

**From:** charlotte capel  
**Sent:** Friday, October 18, 2019 9:36 PM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Re: Bloxham - objection

Good evening,

Thanks so much for getting back to me.

My address is as follows -  
1 The Old Cottage  
Church Street  
Bloxham

Kind Regards,  
Lottie

---

**From:** Planning <[Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 18 October 2019 17:06:14  
**To:**  
**Subject:** RE: Bloxham - objection

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your email however please provide your full postal address so your comments can be registered against the planning application.

Kind regards

**Development Management**

Cherwell District Council

Direct Dial 01295 227006

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

[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)

[www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk)

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](https://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

Follow us on Twitter [@Cherwellcouncil](https://twitter.com/Cherwellcouncil)

**From:** charlotte capel  
**Sent:** 17 October 2019 14:16  
**To:** Samantha Taylor  
**Subject:** FW: Bloxham - objection

Hello Samantha,

I am writing to submit my objections against the development in Bloxham next to the wreck. Apologies for the delay in this, I understand it is past the submission date. I hope these comments still count.

I have listed below what I see to be the most important points.

### **Principle of development**

The proposed site is allocated existing green space. The neighbourhood plan should be given the greatest amount of weight by the decision maker. Policy BL2 states 'in addition to the major development set out in Policy BL1 the following development will also be permitted: conversion, infilling and minor development within the existing built up limits provided that such additional developments are small in scale typically, but not exclusively, five dwellings or fewer'. At the site identified in Policy BL1 permission has been approved for housing of 85 dwellings. It is acknowledged that the site within this application proposes 95 dwellings. This clearly is not in accordance with Policy BL2 and the proposal fails at the principle of development. From the applicants planning statement it is apparent that they have afforded limited weight to the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan. This is not in accordance with the NPPF and should be noted when reading the planning statement that little consideration has been afforded to the NP. The Cherwell Local Plan has defined settlement boundaries of which this site is not within. The proposal fails on the principle of development yet again. Local Plan Part 1 Policy Villages 1: village categorisation identifies Bloxham as a Category A village. Part C.272 states that 750 dwellings should be accommodated in rural areas, this has been achieved long ago. The Local Plan reiterates the need for small scale housing developments of 10 or less to meet housing targets. This proposal is in conflict with several aims of the Local Plan and the huge amount of housing is not appropriate in this village setting. It should be noted that the site is separate from the village and is not an acceptable extension to a settlement. The protected open space of the recreation ground should remain as such and not be severely negatively impacted upon from a large housing proposal. The proposal fails at Neighbourhood Plan level and the Local Plan level on the principle of development and should not be considered further. However there are many other aspects at which I can object and illustrate the failings of this scheme. The proposal is also not in accordance with the NPPF as it is not a natural extension to the existing settlement and therefore is not in the presumption of sustainable development. Large housing schemes such as these should only be allowed within existing TOWN centre settlements and not create unacceptable development within a village with a sensitive character and outstanding conservation area.

### **Conservation**

When considering the proposal great weight should be afforded to protecting and enhancing Bloxham Conservation Area. Paragraphs 193-196 of the NPPF state that the concept of harm that can be caused by the development and these degrees of harm must be balanced against the PUBLIC benefits of the development. It is clear that the only benefits would be for developer and no public benefits would arise from the development of this proposal. The proposed housing would have a detrimental impact on the character of a significant heritage asset. Once this harm has taken place it can never be replicated. The housing which has already taken place around Bloxham has been to the detriment of the conservation area and the decision maker must consider the harm of large housing schemes such as this proposed have on this exceptional heritage asset. The developer has given little to no consideration of the impact this would have on the conservation area. The outline application must be refused at this stage as the sheer mass of housing alone is enough to significantly negatively impact on the conservation area.

**Ecology**

The slade nature reserve is designated and should be given due consideration when examining any adjacent proposals. There are bound to be protected species such as great crested newt as they have been identified in nearby areas such as Bicester. All protected species should be protected at all costs and this proposed housing would be to the detriment of ecology in Bloxham.

**Traffic**

The traffic in and around Bloxham is a well known issue to all. The proposed housing would exasperated an already awful situation. It should be considered that the volume of traffic is not something which can be conditioned. The proposal is not in accordance with part c of Policy BL9 as there are no mitigation measures which can be put in place to ensure there is not an adverse impact on the highway network. The location to the south of Bloxham would cause residents to use the village road of Bloxham as a through road to Banbury. This would generate unacceptable volumes of traffic through the village.

I would appreciate receipt of this email.

Many thanks,

Lottie