**From:** Public Access DC Comments
**Sent:** 21 July 2015 16:26
**To:** Public Access DC Comments
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 15/00252/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:26 PM on 21 Jul 2015 from Mr roger dyson.

|  |
| --- |
| **Application Summary** |
| **Address:** | Land To Rear Of 2 The Villas Main Street Wendlebury Bicester OX25 2PW  |
| **Proposal:** | Erection of 2 no detached houses with garages.  |
| **Case Officer:** | Aitchison Raffety (Planning Consultants)  |
| [Click for further information](http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications/centralDistribution.do?caseType=Application&keyVal=NJLVX6EM0KR00) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Customer Details** |
| **Name:** | Mr roger dyson |
| **Email:** | rogeradyson@yahoo.co.uk  |
| **Address:** | Bridge House Main Street, Wendlebury, Oxfordshire OX25 2PW |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments Details** |
| **Commenter Type:** | Neighbour |
| **Stance:** | Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | Bridge HouseWendleburyOxonOX25 2PW21st July 2015Dear Sir/MadamPlanning Application Number: 15/00252/F (Erection of 2no detached houses with garages)We would like to withdraw our letter of objection to this planning application dated 14th July 2015. In its place please find below our general and specific comments to the above proposed planning application.General comments1. My wife and I moved into Bridge House, Wendlebury in late 1996. We were aware that planning permission had previously been applied for and refused to build three dwellings and garages on the land behind (to the east) of Bridge House. At that time the land was an open field, and by our contract of purchase of Bridge House we agreed that we would not object to a future development proposal, on the grounds of "..any right of light or air.."; and nothing said in this letter should be considered to conflict with this undertaking.2. Since then a Manège (all-weather equestrian riding arena) has been introduced across the middle of this land (north to south), which has meant that any new proposals will be condensed into the area between the rear of the Bridge House plot and the new Manège. 3. Is it possible to inform us of the reasons that the planning application (No. 95/00819/OUT) for the erection of three detached dwellings and garages etc was refused?CommentsThe following comments refer to the Access & Design Statement submitted by the applicant:1. Key Design issue iv) Point 1 Access to 2 The Villas will be lost as a result of this development thus lessening the impact of any extra traffic flow caused by the project.Currently the occupant of 2 The Villas (applicant's father) nearly exclusively uses the hard standing at the front of 2 The Villas to park and very seldom uses the rear access. This is only used very infrequently by visitors. Therefore there will not be any discernible lessoning of the impact of the inevitable increased traffic flow resulting from this proposed development.Being a small village generally without footpaths or street lighting, this could potentially exacerbate the growing use of the back lane/road from the Weston on the Green junction through to the Wyvale Bicester Garden Centre as a rat run for traffic to and from Bicester avoiding the A34/M40 Junction 9.2. Key Design issue vi) The mature Ash and Walnut trees on the site would be retained The 1:500 Site Plan included in the application is inaccurate as it shows the Ash tree where the Walnut tree is, and vice versa. These trees offer a significant benefit to wildlife and the environment, and it is suggested that a preservation order is put on these trees to protect them under this development, and this commitment to retain them is welcome.However, it seems unlikely that the construction of the proposed garage for Plot 2 will be able to take place without interference (overground and underground) to the Walnut tree at the rear of Dunsford, Farriers Mead. This is of particular concern as the planning permission approved for the recent adjacent (non-hotel) developments at The Red Lion Public House included a commitment to not remove or interfere with any existing trees or hedgerows, and a mature Poplar tree was chopped down and removed apparently going against that commitment. A repeat ignoring of such a commitment on this proposed development would be unacceptable.The following comments refer to the Flood Risk Assessment ref: 15-1749.07.001-Rev.1. Page 4 of 26 includes the statement "To the north and south [of the property] are residential properties that by their nature of their areas will not generate overland sheet flows".This statement is inaccurate, in as much as there are no residential properties to the north of the land permission is being sought to be developed upon. The land adjacent to the north is the relatively extensive garden area of the Red Lion Public House, which has recently had some banking formed at the eastern extremity of the garden area which may deflect excessive ground water into the vicinity of the houses proposed for development.We would be grateful if you would consider the comments raised in this letter in the Council's consideration of this proposed development.Yours faithfully,Roger A Dyson |