

**We strongly object to this development on the following grounds.**

**1)a.** Caversfield is a Category C village – confirmed during a call to Cherwell Council on 16/10/2019. As such (according to Cherwell District Council on 16/10/2019) any development can only be Infill or Conversion.

**b.** Infill is defined as an undeveloped gap in an otherwise built up frontage. As this development is neither a conversion nor the filling in of an undeveloped gap in a built up frontage the plans must be rejected.

**c.** Within the last 3 years no such development has been considered in Caversfield by the Cherwell District Council - in keeping with their policy that it would be in conflict with policy ESD1 and policy villages 1 which seeks to restrict new developments in category C villages.

**d.** If the plans for this development were to be approved this could create a very undesirable precedent for further development in this Category C village.

**e.** I feel the proposal is trying to argue for this development to go ahead by comparing it with villages that are either category A or B. All of these villages have facilities that Caversfield does not have. Are they trying to re categorise the status of Caversfield?

**2)** There is no centre to the village. The nearest amenities which are limited are on Southwold. To get to Southwold there is only a footpath on one side of the road which is narrow, overgrown and very close to the road. The road goes from a 40mph speed limit to a 60mph speed limited. This single footpath is shared by with both pedestrians and cyclists. There are no street lights at night on the whole of Fringford Road including this footpath. Most facilities are a car ride into Bicester.

**3)** The Design and Access Statement prepared by SC Architecture lists the property address as Chandlers Ford? It also lists the site as '2.2 Site Location The application site is located at Fringford Road, Oxford. The postcode of the site is OX27 8TH.' The site is located on Aunt Ems Lane. It is in Oxfordshire but not in Oxford.

**4)a.** The access to the site is on the very narrow Aunt Ems Lane. Most of this lane has a speed limit of 60mph. The limit changes to 40mph heading towards the Fringford Road at the very point of the intended access to this site of 4 houses and in the other direction changes from 40mph to 60mph, again at the very point of the intended access.

**b.** The access is very close to the substandard junction with Fringford Road which has a 40mph speed limit and no lighting. Cars are prone to drive much faster than the limit. Turning right onto Fringford Road is a blind spot. There have been a number of accidents at this junction.

**c.** The width of the proposed drive/road leaves very little room to turn a full 180 degrees therefore I envisage cars reversing out of the drive/road onto a very busy lane which is extremely close to a very busy junction. This has been made even busier at peak times due to the difficulty turning right from Fringford Road onto Southwold Lane, because of the junction's proximity to the roundabout.

**d.** The exit from the proposed site will be severely disadvantaged by the existing hedgerow to the right. As this does not belong to the residents they will be unable to modify the hedgerow. This is also at the very point where the speed limit changes from 60mph to 40mph.

**e.** Parking will also be a problem with visitor and deliveries parking on the narrow Aunt Ems lane or around the corner on the busy Fringford Road.

**5)** The 4 houses currently occupying this area have in the past had problems with flooding when the ditch dug around the properties has become blocked. The addition of a large tarmac drive/road and 4 houses and garages and parking spaces will only cause more water to run into this ditch which will increase the risk of flooding the existing properties.

**6)a.** The erection of these 4 properties will infringe on the lives of the residents of the adjacent properties.

**b.** 4 two storey houses within less than 27 meters of the neighbouring properties will block out the views to open countryside. They will impact onto the tranquillity of the neighbouring properties.

**c.** The 4 bedroom detached house with garage is too close to the boundary with Prospect House – less than 2 meters. This will cut off light to the garden.

**7)a.** The four gardens as well as the stables behind are a haven for wildlife. There are numerous birds including Woodpeckers, Robins and Heron. There are squirrels, rabbits, mice and moles. There are small deer, pheasants, foxes and the occasional badger that use these areas. There have been bees nesting and there are bats at nights. Surely an afternoon is not enough time to complete a survey on the wildlife in an area. No one has visited our garden - which will be less than 2 meters from the nearest house - to obtain a fair representation of what wildlife uses the area.

**b.** The preserved hedgerow in front of the build will be right next to the driveway/road catering for 11 cars. This will surely have an impact on the wildlife living there.

**c.** It should also be noted that there is a pond in the garden of Aries which may support wildlife not listed on the report.

**8)** The proposed site does not have mains drainage – I think the current location of the septic tank for the Old Vicarage will be in the garden of one of the properties. If all the new houses have to have septic tanks then where will they drain and what effect will that have on our property?

**9)** At the moment the Old Vicarage has on average 8 cars parked daily on grass belonging to its owners and their boarders. Where will these cars be parked when this grassed area becomes the garden of a different property? It is particularly dangerous to park cars on either Aunt Ems Lane or Fringford Road, particularly in the dark due to lack of lighting and the speed limit (not always adhered to) on these roads.

**10)** There is no doubt that there will be light pollution from these 4 proposed builds. There will be light from vehicles and lighting from inside the houses as well as security lights. This will have an impact on the wildlife in the area as well as the lives of the closest neighbours.

**11)** This is the sixth planning application that has been put forward by the residents of The Old Vicarage. The one which was passed to build two garages and one car port has been flaunted as a three car garage has been built.

**12)** We have had to look out onto taxis, minibuses, old cars, coaches, Kebab van and regular bonfires and now possibly 4 houses.

**13)** The residents of The Old Vicarage have had since May 2019 to prepare plans and reports. We were notified on Friday 11<sup>th</sup> October with a deadline of 1<sup>st</sup> November 2019 giving us very little time to fully address the impact of this proposal.

**IN CONCLUSION - WE STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS DEVELOPMENT**

**Caversfield is a Category C village with no amenities.**

**The intended build is neither Infill nor Conversion in keeping with the directive of Cherwell District Council.**

**The position of the site is dangerous in relation to the substandard junction with Fringford Road. It is too close and will be a particular hazard for cars reversing onto the small Aunt Ems lane in particular at peak times. The entrance to the site is at the point where the speed limit changes between 40mph and 60mph and will be concealed by the existing hedgerow.**

**There is not the road infrastructure, nor the utilities to support this garden site.**

**If the plans for this development were to be approved this could create a very undesirable precedent for further development in this Category C village.**

**The build on plot numbered 4 is too close to the boundary of the neighbouring property (Prospect House).**

**[REDACTED]**  
**Prospect House**  
**Fringford Road**  
**Caversfield**  
**Bicester**  
**Oxfordshire**  
**OX27 8TH**