

169 Homes and Health Centre

Witney Road, Long Hanborough

15/02687/OUT

This application is very similar to one you unanimously rejected in March 2015 citing issues of urbanisation, coalescence and its failure to address the education and healthcare implications. The only differences are some boundary screening, a potential footpath to the village over land that is not in control of the applicant, details of a traffic survey in Hurdeswell and a proposal to fit out the new health centre, the costs being borne by reducing the proportion of affordable homes from 50% to 35%.

Once again there have been almost 400 individual letters of objection.

By now you will be well aware of concerns about the traffic on the A4095 and I do not intend to say any more on the subject.

Regarding the school, the last meeting of Uplands unanimously voiced its opposition to the proposal to build a new playing field, the purpose of which was to free up land on the main school site to build extra classrooms. The school situation is far from resolved with issues remaining about how an enlarged school will cope with the reduction in play space on the main school site, inadequate communal facilities and also the intrusion of the proposed fenced playing field into sensitive open countryside.

The surgery. The applicant now intends to fit out the surgery, funding its completion by building 25 fewer affordable homes. As the proposed total number of homes remains the same then it can be assumed that these will still be built for the commercial market. It is likely that the extra profit will exceed the costs of fitting out, thus benefitting the applicant. Is it morally right that a developer benefits at the expense of affordable homes?

In addition local concerns remain about the adequacy of the proposed surgery car park and its inconvenient location at the edge of the village.

Regarding the site, the proposed boundary screening does little to address the previous reasons for refusal, namely urbanisation and coalescence. Note, the indicative site plan gives means of access should further developments be proposed.

Finally I do not wish to enter the housing numbers debate but simply point out that any increase in numbers should not encourage a free-for-all among developers. First and foremost, housing has to be on suitable sites where the impact on the community is managed and the rate of build does not put a strain on existing services.

Here the impact outweighs its benefits. The school proposals are stop-gap, the health service proposals unsatisfactory, the A4095 problem remains in a village served poorly by buses and the issues of urbanisation and coalescence have been addressed in a derisory fashion.

Please discount the crude threats made by the applicants to apply for costs if you refuse this application and they succeed in their appeal. If you give way once it will open the floodgates and be a tactic that every developer will use.

We request that you refuse this application.

Spoken presentation on behalf of Hanborough Parish Council
regarding Application No.15/02687/OUT
for the development of land south of Witney Road (A4095), Long Hanborough

The Parish Council's first comment is on the size of the proposed development. We strongly support the District's assessment of housing need in West Oxfordshire, but let us consider for a moment how house-building numbers would change if the SHMA mid-point of 660 per annum, plus a quarter of the Oxford city overspill, were imposed: the total would go up by 61.4% (from 10.5K to 16.95K). Apply this level of increase to the 2014 SHLAA for Hanborough, which forecast 135 new dwellings by the year 2029, and the new requirement would be 218 new dwellings during the life of the Local Plan; 83 more than in the 2014 SHLAA. The applicant wants to build **twice** that (169 dwellings) all at once, over-stretching services and upsetting the dynamics of our village community.

One service provider in particular, our local primary school, would be badly affected. County education officers estimate an influx of around 50 more pupils, requiring a third new classroom to be built in addition to the two already anticipated for windfall growth and children from the prospective Church Road development. There is no room for three new classrooms at the western end of the school site, even with the playgroup hut removed; so, part of the existing playing field, which is only just big enough for 200 pupils, would have to be sacrificed to build accommodation for an extra 50. Members will recall unanimously rejecting the applicant's proposed mitigation for this loss of play space. Moreover, an off-site sports field does not begin to address inadequacies in built spaces (e.g. school hall capacity) that would become acute with over 250 pupils.

Our third reason for objecting is concern about the traffic that would be generated on the already heavily congested A4095 road. County Highways have accepted the applicant's low estimate that the proposed development's impact would be a 4% worsening of traffic and, in the absence of Highways' technical support (for them, 5% was the tipping point), District officers did not feel they could recommend objection on traffic grounds. However, a Planning Inspector has found differently elsewhere: residual cumulative highway problems **are** liable to be counter to NPPF policy if they are "*destined to make the situation far worse, with the attendant dangers and delays and impedance to emergency vehicles and public transport.*"

We respectfully ask that you refuse this unwanted planning application.

Summary of Submission by Mr John Ashton

Mr Ashton, representing West Waddy (the applicants agent), thanked members for the opportunity to address the sub-committee.

Mr Ashton indicated that changes in circumstance meant that the new application could now be approved. Mr Ashton suggested that the council needed to plan for a greater amount of housing, the Local Plan was out of date and there was not a five year housing land supply. Mr Ashton advised that the emerging Local Plan had been set aside as a result of the suspended inquiry and therefore the application should be judged against the NPPF.

It was highlighted that the proposed scheme delivered a new health facility, would have a minimal impact and a gap between Long Hanborough and Freeland would be retained. Mr Ashton referred to the reduced affordable housing provision and emphasised that this was justified by a viability assessment and 35% had been accepted elsewhere.

Mr Ashton reported that the scheme would alleviate local flooding, that local public transport was accessible together with shopping facilities. Mr Ashton indicated that the proposal was not in the AONB.

In conclusion Mr Ashton suggested that the balance was in favour of the development and that it was sustainable in accordance with the NPPF. Mr Ashton asked members to support the scheme.

Notes for WODC Committee, Thornycroft, Charlbury

- We worked very closely with Officers right through from the pre-application stage, to make sure that this scheme follows their advice and meets their views.
- The Committee Report offers an unequivocal recommendation for approval.
- We continued working with your Officers even after the application was submitted, and the County Council Highways Officer, and amended the scheme.
- Ensures that the required visibility is achieved onto Woodstock Road
- The County Council offer no objection whatsoever on any highway related grounds.
- We amended the scheme of the house to ensure that there is no neighbour impact to the property to the rear.
- The neighbouring property is located on higher ground and looks over and beyond this property.
- The careful design has been accepted and endorsed by the Conservation Officer. No objection.
- The scheme proposes low energy and high quality sustainable design.
- The Parish Council does not object.
- No objections from statutory consultees
- Clear recommendation to approve.

Summary of Submission by Mr Martin Armstrong

Mr Armstrong thanked the sub-committee for the opportunity to speak and that he was addressing the meeting on behalf of Mr & Mrs Kirk.

Mr Armstrong indicated that the primary concerns related to the principle of development, details of the application and highway visibility splays. In acknowledging that the highway authority had not raised an objection it was highlighted that the visibility was still considered an issue and could be dangerous.

Mr Armstrong emphasised the potential for overlooking of neighbouring gardens which could have a detrimental impact on amenity. It was further indicated that the principle of development in the Conservation Area needed to be fully considered.

In acknowledging that the appeal was some time ago it was suggested that the reasons for upholding the refusal were still relevant.

Mr Armstrong asked members to refuse the application.

Summary of Submission by Mrs Emma Goodman

Mrs Goodman thanked members for undertaking a site visit and the support that had been expressed at the previous meeting.

Mrs Goodman advised that the issues raised had been taken on board and amendments had been made to try and address any concerns. Mrs Goodman outlined changes to materials to be used on some parts of the scheme, revised garage layout and obscuring of some windows.

Mrs Goodman expressed the hope that the sub-committee would support the application with the various amendments proposed.