

Further objections from Neighbour (Reads house, Creampot lane, Cropredy).

1. The planning application states that this land is currently vacant. Today (26th April 2023) The farmer has spread fertiliser across the field and is preparing to plant crops. Whilst this is land is vacant of people it is still “in use”, farming of this land suggests it is far from being degraded land. I believe this declaration is not accurate.
2. The application states that the proposed development will not add any parking spaces, this is clearly incorrect. The design and access plan shows in excess of 100 car parking spaces within the Illustrative Proving Layout making this declaration wrong.
3. The application states that surface water will dispose of by use of a SuDS ONLY. Section 4.25 of the planning statement shows that the SuDS will be deliberately discharged into the neighbouring water course (I assume this means the canal via the marina). The box on the application form for ‘Existing water course’ has been left unchecked so this declaration is not complete.
4. The application states that the proposal does not involve the gain of non-residential floorspace. The plan clearly shows a large building that the developer suggests will be a new Surgery (from the 4.13 and 4.14 of the planning statement). This cannot be classed as a dwelling house and so this declaration is wrong.
5. The application states that there will be no commercial processes carried out on this site. GP's are all self employed, conducting business at the proposed new surgery constitutes a commercial process, so this declaration is also wrong.

Wading through the accompanying documents, I have found the initial basic contamination report that I had missed on the previous review of the accompanying documents which shows that the land may or may not be contaminated. This report advises that a more comprehensive report be undertaken to identify the source or presence of any contaminated ground (if any) at this site.

The site conditions at the time of the assessment ‘walk around’ was raised in the report as being of importance and all directions of run off / groundwater flow were based upon assumptions rather than facts.

Neighbour flooding by run off and winter springs having been reported to Obsidian Strategic Asset Management Ltd and Carter Jonas which was not communicated to RSK who could have formed a more rounded conclusion based on local knowledge.

Moreover, It is apparent that planning should not be granted until a more detailed investigation (with possible lab analysis) has been carried out at this site and the site claimed safe.

Thank you.