

**From:** Carlo Tosti  
**Sent:** 19 June 2025 21:23  
**To:** Planning Policy <[Planning.Policy@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Planning.Policy@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** 25/01346/OUT - Mr Giancarlo Tosti - 166 The Moors, Kidlington, OX52AD

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Objection to planning:

1) The application by the developer to change the classification of green belt land to grey belt land, to allow the proposed development.

The fundamental purpose to utilise land for the main following reasons:

- A) Under-utilised land, poor quality areas of land, previously developed land, car parks, waste land, poor quality scrub land.
- B) Revisions to the NPPF (Dec 2024) statutory green belt purposes, suitable for development, ensuring the aim of green belt protection would not be compromised.
- C) Are not ecological designations, listed heritage assets or flood - risk zones.
- D) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.
- E) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- F: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Reading through the latest government document, some areas apply to towns and not villages, and Kidlington is currently classified as a village.

Objections to each classification as listed above:

A) None of the criteria applies, the land has been used for agriculture, leisure, preservation or natural beauty.

B) Green belt protection is clearly compromised, this area has been classified as green belt for many decades, and is of great value and importance to the local community.

C: Ecological environment, includes both abiotic features, climate salinity, when environmental changes are at the forefront, you are proposing to destroy a valuable area of natural importance.

St Mary's church is of great value to the village and is a Grade 1 listed building, which only (2.5%) of listed buildings are in the country. The church dates back to (1220) but there is evidence of a church on the site since (1073)

Flood risk - Last year we experienced severe rainfall that resulted in houses along the Moors flooding, one property I know personally had (100 - 200mm) on the entire ground floor and had to evacuate the property.

Mill street located at the bottom of the Moors has flooded regularly for several years, with numerous houses and shops being severely affected.

Our property had severe flooding in the rear garden and patio area, that resulted in all the drains, gulleys back filling all my ground floor electrics failing and me reverting to sweeping water into the fields and surrounding areas to try and displace. I had no ground floor electrical supply for several days, the electrician had to isolate many areas, with us reverting to running extension leads from the first floor to the ground floor (fridge etc.)

Will Cherwell council cover all costs associated, if insurance companies will not offer cover to properties, commercial and domestic that will be severely affected by the increase of flood risk, due to the proposed development.

I telephoned Thames water, to see if there was anything I could revert to in the future, to be informed that the current infrastructure was not fit for current demands and Thames water is undergoing improvements that will take several years, the estimate was (2031) but realistically could be (2035.)

I had a meeting with a planning consultant regarding flooding, that they are proposing to build (340) units behind my property, to be informed of the following:

One average property roof equates to (60m<sup>2</sup> - 100m<sup>2</sup>) when taking garages into the equation (120m<sup>2</sup>) is the average, therefore (340 units by 120m<sup>2</sup> = 40,800 square meters of water and using (2mm) as a guide would equate to (2 litres or 0.42 gallons) per square meter. Therefore for every 2 mm of water (81,600) litres of water would be discharged into a system that is currently not fit for purpose, and could not cope previously.

The consultant also went to great lengths to explain that this is only part of the problem, with the (340 units) there are roads, pathways, driveways and verges etc, all being hard standing areas. The water absorption that would normally occur in the natural fields, would therefore not take place, and a considerable discharge of water would be redirected to other areas.

I as others will be documenting all these facts, and if the proposal to build units, when Cherwell Council are fully aware of a sub standard, out of date, not fit for purpose, drainage system is currently in place. The additional fact, that huge amounts of water will be redirected onto existing properties, from the development will lead to numerous lawsuits against - Cherwell Council, who will be wholly liable for the increased threat of flooding.

The developer - Bloombridge has submitted an out of date government map, showing a small amount of boggy land, with no accurate and up to date survey. When using portals to evaluate the risk of flooding, they are in essence very generic and not site specific in the detail.

The other area that needs addressing is the foul water, from (340) units, that Thames water are stating is not fit for current demands, out of date and not fit for purpose. What guarantees can Cherwell Council offer, that the current system in place can accommodate the added waste water from (340) additional units. The main gully that proceeds from (166 - 168) to the main road drain has failed in the past, with current levels at capacity, with a current system that should be obsolete, how can Cherwell Council realistically place the strain on a archaic system.

D: The proposal will lead to the sprawl of a large built up area, and eradicate a large section of natural beauty.

E: This clearly could lead to the merging of areas, with the built up area expanding, the large development on the Banbury Road, opposite North Oxford Golf Course, the new proposed football stadium. Blenheims proposal to build many more houses on fields near Kidlington airport, will result in an absorption and fundamentally becoming a suburb and not a village.

F: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, yes we are currently a village, but this proposal will destroy the special character of this village. The history of Kidlington dates back to the Domesday book, in 1086 records state Chedelintone, by 1214 the spelling Kedelinton appears in the Bodleian Charters.

### **Vehicles and congestion:**

The quantity of vehicles quoted in the proposal is grossly underquoted, figures that are in the public domain are as follows:

1) UK average quantity of bedrooms in a (300+) size development, equals - 2.95 bedrooms, therefore (340) multiplied by (3 persons) = 1020 persons.

2) The accurate volume ratio of vehicles per person is (.62) vehicle per person, this was carried out by a think tank as follows - UK population (68.5) million, number of vehicles on the road today (42.5) million.

3) Therefore, three persons per unit house as an average (.62) vehicles per person, results in (1.86) vehicles per property, the average quotation is (1.4) however the survey found this was incorrect, the UK population when calculated with quantity of vehicles in the UK, is the only accurate formula you can apply.

4) By using the accurate figures above, the quantity of vehicles from the development will be a basic - six hundred and thirty two cars. When you take into consideration the quantity of visitors, relations, delivery drivers and other associated vehicles, this will be in circa one thousand vehicles.

5) There is currently no bus stop on the Moors, the developer shows in the proposal a bus stop conveniently close to the planned development, adjacent to Homewell House. If the developer had carried out a proper and accurate survey, he would have noted that

this is a redundant bus shelter and no bus has stopped along the Moors for several years.

There is a lack of available public transport to this area, which increases car usage, combined with the destroying of carbon absorbing fields, increases emissions.

6) The proposal shows two routes of entry/exit, one the demolishing of - 162 The Moors and second a roundabout formed adjacent to - Benmead Road, the Moors is a single carriage-way with parking.

There is a primary school on Benmead Road, there is also retirement housing next to Benmead Road (Homewell House) which has (40) one and two bedroom flats, and Moorside Place care home with (54) purpose built apartments.

The allowance of a simple road for entry and exit at - 162 The Moors, will lead to unprecedented traffic of vehicles turning from the proposed development, the volume of vehicles entering and exiting will be not fit for purpose. How can children, elderly, pedestrians cross this area safely with such a dense volume of vehicles, with only two forms of entry and exit.

The addition of six hundred to a thousand vehicles to a single normal road, with infants and the elderly, constantly at the Benmead Roundabout will be catastrophic (mobility scooters) are constantly driving along this area due to the retirement home and care home.

7) Our property (166 The Moors) will be next to this main road of entry, can Cherwell Council please legally prove to me and detail what is in place to ensure how levels of toxic fumes, from stationary and moving vehicles will not increase to cause damage and harm to the health of myself, wife and children. Thereafter, to increase the threat of ill health in later life, due to the increased volume of vehicles, that will now be in close proximity to our property and garden.

I will be taking readings of levels of air quality along the track road, with a witness present where the proposed entry/exit will be located, this will provide an accurate level of reading prior to the proposed development.

### **Infrastructure:**

The proposed development will increase the population by approximately (1000) people, and realistically could be more, can Cherwell council please explain the proposals in place for the following items:

A) Schools - primary and secondary

B) Doctors - currently near capacity

C) Dental Surgeries

D) Public Transport

E) Local Shops and services

Above are just the basic areas that will be put under strain, with the increase of circa (1000) additional people. There appears to be no pre-planning in place, which will lead to more commuting to surrounding areas and more pollution.

### **Nature Conservation/Environment:**

The area is in essence is a form of nature reserve in St Mary's Fields and surrounding fields, the living creatures need corridors to move through, the Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust wrote:

We are greatly concerned by this site allocation and object to it, it takes Kidlington even further towards the Lower Cherwell Valley CTA (conservation target area and directly into the NRN (nature recovery network) recovery zone. We consider the extension to Kidlington presents a considerable risk to the wildlife of the CTA, the river valley, and the protected sites, through increased recreational impact, air pollution, hydrological impact and ecological isolation, and from the impacts of urbanisation on species that are not adapted to tolerate such urbanisation.

There are a total of nine fields and five would be developed, presently it is a self contained unit with natural boundaries, to the south there are natural barriers that form drains, to the east a graveyard and beyond a nature reserve, to the north the river basin and forest, to the west the railway line and road.

To propose this development would be destructive, one cannot create such good natural barriers, the proposal has not allowed for an environmental survey.

The site is currently home to - Tawny Owls, muntjac deer, badgers, foxes, roe, over (44) species of birds have been recorded, and are a historical breeding ground for skylarks (threatened species) with seven varieties of bat.

Flora, wildflower meadows etc for insects/bees and pollinators that are vital to the ecosystem and food source for fauna.

### **Mental Health:**

Many people walk or take pets for walks along the fields, the importance of mental health is now at the forefront of our relationship with nature. How connecting with nature benefits our mental health, nature is an important need for many and vital in keeping us emotionally, psychologically and physically healthy.

Throughout the pandemic, nearly (45%) of people in the UK stated that visiting green spaces helped them cope, now evidence shows us that the quality of our relationship with nature is part of the reason for its positive impact on our wellbeing.

### **Summary:**

1: Kidlington area, already in planning to build (4400) new homes.

2: The options consultation on the (2040) draft plan, said that in view of the (4400) houses already planned, no option for further green belt development was envisaged. The council would have to have valid reasons to rescind on this.

3: This land was not on the list of land for development in the council's local plan.

4: Major issues with increased flooding and runoff water.

5: The foul water and rainwater present infrastructure is not fit for current demands, the estimate for new capacity (2031 2035.)

6: Increase of circa (620 - 1000) vehicles, with only two roads, would lead to potential accidents and fatalities with infants and elderly in close proximity, catastrophic traffic and pollution.

7: Pressure and demands on - Schools, Doctor surgeries and dental practises, public transport.

8: Destruction of a natural nature area with an impact on natural barriers/wildlife and the ecosystem.

9: The removal of a natural area that provides wellbeing and promotes our mental health.

I can not see any benefits to the area and community, with this proposal.

Kind Regards

Giancarlo Tosti