From: Janet

Sent: Wednesday, October 9, 2019 5:09 PM **To:** Planning Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk

Subject: Re: Objection to Planning Application 19/01705/OUT

Yes, here it is:

Janet and Stephen Porter

Chalcroft, Little Bridge Road Bloxham Banbury Oxon OX15 4 PS

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Oct 2019, at 13:28, Planning < Planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk > wrote:

Good Afternoon,

Please could you supply your full postal address so that we can register your comments against the application.

Thank you

Regards

Development Management Place & Growth Directorate

Cherwell District Council Extension: 7006

Direct Tel: 01295 227006

mailto:planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk www.cherwell.gov.uk

Details of applications are available to view through the Council's Online Planning Service at https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/

From:

Sent: 06 October 2019 11:30

To: Samantha Taylor

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 19/01705/OUT

Dear Samantha,

We write to outline the many objections we have to the proposed development of 95 houses just outside the built- up limits of Bloxham.

The proposal contravenes many aspects of the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan, (BL) Cherwell Local Plan Policies and aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework. (NPPF)

Traffic: please refer to BL 9; NPPF para 84 and NPPF 108(c)

Our most pressing concern is the impact that 150+ additional cars will have on the safety of the A361 and the Bloxham village centre. The village experiences significant congestion already, it is home to three large schools which account for large amounts of traffic during school drop off and pick up times. In addition, we have concerns for the safety of the children (as well as adults) living in the village and using the road. The shopping area of the village is congested at all times and exacerbated by the many HGVs that use the A361. Parking is inadequate therefore cars park on the road, so traffic is forced to idle most of the time as they travel through this part of the village. This must have a significant impact on air pollution in the village. In addition traffic is at capacity at the South Newington roundabout and there is no feasible way to improve the situation according to OCC. A further concern is that the junction directly onto the A 361 for the proposed development is in a particularly dangerous area where there have been three major crashes this year already.

Additional Housing Development: please refer to BL1, BL2, Cherwell Local Plan part 1: Policy Villages 2

Bloxham has experienced three developments in the last 5 years representing an additional 220 houses as well as 50% growth in the last 10-15 years. The development is outside the built- up limits of our village and too large. Cherwell's local plan specifies that a total of 750 homes will be delivered at Category A villages, of which Bloxham is one. However Cherwell already has plans covering the 750 as well as a 5 year housing supply fulfilling the requirements to support government house-building. The proposed development is therefore quite unnecessary. It is also interesting to note that (at time of writing) Rightmove has around 50 houses in Bloxham listed on its website starting from £105,000.

Lack of sustainability: please refer to BL9(d) NPPF 94, NPPF para 122 (c)

The development is not sustainable in terms of schooling and services as well as traffic. Bloxham Primary School is full and cannot be expanded any further.

Flood Risk: please refer to BL7

The proposed site includes a flood area that spreads onto the Rec, which has often flooded in that corner of the site.

<u>Character, rural heritage and biodiversity: please refer to BL11, B12; ESD10 ESD 13;</u> NPPF para174

The proposed development will have a negative impact on the open views of fields and church spire on entrance into the village from South Newington, by overlaying it with

housing. In addition the development will surround the recreation ground turning it from rural open space into urban park. Furthermore, it would be adjacent to a registered nature reserve (also a Cherwell District Wildlife Site) which would cause harm to wildlife and have a heavy impact on the inhabitants in this rare wet woodland.

Yours sincerely,

Janet and Stephen Porter