

Older people who chose to live in this development accept, that as they age their lives will change, who wish by their own means, to maintain their independent lifestyle as long as possible. They also accept that they will not be able to do this on their own, and in choosing to live in one of the dwellings, will seek to assist in helping and at times caring, for the other residents in the group, as they will for them.

In this instance, the residents will be buying into a lifestyle choice; one that allows them to take control of their own lives as they age.

This housing model put forward to you today seeks to promote a different approach to older peoples housing. I do hope that you are able to approve the application.