

14 Lower End
Piddington
Bicester
Oxon
OX25 1QD
25/8/20

Dear Sir/Madam

Planning Application Ref: 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

Hard to believe but this is yet another planning application for the same plot of land for which approval for a development of 6 pitches was reluctantly approved at appeal and **only** if certain strict conditions were met by the applicant (see **APP/C3105/W/18/3209349**).

To understand the context of this application, it must be considered not only in conjunction with the approved application for 6 pitches (**APP/C3105/W/18/3209349**) but also with another current application (**20/01122/F**) for a further 6 pitches on the approved site, as well as CDC's reasons for refusal of the two previously refused applications (**17/001145/F** and **17/01962/F**). Taken together, these three applications (one approved, two current) would take the total number of pitches to 18 – on a site that was agreed by CDC at every stage to be completely unsuitable. Looking at the information supplied, it appears that application **20/01747/F** is being made on land at least jointly owned by the same person who made the previous applications – although this application has been submitted in a different name.

I therefore wish to object to this planning application in the strongest terms on the following grounds:

(1) All my objections to the other current application (**20/01122/F**), which is for a G/T site on land that is adjacent to the site in application **20/01747/F**, and in the same field, stand for this application too. **Before any expansion should be considered, the applicant should be seen to have implemented the approved application for 6 pitches and demonstrated to the council's satisfaction that the conditions imposed at the public inquiry have been strictly observed.** To do otherwise suggests that by submitting this as a new application, together with the other current application for this plot (**20/01122/F**), at this time, before any work has been done at the site, the applicant may be attempting to avoid the conditions imposed in the appeal.

(2) Where is the evidence that CDC needs 18 pitches (or even 6)? Rather than rehearse all the details here, I refer you to Andrew Coleman's comprehensive analysis suggesting that much of the decision-making – past and ongoing – was based on a flawed model, flagging up a need that in fact was the result of a mistake. (**See Andrew Coleman's letters to you in responses to this application and application 20/01122/F.**) To be clear, **there is absolutely no need for any extra pitches across Cherwell at the present time.** Any analysis of the available documentation makes this clear.

(3) If both active applications go through, then, the total number of caravans will be 36 across 18 pitches, making it the largest G/T site in the District. As such **it would overwhelm and dominate the small village of Piddington**, a community of approximately 300 people, as well as generating a substantial increase in traffic on our rural narrow roads. Clearly, **this much larger site would be unsustainable within Piddington, a category C village with no infrastructure, which was described in the previous planning reports as one of the least sustainable locations in Cherwell.**

(4) This site is far from suitable as a G/T site even of 6 pitches, and there was considerable objection to it by the Parish Council and many villagers at all the previous attempts to get the site through the

planning process. The appeal was upheld by the Inspector only because of ‘a perceived need’ for pitches – for which no credible evidence has ever been submitted. (My objection to the other current application **(20/01122/F)** explains why Piddington Parish Council’s detailed research querying this ‘perceived need’ was not allowed to be put before the Inspector for consideration as part of the appeal.) **All the grounds for objection in relation to the previous applications are even stronger for this new application.**

(5) A minor point, perhaps, but the **catalogue of errors and inaccuracies in the submitted application**, repeating and adding to those appearing in the applications **17/001145/F**, **17/01962/F**, and the active application **20/01122/F** (e.g. road numbers that aren’t even in the same county, stating wrongly that the site is not prone to flooding, or that there are mains water and electricity on site, identifying an ‘Existing Entrance’ onto Widnell Lane on the Block Plan that does not in fact exist from this land; the only entrance is on the land associated with the active application **20/01122/F**), suggest a rather cavalier attitude to the facts. CDC should assiduously check all the information for accuracy themselves to avoid being unknowingly misled.

For all the reasons given here, I strongly urge CDC to refuse this planning application.

Yours sincerely

Hazel Coleman