

# Comment for planning application 24/00097/F

<b>Application Number</b>	24/00097/F
<b>Location</b>	Land South Side Of Widnell Lane Piddington
<b>Proposal</b>	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
<b>Case Officer</b>	Jeanette Davey
<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Laurence Keel
<b>Address</b>	2 Drinkwater Close,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1PR
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>My Garden looks over a green field and just beyond this is the site under consideration, we already experience noise and interruption to our quiet enjoyment due to the awful concrete crushing taking place on a daily basis and long rows of cement mixers coming and going to the industrial site nearby.</p> <p>The view is spoilt by a large crane that swings each day. The works going on here are not agricultural in any way whatsoever, and should not have been granted permission but what's done is done, having the possibility of a Traveller site in the adjoining field as well adds insult to injury, and increasing it from 6-12 pitches would be awful and a detriment to the locality.</p> <p>As well as everyone else in the village the Travellers would be disturbed by the noise and dust from the concrete crushing next door, MOD do training and sometimes set off explosions and gunfire, electric pylons above your head would not be good and most if not all the land surrounding the site is Grade 3 Agricultural. Why change this?</p> <p>The applicant submits a speculative development application and has no ties with the village this will be detrimental to it and such a proposal is not recognised in the CDC's local Plan.</p> <p>The applicant has already carried out unauthorised works and has destroyed a protected wildlife habitat (newts) and the applicant does not seem to have been held accountable. Work have been carried out but does not relate to the pre-commencement conditions set by the authority previously.</p> <p>The site is not looked after, fly tipping goes on and the redundant buildings and caravans have been set on fire two or three times.</p> <p>There are no services, shops, school, bus route, medical facility or anything else here in the village, there are only 150 residencies in the village, how will lets say 4 persons per family (no doubt more) x 12 = 56 persons be adequately served if the application is allowed. This would be a large increase in the population.</p> <p>There will be countless numbers of cars, vans, large trailers lorries etc going up and down Widnell Lane, causing the already poor road surface and grass verges more damage, and getting into the entrance to the Jubilee reserve and park etc will be limited and people will be inconvenienced by all the coming and going and such an increase in traffic will be a danger to the many residents and children, walking their dog and riding the horses along the road because, as you know there are no footpaths or pavements.</p> <p>There is inadequate parking shown and I expect it will be difficult manoeuvring vehicles in and out of the site and along the lane. The lane is too narrow to accommodate large vehicles and there is a dangerous bend just by the site which could cause accident. Joining the B4011 has always been difficult, the traffic here goes very fast especially motor bikes so yet again more risk of accidents if traffic is increased.</p> <p>Driving through the village with large vans, trailers and the sort of vehicles travellers have would be difficult and be a real disturbance and inconvenience to the residents as the road through the village is bendy and narrow and has lots of residents parked vehicles.</p>

This site and proposed number whether for 6 or 12 pitches will dominate the local community of Piddington which is contrary to government guidance for such sites.

The village floods in heavy rain and concreting over more green spaces/fields will add further flooding. Where is the drainage and foul waste water from the site and all those additional persons going to go? to has this been looked into carefully.

There could be a risk of spillage from septic tanks. No doubt all the fuel and chemical run off from vehicles and the type of work Travellers do (Tarmac drives etc) running off the site into the river Ray, which is already polluted and silted up due to lack of proper maintenance, this will contaminate the water source even more and kill any wildlife left in it.

On many occasions the Lower End access road to the village is impassible due to flooding and we are cut off from the A41 all the extra water from hardstanding's etc flowing from Widnell Lane would cut the village off even further.

There is no need for a Traveller site in Piddington, this will change the whole ambiance and character of the village. The Station Caravan Park at Banbury was never designed as a traveller site and being closed is not a loss to traveller site pitches, nor does the closure of the Smith site at Bloxham have any bearing on Piddington as the families there have ties to work health and education in that area.

There is no provision in the local plan for Traveller Sites in sustainable locations, Why not consider brownfield sites before spoiling limited greenfield areas?

In summary:-

The applicant has already allegedly broken the law.

The location is far from suitable.

The site is important to wildlife.

Piddington village and its environs has already been blighted by the authority giving permission for the concrete crushing facility which is industrial not agricultural.

The design does not attempt in any way to be in keeping with the historical and architectural style and tradition of an ancient and rural village.

There are no amenities to support such a large increase population.

There is no need for a traveller site here in the village, alternative locations should be considered.

The existing flooding situation will worsen.

Thank you for considering my thoughts on the proposal and my objection.

Kind regards

Laurence J Keel

**Received Date**

08/02/2024 12:18:54

**Attachments**