

Comment for planning application 21/00922/OUT

Application Number	21/00922/OUT
Location	Land West Of Foxden Way Great Bourton OX17 1QY
Proposal	OUTLINE Planning Application for up to 9 entry-level affordable houses - all matters reserved save for access
Case Officer	James Kirkham
Organisation Name	Ivan Miller
Address	Old Bakehouse, Swan Lane, Great Bourton, Banbury, OX17 1QR
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>The main problem with this proposal is that the development is sited on a greenfield site outside of the boundaries of a village that only recently underwent significant expansion across a greenfield site towards Southam Road (Garners Field). The use of Claridge's Piece allotments to redefine the boundary of Great Bourton is incorrect. The allotments are shared with Little Bourton and are separated from both villages by what is clearly agricultural land. Another issue is the Transport technical note. Point 2.49 of the Transport technical note asserts that "The above review demonstrates that the site is readily available by a variety of modes of transport that have the potential to reduce the reliance on the private car." This conclusion is mistaken as residents frequently enter and leave the village in cars, but few do so on foot or by bike. Those that do leave the village without their car (myself included) are generally doing so for leisure purposes on circular routes, not for work or shopping. As the report points out there are only two buses a week. The lack of any alternative options to the private car or taxi means there will be many more than the predicted 12 car journeys per day. The pricing levels and range of products at the sole local shop in Cropredy does not represent a realistic option for day-to-day food requirements. Furthermore, that shop is a 3.8km round trip (almost twice the MfS upper limit) and incorporates a long uphill stretch on the return trip. Traffic free cycling is touted in the report as a viable alternative to driving yet the cycle route to Banbury hinted at in the report via Mill lane and the canal towpath is actually a very narrow, potholed and muddy tow-path which a cyclist would not generally use. Other bridleways are very few in this area and none offer practical destinations which would replace the use of a car. The bus timetable shown in the report has definitely not (as the report implies) been reduced owing to the Covid pandemic. It is the same as the service prior to the pandemic and will presumably continue to be the service in the future. The report claims one can cycle to the train station in 15 minutes. I'm a regular and reasonably fit cyclist and for me the route to the station is 20 minutes there and 25 minutes back (due to the hill). It's not a particularly pleasant ride in either direction and I very rarely see anyone else attempting it. Anyone other than a keen cyclist wishing to use the train will almost certainly take a taxi or drive. The factors above will lead to an increase in traffic along roads described in point 2.7 of the report as "lightly trafficked rural lanes that essentially operate as 'quiet lanes', being safe for pedestrian use alongside vehicular traffic." The report inexplicably predicts that 0% of the traffic will head south directly towards Banbury. As Banbury is the focus of local services and facilities the most direct route to it, which is south along Foxden Way, will clearly be the most likely one. This is particularly unfortunate as Foxden way is the most popular pedestrian route for residents of both villages. It is the only accessible walking route for people who aren't able (or minded) to manage the uneven footpaths or inclines which are a feature of any other route out of the villages. Passing traffic is already a hazard for pedestrians here as the road is narrow and not all cars slow down to pass at a civilised speed. There is a lot of housing development in Banbury (including very recently in this village) and I am not against it in principle but this development chips away at the countryside and would result in poorly considered additional traffic.</p>
Received Date	17/04/2021 21:57:07
Attachments	