

-----Original Message-----

From: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk <planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, October 7, 2019 10:04 PM

To: Planning <Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: New comments for application 19/01705/OUT

New comments have been received for application 19/01705/OUT at site address: Land Adjoining And West Of Bloxham Recreation Ground South Newington Road Bloxham

from Jonathan Game

Address:

13 Milton Road, Bloxham, Oxfordshire, OX15 4HD

Comment type:

Objection

Comments:

I object to this application on several grounds:

The land in question sits outside the natural boundary of the village, being south of the old railway line. There is no way for this site to be integrated in to the village given the divide formed by the recreation ground. Its location will therefore require residents to use their cars to access village services, putting strain on the local infrastructure.

The site is not part of the existing plan for strategic housing, and Bloxham, with its local plan, has already met its quota. There is no justification for a new site, let alone one outside the existing limits of the village. There is also no need for such a large scale development with more than 50 houses available in the village and two ongoing developments to help meet the quota from Cherwell DC to meet 750 houses, in line with its 5-year housing supply.

The Bloxham plan in BL1 allows for infilling, conversions and minor developments of a handful of properties, typically less than five. Clearly this doesn't meet that criteria.

The proposal is for 95 houses. However given the high density of new housing, this is likely to rise significantly; the existing adjacent housing has around 100 houses in a similar size area, but at much lower density than new build housing. All information provided should therefore be considered with the expectation of a revised outline planning application (should this be permitted) with a significant increase in housing units. Should this outline application be permitted, then it will be harder to reject an increase in units later. The risks associated with this, outlined herein, will be increased, especially in relation to traffic and strain on local highways.

The application expects an extra 150 cars on the village roads; however 95 units, in a village location, with no services within a distance which most people would want to walk, will no doubt result in a much higher number of cars. Section BL 9 of the Bloxham Neighbourhood plan requires that new developments do not put a strain on the highway network, explicitly NPPF 84. Adding more than 150 cars, maybe in excess of 200, would put a huge strain on the network.

The location of the site requires the 30mph speed limit to be moved, demonstrating that this is outside the current village boundary. The A361 is one of the 50 most dangerous roads in the country, evidenced by Oxfordshire County Council recently receiving a multi-million pound grant to improve it. Putting an access off this road will result in significant risk, both turning in to and out of

the site, given the bends either side of the proposed access. I therefore don't consider that the risks can be mitigated to meet NPPF 108(c) given that there have been multiple crashes already this year close to that location.

The local infrastructure and services are stretched so NPPF 122 (c) can not be met. NPP 94 requires adequate schooling. The local primary school is full and can not be expanded; and should there be places in schools in adjacent villages, this will put more cars on to the highway network.

When considering the local amenities, the shops in Bloxham, acknowledged as a satellite village in the Cherwell plan, serve more than the village of Bloxham. Those shops are also frequented by students from two large secondary schools, which creates additional challenges for them in terms of air quality caused by increased vehicles.

The site is adjacent to a Cherwell District Wildlife Site and registered nature reserve. Both the construction period, and the permanent change of land use will impact the nature reserve. This does not meet the protection requirements of Para 174 of the NPPF and would likely result in loss of biodiversity, contrary to ESD10

The land in question is also part of the flood plain, as evidenced by surrounding fields being ridge-and-furrow. Aside from the inconvenience for new homeowners buying a home that could flood, the development will change forever the flooding characteristics of the area, increasing the risk of flooding in existing housing, notably along Brookside and the surrounding roads.

Being outside the village boundary, a development like this will forever change the views across the countryside from the recreation ground, changing it from a tranquil place to play to any other park in Banbury with urban surroundings. This development is therefore in contravention of Bloxham's plan (BL11) as it doesn't protect the open space and retain the rural character.

I have also noted that the Design and Access statement from Gladman's is very selective in its application of the relevant policies and planning frameworks, some of which are mentioned above, with an alternative perspective. Although Gladman note the need to protect the rural character of the village there is no way that this development does this.

For the many reasons outlined above, this application should be rejected.

Case Officer:
Samantha Taylor

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..