

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/23/3327213

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/C3105/W/23/3327213
Appeal By	ARCHSTONE AMBROSDEN LTD, BELLWAY HOMES LTD AND ROSEMARY MAY
Site Address	Land East of Ploughley Road Ambrosden OX25 2AD Grid Ref Easting: 460471 Grid Ref Northing: 220023

SENDER DETAILS

Name	DOCTOR TOM PARKER
Address	24 Ploughley Road Ambrosden BICESTER OX25 2RJ

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

On my initial objection to this application I noted this unnecessarily large and speculative development offers no meaningful infrastructure for the village. The small play structure within the proposed development will only add to the legion of poorly maintained and infrequently used play structures across the settlement which only cater to a small sector of the population, and may serve as a hub for antisocial behavior. There are no facilities in the village for older children.

In the appeal document Table 1 notes a number of 'facilities' in the local area which upon further inspection are clearly inadequate:

The Costcutter convenience store and post office both have limited opening hours. They are also exceptionally small and neither carry a wide variety of stock or sell fresh meat or vegetables. They are not suitable to the village's current needs.

The hairdressers ('The Hair Lounge') only caters to adult females, and leaves a significant proportion of the population (including the children who would be expected to live in the family homes proposed) unaccounted for. Regardless, this business has now closed.

Tiddly Winks Preschool has limited opening hours - sessions finishing at 14:50 on weekdays and only opening during term time, severely limiting its utility to any working parents. Five Acres nursery only accepts children over the age of three, and again is only open until 15:00 and during term time, with no wrap around care on offer. Parents (like us) must travel daily into Bicester for childcare.

The Turner's Arms pub has especially erratic opening hours at the whim of the proprietors. It does not serve hot or cold food nor does it have any alcohol on draught, bizarrely serving only bottled drinks.

It is clearly demonstrated that the current infrastructure is lacking and unsuitable for even the village's current needs, and certainly not with the addition of 120 further dwellings.

It should also be noted the road infrastructure is poor, exacerbated by the new junction at A41/Ploughley Road, which pushes westbound A41 traffic to the unlit and dangerous junctions of A41/B4001 and then B4001/Blackthorn Road to get into the village. Traffic bound for this new development from Aylesbury are forced to drive through the entire village (as per road signage instructions from the A41).

Buses are infrequent at weekends, with only two Bicester bound and three return services on Sundays. Walking the 3.5km towards Bicester is not viable for any person who would consider themselves vulnerable at a time without natural light, with over 1 km of rural path along Ploughley Road completely unlit. Obviously during the winter months this makes up a significant proportion of the day. Furthermore pedestrian paths adjacent to the busy A41 are narrow and often overgrown. To access the amenities of Bicester inhabitants will be required to drive, in particular at weekends and at night.

The scale of the development is not in keeping with the size of the village, and is significantly larger than any other approved scheme in recent history - as per the appellants own submission. This application in general should be assessed in the context of the ongoing construction of 84 dwellings in 'Sanderson Park' along Merton Road as well as the recently accepted planning application for 75 dwellings near Allectus Avenue (22/01976/OUT). In addition the 'Church Leys Fields' development of 85 dwellings has only recently been completed.

The proposed scheme extends towards the A41 and adjacent industrial park, associating the village with the large format warehouses not in keeping with the village's character. The appellant also within their own submission and LVA (Landscape and Visual Appraisal) admit that there is going to be a negative impact on the character of the village, including in some areas major negative impact. This is outlined in section 6.19 of the appeal document - with adverse impact from the approach to the village along Ploughley Road, along the nearby bridleway, and to residential properties both to the south and east of the development. The sloping nature of the site makes the development particularly conspicuous and there is no conceivable landscaping that would lessen the impact of a proposal of this size.

It is clear for the above reasons that this purely speculative development cannot possibly be allowed -

it's prominent location will significantly negatively impact the appearance and character of the village. The appeal submitted by the appellant fails in all areas to justify the scale of the proposal, especially the lack of infrastructure to support it and given (despite their insistence to the contrary) there is already a 5 year housing supply.