

16<sup>th</sup> May 2019

Dear Ms O'Hanlon,

Please find enclosed a photocopy of my handwritten letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019, regarding an objection to the proposed marina in Claydon. (A photocopy of that letter was provided to the Chairmen of the Claydon and Clattercote Parish Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2019.)

I am resubmitting the letter with the specific purpose of having my punctuation reinstated as it was provided in the original letter, but which, for some unexplained reason subsequent to my writing and delivering of it in person (1<sup>st</sup> May 2019 at 16.11; label ref: 9058), in CDC's published version several full stops have vanished. In my opinion, the missing points make that letter not my own representation and their omission detracts significantly from what would otherwise be a correct presentation.

I would like CDC to publish the supplied photocopy in lieu of the version published on CDC's website, taking care to ensure that nothing else is redacted - so that any mistakes which may be contained therein are purely of my own making. Alternatively, please scan the above referenced original letter again. My signature was not provided, although my full name was supplied in capitals at the close of that letter; therefore no redaction is required. In the current published version, the final word in the body of text - perhaps positioned by me too closely to the margin - is also cropped along with its adjoining full stop and my name is redacted (making five full stops missing in total).

You may regard this request as purely pedantic; however, the point is that punctuation is essential to making sentences and phrases clearer. The point of a full stop, I am sure you will agree, is to indicate a definite pause at the end of a sentence in order to prevent sentences from running together and leading the reader toward a disinterested state of confusion.

I hope I have emphasized my point adequately.

Thank you in anticipation for obliging my wish.

Yours sincerely,

IAIN KIRKPATRICK.

Note: photocopies made.



Iain Kirkpatrick  
C/O 24 Beaconfields  
Camborne  
Cornwall TR14 7BH

Clare O'Hanlon  
Case Officer  
Cheswell District Council  
Bodicote House  
Bodicote  
Barbury OX15 4AA

1<sup>st</sup> May 2019

RE APP NO: 18/00904/F

Objection to proposed inland marina at Glebe Farm, Boddington Road, Claydon.

Dear Ms O'Hanlon,

I was not able to make an arrangement for this letter to be typed, it is therefore handwritten. I shall endeavour to write clearly.

In amongst the publicly viewable comments, I recently read an interesting e-mail correspondence between Rashid Bbosa, dated 24<sup>th</sup> April 2019 12.35 (pm), (Senior Transport Planner for Oxford County Council (OCC)) and Sylvia Ingram, dated 24<sup>th</sup> April 2019 13.13, (Chairman for Claydon and Clattercote Parish Council) concerning the widely held view in the inappropriateness of Boddington Road serving as an access to the proposed marina. I was disappointed by the content in Officer Bbosa's e-mail addressed to Mrs Ingram, wherein OCC's differing opinion concerning that particular matter was explained regarding the stated "anticipated marina" (see the first paragraph).

First of all, as the word "anticipated" connotes an expectation of fulfilment, it is my hope that that emphasis simply represents nothing other than a poorly chosen word rather than an indication of the predetermined decision of either OCC or CDC (Cheswell District Council) for this planning application. At this stage of the consultation process, I feel that in respect of an impartial civil servant's view point, the words "proposed marina" would have been more appropriate.

Secondly, in the second paragraph, Officer Bbosa writes: "By nature and scale of this development, it is unlikely that its impact shall be felt during network peak periods." That comment is nonsense. The peak periods regarding traffic associated with the proposed Claydon Marina will not be limited to weekly rush hour times, but will include any time throughout typical holiday seasons. The reasons being:

- (a) the "nature" of this development, which is a marina with ancillary features; and
- (b) the "scale", amounting to 132 berths.

There is no "unlikely" element in that not actually producing a detrimental impact, for those whose homes and lives are situated in and about Claydon, if there is an appreciable increase in through traffic brought about by this development. If there is not to be an appreciable increase in through traffic, it would reflect a poorly attended marina with its attendant reasons.

Thirdly, I cannot fail to see the irony in Officer Bbosa's admonishment, in paragraph three, when saying: "On quiet lanes whose traffic speeds are inherently low due to physical constraints, it will usually be appropriate for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians to walk/ride along the carriageway on an informal shared-use basis (especially where remote from built up areas)." The comment in parenthesis ignores the fact that the proposed development will do away with any part of Claydon being "remote" and will increase the traffic passing through it as if it were a satellite town (in relative terms to Claydon's occupational extent). However, if the marina proposal is derided the status quo predisposes that the "informal shared-use basis" of Boddington Road may remain without notoriety of incidents.

And finally, I believe that the Claydon community is not so much being asked to share space in the proposal for this marina, but to accept an invasion of space without regard for their own interests and safety (see my correspondence dated 8th July 2018, at subheading "Antitropic Encroachment", para 3.3(ii)(a) and (b)). Such demand imposed by persons acting in that capacity as civil servants, would be manifestly uncivil and also non-servant-like; an aberration in that commission to working in the interests of society within that role in public administration.

Note - Mrs Sylvia Ingram has consented to my referencing her in this correspondence.

Yours faithfully, IAIN KIRKPATRICK.