

Comment for planning application 20/01747/F

Application Number	<input type="text" value="20/01747/F"/>
Location	<input type="text" value="Land South Side Of Widnell Lane Piddington"/>
Proposal	<input type="text" value="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	<input type="text" value="Matthew Chadwick"/>
Organisation Name	<input type="text" value="Kenneth Howard"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="The Old Farmhouse, Middle Cowleys Farm, Marsh Gibbon Road, Piddington, Bicester, OX25 1QG"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<input type="text" value="Please see attached my objection letter."/>
Received Date	<input type="text" value="17/08/2020 16:26:58"/>
Attachments	The following files have been uploaded: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• OBJECTION REPORT INTO PLANNING APPLICATION 20[22456].pdf

OBJECTION REPORT INTO PLANNING APPLICATION 20/01747/F.

17th August 2020.

I am a resident of Piddington living at OX251QG The Old Farmhouse.

This is a planning application made by a Mr L Sweeney for 6 gypsy/travellers pitches each with 2 caravans. At OS Parcel 9635 North East of HM Prison Widnell Lane, Piddington.

This application 20/01747/F is 0.95 hectares, located in the same field as application 17/01962/F consisting of 1.59 hectares, which was made by a Mr H L Foster. The Planning Inspector on appeal allowed 6 pitches each with 2 caravans to be allowed, with conditions prior to occupancy.

20/01122/F is another application by a Mr P Foster, to increase the 6 pitches with another 6, making a total of 12 each with 2 caravans, 24 in total, all in this same field.

Firstly, Mr Sweeney's background is unknown, the original Mr H L Foster was apparently from a 'Romany' background. The clash of cultures could be a problem on and off site if all is approved.

However, are they all different people, or the same. Mr Sweeney's address in 20/01747/F in Bicester is shown as the same address as the alleged field owner in 17/01962/F application, a Mr Graham Legge, as shown by Mr H L Foster on his Planning Application Document.

Are CDC satisfied that the applicants fall into the category of being Gypsy/traveller under the Government definition of 2015? How do they do this? The CDC planning Officer in case 17/01962/F specifically asked the applicant to ID details of who were to come on site if approved, and where were they coming from, not surprising she received no reply.

Is this some kind of way of hoodwinking the planning committee and planning officers. Will the same question be asked in the case of present applications.?

Should all applications be approved we are looking at a site with 36 caravans, and a possible new population of anything up to a 100 people, into a Category 'C' village, with just a Church and Village Hall as their amenities.

Clearly this would dominate the present village of 150 properties and about 370 residents, an increase of about 25%.

The planning inspector allowed the appeal because of alleged need in Cherwell, but agreed sustainability was an issue, hence the conditions laid down.

These further applications on this site are against Cherwell Local Planning laws.

There is also, a failure to conform to Government Planning Policy (PPTS 2015). These will be highlighted by the Parish Council in their objection report.

It would now appear from a Cherwell in house report, that the need no longer exists, that there is no shortfall for the next 5 years.

In a Government Report February 2019, signed by James Brokenshire MP, from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, quote ' In terms of wider Government support for the provision of traveller sites, the New Homes Bonus (NHB) provides an incentive for local authorities to encourage housing growth in their areas and rewards net increases in effective housing stock, INCLUDING PROVISION OF TRAVELLERS PITCHES'. It has also been reported in various Inspectors Reports that (NHB) monies is also for use to provide pitches or sites for travellers. The Government has a £9bn fund until March 2022, to boost housing supply and more affordable homes, this included funding for new travellers' pitches by local authorities or registered providers. CDC did obtain a large sum of money from the Government; none went into providing travellers pitches or sites. I suspect any such monies went into CDC's love affair with Banbury and Bicester, none to help the Rural areas from being overwhelmed by traveller site applications.

These applications are objected to as to need there is none, dominance of site on a category 'C'; village, and not sustainable.

K Howard.