

Appendix A

Chair, members of the sub-committee. My name is David Lines and I represent Sustainable Stonesfield – SUSTO.

It was the Woodstock Rd application, this application. that brought about the formation of SUSTO.

Your Officers note the 232 objections received in response to this application.

Their report does not mention the demonstration that was met by some members of this committee when they visited the site – an unprecedented event in the 30 years I've lived in Stonesfield.

Together they provide a good measure of the depth of feeling against a development which is described by our Landscape Assessment as - 'an incongruous and unnatural urbanization of the countryside' to the East of Stonesfield.

The Officers recommends rejection of this application because there is no basis to claim 'exceptional circumstances', critical of course for any development in the AONB.

It says a '**need**' for these houses cannot be demonstrated. It quotes the Local Plan Inspector who says that a contribution from the sub-area, is not required to satisfy District-Wide housing numbers.

The report fails to say why that contribution is not required – but the Inspector does. He says that 99.5% of the District-Wide requirement had already been achieved! How had that been overlooked?

Neither does the report refer to **'need'** specifically in the sub area - but the inspector does. He says that no substantive evidence had been provided to him sufficient to quantify housing need in the sub area. WODC estimated 'local need' at 834 houses. How is that explained?

A key issue has proved to be an ability to calculate and interpret **'Need'** data accurately. FOWOC have been reviewing AH data for the sub area. WODC uses a figure of 534, FOWOC suggest it should be 74.

An application for 68 houses, on just half the site that you earmarked for 50 houses, and is totally within the AONB, has taken 18 months to reject. We ask you to put that right today.

But we have to ask why it has taken that long and why it has taken the Inspector of the Emerging Local Plan to remind us of the protection that the NPPF provides to the AONB and more importantly, to demonstrate how that protection should be applied in practice.

STONESFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
Wendy Gould – Chair

Good afternoon

There are 442 documents associated with this application containing facts, detailed analysis, comments and objections so I won't repeat what you have already studied. However, there are salient points worth repeating:

FIRSTLY, this is an ill-conceived, very average housing scheme shoe-horned onto half of the proposed plot at the entrance to the village. It is too dense, there is no integration with the village and the affordable housing element is placed gable-end on to an existing close of bungalows in an over-bearing fashion.

SECONDLY, and of vital importance, the proposal is to build in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty now deemed unacceptable for construction unless essential; the findings of the Inspector and the realisation that WODC will now achieve its building quota, deems this development unnecessary.

I wish to reassure the Committee, we are not NIMBYs and welcome newcomers to keep our village vibrant and alive, accepting in-fill, new developments and 34 shared ownership and rental properties built in the recent past which together with over a dozen Community Trust properties for those with housing need proves our point.

We now need to consolidate and absorb these new residents to offer a quality life and sense of community.

Stonesfield is a rural village, we have very little local employment opportunities, retail facilities or entertainment and car ownership is essential adding to infrastructure and highway issues.

Your Planners have recommended refusal and we hope you will be guided by them and reject this application.

Appendix C

- Worked with the Officers for a long period, going right back to 2016 when the site was first identified through the SHELAA and then allocated for development in the emerging Local Plan;
- Officers remained in support of the scheme for the past 2 years, until the Local Plan Inspector wrote to the Council in February this year;
- The Inspector didn't rule out all development in the AONB, but set out that each application that comes forward should be judged on its planning merits;
- On its planning merits, this site raises no planning issues at all;
- There are no planning objections from any of the statutory professional consultees – none from Natural England/the Council's own Landscape Officer/ Highway Authority/ EA/ Thames Water etc – no objections at all;
- No objections from Natural England, who are the specialist consultees on new development in the AONB;
- This site is free from any planning objections;
- The Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply;
- This site goes towards improving that under supply;
- It is available now for ready development;
- It should be supported.

Appendix D

When it was purchased Honeydale Farm it was facing the same difficulties typically experienced by tens of thousands of small farmers; depleted soils, little diversity and making no money with a poor outlook.

Having purchased the farm in 2013 nothing was changed during the first 12 months. However, from 2014 to date Honeydale was changed to a diverse farm.

Now the following improvements had been made:-

- Deep rooted, soil improving crop rotation

- Natural Flood Management scheme

- All field margins have wildlife habitats

- 12,000 trees had been planted

- Half a mile of new hedgerows

- Green manures and cover crops

- Apiary – 13 hives

- Orchard – 250 fruit trees mainly Oxfordshire varieties

- Introduced livestock

All these initiatives were well documented and had attracted a lot of interest

Example of the results achieved so far included:-

- An increase from 44 to 77 species of bird

- Soil life is coming back

And it's attracting people too...

- Farmers, of course

- Policy makers – Nat Eng, DEFRA, EA, Govnt. Ministers and PM

- Academics and researchers

- Students from plant science depts at Uni's – Agricultural students too

- School visits

Charitable organisations – National Trust, Woodland Trust, FWAG and our very own Wychwood Project

Community help and support with tree planting

So, what do we want to do next?

Back in 2013, we wanted to demonstrate how a diverse farming system can produce great food and farming

BUT , we've created something unique, that has never been done before, for groups of people that are making change.

Honeydale is inspiring hundreds, possibly 1000's of people and the development of the centre will provide resource for presentations, food processing and enterprise for people engaged in land use.

BETTER SOIL, BETTER FOOD IN HARMONY WITH NATURE. I hope that you will be able to lend your support to this scheme.

Thank you.

Appendix E

Planning Committee 30th April 2018

Chairman, Councillors, thank you for taking the time to consider this application further and to those of you who attended site last week.

I am mindful that we have circulated papers detailing the application at length, including Counsels Opinion, and therefore only intend to address you briefly.

Now you have seen the site, I am sure you will agree with me that it is indeed in need of a new future to prevent its steady decay. We believe we have comprehensively demonstrated that our proposal is in accordance with prevailing planning policy, and the interpretation being placed on it by the Inspectorate and the Courts. This is extensively set out in the Opinion that has been sent to you.

We have previously tried to find a use for the site. This is evident in the planning history for the site, with an application seeking to running boarding kennels. Several attempts at obtaining planning for this failed not least on the proximity of the nearby houses.

Indeed, as explicitly set out in the feasibility report supporting the application, residential re-use really is the only viable option on this site – these findings are not disputed by Officers. We are looking to re-use existing redundant buildings and enhance their immediate setting as well as that of the immediate area in accordance with the aims of para. 55 of the NPPF.

Further the new NPPF currently under consultation (para 69) advocates that 20% of housing allocation in all districts should come from sites under half a hectare, to encourage diversity in provision of housing need, and to speed up the rate of delivery and the approach to rural conversions has not changed – yet another pointer indicating of the direction of travel in policy, which is also increasing emphasis on the re-use of existing sites, in the provision of new rural housing need.

In regard to design, many current proposals for new build houses under para 55 play on a style which emulates modern agricultural buildings as they blend into the landscape. This proposal will re-use existing buildings, utilising their current built form to deliver a scheme that is a high quality innovative design. Officers do not object to this approach.

As set out explicitly in Counsel's Opinion, Officers agree at paragraph 5.7 that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged, (NPPF Para 14). That sets a high bar for refusal - the adverse impacts of granting permission must; significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

I will not repeat them, but the clear range of benefits associated with this revised scheme weigh strongly in favour of the development before you.

We respectfully ask that the scheme be supported to secure the enhancement of this site.

Thank you.

Address to Planning Meeting

Site Address: Land North of Witney Road, Long Hanborough

Uplands Planning Meeting: 30th April 2018

Author: Philip Reese, BSc (Hons), MRICS, MCIPS, MAPM, CBIFM

Introduction

My name is Philip Reese. I am a Chartered Surveyor and young resident. My children would be directly affected by a development.

I am not against all development, but am against development in the wrong places, for the wrong reasons, and based on out-dated information.

Residents have raised concerns about impacts on roads, schools and health facilities.

There are recent developments which we believe necessitate a re-think.

The demand for affordable homes.

- Data from Homeseeker Plus identifies **only** 21 households with a local connection. All the remainder on the list are already “adequately housed”.
- 137 affordable houses have already been permitted, **an over-provision of 7:1**. This development would make it 10:1. **It’s not needed.**

Draft Local Plan

- The Inspector indicates that the draft local plan is likely to be found legally compliant and suitable for approval. **This site is not required** in the plan to deliver houses.
- Recent appeal decisions demonstrate that even if all other factors are taken, they **still cannot** supersede protection of the setting as a **key policy principle**.

The Site, Setting and Outline Design

- The developer continues to reject the importance of the Conservation Area (CA), demonstrating continued disdain for West Oxfordshire’s (WODCs) policies.
- Their revised scheme will not ‘preserve or enhance’ the character or appearance – the **statutory test** which **must** be given great weight.
- Conservation Areas are statutory designations and a developer **cannot flagrantly** decide which bits to ignore.
- Contrary to what you will have previously been advised, the significance of **rural surroundings and views** are **very clearly set out** in the formal Conservation Appraisal.
- Losing two fields round the area would be a major loss and be **Substantial Harm**.
- By definition in the NPPF, ‘**setting**’ is about how it is EXPERIENCED – not just ‘seen’.

- This latest design **bears no relation, connectivity nor continuity** to the form and character of the village, and due to their height, new houses would overbear on Millwood Vale.

Archaeology

- We have very recently discovered, that in addition to the Dyke, there is a highly unusual 'nemeton', a sacred Roman grove. **Highly significant**, and only six in the whole country.
- There is also **potential** for a Roman villa.
- Great weight **must** be given to **nationally important archaeology**.
- The revised scheme would obliterate this area.
- Development would destroy two heritage assets, perhaps merely to **enable** gold leaf on the gateway to the palace. (Times newspaper).

In Summary

- The developer now knows that this development would almost certainly be rejected at an appeal.
- West Oxfordshire can therefore confidently refuse this application.
- Local relations are at an all-time low. We request therefore that the developer respects West Oxfordshire policy, villagers and the nations heritage by **withdrawing their application for outline consent**.

Spoken presentation on behalf of Hanborough Parish Council regarding the April 2018 Revision of Pye Homes' Outline Planning Application No. 17/01082/OUT

This revision of the applicant's Schematic Layout is premature. A further survey is necessary, because more important archaeological finds are likely.¹ The stretch of Grim's Ditch that has already been discovered has shaped the indicative site layout and limited its boundary, but more archaeological finds could add more constraints and necessitate a change of boundary. HPC does not believe the site could absorb 170 dwellings without ignoring our heritage; the presence of Grim's Ditch is a potent reminder of where our ancient village boundary lies.

WODC's emerging policy H2 has recently revised wording, to the effect that greenfield extensions to villages should be prevented, unless there is an incontrovertible need for them. Those words weigh heavily and precisely on the threat to Long Hanborough's edge. However, the officer is wary of relying on H2 because, unsurprisingly, the "development industry" object to it; hence, he thinks it prudent to assume *"that the tilted balance is still in place and that significant and demonstrable harms would be needed to justify a refusal."*

It is perfectly proper to expect *"sound reasons"* for overturning *"a democratically arrived at decision,"* but the fact that the *"developer spent considerable time and expense in getting the application to a point that it secured a resolution to approve"* is not a valid reason for sticking to that decision. Democracy is not well served when one side deploys huge resources and the other relies upon amateurs.

HPC and other Hanborough residents have made written submissions with sound reasons for refusing Pye Homes' revised application: 1st fitting 170 dwellings into the available space results in a dense urban style that is an affront to the location and detracts from the adjacent Conservation Area. 2nd the land supply position is now much more positive than when last considered and this ought to receive due consideration and weight. Given that 339 new dwellings are currently being built in Hanborough, the officer's suggestion that we could take 170 more as a "cushion" against any shortfall elsewhere seems utterly unreasonable.

Our infrastructure cannot keep pace. It has just emerged that only the youngest primary aged incomers will get local school places in the first few years of capacity being increased to 1.5-form entry. We hope Uplands' Members will follow the precedent set by Appeal Inspector Paul Jackson, who recently concluded that whilst the prospect of adding a substantial number of affordable homes *"attracts very significant weight,"* the application should fail because: *"the proposed scheme would have serious disadvantages in the form of a conspicuous harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and the countryside, in particular the setting and perceived edge of the settlement."*

Niels Chapman, on behalf of HPC, 30.04.2018

¹ Ref. Prof. Tim Copeland

Re: Agenda item 6
Application Reference 17/01082 - Long Hanborough North of A4095

I am Roger File COO for Blenheim.

I would remind you that this application has already been approved by you based on the scheme representing sustainable development.

Our advice from a leading QC is that officers did not have to bring this application back to you, however they have they have decided to do so to update you on minor changes in circumstances.

However, their advice remains the same, being, that the previous approval be reconfirmed.

Officer are bringing this back to you for 2 reasons and 2 reasons only.

Firstly, since this application came to committee last December the Local Plan inspector has written to the District Council saying he feels that he **may** be able to find the emerging Local Plan sound, **not** that he has **but that he may**.

Also, please remember that having a 5-year land supply is a requirement for the District and it is **a minimum, not a cap** and must be sustained each and every year

We don't know what the inspector will find, although the recent appeal decision in Church Road concluded that the District had 4.9 years supply.

Secondly, officers wanted to formally advise you that further investigations have found evidence of prehistoric or medieval ditching on site although the County Archaeologist is happy that this does not prevent development.

Many of you will have read our 10 goals and our economic impact assessments, these goals aim to enhance our local communities and alter the way landed estates are perceived.

I would like to reiterate that this application delivers **far more significant benefits than most private developers can offer**, firstly:

- The land is owned by Blenheim we are focused on legacy development and want to ensure development on our land is of the highest standard.
- Secondly, the scheme will deliver **50% affordable housing** so is fully policy compliant, **not many sites can say that**.
- Thirdly, the affordable housing will be retained by Blenheim and offered to occupiers as part of **the new affordable model** developed with **your** officers.

*It will deliver **genuinely** affordable housing at up to **40% discount** to market value as opposed to the usual 20% discount offered by Registered Providers.*

- Fourthly, the redesigned site layout respects the archaeology.

The County Archaeologist did not require this, but we believe it is the right thing to do, further respecting our heritage.

Long Hanborough is accepted as a sustainable settlement:

It has a new doctors surgery coming,

It has a railway station and a regular bus service

Provisions to extend the primary school are in place, including accommodating children from this development.

It also has a supermarket, several other small local retailers, and 2 pubs.

Long Hanborough's is sustainable. Where the benefits, outweigh the harm, the NPPF states, consent should be granted without delay.

Nothing has changed

This development brings the exceptional offer of genuinely affordable housing and the landowner's clear focus on legacy, and should, **as before**, receive your continued support.