

***P15/V1504/FUL Residential development to provide 213 dwellings with associated highway works, open space and infrastructure improvements (Amendment No.2 dated 13th January 2016)***

***Response from the Keep Harwell Rural Campaign***

**Contact:**

Dr A E Hughes

Chairman: Keep Harwell Rural Campaign (KHR)

Kingswood

2 King's Lane

Harwell

Didcot

OX11 0EJ

Tel: (01235) 835301

Fax: (01235) 832667

E mail:

a.hughes09@btinternet.com

---

*Keep Harwell Rural (KHR) is a residents' group independent of any statutory body. It was formed in 1998 to enable residents to express their views about changes that may affect Harwell, in ways that could augment and complement the views expressed by the Harwell Parish Council. KHR has inputs from a cross-section of villagers concerned about education, traffic and road safety, sustainability, the amenities provided by our nearest town, Didcot, and the preservation of the character of a village with a thousand year history.*

*KHR has responded to planning documents since 1998 and has taken part in Structure Plan and Local Plan Public Enquiries.*

---

**We submitted a response dated 28 July 2015 to the original Planning Application and then a further one dated 1 December 2015 to the Revision of November 2015.**

**The Keep Harwell Rural Campaign continues to object strongly to this revised Planning Application. Specifically with reference to Amendment No. 2 we cite the following grounds.**

- 1. The proposed highway improvements involve double yellow lines and a mini roundabout at the 5-way junction of Grove Road with the High Street. Such features, common in urban locations, do not fit with the character of a rural village in a conservation area.**
- 2. The proposed highway improvements will anyway not actually help pedestrians trying to cross Grove Road or the High Street near this junction. The additional uncontrolled crossings are simply dropped kerbs and will not make it any easier for the people to get across the various roads at this junction, especially children and older people who are not fleet of foot. The mini roundabout could well make it harder for pedestrians trying to cross in its vicinity, since they will have to anticipate how cars and other**

vehicles are going to be manoeuvring around it and which vehicle is going to move next, and how quickly.

3. The proposed double yellow lines will inhibit drivers who wish to call at the shops, especially delivery vehicles who cannot park on the forecourt. They will also adversely affect the residents of the houses between the shops and Jennings Lane who have insufficient off-street parking.
4. The proposed peak time parking restrictions on Burr Street will seriously deplete the quality of life of those residents who have no off-street parking. The idea that they should park some way off in Townsend is an unreasonable restriction to what residents should expect in a village.

Amendment No.2 has not changed the other points that we raised in our earlier objections. We particularly draw attention to:

- Our concern that the proposed main vehicle entry to the site approximately 100m west of the junction with Manor Green is just east of where the road bends and enters a dip. Even with the proposed road narrowing measure this is not a good position for a junction. This issue does not seem to have been addressed at all.
- Point 3 in the Response dated 24 November 2016 from Harwell Parish Council has not been addressed. We totally agree with the Parish Council that the Planning Application is imposing an urban housing density, design and layout onto a traditional village, with no sympathy for its surroundings, and hence does not conform to the VWH policies H15 and DC1 cited in the Parish Council Response.

VWH has selected this site for its Local Plan, and its suitability is due to be considered in the Examination in Public in February. It is clear from the way that the developer's proposals have changed that they are struggling to find acceptable solutions. This site, located down a narrow rural lane with traffic restrictions and poor pedestrian access, is intrinsically unsuited for development on this scale.

The Planning Application should be rejected and only reconsidered if the Inspector at the EiP rules that the site is necessary. Any reconsideration should of course be subject to satisfactory solutions to the site's various inherent problems.

*26 January 2016*

---