

Comment for planning application 23/00853/OUT

Application Number	23/00853/OUT
Location	Land East Of Warwick Road Drayton Warwick Road Banbury
Proposal	Outline application for up to 170 dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated open space and vehicular access off Warwick Road, Banbury; All matters reserved except for access
Case Officer	Richard Greig
Organisation Name	
Name	Peter Monk
Address	55 Waller Drive,Banbury,OX16 9NS
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I write on behalf of the Banbury Civic Society to object to this proposal as this site is NOT allocated for development in the current Approved Local Plan and it breaches the de facto boundary of the approved development area for Banbury.</p> <p>There are extensive areas in and around Banbury that are already approved for development which are currently lying fallow (e.g. Parts of Ban 17 and Canalside) and until these, and the associated infrastructure elements emerge, no more sites should be approved. Further moves towards coalescence with Hanell village must be resisted.</p> <p>Consideration of this application is therefore premature, particularly in the light of the current consultation of the Local Plan Review now in hand and therefore this application should be refused.</p> <p>This is yet another speculative development proposal on the furthest outskirts of Banbury and given the dearth of infrastructure provision thus far and the pressure already placed on most of the social, economic and cultural facilities of the town, it seems not unreasonable to request the developer to undertake some research into the effects of their proposals on the viability of these features of the town and to report in relation to the application accordingly. Whilst this cannot be insisted upon under current legislation, refusal, or inability, to provide this information should be reported to the Planning Committee by officers in order to draw attention to the uncaring attitude of the proposer.</p> <p>To be precise : - Do the under-mentioned facilities / services have capacity at present to meet the needs of their intended occupiers and will the proposal not worsen the current situation and performance of the facilities and services mentioned.</p> <p>Utilities - water, gas ,electricity, telephone and broadband</p> <p>Education -Primary and Secondary.</p> <p>Health - GP Surgery services, specialist clinics, dentistry etc.</p> <p>Transport - Highway capacity and public transport services , distance to longer distance transport facilities and accessibility</p> <p>Employment - vacancies at all skill levels.</p> <p>Cultural - proximity to social centre facilities and to mainstream amusement outlets and cultural events.</p> <p>Positive responses should be expected for all these aspects of life for both new and existing residents if the existing town to avoid residents being burdened with yet more expenditure to maintain a modicum of social adhesion and experience.</p> <p>WE JUST CANNOT KEEP ON 'BOLTING-ON MORE AND MORE DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT ADDITIONAL STRENGTHENING OF THE FACILITIES MENTIONED.</p> <p>Banbury is struggling to absorb the additional population generated by the developments approved and constructed over the last few years and both physical and social infrastructure needs to catch up. Primary medical services have become a joke during and since the pandemic with less and less availability for face-to -face consultations and virtually no no</p>

highway or public transport improvements have taken place over the past many years. The comments regarding sustainability, with particular reference to public transport, access to further transport opportunities, and the commercial and employment activities in Banbury are overly optimistic and would appear to have been assembled via a 'desk-top' study - not from actual experience..

These points should be pressed to the Planning Committee.

Peter Monk

(Vice Chairman)
55 Waller Drive.

Received Date

16/05/2023 18:36:04

Attachments