



The Planning Inspectorate

Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 03034445273

Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email:
NSI.HAS@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Matthew Swinford
Cherwell District Council
Public Protectn & Development
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxon
OX15 4AA

Your Ref: 20/01747/F

Our Ref: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

22 March 2021

Dear Mr Swinford,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal by Mr J Sweeney

Site Address: Land on South Side Widnell Lane, Piddington, Bicester, OX25 1AE

I enclose third party correspondence relating to the above appeal(s).

If you have any comments on the points raised, please send them to me no later than 02 April 2021.

You should comment solely on the representations enclosed with this letter.

You cannot introduce new material or put forward arguments that should have been included in your earlier full statement of case. If you do, your comments will not be accepted and will be returned to you.

Comments submitted after the above deadline will not be seen by the Inspector unless there are extraordinary circumstances for the late submission.

Yours sincerely,

Jade McNamara

Jade McNamara

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/online/search

APPEAL REF:-
APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Mr & Mrs WOODHOUSE
10 LOWER END
PIDDINGTON OXON
OX2519D

15/MAR/2021.

DEAR SIRs

We fully uphold all our original
objections to this planning application :-

IT IS THE WRONG PLACE,
THERE IS NOTHING HERE FOR
THE TRAVELLERS,

NO SCHOOLS,

NO SHOPS,

NO BUSES,

NO LIGHTS, NOTHING.

How BIG will THIS SITE
END UP??



Mr HLF WOODHOUSE

Dear Jade McNamara,

Please see below third party representation we have received in error regarding app ref 3262394.

Kind regards

Matthew Swinford

Appeals Administrator

Cherwell District Council

Direct Dial 01295 221889

matthew.swinford@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

www.cherwell.gov.uk

Follow us:

Find us on Facebook www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil

Follow us on Twitter [@Cherwellcouncil](https://twitter.com/Cherwellcouncil)

My usual working hours are: Monday to Friday, 08.45am to 17:15pm.

Coronavirus (COVID-19): In response to the latest Government guidance and until further notice, the Planning Service has been set up to work remotely, from home. Customers are asked not to come to Bodicote House but instead to phone or email the Planning Service on 01295 227006: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk. For the latest information about how the Planning Service is impacted by COVID-19, please check the website: www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk.

From: Sam Phillips [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 February 2021 13:15

To: Submit Appeal <Submit.Appeal@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

APPEAL REF: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394 relating to:

20/01747/F - OS Parcel 9635 North East of HM Bullingdon Prison, Widnell Lane, Piddington

Material change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 12 gypsy / traveller families, each with two caravans, including improvement of access, laying of hardstanding and installation of package sewage treatment plant.

I, Mrs S. Phillips of Piddington, would like to register that I am wholly against this latest application.

- **This is the fourth application for Gypsy/ Traveller pitches on this parcel of land. 17/00145/F (16 pitches) and 17/01962/F (6 pitches) were both refused; the refusal of 17/01962/F was subsequently overturned at appeal. A further application 20/01122/F to build 12 pitches rather than 6 on the appeal site is currently under consideration. If both the current applications were to be approved, a total of 18 double pitches, i.e. potentially 36 units of**

accommodation, would be constructed near a village of fewer than 150 households.

THIS WOULD BECOME THE BIGGEST TRAVELER/GYSPY SITE IN THE COUNTY - SET IN AN ISOLATED VILLAGE WITH ONLY 150 HOUSEHOLDS AND NO AMENITIES.

- **What is more these applications 17/01962/F and 20/01122/F appear to be coming from the same source – albeit using different names.**

CDC has failed to publish Part 2 of its Local Plan which would have included the allocation and designation of land already held under CDC ownership for use as traveller sites. Despite the monumental amount of land development, housing estates, warehouses, shopping centres, not one traveller site has been identified by CDC. They have also failed to follow Government guidelines. The Home Bonus Scheme is an incentive for local authorities to invest in traveller sites. CDC has failed to act upon this and allocate these funds accordingly.

- **DOMINANCE OF NEAREST SETTLED COMMUNITY.**

Piddington is an isolated Category C village with no amenities.

The Government Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS 2015) requires that consideration is given to the scale of sites with respect to the nearest settled community. Policy B par 10, sub paragraph d)

"Relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density."

Further, in section Policy C, relating to sites in rural or semi-rural areas and the countryside in par 14 says:

"When assessing the suitability in rural or semi-rural settings, the local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community."

Policy H par 25 also states:

"Local planning authorities should very strictly limit traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community"

If these two new applications are granted, this would increase the overall size of the development from 6 pitches to 18 pitches (2 caravans per pitch, 1 mobile and 1 static, so overall 36 caravans on site). If we assume an average of 6 residents/ pitch this would result in a site population of 108 people. With a population of 370 in the whole quite extensive parish of Piddington, about 330 in the village itself, this equates to a population increase of nearly 30%, **ie 23% of the resulting total population would be from the Gypsy/ Traveller community.** The 2011 census recorded 58,000 Gypsy/

Travellers in England and Wales or 0.1% of the total population. **Increasing the Gypsy/ Traveller population of Piddington to 23% of the total population as compared with the national average of 0.1%** would, in the opinion of the Parish Council, be contrary to PPTS 2015 Policies B (10) (d), C (14) and H (25) and constitute dominance of the settled community.

Policy H paragraph 25 of the PPTS 2015 states:

"Local planning authorities should avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure."

- **ERRONEOUS ACCOUNTING OF DEMAND AND SUPPLY.**

CDC have based their decisions on the GTAA 2013 which is seven years out of date and was carried out prior to a change in definition. It has been superseded by the GTAA 2017, which takes account of the change.

Two entire or partial sites where either travellers did not live or which were not designated specifically for their use have been erroneously included, both in the base for calculations of growth and overcrowding and as losses when they closed.

Station Approach, Banbury **was not** a Gypsy/ Traveller site. No restrictive condition regarding occupancy was placed it at the time the original planning application was approved and when it closed, only non-travellers were living there.

When Planning Application 17/01233/OUT for development of the site was considered by Committee the officer wrote:

"8.12 Discussions with the County Council Gypsy and Travellers Officer have confirmed that none of the previous caravan pitch occupiers are Gypsies and Travellers, and that it may be some time since such occupiers have used the facility. Furthermore that permission granted in the 1970s was not specifically for or limited to such occupiers. In these circumstances your officers consider that a refusal based on the loss of this facility could not be sustained at appeal."

When an application 12/01368/F for a site at Mollington was considered at appeal APP/C3105/A/13/2196896 the inspector remarked:

"27.However, the Council accepted that the Station Caravan Park in Banbury is not wholly restricted to occupancy by gypsies and travellers....."

Estimates employing alternative official data imply that a large proportion of existing pitches are occupied by households who do not comply with the PPTS 2015 definition. Estimates of need for pitches are inherently uncertain owing to incomplete and flawed data about the travelling community.

- **UNSUSTAINABLE IN RELATION TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE**

Policy H paragraph 25 of the PPTS 2015 states:

"Local planning authorities should avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure."

In terms of sustainability, the site for this new application, which is part of the same parcel of land as previous and current other Gypsy/ Traveller site planning applications 17/00145/F, 17/01962/F and the site was, and still remains entirely unsustainable as laid down by the DCLG PPTS 2015, The National Planning Policy Framework and Cherwell District Council's own Policy.

Piddington is a category C village, with a village Hall and a Church as its only amenities. The nearest category A village is Arncott but this has been described in a previous planning report as one of the least sustainable Category A villages with only a small shop and lacking a school or health provision. There are no schools or doctors within 3km of the site and only 1 small shop at about 3km distant. The nearest primary school is 4km away in Ambrosden and is already full. The nearest GP surgeries in Brill and Bicester are closed to new patients - a known issue with the rapid development of Bicester and although there is a small surgery in Ambrosden it is open only 2 hours a week and is scheduled for closure.

The planning inspector's report 17/01962/F acknowledged the site was wholly unsustainable, because of an (unverified) need, he approved 6 pitches. As already stated, this need, we now know is based on erroneous accounting and no such need exists. Surely any increase on this number of pitches under this application or Application 20/01122/F, revisits the overall unsuitability of the site and will only exacerbate the sustainability issues, for example more flash flood run off, more school places and school transport required, no access to GP services. The appeal was assured by the appellant that 6 pitches was all that was required.

The Gypsy/Traveller site at Oaksvie just outside of Arncott also cites Arncott as the nearest Category A village. How can one Category A village, deemed by CDC as 'not the most sustainable of the Category A villages' owing to its very limited facilities, be expected to support 3 Gypsy/ Traveller sites, 13 pitches at Oaksvie Park, 6 pitches under 17/01962/F, potentially 6 pitches under 20/01122/F, and a further 6 pitches under this application. All of these pitches are within 3km of each other. This is irrefutably not sustainable, nor in keeping with any policy document and would most certainly place an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.

The above information must be taken into consideration. Mistakes, failures, and inaction by CDC has allowed a group of savvy individuals to speculatively buy up pockets of land in rural villages. They are exploiting, flouting, and manipulating the planning laws at the expense of rural communities and it's about time CDC took responsibility for this.

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail (and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990-APPEAL AGAINST REFUSUAL.

REFERENCE APP/C3105/W/20/3262394.....J SWEENEY.

OBJECTION TO APPEAL BEING APPROVED.

I am a Piddington resident and have been so for 14 years. I object to this appeal being approved for the following reasons.

On the 29th October 2019, Mr Richard Clegg (BA Hons) DMS MRTPI a Planning Inspector under reference APP/C3105/W/18/3209349, allowed on appeal for 6 Gypsy pitches each with 2 caravans, to be sited in a field in Widnell Lane within the Parish of Piddington.

The original application had been made to Cherwell District Council under reference 17/01962/F, originally dated 22.9.2017. But was withdrawn on a number of occasions.

The Inspector laid down a schedule of conditions with a proviso that no development should take place until a site development scheme had been submitted in writing and approved in writing by the local planning officer (Cherwell District Council). To date no such application scheme has been made or approved. The appeal allowed mainly on 'The Need'. To date no Gypsy/Traveller is on the site.

In April 2020, the same applicant Mr Foster, under Cherwell Reference 20/01122/F applied for change of use to 12 Gypsy pitches, an additional 6 pitches to that already approved, at the same location.

This application was refused by the Cherwell Planning Committee on the 15th October 2020. Papers presented at that meeting was a document prepared by Cherwell's Senior Manager Planning Policy, Conservation & Design (Ms Heather Seale dated 13/8/20). Informing the committee that Cherwell had sufficient supply of pitches on most up to date information.

In Fact, since the appeal 28/10/19, 13 new pitches have been approved by Cherwell District Council within their district.

The number of pitches in Cherwell District Council according to Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government (MHCLG), count dated January 2020, showed 111, an additional 13 have since been added. Now 124. Additional counts by MHCLG postponed due to Covid19.

In July 2020, a totally different named person Mr J Sweeney has applied for 6 gypsy pitches (20/01747/F) in the same field in Widnell Lane as mentioned above. This application was refused by the planning committee on 15/10/20.

In fact, this and the previous application by Mr Foster were heard on the same day by the planning committee, they were aware that 6 pitches on the same field had already been approved. This case Mr Sweeney (21/00003/REF) is this appeal reference).

Facts as I know them: In that the first applicant in 2017, was a Mr Foster. He indicated at the appeal hearing he was not intending to live on this site. He in fact lives in a mobile home in Kingham Oxfordshire, 30 miles away, in 5 acres an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). He is I believe of Romany birth.

He was asked originally by the Planning Officer which she had the right to, who was coming to the site and from where. There has been no reply to this request.

In His original application document dated 17/1/2017, under Certificate of Ownership Certificate 'B' he gives the details of a Graham Legge, 36 Wensum Crescent, Bicester, Oxon OX26 2GL.

Mr J Sweeney the subject of this application and appeal, in his original document he gives the same address as Mr Legge above.

I have no personal details of Mr Sweeney other than the recurring address, which is a nice semi-detached house. Is he a genuine traveller/gypsy or speculator? Would you leave a semi-detached house surrounded by all the amenities of a town to move to a Caravan with no amenities or infrastructure?

An appeal document mentions his site would have access for horses. Therefore where are they now? Where will the residents of the 6 pitches be coming from?

The general rumour is that it will be residents moving to this site from the already approved site in Arcott (Bucks) just over the border from Oxfordshire, and about 3 to 4 Kms from this Piddington location. Why then should I be suspicious!

Mr Foster has until the 15th April 2021, to make an appeal against his refusal application (20/01122/F) for the additional 6 pitches. I am certain that on or about that date Mr Foster will make his appeal.

As a resident of Piddington there is a prospect of eventually 18 gypsy pitches being approved, 36 caravans. A possible increase in population of 25% over the present Piddington population, which has no facilities or infrastructure other than a Village Hall and a Church: No buses: No shop or other amenities.

The Inspector allowed the original appeal on Need. It is almost 17 months since that Need appeal was approved nothing has moved. Neither are the details of the inhabitants or where they are coming from is known.

These applications on block are of no more than a commercial venture, there is no known need. Mr Fosters legal representative at the appeal unfortunately went as far as to state that pitches change hands for £100,000 plus.

The thought of two separate and different gypsy/traveller clans in the same field using the same entrance and exit is fraught with danger, within the site and outside.

Clearly the 6 original appeal pitches allowed is as much as this location and site could accommodate safely.

The appeal document from the applicant in this case the penultimate paragraph states ' Whilst it may be considered that the site is not perfect or an ideal one for this type of proposal, officers should consider the harm is outweighed by the immediate need for new gypsy and travellers' pitches in the District'

There is no need, Cherwell have increased pitches by 13 since the last appeal. They quote harm in this case, not me.

Incidentally this appeal site, part of the field has a very high voltage 400,000 V pylon in it.

K Howard Piddington OX251QG

Dear Jade McNamara,

Please see representation below from an interested person in relation to the above appeal.

Kind regards

Matthew Swinford

Appeals Administrator

Cherwell District Council

Direct Dial 01295 221889

matthew.swinford@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

www.cherwell.gov.uk

Follow us:

Find us on Facebook www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil

Follow us on Twitter [@Cherwellcouncil](https://twitter.com/Cherwellcouncil)

My usual working hours are: Monday to Friday, 08.45am to 17:15pm.

Coronavirus (COVID-19): In response to the latest Government guidance and until further notice, the Planning Service has been set up to work remotely, from home. Customers are asked not to come to Bodicote House but instead to phone or email the Planning Service on 01295 227006: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk. For the latest information about how the Planning Service is impacted by COVID-19, please check the website: www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk.

From: Salim Sajid [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 March 2021 18:51

To: Submit Appeal <Submit.Appeal@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Good afternoon

Appeal Reference Planning Appeal reference: 21/00003/REF

As a resident at 26 Vicarage Lane, Piddington, near Bicester OX25 1QA I'm writing to express my concerns and disappointment over the resubmission of the above planning application

Having seen previous rejections and supported appeals from both local residents as well as the Ministry of Defence, I'm saddened over the persistence of this application

On looking at the planning portal and seeing some over 100 pages of objections, should be considered as significant enough for this application to be rejected. A large proportion of those objections come from local residents that will be directly affected by this proposal. As local officers, I urge you to carefully consider this and represent your local community well.

We have already seen the intensification of buildings & development in Bicester and the surrounding areas, which in turn is further reducing the local areas of grassland, grazing space and natural areas for local habitat. This "green space" is essential in keeping the balance for residents as well as wildlife.

There is well documents evidence that there are sufficient local static traveller sites available, some of which appear to be under utilised, so why an addition capacity might be needed has not been demonstrated.

The number of proposed mobile & touring pitches on this sites will bring a significant number of vehicle movements to Widnell Lane. Has a Traffic Assessment Plan been produced? How will such a narrow lane deal with the access & egress of such long and wide vehicles safely? Has an assessment been make of turning circles, visibility splays and sight lines from both ends of this lane been carried out. The road cambers significantly at either edge, which would make the stability and safety of vehicle entering and existing extremely dangerous, not only to travellers dwelling but also to Piddington's residents.

The sheer potential population of this site will be a significant uplift to the the inhabitants within Piddington. We know that facilities are already stretched. SSE have had to upgrade power twice in the past 12 months, Open Reach have also had to update telecoms provisions locally

Whilst the site itself may not be on a flood plane directly, the intensification of hard standings, roadways both into the site and around the pitches, would lead to an assessment of water displacement locally. This could lead to local flooding and therefore more dangerous driving.

Finally many of the dwellings will consist of youngsters, who will also need local facilities to play - Widnell Road and the local Jubilee Park are both insufficient to make safe provisions and could lead to potential accidents and injury.

With kind regards and thanks

Salim

Salim Sajid

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR JOHN BELL

Address
Fir Tree House, 78 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

Company/Group/Organisation Name owners of Fir tree House, 78,Lower End, Piddington OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement

- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Together with other residents of Piddington, and nearby including HMP Bullingdon and the Armed Forces, we are sick and tired of the constant applications by the appellant. Our comments and objections are familiar to the Local Authority and the Inspectorate and remain unchanged so will not repeat them once again.

Suffice it to say that if the appellants wish to expand their site, they should first build the development which, regrettably, has already been permitted. Then, if the appellants still decide to expand the site, they could make a further application which the planning Authority can then consider in the light of actual experience.

Meanwhile, we strongly OBJECT to these proposals and do sincerely urge that you remain FIRM and that the refusal remains in place. If the appeal were to be allowed it would set a precedent for further such applications in the future.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS GLORIA BROWN

Address
18 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

This site is totally unsuitable for the additional 6 pitches.

Piddington is a category C village, one of the least sustainable locations in Cherwell.

We have no school, no doctor's surgery, no shop, no pub and no bus service. The site in question is prone to flooding and has no connection to mains services. The site is on an unclassified road, with no footway, subject to a speed limit and close to a blind bend.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR ANDREW COLEMAN

Address
14 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

COMMENT DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below were uploaded with this form:

Relates to Section: REPRESENTATION
Document Description: Your comments on the appeal.
File name: Objection to appeal against the refusal of Planning Application
20-01747-F.pdf

PLEASE ENSURE THAT A COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED WHEN POSTING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS TO US

Objection to the appeal against the refusal of Planning Application 20/01747/F at Land to the South of Widnell Lane, Piddington

From Andrew Coleman, 14 Lower End, Piddington, OX25 1QD

I would like to refer you to the objections I made to the original planning application. I made a detailed case showing that Cherwell's estimate of need is based on a series of errors, and demonstrated that, in any case, given the change in the planning definition of gypsy/travellers and recent planning approvals there was no lack of a 5-year supply of pitches. As there is no demonstrated need for these pitches, either by named individuals or with regard to a more general unsatisfied lack of supply, the acknowledged harm to the countryside and environment therefore outweigh any perceived need. If sites are approved when there is no need, then one of four things will happen: (1) no one will move in and an unnecessary development will remain empty; (2) people will move in from other sites in the area leaving them abandoned; (3) people who are not gypsy/travellers will move in illegally, and I suspect there is no mechanism in place to check whether this occurs; (4) gypsy/travellers from other regions will move here creating further pressure to develop more sites in the future.

I have included a copy of my original objections at the end of this document.

I would also like to address several points in the appellant's statement of case; the quotes are from that statement of case.

"The proposals include the improvement of the existing site access, which includes the widening of the access". There is no current access, other than that to the site for 6 pitches already approved, which the appellant claims is a site completely unrelated to the current appeal.

"no objections were received from Oxford County Council Major Planning". Of course there weren't -- as the site is slightly under 1 Ha (0.95Ha according to the application) it is considered as a minor application. There were, however, objections from Oxford County Council Transport Schedule and Lead Local Flood Authority. I suspect that one reason why the field has been split up and separate applications made for 2 allegedly different sites is to avoid it being classed as a major planning application. If they were considered together the area would be much more than 1 Ha.

"There has also been some confusion by the Parish Council that this site already has permission for 6no pitches and has an application in for a further 6no pitches so with this application there would be 18no pitches. This is an error on their part as they are talking about another site which was allowed at appeal and is yet to be established. The site which is subject to this appeal is for 6no pitches only".

I think the point being made by Piddington Parish Council is simply that these applications for adjacent sites need to be considered together. In my view they are inextricably linked. These sites are adjacent to one another and are in a field that was originally one field. The owner of the land currently under appeal was at the time of the appeal for planning application 17/01962/F Mr Graham Legge. Mr Legge wrote to the Planning Inspector saying that he owned the land adjacent to that site (i.e. the land currently under appeal) and that he was happy to let the appellants use his water supply (even though it wasn't demonstrated that there was a suitable water supply). The same Mr Legge was named as owner of the land subject to planning application 17/00145/F (the same land as planning application 17/01962/F). Although Mr Legge's name did not appear on the application currently under appeal (20/01747/F), his address is given in Section 25 'Ownership Certificates and Agricultural Land Declaration' of the application form (the 'Name of Owner/AgriculturalTenant' was left blank). To put it simply, it appears that Mr Legge has owned

both application sites when the applications have been made, so it seems to me that the applications are not separate in any meaningful sense.

“Policy ESD6 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 and the NPPF state that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required for proposals of 1 hectare or more in in Flood Zone 1. The site does not exceed 1 hectare therefore an FRA is not required.” The local plan also states that FRAs are required for ‘Development sites located in an area known to have experienced flooding problems’ and ‘Development sites located within 9m of any watercourses’. The area has experienced flooding problems and there is a drainage ditch alongside the property, and a ditch is defined as a watercourse by the Environment Agency, even if at certain seasons it appears dry. So an FRA would seem appropriate.

“Any surface water issues would be dealt with by virtue of the fact that the applicant will connect to mains water/sewers.” The original application stated that the site would employ a package treatment plant and would not connect to main sewers.

The rest of this text is taken from my original objection to the planning application.

Planning Application - 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

I am writing to object to the above planning application. All my main objections concerning Planning Application 20/01122/F for 12 pitches on this same field also apply to this application, so I am including that objection below. In addition, I would like to make the following comments on this application.

In the Planning Statement Section 1 ‘Introduction’ it says ‘planning application for an application for 1no new four-bedroom dwelling house.’ What is this about? There is no mention elsewhere of a house.

In Section 2 ‘Site description and context’ it says ‘The site has an existing vehicular access from Widnell Lane on the northern boundary of the site’. There is no access to Widnell Lane from this part of the field. The only access to this field is via the entrance that forms part of Application 20/01122/F for 12 pitches which is also under consideration. As such, a new access point closer to the B4011 would be needed and this should be indicated clearly on the plans and the safety of such an access needs to be assessed.

In Section 6 ‘Considerations’, part (a) it says ‘There is currently no supply of sites to meet the need for gypsy and traveller accommodation in Cherwell’. This is wrong. Recently 13 pitches have been approved. The section then quotes the 2018 Annual Monitoring Report to show a 5-year deficit. In fact, based on the more recent 2017 GTAA, the 2019 AMR states ‘3.28 The AMR's second five year supply calculation for Gypsies and Travellers is therefore based on a need for 15 pitches from 2017 to 2032 (7 plus 8). Having regard to the projected supply of 10 pitches, this produces a five year land supply of 4.2 years for 2019-2024, and 3.8 years for 2020-2025 (commencing 1 April 2020). Under this calculation, a supply of 2 pitches would be sufficient to secure a 5 year supply for 2019-2024 and 3 pitches for 2020-2025.’ Since this report was written three additional pitches at Chesterton have been given permission. Therefore, even using figures that I believe are essentially flawed (as described in my objection to the application to 12 pitches below), a five-year supply to 2025 is secured. In Part (b) of this section it states ‘The site at Station Road, Banbury had previously been occupied by travellers before it was closed,’. This is false. The site was never a formal gypsy traveller site, its original permission was for a caravan site with no restrictions, and at the time of closure

none of the residents were gypsy/travellers – this has been accepted by CDC and by planning inspectors in appeals for other local traveller sites. In fact, in Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/A/14/2227894 ‘Land to the north of lay-by and north-west of Hill Cottage, Lower Heyford Road, Caulcott OX25 4ND’ it was stated that the gypsy/traveller ‘appellant excluded 10 pitches at “Station Approach” which are not subject to an occupancy condition’. Therefore its loss was not a loss of gypsy sites and the site should never have been included in CDC’s calculation of need.

Site Plans.Having looked at the site plans, there seems to be an overlap between this site and the site in Planning Application 20/01122/F. As the land in this application and that in Application 20/01122/F were originally one field, and the fact that the address of the owner of the field in the successful application for 6 pitches and the owner of this field are identical, it seems very likely that this application and Application 20/01122/F are in reality one application for 18 pitches but split into two for tactical reasons.

The rest of this objection consists of my objection to Planning Application - 20/01122/F “Material Change of Use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 12no gypsy/traveller families, each with two caravans, including improvement of access, laying of hardstanding and installation of package sewage treatment plant”

I am writing to object to this application.

As the result of an appeal, the applicant has permission to develop 6 pitches on this site and I believe that these should be developed before permission is granted for a further 6. If the 6 pitches are developed to the standard required by the appeal decision document, and if the site is well run and maintained, then it is less likely that an application for an additional 6 pitches would attract strong opposition. Given the applicant’s assurances at the appeal that there would be no problem funding the development of 6 pitches to the required standard, with all amenities provided, there is no reason to think that it essential to approve further pitches to make the development economically viable.

The main reason that the appeal was allowed was the fact that there were no new pitches available within Cherwell to satisfy whatever future demand there may be.

As a result of this appeal and the outcomes of other applications, there is now approval in place for 13 new pitches within Cherwell. In CDC’s 2019 Annual monitoring report (published December 2019, after 10 of these pitches were approved but before the final 3 had been) the calculation of 5-year land supply from 1 April 2020 for gypsy and traveller pitches based on the 2017 GTAA showed a shortfall of 3 pitches. Since a further 3 pitches have been approved, on this calculation there is no shortfall over the next 5 years, so there is no pressing need to grant permission for further pitches on a site which, to quote the Planning Inspector’s report, “given its conflict with Policies ESD 13, ESD 15 and C28 concerning the character and appearance of the area, it would conflict with the Development Plan considered as a whole.”

A robust defence of the GTAA 2017 calculations was prepared by Steve Jarman of ORS for the appeal hearing, but was never used because it was considered irrelevant since as a matter of common ground Cherwell and the appellant agreed that there was no 5-year supply, even if they did not agree what that supply should be. Now that there is a supply of 13 pitches, this report is very relevant and is available on the planning portal with other appeal documents. (Appeals – Council’s Evidence, 27/02/2019, LPA - Steve Jarman Proof of Evidence)

Unfortunately, CDC has never really had a clear idea of how many pitches are actually needed, and its calculations have always been based on flawed data, which is why applicants have been so successful at appeal. One major source of error was introduced in 2011/2012. In 2011, the number of pitches available in Cherwell was 54. An application was made for 16 additional pitches at Bloxham (which already had 20 pitches), which would bring the total up to 70. David Peckford (now Assistant Director – Planning and Development) wrote a report supporting the application. In it he said:

‘Although the level of need that will be identified by the new Needs Study [the upcoming 2012 GTAA] cannot be predicted, it is likely that household growth and ‘concealed need’ (for example, overcrowding) will create a requirement for new pitches. The draft PPS refers to an objective of increasing the number of traveller sites, in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply.’

And

‘The additional pitches would contribute to a need over the Core Strategy plan period that is likely to be higher than that identified in the 2006 GTAA. The grant of permission would assist the Council in meeting the proposed requirements of the draft PPS.’

So, basically, he was supporting the additional pitches as they would fulfil an increased need that was likely to be identified in the 2012 GTAA. Very reasonably, planning permission was granted on this basis.

Unfortunately, this is where things go awry. The 2012 GTAA was produced but instead of taking the 54 existing pitches as the baseline and calculating household growth and concealed need from that figure, it explicitly treats the recently approved 16 pitches as if they are already part of the current supply and occupied, and bases its future-need calculation on the 70 pitches (*“This analysis assumes that all pitches described in Table 4.1 are occupied which includes sites with full planning permission”*). Thus the 16 additional pitches, instead of satisfying a need that might have been identified in the 2012 GTAA had they not been approved, have erroneously increased the ‘need’ identified by the GTAA by 16 plus an extra amount calculated from presumed household growth and ‘concealed need’. The Local Plan then incorporates the 2012 GTAA figures and all future planning decisions are based on these figures. To make matters worse, the 16 approved pitches were never built and so have always appeared as part of a mythical deficit.

Another flaw was the belief by CDC that the Station Approach Caravan Park was a gypsy/traveller site, when in fact, as became apparent when it closed, it never had been designated a G/T site and at the time of closure was occupied by people who were not gypsy/travellers. So it should never have been included as part of the supply or treated as a loss when it closed.

It is clear that unless someone does a physical count of how many gypsy/travellers there are in the district, whether living on sites or waiting to live on sites, no one, least of all CDC it seems, has any idea what the real need is. So the loophole in the planning system that allows pitches to be developed on unsuitable sites because of presumed need will continue to be exploited.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS HAZEL COLEMAN

Address
14 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

COMMENT DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below were uploaded with this form:

Relates to Section: REPRESENTATION
Document Description: Your comments on the appeal.
File name: Personal objection to appeal againgst refusal of gypsy site
application2001747F.pdf

PLEASE ENSURE THAT A COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED WHEN POSTING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS TO US

Objection to the appeal against the refusal of Planning Application 20/01747/F at Land to the South of Widnell Lane, Piddington

From Hazel Coleman, 14 Lower End, Piddington, OX25 1QD

Please refer to my objections to the original planning application, which I submitted on 25 August 2020. I've pasted this below for your reference.

All my objections still stand, and so, for all the reasons given there, I strongly urge CDC to refuse this appeal.

Yours sincerely

Hazel Coleman

Objection to Planning Application 20/01747/F at Land to the South of Widnell Lane, Piddington, made 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 active 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

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

Appeal By

Site Address

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I wanted to take the opportunity to reiterate the concerns I made when the plans for this development were first published. Principally, that this is a plot of land adjacent to a site that has already been given planning for 6 pitches and where the owners have as yet started no work other than to instate a wide drive on to land. The fact that the owners of this site have themselves submitted planning for an additional 6 pitches should be considered. Although this planning application was also turned down there is every likelihood it will also be appealed.

1. Coincidence may not be a planning term but it concerns me that potentially 18 pitches could be given permission. This size of site will overwhelm the local village of Piddington and be a mockery of protecting the local countryside.
2. Furthermore if planning is given in time for both applications it will be a G/T site run by two different individuals which brings its own concerns.
3. Concerns have been raised as to whether the owners can provide the necessary utilities and remain so based on the information received to date.
4. This is another opportunistic development with again no evidence supporting who will live at the site. If 'need' in Oxfordshire was so great why has the site already with planning not been developed? The owners have had a year to put facilities in place.

I would urge the Inspector to look at this Appeal application not on its own but in the context of the whole site and turn it down as inappropriate.

Thank you.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

Appeal By

Site Address

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence

Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

In respect of the Planning Inspectorate Reference 3262394 and planning appeal reference 21/00003/REF I would like to formalize my objection. I am given to understand that all 94 objections relating to the original application, 20/01747/F have been effectively forwarded and will form part of the duly considered public representations subject of this appeal. In this respect my personal statement of objection still stands (including typos I can't undo. ☐☐).

I will be brief and simply comment further on the appellants points submitted in their effort to mitigate the council's objections to the original application.

In regard to Point 1 and the Local Planning reasons for refusal, referenced in the letter of appeal, it is very relevant to remember that the land adjacent to and contiguous with this proposed site of 12 vans already has recent approval at the inspectorate level for 12 vans, each with associated ground works. A larger proposal for the adjacent property was rightly rejected. In essence this development is a cynical attempt to circumvent the decision of the planning process with this separate application for like immediately adjacent.

Forgive me but the question of visual impact is partially subjective, and it should not be forgotten that there is rising ground to the rear of the expansive field, from which dare I say some might consider that the unsightly sprawl of 24 caravans and ground works will be an eyesore.

This is a rural location blighted only by Bullingdon Prison and the adjoining MOD property. The location of the site subject to this appeal is within a very large low-lying agricultural field and I fear it will become the subject of ongoing application and rounds of appeals until both this and adjoining but contiguous land is filled with Gypsy Traveler vans.

The appeal proceeds to state that... "The proposal would not dominate the nearest settled community". How comforting it is that in their opinion this is a statement of fact. Sadly, I reserve the right to disagree. The numbers of families in the two developments, if approved will have an impact on local services already strained and local facilities as few they are.

The original application was short on detail particularly in relation to the entrance to the proposed site. I am unclear if that has been clarified but there was no access off Widnell Lane at the point indicated. I am concerned also that the traffic added to this twisty section of road used regularly by cyclists, runners and walkers will present an unwelcome danger.

The appellant acknowledges that... "Overall the development will result in some harm to the landscape character of the area and the visual amenities of the locality..." a point that sadly seems to be recognized at the local planning level only.

In respect of the remaining points regarding the failure to provide adequate technical documentation I do not feel qualified to judge or comment. I must wonder if owing to the strict guidelines for objecting to an application, the wider implications of a proposal are often unable to be commented on and where a development is undesirable, we strive to find acceptable plausible reasons to object.

Very Best Regards,
Roderick Delve

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR ALAN HOPKINS

Address
33 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Please note I have already objected to the increase for a further 6 pitches on the earlier application proposal which would increase the number from 6 to 12 20/01122/F:

I now wish to object to this application (which is under a different name, and case planner) – so is the Planning Committee being “blindsided” by a developer?

The proposed increase of 6 additional pitches will extend the site to 18 pitches (which was the original application back in 2017, which was then reduced to 6 and refused twice by CDC)

There are also some worrying statements in the application, which shows lack of professionalism by those agents submitting it.

Planning Statement Section 1 'Introduction' it says 'planning application for an application for 1no new four bedroom dwelling house.' – this has never been applied or referred to before

Section 2 'Site description and context' states 'The site has an existing vehicular access from Widnell Lane on the northern boundary of the site'. There is no access to Widnell Lane from this part of the field. The only current access to this field is via the entrance that forms part of Application 20/01122/F. As such, a new access point closer to the B4011 would be needed and this should be indicated clearly on the plans and the safety of such an access needs to be assessed.

In Section 6 'Considerations', part (a) it says 'There is currently no supply of sites to meet the need for gypsy and traveller accommodation in Cherwell'. This is wrong. Recently 13 pitches have been approved by CDC

These issue aside, I object to this application under 2 main planning points, HOWEVER my previous objections and reasons remain valid for this application as the other application objects for the piece of land.

Dominance on the local community:

If this application were to be granted, than the site could have over nearly 150 people on site which is approximately half the population of Piddington – this would clearly dominate the local community.

Need:

Cherwell District Council have recently allocated several sites within the district for gypsy/traveller site development. Therefore there is no longer any need for additional sites.

In summary this planning application has no merit, is not sustainable and there is no need for further development of this type in this location.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS ALAN HOPKINS

Address
33 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

REF: Planning Application 20/01747/F: Land South Side Of Widnell Lane Piddington: 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.

I have carefully read the above application which should be considered in conjunction with (i) a current application 20/01122/F, and two refused applications (ii) 17/001145/F and (iii) 17/01962/F. Please note that TWO similar applications have been REFUSED by Cherwell (17/001145/F, and 17/01962/F) and the smaller development of 6 pitches only scraped through on appeal if certain strict conditions were met by the applicant (see APP/C3105/W/18/3209349) none of which appears to have been implemented.

With all these different applications on the same field (under different names), it seems as though Cherwell DC is being hoodwinked by a property developer. They even state that no additional planning applications are being processed, which is clearly a lie 20/01122/F:

I object to this "new" application 20/01747/F on the following grounds:-

1. There is no NO NEED for any additional G/T pitches: - see Mr Colemans comprehensive analysis in his letter to you in responses to this application and application 20/01122/F. - there have now been an additional 13 pitches across Cherwell in the last 18 months which already meet all G/T requirements, see 2017 GTTA. NOTE: a previous application in a different area of the same field for 6 pitches (12 caravans) 17/01962/F was only granted at appeal due to the 'perceived need' and it is important to note that the Officer fully acknowledged the unsuitability of the field site.
2. Piddington is a Category C village with no amenities (only a church) of only around 160 properties. The proposed site would be the largest in the district and overwhelm and dominate the area. - Application 17/01962/F which only scraped through on appeal already has 6 pitches for 12 caravans. With a conservative estimate of 4 in each caravan, Travellers will total at least 48. This represents nearly a 15% increase in population of Piddington. If both active applications go through then total caravans will be 36 across 18 pitches. So the resulting new 144 residents would represent an astonishing nearly 50% increase in Piddington population which contravenes planning guidelines to "not overwhelm surrounding populations size and density". -
3. The remote field location of the site (8.74km from Bicester services & 3.54km from a small MOD shop in Arcott, both on-the-ground measurements) contravenes both Cherwell District Council (CDC) own Policy and also the Planning Policy from Department Of Communities & Local Government (DCLG) with regards to Travellers Sites because it is well outside the 3km stipulated by Cherwell (see details below)
4. Inadequate Facilities and Services: - no provision for any mains electricity power - no provision for any mains water supply - no provision for main sewage connection for foul drainage even though this is stipulated as the site is prone to flooding and thus unsuitable for any septic tanks.
5. Unsatisfactory Amenities on Site: - no provision for adequate parking spaces - no turning space - no provision for recycling storage and collection from site - no attempt to minimise noise and light pollution from the site - no details are supplied as to the "lamppost style light per pitch".
6. It is located in a wildlife sensitive area with several Red Listed species of birds, butterflies and amphibians

Inaccuracies in Application Documents I am dismayed to see that again there are several inaccuracies in the submitted Form, as there were in the applications 17/001145/F, 17/01962/F, and the active application 20/01122/F. In particular, the site is prone to flooding, there is a brook along the northern boundary, there is no mains water and no electricity on site, there are protected and priority species nearby, there is poor visibility at the entrance, and the proposed site can be seen from the public road Widnell Lane and is not within 3 Km of any amenities.

The Block Plan submitted identifies an 'Existing Entrance' for application 20/01747/F. Please note that there is NO EXISTING ENTRANCE onto Widnell Lane from this parcel of land. The only entrance is on the land associated with the active application 20/01122/F. This entrance has NOT been constructed in accordance with current regulations

Please note the errors and omissions above as I would not like CDC to be misled in their considerations.

Site Contravenes CDC (para B139* and BSC6*) and DCLG (2015 para 25

"...authorities should very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside" Proposed site is a green-field pasture site in a rural agricultural situation

"...Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community" and "which will not be out of scale with or dominate nearby settled communities"

As CDC has already approved on appeal the application 17/01962/F , Travellers will represent a nearly a 15% increase in population of Piddington. As detailed earlier, if both active applications go through, and using a conservative estimate of 4 people per caravan, then the resulting 144 residents would represent an astonishing near 50% increase in Piddington population!

"...sites will be within 3km road distance of the built-up limits of Banbury, Bicester or a Category A village."

Accurate road level measurements show site is 8.37 km from Bicester which is the nearest place for amenities such as Schools, Shops, Doctor and Dentist, Entertainment etc. A small MOD shop at Arccott is 3.54 km from site entrance and another small MOD shop and MOD primary school at Ambrosden is 4.18 km. All these measurements are well in excess of the 3km limit set by CDC.

"assessing the suitability of sites: a) access to GP and other health services b) access to schools"

The site location is too far from GPs and dentists and schools (8.74 km from Bicester)

" avoiding areas at risk of flooding"

The site is a green-field pasture land, low lying and prone to standing water & flooding [see Drainage Report from previous applications in this field, and talk to people who live in the village, and have and continue to witness this flooding.

" the potential for noise and other disturbance"

As there is no mains electricity on site, power will be from generators which will adversely impact the linear village of Piddington which lies less than a mile across fields in a quiet rural environment. •

"the potential for harm to the historic and natural environment"

The proposed site is in a wildlife sensitive area with Red List species of birds and butterflies – including recorded Curlew, Lapwing, Brown Hairstreak Butterfly, Black Hairstreak Butterfly. The extremely rare Stone Curlew has been sighted locally (see village website). Crested newts are also known around the western edge of the village close to sites of old ponds. The two ponds close to the proposed site need to be assessed again for rare species. Anyone with local wildlife knowledge will also know of the badger set within the scrub land to the east of the proposed Travellers Site. □

Curlew use the field for the proposed Travellers Site and fields around as feeding stations in the soft wet pasture land. (see BBOWT reserve at Meadow Farm) □ Given the loss of rural land when the MOD established nearby, it would be a real pity that yet more green-field sites are turned over to hard standing resulting in further loss of habitat and foraging opportunities for Red List species.

"the ability to provide a satisfactory living environment"

Unfortunately the proposed site is too far from any services such as Doctors, Dentists, Schools as well as shops and entertainment facilities. The arc4 report stated "GP services were accessed by 90.8% of respondents in Cherwell" and "over 90% felt it was important to be close to shops and doctors" which shows there is a Travellers need for easy access to the medical services. The proposed site will not meet these needs. Proposed application contravenes the Government Planning Policy for Travellers Sites:- (see House Of Commons Briefing Paper number 07005 19 December 2019 "Gypsies and Travellers: Planning Provisions" by Gabrielle Garton Grimwood) - The Planning Policy for Travellers clearly states that sites "must relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density".

Piddington is a small village with no amenities. It is not suitable for any travellers site. - The Planning Policy for Travellers states that sites should NOT be used by anyone who "does not meet the definition of Traveller" and "EXCLUDES those who have permanently ceased travelling". □ Why does the

application refer to permanent static caravans when all residents should be Travellers?

The Planning Policy for Travellers states that "Local Planning Policy must consider needs for Travellers when preparing Local Plans" □ So, IF there is a need for Traveller Sites, why hasn't Cherwell set aside sites in the town development area to provide for Travellers? - The Planning Policy for Travellers states that Public Sites for Travellers now represent only 29% of sites, and Private Sites now account for 59% of sites (vs 41% in 2008).

It seems that because Cherwell has NOT provided Public Sites for Travellers, this has encouraged private sites that are not in suitable areas, well away from amenities that are so important for Travellers. ... In conclusion, all the above demonstrates clearly that the location of the proposed Travellers site contravenes CDC's own policy and that set out by the DCLG. It will not contribute positively to the surrounding environment or communities. The loss of green-field pasture land is highly likely to be detrimental to Red List species of wildlife. But most importantly the proposed site will in no way address the concerns of the Travelling Community and fails to meet their needs as reported in CDC's own independent research. Moreover, with the 13 G/T pitches newly approved in other applications in Cherwell, there is NO CURRENT NEED for any more G/T sites in Cherwell. I urge CDC to reject the planning application.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR WILLIAM JACKSON

Address
5 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

As an observation, an earlier application for more pitches was rejected by the council. This current application for more pitches over an above the number approved appears to be simply to get around the previous rejection.

Looking at this application specifically, I want to object for the following reasons:

1. The site is not sustainable.
2. It is too close to the MOD training facility.
3. Widnell Lane is narrow and winding and prone to ice in the winter. The additional traffic will create a hazard.
4. Piddington is a small village with limited services that cannot support the additional pitches.
5. The increased size of the development will dominate the village of Piddington.
6. Cherwell already has an adequate 5 year plan for pitches.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS KAREN JOY

Address
109 thame road piddington
Piddington
nr. Bicester
OX25 1QB

Company/Group/Organisation Name Local resident

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground

Interested Party/Person Correspondence

Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I find that the application to include even more living quarters goes against the reasons for the refusal last time. With more living quarters there will be room for more residents and the pitch is just not suitable, as has been accepted before, especially as it is 1) on a very wet piece of land and inclined to flooding. 2) no services what so everywhere within reach and it has also been agreed before there is no necessity for added living accommodation in this space.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR ROY MARSH

Address
24 Vicarage Lane
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QA

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I would object to anything causing additional problems to an already dangerous junction. Coming out of Widnell Lane onto Thame Road is already hazardous, increasing traffic and adding distractions is really not a good idea.

I'd also be concerned at what this proposed community would do for amenities and entertainment. I would be concerned that the use by our village of Widnell Park would be compromised. There are no amenities in this area to accommodate such an increase in population, and most pertinently would seriously affect the peace and tranquillity of the area. Our village is small with no facilities, it is not capable of sustaining such developments, safety for existing residents must come first.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

Appeal By

Site Address

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I object to this planning permission, Widnell lane is a lane, you can barely fit two cars down there side by side, you are now adding a junction in between two blind corners, people going in and out of there will result in accidents and fatalities, it is very dangerous to a family area which kids are travelling through, you are and will make this lane a death trap and no improvement to the entry will make the lane wider of get rid of the two blind corners, first and foremost the safety of the people in the area is paramount and no care has been given. This request to for this site to add a development and caravans is ridiculous and is a lack of safeguarding for the existing people in the area. This is small village with no facilities, it is not capable of handling such developments, safety for existing residents must come first.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference

Appeal By

Site Address

SENDER DETAILS

Name

Address

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

The planning inspector will I am sure know that this appeal relates to the fourth application for this field/development. The first two, for 16 pitches (17/00145/F) and then for 6 pitches (17/01962/F), were both unanimously refused by the Cherwell planning committee. The second refusal decision by the planning committee was eventually overturned at appeal and a development of six permanent and 6 touring caravan pitches was granted by the Planning Inspector subject to a series of detailed conditions set out in two pages covering 14 paragraphs of conditions. Since the appeal was granted a further 12 pitches have been applied for, 6 in application 20/01122/F and a further 6 (20/01747/F) which are the subject of this appeal. If this appeal and the expected appeal against application 20/01122/F are granted this will take the overall site size to 18 pitches (18 static caravans and 18 touring caravans). Contrary to the appellants claim that this is a standalone development unrelated to existing granted pitches and applications on the same field it is clear that these developments are all connected, the site will share an existing entrance on to the field where the site is proposed. Piddington is a small category C rural village of just over 350 residents. Increasing the size of this deployment from 6 to 18 pitches would lead to approx. 108 new residents (assuming an average of 6 people per pitch) which would dominate the nearest settled community and be unsustainable within a category C village with no infrastructure. Piddington was described in the previous planning report as one of the least sustainable locations in Cherwell. I question the need for these additional pitches. At the appeal hearing the Parish Council presented compelling evidence that the gypsy and traveller needs assessment was flawed and inaccurate. Since the original application to develop this site the number of traveller pitches granted by Cherwell has risen by 13 and Cherwell now acknowledge that, there is an adequate 5 years supply so there is no need for this development. This field is wholly unsuitable for a gypsy/traveller site development. The field is prone to surface water flooding, there are no basic services available, no mains sewage, no mains electricity and no mains water and the cost of installing these services would be prohibitive. In the previous appeal for this site the Planning Inspector made it clear in his report overturning the Councils decision and granting permission for six pitches that prior to commencement of any work that: " The site shall not be occupied until a water supply and electricity supply have been provided in accordance with schemes which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority". In paragraph 8 the inspector also says: "No development shall take place until detailed schemes for the foul and surface water drainage of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water scheme shall be based on sustainable drainage principles and no surface water from the site shall discharge into the public highway or into the adopted highway draining system. The approved foul water drainage system shall be implemented prior to first occupancy of the site and shall be retained thereafter". The site is not sustainable; there are no facilities in the village, no bus service and no shops. The residents of this site would be entirely reliant on private transport to Bicester (approx. 5 miles distant) for all their services. The field where the site is located is a few hundred meters from an MOD training site, which is frequently used. The training uses simulated explosions, pyrotechnics and gunfire. The noise and nuisance for anyone living in a poorly insulated caravan so close to the training site would be intolerable. For the reasons stated, I urge the planning inspector to refuse this appeal.

From: Piddington Parish Council

Date: 12th March 2021

Appeal Reference: APP/C31035/W/20/3262394

The comments contained in this correspondence should be read in conjunction with the letters of objection submitted to the original application to Cherwell District Council by Piddington Parish Council.

Piddington Parish Council (PPC) objects to the application on the following grounds:

- **Cherwell District Council (CDC) can demonstrate a five-year supply of pitches and therefore there is no need for additional pitches**
- **Development of this site would dominate the nearest small settled community of Piddington when considered in conjunction with the immediately adjacent site on the same OS Parcel 9635, for which permission was given on appeal (APP/C3105/W/19/3209349) for 6 pitches (and for which an application to increase to 12 pitches has been refused, but is also likely to be the subject of an appeal)**
- **The site is not sustainable in terms of access to services or transport and would place additional pressure on already stretched infrastructure**
- **The area is prone to flooding and the replacement of turf by hard standing can only make this worse**

ADDITIONAL PITCHES ARE NOT NEEDED

The following is extracted from CDC's 2020 Annual Monitoring report which shows the estimated supply situation for pitches. As can be seen, until 2025 CDC estimates no shortfall and therefore no requirement. In the year from 2025-2026, possibly one additional pitch may be required, with all the uncertainty of guessing the situation five years into the future. There is certainly no pressing need at present for six more pitches in Piddington

Table 23 – Calculation of 5 Year Land Supply for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches (GTAA, June 2017)

		Five Year Period 2020 - 25 (current period)	Five Year Period 2021 - 26 (from 1 April 2021)
k	Shortfall (g- i)	0	1

In fact this is an overestimate because CDC underestimates net completions from 2017 to 2020. PPC has consistently argued that the former Station Approach site in Banbury should not have been included in the supply in 2017 because it had never, from the time it was given planning permission in the 1970s, been restricted to occupation by Gypsies and Travellers. When it closed and its 10 pitches were erroneously counted as lost G/T pitches, the effect was to understate the net completions as 8 rather than the correct figure of 18. If this were to be corrected CDC would have no calculated shortfall for the foreseeable future.

When permission was given on appeal (APP/C3105/W/19/3209349) for 6 pitches on the adjacent site in this field the Inspector gave as his sole reason for overturning the refusal that CDC could not demonstrate a five-year supply. Since then, permission has been given for 13 pitches in Cherwell and that reason can no longer be applied.

The outcome of that appeal was published in October 2019. in the 17 months since then the only work that has been undertaken there is some improvement to the entrance. If the need for pitches were pressing, surely these would have been brought into use more expeditiously.

THE SITE WOULD DOMINATE THE NEAREST SETTLED COMMUNITY OF PIDDINGTON

PPC totally refutes the accusation that it is confused concerning the total number of pitches proposed on OS Parcel of land 9635. It is the appellant or his agent who is confused, or perhaps trying to sow the seeds of confusion. The applicant states that they will be using the existing entrance to the field, which is the entrance for the original application, made by Mr Foster (application 17/01962/F) and therefore the appellant acknowledges the two sites are in fact linked. The history of applications for Gypsy/Traveller pitches on this field is as follows.

This is the fourth application in four years for Gypsy/Traveller pitches on this parcel of land. 17/00145/F (16 pitches) and 17/01962/F (6 pitches) were both refused; the refusal of 17/01962/F was subsequently overturned at appeal in October 2019. A further application 20/01122/F to build 12 pitches rather than 6 on that part of the field was refused on the same day as the application for a further 6 pitches, 20/01747/F, currently being considered in this appeal. If all the developments, except the first, for 16 pitches, were eventually to be approved, a total of 18 double pitches, ie potentially 36 units of accommodation, would be constructed on the parcel of land about 1 km from a village of fewer than 150 households.

There does not seem to be, in planning terms, a definition of domination. However, both CDC and the appellant's agent appear to consider that the only form of domination that matters is visual intrusiveness and that a few hedges is all that is required. Welcome though hedges would be, they are almost irrelevant to the effect of the site on the people who already live here. Piddington is a tight-knit rural community with its own culture and a strong community ethos. We hope no family who settles in the village, no matter what their background, is made to feel unwelcome. But that is not the same as potentially 100+ people, equally tight knit and with their own culture, taking up residence in a bloc within 1km of the village. Should this appeal be granted and the application 20/01122/F appealed successfully as well, the resultant 18 static and 18 touring caravans on the field in question would increase the population of Piddington by approx. 25%, an increase which would constitute a size of development that would dominate the nearest settled community, namely, Piddington.

THE SITE IS NOT SUSTAINABLE

Although the site is just within 3km of Arncott, a Category A village, Arncott is accepted by CDC as being one of the least sustainable and poorest in terms of services of Category A villages in the district, in that its main claim is a small shop, a pub and a bus service (the third of these is irrelevant to the proposed site some 2.5km distant).

There is an infrequent and inconvenient bus service from Bullingdon Prison, about 600m distant. However the walk there is hazardous as Widnell Lane is narrow, with bends, has no footpath, no street lighting and is subject to the national speed limit (60mph for most vehicles). It also entails crossing the busy B4011, where visibility to the right is restricted by the remains of a military level crossing and overgrown vegetation. It is inconceivable that anyone from a site in Widnell Lane would use this bus service. Every journey, however trivial, would be made by private vehicle.

There is a GP surgery in Ambrosden, normally open for 2 hours on Fridays only, and scheduled for permanent closure. Otherwise, site residents would have to try to register with a practice in Bicester, one of the fastest growing towns in Europe.

The nearest primary school is in Ambrosden, nearly 4km distant, which is already accommodating growth in Ambrosden itself and Arncott. Children would attend secondary school in Bicester, a journey of about 9km.

SERVICES

The site lacks basic services. There is no mains water connection, no mains electricity and no connection to mains sewerage, all of which would be required to sustain a habitable site. The Parish Council has been advised by the service providers that, owing to the location, to connect to these services would not be straightforward and would cost in the region of £100,000 to £150,000 per service.

PROXIMITY TO MOD FIRING AND TRAINING RANGE

The site is adjacent to an MOD training ground, which is in constant use including simulated explosions, small arms, machinegun fire and pyrotechnics. The noise generated from the training ground can be intrusive and this relates both to the proximity to the training area and to the construction and relatively low acoustic insulation of static and touring caravans. Living next to the training ground in such conditions would be intolerable.

THE AREA IS PRONE TO FLOODING

The entire area of Piddington experiences flooding, both standing water and flash floods. The site under consideration has a high water table and has had some standing water this winter.

The appellant is proposing the use of a soakaway to deal with surface water from the site. The details have not been provided, however disadvantages of soakaways in general include that at times, they will be taxed beyond their capacity and as a result, the excess will end up where it is not wanted, probably on the road, thus exacerbating an already existing problem.

A permeability test conducted in support of the original application for this field (17/00145/F) concluded the site is not suitable for soakaways because of the poor permeability of the heavy clay soil. Such an approach cannot be relied upon always to purify the runoff to a satisfactory level, so that contaminated water will find its way into the drainage ditch alongside the road and ultimately into the River Ray.

The proposed use of septic tanks with a packet sewage treatment plant, not the Environment Agency's preferred approach of connecting to the main sewer, also presents a pollution hazard in times of heavy rainfall and a high water table.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Parish Council maintains that the site is unsuitable for the development proposed. The site is not sustainable; it is prone to surface water flooding and would provide a very poor living environment and would have a potentially damaging effect on the small community of Piddington. These reasons, together with existence of an adequate 5 years' supply of gypsy/traveller pitches in Cherwell should lead to the conclusion that the undoubted harm that would be caused by this development is not outweighed by need and this appeal should be refused.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS SUSAN ROBERTS

Address
12 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

Company/Group/Organisation Name Mrs Susan Roberts

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground

Interested Party/Person Correspondence

Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

. amount of static and tourers will be overwhelming, for this site . Environmentally.
As for welfare of the residents, it's in a high water table area, close to a army training site, no local
aminaties .
Is it not the council duty of care for these residents,

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR MARIO TERZINO

Address
3 East Brook Close
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1PD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I strongly object to the above application.

The application's only merit appears to be that it would fulfil the requirement for "Need" although there is no evidence to support this requirement. The Merit of Need is very much in question especially as the original 6 pitches granted over a year ago has still not been developed.

I urge the appeal court not to grant any further pitches on this site and to carefully consider the detrimental impact it will have on the nearest settled community. I would also like to see the original 6 pitches developed and for the applicant to show compliance to conditions previously laid out before any further requests are considered.

The applicant indicates that this is a separate planning application to the one that was granted under appeal over a year ago and indeed it may first appear to look like it. But on close inspection this is just an underhanded way of them attempting to get their original 12 pitches.

Any benefits provided by the site will be outweighed by the harm that it would have to the character of the surrounding countryside, the environment, and with the 6 pitches already granted and with the new application 20/01122/F to extend the original application granted from 6 to 12 pitches will dominate the nearest settled community.

I therefore urge the appeal court to refuse permission based on the grounds of no evidence supporting the requirement for Need and with 6 Pitches already granted a further increase will harm and Dominate the nearest settled community of Piddington.

These were some of the same reasons it was unanimously refused for by the planning committee time and time again.

Yours sincerely

Mario Terzino

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MS RACHEL TIMBS

Address
3 East Brook Close
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1PD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I strongly object to the proposed additional 6 pitches on the Widnell Lane Site, Piddington. This will create increase in traffic on what is a small village lane with no footpath, causing disruption and danger to villagers driving and walking along this road and potentially through the village of Piddington . Any further developments on this site would be to the detriment of the local community and surrounding area.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MR EDWARD WEST

Address
1 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

The extension of this development over the existing 6 pitches already permitted will have a further negative impact on the landscape in what is currently open countryside. This will be visible from the adjacent hillside. The additional traffic that will be added by another 6 dwellings on this site onto a minor road with poor visibility is a concern. Is there a need for an additional 6 pitches in the area? None of the 6 pitches already permitted have been occupied. The site is not connected to mains foul drains therefore all waste has to be taken off site via road.

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/20/3262394

Appeal By MR J SWEENEY

Site Address
Land on South Side Widnell Lane
Piddington
Bicester
OX25 1AE
Grid Ref Easting: 462853
Grid Ref Northing: 217389

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS PATRICIA WILLS

Address
15 Lower End
Piddington
BICESTER
OX25 1QD

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I fail to understand where there is a proven need for these additional sites. The original (unproven) need has not been catered for in over two years since the first appeal.

At what stage of continual increase in the number of plots applied for will consideration be given to the domination of a small Cat C village by a new green field settlement. By domination, I don't mean physical views or the need for screening.