

**From:** Stephen Phipps  
**Sent:** 24 October 2019 15:44  
**To:** Samantha Taylor  
**Subject:** Objection Gladman 19/01705/out

Dear Samantha Taylor  
Please see below my objection to the above.

**Gladman Development Bloxham 19/01705/OUT**

I wish to register my objection to the proposed speculative planning application.

The NPPF sets the framework under which decisions on **planning** applications are made. Under the **policy** framework provided by the NPPF, local **planning policies** are set out in a group of documents which are known together as the Local Development Framework.

The function of a **Local Area Plan** is to take a detailed look at a specific **area**, identifying and analysing the various issues of relevance, before establishing and setting out principles for the future development of the **area**.

The government is clear that **local** authorities **are** expected to **have** up-to-date **plans** in place to guide **development** within their area to **plan** for the infrastructure, homes and jobs that our residents **need**.

Cherwell has a **local plan to 2031** and the development proposed by Gladman has not been identified in it.

Nor has its proposed location been identified as a possible site for development in the future.

Nor has this development been identified in the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan to 2031.

Literally years and a vast number of planning officers and residents have spent time developing ,consulting and finalising our local and our neighbourhood plans that determines the future of Bloxham and the district.

These plans have considered what sustainable development is to take place that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

The economic, environmental and social success of the district and Bloxham have been considered in drawing up our plans and they should not be dismissed or attempted to be overridden by a speculative developer with no local knowledge or consideration for the wider view adopted by local and neighbourhood plans.

**For these reasons alone it should be refused.**

There are of course specific policies that this application should fail upon listed by our Parish council in their response. These have already been registered by them as an Objection which I endorse and site as my additional objections for you to take account below. **I object on the basis of these specific policies:-**

It should be noted that as part of the adopted Bloxham Neighbourhood Development plan (BNDP) there was already a commitment to build 85 houses including affordable housing (**Policy BL1**) and beyond that **BL2** specifies remaining new houses should be limited to infill and small developments within the current building line. The proposed site is outside the Bloxham built-up limit.

The final general objection is that development has been so extensive in Bloxham over the last few years that local services and infrastructure are at capacity. Traffic and congestion, schools, facilities, culverts, etc are all struggling with the growth. Further development of major new developments such as being proposed are **no longer sustainable**.

Apart from these general objections, specific objections are:

**BNDP BL7:** The site includes a flood area that spreads onto the Rec, which has often flooded in this corner.

Any building on the fields adjacent to the Rec are likely to increase the flooding risk.

**BNDP BL9 (c):** Traffic volumes are already causing issues on the A321 through Bloxham. Adding another 200-250 cars will exacerbate the problem further. In addition the junction directly onto the A361 at a particularly dangerous area where there have been three major crashes this year makes the road even more dangerous. The mini roundabout as you enter Bloxham was assessed as being over capacity when the last development was sanctioned at Wellington Park and which has no solution to resolve despite monies being allocated to investigate this matter. (NPPF para 84 also applies)

**BNDP BL9(d):** The Bloxham Primary School is full, and cannot be expanded further. So there are no facilities for primary school children in the new development and no prospect for any in the future.

**BNDP BL11(c):** Currently the entrance to the village from South Newington shows the Church spire with the green fields leading to the Rec on the left. The proposal removes the rural nature by overlaying it with housing.

**BNDP BL11(f):** Surrounding the Recreation ground with housing turns it from a rural open space into an urban park.

**BNDP BL11(i):** Placing a residential development adjacent to the Slade Nature Reserve (also a Cherwell District Wildlife Site) will cause harm to the wildlife and have a heavy impact on this rare wet woodland area.

**BNDP BL12(b)(ii) and (iii):** Enclosing the Rec with housing removes the open, rural nature of the space and impacts the views from the local PROWs.

**NPPF para 72(b):** The new development will not be sustainable because the additional traffic and congestion issues will cause issues for the village as a whole. Other services (eg dentist, primary school etc) are at capacity.

Stephen Phipps

Bloxbourne, Barford Road, Bloxham OX