

## Appendix A

- The application before you today is for the erection of 77 dwellings and associated infrastructure on land otherwise known as Eynsham Garden Centre.
- The proposal includes a good mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed properties. 50% of these will be affordable.
- The proposal also includes 2,700 sq meters of public open space and the developer agrees to pay all reasonable s106 requests.
- The scheme makes effective use of previously developed land in a highly sustainable location.
- Eynsham is identified in both the adopted and emerging Local Plans as a “*rural service centre*” offering a good range of local services and bus and cycle links into Oxford and Witney.
- Significant weight needs to be given in the planning balance to the issue of housing needs as the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply.
- The application site is deliverable within a 5 year period. It is available now; it is suitable and is in a sustainable location.
- There is no policy justification for requiring the development of the application site to be considered together with other land on the west side of Eynsham. Without such a policy basis, the current planning application must be considered on its own merits.
- Nevertheless, it is important to note that the current proposal does not inhibit the potential development of other land to the west of Eynsham.
- If other land on the west side of Eynsham is promoted for development, a new junction onto the A40 would be best located further to the west and outside of the application site.
- The limited capacity of Eynsham Primary School is noted. However, school capacity is not a valid reason to refuse planning permission, as numerous appeal decisions confirm. Nevertheless, appropriate s106 contributions will be made by the developer.
- We consider that the proposed development of the site is fully in accordance with the principles laid down in the NPPF and we respectfully request that you look favourably upon this planning application before you today.

PLANNING APPLICATION 15/01184/FUL

WODC Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee, 22 June 2015

Comments from Beth F Wood

Referring to Section 5: The Planning Assessment

5.1 These proposals include accommodation with 4 bedrooms, but is there a need for these? In the previous application just discussed the Head of Housing for WODC says there are only 9 households currently in need of 4-bed houses for sustainable housing, as against 270 for smaller properties. In the 2 previous applications quoted in 5.4 the extent of need for the Learning Disabled was proven yet it was still rejected. Is there any real need for these houses and apartments?

5.4 Only 2 previous planning applications are referred to here – both of which were refused. However there have been SIX previous applications, ALL of which have been refused, for the same reasons as quoted here. If the Council were to permit this development, there would have to be a very strong reason for deciding that the reasons for all 6 previous refusals are not still valid. I can see no reason for any change of heart or mind in this document.

This proposal would also result in ‘the partial loss of one of the few remaining open spaces; the appearance would also change from an agricultural paddock to an urban, residential development; the works would also impact detrimentally on the wall and tree belt and the unspoilt appearance of the frontage generally; in this case there is no proven need for the development, unlike the previous 2 applications.

The objections made by the Parish Council in particular must all be fully addressed.

[1981 – no ref available – Refused

1997 W97/1466 Refused

W97/1467 Refused

2007 07/1024/P/FP Refused

2008 08/1341/P/FP Refused

08/1504/P/FP Refused]

5.8 This is neither infilling nor rounding off. It WILL have a harmful impact on existing occupants, particularly those in the cottages facing the development; it does not protect, let alone conserve, the local landscape – it removes landscape; it involves the loss of an area of open space which makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

This proposed development is within your own designated conservation area. Eynsham is a particularly dense settlement and the paddock is one of the very few remaining open spaces remaining in this conservation area.

Safe vehicular access is questionable, given there are more parked cars now than in previous years, making the road single track and with a semi-blind bend. However pedestrian safety is not considered. There is NO footpath nor grass verge at that side of the road and visibility for crossing the road is not always clear because of the parked vehicles and the speed at which vehicles travel here.

5.12; 5.20; 5.24; 5.25; 5.27      The proposed orchard

While noting that there would be a requirement for a legal agreement on this, it is not a part of the current application.

It is NOT to be for the benefit of the community at large. It is proposed that it should be available only for a small, as yet not defined, group of people who will rent it for a period of 20 years if the group lasts that long, while it remains in the ownership of the applicant, who could at some point decide to develop the orchard land too.

I think far too much is being made of this proposed orchard which may never even emerge.

5.13 and 5.15

This is quite a large-scale development for a small site, I agree, and in terms of height the land it would be built on is higher than that on the opposite side of Cassington Road which would result in the taller buildings opposite cottages there being towered over by the new buildings. Tree cover is almost entirely deciduous, so a visual barrier is only there for 4 months of the year in effect. I can't agree that there would be very little adverse impact on these cottages. (I do live in one of them.) There will also be light, noise and increased exhaust fume pollution for adjacent buildings, including the listed buildings mentioned.

Overall I think the onus is on the Council to provide a very strong case indeed for supporting this application in the light of so many previous refusals, given the need for such a development – at such a cost to the area and the conservation area in particular – is so weak in this application, compared with the 2 quoted in this document, and that all of the previous reasons for refusal of the 6 previous six applications remain.

## Appendix C

Mr Chopping advised that the prospective developers, Oxford Homes, were a local family company experienced in development in conservation areas. He made reference to awards and recognition received by the company and indicated that they were excited and enthused by the prospect of delivering this project which provided a sympathetic design led solution which would complement the village and reflect the local vernacular. Both the developers and the landowner were proud of the scheme and the proposal to create a community orchard which would secure this parcel of land for future generations, protecting the archaeology under the site and the setting of the adjacent listed building.

Mr Slater indicated that the scheme differed from earlier proposals in that it offered a reduced density and footprint, a new access and repairs to the existing boundary wall. The provision of the community orchard would also protect an area of open land for community use. The mix of units included some smaller properties and the design reflected existing local buildings.

The developers had agreed, in principle, to meeting the requested section 106 contributions to the parish council and to the district in lieu of affordable housing. Given the high quality and cost of the development, contributions towards affordable housing of up to £5,000 per unit were proposed.

Mr Slater indicated that the developers had engaged with the Council's officers to create a high quality scheme with a package of local benefits.