

SUSTAINABILITY AND THE WATES APPLICATION

PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

ADVERSE IMPACTS THAT OUTWEIGH THE BENEFITS:

1. **Traffic on local roads.** BSA expansion approval. GWL development, Kingsmere expansion. Safety issues at The Hale crossroads and on Church Rd. Access via Green Lane. An expansion of playing fields would also create more traffic, especially on Church Road and Green Lane.
2. **No public bus service** since 2015.
3. **No shops.** The only public service is the Red Cow in new hands and only serving coffee and drinks. No meals.
4. **School numbers** - virtually full partly because of “full” at Kingsmere Schools.
5. **Incompatible development** has given 100 new homes in Alchester Park and Audley Gardens in the last 5 years. This development would add 30% more homes. Already problems with drainage (physical infrastructure e.g., water – GWL) Policy ESD3 states that Cherwell is in an area of water stress. The whole issue of drainage and water courses in this area, particularly impacting Wendlebury, is a major issue of concern and has yet to be resolved in the preconditions with GWL.
6. **Category 1 villages and housing.**
(5.77 of the Local Plan up to 2031) 750 homes in Category A villages. 22 villages. If the 150 homes were permitted, we would then take up 33% of the total initially stated for Cat. Villages such as Adderbury, Hook Norton, Kidlington, Yarnton & Deddington.
7. Fair to say that the **village’s view** of further development on this scale has gone down like a lead balloon partly because of the GWL’s successful appeal despite CDC opposition and the BSA expansion off Akeman Street towards Little Chesterton.
8. In 2015 the PC objected to the development of 60 homes on a site adjacent to The Hale and Green Lane. On Appeal the Planning Inspector quoted reasons for her refusal which included: para 35 – *“I conclude that the development would have a significantly harmful effect on the setting of Chesterton and or the rural character and appearance of the area” (15/00454/OUT)*
9. The planned development is speculative and not in CDC’s current plan & is only one amongst several speculative proposals e.g., off The Hale, A4095, and University College housing plans.

ARGUMENTS FOR SUPPORT

10. The development would increase the recreational provision, especially benefiting the football clubs and tennis provision. More walkways for pedestrians and dog walking.
11. 150 homes would lead to an increase in our Tax Base and increase our precept significantly without major changes in percentage increases but would make demands upon our budgets.
12. If the PC does not offer qualified support, then the developers could well go to an Appeal and succeed there without a commitment to recreational improvements.

PJC

31/10/22