



EYNSHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee meeting held at St Leonard's Church Hall
on Tuesday 6 October 2015 at 6.30 pm

MINUTES

Present: Mr D Stukenbroeker (Committee Chairman), Mr R Andrews, Ms J Baldwin, Mr A Bickley, Mr P Emery, Mr Mosson.

Also Present.: Rachel Faulkner, Clerk to the Council and 12 members of the public.

15/P62 Apologies for Absence: Mr G Beach

15/P63 Declarations of Interest: None

15/P64 Minutes of the last meetings The minutes of 1 September 2015 were signed as a true record.

15/P65 Public Participation

- Members of the public attended the meeting to comment on the planning application for access to land west of Thornbury Road.
- Residents asked that the decision makers witness the traffic situation at the end of the school day at around 3.10pm. There was general consensus that access to a large development via Thornbury Road would not be suitable.
- A member of the public felt that the current piecemeal approach to future development of Eynsham was not the best approach.
- A local resident and member of staff from Bartholomew School commented that the area was already congested and presented traffic dangers. She was also concerned about the lack of places at the school for new residents. This was reiterated by a governor of the school.

15/P66 Applications discussed:

- 15/03168/HHD Erection of single storey side and rear extension. 86 Spareacre Lane. No objection.
- 15/03148/OUT Residential development of up to 160 dwellings (means of access only). Land west of Thornbury Road. Eynsham Parish Council (EPC) objects to this application as proposed, for the following reasons:
 1. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, June 2014 (SHLAA) refers to this Site (179) as 'Suitable in principle for development ... although access is a key constraint. Could potentially come forward as part of a comprehensive scheme including 187a'. Approval as proposed could seriously frustrate a more comprehensive development of the western edge of the village as identified in the emerging local plan and the SHLAA.
 2. This is a short-term opportunistic development proposal which is isolated from and does not relate to the village as a whole or other sites in the village identified for future development.
 3. The Site should form part of a comprehensive master plan for the longer term growth of Eynsham with other landowners of sites for sustainable development, which takes into consideration emerging plans by Oxford County Council for improvements to the A40 and

identifies key infrastructure provision for local transport (in co-ordination with A40 improvements), schools, healthcare, utilities and social amenities.

4. Little weight should be given to the submitted Traffic Assessment (TA) which fails to identify adequately or at all when the base manual survey data in the Study Area (TA Appendix G) was collected and takes no consideration of term times of Bartholomew School, which has the biggest impact on traffic on Witney Road and Thornbury Road. It is also noticed that the automatic traffic count points selected do not reflect the key congestion points of limited access to the village (for example, Witney Road was sampled between Thornbury Road and Acre End Street but not between Thornbury Road and the A40, which would reflect the additional traffic from Old Witney Road and Spareacre Lane).
5. Likewise, the comments of OCC on transport should be accorded little weight as these rely on the same flawed procedures and data which it approved in pre-application discussions.
6. The proposed sole access for all vehicular traffic through Thornbury Road to Witney Road is totally unrealistic and impractical. The Applicant is clearly wrong when it asserts the buses parking in the vicinity of the Bartholomew School layby 'do not impede traffic flows on Witney Road' (TA 3.6) or that there is 'excellent visibility' and 'the development is unlikely to conflict with the operation of the layby' (TA 3.7). This is directly contrary to the experience of residents in the vicinity and users of Witney Road, as is reflected in the comments posted on this Application. The addition of 630 vehicles a day (TA Table 5.7) into the mix of school buses, scheduled buses, school generated car traffic, pedestrian and cycle traffic of hundreds of students and others, together with the regular commuter and commercial traffic on Witney Road would not be 'modest' but unsafe and would have an unacceptable degree of impact on the local highway network contrary to BE3, T1 and T6 of LP 2011 and T2 of the draft LP 2031.
7. EPC agrees with the objections of OCC as to the impact the development would have on both the Eynsham primary school and Bartholomew School, both of which are at capacity. It is unacceptable that pupils should be bussed out of the village because development has exceeded the schools' ability for expansion, which would not be satisfactorily remedied by s106 contributions.
8. The Application is further flawed in that it fails to adequately assess the capacity of local healthcare facilities. Eynsham Medical Centre (and its branch at Long Hanborough, which is also subject to significant development proposals) is already rationing patient appointments. The practice has in excess of 13,600 patients and is under strength with most doctors only working part-time.
9. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) admits that the Chil Brook presents a flood risk to the southern end of the Site which can not be used for development. The site has a drop to the Chil Brook of approximately eight metres and further falls off towards a drainage ditch which forms the western boundary of the Site. This ditch runs into the Chil Brook, which subsequently flows through the village to the Wharf Stream and ultimately the Thames. It is intended to use a SUDS drainage system (6.0) but the FRA states (at 2.6) that 'Generally soils are relatively impermeable, resulting in greater run-off towards the watercourse.'
10. The FRA wrongly states (at 4.11) that surface water flooding has not led to flooding of property and omits any reference to associated fluvial flooding by the Chil Brook of properties

on Station Road on various occasions (Appendix E, historic flood map). The Site is upstream from known settlement areas at flood risk in the village. These have not been adequately taken into consideration in the SUDS proposals contrary to NPPF 100 and 103.

11. The Design and Access Statement at 5.1.3 proposes up to three storey development on the middle to high ground of the Site (see also Indicative building height zones drawing). This, and a density of 35 dph would have an adverse visual impact upon the soft western edge of the village that would stand out as a hard, incongruous urban extension contrary to BE2, BE4, H2 and H7 of LP 2011 and OS2 and EW2 of draft LP 2031.
12. The Application as proposed should not be approved as its adverse impact on future growth and infrastructure of Eynsham would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits contrary to NPPF 14, LP 2011 BE1 and draft LP 2031 OS1 and EW2.

If the Application is approved:

A comprehensive Construction Travel Management Plan should be required due to the limited and residential nature of Thornbury Road, the nature of Witney Road as a scheduled bus route and the safety aspects of the adjacent Bartholomew School.

The Parish Council requests a developer contribution in the amount of £496,000, indexed linked, towards street furniture, play and recreation areas and facilities or other appropriate village amenities to reflect the additional strain on existing community infrastructure the development will represent.

14/P67 Date of next meeting – Tuesday 1 December at 6.30pm unless a meeting is required beforehand. Smaller applications will be discussed at the next full council meeting on 3 November at 7.30pm

The Meeting closed at 7.20pm.