

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

From: [planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk) <[planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)>

Sent: Wednesday, October 9, 2019 4:53 PM

To: Planning <[Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto: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 Craig Stewart

Address:

13 Painters Close, Bloxham, Banbury, OX15 4QY

Comment type:

Objection

Comments:

I object to this planning application on several grounds.

It is not in keeping with either the detail or spirit of the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan.

It makes both unsupported and irrelevant claims regarding the need for housing in Bloxham and uses quasi-political argument as a justification.

In particular it uses global Select Committee statements in support of this particular application with no clear link made to the relevance with regard to Bloxham.

It makes claims that the need for the nation to provide additional housing overall is a justification for yet another development in Bloxham and quotes a government minister in support of this - this is of course flawed reasoning. Indeed much of the reasoning behind the application is flawed and clearly based on false or questionable premises. It is up to the planning authorities to examine these claims in detail and reject them for this reason alone. It is not acceptable for a planning application to submit opinion and propaganda as a justification for development.

This developer (Gladman) promotes its expertise at winning planning appeals and boasts of its skilled team, including where necessary legal representation, being able to provide robust and detailed 'evidence' to a planning inspector. In other words, they are 'tooled up' to run roughshod over the objections of local people who cannot afford the equivalent level of expertise and representation.

Many of the statements made in the application are, at a minimum, highly questionable and the justification in support flimsy at best.

Particular, specific objections I have are:

Enclosing the recreation ground by development and destroying its appeal and open aspect on the edge of the village overlooking countryside.

Adding to the congestion already experienced in the village at both the Primary School and the Warriner.

We are told that there is no possibility of expansion at the primary school in which case this development will lead to even more traffic congestion.

The application makes unfounded statements that it will not adversely impact the Slade local nature reserve and district wildlife site. Also that an environmental impact statement is not required. Every development creates an environmental impact to some degree.

The application promotes the need for further housing at a time when there is housing still unsold from previous developments and a significant proportion of the existing housing in Bloxham available for sale.

The proposal is in direct contravention of the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan with regard to location (outside the built up limits of the village) and in any event too large.

No evidence is provided regarding flood prevention when it is apparent now on an annual basis that this is a problem in the area of the recreation ground.

My understanding is that the existing Cherwell plan for villages such as Bloxham specifies a total of 750 houses which are already included in existing developments. The district also has a full 5 year housing supply in discharge of its requirements to support government house building.

The proposal also does not respect the local character and historic natural assets of the area. This should be self evident to the planning committee.

In short, it is clear that we have had enough of a developer such as Gladman. There is no integrity behind this proposal - it is a scheme for making obscene amounts of money using politics and a shortage of housing elsewhere as a justification. It is accompanied by a thinly veiled threat on their web-site that in around two-thirds of cases they use a team of 'professionals' with legal assistance to get their own way.

This application should be rejected now and however many times are necessary should they choose to appeal.

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..

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..