

## Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** Bob Neville  
**Sent:** 13 May 2020 12:34  
**To:** DC Support  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to Planning Application - 20/01073/F

---

**From:** Andrew May [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 May 2020 11:14  
**To:** Bob Neville <Bob.Neville@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Objection to Planning Application - 20/01073/F

Dear Mr Neville,

I am a resident of Milton village, which is closer to the above proposed development than much of Adderbury village.

I have read the application and initial comments from other neighbours and despite wanting to see local businesses flourish and amenities supported, I find myself in total agreement with the submissions from local people I see on the planning portal to date.

The application claims to present a plan for a "recreational caravan park" ("camping" gets mentioned here and there, with little weight attached to this aspect). If I take a look at a couple of the sections:

**Economic Objective**

*"The proposal would provide for around 1 full time and 3 part time staff members which exceeds the current use."*

There is a small office/toilet/shower block. I assume that the full time employee will occupy the 'reception' as their place of work. This seems unlikely for the period from November to March – how many holiday makers will be there during these dark, cold months? What will these 3 other 'part time' staff be doing? Just how 'part time' are they going to be? How have they padded the numbers out beyond someone to mow the lawns once a week for 6 months and empty the septic tank every year?

*"The close proximity to Adderbury and the Ball Colgrave Summer Showcase (producers, landscape/garden designers, general public) which runs for 3 weeks every year offers real opportunities to promote sustainable tourism as both are with walking distance of the site entrance."*

I see that Ball Horticultural to not concur with the 'real opportunities' the proposal claims and vehemently object to it. I fail to see that a business plan based on anticipated visitor numbers to Ball Colgrave each July and the many attractions that Adderbury offers all year round truly stack up.

**Social Objective**

*"the facility will appeal to a wide audience including families ....."*

This caravan park will offer very few recreational facilities, there are no footpaths from it into local woodland or lakes, there is no bar, restaurant or swimming pool. The *"amenity space and play ground"* on the plan is derisory; are we supposed to imagine the small children from 73 caravans enjoying their summer there? If Ball Colgrave happens not to be open for the kids to take an interest in horticulture, at least they can walk along the side of the road (there being no pavement...) for the delights of Adderbury. If the speeding 50+ mph cars on this narrow road are deemed to present a hazard to the little ones excitedly heading to Adderbury, then of course they can always be driven – the good people of Adderbury will welcome 70 cars heading back and forth to shuttle children through the chicane near St Mary's Church for their daily visits to .... er ... the library?

Mr Neville, forgive the sarcasm. The more one thinks about this application, however, the more ludicrous it seems. The claims of economic and local employment benefits to Adderbury and Ball Colegrave are laughable. The social objective paints a happy picture of families and retired couples enjoying their holidays there, which sounds like a highly risky and unattractive proposition. I shudder to imagine the combination of unaccompanied children exiting onto the Milton Road in search of something to do or families walking back in the dark after drinks and a meal at one of the pubs. The plans are so flawed and the probable outcomes so ghastly that it is impossible to take them seriously.

I can only imagine why such an ill-conceived proposal would be presented to the council. What is in it for the applicant? I am sure that the planning committee at CDC is not naïve and will spot a stalking horse when it sees one. This is clearly not a business proposal as described. The only way the applicant can make money from this is if:

1. No significant site amenities are required; no capital cost/no maintenance, just a toilet block.

2. Virtually no staff are required – a skeleton operation only. **Not** one full-time and 3 part-time, well-paid staff.
3. Few children or horticultural enthusiasts are in fact expected to arrive for recreation. Nobody believes that anyway.

No, this can profit the operator only if the site is populated with long-term residents or itinerant traveller families. They require no activities laid on for them – nature trails, playgrounds and picnic areas don't have to be created and maintained. This likely outcome had been mentioned in many of the other objections. A residential site of semi-permanent caravans is a different proposition, the merits or otherwise of such a proposal could be addressed by the community if such a genuine application were made.

This is not an application made in good faith and should be turned down.

Andrew May  
Threshers Barn  
Milton.

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail (and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..