

Comment for planning application 23/01316/F

Application Number	23/01316/F
Location	Land South of Faraday House Woodway Road Sibford Ferris
Proposal	Erection of 5 two storey age restricted dwellings (55 years) for older people with access, landscaping and associated infrastructure
Case Officer	Saffron Loasby
Organisation Name	Suzanne Tharani
Address	Larksfield, Hempton Road, Deddington, Banbury, OX15 0QJ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Having family in Sibford and a weekly visitor to the village, I strongly believe that this development will cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, I would like to highlight that Cherwell now has a five-year land supply, rendering this development unnecessary and unwanted.</p> <p>This development is in direct conflict with Policies BSC1 and Policy Villages 1 and 2 of the Local Plan Part 1. These policies are in place to safeguard the unique character and integrity of our local area. The proposed development fails to adhere to the guidelines and requirements set forth in these policies, thus undermining the purpose and effectiveness of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important to note that Cherwell now has a five-year land supply, indicating that there is currently sufficient land available for development within the area. As such, there is no pressing need for this specific development, and it would be more appropriate to focus on utilizing the existing land supply effectively rather than encroaching upon areas that should be preserved.</p> <p>Additionally, it is crucial to consider the wishes of the local community. It is important for planning decisions to reflect the desires and concerns of the local population, and approving a development that is unwanted contradicts the principle of community engagement and consultation.</p> <p>In light of the aforementioned reasons, I respectfully request that you carefully reconsider this planning application and reject it based on the harm it would cause to the character and appearance of the area, as well as its inconsistency with Policies BSC1 and Policy Villages 1 and 2. The availability of a five-year land supply further supports the argument against this development.</p>
Received Date	25/05/2023 21:18:37
Attachments	