

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

Sent: 24 August 2020 22:22

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 Marie-Claire Nixon-Davingoff

Address:

81 Thame Road,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1QB

Comment type:

Objection

Comments:

Comment for planning application 20/01747/F Application Number 20/01747/F Location Os Parcel 9635 North East Of Hm Bullingdon Prison Widnell Lane Piddington

Name Marie-Claire Nixon-Davingoff

Address 81 Thame Road,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1QB

I wish to enter my objection to the above referenced planning proposal. The original planning application for 6 caravans was granted even though the nearby village of Piddington is classed as a category C village. This means that the residents of the site will not have easy access to public transport, GPs or other medical services, schools, shops or a pub. To access basic amenities they will need to drive, walk or catch the bus from Bullingdon prison, which now runs a reduced timetable. Of more concern to me is the lack of basic facilities for those families that are destined to end up living on what is basically a field.

It is located close to the army firing range that, under normal non - Covid conditions, has live firing every day at high decibel ranges. The field has no power, water or sewage facilities, the provision of which was an original planning condition stipulated prior to any works at the site being commenced. That was when the original application for 6 caravans was granted.

Since that application there have been ground works to make a rubble standing to the field and some initial sewerage provision has been installed. Since the original application was granted Cherwell district council has established further travellers' sites in the area and have not updated their gypsy and traveller accommodation needs assessment (not updated since 2017). The question is, therefore, how desperately does Cherwell council need this site? If there's no immediate need for another 6 caravans then there is certainly no need for 18. I would urge Cherwell council to consider the implications of having a larger number of families and children on a site that has safety and health issues for its residents; the original approval for a smaller number of caravans was clearly not based on sound reasoning or due regard for the realities of the site, so tripling the number of residents will only add to these issues and turn a bad situation into something much worse. If the site really is suitable for a larger number of families I would ask each and every person on the planning panel to honestly say that they themselves would be willing to live there. I doubt if anyone can vouch that they would.

Case Officer:

Matthew Chadwick