

## **GLEBE FARM MARINA CLAYDON**

**Revised Application Ref. No. 20/02446/F**

### **OBJECTION STATEMENT BY ROBERT ADAMS B.Sc. *Landscape Architect (retired)***

#### **1.0 SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

1.1 Is there a need for a further marina on the Oxford Canal in this district when there are two marinas already – Fenny Compton and the recently increased Cropredy Marina? This development would constitute over-development.

1.2 Highways access along the Lower Boddington Road is very poor with a hump back bridge immediately before the entrance. The Lower Boddington Road from Claydon is within Oxfordshire and north of the site it is in Northamptonshire. Has there been any consultation with Northamptonshire by the applicants? Nothing advised to village.

1.3 Visual Impact would be caused by large earth bunds east of the Lower Boddington Road which would obliterate views over a traditional and historic landscape, also changing the nature of the views of the historic Canal. Current amenity values would be lost.

1.4 Landscape Impact would be extremely significant and severe. Land form amendments would introduce land forms that do not exist elsewhere in this local landscape. The former railway land, which is unaffected by the proposals, is level with the site. It is now a public footpath and the new marina embankment alongside it would completely change the views of the Canal and landscape from the footpath.

1.5 Impacts on the Canal and towpath would increase wear and tear significantly. Currently the northern bank is seriously eroding in a number of locations from increased local foot traffic. Local narrowboat owners object to the likely increase in boat traffic because it would cause greater congestion in the summer, increased flow of water through the Claydon Locks causing more water shortages and closures of the Canal, which would be exacerbated by the additional new moorings. These effects would lead to congestion at Claydon Locks, lower the amenity of the Canal for existing boat owners and would affect the peace and beauty of the Canal. They would reduce significantly the expected pleasure of the new boaters.

1.6 Ecology and Biodiversity Impacts would severely affect local wildlife which access the Canal for water. Aquatic birdlife would be affected (swan nesting, deer and badger access). To the west of the proposed lake there is a large badger sett using the Canal as its water source.

1.7 Flooding occurs periodically and the canal has overflowed. This has been basically ignored as no proposals are indicated to mitigate the effects of flooding into the marina.

1.8 Economic and Social Implications on the village of Claydon have also been basically ignored. Claydon would not benefit from the proposed marina during development or after

completion, because the marina is to be closed to villagers. Access during construction could lead to changes in the nature of the road through the village : lighting, kerbs, signs, etc. The amenity qualities of the quiet village would be downgraded significantly.

1.9 Planning law states that development in the countryside should include enhancement of the landscape. The proposed marina would alter the landscape but where would it enhance it, i.e. would not make it more attractive than now? The proposed embankments, the planting and the wildflower seeding attempt the impossible. The landscape proposals are for internal benefit, not external. No benefit would accrue to the general public, especially nothing for the local residents. The development of HS2 to the north should not be considered a precedent for the proposed marina, as they are totally different in character and in scale and in national need.

1.10 The Service Building seems to have been amended to appear more like a barn. These proposals have not been viewed by the village. Have drawings been issued to the Parish Council? Were they advised of the changes? Why was there no site visit when these changes could have been clarified to the village by the applicants? The light pollution that would arise from the building (and from the marina as well) would significantly harm the character of the landscape and its 'dark night' amenity.

1.11 Drawings for this project have been poor throughout because they are both difficult to read (levels, contours, etc.) and to understand (the scale of the proposed embankments and the reason for their inappropriately massive scale, etc.).

1.12 Farming alterations that would occur would include the loss of land and potential crops, both being usual matters resolved by compensation. The deterioration of the local countryside has not been compensated for by the proposals. In the instance of access from the applicant's farm across the stream along the north boundary, there are no details regarding bridging, structural matters including drainage, pollution monitoring, etc.

1.13 Regarding the lake proposals, would its water supply be from the Canal or from a local source? Would it be regular and permanent? What arrangements are there for times of drought, especially if its water might be used for local crop irrigation simultaneously? What details are there on what structures would be needed for such extraction and delivery?

1.14 Planning Conditions needed are considerable. Therefore, because there are so many significant shortages in information, the conditions should be discussed with the village in detail **before** any works start to ensure that they are fully understood by them and adhered to during construction and after completion. The village will surely monitor the works as they are to be excluded from it. This is very objectionable.

1.15 This is a very large project in a small scale landscape; totally out of character with it, both physically and functionally. To date there seems to be no understanding of the massive change that will take place in the name of tourism. The number of boats proposed would significantly affect local conditions, local amenity, local residents and not least a historic landscape. The quality of the submission leaves many questions to be resolved and should be objected to until resolved in public.