

# Comment for planning application 21/00343/F

<b>Application Number</b>	21/00343/F
<b>Location</b>	Land East Of The Leys Adderbury
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of 2 dwellings
<b>Case Officer</b>	Bob Neville
<b>Organisation Name</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Teresa Wilkinson
<b>Address</b>	6 Dog Close, Adderbury, Banbury, OX17 3EF
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Many others will be giving "technical" reasons why this development is unsuitable for our village, and I agree with all of the main points, eg the site is outside the settlement area, increased traffic is inappropriate/dangerous, building on gardens adjacent to the countryside is against the Adderbury Plan, a wildlife corridor will be lost, a much-loved footpath will be diverted. However, what may be overlooked is that the village plan and other planning guidelines actually exist to protect the everyday, personal experiences of villagers, and I would like to describe a little of why this development and the loss of this footpath would affect me - and I am sure a lot of others - in a very personal way. [REDACTED] and as a result I am often only able to go for very short walks. A major reason I chose to live in Adderbury was because - unlike many other villages - it's possible, here, to go for many different walks, straight out of one's front door, and to experience both village streets and little bits of countryside, without having to walk very far at all. When I found the footpath through an absolutely stunning Victorian-style garden I was amazed. It became my favourite walk, from Dog Close. There was the feeling of welcome, too, the path well maintained and charming garden features like the round seat encircling an old tree (now collapsing under briars) close to the footpath rather than - as with other paths crossing private properties - all charm removed from around the path and a sense that one is an unwanted intruder. When it all changed and the path and then the garden became horribly overgrown, I stopped walking there. The change made me very sad. It was only too clear that walkers were utterly unwelcome. And the path was dangerous. I couldn't risk turning my ankle and I'm sure others - mothers with small children and older people, for example - felt the same and didn't particularly want to push through a jungle. The documents suggest the footpath isn't wanted, as not much used. It was made unusable - that is very, very different. Clearly others, feeling angry as I do, have now - as I have - determinedly started using it again, no longer demonstrating an English reticence about walking where we feel unwanted. It is our path. We love it even in its overgrown state. Please don't let us down and agree to this development. Thank you.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	11/03/2021 23:59:06
<b>Attachments</b>	