

# Comment for planning application 23/01233/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	23/01233/OUT
<b>Location</b>	OS Parcel 4347 East Of Pipal Cottage Oxford Road Kidlington
<b>Proposal</b>	Outline application (with all matters except access reserved for future consideration) for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of up to 800 dwellings (Class C3); a two form entry primary school; a local centre (comprising convenience retailing (not less than 350sqm and up to 500sqm (Class E(a))), business uses (Class E(g)(i)) and/or financial and professional uses (Class E(c)) up to 500sqm, café or restaurant use (Class E(b)) up to 200sqm; community building (Class E and F2); car and cycle parking); associated play areas, allotments, public open green space and landscaping; new vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access points; internal roads, paths and communal parking infrastructure; associated works, infrastructure (including Sustainable Urban Drainage, services and utilities) and ancillary development. Works to the Oxford Road in the vicinity of the site to include, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, drainage, bus stops, landscaping and ancillary development
<b>Case Officer</b>	Linda Griffiths
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council
<b>Address</b>	Kidlington Parish Council,Area Office,Exeter Hall,Oxford Road,Kidlington,OX5 1AB
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Good Morning,</p> <p>Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council would like to object to Development site: PR6a - CDC planning reference 23/01233/OUT</p> <p>Objection -on the following reasons:</p> <p>Buildings: Object to Increase in numbers and height of buildings. There is a significant height with little outdoor space for flats (out of character, not good for health and wellbeing). Some of the flats in the design could be up to 18m high. This is significantly different to other properties in the area and too high.</p> <p>Management levy: strongly objected against. Concern that all properties will have a maintenance levy (in addition to council tax charges) to manage the estate maintenance (verges etc) and parks. A management company will look after these areas. The council strongly objects to this plan, it is unreasonable to expect people purchasing properties to have this levy and will lead to confusion (it should be within council tax so one charge that is managed and scrutinised not profiteered by management companies, by putting through council tax it would also be capped). In addition, other people would use the areas (not just residents) so essentially residents would be paying for services for other people which is not a fair measure. Standards of maintenance could be ambiguous, and residents would be confused about who they can speak to when issues.</p> <p>Recreation: Object lack of information - needs something more definitive on recreational spaces (define what they are), 5 pocket parks detailed - we asked for 1 or 2 larger play areas because pocket parks are inefficient and do not cater for all ages of children as too small. Also, there is no hardstanding play areas considered - nothing for netball etc. There seems to be no recreational consideration, all on assumption its going elsewhere but that is not submitted to planning so not guaranteed. It is a strong concern.</p> <p>Demolition plan: Object to Pipal barns being demolished is objected on, historic significance - not listed but of significance to the area.</p> <p>Council office provision: Object that there is no designated council office (requested from the start) - this could be situated in Pipal barns -re-utilise for council office and council hub rather than demolish them. This is different need from community centre / village hall - we requested separate premises. The council hub could also be used for pop up services (bank, library, citizens advice too as well as council business, staff) but managed for council.</p> <p>Community hub: objection on this area, no clarity on what's going there, we do not expect fast food outlets (what limitations will be there?). Definition of public space (use by public, open area, rented buildings, lease buildings, retail units. Nothing for local 'farmers markets' etc? There does not seem to be any specific provision for drama / arts / theatre groups? Big lack of detail.</p> <p>Parking: Objection - lack of provision. Where are these people going to park, where are cycle</p>

bays going to be? Are the kerb heights and road widths going to allow roadside parking? Parking enforcement would also need to be clarified. Parking provision for flats is not enough at all. No electric charge points provided, and they need larger spaces. Needs consideration on who will monitor parking and manage electric parking spaces.  
Education: Objection - Need guarantee that money for local special education need provision / funding is allocated. No provision for 0-5 (nursery), locally nurseries are closing. Provision / space (not community centre) needs to be available for this.  
Youth Facility: No provision for youths (teenagers). The community hub has potential to become anti-social as a result. We object on the basis there is no provision - it needs to have a defined space in the plan as high demand for it.

Kind regards

Karen East  
Parish Clerk to Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council  
clerk@gosfordandwatereaton-pc.gov.uk

**Received Date**

07/06/2023 09:29:15

**Attachments**