**From:** Public Access DC Comments   
**Sent:** 07 September 2016 17:08  
**To:** Public Access DC Comments  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 16/01645/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 5:07 PM on 07 Sep 2016 from Mr roger dyson.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Summary** | |
| **Address:** | Land East Of Bridge House And 2 The Villas Main Street Wendlebury |
| **Proposal:** | Erection of 2 No detached dwellings with garages - re-submission of 15/00252/F |
| **Case Officer:** | James Kirkham |
| [Click for further information](http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications/centralDistribution.do?caseType=Application&keyVal=OBSSNZEM0KR00) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Details** | |
| **Name:** | Mr roger dyson |
| **Address:** | Bridge House Main Street, Wendlebury, Oxfordshire OX25 2PW |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments Details** | |
| **Commenter Type:** | Neighbour |
| **Stance:** | Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | Planning Application Number: 15/01645/F (Proposed erection of 2no detached dwellings with garages)  We note the submission of the above subsequent to the withdrawal last year of a similar planning application. This letter serves to identify our concerns over a) potential negative consequences if such the application were approved, and b) the lack of promised consultation by the applicant's father to consult with us prior to its submission; thereby allowing us to suggest ways of alleviating any perceived or real negative consequences.   General comments  1. My wife and I moved into Bridge House, Wendlebury in late 1996. We were aware that planning permission had previously been applied for and refused to build three dwellings and garages on the land behind (to the east) of Bridge House. At that time the land was an open field, and by our contract of purchase of Bridge House we agreed that we would not object to a future development proposal, on the grounds of "..any right of light or air.."; and nothing said in this letter should be considered to conflict with this undertaking.  2. Since then the applicant has installed a Manège (all-weather equestrian riding arena) across the middle of this land (north to south), which has meant that any new development proposals will be condensed into the area between the rear of the Bridge House plot and the new Manège, rather than be further to the east of the field.   3. During the planning application process in 2015 the Planning Consultant used by CDC was of the opinion that the proposed development was outside of the "building line" and therefore would not be recommended for approval. The current proposals do not differ in this regard. The Consultant also expressed concern that the 2015 proposals also constituted an "infill" development which he also considered unacceptable. Again, the current proposals do not differ in this regard.  Comments  The following comment refers to the Access & Design Statement submitted by the applicant, and consequential traffic issues:  Within the Access & Design Statement there are a number of references to the proposed development leading to a reduction in motor vehicles accessing Main Street via the private access road. This is inaccurate. If this proposed development is approved both proposed dwellings would be four bedroomed properties, and given an average of 2 or 3 cars per dwelling the number of cars using the private access road would far outnumber the single vehicle two or three times a day currently experienced and witnessed.  Also, it is generally accepted that vehicle egress from the private access road has limited vision particularly to the north, with parked vehicles on both sides of Main Street. This growth in vehicle use will increase the risk of motor and pedestrian accidents.  Traffic issues generally:  Wendlebury is a small village without footpaths or street lighting on the main road through the village. The growth in vehicle movements on to and off of Main Street identified above should this application be approved will exacerbate the currently growing problem of the use of the back lane/road from the Weston on the Green junction of the A34 through the village to the Wyvale Bicester Garden Centre area as a rat run for traffic to and from Bicester avoiding the A34/M40 Junction 9.   The following comments refer to the Flood Risk Assessment ref: 15-1749.07.01-Rev, and flooding issues generally:  1. Page 4 of 26 includes the statement "To the north and south [of the property] are residential properties that by their nature of their areas will not generate overland sheet flows".  This statement is inaccurate, in as much as there are no residential properties to the north of the land that permission is being sought to develop. The land adjacent to the north is the relatively extensive garden area of the Red Lion Public House, which has recently had banking (unapproved) formed across the eastern boundary which may deflect excessive ground water into the vicinity of the dwellings proposed for development.  Flooding risk generally:  Indeed since the banking referred to above has been installed, surface water conditions have changed for the worse. Whereas surface water from the fields to the east would run off towards the west across a wide area, this water is now deflected to either side (north and south) of the public house garden area. The deflected water to the south runs onto the field proposed for development particularly onto the area used to store horse manure. This run off water is thereby contaminated and then runs west off of the field, down the "private access road" and onto Main Street.   We would be grateful if you would consider the comments raised in this letter in the Council's consideration of this proposed development.  Yours faithfully,       Roger A Dyson Elaine M Dyson |