

# Comment for planning application 25/01346/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	<input type="text" value="25/01346/OUT"/>
<b>Location</b>	<input type="text" value="Part OS Parcel 0006 North Of The Moors Kidlington"/>
<b>Proposal</b>	<input type="text" value="Outline planning application with All Matters Reserved (except means of access) for up to 340 dwellings (Use Class C3), land for local community use and pavilion, landscaping, public open space and associated infrastructure, including demolition of 162 The Moors to enable all modes access"/>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<input type="text" value="Carlos Chikwamba"/>
<b>Organisation Name</b>	<input type="text" value="Ian Wild"/>
<b>Address</b>	<input type="text" value="45 Mead Way, Kidlington, OX5 2BJ"/>
<b>Type of Comment</b>	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
<b>Type</b>	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
<b>Comments</b>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Please find below my objection to this proposed development.</p> <p>1. Impact on local traffic</p> <p>The figures for increased car traffic are based on some very detailed statistics but end up with what appears to be an assumption that the increased morning / evening car journeys will be spread evenly over the commuting period. Realistically, journeys will bunch at peak times resulting in a much higher increases in car traffic at peak times from the 1 car every 30 seconds suggested. Furthermore the assumption that 340 houses will generate between just "90 and 110 additional vehicle trips in the weekday morning and evening peaks" seems unrealistically low.</p> <p>I note that other recent developments in the county often feature new perimeter roads to feed traffic on to the main road network. There is no opportunity to do so on this proposed development area. Consequently, all the new traffic will enter onto The Moors - a narrow single carriageway road - with the bulk of it assumed to use the East Exit by Benmead Road, an area already suffering additional roadside parking during working hours making the road essentially a one lane road at times. No mention is made as to how this will be addressed. Restricting parking on The Moors will just push the problem elsewhere.</p> <p>2. Impact on local services</p> <p>The plan for the development rests on the the premise that it can tap into existing infrastructure: transport, education, GP services etc. 340 houses would likely mean an additional 1000+ residents . There is no reference as to how existing GP services - already stretched based on my own experience - can be funded and expanded to cope with the increase.</p> <p>3. Flooding / drainage</p> <p>The supporting documents state that there have been no incidents of surface water flooding in the area and that "Approximately 3.02% of the total site area is at risk from flooding from surface water". This may be a technical definition but 3.02% seems far too low based on what has been seen in recent winters. This area does suffer from surface water flooding in winter, particularly near the church and elsewhere.</p> <p>Given that the area around the bottom of Mill Lane has flooded several times in recent years, and that there have been drainage issues off The Moors, it seems questionable that the current draining system will cope. The proposal seems to be relying on future planned work by the council to cope with the increased drainage requirement but this may - at best - be some years away.</p> <p>4. Impact on Green Belt</p>

The proposed site lies entirely within the Oxford Green Belt. The Cherwell Local Plan does not allocate this land for housing, and no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated - as far as I can see - to justify altering the Green Belt boundary. I note that the developers refer to an LUC report that states that Green Belt impact is "moderate" and they then use this to claim that the area is therefore Grey Belt and so more appropriate for development. This seems to be stretching the definition of Grey Belt: The land is open countryside, not previously developed land.

I would be sorry to lose the benefits that the Green Belt classification brings to this area and the issues referred to above in points 1,2, and 3 are significant practical obstacles that do not seem to have been satisfactorily addressed and on that basis I object to the proposal.

Ian Wild

**Received Date**

12/07/2025 14:21:19

**Attachments**