

Hanborough Parish Council's Objection to Planning Application 14/1102/P/OP, which outlines a Housing Development on Land to the East of Church Road

Hanborough Parish Council (HPC) objects to Savills' planning application on behalf of landowner Corpus Christi College, because the proposed development would not be sustainable in our parish. Our reasons for objecting are threefold:

- 1) Traffic generated by a development of this scale, added to existing traffic congestion in the parish, would have a *severely detrimental* impact and would *degrade our environment, our economy and our social fabric*;
- 2) A development of this scale would overwhelm public sector and voluntary support services for residents, *damaging the community's health/social fabric*;
- 3) Hanborough Manor Primary School could not accommodate the 17 additional primary school pupils that would be expected* from a development of this scale, without sacrificing scant outdoor play space and thereby jeopardising children's *health, fitness and socialisation*.

None of these threats to Hanborough's sustainability could readily be mitigated, except by a *substantial reduction* in the scale of development proposed. Traffic projections are already dire and neither the GP Surgery nor the School has room to expand their premises for extra people from "up to 68 residential units."**

HPC has specific comments it wishes to make regarding points in two of Savills' planning application documents. Numbering corresponds to that of the document paragraphs.

Comment on the *Transport Report*

We note the contrast between policy aspiration and recognition of the reality in Hanborough: 2.8 "OCC will seek to ensure that..... developers promote sustainable travel for all journeys associated with new development, especially those to work and education;" versus 7.11 and 7.12 "Our assessment of the Main Road/Church Road/Co-op Access mini-roundabout junction demonstrates that the Main Road West approach arm operates over capacity..... over the recommended upper limit..... for all scenarios during the AM peak hour.....The PM peak period operates slightly worse.... In 2021, all approach arms (except the Co-op access) operate over capacity in both the 'with' and 'without' development scenarios. In the worst case, during the 2021 PM peak hour, the Main Road East approach is predicted to operate with a delay of up to 5.5 minutes without development traffic. The additional development traffic is predicted to add 45 seconds to the length of this delay in 2021."

HPC disagrees with the view that 45 seconds of extra fumes, noise and dust is "negligible" when multiplied by the one and a half thousand vehicles affected each hour. Even the 1.7% of extra traffic admitted in paragraph 7.14 (which HPC believes

to be an underestimation^{***}) could prove to be the last straw that breaks the camel's back, reducing painfully slow traffic flow to prolonged periods of standstill or worse. Further congestion at the junction of Church Road and the A4095 is likely to lead to the use of Churchill Way (a residential estate road with several blind bends) as a rat run. The increased danger posed to those travelling along or crossing this road would be exacerbated by the significant on-road parking by patients attending the GP Surgery from eight o'clock each morning.^{****}

The impact of development-generated traffic ought not to be isolated as a mere fraction of the problem, as Savills do in their attempt to deny that it would have 'severe' consequences when assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), because its addition would have the potential to tip Hanborough's transport into chaos.

Comment on the *Planning and Consultation Statement*

At paragraph 8.14 of this document, the question is asked: "*Is the Site in a Sustainable Location?*" HPC's answer must be: "Not where up to 68 new dwellings are concerned." There are constraints upon development in Hanborough that cannot be removed by means of the usual contributions (under Section 106 or another binding agreement) towards highways/transport, education and public realm/open space/recreation projects. Money cannot reduce traffic volume; it cannot create space for another doctor's consulting room without loss of already inadequate patient parking; and it cannot create space for another classroom without loss of precious outdoor play space.

Oxfordshire's officer with responsibility for Pupil Place Planning forecasts that 30 local children will be admitted to the reception class in Hanborough's primary school in 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 and the school as a whole will be operating at full capacity. Legislation forbids class sizes above 30 in the younger age groups. The school is organised in classes corresponding to National Curriculum year groups. The disruption, dismay and deprivation that would be caused by 17 extra arrivals from a new housing development are too daunting to contemplate.

HPC finds it revealing that this planning application is weak when it comes to extolling the merits of the proposed development for Hanborough or for West Oxfordshire, but strong in its reliance upon the District Council not having been able to identify the 5 year supply of housing land required by our national government. **We trust that even if this planning application is considered in the context of a presumption in favour of allegedly sustainable development,^{*****} it will be denied because the adverse impacts referred to above would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against government (and local) policies (ref. NPPF paragraph 14).**

*Figure derived from OCC's standard assumption of 25 infant/junior pupils per 100 households.

**Hanborough's GP Surgery has several doctors, whose time amounts to the equivalent of 3.5 full-time practitioners, sharing 3 consulting rooms and serving 5,485 patients. They are highly efficient (93%) in using the working space available. Theoretically, if 100% efficiency were possible, another 0.25 of a full time doctor could be based in the surgery and the team could see 7% more patients. Realistically though, as one of the practice partners has stated publicly, an increase of 170 extra patients (the number expected to live in the 68 houses proposed) would be extremely difficult to accommodate.

***The 7 day traffic survey began in a week when there was a bank holiday and so it is likely that people will have used the opportunity to take a week's holiday, thus reducing numbers on the road. In normal working weeks, traffic volumes are greater, particularly during inclement weather.

****Traffic is also liable to try to escape along the road through Church Hanborough, where there is a weight restriction and a narrow pinch point just north of the Hand and Shears public house.

*****The applicant asserts that "this residential development will provide an opportunity to create, support and enhance local facilities and service provision," but HPC did not find evidence to support that assertion. The effects on our parish economy, environment and social fabric would be more negative than positive and we therefore consider the applicant's proposals to be unsustainable.

Hanborough Parish Council's suggested Section 106 contributions, in connection with planning application 14/1102/P/OP

Context

Hanborough Parish Council (HPC) has objected to the proposed building of up to 68 houses to the east of Church Road, as outlined by Savills on behalf of Corpus Christi College. We believe that such a large scale development would be unsustainable on this site or anywhere else in Hanborough. If it were to go ahead as per the current application, means of mitigating its negative effects would be hard to find. The problems would be less if the scale of development were reduced. What follows is a first attempt at identifying steps that might make some development east of Church Road possible.

Land Swap

Given a house-building proposal that conformed approximately to WODC's "infilling and rounding-off" policy for service centres (H7), HPC would be willing to negotiate with concerned parties to arrange a land swap designed to allow the Primary School to expand slightly onto land managed by Hanborough Playing Fields Association (HPFA) on behalf of the Parish.* The School's physical capacity to take extra pupils from new homes could thus be enhanced. Compensation under Section 106 would be in the form of a new leisure area located in the eastern half of Corpus Christi's land, i.e. beyond the line defined by the eastern boundary of adjacent housing.**

Leisure Facilities

This land swap would be asymmetrical: a small playground-sized piece from Hanborough to the School, in exchange for a relatively large piece from Corpus Christi to the Parish. This nett gain for the Parish would go some way towards compensating residents for upheaval, separation of younger and older siblings' play areas, and greater distances to walk.*** Martin Holland, WODC's Leisure Services Manager, has kindly calculated the cost of providing and maintaining new leisure facilities. His figures (total £98,650) are only indicative, since they are based on 68 houses and a conventional formula for Section 106 contributions (see Appendix 1).

Voluntary Support

To compensate for the strain extra residents would put on voluntary support services, HPC suggests a contribution towards the planned refurbishment of the *Welcome Room* attached to the Methodist Church. This facility will include a weekly Dementia Café, which requires a suitable hygiene area that will cost up to £10,000). WODC's Health Policy Officer will provide a narrative to justify a contribution (this will constitute Appendix 2, when available).

Public Sector Services

HPC is aware that the Police have asked for a contribution (£11-12K) to their anticipated costs, but we have not seen figures for other public services. We assume

that Hanborough's School and Surgery will have any capital costs covered, their revenue costs will be amortized, and they will also recover clear-cut opportunity costs of spending management time or paying professional fees consequential on development east of Church Road.

Highways

Savills have already acknowledged the need for better traffic calming measures on Church Road and possibly on the A4095. While it is hard to see what could be done to improve flow around the mini roundabout, traffic flow on stretches of the A4095 to the east of the roundabout could possibly be improved by: 1. Planting trees and/or extending yellow lines from the station to the shops to prevent parking and hence vehicle movements onto/off the grass verges; 2. Widening the railway bridge or adding a separate cycle/pedestrian path alongside it; 3. Re-activating the speed camera; and 4. 20mph zones.

*See area outlined in blue and **area outlined in red on map below.



***For these reasons, land swap negotiations might come to nothing; in which case HPC believes Savills' proposals in Planning Application 14/1102/P/OP would be rendered completely unsustainable, even if reduced in scale. The Hanborough Playing Fields Association (HPFA) response to this application makes clear that interested parties are far apart in how they perceive the situation. HPFA's chairman writes:

"Despite being told by HPFA at the public consultation that they had no right to use any of the land under the control of HPFA, Savills told some residents at that same event that the school could expand into the playing fields and they then give an equivalent area to us from the "green" area of their site. As well as being untrue, this is a foolish and commercially naive view. If playing fields land were to become part of the project then either we have a ransom strip commanding a good price that goes to the parish or HPFA become a co-developer in which case the plan would be very different and provide appropriate consideration for the parish and residents because residents would literally have to vote for it as required by the terms of the conveyance.

In summary, the new development would not have access to the playing fields, the school cannot expand into the playing fields and we will not change our hedge-cutting policy thus damaging our sport pitches for the convenience of a developer."

Conclusion

Without certainty that Hanborough Manor Primary School will be able to expand to accommodate more pupils, as a result of extra land and costs being covered, then other Section 106 contributions could not amount to enough mitigation of the impact on our Parish. HPC needs a Section 106 agreement that it can present to residents with conviction. We hope Savills and Corpus Christi College will engage with us and WODC in producing plans that will be binding upon a developer and sustainable in implementation.

Appendix 1

Leisure and Communities consultation response

Section 106 contributions: Application No: 14/1102/P/OP

Ref: Erection of 68 Dwellings at Land to the East of Church Road, Long Hanborough.

Applicant: Corpus Christi College.

Sport/Recreation Facilities

Offsite contributions are sought for sport/recreation facilities for residents based on the cost of provision and future maintenance of football pitches (the cheapest form of outdoor sport facility) over a 15 year period at the Fields in Trust standard of 1.2ha per 1,000 population.

Based on a football pitch of 0.742ha, a provision cost of £81,600 (Sport England Facility Costs Fourth Quarter 2013 plus 2% inflation for 2014) and a commuted maintenance cost of £204,408 per pitch (Sport England Life Cycle Costings Natural Turf Pitches April 2012), this would equate to £462,547 per 1,000 population or £1,110 per dwelling (at an average occupancy of 2.4 persons per dwelling).

Contributions

£1,110 x 68 = £75,480 off site contribution towards sport/recreation/facilities for young people within the village.

Play Facilities

WODC endorses the Fields in Trust (FIT), formerly the National Playing Fields Association, standard of 0.8ha of children's play space for every 1,000 people. It also endorses the FIT guidance on distinct types of play areas to cater for the needs of different age groups (LAPs – Local Areas of Play, LEAPs – Local Equipped Area of Play and NEAPS – Neighbourhood Equipped Areas of Play).

DEVELOPMENT TYPES, THRESHOLDS AND REQUIREMENTS

Of the FIT standard of 8sq m of play space per person, we will expect 5sq m to be casual and 3sq m to be equipped. At an average occupancy rate of 2.26 persons per dwelling this equates to 11.3sq m of casual space and 6.78sq m of equipped space for every dwelling. We will liaise with the town/parish council to establish the most appropriate form of provision taking account of the location, scale and form of the proposed development. In particular, the type of play facility will need to reflect the minimum sizes for a Local Area for Play (LAP) (100m²), a Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) (400m²) and a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP) (1,000m²) and the need for adequate buffer zones and minimum distances from dwellings.

Contributions

The cost of providing and maintaining play facilities of the minimum sizes set out above is estimated to be as follows:

Facility	Provision	Maintenance
LAP	£ 16,000	£ 22,128
LEAP	£ 52,000	£ 71,916
NEAP	£143,000	£197,769

We will assess contributions towards equipped play facilities on the basis of providing and maintaining a NEAP that will meet the needs of 1,000 people. The contribution per person will therefore be £143.00 for provision and £197.76 for maintenance. This equates to an overall contribution of £340.76 per dwelling.

£340.76 x 68 = £23,171.68 for the enhancement and maintenance of play/recreation/Activity areas within the village.

Total of Contributions Sought for Community Facilities = £98,651.68.

Professor Richard Carwardine FBA

President, Corpus Christi College

Oxford OX1 4JF

president@ccc.ox.ac.uk Telephone: 44 (0) 1865 276739/40