

From: dc.support@cherwell-dc.gov.uk <dc.support@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

Sent: 24 August 2020 22:08

To: DC Support <DC.Support@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

Subject: New comments for application 20/01747/F

New comments have been received for application 20/01747/F at site address: Land South Side Of Widnell Lane Piddington

from Roderick Delve

Address:

18 Thame Road,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1PX

Comment type:

Objection

Comments:

I am writing to strongly object to this application.

I am beginning to think that this is a war of attrition with application after application being thrown around speculatively and I can honestly see no end as long as no matter how democratically they are considered and rejected at local and district level, they are rubber stamped on appeal to the planning inspector.

Others have more eloquently and in an informed way expressed their strong belief that Cherwell District Council have erred in their calculations in respect of the number of Gypsy/Traveler sites they need provision for. I would concur that it may have been influential in the recent appeal decision relating to 17/01962/F but am concerned moreover that it may impact the council's position on both applications 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F.

It would seem evident that the entire process from the initial application for 16 pitches (aka 32 vans) through being granted 6 pitches (VIS. 12 vans) to an application for change of use for 12 (IE 24 vans) and now the fresh almost parallel change of use of adjacent land reference application 20/01747/F to accommodate 6 pitches (vis 12 vans) is nothing short of opportunistic at the least and a blatant attempt to capitalize on their recent success in bamboozling the planning process and gaining support from the planning inspector.

The size of this development relating to BOTH applications, 20/01122/F and 20/01747/F arguably by the same person or 'partnership' and in utterly the wrong place will effectively be completely out of step and character with Piddington, a small category 'C' village with no amenities whatever. The increased population of Gypsy Travelers will again put unparalleled pressure on services including Schools and Medical facilities at a time when social distancing and the effects of the Pandemic are already having a negative impact.

The application in question, 20/01747/F refers to an 'existing' access. Maybe this is a language I am not privy to because when I study the plans it is quite clear that there is no such access excepting that provided for by the application for the adjacent encampment of 20/01122/F. Nothing new there then.

Widnel Lane is already busy with village traffic and increased use by cyclists and walkers. Another access will not be welcome.

From a health perspective I think the jury is still out, but it wasn't that long ago that it was scientifically proposed that living within 200 meters of 132,000 volt power lines was linked to an increased probability of childhood cancers. Whatever the reality living under the shadow of these power lines must be a higher risk in many senses and one that should prudently be avoided.

I have already made a detailed objection to the change of use of the adjacent site in respect of 20/01122/F and many of those arguments are equally relevant here. The botanical, biodiversity and

ecology assessments of the adjacent parcel are now more than 3 years old! Further development of what tant amounts to a Gypsy/Travller village in the making will naturally add to light pollution, hand in hand with noise and environmental nuisance to mention the mentionable

Roderick Delve