Comment for planning application 23/02523/F

Application Number	23/02523/F	
Location	Kirtlington Village Hall South Green Kirtlington OX5 3HJ	
Proposal	Erection of single storey detached community shop and cafe	
Case Officer	Clancy Sloan	

Organisation

Name

Mrs. J. Mary Scraggs

Address

Otters Pond, South Green, Kirtlington, Kidlington, OX5 3HJ

Type of Comment

Objection

Туре

neighbour

Comments

I am strongly opposed to this application for many reasons.

Firstly, I would point out that although the proposed site is adacent to the Village Hall, it is in no way part of the plan for the Hall, the planning application for which was made by the Parish Council as representatives for the village residents. The current application is made by a minority group, mostly relative newcomers to the village who have no real knowledge of its traditions and workings, and who have not heeded Parish Council's request that they hold a public meeting before proceeding further. The only consultation with the village was the inaugural meeting in c. July 2022 to ask "do we want a shop?", and a subseqent loaded questionnaire which inevitably produced the pie chart shown as Appendix A of the Design, Access and Heritage Statement. At no time have we been presented with a full business plan and costings, as requested on many occasions, yet we are invited and/or expected to invest in the project. It is reasonable to expect any business venture requiring finance to be accompanied by a prospectus, but we are told that the preparatory documentation and feasibility studies "are not for general release".

The proposed site is totally inadequate, vehicular access being over the roadways surrounding South Green, all of which is private and on which the properties abutting at extremely close proximity already suffer from the regular flow of traffic, the roadway surfaces incurring resultant wear and tear, repairs for which the village is responsible. Nevertheless commercial and other traffic is already at a premium, at the very least thirty and up to one-hundred vehicles daily, which by their very nature cannot possibly be all village traffic.

Parking is not adequate as suggested in the application. That existing is for users of the Village Hall. Letting of the Hall to non-residents is essential to provide revenue for upkeep. Shoppers will not be "mostly on foot or cycle" as suggested, and elderly residents have stated that it is too far for them to walk. (All this was claimed previously at the time of the application for the VH!).

A timber building is incongruous among all the surrounding stone, particularly that of the Village Hall adjacent and our beautifull St. Mary's Church within sight, together with the properties throughout South Green and the village in general. A village shop cannot survive simply with village trade, no matter under what circumstances of management, and enthusiasm of volunteers are renowned for waning.

The previous shop premises, in prime location on the main road, were offered to the applicants on a sale or lease basis. It is not necessary to erect a new building in this Conservation area.

On a personal level, I feel we already have more than our fair share of amenities on my own and others' doorsteps which nobody admittedly wants on theirs. I have repeatedly enquired of your Planning Department why private addresses without the postcode OX5 3HJ which are not impacted by the application have been specifically informed of the application, whereas others on the postcode who are immediately affected have not. I still await a satisfactory reply.

Mary Scraggs Mrs. J. Mary Scraggs Otters' Pond South Green

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS :-

- 1. Timber building in this beautiful Cotswold village of stone. Particularly consider its position in close proximity to Kirtlington Village Hall, St. Mary's Church and private residences.
- 2. Approach roads around South Green already carry unacceptable levels of traffic beyond that for which they were intended.
- 3. Traffic volumes already impact on the lives of those immediately adjacent on South Green, particularly those whose frontages are within a metre.
- 4. Parish Council are already struggling to meet the cost of maintaining the tracks (roads).
- 5. Those applying for Planning Permission are blinkered as to the large number of villagers who are not in favour.
- 6. It is not a viable proposition. No figures have been provided to prove otherwise.
- 7. No business plan or costs have been presented; in fact, we have been told "not for general release".
- 8. Diverting trade away from local businesses.
- 9. Several organizations run coffee mornings, and the free 'Winter Warmers' failed.
- 10. The previous shop on the main road through the village could not maintain viability, and it is highly unlikely that this new project in its location has any chance of survival in spite of volunteer staff. It is believed that another enterprise about to/just opened on the main A4095, centrally located and with its own parking, is to provide all the facilities of the proposed shop/cafe in this application.
- 11. The village could be left with a huge burden of debt should it fail.
- 12. Land of the proposed site is leasehold. Surely better on a site already owned by the village and which is available.
- 13. South Green, together with its roads (tracks) were given for the use of Kirtlington inhabitants. At the time of erection, some builders were obliged to provide buyers of properties with affidavits in order to obtain legal access and egress.

RESPONSES TO APPLICATION DOCUMENTS:-

- A. Pedestrian & Vehiclar Access, Roads and Rights of Way: Application states that there are no new public rights of way to be provided within or adjacent. Nowhere is it stated that South Green and its roads are private and that there is no automatic vehicular right of way.
- B. Vehicular Parking: Existing parking is specifically for users of the Village Hall, as designated in the Planning Permission; therefore it is not available nor adeqate to accommodate further parking without utilising highly desirable and regularly maintained grassed areas.
- C. Pre-Application Advice: We have been told repeatedly by the applicants that no preplanning advice has been sought. Why should we be deliberately mislead when there is a reference no. 21/03745/PREAPP dated 16th December, 2021, within some six/seven months of the first village meeting? This depicts the lack of transparency and is not conducive to seeking support.
- D. Transport Statement from Highway Planning Limited
- (3.2) is without foundation. There are blind spots at both ends of the short stretch of roadway between the properties Honeoye, Otters' Pond and Cansum, and there have been a number of dangerous incidents here and on the access roads around South Green.
- (3.3) Drivers do not proceed at very low speeds, and pedestrians are most certainly compromised by passing vehicles. At times I have difficulty in leaving my property either on foot or by car due to speeding and continuous traffic.
- (3.4 & 3.5) Contrary to the suggestion, parking for the Village Hall is often insufficient for further activity during daytime, overspilling onto the mown grass areas with no consideration.
- (3.6) Likewise we were told that most people would be walking/cycling to the Village Hall at the time Planning Permission was sought. This ridiculous statement is issued by someone who has no knowledge of the village and Village Hall usage, together with those from

outside the village who park their vehicles to use the Oxfordshire Way, walk their dogs, exercise their horses, etc. etc.

(3.7) Deliveries of milk, bread and fresh produce are daily activities and by their very nature cannot be infrequent as suggested, impacting even further on the erosion of the tracks and VH car park and disruption of the lives of those in adjacent properties.

E. Conclusions

- (4.1) It is impossible for an establishment of this nature to survive from village usage only, and traffic is likely to be exacerbated to unbearable proportions.
- (4.2) South Green roads are PRIVATE as described above and there is no vehicular 'right of way'.
 - (4.3) is an extremely irresponsible and ill thought-out statement.

Design, Access & Heritage Statement:

Introduction: There is no "great gap in the village amenity", all extremely good amenities in abundance being within five miles in north, south, east and westerly directions. For the elderly and infirm the village has an excellent 'Good Neighbour' scheme too. There is no "overwhelming support" for the project as suggested; in fact, there is a great divide within the village due to the proposal. Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, so many people have expressed that "although (they) are against it (they) are not going to bother objecting"!

Planning History: Last paragraph relative to the previous village shop and the application for change of use states that "there was no available parking provision". Why then does this current application continually refer to foot and bicycle approach? (The previous shop premises in prime position were offered to the current applicants for either sale or lease and were rejected, as was a well-placed site elsewhere in the village.)

Design Proposals: Reference to the timber cladding of Kirtlington Polo Club (possibly one mile +/- away) Scout Hut (hidden from view and now in process of being demolished), and a garage again nowhere within the vicinity are simply red herrings.

Planning Policy: The building "tucked up against the existing village hall within an existing unused space" is a misnomer. This area is paramount to the various functions which take place including the traditional Lamb Ale Feast and Village Fete, and it most certainly is a relevant part of vistas and views.

Access: I have demonstrated earlier the car park usage and how it is currently far from adquate. Here again we have this access "by foot or bike" syndrome.

Heritage: Extensions to the Village Hall have been minimal and not at all on the scale of this complete new build.

Received Date
Attachments

10/10/2023 22:24:51