

## Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** Peter Monk [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 May 2023 18:36  
**To:** DC Support  
**Subject:** Re 22/03868/OUT

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

These are belated comments on this proposal which I hope can be considered.

I object to this proposal as this site is NOT allocated for development in the current Approved Local Plan and it breaches the de facto boundary of the approved development area for Banbury. There are extensive areas in and around Banbury that are already approved for development which are currently lying fallow (e.g. Parts of Ban 17 and Canalside) and until these, and the associated infrastructure elements emerge, no more sites should be approved. Further moves towards coalescence with Bloxham must be resisted.

Consideration of this application is therefore premature, particularly in the light of the current consultation of the Local Plan Review now in hand and therefore this application should be refused.

This is yet another speculative development proposal on the furthest outskirts of Banbury and given the dearth of infrastructure provision thus far and the pressure already placed on most of the social, economic and cultural facilities of the town, it seems not unreasonable to request the developer to undertake some research into the effects of their proposals on the viability of these features of the town and to report in relation to the application accordingly.

Whilst this cannot be insisted upon under current legislation, refusal, or inability, to provide this information should be reported to the Planning Committee by officers in order to draw attention to the uncaring attitude of the proposer.

To be precise : -

Do the under-mentioned facilities / services have capacity at present to meet the needs of their intended occupiers and will the proposal not worsen the current situation and performance of the facilities and services mentioned.

Utilities - water, gas ,electricity, telephone and broadband

Education -Primary and Secondary.

Health - GP Surgery services, specialist clinics, dentistry etc.

Transport - Highway capacity and public transport services , distance to longer distance transport facilities and accessibility

Employment - vacancies at all skill levels.

Cultural - proximity to social centre facilities and to mainstream amusement outlets and cultural events.

In this context it is worth noting that the site on the other side of the A361 ( Ban 17) promised a primary school, a GP surgery and a local shopping facility, none of which have materialised thus far and are not likely to do so for many years.

Positive responses should be expected for all these aspects of life for both new and existing residents if the existing town to avoid residents being burdened with yet more expenditure to maintain a modicum of social adhesion and experience.

**WE JUST CANNOT KEEP ON 'BOLTING-ON MORE AND MORE DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT ADDITIONAL STRENGTHENING OF THE FACILITIES MENTIONED.**

Banbury is struggling to absorb the additional population generated by the developments approved and constructed over the last few years and both physical and social infrastructure needs to catch up. Primary medical services have become a joke during and since the pandemic with less and less availability for face-to -face consultations and virtually no no highway or public transport improvements have taken place over the past many years.

The comments regarding sustainability, with particular reference to public transport, access to further transport opportunities, and the commercial and employment activities in Banbury are overly optimistic.

These points should be pressed to the Planning Committee.

If by some quirk of legal or planning advice Committee is minded to agree this additional tranche of housing, can it be relocated on the yet to be commissioned allotments in Ban 16 and the latter relocated on the site presently proposed for development ? This would be in conformity with the non-coalescence principle

Peter Monk

55 Waller Drive.