Comment for planning application 20/02446/F

Application Number 20/02446/F

Location Glebe Farm Boddington Road Claydon Banbury OX17 1TD

ProposalFormation of inland waterways marina with ancillary facilities building, car parking, access and associated landscaping including the construction of a new lake - re-submission of

18/00904/F

Case Officer Shona King

Organisation

Name Suzanne Craven

Address Little Nell, Crossing Lane, Claydon, Banbury, OX17 1EX

Little Nell, Clossing Lane, Claydon, Danbury, OX17 12.

Type of Comment

neighbour

Objection

Comments

Type

Please accept this as my objections to this application for the following reasons: 1) Increased Traffic Levels - Claydon is not a busy through village which is evident from the traffic reports provided in Transport Statement from the applicant. As a consequence, there are very few roadside footpaths throughout the village, and none on roads leading in and out the village, including Fenny Compton Road and Boddington Road. Both of these roads are regularly used by villagers and ramblers to gain access the public footpaths around the village on a daily basis. Although the applicant suggests they can send guidance to visitors and contractors to take alternative routes, you cannot guarantee or physically enforce that, and satnay routes from the North and South take you straight through the village. Therefore, with the increased traffic which will inevitably occur from the development of this marina and with no suitable roadside footpaths, you are decreasing the safety of all villages and visitors who currently walk along the roads to access the local footpaths. In addition, the roads themselves are of very poor quality, with pot holes and uneven ground everywhere. Mollington Road, one of the main roads into the village, has a very narrow and blind corner just as you enter the village. Even with a passing point, this is already hazardous area and so with increased traffic it will only get worse. 2) The Canal Tow Path on the stretch from Boddington Bridge to the Claydon Locks is of very poor quality for the majority of the stretch with holes, steep slopes, and even falling in at places. The increase in footfall you would see from 192 berths will put more pressure on this and decrease the safety of it further. 3) Claydon is a small village with approx. 100 houses - no school, no doctors, no amenities apart from a small playing field. To build a marina with 192 berths will more than double the size of this village without the infrastructure to support it. In addition, it will bring absolutely no economic or environmental benefit to a single resident of the village. While Villages pay their council tax to support the local infrastructure as it is, the users of this marina will be able benefit from the area without providing a single financial benefit. Only the applicant is set to see any benefit from this marina. Villages are not even allowed to use the clubhouse if they wanted to. 4) There are already 2 other marinas either side of Claydon, with Cropredy being expanded currently and not at full capacity. The queues for the Locks in Claydon during the weekends and in the summer months are evident. Is there even a need for another marina in such a short stretch of the canal. Surely this is over development of this type of facility. 5)This village is the northernmost village of the county and is currently unspoiled. This marina is almost 75% the size of Claydon and will completely destroy the area aesthetically. There is no justification for taking this away for everyone enjoying it now and in the future. All because of one person/entity wanting to financially gain. 6)The applicant references PROW 170/6/20 as an option for villagers to have access to the canal. This footpath is already 'accessible' however the fields are often water logged and also regularly have cattle in - therefore are not safe or useable for many dog walkers or ramblers. There are also stiles in place making it inaccessible for dog walkers unless you can lift your dog over. 7)I don't think their information provided concerning how they will manage Sewage is clear enough. It looks like a brochure from another company rather than a detailed description of how they intend manage this to an acceptable level in their exact scenario.

Received Date

02/11/2020 18:59:20

Attachments