

Comment for planning application 20/02453/F

Application Number	<input type="text" value="20/02453/F"/>
Location	<input type="text" value="Hornton Grounds Quarry Hornton"/>
Proposal	<input type="text" value="A fuel depot including ancillary offices, the installation of plant and hardstanding"/>
Case Officer	<input type="text" value="Bob Neville"/>
Organisation Name	<input type="text" value="Roger and Lynn Corke"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="The Cottage,Church Lane,Hornton,Banbury,OX15 6BY"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<p>We have just been reading, with increasing incredulity, the report that Steven Newman, Cherwell's Senior Economic Growth Officer, has written in connection with this application. It is riddled with a major inaccuracy and so many inconsistencies that we can only suggest that Mr Newman retracts his report, does his homework and submits a new one. If he doesn't, the last thing his colleagues in Cherwell's planning department should do is take any notice of it. First, the inaccuracy: he claims that the disused quarry on which this fuel depot will be built is a brownfield site. It isn't. If Mr Newman would care to go to: www.planningportal.co.uk/directory_record/444/previously_developed_land_or_brownfield_land he will see that brownfield land is land "which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill purposes where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures." So brownfield land doesn't include "land that has been developed for minerals extraction". That in itself should be enough to dismiss Mr Newman's findings but then we go onto the inconsistencies in his report. He says: "The environmental and operational factors associated with this proposal deserve very careful consideration by specialist consultees. From a local economic development perspective, controls should ensure that no unreasonable adverse impact is placed upon the natural landscape/ecology, or experienced by neighbouring businesses/residences - especially those located nearby such as Hornton Grounds B&B." And how would the imposition of a noisy industrial facility in a quiet rural area, working round the clock within a few hundred metres of a working farm, a B&B and riding stables not have an "unreasonable adverse impact" on those businesses? It would wreck at least two of them and severely damage the third. No one wants to come for a quiet weekend away on a farm only to be woken up at all hours of the night by tankers trundling in and out of the site and the noise of their reversing warning beeps echoing round the valley. And why go for a quiet ride on their horse right next to a noisy fuel depot when other, much more tranquil places are available? Mr Newman concludes by saying that: "This proposal to relocate an established business and service provider would enable the existing jobs and important supply of oil for heating and transportation to be provided from a local hub away from a centre of population. The availability of alternative sites has been investigated and no suitable alternative is apparent." We're sorry, but his own council's Local Plan - which we can only conclude it is not part of his job remit to be familiar with - says precisely the opposite. It says this kind of intrusive, industrial activity should positively not be located in areas such as the Ironstone Hills, which includes this site. Instead, the Local Plan has allocated certain sites for this sort of activity and, if Mr Newman were to read it, he would see where they are. He might also be able to help the applicants find one of them. The applicants don't want to do that, of course. They want to dump this fuel depot on this site because it's a convenient - and cheap way - out of the problem, even if it does damage the environment and ruin three businesses into the bargain.</p>
Received Date	<input type="text" value="27/10/2020 14:16:07"/>
Attachments	