

From: Mathieu Walker
Sent: 24 August 2020 22:36
To: DC Support
Subject: RE: Planning Application 20/01747/F

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have tried to upload my OBJECTION to an application to your portal but I keep getting an error message.

Please find attached my Objection letter for your consideration.

Regards,

Mathieu Walker

Laurell Farmhouse
51 Thame Road
Piddington
OX25 1PY

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: Planning Application 20/01747/F

Change of Use of land to a 6no pitch Gypsy and Traveller site to include 6no mobiles, 6no tourers and associated operational development including hardstanding and fencing

Please accept this letter as my **OBJECTION** to the proposed traveller caravan site on Widnell Lane, Piddington.

OVERWHELMING AN ISOLATED VILLAGE

Piddington is a small community approx. 350 people.

Application (20/01122/F) to build twelve pitches on adjacent land – (rather than the six already approved at appeal) -- is also currently under consideration.

If both applications are allowed that would total 36 caravans. At 2.39 individuals per caravan that would add approx. 86 individuals, representing a 25% population increase. This is totally disproportionate and would clearly overwhelm the village.

Piddington is a Category C village – which according to Cherwell's own policy means this sort and scale of development is not permitted. Approval would contravene The Department of Communities and Local Government's Planning Policy for gypsy/traveller sites which states:

"Local planning authorities should very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan".

Allowing the site would go against Cherwell Council's very own Local Plan (2011-2031) which states:

"It will be important to identify sites that will enable access to services, facilities and potential employment".

Piddington has absolutely no services or amenities. No shop, no pub, no school, no doctor, no Post Office, not even a regular bus service. The Council itself admits neighbouring Arccott is one of Cherwell's least sustainable Category 'A' villages.

PLANNING INSPECTOR CONCERNS

In his conclusions to the appeal allowing 6 pitches on adjacent land, the Planning Inspector states:

"There shall be no more than six pitches on the site, and no more than two caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 shall be stationed on each residential pitch at any time."

The Planning Inspector's report acknowledges that the site is wholly unsustainable and his stipulations on size reflect clear concerns about the severe limitations of the area. This latest plan to add a second site, extending the overall footprint and demands, cannot possibly be considered acceptable. It further exasperates all the issues the Planning Inspector recognised and must be refused.

DEMAND AND ALTERNATIVES

Cherwell District Council has already recently approved a high number of other sites – 13 brand new pitches within the last 18 months. This begs significant questions about actual demand. Where is the evidence that so many new sites are necessary?

ROAD DANGER

The site will use a small, narrow unclassified country lane for access. The lane has no markings, street lights, or warning signs for the tight, blind corners. The lane also does not have a path for walkers. Using this country lane as the main entry/exit is dangerous and entirely inappropriate. **Has an appropriate risk assessment of road safety been completed?**

Will Cherwell District Council be held accountable and liable for the first injury/fatality due to increased traffic on this unsuitable country lane?

In addition, the application presumes all site traffic would use the B4011. This is an extremely fast, busy road - the major route between Thame and Bicester. Access to it from Widnell Lane is already a safety hazard as a result of poor visibility and there are no pedestrian crossings, making it highly unsafe for anyone on foot. People attempting to walk from the site to the nearest Category 'A' village would be at risk as the large 'B' road does not have pavements.

EXPLOITING THE SYSTEM

This application is a flagrant attempt at exploiting the system, which I hope that the Council will see through. Giving this application any credibility will make a mockery of the process and set a dangerous precedent; you will be inviting more disingenuous applications at the expense of genuine/legitimate applications.

I, for one, would welcome additional residential development in Piddington if this could be done in properly considered manner and in conjunction with developing some basic and critically needed amenities. The recent COVID-19 pandemic made clear just how vulnerable the community was with no local shop and limited delivery options for basic essentials. Piddington's high number of vulnerable (aged) residents aggravated this issue.

Thank you for taking the time to read my objection.

Yours faithfully,

M Walker
Thame Road
Piddington