

Comment for planning application 20/01747/F

Application Number	20/01747/F
Location	Land South Side Of Widnell Lane Piddington
Proposal	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
Case Officer	Matthew Chadwick
Organisation Name	Michael Nixon
Address	81 Thame Road,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1QB
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I am writing to object to the planning application 20/01747/F to increase the size of the gypsy/traveller by a further 6 pitches, increasing the development size to 18 pitches from the current 6 pitches (as granted at planning appeal in 2019, see APP/C3105/W/18/3209349). The planning committee and planning officers will know that this is the fourth application for this development. The first two, for 16 pitches (17/00145/F) and then for 6 pitches (17/01962/F), were both unanimously refused by the planning committee. The second refusal decision by the planning committee was eventually overturned at appeal and a development of six permanent and 6 touring caravan pitches was granted by the Planning Inspector subject to a series of detailed conditions set out in two pages covering 14 paragraphs of conditions. Since this appeal was granted a further 12 pitches have been applied for 6 in application 20/01122/F and a further 6 in this application 20/01747/F and if granted this will take the overall site to 18 pitches. Piddington is a small category C rural village of just over 350 residents. Increasing the size of this deployment from 6 to 18 pitches would lead to approx. 108 new residents (assuming an average of 6 people per pitch) which would dominate the nearest settled community and be unsustainable within a category C village with no infrastructure. Piddington was described in the previous planning report as one of the least sustainable locations in Cherwell. I question the need for these additional pitches. At the appeal hearing the Parish Council presented compelling evidence that the gypsy and traveller needs assessment was flawed and inaccurate. Since the application to develop this site the number of traveller pitches granted by Cherwell has risen by 13, so before any further expansion anywhere in Cherwell is considered the District Council must address these deficiencies in their needs assessment (GTAA) and commission an updated and accurate assessment to define the real need. Should a need be found then emphasis should be to develop sustainable locations close to medical support, schools and shops, such as the Council's development at Graven Hill. Cherwell should identify suitable sites in its new Local Plan. Should the Council be minded to allow this development and grant permission then I would expect all the conditions imposed by the planning inspector in his report of 28th October 2019 ref APP/C3105/W/18/3209349 be applied to this application. The Planning Inspector made it clear in his report overturning the Councils decision and granting permission for six pitches that prior to commencement of any work that: " The site shall not be occupied until a water supply and electricity supply have been provided in accordance with schemes which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority". In paragraph 8 the inspector also says: " No development shall take place until detailed schemes for the foul and surface water drainage of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water scheme shall be based on sustainable drainage principles and no surface water from the site shall discharge into the public highway or into the adopted highway draining system. The approved foul water drainage system shall be implemented prior to first occupancy of the site and shall be retained thereafter". I, along with most Piddington residents, would expect to see compliance with all the conditions for the already approved six pitches and evidence of continued compliance before any consideration for further development is considered. This application warrants determination by the full planning committee and should be considered at the same time as application 20/01122/F as these applications are for the same site. For the reasons stated above I urge that the planning committee refuse this application.</p>
Received Date	24/08/2020 11:00:22
Attachments	