

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	Gina and Jamie Perkin
Address	41 Thame Road,Piddington,Bicester,OX25 1PY
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>We strongly object to this application. Reasons to why as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- First and foremost, this planning application is invalid. This is stated as a retrospective application yet no caravans have been erected as per the 6 that were originally approved on the first appeal.- The application location site is very close to an MOD site, which even to villagers further afield is disruptive and very loud so to be living in close proximity as the proposed is just not suitable.- For the same reasons as the above point but instead this time next to a cement works, it is totally unsuitable for a residential set up due to noise and dust but also possible misadventure from youngsters and potential hazards.- It is a real concern that additional traffic on an already narrow road with poor visibility is bound to cause accidents, especially so close to a main road entrance.- This will cause substantial extra surface water with changing the landscape typography in an area that already floods regularly. Extra water that would normally soak into this area will have nowhere to go and put extra pressure back into the village. Personally, my family home in Piddington has been flooded and it was a traumatic experience to say the least. The thought of this being exuberated by this particular application shows a total disregard of the current villagers.- The fact conditions on previous applications at this site have been broken is surely a good indication to whether any future conditions will be adhered to - again total disregard of the process.- There are no footpaths leading to or from the site so any foot passengers from the site will be in potential danger.- No consideration for the design which is not in-keeping with local village design and aesthetic, which any other application in the village would have to adhere to.- There have previously been applications refused, for this amount of pitches. Why is this one any different?- We cannot see lighting plans for the application area. As there are no streetlights at the application site this could prove dangerous for foot passengers, both of villagers and caravan residents. It would cause difficulty in the way of accessing the road for residents and for other road users too, without sufficient lighting. However, if the lighting plans included large flood lights for example, this would change the countryside aesthetic and landscape value we have, as noted as us having in CDC's local plan.- Cannot see any waste provisions for the site. This is a concern.- If animals such as horses and dogs are to be kept on the application site, is there security to prevent them escaping onto a poorly visible road and then on to a very close main road?- Parking for visitors would cause obstruction to the road into the village.- As a location to reside there are zero amenities close by.- Coming into the village it would completely dominate over the small village we have. It would change the values and aesthetic we hold dear to us. As well as going against government guidance on this. <p>To us, it seems clear and obvious this is not a viable, sensible and or safe location.</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Perkin</p>
Received Date	17/02/2024 23:13:27

Attachments

