

## **Church Road Application**

I am speaking today on behalf of the Hanborough Action Group, residents concerned about the scale of development in Hanborough, concerns that are shared and feature strongly in the 100+ letters received by WODC.

Everyone recognises that Long Hanborough must grow, but grow steadily.

Today you will discuss the principle of developing up to 68 dwellings on this site.

Although it does not comply with policy H7 of the 2011 local plan the site is deemed suitable for development in the draft plan recently out for consultation. We agree the site has merits but 68 houses are too many.

The NPPF requires that any development is sustainable with benefits outweighing any adverse impacts. It is the benefits and impacts I wish to discuss.

The benefit is the possibility, not commitment, for up to 50% affordable housing. The range of housing could change and the commercial arrangements unspecified. Long Hanborough is fortunate in that 42 affordable homes have or are being built in the area in the last two years.

Turning to the impact of 68 homes, you have heard of the likely consequences on the already oversubscribed local school.

Long Hanborough has a surgery which serves patients from Hanborough and surrounding villages. This development is predicted to add around another 49 patients per GP. The consulting rooms have a 95% utilisation and there is little scope to expand. Patients have to park in local streets due to the extremely small car park. The practice is one of the objectors.

Finally there is transport. Like most rural villages the bus services are poor, non-existent at nights and on Sundays. FGW and the CLPG confirm that the railway station car park is 85%+ full on weekdays and the trains are notoriously crowded, facts which do not encourage commuting by rail.

Traffic on the A4095 is over capacity at peak hours, with slow moving lines of cars through the village. This is acknowledged by the applicant who undertook a traffic survey for a 7 day period that began in a week that included a bank holiday when traffic would be lighter than normal.

Using their optimistic data they predict that the development would increase the traffic by 1.7% at peak times. Their case is that this development would have a negligible impact on an already unsatisfactory situation. "It's already unacceptable so it doesn't matter if it's made worse."

The applicants have failed to address any of these concerns or put forward any mitigation measures. Reading their application the overall impression is that it is based on a generic document.

All they say is that “the development will provide an opportunity to create, support and enhance local facilities and service provision.” In other words – we create the problem, you solve it.

The adverse impacts on local services, the school and surgery, far outweigh the uncertain benefit of affordable housing. 68 homes is too large a development on this site and the application should be refused.

## Appendix B

### 14/1102/P/OP

My update is about the capacity of Hanborough's primary school and the possibility of a land swap to enable expansion. District officers have optimistically described this matter as being "under active negotiation."

However, two stumbling blocks have arisen: first, County officers want a six times larger increase in capacity than would be necessary to accommodate the primary aged children expected to be living in the new houses: 105 new spaces for 17 pupils. This excessive "future proofing" assumes planning permission will soon be given for hundreds more houses in Hanborough. It would necessitate a substantial new building, rather than simply replacing the temporary huts with a block that includes an extra room.

Secondly, the patch of grassland adjacent to the school is far too small to compensate for the existing grassed play space that would be lost to a substantial new building. Hence, County officers want twice, or preferably four times, the patch of Parish leisure space that was originally under discussion. This would certainly remove an enclosure with privately donated play equipment for young children; and possibly the parish tennis courts, which are about to be refurbished for £48K.

Such a sacrifice of parish leisure space would be highly controversial, as it is heavily used, particularly in the hour after school finishes. It provides an opportunity for parents to meet while their younger children play on equipment in the enclosure and their elder children kick a ball around on the grass. Moving this leisure area to the eastern half of Corpus Christi's land would mean mothers and infants having to go across the football and cricket pitches, away from the village centre.

The leisure space in question is not within the Parish Council's gift, despite the fact that we hold the deeds. Management of this land has been given to a charitable trust, Hanborough Playing Fields Association. Their constitution requires that they consult residents about land disposal. Members of the Planning Committee will know from residents' responses to the planning applications on today's agenda that no land swap proposal is likely to be endorsed.

Negotiations might have progressed further in the context of a smaller development. The Parish Council regrets that the applicant did not submit a proposal for far fewer houses. We, and the School, wish to encourage some parents to bring and fetch their children via the School's back gate, parking outside the Village Hall. Traffic from 68 houses risks deterring parents from adopting this safety measure; i.e. using Church Road and Roosevelt Road instead of the front entrance in Riely Close.

Land to the East of Church Road, Long Hanborough (14/1102/P/OP)

Committee Speech 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2014

Thank you Chairman and Members of the Committee.

My name is James Stewart-Irvine of Savills Planning in Oxford.

We act for Corpus Christi College which is both the landowner and applicant for the proposal for residential development on land at Church Road in Long Hanborough.

I wish to thank Mr. Shaw for his comprehensive report which sets out the key issues to be resolved relating to this planning application.

We support the recommendation to defer consideration of the application as we accept there are a number of outstanding matters to resolve before this proposal can be appropriately determined, of which the capacity of the primary school is the most significant.

Whilst the education authority has not raised an objection to these proposals the County Council is seeking additional land on which to expand the school to a 1.5 form entry.

The extent of built development around the site of the school means it can only expand on land to the south which includes an existing play area and adjoining open space.

The land is owned by the Parish Council and managed by the Hanborough Playing Fields Association.

We have offered to provide land to extend the existing recreation ground to the south on land owned by the applicant. This will help to facilitate the relocation of the existing recreational facilities and to extend the area of the recreation ground to allow a larger site for the school.

We met Ken Field the Chairman of the PFA last week after the Committee site visit and we discussed our proposal. We have requested a meeting to discuss the potential to extend the recreation ground as part of the Section 106 planning obligation.

As landowner and applicant Corpus Christi wishes to ensure that the proposed development has a high quality of architectural design and also provides for a range of planning benefits such as affordable housing to meet local housing needs and to improve community facilities.

The Council's strategic housing land availability assessment or SHLAA identifies this site as the only site for dwellings and estimates a capacity for some 70 dwellings. Our application is for up to 68 dwellings.

The College wishes to ensure that the proposed development reflects the architectural character of the village and makes a positive contribution to Long Hanborough.

We understand the concerns raised here today by the Parish Council and Mr. Brooks and as such we look forward to continuing to work with Mr. Shaw and his colleagues to resolve these outstanding issues.

James Stewart-Irvine (Savills)

3<sup>rd</sup> November 2014

## **Appendix D**

### **Summary of Submission by Mr Stephen Simkins – West Waddy ADP**

Mr Simkins introduced himself and thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to speak.

Mr Simkins clarified that the application was for amendments to an extant permission and therefore the principle of development was not in question.

Mr Simkins advised that the proposal was for the removal of the garage element which was to be replaced with a bedroom suite. It was clarified that the materials proposed was now timber with a slate roof for the front façade which was suitable materials for the location. Mr Simkins suggested there was no detrimental impact on neighbours and the scale, the footprint was less than the previous application, was appropriate.

Finally Mr Simkins suggested that the proposed alterations would not have a detrimental impact on the Conservation area.

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

## **Witney Road Application**

Over 400 people have written individual, not pro-forma, letters to object to this application which seeks outline planning permission to build 169 houses on this site.

The site judged “not suitable” in the present WODC draft plan. The applicant admits that it contravenes policy H7 of the 2011 Plan and looks to the NPPF with its “presumption in favour” unless adverse impacts outweigh the benefits.

The applicant identifies the main benefits to be affordable housing and the source of capital to maintain Blenheim Palace.

I have already spoken about the affordable homes situation in Long Hanborough. In common with the previous application there is no firm commitment to making around 50% of the homes affordable and no firm details about the homes themselves.

Regarding the provision of capital to finance the maintenance burden of Blenheim Palace, nothing is said about how the money will be used. Any monies raised in this way should not simply release other funds held by Blenheim to be used for purposes not necessarily connected with the world heritage site.

Thus the benefits are uncertain.

The major impacts are clear cut. You have already heard about the school situation. It is over-subscribed and has limited scope to expand.

In my previous address I spoke about the surgery, the lack of potential to expand and the parking issues. Suffice it to say, this scheme is estimated to add a further 123 patients to the list of each GP.

Traffic is the major issue. OCC data points to over 12000 vehicles using the A4095 each day and it is a primary route for emergency vehicles. Lines of slow moving traffic at peak times are common. Unlike OCC and the recent transport study in support of the Church Road development, the applicant asserts that the A4095 operates and will continue to operate within capacity.

Their consultants have disputed industry standard base data and “recalibrated” it to model the effect of the development on traffic congestion.

There are serious inconsistencies between this study and the Church Road findings.

The applicant predicts that the 169 homes will produce 690 vehicle movements on weekdays in the 12h period beginning 07.00. The Church Road study predicted that its 68 home would, in the same period produce 443 vehicle movements. Surely if one builds two and a half times more homes you will get around two and a half times more traffic, that is 1100 vehicles not the 690 estimated by the applicant. OCC Highways have objected.

The one thing certain about modelling predictions is that they are never accurate. They can go away and remodel and remodel but the evidence is that there is already a traffic problem in Long Hanborough and 169 homes will make it worse.

The potential impact on schools, the surgery and road traffic far outweighs the benefits. It is hard to see how the traffic problem can be solved and the site has been classified as "not suitable." The application should be refused.



**14/1234/P/OP**

My update about the capacity of Hanborough's primary school and the possibility of a land swap to enable expansion has been detailed in response to planning application 14/1102/P/OP. Here, I shall just make a further comment, on Section 106 funding. The amount proposed, £625,428, would be nowhere near sufficient to pay for the 105 extra pupil spaces wanted by County officers (approximately half of this additional capacity would be filled by the expected pupil generation from 169 houses).

Even if the developer offered to contribute the full cost, the land for such an expansion is unlikely to become available. Residents are entitled to be consulted on the disposal of the relevant tranche of land adjacent to the school, and they have already indicated their opposition to yielding green space to make way for a large scale housing development. West Waddy's addendum of 31st October, which says in paragraph 5.24 that County officers clearly believe "that the capacity issue is capable of resolution" subject to payment of a contribution, is therefore misleading.

The Parish Council supports the hundreds of residents who have declared their opposition to this development, on the following grounds:

- The site is not considered suitable for development under the Council's own housing policies, e.g. BE1, BE2, BE3, NE3 and NE6, and site assessments.
- The site is isolated and not integrated with the existing village.
- There is a lack of capacity in key infrastructure to serve the new development, including the GP surgery. West Waddy's claim that they have identified a feasible means of increasing the surgery's capacity in addendum paragraphs 5.2 to 5.4 is flatly refuted by the GPs (see Dr Rust's letter of 31<sup>st</sup> October).
- The development would compromise the separation of Long Hanborough and Freeland, harming the local landscape character. West Waddy's addendum paragraph 5.6 describes a gap of 250m as more "substantial" than a prospective gap of 150m between Brize Norton and East Carterton, but makes no case for a legitimate comparison of the different sites.
- There are significant concerns regarding traffic impact and how this has been assessed. The "recalibrated" traffic assessment model neither appears to represent the reality drivers, cyclists and pedestrians experience daily, nor is it consistent with a parallel survey by Cole Easdon. The Parish Council finds it implausible for the applicant to assert "no adverse impact in terms of delay and queuing," given the circumstances of existing delay and queuing that obtain in Hanborough.
- The suggested improvements to local infrastructure and supporting the maintenance of Blenheim Estate are not secured; they are unsubstantiated.

The Parish Council has identified severe adverse impacts that would outweigh the benefits identified by the applicant, and believes it can only be concluded that the proposal does not represent sustainable development under the terms of local and national planning policy.

## Appendix G

### Summary of Submission by Mr John Ashton – West Waddy ADP

Mr Ashton introduced himself and thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to speak.

Mr Ashton highlighted that the application was for up to 169 dwellings, was a mixture of sizes and all were two storey. It was emphasised that there would be 25% of open space which was a significant proportion of the site. Mr Ashton advised that the separation distance to Freeland was 250 metres.

Mr Ashton detailed the site to the sub-committee and that it was bounded by the A4095 to the north, properties to the east and open countryside to the south and west. It was indicated that to the west the site went no further than the existing Old Police House.

Mr Ashton suggested it was a sustainable location offering access to good transport links, employment and facilities such as pubs. Clarification was given that 83 affordable homes, of various sizes, were proposed and improved pedestrian/cycle access would be provided.

Mr Ashton highlighted that £1.3m was proposed in the legal agreement towards education provision, there would be improved flood mitigation and money would be ring fenced for the protection of Blenheim.

Finally Mr Ashton suggested that the council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply and as such there was no up to date housing policy and the application needed to be determined against the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

**Professor Gary Ford**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to your committee. I, my wife, teenage daughter and 22 year old son with Downs Syndrome purchased 15A Cadogan Park two months ago. We will be moving into the property when renovation work is complete next year. We would not have purchased the property if we were aware that the football club had plans to put in place 15 m high floodlights. I am also speaking on behalf of my neighbours Peter Luff and Anumod Gujral who are long standing residents in the area who also live adjacent to the land where the football pitch is located.

I have worked in the garden of our house over the autumn weekends and had the opportunity to witness a number of football matches that have taken place on Saturdays.

Our objections submitted in writing to the committee are based on 4 grounds.

First the **adverse visual impact** on the residential environment with 6 floodlights that are the height of a four storey building. No other man made structure is this high within the area and we do not believe any application for a 4 storey building would be approved.

Second the development will result in significant **light pollution** directly into our gardens and properties. The existing leylandii trees of 3-4 metre height and taller deciduous trees, which have no leaves in the autumn and winter months, will not block the light pollution through our windows that face the grounds and into our gardens. Encroachment into our property's space was considered a key reason why the planning application for floodlights made 5 years ago was rejected. The application refers to permission for floodlights at Witney Rugby Club but this is an inappropriate comparison as that ground is surrounded by fields.

Third the development will result in a major increase in **noise** during weekday and weekend evenings both from the match players and spectators who could number over 200 for a cup game moving in and out of the site. The adult matches I have witnessed have always been accompanied by shouting and swearing from the players. The noise and swearing can be avoided by families at weekends by leaving ones property but not in the evenings particularly during the week.

Fourth we consider approval of the floodlights will lead to **future development** on the site with fencing off of the development to protect the floodlights and applications for stadium seating, and a larger club room. Use of the site is likely to be much greater than that stated or planned with the pitch leased to other teams from outside Woodstock. We understand that the club room was built without formal planning permission. The development will lead to less access of local residents and young people to use the land, which in the past was entirely open to the people of Woodstock. Young school lads who wish to play recreational football are currently being moved off the pitch by the football club members and are using the newly built basketball court by the lawn tennis club to play football.

Five years ago your committee unanimously rejected the application for floodlights after a site visit because of the impact it would have on residents. In the intervening years nothing has changed that requires that decision to be changed.

Planning application for floodlights at New Road ground.

Chairman and Committee members.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity of speaking in support of the application for floodlights at the New Road ground, Woodstock, which has been recommended for approval by your planning department and also by Woodstock Town Council at their meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup>. of October.

The football Club that was formed over 100 years ago has always been located at New Road. The club recently achieved its highest ever position, playing in the Premier Division of the Hellenic League and they also reached the later rounds of the Football Association Vase, which is the premier cup completion for amateur teams. However, due to the leagues rule that premier league sides must have floodlight facilities, the club was eventually forced to instigate its own relegation to Hellenic Division One West. This was despite attempting to play their home games at Bicester, Abingdon and North Leigh. This arrangement was extremely costly and could not be maintained.

As confirmed in a letter from the General manager of the Hellenic League, if the club does not have floodlight facilities by the end of March 12015 they will be omitted from the league. The Youth team has already been disbanded due to a requirement for them to be able to accommodate mid-week evening matches. If the club were confined to play in a lesser league or even disband it would be ironic because in the Winter 2012 issue of the West Oxfordshire D.C. newsletter for residents the Leader of the Council wrote '*We hope that the legacy of the Olympics can go on both nationally and locally, and our Council will continue to support and promote local sporting opportunities*'. With regards to this the club are currently in discussions with an organisation for the ground to be used by teams consisting of youths, ladies and people with disabilities and learning difficulties.

The application being considered is similar to a previous submission with one major amendment. The locations of the playing area and lights have been moved 6 metres to the East. This will further reduce any impact on all of the adjacent properties. The revision ensures that the lowest level of 'light spill' of 2 Lux will not reach any of the adjacent residential buildings, including those on Cadogan Park.

The lighting scheme has been design by an experienced specialist company using the very latest technology which is devised to eliminate upward lighting and glare and also minimise any overspill from the playing area.

**The use of the floodlights would be limited. They would not be used for training purposes. They would be used on Saturday afternoons until 5.00pm during the winter months and approximately once every fortnight for evening matches. These matches will finish at approximately 9.20pm for a league game or 10.00pm if a cup game goes to extra time. Due to the cost for the club, the lights will be switched off immediately games are completed.**

**It is hoped that the revised application will be favourably received and that the Football Club can develop its facilities and continue to provide a valid service for the local community.**