# **Public Document Pack**



# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee			
16 August 2012			
Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	
16.	(Pages 1 - 3)	Written Update	

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Law and Governance natasha.clark@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 221589

# Agenda Item 16

# CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

### 16 August 2012

#### **WRITTEN UPDATES**

### Agenda Item 6 11/01755/F

Land North of The Bourne and adjoining Bourne Lane, Hook Norton

- It is **recommended** that in the reason for granting permission set out on page 38 that reference to 'Policy for Villages 1' is deleted from the reason as it was included in error.
- 5 e-mails have been received objecting to the application on the following grounds;
  - the huge increase in traffic to an already under pressure road system, the junction is dangerous
  - the huge increase in population and its demands
  - Hook Norton would not benefit in any way from this development
  - the school would not cope with the increase in population and would therefore need extending
  - the increased demands on local services e.g. water and electricity
  - this is greenbelt land and should be protected.
  - -The field is on open country side and therefore isn't as the government had set out to do, to build on this sort of site!
  - -There isn't any money to extend the school which is a great school at the moment.
  - -The village can't handle more traffic.
  - -Over 90% of the villages don't want this field built on.
  - -there are better sites in surrounding areas and it is not clear how the village would absorb the huge increase in population
  - Hook Norton has had many large housing developments over the past 30 years, I think the village of Hook Norton has done more than its far share in trying to ease the housing shortage.
  - that the Adderbury planning decision should give the Council confidence to refuse development and NPPF foot note 10 provides the opportunity to do so.
  - that it is not clear how the proposal is in accordance with village Policy 1 which only allows for minor development infilling and conversions.
  - The report fails to recognise that the Highway Authority recommended refusal.
  - -We don't believe that these properties will be truly affordable to those young village residents who are not able to afford a significant deposit
  - the size of the proposed development is out of proportion with the size of the village and that infrastructure such roads, water, broadband, sewage, schools, doctors, dentist are inadequate to support a development of this size. There is no gas in the village and most families have to travel to do their shopping.
  - -Will there be provision for newcomers who cant drive as buses are already sparse?
  - -We have very limited employment within the village so anyone moving in would have to travel to work
  - -The village shop and post office offer very limited ranges of food etc. meaning that

'family' shopping has to be done in Chipping Norton or Banbury.

1 e-mail of support has been received on the following grounds;

In the interests of balance we feel that you should be aware that not everybody in Hook Norton is opposed to the development. In our view the village would benefit from the additional housing particularly if a proportion is genuinely affordable and available to local people.

# Agenda Item 7 12/00472/F

# DJ Stanton (Eng) Ltd. Station Rd. Hook Norton

- Two further letters have been received from neighbouring residents following the submission of amended plans, one is withdrawing an earlier objection and the other raises concerns. They are both summarised below;
  - 1. The amendments to the scheme includes the removal of plot 31 and the erection of a two metres high fence therefore objections are removed.
  - 2. The plans do not include the removal of all the tall trees which had been the main reason for supporting the proposal. The trees are an inconvenience to television signal, and a danger to property and people. The trees also block light to the properties on Austin's Way causing green slime and moss to accumulate. This proposal would seem the ideal opportunity to remove the trees at the developers cost.
- Amendment to the legal agreement requirements to;
  - -delete the requirement for indoor sport provision and open space maintenance. Insert requirement for a management company details and specification for tree and landscape maintenance, and for waste and bin contribution

## Agenda Item 8 12/00643/OUT

### Former B-line Business Centre, Enslow

Late this morning the applicant has supplied a completed unilateral undertaking and a
marketing report. These arrived to late to be able to comment upon them in this written
update. Verbal comments will be given at the meeting.

# **Agenda item 9** 12/00696/F

OS Parcel 0039, Heathfield Village, Islip Rd. Bletchingdon

Recommend add Planning Note
 In the event that it is considered necessary to install catch fencing to catch
 wayward balls either towards the road or adjacent land in the ownership of
 others you are reminded that these fences will need planning permission.

### Agenda Item 10 12/00779/F

### The Hermitage, High St. Souldern

- Members will have received direct a letter from the applicant's agent dated 10.8.12. enclosing comments from their tree consultant and comments of the applicants as well
  - In response to this letter the HPPDM has the following comments
  - 1. This is not considered to be an infill plot because of its width and the woodland character of this space within the Conservation Area
  - 2. It is considered inevitable that the occupiers of this house will consider that the trees that it is intended to retain between the house and the roadway will cast too much shadow and will look untidy. We anticipate

requests for thinning of these trees, and the removal of creepers and understorey, and that this is likely to change the character of this woodland area to a more manicured garden to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

- No response yet received from English Heritage
- County Archaeologist raises no objection subject to a watching brief during foundation construction ( achievable by condition)