

From: Andrew Coleman

Sent: 13 August 2020 12:30

To: James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: Yuen Wong <Yuen.Wong@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Mike Nixon' <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; Piddington Parish Council <piddington.parish.clerk@googlemail.com>; Matthew Chadwick <Matthew.Chadwick@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor James Macnamara <James.Macnamara@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Mike Nixon' <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; 'Pam Feltbower' <pam.feltbower@piddingtonpc.com>; Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Applications 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F

Dear Mr Kirkham

Thank you for your reply. I am pleased to see at the end of the comments from the Council's Planning Policy Team that:

"There is currently a sufficient supply of gypsy and traveller pitches based on the most up to date evidence on need therefore there is no pressing need for additional land to be released at this time."

as this does address one of the concerns I raised.

While I appreciate that as the Planning Officer for one of the recent applications near Piddington you may not be able to give detailed responses concerning that application, I would like to stress, especially to others reading this email, that my points about how Station Approach Caravan Park, Banbury, and the Bloxham site, both now closed, have been used in calculating need for traveller sites are general points about planning policy, not specific points about recent applications. As such, I see no reason why I should not receive a reply to these questions from the appropriate person.

I would like to know whether council officers agree that mistakes have been made, and if they do not agree I would like to know the reasons for that disagreement.

Best wishes

Andrew Coleman

From: James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Sent: 13 August 2020 11:59

To: Andrew Coleman; Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: Yuen Wong <Yuen.Wong@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Mike Nixon' <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; Piddington Parish Council <piddington.parish.clerk@googlemail.com>; Matthew Chadwick <Matthew.Chadwick@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor James Macnamara <James.Macnamara@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Mike Nixon <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; Pam Feltbower <pam.feltbower@piddingtonpc.com>; Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Applications 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F

Dear Mr Coleman

Thank you for your comments on this application and I apologise for the time taken to respond. Given that these are comments relating to ongoing planning applications we are unable to provide a detailed response to your queries. However, please rest assured the matters that you have raised will be covered within the Committee Papers for the elected Councillors to consider when they make a determination of the planning application.

You may also have seen that we have recently received comments from the Council's Planning Policy Team who are advising that the most appropriate figures to base the determination of the application on would be the figures in the 2017 GTAA rather than the figures within Policy BSC6 of the Local Plan 2015.

Whilst I appreciate this is not the detailed response you may have hoped for I trust it provides you with some assurance that your comments will be considered fully.

Kind regards

James Kirkham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer – General Developments Planning Team

Development Management
Place and Growth Directorate
Cherwell District Council
Direct Line: 01295 221896

www.cherwell.gov.uk

Follow Us:

Facebook www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil

Twitter @cherwellcouncil

My usual working hours currently are: Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, 08:30 to 17:00

Coronavirus (COVID-19): In response to the latest Government guidance and until further notice, the Planning Service has been set up to work remotely, from home. Customers are asked not to come to Bodicote House but instead to phone or email the Planning Service on 01295 227006: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk. For the latest information about how the Planning Service is impacted by COVID-19, please check the website: www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk.

From: Andrew Coleman

Sent: 10 August 2020 16:24

To: Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Yuen Wong <Yuen.Wong@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Mike Nixon' <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; Piddington Parish Council <piddington.parish.clerk@googlemail.com>; Matthew Chadwick <Matthew.Chadwick@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor James Macnamara <James.Macnamara@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Mike Nixon <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; Pam Feltbower <pam.feltbower@piddingtonpc.com>; Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Applications 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F

Thanks Nat.

As you can appreciate, I pushing this because I am keen to get some recognition from CDC that there have been errors in the way that the need for gypsy/traveller sites has been calculated before the

applications on land near Piddington are decided. I believe that the miscalculations of need and reluctance to take into account the changed legal definition of gypsy/travellers that is accepted in the 2017 GTAA have led directly to CDC having its planning decisions overturned at appeal. The figures in the Local Plan are clearly not applicable since the change of definition, yet the planning department continues to give them a significance equal to or greater than the more recent GTAA. The loss of the Station Approach Caravan Park clearly shouldn't have been included in CDC's calculation of deficit as it never was a gypsy site and was not occupied by gypsies, yet despite the fact that CDC officers have acknowledged this on several occasions, the statistics continue to show them as a loss. I appreciate my points about the Bloxham site are more complex and need looking into, but I am concerned that unless planning officers have additional concrete direction concerning need very soon, they may be persuaded by the recent appeal decisions that they cannot reasonably recommend refusal for these additional applications at the Piddington site.

The development of this land was clearly a commercially venture from the start whose intention was to create a very large site. Even the 18 pitches now proposed do not fill the land available to the owners, so I can see future applications being made if the current ones are successful.

Best wishes

Andrew Coleman

From: Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Sent: 10 August 2020 13:54

To: Andrew Coleman

Cc: James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Yuen Wong <Yuen.Wong@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Mike Nixon <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; Piddington Parish Council <piddington.pariah.clerk@googlemail.com>; Matthew Chadwick <Matthew.Chadwick@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor James Macnamara <James.Macnamara@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Applications 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F

Dear Mr Coleman,

Thank you for your email to David re the above.

David directed me to contact you, to arrange a discussion to include Yuen Wong in our Policy team, once I had a chance to consider the matter. Unfortunately I have not yet had opportunity to consider the matter further.

The DM planning officers dealing with the current applications will need to take advice from our colleagues in planning policy, and also consider the very important issue of cumulative impact and at what point a parish / village / settlement may be 'overwhelmed' by such provision in its vicinity.

We will be having that internal discussion as DM officers next Monday (arranged on that date for a weeks now as a date/time convenient to DM officers) and will then discuss with Yuen the following week who is unfortunately on leave next week. We will then be in more of a position to respond to you.

This is a complex area of planning, where the Council is frequently 'overruled' at appeal, and we are very conscious of the need to make the most informed, reasoned discussion possible weighing all the relevant material considerations.

I hope this assists and we look forward to being in touch again in due course.

Kind regards,
Nat

Nathanael Stock MRTPI
Team Leader – General Developments Planning Team

Development Management
Place and Growth Directorate
Cherwell District Council
Direct Line: 01295 221886
www.cherwell.gov.uk

Details of applications are available to view through the Council's Online Planning Service at <http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications>

Instructions on how to use the Public Access service to **view, comment on and keep track of applications** can be found at <http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/viewplanningapp>

Follow us:

Facebook www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil

Twitter @Cherwellcouncil

My usual working hours are: Monday to Friday, 09:15 hrs to 17:15 hrs.

Coronavirus (COVID-19): In response to the latest Government guidance and until further notice, the Planning Service has been set up to work remotely, from home. Customers are asked not to come to Bodicote House but instead to phone or email the Planning Service on 01295 227006: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk. For the latest information about how the Planning Service is impacted by COVID-19, please check the website: www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk.

From: Andrew Coleman

Sent: 10 August 2020 13:40

To: David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Yuen Wong <Yuen.Wong@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor James Macnamara <James.Macnamara@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Maurice Billington <Maurice.Billington@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Mike Nixon <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; Piddington Parish Council <piddington.park.clerk@googlemail.com>; Matthew Chadwick <Matthew.Chadwick@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Applications 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F

Dear Mr Peckford

I have still had no reply to my emails from anyone other than a brief response from James Kirkham on 24 July to say he was looking into it. It is now 6 weeks since my original email? What is happening?

Andrew Coleman

From: Andrew Coleman
Sent: 23 July 2020 15:04
To: 'David Peckford' <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Councillor David Hughes' <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Councillor Simon Holland' <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Councillor Timothy Hallchurch' <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Sarah Stevens' <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Nathanael Stock' <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'James Kirkham' <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'Yuen Wong' <Yuen.Wong@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; 'james.macnamara@cherwell-dc.gov.uk' <james.macnamara@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; 'maurice.billington@cherwell-dc.gov.uk' <maurice.billington@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; Mike Nixon <michael.nixon@piddingtonpc.com>; piddington.pariah.clerk@googlemail.com;
'matthew.chadwick@cherwell-dc.gov.uk' <matthew.chadwick@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Applications 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F

Dear Mr Peckford

I am writing again as I have had no reply from any of the people you asked to contact me. As you may be aware, yet another planning application has been made for a gypsy site on Widnell Lane, Piddington. This means that there is approval for 6 pitches here plus applications for a further 12 pitches, making 18 in total. The latest application, 20/01747/F, is adjacent to application 20/01122/F, on the same field and as far as I can tell on land at least jointly owned by the same person as the earlier applications, although the applicants are different. In view of these applications I think it is now urgent that someone at CDC takes a serious look at the actual need for gypsy/traveller sites in the district in light of the comments I have made in my objection to application 20/01122/F. I am attaching that objection again as I am now including the chairman and vice-chairman of the planning committee in this email so I want to make sure that they read it.
Best wishes
Andrew Coleman

From: David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 July 2020 11:42
To: Andrew Coleman
Cc: Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Yuen Wong <Yuen.Wong@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Application 20/01122/F

Dear Mr Coleman

I appreciate that you are looking for specific advice. I'm afraid that I have not been involved in the detail of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation provision for some years and rely on officers to assist. Nat, once you have had the chance to consider, could you arrange to speak to Mr Coleman with Yuen Wong from the Planning Policy team. As you are aware, Yuen is now far more familiar with the detail than I am.

Thank you

David

David Peckford

Assistant Director - Planning and Development

Place and Growth Directorate

Cherwell District Council

david.peckford@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

www.cherwell.gov.uk

Facebook www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil

Twitter @cherwellcouncil

Coronavirus (COVID-19): In response to the latest Government guidance and until further notice, the Planning and Development Services have been set up to work remotely, from home. Customers are asked not to come to Bodicote House but instead to contact the service required. Development Management and Building Control can be contacted on 01295 227006. Planning Policy, Conservation & Design can be contacted on 01295 227985. For further information visit : www.cherwell.gov.uk

From: Andrew Coleman

Sent: 01 July 2020 11:16

To: David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Objection to Planning Application 20/01122/F

Dear Mr Peckford

Thank you for your reply. I would like to make it clear that I would like a considered reply from someone to the specific points about errors in the calculation of need for gypsy/traveller sites I made in my objection letter. If I am right, I think that a serious error has been made by CDC in the past and that this is being perpetuated to the detriment of CDC and areas affected by planning applications that are speculative and for profit rather to satisfy a genuine need. I don't wish to see this just buried in the public responses to the Piddington application and ignored.

I sent my original email to you as you were clearly involved at the beginning of this error and hold a high position within CDC. I was not suggesting you were responsible for the error – the reverse, in fact, as I think at the time you were trying to help make sure there were sufficient pitches to satisfy future need.

Best wishes

Andrew Coleman

From: David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Sent: 29 June 2020 11:10

To:

Cc: Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch <Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Nathanael Stock <Nathanael.Stock@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; James Kirkham

<James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Objection to Planning Application 20/01122/F

Dear Mr Coleman

Thank you for your email.

I am copying in Sarah Stevens – Senior Development Management Manager - and Nat Stock one of our Development Management team leaders who will pick this up.

Kind regards

David Peckford

Assistant Director - Planning and Development

Place and Growth Directorate

Cherwell District Council

david.peckford@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

www.cherwell.gov.uk

Facebook www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil

Twitter @cherwellcouncil

Coronavirus (COVID-19): In response to the latest Government guidance and until further notice, the Planning and Development Services have been set up to work remotely, from home. Customers are asked not to come to Bodicote House but instead to contact the service required. Development Management and Building Control can be contacted on 01295 227006. Planning Policy, Conservation & Design can be contacted on 01295 227985. For further information visit : www.cherwell.gov.uk

From: Andrew Coleman

Sent: 28 June 2020 17:45

To: David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland

<Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Timothy Hallchurch

<Timothy.Hallchurch@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; James Kirkham <James.Kirkham@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 20/01122/F

Dear Mr Peckford

I am attaching a copy of my objection to the above planning application for a gypsy/traveller site with 12 pitches near Piddington. I am sending it to you as I am using a memo written by you in 2012 concerning an application to extend the Bloxham site by 16 pitches as part of an argument that CDC has consistently overestimated its need for gypsy sites. I have traced this overestimate back to an error in the 2012/13 GTAA whereby the additional 16 pitches at Bloxham (which were never built) were treated as being existing occupied pitches upon which calculation of future need was based instead of pitches that were approved in order to satisfy any future need that might be identified based on the number of pitches that were actually occupied before the 16 were approved. It is clear from your memo (copy attached) that the intention was for these sites to satisfy future need, whereas in fact they ended up artificially inflating the perceived future need. This error was then perpetuated in the Local Plan which has from the time of its publication been used as a basis for planning applications and approvals.

I would be grateful if you could look into this and let me now whether you agree with my argument. I think it is important, as applications consistently say that the Local Plan is the definitive basis for

calculating need even though a more recent GTAA (2017) has been published which indicates a much reduced need.

I haven't attached the 2012/13 GTAA, but I have inserted screenshots below of the relevant sections where it is clear that the document is assuming all pitches are occupied, including the newly approved 16 at Bloxham that are therefore erroneously included in the calculation of future need.

I am also attaching a report from Steve Jarman of ORS explaining why it is sensible to use the 2017 GTAA in place of the earlier 2012/13 GTAA as the basis for calculating future need, as that is also another strand of my argument about how the need is overestimated. This report was produced for the 2019 appeal but was never used because it was common ground between the LPA and the Appellant that there was no supply of sites to meet the need for gypsy and traveller accommodation in Cherwell. Now that 13 additional sites have been approved this document is once again relevant.

Andrew Coleman

Piddington

Extract from

**Cherwell, West Oxfordshire and South
Northamptonshire Gypsy and Traveller
Housing Needs Assessment 2012/13**



Reconciling supply and demand

6.18 In summary, there is a total demand over the next five years (2012/13 to 2016/17) for 5 pitches in Cherwell, 6 in West Oxfordshire and 6 in South Northamptonshire. This analysis assumes that all pitches described in Table 4.1 are occupied which includes sites with full planning permission and tolerated sites.

Table 4.1 List of authorised sites as at 31st March 2012¹⁰

Local Authority	Site Address	Number Of Pitches	Type	Notes
Cherwell DC	Station Caravan Park, Station Approach, Banbury, Oxon OX165AB	10	Priv	Full Planning Permission
Cherwell DC	Smiths Caravan Site, Bloxham Road, Milton, Oxon OX15 4HE	36	Priv	Previous long-standing planning permission expired. Permanent permission granted on 24 th Feb 2012 for 36 pitches
Cherwell DC	Bicester Trailer Park (Rossiter's), Oxford Road, Chesterton, Bicester, Oxon OX25 2NY.	8 out of 18 pitches on site available for Gypsy and Traveller use	Priv	Full Planning permission for use of eight pitches for Gypsies and Travellers; remaining 10 pitches for alternative use.
Cherwell DC	Corner Meadow, Off the A423, Mollington, Oxon OX17 1ND	4	Priv	Full Planning Permission Site subject of current application for further pitches.
Cherwell DC	Horwood Site, Ardley Road, Ardley, Oxon OX27 7HP	1	Priv	Full Planning Permission (personal permission only)

¹⁰ Northamptonshire Countywide Traveller and Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Gypsy and Traveller Services data

Local Authority	Site Address	Number Of Pitches	Type	Notes
Cherwell DC	Land Adjoining A34 by Hampton Gay and Poyle, Oxon	8	Priv	Full Planning Permission.
Cherwell DC	Land South West of Woodstock Road, Yarnton, Oxon	3	Priv	Personal and temporary Planning Permission granted 16 th Feb 2012 for three years.