

Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** James Kirkham  
**Sent:** 19 August 2020 09:16  
**To:** DC Support  
**Cc:** Matthew Chadwick  
**Subject:** FW: Representation - Piddington 20/01747/F and 20/01122/F

Hi

Can the below please be added to DEF as a public rep against 20/01747/F and 20/01122/F?

Thanks

**From:** Samantha Phillips <[samhoward@samphillips.net](mailto:samhoward@samphillips.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2020 4:27:35 PM  
**To:** Councillor Barry Wood <[Barry.Wood@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Barry.Wood@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Piddington

**20/01747/F - OS Parcel 9635 North East of HM Bullingdon Prison, Widnell Lane, Piddington**  
Material change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 12 gypsy / traveller families, each with two caravans, including improvement of access, laying of hardstanding and installation of package sewage treatment plant.

I , Mrs S. Phillips of Piddington , would like to register that I am wholly against this latest application.

This is the fourth application for Gypsy/ Traveller pitches on this parcel of land. 17/00145/F (16 pitches) and 17/01962/F (6 pitches) were both refused; the refusal of 17/01962/F was subsequently overturned at appeal. A further application 20/01122/F to build 12 pitches rather than 6 on the appeal site is currently under consideration. If both the current applications were to be approved, a total of 18 double pitches, ie potentially 36 units of accommodation, would be constructed near a village of fewer than 150 households.

What is more these applications 17/01962/F and 20/01122/F appear to be coming from the same source – albeit using different names.

CDC has failed to publish Part 2 of its Local Plan which would have included the allocation and designation of land already held under CDC ownership for use as traveller sites. Despite the monumental amount of land development, housing estates, warehouses, shopping centres, not one traveller site has been identified by CDC. They have also failed to follow Government guidelines. The Home Bonus Scheme is an incentive for local authorities to invest in traveller sites. CDC has failed to act upon this and allocate these funds accordingly.

#### **DOMINANCE OF NEAREST SETTLED COMMUNITY.**

Piddington is an isolated Category C village with no amenities.

The Government Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS 2015) requires that consideration is given to the scale of sites with respect to the nearest settled community. Policy B par 10, sub paragraph d) "Relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density."

Further, in section Policy C, relating to sites in rural or semi-rural areas and the countryside in par 14 says:

“When assessing the suitability in rural or semi-rural settings, the local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.”

Policy H par 25 also states:

“Local planning authorities should very strictly limit traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community .....”

If these two new applications are granted, this would increase the overall size of the development from 6 pitches to 18 pitches (2 caravans per pitch, 1 mobile and 1 static, so overall 36 caravans on site). If we assume an average of 6 residents/ pitch this would result in a site population of 108 people. With a population of 370 in the whole quite extensive parish of Piddington, about 330 in the village itself, this equates to a population increase of nearly 30%, ie **23% of the resulting total population would be from the Gypsy/ Traveller community**. The 2011 census recorded 58,000 Gypsy/ Travellers in England and Wales or 0.1% of the total population. **Increasing the Gypsy/ Traveller population of Piddington to 23% of the total population as compared with the national average of 0.1%** would, in the opinion of the Parish Council, be contrary to PPTS 2015 Policies B (10) (d), C (14) and H (25) and constitute dominance of the settled community.

Policy H paragraph 25 of the PPTS 2015 states:

“Local planning authorities should ..... avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.”

## **ERRONEOUS ACCOUNTING OF DEMAND AND SUPPLY.**

CDC have based their decisions on the GTAA 2013 which is seven years out of date and was carried out prior to a change in definition. It has been superseded by the GTAA 2017, which takes account of the change.

Two entire or partial sites where either travellers did not live or which were not designated specifically for their use have been erroneously included, both in the base for calculations of growth and overcrowding and as losses when they closed.

Station Approach, Banbury **was not** a Gypsy/ Traveller site. No restrictive condition regarding occupancy was placed it at the time the original planning application was approved and when it closed, only non-travellers were living there.

When Planning Application 17/01233/OUT for development of the site was considered by Committee the officer wrote:

“8.12 Discussions with the County Council Gypsy and Travellers Officer have confirmed that none of the previous caravan pitch occupiers are Gypsies and Travellers, and that it may be some time since such occupiers have used the facility. Furthermore that permission granted in the 1970s was not specifically for or limited to such occupiers. In these circumstances your officers consider that a refusal based on the loss of this facility could not be sustained at appeal.”

When an application 12/01368/F for a site at Mollington was considered at appeal APP/C3105/A/13/2196896 the inspector remarked:

“27. ....However, the Council accepted that the Station Caravan Park in Banbury is not wholly restricted to occupancy by gypsies and travellers .....”

Estimates employing alternative official data imply that a large proportion of existing pitches are occupied by households who do not comply with the PPTS 2015 definition.

Estimates of need for pitches are inherently uncertain owing to incomplete and flawed data about the travelling community.

## **UNSUSTAINABLE IN RELATION TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE**

Policy H paragraph 25 of the PPTS 2015 states:

“Local planning authorities should ..... avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.”

In terms of sustainability, the site for this new application, which is part of the same parcel of land as previous and current other Gypsy/ Traveller site planning applications 17/00145/F, 17/01962/F and the site was, and still remains entirely unsustainable as laid down by the DCLG PPTS 2015, The National Planning Policy Framework and Cherwell District Council's own Policy.

Piddington is a category C village, with a village Hall and a Church as its only amenities. The nearest category A village is Arncott but this has been described in a previous planning report as one of the least sustainable Category A villages with only a small shop and lacking a school or health provision. There are no schools or doctors within 3km of the site and only 1 small shop at about 3km distant. The nearest primary school is 4km away in Ambrosden and is already full. The nearest GP surgeries in Brill and Bicester are closed to new patients - a known issue with the rapid development of Bicester and although there is a small surgery in Ambrosden it is open only 2 hours a week and is scheduled for closure.

The planning inspector's report 17/01962/F acknowledged the site was wholly unsustainable, because of an (unverified) need, he approved 6 pitches. As already stated, this need, we now know is based on erroneous accounting and no such need exists. Surely any increase on this number of pitches under this application or Application 20/01122/F, revisits the overall unsuitability of the site and will only exacerbate the sustainability issues, for example more flash flood run off, more school places and school transport required, no access to GP services. The appeal was assured by the appellant that 6 pitches was all that was required.

The Gypsy/Traveller site at Oaksvie just outside of Arncott also cites Arncott as the nearest Category A village. How can one Category A village, deemed by CDC as 'not the most sustainable of the Category A villages' owing to its very limited facilities, be expected to support 3 Gypsy/ Traveller sites, 13 pitches at Oaksvie Park, 6 pitches under 17/01962/F, potentially 6 pitches under 20/01122/F, and a further 6 pitches under this application. All of these pitches are within 3km of each other. This is irrefutably not sustainable, nor in keeping with any policy document and would most certainly place an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.

**The above information must be taken into consideration. Mistakes, failures, and inaction by CDC has allowed a group of savvy individuals to speculatively buy up pockets of land in rural villages. They are exploiting, flouting, and manipulating the planning laws at the expense of rural communities and it's about time CDC took responsibility for this.**

Mrs. S Phillips  
17.08.20

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..