

From: Steve Craggs (saint)
Sent: 30 September 2019 08:55
To: Samantha Taylor
Subject: Re 19/01705/OUT

Hi Samantha,

I have been through the materials provided by Gladman to support their planning application, and I wanted to share with you some thoughts that I hope you might find helpful as you build your assessment of the application. I have attached a short file with the main points. Many of them seem to reflect that much of this material dates back to 2016/17 and has hence become somewhat out of date. Anyway, I hope you find this useful. Please don't hesitate to call me if you want to discuss any of it – my number is [REDACTED]

Cheers
Steve Craggs

4 Gascoigne Way, Bloxham, OX15 4TL

For your consideration re 19/01705/OUT (Gladman)

When considering the application 19/01705/OUT for a development of up to 95 houses in Bloxham, I wanted to draw your attention to the following points with regard to the materials provided by Gladman.

1. In the Bloxham Planning Statement 4.5.3-5, Gladman attempts to sideline the NDP on the basis that since it specifies development should be in the built-up area it is restrictive and does not prevent development outside the built-up area. The ruling by the Court of Appeal against Gladman on 23rd April 2019 ruled that specifying development within the building limits etc does not provide a reason for ignoring the NDP. The Court threw out the planning application in this case.
2. In Risk assessment 1 (Contamination) the report states on page v

*“LKC identified seven potential pollutant linkages, of which one was considered a **high risk** and the remainder a moderate to very low risk.”*

The High Risk item appears to have been removed? The only risks discussed are low and moderate ones. Seems to be very important we know what the high risk item was and why Gladman chose to remove it.

3. Heritage assessment

This was written November 2016, which was before Bloxham had a made Neighbourhood Development Plan

4. Arboricultural report

This was done late 2016 / early 2017, but the report states they should be done every 12 months. If this is the case, this one has elapsed. It also says it identifies 5 potential veteran trees, which apparently requires a Veteran Tree Assessment to be done. It would appear this has not been done.

5. Archaeological assessment

Points out that the planning balance must take into account the loss of the ridge and furrow earthworks

6. Ecological survey

This was dated 10/16, before the Slade was designated as a District wildlife site and a Nature Reserve. In various places (3.5, 4.2, 4.3) this report refers to the Slade but because this was prior to the Slade being registered it mistakenly claims it is not at all.

7. The Lvia survey

All of the information in the survey assumes that the layout of the site is as imagined by Gladman, despite all these matters being reserved. There is no guarantee the builders will follow this indicative layout plan.

8. Socio-Economic report

This was written apparently directly by Gladman and seems very misleading. For example, in 2.2.1 it states the Bloxham population only rose 7% between 2001-11, whereas Cherwell grew by 20+% but this was for 1999/2011, ie an extra 10 years! In addition, the report refers to 'those unable to purchase a house in Bloxham'. There are currently 20-30 properties for sale in Bloxham, including a number of the brand new affordable and larger houses in the new estates that have not been able to find buyers. Miller Homes is currently holding back on phase 2 of the Tadmarton site because the Bloxham demand is not seen as sufficient to ensure they can get them sold.

9. Transport

This report was done early 2017, before a lot of the new houses had come on stream. In particular, 5.1 discusses walking to the village and says 2km is perfectly acceptable as walking distance. Of course if you are carrying bags of shopping, or you are one of our more senior citizens, this is not the case. 5.2 then talks of the ease of cycling into the centre, taking no account of the fact that the A361 through the centre of Bloxham is highly dangerous for cyclists with the narrowness of the road and the HGVs using it. Many people would not dare cycle that route.

In addition, the bus service has been reduced since this report. In terms of 6.3 where it is discussing accidents in the area, so far in 2019 we have had a car go through the fence of the Rec (speeding), a car obliterating our VAS which was located right on the bend of the proposed site (speeding) and a nasty accident at the junction of the A361 and Tadmarton Road.

10. Travel Framework – same comments as for transport.