

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Paul Varnsvery [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 July 2023 21:37  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Natasha McCann  
**Subject:** Planning Application 22/02455/OUT

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Since my intention to attend this week's meeting of the Planning Committee, and to speak in objection to this application, is regrettably not possible due to work commitments, I trust this supplementary comment can be circulated instead.

Forty-three local residents have submitted objections to this application; the most recent on 1st November 2022, since which the applicant has submitted 19 amendments to their original proposals. None of those 19 documents comes even remotely close to lifting the application out of the deep pit of unacceptability, in the sludge at the bottom of which it languishes.

As I stated in my original objection, developers know which buzzwords to use to tick the right boxes and make the abhorrent seem desirable. In this regard, I note a "Statement of Community Involvement" has been produced, in which it is claimed that leaflets were sent to 55 properties located immediately to the west of the site, with four responses. Considering the proposed development would adversely impact a far greater number of residents than those living on the adjacent development, a wider consultation would have been appropriate, but as a tick-box exercise the activity ticks a box.

Although 'only' four responses are claimed to have been returned, the summary provided in clause 4.2 of the document reflects commonly held concerns that are regularly expressed by many Ambrosden residents on local social media. It is difficult to reconcile the content and tone of the four anonymised responses the developer has published in the document with the stance of the wider population of Ambrosden.

It is also interesting to note that in response to comments regarding the developer's choice of materials, they respond, "The use of local stone will be considered." The key word here is "considered", but that decision is not and should not be the developer's to make, and reads as an arrogant dismissal of the originator's comment.

In conclusion, I maintain my original objection, dated 6th September 2022, and the developer's attempt to make it look like they have radically amended their proposals after reading the original objections is unconvincing and has failed.

Best regards,

Paul Varnsvery  
1 Jaspers Row  
Ambrosden OX25 2AT

[REDACTED]