

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	
Name	Keith Innes
Address	Oak House,45 Thame Road,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1PY
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I am somewhat perplexed that this application has been submitted, as I understood the expansion from the initially agreed smaller footprint have been refused by the government Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Furthermore, during the period waiting for the Inspectorate decision, namely the Easter weekend when the council planning enforcement officer and the council offices were closed, they engaged in an illegal activity. Two construction dumper trucks that are typically only seen on motorway construction drove from dawn to dusk filling the proposed site with huge boulders. I should also be noted these loads were carried illegally as the loads were not secured and debris from both vehicles was falling from the rear of the bogies which only had raised sides with the back open to debris dropping onto the road surface and no netting in use. If the licensed skip carriers behaved in such a manner their licences would be revoked. These boulders were then crushed on site by an extremely large crusher which then covered most of the site including the two ponds of great crested newts that had already been confirmed in the initial smaller planning approval as a condition to be maintained. No attempts were made either to put in the drainage and ancillary requirements for waste as also required by the previous planning consent.</p> <p>The enforcement officer eventually served notice on the Thursday after the easter weekend, by which time the damage had been done.</p> <p>I refer to a similar case in the public eye when this month the family of Sit Tom Moore have been required to return an illegal change to an original planning approval back to its original state at their cost. The same enforcement should be applied here regardless of the application.</p> <p>The applicant has shown a total disdain towards the rules and regulations that we all would be held totally accountable for, therefore the application should be dismissed on the grounds of both the above factual comments.</p> <p>For further consideration, the initial smaller application was eventually approved on the basis there was an urgent need within Oxon for traveller permanent pitches. this was in 2017. 7 years later, the applicant chose not to develop the smaller site which he initially had approval for, now rescinded by his actions. If the need was so urgent, why did he choose not to develop the smaller site following the agreed planning requirements ?.</p> <p>The same reasons why the village objected in the first case are also all still extremely relevant, with the addition now of the concrete plant adding to the site pollution as it is within very close proximity.</p> <p>During this current extremely wet year to date, there has been significant flooding in the field spilling out onto the road, clearly not helped by the hundreds of tonnes of rubble that has been dumped on the site without the appropriate drainage requirements being met. The meteorologists tell us moving forward this is more typical of the weather we should expect, so if its flooded now and overflowing onto the road that's not a one off.</p> <p>This enlarged application would bring with a typical family of 4 , nearly 100 residents to a narrow country lane, and would obviously therefore have a significant impact on a very small localised community.</p> <p>I do hope the illegal activities of the applicant on the site, and his total disregard for the laws that we all have to abide by , alongside his clearly planned and executed strategy over an easter bank holiday demonstrate how seriously he is likely to take and stipulations made by the council, in fact it demonstrates total disdain for the planning process.</p>

As clearly the "urgent need" for pitches can no longer apply, why are the council not looking at brownfield sites for future developments of this nature not grade 3 arable land.

Received Date

13/02/2024 13:25:10

Attachments