

# Comment for planning application 22/02866/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	<input type="text" value="22/02866/OUT"/>
<b>Location</b>	<input type="text" value="Land East Of Ploughley Road Ambrosden"/>
<b>Proposal</b>	<input type="text" value="OUTLINE planning application for up to 120 dwellings, vehicular and pedestrian access off Ploughley Road, new pedestrian access to West Hawthorn Road, surface water drainage, foul water drainage, landscaping, public open space, biodiversity and associated infrastructure. Access off Ploughley Road is not reserved for future consideration"/>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<input type="text"/>
<b>Organisation Name</b>	<input type="text" value="Kathryn Chen"/>
<b>Address</b>	<input type="text" value="1 Jaspers Row, Ambrosden, Bicester, OX25 2AT"/>
<b>Type of Comment</b>	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
<b>Type</b>	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
<b>Comments</b>	<p>When added to the two other planning applications which have been submitted on nearby land (22/01976/OUT &amp; 22/02455/OUT), this application brings the total to 250 new properties which developers want to build on farmland. Developers also have their eyes on other fields in and around the village. How many properties will these take the total to: 350? 500?</p> <p>Something needs to be done to prevent Ambrosden from being overwhelmed just to satisfy the mutual greed of landowners and developers, both of which want to make a fast buck at the expense of villagers who simply want to peacefully enjoy their homes and not to face overdevelopment compounded by a lack of infrastructure which, in many cases, could never be provided in sufficiency to mitigate the adverse impact these proposals represent.</p> <p>This planning application in isolation does not meet the "minor development" criteria in the local plan, which is considered the maximum acceptable development for a village the size of Ambrosden. Add in the other applications which have been submitted, AND those which it is strongly suspected will follow at some point, and it should be crystal clear (to all but the landowners and developers concerned) that they are inappropriate both in isolation and in combination and should therefore be rejected as entirely out of keeping with local planning policy and common sense.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	<input type="text" value="23/09/2022 21:00:30"/>
<b>Attachments</b>	