

# Comment for planning application 22/01772/PIP

<b>Application Number</b>	22/01772/PIP
<b>Location</b>	Land To Rear Of Bridge House Main Street Wendlebury OX25 2PW
<b>Proposal</b>	Residential development of 2-3 dwellings
<b>Case Officer</b>	Katherine Daniels
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Will Boucher-Giles
<b>Address</b>	Bridge House,Main Street,Wendlebury,Bicester,OX25 2PW
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Further to previously registered objection I offer the information relevant to the previous failed application on this site from the same source:</p> <p>15/00252/F Land To Rear Of 2 The Villas Main Street Wendlebury Bicester OX25 2PW - Erection of 2 no detached houses with garages - 26/06/2015 Application Withdrawn</p> <p>16/01645/F 12/08/2016 Full Development Land East Of Bridge House And 2 The Villas Main Street Wendlebury Erection of 2 No detached dwellings with garages - re-submission of 15/00252/F Refused 07/10/2016</p> <p>Other applications for multiple houses to be built on this site have been made prior to the period searchable on the planning portal, these are listed in previous objections to previous applications on this site. Please see documents:</p> <p>8631275 - 15/01645/F - Objection Dyson, R - 07.09.2016 - Mr. Dyson's objections 2 and 3 remain true, as do the concerns of the planning consultant:</p> <p>2. Since then the applicant has installed a Mange (all-weather equestrian riding arena) across the middle of this land (north to south), which has meant that any new development proposals will be condensed into the area between the rear of the Bridge House plot and the new Mange, rather than be further to the east of the field.</p> <p>3. During the planning application process in 2015 the Planning Consultant used by CDC was of the opinion that the proposed development was outside of the "building line" and therefore would not be recommended for approval. The current proposals do not differ in this regard. The Consultant also expressed concern that the 2015 proposals also constituted an "infill" development which he also considered unacceptable. Again, the current proposals do not differ in this regard</p> <p>8658144 - 15/00252/F - 95/00819/OUT - Outline for erection of 3 dwellings - REFUSED as it was outside the built limits and the proposed access was substandard in visibility and geometric terms.</p> <p>I do not see that any of the objections from previous application have been addressed in this new application.</p> <p>Further, a notice of planning was only received today (27.06.22) and states that comments are to be registered before the 8th July. At 9 days this is much less than the 21 days that is required.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	27/06/2022 14:00:09
<b>Attachments</b>	