

**Application to Develop Land East of Church Road Long Hanborough**

**14/1102/P/OP**

Over 150 people have previously objected and not one person has withdrawn their objection as a result of this second amendment.

By now members will be fully aware of local concerns regarding traffic, the site, the school, the playgroup and the surgery. I do not intend to repeat previous arguments but simply comment on the content of this latest amendment.

The applicant's claim that moving the playgroup to the site will not increase rush hour traffic entering from and exiting onto the narrow Church Road is disputed. A simple calculation using the applicant's data predicts that peak hour traffic will increase by 25%.

I cannot comment on the adequacy of the applicant's undertakings regarding the surgery and OCC, simply to question whether the arrangements are satisfactory, will have no adverse impact on present residents and have been agreed by all parties?

It is now proposed that the number of dwellings be reduced from sixty four to fifty and the officer's report states that fifty is acceptable to local members. When this application was last considered by Uplands, the minutes show fifty was a figure introduced by the responsible officer to support his argument that it would hard to demonstrate a reduction in impact should the number of dwellings be reduced from 64 to 50.

Fifty was used for purely illustrative purposes and had no background justification. Hanborough Parish Council are probably most in touch with the community and their submission at that meeting stated that 40 dwellings would be acceptable. Their opinion has been totally ignored by officers.

At this point, when the officers show you the site map, I would draw your attention to its boundaries. In particular the eastern boundary extends beyond the existing boundary line of gardens in Pinsley Road. If this boundary were to be brought into line it is possible that the number of dwellings would have to be reduced to something approaching the Parish Council figure.

Notwithstanding this point, many residents are concerned about developing this farmland. Building here will reduce the spatial buffer between Long and Church Hanborough.

Finally, the reduction in the number of dwellings has been achieved SOLELY at the expense of the number of affordable homes. While the number of private homes is unchanged, the number of affordable homes has been reduced by 14.

Is this the message that WODC wishes to send to developers about how planning policy will be implemented and what is acceptable?

The applicants will argue that their amendment addresses local concerns but by simply reducing the number of affordable homes they have made the scheme more profitable.

Any further reduction in the total number of homes, achieved by reducing the number of private homes, will certainly be opposed by the applicant on the basis of financial viability. Viability should be secondary to producing a development that integrates with the village and does not simply become a satellite dormitory settlement. If developers cannot get their sums to add up then so be it.

Please reject this application based on the size of the development and the impact on the community, its encroachment into open countryside and the erosion of the spatial gap between Long and Church Hanborough.

Policies BE2, BE4 and H7 of the adopted local plan and policies H2, OS1 and OS2 of the emerging plan apply.

Hanborough Parish Council feels unable to withdraw its objection to this proposal at this time. When this application was last heard by the Planning Committee it was resolved to defer any decision pending further negotiation and clarification of certain matters. Unfortunately we still feel that the amended application lacks detail on several important matters such as:

- the level and impact of additional traffic generated by the development and the movement of the pre-school.
- And whether the amount of money offered to the Eynsham Medical Group will be sufficient for them to address their need for further space.

We have also received representations from several parishioners about the lack of adequate consultation on this amended application. No notifications regarding this application were posted to affected neighbours. The original notice on the site contained the wrong deadline for submissions. Even though the deadline for submissions on the amended notice is the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April the Planning Officer has confirmed that his report and recommendation was completed before the 10<sup>th</sup> of April. There would therefore appear to be little point in objecting if the Planning Officer's decision on his recommendation had already been made.

The reduction in house numbers in this application is welcomed as a step in the right direction, but we would feel more comfortable if the numbers were further reduced to forty which has always been the Parish Council's preferred position. Forty houses would generate a number of new pupils and residents that could be better accommodated by the Manor School, doctors surgery and other services in the village.

The applicants mention in their submission the economic viability of the site, but the number of houses for sale on the open market on the site has not reduced. We would therefore contend that a further reduction from 50 to 40 would not impact negatively on its viability if that reduction were also in the number of affordable houses.

There is considerable disquiet in the Parish over the allocation of the affordable houses that are currently under construction and those recently completed. According to the applicants there are over 250 people on the housing waiting list with a connection to the Parish. Having analysed WODC's own figures the Parish Council has concluded that the number of people with a connection just with Long Hanborough who have sufficient points to qualify for a house, and would want to take that offer up could be as low as 4.

We are not opposed to development in our parish, nor are we opposed to the development of affordable housing. Over the last year planning permission has been granted for 19 new houses in our parish and over the last five years 54 new affordable houses have been built. What we want is housing development that can be accommodated within our village, and affordable

housing that is appropriate in type and number for those people with a local connection to be able to move to or remain in our parish.

Contrary to the Planning Officer's report Hanborough Parish Council responded to this amended planning application on the 15th of April. We are also aware of other responses that have been sent but apparently not recorded. Furthermore errors and omissions have been made in the processing of this application. We therefore feel that insufficient time has been allowed for proper consultation on this application and that a decision is being rushed. We would therefore ask the Planning Committee to defer this application once more to allow more time to resolve the outstanding matters and uncertainty surrounding this proposed development.

**Summary of Submission by Mr Smith**

Mr Smith introduced himself and thanked officers for the report that had been produced.

Mr Smith suggested that people acknowledged the need for housing but it was often difficult to deliver at a local level. It was advised that there were no technical objections to the application and the site had been identified by the Council as being suitable for development.

Mr Smith made reference to the deferral at the March meeting and that the issues of concern had been addressed since then. In particular it was highlighted that a reduction in the number of houses was now proposed, the playgroup relocated and a contribution for new health facilities was included.

Mr Smith acknowledged that there was a lot of local concern about the application but the report concluded that the proposals were acceptable. Mr Smith made reference to the other application that had been refused in Hanborough and that there had been no appeal in that regard.

Mr Smith concluded by indicating that if the application was refused it would indicate that no development at all would be acceptable. Mr Smith encouraged the sub-committee to support the officer recommendation.

### Summary of Submission by Mr Morgan

Mr Morgan suggested that the development was inappropriate with the proposed access having a negative impact on the residents of 3 Chaucers Lane. Mr Morgan also highlighted the impact on the character of the area.

Mr Morgan questioned whether the submitted design statement was adequate and whether it could be properly analysed. It was emphasised that the site was in the Conservation Area and Mr Morgan indicated that the site was not developable without the access and the creation of the access would have a detrimental impact on 3 Chaucers Lane.

Mr Morgan suggested that the demolition would be harmful to neighbouring properties. Mr Morgan indicated that the proposal was contrary to a number of local plan policies.

In conclusion Mr Morgan advised that the neighbours were not against development but the current application was not acceptable and would have a negative impact.

Mr Morgan suggested it would be beneficial if the sub-committee undertook a site visit prior to determination of the application.

### Summary of Submission by Mr Mellor

Mr Mellor introduced himself and thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to speak in support of the application.

Mr Mellor highlighted that the application had been through a long pre-application process of well over 12 months and officers unequivocally supported the scheme as submitted. Mr Mellor suggested that the principle of development of this large site never been at dispute.

Mr Mellor advised that the proposal had been specifically designed as a single storey structure to fit the context of the site. By keeping the property low and set well away from the main listed house there was no impact on the main house. The design also had the benefit of avoiding any neighbour impact and keeping it below the height of wall to Blenheim Park to avoid impact to World Heritage site and also the Woodstock Conservation Area. Mr Mellor highlighted that Conservation Officer had not raised any objection.

In respect of traffic Mr Mellor advised that there would only be a small number of traffic movements from the proposed (8-10 per day) means less than one car every two hours using the new access past 3 Chaucers Lane. Mr Mellor suggested that this did not represent a significant impact to the neighbour and the Highway Authority did not object.

In conclusion Mr Mellor expressed the hope that the Sub-committee would follow the recommendation of officers and grant approval.