

# Comment for planning application 23/00977/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	23/00977/OUT
<b>Location</b>	OS Parcel 9195 North Of Claydon Road Cropredy
<b>Proposal</b>	Outline Planning Application (except for access) for residential development of up to 60 dwellings (Use Class C3) including a community facility, new vehicular and pedestrian access off Claydon Road, public open space and associated landscaping, earthworks, parking, engineering works and infrastructure
<b>Case Officer</b>	Katherine Daniels
<b>Organisation Name</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Paul Gellatly
<b>Address</b>	17 Kyetts Corner,Cropredy,Banbury,OX17 1JW
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>To whom it may concern at the Cherwell Planning Department,</p> <p>I am writing to express my objections to the proposed planning application. My main concerns are centered around the disproportionate scale of the development in relation to the size of the village, and the negative impact it would have on the local amenities and infrastructure. The addition of 60 households would cause a 25% to 30% increase in population, placing an enormous strain on already stretched resources.</p> <p>The proposed development also contravenes the Cherwell local plan. As a category A village, and because Cherwell has already achieved a 5-year supply of housing, this development is unnecessary and promises of community building seem to be ill-conceived and misapplied. The planning submission mentions a new doctor's surgery as a benefit of the development many times, but it has come to light that this was never a feasible option in the eyes of the Surgery's board and had to publicly "express our surprise regarding the content of this applicationNo approach has been made by either party to the ICB who would be in the position to authorise such a move. We therefore do not feel that this (planning) application can be assessed on the merits of it providing a new surgery." regarding this point, building the surgery further from the village will make it harder for people, especially the elderly and disabled who do not have access to a car, to access vital medical care. This is not sustainable planning.</p> <p>There is enough housing supply for over five years without having to build on open countryside outside of village boundaries. The development is outside the village boundary and does not qualify as infill, which is typically the only exception to building outside of village boundaries. There are other areas in the village with more definable boundaries that would be more suitable for small-scale development</p> <p>According to the application, the proposed development is not located within a conservation area. This is because the development extends beyond the village boundary, and the edge of the village is considered the conservation area. However, there are several sites within the village boundary that could be suitable for small-scale development, rather than one large development beyond the village boundary. The planners have suggested in their publicity that the marina forms a natural border for the village, alluding to future plans to extend the site all the way down to the marina. Allowing the first 60 houses to be built on this site clearly opens the way to further developments on the land, which will result in further objections.</p> <p>With Cropredy being classified as a 'Category A Service Village', it means that minor development outside the settlement is supported in principle, in addition to infilling and conversions. This means not having new developments of over 10 houses and should be within the "built up limits of the village". This development cannot be considered within the limits of the village as it is outside the village boundary and certainly does not classify as infill However, in my opinion, the proposed scale of development and the size of the village population mean that the proposal cannot be considered as "minor development". As a result, it automatically conflicts with Policy Villages 1, making the proposal unacceptable in principle.</p> <p>Additionally, the development will significantly increase the traffic going through the village,</p>

which will have an adverse effect on road safety and congestion. The report on traffic impact is based on the assumption that the surgery will be relocated, which is not the case. Furthermore, the bus service mentioned in the report, and quite frankly embarrassingly incorrect factually, runs only twice a week, on a Thursday and Saturday, there and back. The public transport on offer would in no way be applicable for residents of a new estate getting to and from work in Banbury or further afield. Therefore, car transport would be the only option and will exacerbate an existing issue of commuter traffic through the village especially past the school, making it an increasingly dangerous route.

A modest suggestion that most households have on average, 2 cars would equal over 120 additional cars, increasing traffic journeys through Cropredy, Great Bourton, Claydon and Williamsclott. Furthermore, any children from the proposed development who wish to attend the local primary school would undoubtedly also be driven to school as the site is at least a 15-minute walk for an adult, which would increase road traffic dramatically and cause further chaos at drop-off time at the local school. The provision for transport to secondary schools are in place, but for schools that are in the catchment of the village. These are oversubscribed and are no longer available as first choices for residents of the village, again increasing car traffic.

Moreover, if approved, the proposed development will lead to the destruction of agricultural land, green space, and tranquil views of our village. At a time when Britain's wildlife is already declining, it is grossly inappropriate to build on green land. Wildlife, including several bird species that are ground nesting and are observed every year on that site. Smaller mammals are often observed such as crucial to the environment as a whole and something nationally we are called upon to protect and it would be irresponsible to destroy established habitats when Britain is desperately trying to re-wild areas of the countryside. Again, I feel that Obsidian's report only conveniently touches on the diverse wildlife that live on this site to suit the application.

Hilariously the application states the land as 'Vacant' and of poor quality. Having lived in this location for 20 plus years I can make assurances that it has always been farmed, with a variety of crop, Wheat, Rape, Linseed etc. and am currently looking at a fertilized, seeded and currently growing field as I write this May 2023!

Another truly concerning matter being the trustworthiness of the publicity and the application documentation by Obsidian. The first cover letter submitted by Obsidian was amended, but the updated version retained the original date of 4th April. I know in other areas there are measures in place to prevent this as it would have been considered a re-admission of the document, outlining it had been updated. The amendment was necessary because the original letter wrongly suggested that the Parish Council was in favour of the proposed development, which the Council had to request be removed. Additionally, the letter claimed that the development was broadly supported by the village, which is truly not the case.

Obsidian's submission gives emphasis to the proposed new surgery as a central reason for the development. However, this is contradicted by the surgery's own statement that they instructed Obsidian not to use them to promote the planning application. This is a serious issue, and it is disappointing to see that the surgery had to publicly refute the falsehood.

Obsidian's lack of attention to detail is also concerning. For example, they wrongly claimed that there are multiple buses a day in the village when in fact there is only one bus service that operates on Thursdays and Saturdays. In the initial community consultation, many residents suggested an increase to the buffer zone between the new development and existing properties. However, Obsidian ignored these concerns and stuck with their original plan, which shows a lack of empathy towards local residents.

Obsidian's tactics are seemingly underhanded and deceptive. They have misled people by disseminating incorrect information about the proposed development and the availability of a new surgery. This erodes community faith in large-scale planning proposals and undermines the sustainability of such projects.

Allowing this development to pass could set a dangerous precedent for building on agricultural land outside of village boundaries, which goes against the local plan. The proposed development would also destroy the habitat of wildlife that reside in the area, and negatively impact biodiversity. Moreover, the site is an attractive open space that many people use and enjoy, and the development would destroy this open space.

Personally, I feel the development will have a severe impact on my well being and property value, as vast majority of our windows will be directly overlooked. This will also restrict my access to natural light and views. Additionally, the building surveys suggest that the

construction will take place between Sep - Jan to avoid disruption to breeding birds, which is impractical and will cause significant noise pollution during working hours. Two adults work from home in my household, the noise will have a considerable impact on our daily lives.

The proposed buffer zone of planting between the development and our property is insufficient, and it could take up to 5+ years for it to mature enough to provide suitable screening. Even then, it will also affect the natural light that we currently enjoy. Also, who is maintaining this?, the lack of planting previously promised to screen us from the lights of the marina leaves me with no confidence that the developer's promise to maintain this buffer zone will be upheld by the council

The proposal will have a life-changing impact on myself and my neighbors who border the field, affecting our homes and rural life.

Therefore, I strongly object to this proposed planning application

Sincerely,  
Paul Gellatly

**Received Date**

11/05/2023 12:05:33

**Attachments**