

Written following attendance of event held by GVA 20 June 2017.

On Thu, Jun 22, 2017 at 8:41 PM, CH(member of WNP committee) emailed OBU/GVA;

Dear sirs,

I attended the consultation event and wish to give my feedback. I am CH...

1. The site lies within the Green Belt. You are therefore permitted to redevelop the existing built footprint but no more. Your proposal takes significant undeveloped green space in addition to the built footprint.

2. Staff manning the event sought to justify this with an argument that the existing gross floor area is equal to the proposed 600 houses. This is fatuous as it is in no way relevant in determining the new use for the site. Indeed, if your argument was valid you could propose to take even more Green Belt by building bungalows.

3. The proposal fails to address any infrastructure issues:

- Wheatley is a current traffic bottleneck, particularly with north/south traffic and the single lane route to the primary school. The significant traffic increase associated with 600 houses impacts vehicle and pedestrian safety along with general enjoyment of the village. Air quality, already of sufficient concern as to be officially monitored in the High Street, can only be negatively impacted.

- 600 houses might imply 500-1000 children.....15 to 30 large classes extra. The existing schools do not have the capacity. Similarly the Health Centre cannot cope with, say, 1500-2000 new patients.

- The proposal includes no retail, leisure or community facilities meaning that the residents will need to use Wheatley. No doubt the retailers will be happy but Wheatley's community facilities are currently inadequate. Additionally Wheatley parking is very limited yet without any easy pedestrian or cycle access provisions the new house occupants will inevitably drive.

- I understand that there will be a Community Infrastructure Levy applied to the 'non-affordable' dwellings.....360. I see no proposals of how this could be stretched to cover the school, health, roads, pavements, leisure space, parking and other infrastructure requirements. I think it pretty clear that it couldn't be.

- The proposal provides no open spaces for recreation yet takes existing open space and many mature trees with TPO's.

4. The west end of the proposal, where you wish to take undeveloped Green Belt land, is about 17m higher than the ground at the base of the existing tower. Any property built there would totally disregard the severe visual intrusion into the landscape.

5. Although within the Parish of Holton, the site lies within the Wheatley neighbourhood plan. This is sensible, and is supported by Holton PC, as any residents there would have use Wheatley facilities, Holton having just a village hall. Wheatley has seen a 30% increase in housing in the last 25 years and your proposal equates to a further 37%. Wheatley and Holton residents do desire more housing (see the Neighbourhood Plan) and are prepared to accept up to 300 new dwellings. This is in fact considerably in excess of the 10% figure in general use for small villages.

6. Your desire for 600 is born purely from commercial ambition and pays absolutely no thought to existing residents, the environment or the infrastructure of the area.....in turn that also ignores the needs of incoming residents. Frankly I am shocked by OBU's

complete disregard for the community that has hosted them for so long. It appears that your only consideration is maximising the sale price for the site. You claim to be proud of your home in Oxford where ' you make a significant economic, social and cultural and contribution'. I do not see this being reflected in your proposals. Maybe you feel that Wheatley doesn't merit the same high ideals as Oxford.

In conclusion I strongly oppose any development beyond the existing built footprint. I understand that this could fit up to 300 dwellings and I could support that even though it represents an 18% increase for Wheatley. Such a development could be made visually acceptable, would be just about manageable (with CIL) with regards to infrastructure and would preserve existing valuable open space.

Regards,
CH