

Ashdown
Creampot Lane
Cropreddy
OX17 1NT

27/04/2023

Dear Cherwell Planning Department,

I would like to object to this planning application on the following grounds –

The scale of the development is disproportionate to the size of the village. By adding 60 households to the village, this could cause an increase of 25% - 30% to the population size of the village. This will put incredible strain on already stretched local amenities. This does not constitute sustainable planning in any sense. Much of the planning submission has been centred around how the development brings a new doctors surgery to the village. Obsidian mention this repeatedly in the submission and have included reference to this in the leaflets distributed to neighbouring villages where they are trying to garner support for this application. This suggestion of a new surgery though has led to the surgery having to publicly “express our surprise regarding the content of this application...No approach has been made by either party to the ICB who would be in the position to authorise such a move.... We therefore do not feel that this (planning) application can be assessed on the merits of it providing a new surgery.” Building a surgery further out of the village means it is even harder for people to walk there. This could lead to difficulties for the older generations and the disabled who may not have a car to pick up vital, weekly prescriptions and attend appointments.

The development will significantly increase the traffic going through the village, whilst the traffic report suggests the impact will be limited, many of the assumptions are based on the surgery being relocated, which as I have already pointed out, is not going to be the case. If you use the development as a starting point to go to Banbury town centre, or the M40 (main trunk road to the north and south), a satnav will take you through Cropreddy (using Waze/Applemaps/Googlemaps). This will take all of the traffic past the school and through Great Bourton or over the single lane bridge in Cropreddy and through Williamscott. This will increase traffic through neighbouring villages as well as through Cropreddy and the school. This increases the chances of road accidents and congestion. Due to the very low employment in Cropreddy, everyone who is working will have to leave the village and come back again causing a significant increase in traffic. The submission and traffic report on multiple occasions mentions a bus that runs daily, once an hour. This is just not the case, the bus runs on a Thursday and Saturday and comes to the village twice. It should be considered that 60 houses would equate to at least 2-3 cars per household especially in a rural area where there is such a limited bus route. This would therefore add at least 120 cars in daily use to the community.

The development contravenes the Cherwell local plan. CDC have enough housing supply for over 5 years without having to build on open countryside outside of village boundaries. Cropreddy, as a category A Service village should not typically have new developments of over 10 houses and should be within the “built up limits of the village”. This development cannot be considered within the limits of the village as it is outside the village boundary and certainly does not classify as infill. There are other areas in the village with far more definable hard boundaries where development would have less impact - land village side of the railway line for example. In the application it states the development is not within a conservation area. This is for the simple reason the edge of the village is the conservation area and this development is extending beyond the village boundary. There are multiple sites within the village boundary which could be considered for small scale development instead of one substantial development beyond the village boundary. Cropreddy is a Category A

Service Village where, in addition to infilling and conversions, minor development - by definition outside of the settlement - is supported in principle. In my view, at the scale of development proposed, and having regard to the size of the village and population, the proposal cannot be reasonably described as 'minor development' and therefore automatically conflicts with Policy Villages 1 meaning that the proposal is unacceptable in principle. See policy extract below:

Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation

Proposals for residential development within the built-up limits of villages (including Kidlington) will be considered having regard to the categorisation below. Only Category A (Service Centres) and Category B (Satellite Villages) will be considered to be suitable for minor development in addition to infilling and conversions.

Category	Villages by Category	Type of Development
A	Service Villages Adderbury, Ambrosden, Arcott, Begbroke, Bletchingdon (*), Bloxham, Bodicote, Chesterton, Cropredy, Deddington, Finmere, Fringford, Fritwell, Hook Norton, Kidlington,	Minor Development Infilling Conversions

If this development was allowed to pass it could set precedence that even though CDC have enough housing provision, building on agricultural land, outside of village boundaries is perfectly acceptable. In the leafleting to local villages Obsidian go on to say that “The marina represents a natural northern boundary to the village”. This therefore suggests that even though this development is only for part of the field, if it is granted, they consider the whole field to therefore be suitable for building on. This is a substantial site and by allowing this first phase of development, it clearly could lead to the whole field being built on. This proposal creates an isolated, standalone development and encroaches onto open farm land. This in turn changes the shape, structure and dynamic of the village. To make matters worse it detrimentally affects the open countryside.

The site for the development itself is teeming with wildlife. I feel the report submitted only touches on some of the wildlife that reside in this location. This development will cause a loss of habitat for these animals and therefore negatively impact biodiversity. The land has been successfully farmed in the past, in fact despite the application saying the land is vacant, fertiliser has been spread (26th April) assumably for planting crop. The site is also an attractive open space and by building on it, this will be destroyed, affecting the properties that overlook the site and also the many users of the marina and canal tow path. From a personal perspective our tranquil outlook over rolling fields and down to the canal will be completely ruined, changing the character of our home and our neighbours properties. This will ultimately have a detrimental effect to our lives and will impact the enjoyment of our home.

I would suggest further investigation is done into drainage on the site as well. Many of the properties on Creampot lane sit lower than the site. Any increase of surface runoff could be very detrimental. I acknowledge the initial report on this matter in the planning application but would urge these are fully considered. if future flooding did occur to any property on Creampot Lane, a clear path for compensation should be established.

The development proposed is on the outside of the village and just walking to the school is likely to take over 15 minutes. The distances quoted in the planning document look like straight line distances. For families with children going to the local school it is likely to cause even more

congestion at the school gate as most people with children of primary age are likely to drive to school instead of walking 15 minutes, especially if they are already having to use the car to commute to work.

On a personal note it amazes me that on such an important application which could affect and blight so many people that –

The first agent cover letter had to be amended (although the updated one still retained the original date of 4th April) because they suggested the Parish Council were in favour of the submission which the Parish Council had to request was removed. The letter also removed a line suggesting this development was broadly supported by the village, which it is not.

The submission puts a new surgery at the heart of the reasons for the development, this is completely undermined by the surgery themselves confirming “we specifically instructed Obsidian that we were not to be used to promote their planning application”. (taken from Surgery public announcement. A doctors surgery has better things to do than have to publicly denounce untruths as well but this is what they have had to do!)

Obsidian could not even be bothered to check what bus service the village has and based the submission on completely the wrong information. Claiming multiple buses a day instead of a bus that comes on Thursday and on a Saturday.

In the initial community consultation many people suggested an increase to the buffer zone between the new development and the existing property boundaries. This has been completely ignored and Obsidian have stuck with the original plan. This to me shows a complete lack of understanding and compassion to the local residents. Obsidian have already had to amend their own personal statement once on the planning portal. Obsidian have made a new doctors surgery key to their submission which they have no possibility of providing currently. Obsidian have made the information regards the surgery public, on the planning submission and leaflets distributed to local communities to gain support for their development over other developments. This in turn means people have been given incorrect information and have been misled.

The deception and underhand tactics being used by Obsidian in this application erodes community faith in large scale planning proposals such as this. Planning proposals should be sustainable and this application does not in anyway promote fair and sustainable development.

It is for the reasons set out above that I whole heartedly object to the proposed planning application.