

# Comment for planning application 24/00245/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	24/00245/OUT
<b>Location</b>	South Lodge Fringford Road Caversfield Bicester OX27 8TH
<b>Proposal</b>	Outline application for demolition of existing structures and erection of up to 99 dwellings, access, open space and associated works with all matters reserved except for access
<b>Case Officer</b>	Andrew Thompson
<b>Organisation Name</b>	Charlotte Young
<b>Address</b>	29 Fairhaven Road, Caversfield, Bicester, OX27 8TU
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I have downloaded and read the proposed Planning Application for South Lodge, Caversfield put forward by Richborough Estates (RE). My objections are as follows:</p> <p>General objection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This is a Green Field site. From the pdf it appears that this plot of land has been untouched for about the last 200 years. Currently, there is a peaceful riding stables there. I see no reason to change that.</li><li>2. As it has been untouched for at least 200 years (maybe more), there is a lot of wildlife in the area which also inhabits this field along with the horses. i.e. foxes, deer, badgers, yellow hammers plus other endangered hedgerow birds.</li><li>3. Even if RE leave the current hedgerows &amp; vegetation intact, all the wildlife which currently lives there will move out. Then families/people will not be conducive to them moving back in once complete. We are losing wildlife at an alarming rate, we do not need to accelerate it by disturbing this peaceful site.</li><li>4. The current road which they propose to use for access to this site is small and in a bad state of repair. It would not be able to handle at least 120 - 150 more cars using it on a regular basis.</li><li>5. There is already a lot of litter along Fringford Road and Aunty Ems Lane. With 99 more houses in the vicinity, the amount of litter will maybe double. This could severely hamper the wildlife in the surrounding area.</li><li>6. There is already enough Industrial Waste dumped on the left of the footpath between the top of Springfield Road and the A4421, we don't need any more... Nothing is being done to:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Clear/clean up this Industrial Waste</li><li>b. No pressure from Cherwell District Council is being put on the polluters (the owners of the industrial site next to the footpath off the A4421) to clean up their act and clear the industrial waste from beside their plot. All sorts are being dumped there.</li></ol></li><li>7. This is a very quiet and peaceful area. This will probably no longer be the case once 99 more houses are build there...</li><li>8. With 99 new houses running off the existing infrastructure in this road, i.e. sewers &amp; water pipes, I know Fairhaven Road already suffers from low water pressure. What will the water pressure be like with these new houses. There is no statement from RE that they will sort this issue out or that they even know about it. It is a gaping hole in their application.</li></ol> <p>Objections to the RE Planning application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Most of the evidence they put forward seems very contrived:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. There is flooding in the are BUT not in this particular area/site</li><li>b. During WWII there was bombing in the area due to RAF? Bicester across Fringford Road. Bombs fell all over BUT not in this site....</li><li>c. There was a lot of military waste dumped in the area BUT not on this site...</li><li>d. Appendix D, 67, 12.3 Tree Felling Licence - on site 1 - which potentially means that they'll fell all the trees on site</li><li>e. Appendix D, 3 ID - Ax2 - Site - HB Timber Yard, Category: Storing Waste Exemption, Description: Storage of waste in a secure area<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Category and Description seem to contradict each other</li></ol></li><li>f. Appendix D, 3 ID - Bx2 - Site - HB Timber Yard, Category: Storing Waste/Using Exemptions, Description: Storage/Usage of waste in a secure area/for Construction<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Category and Description seem to contradict each other</li></ol></li><li>f. Appendix D, 5.3 - Other Information - Soluble Rock Risk - one of the hazards from soluble rocks is, ground collapse, which in turn can lead to, collapse of buildings and roads and</li></ol></li></ol>

damage. With this in mind is it wise to build on this site?

g. Appendix D, 8 - Surface Water Flooding - within 100 m of this site, flooding can be as bad as 1 meter above normal levels - with Global Warming increasing the extreme's of weather and 99 houses on this site, this could very well increase to flooding levels to 1.5 - 2 m in this area which would severely compromise this site and lead to flooding of the houses nearest the flood area

h. Appendix D, 10.6 - SSSI impact zones & Units - this site is listed as a SSI Impact Risk Zone which means: reflect the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified and indicate the types of development proposal which could potentially have adverse impacts. In this case 99 houses on the site could significantly increase this risk

i. Appendix D, 12 - Agricultural Designation - Grade 3 - good to moderate quality. With the Earth's population growing exponentially, should we really be building on good to moderate agricultural land? Wouldn't it be better to farm this land and provide food for the existing population?

j. Appendix D, 14.5 & 15.8 - Bedrock Geology - shows a Bedrock Fault off (about 1500 m) to the left which could well extend under the site proposed for the housing. Again, it feels contrived that it ends away from this site and everything on site is hunky dory...

k. Appendix E, they say that lots of bombs were dropped in this area historically due to the existence of RAF Bicester - however, NONE were dropped in the proposed site - again this seems contrived seeing as they dedicate about the last 80 pages to talking about "1st Line Defence" - it seems they're going a bit overboard for something which they say isn't an issue... Also they're saying that bombs were dropped just across Fringford Road on RAF Bicester. As we all know back in WWII times, bombing targets were not always strictly adhered to. They just wanted to inflict maximum damage in the designated area.

These are just a few objections from my quick read through the other day. I could go into a lot more depth given the time...

**Received Date**

25/02/2024 17:51:28

**Attachments**