

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	Marie-Claire Nixon-Davingoff
Address	81 Thame Road,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1QB
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I strongly object to the retrospective planning application to site 12 caravans on Widnell lane for several reasons:</p> <p>The use of the word 'retrospective' is a misnomer. There has been no substantive action to install the first 6 caravans granted at the first appeal and the existing planning consent has arguably been invalidated by the owner failing to fulfil the pre- commencement conditions before starting work on the site.</p> <p>The environmental damage that has already been wrought on the site is deplorable: the area is close to the River Ray and is recognisably valuable in terms of biodiversity and the species which live there. The presence of Great Crested Newts is well established thanks to numerous site surveys and ecological surveillance by local natural historians. The fact that the site owner decide to breach the original planning conditions and destroy their natural habitat (in the form of two ponds, filled in during the initial site clearance) which he was never forced to reinstate, is nothing short of a derisory attitude to the environment in which he wishes to site caravans. It also constitutes a failing of the Cherwell DC Planning department to follow through with any form of consequence. The owner also recently commissioned one laughably cursory survey for newts of a few hours, which unsurprisingly failed to find any. Professional bodies recommend that in the case of crested newts that a presence/absence survey of at least 4-6 visits be made during the newt breeding season of mid March to June and this should include pond surveys to establish possible population sizes. Clearly the site owner is not prepared to undertake the necessary steps to provide the detail that shows he is taking this application seriously.</p> <p>My other objection centres round the question of the projected quality of life for any of the families and children unlucky enough to find themselves living at the site. The site is isolated and an arguably poorly located. It's wet and based on clay, presenting potential problems when the area experiences heavy rain and flooding, which now happens regularly. The use of concrete and hard standing will change the way water travels and mean there will be unexpected consequences for the local water courses. The fact that the site is on an unclassified lane, with a speed limit of 60mph, no footpaths and no street lighting is a danger. There is also reduced visibility at the site entrance due to the bend in the road, and this is significant when considering the need for children to access the local area. The site will result in an increase in road traffic and larger vehicles and units needing haulage and manoeuvring will be an issue for those families, and for Piddington village.</p> <p>It's not near any valuable services or facilities, including doctors, shops, schools or linked travel options. Children will need to be driven everywhere and will need close supervision when entering and exiting the site. Their quality of life will be questionable: the site is next to a noisy concrete batching plant, an active MOD firing range and pylons with high voltage electrical lines. There has been recent conclusive evidence from Doctors at the University of Bristol that living downwind of electrical pylons and the field they create increases the risk of certain cancers, including lung cancer, by up to 29%. I would not want any of my own children to live in such a place and would suggest that the idea that this site is a desirable place to live as a family is a falsehood.</p> <p>This site is not economically, socially or ecologically sustainable. It will not enhance the quality of life of its inhabitants or the local village. Why have none of the local brownfield sites been considered or land set aside on the local Graven Hill development? A cursory glance of the 2023 register of Brownfield sites from CDC shows that the majority of these sites are centrally located in or near areas with established infrastructure and facilities that surely would make living conditions at least hospitable for the traveller families. From a humanitarian point of view this application should be refused.</p>

Received Date

14/02/2024 22:43:04

Attachments