

## Rachel Tibbetts

---

**From:** Rebekah Morgan  
**Sent:** 07 March 2023 09:00  
**To:** DC Support  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to Planning Application 22/03873/F

Please log as public comments on DEF.

*With kind regards*

*Rebekah Morgan*

**Mrs Rebekah Morgan**  
**Principal Planning Officer – Development Management**  
**Communities Directorate**  
**Cherwell District Council**  
**01295 227937**  
[rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)  
[www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)  
**Facebook** [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](https://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)  
**Twitter** @cherwellcouncil

*My normal working pattern is: Monday to Wednesday 8am to 2:00pm and Thursday/Friday 8am to 4pm.*

Planning and Development services can be contacted as follows: Development Management - [planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk); Building Control - [building.control@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:building.control@cherwell-dc.gov.uk); Planning Policy - [planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk); Conservation - [design.conservation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:design.conservation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk). For the latest information on Planning and Development please visit [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Christina Honsinger [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 March 2023 13:58  
**To:** Rebekah Morgan <[rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:rebekah.morgan@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Councillor Barry Wood <[Barry.Wood@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Barry.Wood@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Objection to Planning Application 22/03873/F

**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.

Dear Ms Morgan

I am sending this directly to you as I cannot find the submission button on your website.

It is interesting to note that the majority of objections on this site are from local people in Stratton Audley and the surrounding area who enjoy the rural aspect of this village and have a genuine interest in a countryside they enjoy. In contrast to supporters who in the main do not live in the area and have copied/pasted their comments obviously encouraged by the owner of the land in question.

No-one disagrees with the need for alternative green sources of energy but it would appear that little thought has been given to the future of solar developments and their impact on our densely populated island which is losing more and more of its green fields.

I am concerned at present about our food production capacity. And we have enormous quantities of brownfield sites closer to urban areas which could be flagged up to solar developers for their use rather than using productive land – and this land is definitely productive as proved by last year’s application for a grain storage facility. It all feels like a convenient route to financial gain with little effort and a question mark remains over some of the “facts” quoted.

I understand that the Government is still in discussion over allowing greenfield sites for solar panels so I would request that CDC informs itself of the points that are being raised. And it is very possible that this development may well be redundant within the next 10 years such is the speed of advances in technology eg rotating and smaller-sized solar panels, also floating solar installations on lakes and reservoirs. And I do hope that Oxfordshire becomes a byword for fusion energy.

It is equally to be questioned why it is not a requirement for all new housing and warehousing developments around Bicester to have solar panels on their roofs.

The village has already suffered from the disruption of EWR and HS2, and whilst the developers will see the laying of cable through the village as a short-term disruption (which for the villagers will be excessive whilst it is happening), surely the fact that the site lies so far from its destination ie the electricity station on Skimmingdish Lane, makes it questionable as to the quantity of energy lost in the transfer along the long length of cable required.

Stratton Audley is not prone to nimbyism. Many started out in positive support of this application but after reflection and careful study of the location, have decided to object. I too object.

Christina Honsinger  
Stratton House  
Stoke Lyne Road  
Stratton Audley  
OX27 9AT