

Comment for planning application 24/00097/F

Application Number	24/00097/F
Location	Land South Side Of Widnell Lane Piddington
Proposal	RETROSPECTIVE - Material Change of Use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 12 gypsy/traveller families, each with two caravans, including improvement of access, laying of hardstanding and installation of package sewage treatment plant
Case Officer	Jeanette Davey
Organisation Name	Hazel Coleman
Address	14 Lower End,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1QD
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Please refer to my objections to the original planning application, which I submitted on 1 July 2020. I've pasted this below for your reference. My original objections still stand, and I have additional objections, viz.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The applicant crudely levelled the site and filled in natural ponds that had been identified as sites evidencing Great Crested Newt breeding areas, which breached the original planning conditions imposed by the Planning Inspector. This has never been rectified.2. Several old caravans were dumped onto the adjoining plot of land (also owned by the applicant), and the site has been completely trashed. Clearly, much evidence of wildlife and environmental importance, will already have been illegally destroyed. <p>These actions speak for themselves as to the contempt the applicant appears to have for the planning conditions, for the environment and for our community.</p> <p>In all the multiple applications and appeals relating to this land, villagers have up to now been fair and respectful to the applicant and their representatives, preferring only to expose inaccuracies, inconsistencies and mistakes in the applicant's case, believing that justice would eventually prevail. However, patience is wearing thin.</p> <p>Finally, two questions for the Planning Department:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Why is this application for 12 pitches 'Retrospective' when this application has already been refused at appeal? (Permission was only granted for 6.)2. Why isn't the complete history behind this application currently on the website? It's a complicated saga, and no doubt there have been several changes in personnel at CDC as there have been in the village, so the full story behind this application isn't necessarily clear to everyone. <p>For all the reasons given here, I strongly urge CDC to refuse this appeal.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Hazel Coleman</p> <p>Objection to original application, dated 1/7/20</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Objection to Planning Application Ref: 20/01122/F Material Change of Use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 12no gypsy / traveller families, each with two caravans, including improvement of access, laying of hardstanding and installation of package sewage treatment plant</p> <p>I am dismayed but not really surprised to see this planning application to double the size of the site (for which planning permission was eventually granted at appeal) from 6 to 12 double pitches - though I am surprised that the applicant has submitted it before any work</p>

on the original site has in fact begun. As the applicant has permission to develop 6 pitches on this site it seems obvious that these should be developed, and shown to be sustainable and unproblematic, before permission is granted for a further 6.

I therefore wish to object to this planning application in the strongest terms on the following grounds:

(1) This application follows one that was unanimously turned down twice by CDC's planning committee and subsequently went to appeal last year, where it was upheld, subject to several rigorous conditions set by the Inspector that must be complied with fully before the site can be occupied, including that all services (electricity, water, sewage) must be in place. There is no indication in this application of how this is going to be done, and as the original planning request for 6 double pitches has not yet been implemented, it seems premature to even consider a much larger site at this time. Before any expansion should be considered, the applicant should be seen to have implemented the previous proposal and demonstrated to the council's satisfaction that the conditions imposed at the public inquiry have been strictly observed. To do otherwise suggests that by submitting this as a new application at this time, before any work has been done at the site, the applicant may be attempting to avoid the conditions imposed in the appeal. Given the applicant's assurances at the appeal that there would be no problem funding the development of 6 pitches to the required standard, with all amenities provided, there is no reason to think that it is essential to approve further pitches to make the development economically viable.

(2) Where is the evidence that CDC needs 12 pitches? Several new pitches have been approved since the original application, most of which I understand remain unused. Because CDC made a 'common ground' agreement before the Planning Enquiry last year no evidence of the need for the 6 pitches was ever given to the Inspector. This was very unfortunate, as the Parish Council had done a lot of digging into the paperwork behind CDC's planning decisions and rationale about G/T provision in our area and had unearthed evidence that much of the decision-making - past and ongoing - was based on a flawed model, suggesting a need that in fact was the result of a mistake. This evidence was, however, not allowed to be presented for discussion at the inquiry, and so the application was granted based on this flawed model. (See Andrew Coleman's objection for more details.)

(3) Doubling the site size to 12 pitches, each having 2 caravans plus extra road vehicles, giving an estimated population of 48-60 people, would make it one of the largest G/T sites in the District and as such it would dominate the small village of Piddington, a community of approximately 300 people, as well as generating a substantial increase in traffic on our rural narrow roads. Clearly, this much larger site would be unsustainable within Piddington, a category C village with no infrastructure, which was described in the previous planning reports as one of the least sustainable locations in Cherwell.

(4) This site is far from suitable as a G/T site even of 6 pitches, and there was considerable objection to it by the Parish Council and many villagers at all the previous attempts to get the site through the planning process. The appeal was upheld largely based on a perceived need for pitches, which does not seem to be so pressing now. All the grounds for objection in relation to the previous applications are even stronger for this new application.

I strongly urge CDC to refuse this planning application. If, despite the representations objecting to this audacious application, it happens to be granted, at the very least I urge you to ensure that all the conditions imposed by the Planning Inspector should be imposed on the new approval.

Yours sincerely
Hazel Coleman

Received Date

07/02/2024 17:38:44

Attachments