

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/24/3338211

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C3105/W/24/3338211

Appeal By VISTRY HOMES LTD

Site Address
Land east of Warwick Road
Banbury
OX16 1HD
Grid Ref Easting: 433313
Grid Ref Northing: 243119

SENDER DETAILS

Name MRS CATRIONA REID

Address
Dunlea Main Street
Hanwell
BANBURY
OX17 1HL

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 am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to this despicable proposal which would obliterate the remaining gap between the stunning village of Hanwell and the outskirts of Banbury. At it's nearest it is a mere 11 paces from a garden in Hanwell to the edge of the field in question.

There is no possible justification for the wholesale destruction of the existing landscape and ecology. Cherwell can clearly demonstrate the arbitrary five-year housing land supply and this field is not within the current approved local plan, nor the emerging plan and indeed has been previously identified by CDC as unsuitable for development. Even in the absence of a five year land supply this proposal would be too damaging to consider. Approval of this site would make a mockery of the whole local plan process and instead open the doors to a free-for-all land grab by prospective developers. This alongside the fact that the development would represent coalescence between Banbury and Hanwell is my primary objection.

Moreover this location is clearly unsustainable with minimal local amenities and private transport required to access schools, medical facilities, significant grocery outlets and transport hubs. All the above would put additional strain on the road network which is poorly maintained and overstretched as it is. There is insufficient access to primary care, secondary care and dental facilities within Banbury as it is. As a local primary care provider I can state this beyond shadow of a doubt. It is also an issue that no amount of section 106 reparation could address.

Vistry seek to address some of these issues in their frankly farcical and biased supporting documents. The simple fact remains though that if this proposed development were to enhance the local area it wouldn't require the 'mitigating' planting or 'pulling back' that is suggested by their own landscape evaluation, which also notes that it is evident that the field as a whole contributes to the avoidance of coalescence between the village and the town. The only possible way to mitigate this development is to decline it in its entirety as the very need to 'mitigate' acknowledges that the development would be harmful and do nothing to enhance the local area. To assert that separation would be maintained- albeit with a smaller gap- is simply farcical. The artificial inflation of biodiversity as claimed by the applicant makes a mockery of the wholesale destruction of existing habitats and the agricultural heritage of the site. The only possible mitigation is the absence of development and the need to mitigate demonstrates the harm that would be caused.

Vistry as a Company is wholly disreputable. I note their 1.2 star rating on trustpilot which is only as high as it is as zero is not an option. Such a developer and development on the outskirts of Hanwell would irrevocably destroy this beautiful village and detract from the conservation area and grade 1 and 2 listed buildings.

Although I have made many legitimate arguments above which relate to both local and national planning policy I maintain though that this is about so much more than that. This is about people and homes and a community whose very existence is threatened by a greedy corporate land grab. I moved to Cherwell, and Hanwell specifically, in 2014. I had no prior knowledge of the area but I fell in love with the characterful villages in this area and invested my life savings in my first property in Hanwell. I have subsequently had two children and it was my desire to raise them surrounded by beautiful countryside. These young boys adore the view from the bedroom windows and in the summer months they traipse happily through the fields, letting our spaniel exercise and eagerly spotting tractors and combine harvesters. I beg the planning inspector not to allow these simple pleasures, enjoyed by residents of both the town and the villages, to be irrevocably destroyed.

Hanwell is a vibrant community. Its residents are united in disgust and despair at this proposal. We value our village and its farming heritage. The fields in question currently provide a tenant farmer with a livelihood as well as contributing to the food security of the nation, by providing valuable Best Most Versatile land.

This development is neither wanted nor needed.

It is difficult to comment in full on the applicant's appeal given they have not troubled themselves to submit documents relevant to the location - many relate to a site in Tadmarten, far removed from Hanwell. In contrast to villagers this fight is extremely personal and of the utmost importance.