

From: Robert Adams
Sent: 26 April 2019 18:48
To: Clare O'Hanlon
Subject: Objection by Robert Adams to Glebe Farm Marina Amendments : 18/00904/F

Dear Clare O'Hanlon,

Objection to Glebe Farm Marina Amendments : Application No. 18/00904/F

Please find attached the following documents with regards to my objection to the above Glebe Farm Marina planning application no. 18/00904/F :

1. Objection
2. Images showing the relationship between the proposed marina and the village of Claydon and with HS2.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Adams

OBJECTION BY ROBERT ADAMS B.Sc., MLI (RETIRED)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO MARINA AT GLEBE FARM CLAYDON

REF. NO: 18/00904/F : APRIL 2019

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The proposed marina at Claydon is to be reduced in size from 250 boats to 192 boats. The proposed layout has been amended and new reports have been prepared. The landscape proposals have therefore been amended to comply with the revised layout.

1.2 In assessing the area covered by the proposed marina, and cross-checking again the OS Landranger series, it would appear that it would cover approximately three-quarters of the area of Claydon.

1.3 In Claydon there are about 200 houses and the population is approximately 300. 192 narrowboats would serve about 380 people, a considerable increase on the existing population.

1.4 The marina would be located north of the canal at Hay Bridge on the Lower Boddington Road leading north out of Claydon. This road is narrow, not wide enough for two cars, with one unadopted passing place just to the south of Hay Bridge and another near Claydon Hay Farm.

The road has no footpath for pedestrians; it serves cyclists, riders, cars and HGVs, the latter frequently grounding on the bridge. It is not gritted in winter and ice on the bridge makes it impassable because of its steepness particularly on the north side. The road over its whole length from Lower Boddington to Claydon is in very poor condition and appears to be within two counties, Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire.

1.5 Views across the countryside are available from Hay Bridge and the gateway into the field to the west of a long low lying landscape sloping up to the Oxford Canal with a steeper incline up to the canal. Views are also available from the canal nearing Hay Bridge through the thin tree screen along the north side of the canal.

1.6 The canal is in a Conservation Area of some antiquity, being built in the early half of the nineteenth century and is basically unchanged for approaching 200years.

1.7 The proposed marina development would be constructed within the field to the west of the Lower Boddington Road and would require major landscape adjustments within the

- 1 -

Conservation and Heritage landscape area alongside the canal. It would include a facilities building which would include a residential section and a catering area. The marina would have a large maintenance area with, as presently shown, one bay only for narrowboats, high earthworks to retain the marina, an entrance off the canal north of Hay Bridge, close to the former railway line, a new towpath footbridge over the canal entrance and tree planting.

1.8 Glebe Farm house, which is located to the west of the site, south of the proposed lake, is not included in the site. Its access track from the Lower Boddington Road is not included in the proposals as no road is shown crossing the entrance to the marina. Its current function is residential with grounds in increasing disrepair. No other access is shown to this property, neither through the marina, nor from the neighbouring land. It would appear that this property will become isolated, without no form of access.

1.9 Drawings and a traffic report were issued to the Claydon with Clattercote Parish Council. Three important documents were not issued : the drawing showing levels and emergency access to the site, the large landscape and visual impact report and the important design statement, each of which are needed to achieve a full appraisal of the proposals. In addition, the local authority has produced no landscape report on this large scale adjustment of the landscape.

2.0 DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 My objection covers the following :

1. I object to the absence of sufficient plans and reports being issued to the Parish Council for council members and residents of the village to completely assess the nature of the development proposals. I also question whether Northamptonshire County Council Highways Department have responded on the impact future marina traffic would have on the Lower Boddington Road and elsewhere.

2. I object to the proposed marina because it will affect the historic Conservation Area associated with the Oxford Canal, because it will alter the character of its surroundings.

3. The proposed reduction of narrowboats in the marina from 250 to 192 is insufficient because the number of boats currently approved between Cropredy and Fenny Compton, and with this marina the overall total would be approximately 700. The reduction of

- 2 -

58 therefore is hardly significant, as it would still leave approximately 640 boats on this section, not including the 21 boats on private moorings near Hay Bridge. An additional a 50 boat marina has been marked out south of Cropredy.

I object, therefore, to the proposed marina of 192 boats because it would cause over-crowding on the canal, it would lead to over-development on this section, especially when considering the additional 21 narrow boats present nearby to the west of Hay Bridge on private land, it would cover approximately three-quarters of the size of the village of Claydon (see attached images prepared by Emma Ives) and would more than double the number of people living in this rural area. The marina cannot be considered either close to, or part of, Claydon, because it would be out of sight of the village.

4. I understand that the proposers of this project have not spoken to the local boatpeople who are against this development on the basis of over-trafficking this section of the Oxford Canal.

5. I object also because there will be no benefits to the village of Claydon. There are no attractions within the village other than the 12th Century Church. There is no public

house, there is no café or restaurant and there are no shops. Although it is claimed there are benefits, they have not been described in detail. “You could moor your boat here”!

6. The marina would be located north of the Oxford Canal, east of the Lower Boddington Road at Hay Bridge. It would be accessed from the north-east corner of the site off the road. All vehicles entering the site would use this entrance, and would include cars, light vans bringing goods, HGVs servicing the site and emergency and maintenance vehicles. If the proposed entrance became closed, an emergency entrance is shown to exit the Lower Boddington Road immediately to the north of Hay Bridge, on the east side.

The submitted documents do not identify any up-grading to the Lower Boddington Road to take heavier vehicles or the increased traffic, over its whole length from Lower Boddington to Claydon. No passing places are indicated and no strengthening of the road to remedy the current side-slipping is included.

The applicants propose that people walking, cycling and driving on the road would all remain within the existing carriageway. No footpaths are proposed for the safety of any

- 3 -

pedestrians on the road, especially those leaving the marina. It is anticipated that there could be up to 50 children on the boats. No health and safety report was issued with the planning documents to the Parish Council regarding increased pedestrian and other usages on this very narrow one lane poor quality road. In fact, the reports state that there are no walkers to the north of Hay Bridge on the road. This is completely incorrect. Many people walk from Claydon to the pub in Lower Boddington at the weekends in summer, and it is anticipated that some boat owners might well do the same, as there is no pub in Claydon.

Cyclists also use this road in increasing numbers because it is a comparatively safe route. Numbers have increased consistently since the 2012 Olympic Games and this is likely to continue. No up-to-date assessment is included in the reports, nor is there any health and safety report on the risks to cyclists, especially on sections where sight lines are very poor, i.e. the steep Hay Bridge, sharp, blind corners and the bridge over the former railway line north of the site. The quality of the road’s surface and the approaches to the proposed marina are currently cracked and very poor and no restoration or improvement works are proposed. Local property owners’ verges are already damaged; nor was there any mitigation action advised if damaged by increased traffic from the marina, and there is no mention of the need for further passing places.

I therefore object to this development on the grounds of health and safety in the absence of any safety measures proposed for pedestrians and cyclists, etc., and because of the inability of the Lower Boddington Road to take increased traffic safely and easily to Claydon or to Lower Boddington.

7. It is proposed in the reports that traffic should enter the marina from the north but when leaving the marina should turn left and go out through Claydon, (presumably to avoid traffic conflicts on the Lower Boddington Road). This would increase traffic through Claydon and especially when larger HGVs or lorries or vans have served the marina. The bad sections of the roads in Claydon include the sharp left hand turn on the Cropredy Road by Astell Farm going out of the village, the narrow section between Claydon House and the terraced houses on Mollington Road, the narrow bridge on the Fenny Compton Road over the railway and the narrow steep road over Hay Bridge. These pinch points already cause difficulty and any increase in traffic will exacerbate this.

- 4 -

I therefore object to the proposed marina because of the lack of any mitigation measures proposed to cope with increased traffic affecting Claydon and the lack of appreciation shown of the effects it would have in the village.

8. Construction traffic is proposed to go through the applicants' farm. To access the site the route would have to go over Harefurlong Brook, a tributary of the River Cherwell. No details have been given of this, and no bridging details over the brook have been discussed or produced. Nothing on this was included in the review by the Canal and Rivers Trust.

In addition, no consideration has been given to providing a more permanent route through the applicants' farm for all traffic to the marina, thus avoiding any increased traffic on the Lower Boddington Road and through Claydon. The traffic report unexpectedly did not consider this. Furthermore, if the applicants are considering a permanent way through their farm to the marina for all traffic as a permanent solution, no report from the relevant Highways Department was included in the reports to cover health and safety. Would this road become a public road, serving the public in their access to the marina, and are the public roads leading to the farm entrance of sufficient quality not to be impacted by the increased traffic. This would have come from Northamptonshire County Council Highways Department and to date there is no knowledge whether this has been discussed with this County.

I therefore object strongly to the proposed marina because of the lack of information on access and egress to and from the proposed marina towards both Claydon and Lower Boddington.

9. The design and access statement deals with the nature of the lighting for safety within the proposed marina. At present this is a dark night sky area with no light from any development between Claydon and Lower Boddington. Glows in the night sky come from Banbury and from Chipping Warden. Visiting the site at midnight on 13th March 2019 there were no lights in the view. Lighting would have to be sufficient for the access roads and paths to the boats. Even with effective downlight control, and the considered intermittent nature of the lighting, glare off the hard and other surfaces would still occur. Introducing lighting into this area of dark night would be a totally unacceptable and create a severely intrusive impact into the dark night landscape of the Conservation Area. At the Cropredy marina, the lighting, strongly challenged at the time but over-ridden, is still at an unacceptable level of visual impact on this

- 5

now altered, formerly designated countryside, especially when viewed from the village. The countryside designation once applied to that area was somehow downgraded without public consultation and the development was allowed.

I therefore object to this development because the proposed lighting would damage the character of this dark night Conservation Area and the lack of sufficient measures indicated by the applicants to retain the current dark night character.

10. I also question the vast extent of earthworks and high banks and bunds that are required to achieve this marina. No consideration has been given to setting the marina at lower ground levels to avoid such high banks. There are no high banks in the district, the canal being elevated approximately only 2m above the landscape along its north side in this location.

I object in particular to the vast volume of soil required for the bank to the east of the Lower Boddington Road near Hay Bridge. This bank starts at the road level of 113.50m and rises to 118m by the maintenance area, i.e. 3 m. higher than the canal and the marina. It would also therefore be 4.50m ($118 - 113.50 = 4.50\text{m}$) or 13.5ft. above the road, completely blocking all the current long views to the east through gaps in, or over, the existing hedging. In addition, tree planting is proposed all over this high bank, further shutting down this wide-ranging valuable local view.

This bank, topped with a 3m high bund, which continues all around the marina, is placed on top of the proposed banks. This smaller bund is not part of the general slopes of the banks but is added on top of them. What is its function? Is it for flood control? The Canal and River Trust has not commented on this, and there is nothing in the reports that explains why this additional 3m high bund has been added. Is it in fact needed? In effect, I object strongly to the vast earthworks and banks that are proposed for this marina, which are in total contradiction to the gently sloping character of the landscape and the low banks supporting the Oxford Canal.

The bank proposed along the north side of the site is even higher when seen in combination with the bank along Harefurlong Brook. Levels in the brook are lower (107.70m) and the top level of the bank is 115.50, which is the level of the marina perimeter road, i.e. a change of level of 7.80m. i.e. 25.50 feet. Adding the 3m bund on top, the height would increase to 10.80m or 35ft. or higher than a two storey house! In views from the canal, this would

- 6 -

truncate all the trees along the northern boundary, reducing their effective height by 2/3rds. This is not enhancement of the Conservation Area surrounds.

In landscape terms, this low-lying area of land is looked down on by the Oxford Canal. Such high banks to bring the land up to the level of the canal are inappropriate in this Conservation Area and this gradually sloping land away from the canal.

I therefore object to these massive banks that appear required for this marina because they have no relationship to the character of the Conservation Area or elsewhere and they, being a major new landscape feature, would not enhance the local landscape in any way.

11. Some tree planting has been proposed but has little relationship to the historic patterns of vegetation in the district. Vegetation locally is for shelter, along water courses, farm boundaries or along the railway or road, both natural and man-made. The planting proposed along the Lower Boddington Road is a large block, completely out of character with the existing landscape structure of farmland. The northern boundary planting extends from the Lower Boddington Road a short way and then stops for some reason, not identified. It does not complement the existing vegetation pattern. Small groups of trees are shown and if the existing tree screen along the brook were ever to be lost, lighting from the marina would spread across

the farmland to the north, because the marina would be raised high above the level of the farmland. The tree groups are also small and would appear insignificant against the high banks.

12. I also object to the creation of the proposed lake 7m below the marina level. There are therefore two water levels, the marina (115.0m) and the canal, and the lake (108.0m). Although from the site layout it looks as though the marina and the lake are at the same level, it is only when the levels are examined in detail, it is realised that they are not related because they are at very different levels. Also, the levels on the drawings are very indistinct, almost illegible, because they are printed in blue on a blue background and are in very small type. It transpires that the lake is separated from the marina by a 5m high grass bank.

The banks would be in two sections. The first bank is for the lake and is the lower, rising 2m high above water level. This is the level of the marina ring road (110.0m) and the car parking areas. The second is the long, upper bank, 5m high, up which owners would have to climb to get to their boats (115.0m). These western banks face due east and would be visible from public footpath 170/6/20, changing the nature of views to the west by cutting off **all** views,

- 7 -

and, incidentally, the marina. The view from this footpath therefore would, by destroying the existing long view, offers no enhancement of the landscape to walkers along the public footpath. Additional 7m banking is needed at the canal (southern) end of the lake (water level 108.0m) and the canal level (115.0m), and again these levels are not detailed on the drawings.

13. There is insufficient information given on how the proposed lake is to be filled from local sources. No assessment has been given of the water volume available from the 'local' source or how would it be guaranteed? How long will the lake take to fill? What is the position regarding drought years and if one occurs, during construction for instance, how would sufficient water be made available? It is proposed that this would be a water source for the farm. What controls are in place to ensure it does not dry out? All this information is needed to avoid wholesale damage to the countryside, in case of interruption of the water supply.

If, during the works, it proves impossible to keep water levels high in the canal, and work has to cease for good, no measures are identified on how the landscape would be restored. This project is the equivalent of large scale surface mining (for soil) and as such measures to return the area to its former character in case of failure should be detailed, otherwise the Conservation Area will be damaged forever. Recently on *Countryfile* on BBC One, Thames Water advised that they would be extracting water from the Oxford Canal. Have they been

consulted on this project? If not, they should be, so that their views on extraction volumes, and when likely, are made known to the public. This would exacerbate water shortages already experienced in the summer. Are the applicants aware of this, and what would they do about it?

Also, what are the risks of water stagnation in the marina, as water would enter the marina from the canal and leave it through the same short stretch of canal? As there is only one entrance point, how would the water circulate in and out of the marina?

What controls are in place by the Canal and Rivers Trust that might affect availability of water to Thames Water from the canal? It is insufficient to say that there is no problem, because droughts do occur and restrictions are applied on canal usage through the five Claydon locks almost every year. These matters, in particular water shortage, have not been addressed by the applicants or by the Canal and River Trust. Their report does not indicate that there are frequent water shortages, and when canal use as a consequence is restricted. In recent years there was

- 8 -

also a period when the canal was closed until there were sufficient rains to refill the local Wormleighton and Claydon reservoirs.

The risk of flooding has also hardly been discussed and the design statement does not include details on the anti-flooding measures taken. The canal is known to flood and the countryside was flooded in, I believe, 2008 when I was caught in it.

Also, what also would happen if the lake dried out? No information again.

I therefore object because there are insufficient details to assess the marina and lake works accurately. How severely the banks and earthworks proposed for the marina would change the local landscape? How would the marina water levels be maintained during water shortages and how guaranteed is the water supply to both the canal and to the lake? Also, there is no analysis on how the lake would affect the local landscape character?

14. The applicants' documents state that the marina is not to be open to the public, let alone the residents of Claydon. This is objectionable especially because the marina, if approved, will considerably affect the people of Claydon's enjoyment of this bit of open countryside. It certainly would not encourage co-operation between the village and the marina.

A short path connection is proposed from the marina to public footpath 170/6/20 east of the site. This would make Claydon accessible to the marina but not in reverse, especially if

gated for security reasons. Details of this connection are not explored in the documents, and also whether or where or how it would cross Harefurlong Brook. If the short length of path connecting with the public footpath is approved, it should be designated a public footpath so that access is always available.

If security is the reason for no public access, there are no details to show what and where security barriers would be erected to prevent access from various points around the site. Access to the site from the canal towpath is possible at present. Access from the east is also available now. Are fences to be erected all around the site and the canal to prevent access? No details are given.

15. Access for emergency vehicles is shown to be through the opening that currently provides access to the track to Glebe Farm. This track is to be shut off. However, there is no

- 9 -

indication of how emergency vehicles would get down to the marina. If the proposed site entrance were to be blocked for some reason, the route for the emergency vehicles down to the marina would be very difficult, across the high bank by the Lower Boddington Road. Would the bank, constructed for planting, be able to take the weight of fire engines, for instance? The steepness of the 3m high banking near the marina hardstanding could also lead to difficulties. This route, over made-up ground, would need time to stabilise sufficiently to take heavy vehicles, unless constructed properly. Again, no details. Incidentally, the 3m high bank, being adjacent to the perimeter road, would cut off all eye level views outwards from the marina.

Generally, therefore, I object to the lack of detail of the emergency road, the role of the 3m high bank, and what access would be provided for Glebe Farm?

16. The details indicated on the photographs on the internet of the potential extent of the marina show very clearly what a very large land coverage the marina would have. They demonstrate the disproportionate scale of the marina and the way it would dominate the local landscape. The photos show clearly the large size of the area of land that would be completely changed, both in use and character.

17. I also object to the large block of planting to the east of the Lower Boddington Road because it would be out of keeping with this landscape. Even though the proposed bank would eliminate all views, the proposed planting would ensure even further that there would

never again be views from Hay Bridge of the long and attractive local countryside to the east. However, also, from this bridge, until the planting east of the road has grown, there would be views of the maintenance area and the facilities building.

The proposals also show planting on the north boundary continuing eastwards approximately as far as the facilities building but no further. From there, the proposals rely heavily on the existing tree screen along the brook. There may be no guarantee that this screen will remain in the ownership of the farm if the farm changes hand in the future. The only way that this screen can be retained in perpetuity is for it to be conditioned for its protection. Also, the high banks elevating the marina would mask the bottom 5m of the trees along the brook, truncating them and reducing their visual value in the landscape.

- 10 -

18. The introduction of a 6.7m high facilities building into this rural location would also not enhance the area and would cause significant visual impact, because there are no buildings of this scale and height anywhere nearby. It would be totally out of character. The roof ridge would be at a level of approximately 121.7m, well over 6m above the canal level and would dominate the area and significantly downgrade the quality and character of views from both the Conservation Area and the canal.

The facilities building would be visible from the Lower Boddington Road when approaching the canal from Claydon because trees are to be felled along the canal to enable the new marina entrance to be constructed. Current views are of trees along the canal backed by trees to the north of the site. Nowhere in the reports are there proposals to replace these trees in this view. In fact they can't be, because they coincide with the marina access canal. The view of the facilities building would, if built as designed, always be visible from the road, hardly enhancing views of the countryside from the Lower Boddington Road.

19. The building would be accompanied by a maintenance area close by, with one bay for boat maintenance. Is one bay sufficient for 192 boats? Elsewhere, narrowboat marinas have shelters constructed over 2-3 maintenance bays. Again there are no details either on the drawings or in the reports. If they are to be added, details should have been included at this stage so that the impact of the shelters and the facilities building could be properly assessed together.

There is nothing in the reports that state that a two-storey building is essential. To reduce its visual impact, a lower building would be far less intrusive in views and on site, although to accommodate the spaces needed, a greater spread of buildings would result.

20. Lighting would be required for the facilities building (no blackout screens mentioned) and would add to the overall lighting levels of the marina, contributing further to the loss of the dark night sky of the Conservation Area.

3.0 SUMMARY

3.1 Overall, the proposed marina would be a major intrusion into the local landscape and into the designated Conservation Area of the Oxford Canal. It is so large that it would result in increasing the number of boats between Cropredy and Fenny Compton by a third. Given the

- 11 -

current boat touring difficulties during dry summers and the trapping of boats at the locks at Claydon, this would appear to be hardly sensible. That Thames Water may have to extract water from the canal in summer, will only exacerbate touring difficulties. What enhancement of the current status would there be?

3.2 The large size of the marina is out of scale with its area and would be three-quarters of the size of the village of Claydon. Pedestrians, cyclists and riders would be in conflict with marina traffic along the Lower Boddington Road to Claydon and Lower Boddington. The traffic report says that footpaths are not needed and this is challenged by the village. Conflicts with pedestrians and cyclists already occur, and verges are damaged because there are no adopted, purposely-constructed passing places. To get them, it is assumed that verge owners would have to agree to compensation for the loss of their land. Have the applicants considered this and presented an appropriate response?

3.3 The number of people who might live on the marina could total 380, a population approximately 50% greater than people in Claydon village. Is this an appropriate scale and sensitive to local needs? What benefits are there to Claydon? This would be equivalent to adding a large light industrial area to the landscape with no benefits to anyone other than the applicants.

3.4 Traffic numbers would increase in Claydon because the exit route from the marina is advised to be via Claydon. Are traffic and damage conflicts within Claydon to be encouraged?

3.5 The major earthworks required for the elevated marina and for the huge bank along the Lower Boddington Road would dwarf the local landscape. The huge banks and the marina would also dwarf the small scale Oxford Canal, which is the reason for the Conservation Area. The earthworks along the Lower Boddington Road would not enhance the local landscape and would obstruct a major local view. Are such colossal changes appropriate?

3.6 A large facilities building is to be introduced into an area where there are no permanent buildings at all. Its height is out of proportion to the scale of the area, and its lighting, together with the marina lighting, would have a seriously impact on the dark night of the Conservation Area and the local countryside. Upper storey lighting at night would be widely visible. The large hard standing of the maintenance area and its bay(s) would add to the physical impact on the landscape as well. What landscape enhancement would there be from these?

3.7 No details are given of the time it would take to fill the marina. Neither is there

- 12 -

information about the water source, the volumes expected, the water supply guarantees, or the time it would take to fill the lake. There are no details of what actions would be needed if the project were to fail. Also, what measures would be taken to ensure stagnation of water in both marina and lake does not occur? Why have none of these questions been answered by the applicants?

3.8 Frequent comparisons are made in the documents with the marina at Crick. Crick Marina is flat and not an equivalent elevated marina. Where is another site with such exceptional embankments? The report on the sites that were examined for suitability for marina development does not state that this site is the only one owned by the applicants.

3.9 There would be no public access. Views from the one public footpath in the area would be significantly changed and would not be enhanced. Why is the marina not to be open to the public or to the village? No mention has been made on any security measures to be taken, if this is of concern? Would they be to keep residents of Claydon out?

4.0 OBJECTION BY ROBERT ADAMS

4.1 Because of the above, I therefore object to the proposed development of the Glebe Farm Marina because it is inappropriate to the Conservation Area, and its district in scale. To elevate the marina to the level of the Oxford Canal would damage the Conservation Area and the

landscape because the vast earthworks required do not enhance the landscape. The landscape proposals exacerbate this near the Lower Boddington Road. Overall the impact of the marina does not result in any suitable enhancement of the Conservation Area or its locality. The proposed development would be so large that it would be more than three-quarters the size of the village of Claydon. It would be like creating a new village, on water, in the middle of the rural countryside, with a population 50% greater than the nearest village! This cannot be anything other than over-development because it would dwarf both Claydon village and its local landscape. Also, its name should not include Claydon as there is such opposition to it in the village and locally and it is not connected to the village in any way.

4.2 I object also because it would introduce unacceptable traffic conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists and riders on the Lower Boddington Road and within Claydon village.

- 13 -

4.3 There would be no benefits to Claydon. The applicants are the only ones who would benefit. Is this reasonable?

4.4 The introduction of large embankments, a modern building and potential other structures and the large water surface of the marina would not enhance the Conservation Area or the district because they would conflict with, and damage, the appearance and the historic character of the Conservation Area. What enhancements would be provided?

4.5 I challenge the proposals because there are so many questions about the proposals which have not been answered. For instance, the emergency access has been identified but the route has not been detailed, which should have been questioned carefully by health and safety, as lives might depend on how vehicles can gain access quickly at such critical times. In addition, there are questions regarding the guarantee of the availability of water for both the marina and the permanence of the local source for the proposed lake. Safety considerations and the access arrangements are not clearly identified.

4.6 I therefore object to the whole development as presented and because there are so many unanswered questions about the project, it should not be approved.

5.0 CONDITIONS

5.1 Despite the absence of answers to so many questions and the significant harmful impacts on the Conservation Area and its associated landscape, should the marina be approved, it is recommended that a number of conditions which should be complied with. As raised during the last Parish Council meeting, the following explores what could be considered to the benefit of the village of Claydon and its Parish Council.

1. That the Lower Boddington Road is properly surveyed, its structure analysed and its capacity examined in detail under current conditions. The road is to be repaired and/or reconstructed where necessary to take into account the current and predicted future usage by all forms of vehicle, foot and other traffic during the marina construction period and for a period of five years after completion to assess wear and tear and repairs that may be required. That the

- 14 -

applicants will agree with the local authority on the provision of adopted passing places for safety.

2. That the route of the construction traffic through the applicants' farm be appraised as to its suitability to become the future permanent route of all transport and other traffic to and from the marina, thus ensuring that conflicts with pedestrians, vehicles, etc. on the Lower Boddington are avoided and that Claydon would not to be on the exit route from the marina. That the effect on local roads in the area as a consequence of this be approved by both Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire County Council Highways Departments.

3. If this is not agreed by the applicants, safe routes will be provided for pedestrians, cyclists and riders on the Lower Boddington Road as required by the relevant Highways Departments to eliminate health and safety concerns. The applicants are also to ensure that all marina traffic on the road will give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and riders.

4. That all routes into and through Claydon will be inspected for their suitability for the passage of whatever vehicles will be used to construct, supply and maintain the marina. Where unsuitable, the applicants will ensure that vehicle sizes are modified to ensure no risk of damage, etc. to people or property. Where damage or injury occurs, relevant compensation will be payable firstly to the Parish Council or then as relevant. Where amendments to the roads within Claydon or a structure, property or service is unavoidably altered, compensation will be

sought by the village to carry out any necessary works, etc. The applicant will therefore carry public liability insurance as agreed with the local authority.

5. That the applicants and any subsequent owners of the farm and marina in their entirety will agree to free public access to the marina by residents of Claydon. They will also confirm compliance with this free access in the future by the owners and any subsequent owners of the marina, its buildings, facilities, etc., and that any security requirements made for the marina residents, employees, etc. do not affect the rights of the people of Claydon when visiting the marina.

6. That the proposed footpath that is to connect with PROW 170/6/20 will be maintained in perpetuity by the marina for use by local walkers, etc. and by villagers from Claydon.

- 15 -

7. That the applicants will satisfy the local authority, the Canal and River Trust, Oxfordshire County Council and any other statutory consultee that water quality in both the marina and the lake will be high, that there will be a proper and consistent supply of water to the lake from a secure and quantifiable source agreed with the local authority in advance of any construction works, and that both the marina and the lake will not be at risk of either stagnation or flooding. That the applicants will supply to the local authority and other interested parties details of what works will be undertaken to reverse the works, should the completed project fail for whatever reason.

8. In advance of the start of any works, the applicants will agree with the local authority, the Canal and River Trust and Thames Water the volumes of water extraction and the seasons that are considered likely in the event of canal, and other, water shortages.

9. That all planting will be properly executed with healthy British plants, grown by a guaranteed British source, to avoid plant diseases, and to be properly maintained for a period of five years. Where any losses occur or where plants do not grow properly, they are to be replaced in the next season after failure according to the original approved specification.

10. That all lighting will be designed to ensure that the dark night sky of this area is not affected and that all lighting that is not required for safety will be extinguished by a time agreed with the local authority, appropriate to the relevant time of year.

11. That any subsequent structure required for whatever purpose, whether temporary or otherwise, is to be agreed in advance with the local authority and the Claydon with Clattercote Parish Council. No temporary structure is to be erected without advance approval from these bodies.

12. The applicants will ensure all marina operations will not affect the usage of the Oxford Canal by others, including existing canal users and their moorings, including the towpath.

Robert Adams, Clattercote House, Claydon, Oxon OX17 1ES Landscape Architect (retired)

26/4/2019

CLAYDON - SHOWING THE SIZE AND POSITION OF THE PROPOSED NEW MARINA AND LAKE



SATELLITE VIEW SHOWING CLAYDON, PROPOSED MARINA AND HS2

