**From:** McMillan, James / Kuehne + Nagel / LON ZAK

**Sent:** 30 April 2019 13:00
**To:** Planning
**Subject:** RE: Objecton. Application 18/00904/F

Good afternoon, and thank you for your response.

My full postal address is:

23 Manor Park

Claydon

North Oxfordshire

OX17 1HH

Best

**From:** Planning
**Sent:** 30 April 2019 12:47
**To:** McMillan, James / Kuehne + Nagel / LON ZAK
**Subject:** RE: Objecton. Application 18/00904/F

Good afternoon,

Please provide your full postal address so your comments can be registered against the planning application.

Kind regards

**Development Management**

Cherwell District Council & South Northamptonshire Council

Direct Dial 01295 227006

**planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk**

[**www.cherwell.gov.uk**](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)

[**www.southnorthants.gov.uk**](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil) or [www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil](http://www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil)

Follow us on Twitter [@Cherwellcouncil](https://twitter.com/cherwellcouncil?lang=en-gb) or [@SNorthantsC](https://twitter.com/SNorthantsC)

**From:** McMillan, James / Kuehne + Nagel / LON ZAK
**Sent:** 26 April 2019 17:08
**To:** DC Support; Clare O'Hanlon; Councillor George Reynolds; Councillor Douglas Webb
**Subject:** Objecton. Application 18/00904/F

Dear Clare, George and Douglas.

I’m writing to you in reference to the planning application for the proposed 192 birth Marina proposed for Claydon, ref 18/00904/F.

I am sure you will have received many, and very detailed, representations to this effect that go into specifics about the key points of objection which are, principally:

1. The proposed development will detrimental to the landscape and surrounding conservation area bringing with it various forms of pollution, significant groundworks to raise the level of the proposed site higher than any other embankment or bund locally, disturb the naturally settling wildfowl along the canal and occupy an area, overall, of some 75% of the entire footprint of Claydon village itself.

There are already marinas close by, both of which are in the process of expanding to accommodate a not dissimilar number of berths as are being outlined in this proposal. The question needs to be asked whether there is the commercial justification or demand for a this further development.
2. The construction and operation of the marina will bring significant increases in traffic to a location served by very poorly maintained, single track roads with few passing places flanked mostly by mud and fields.

During construction there will need to be a succession of HGV’s and plant vehicles accessing the site. All excavation and piling equipment for a project this size is transported on super-low loaders which will not be able to cross Hay Bridge to the North, although they will not discover this until they have either grounded on it, or are forced to reverse back up the road, and which will struggle to access via the Boddington road. Having driven, managed and operated heavy and outsize load vehicles I can say with absolute certainty that this will be the case, and that the volume of HGV traffic will cause significant degradation to the already poor access.

Additionally, once 192 berths are completed and full, there will be a requirement for the owners to access the site and this will also be by car, causing a risk to the many pedestrians, horses and children who walk to and from the village to the canal towpath.

I am making the assumption that the council is not proposing to increase quality of the access by widening, levelling the heavily cambered road centre sections, and maintaining the existing road network.
3. There is an issue associated with this project around water pollution and supply. As well as congesting the canal network, even given the current levels of usage the canal there is still restricted navigation during summer hours and boats waiting for days to use the claydon lock system due to inadequacies in the current water feed network which is essentially, as evidenced every year, already at capacity.

The applicant proposes the marina itself be filled via the canal water however, in addition to the previous issue concerning existing water shortages, will inevitably be contaminated by bilge water, grey water and diesel/oil residue which in turn will impact the local wildlife and farm animals, potentially, were it to find its way into the lower water table (considering this is bunded up to 8m above the existing brook).
4. Local health services are already stretched and although non-residential, there is no actual way of effectively enforcing this.
5. Given the previous issues mentioned surrounding the road transport network and its perilous winter conditions as well as lack of gritting 24/7 365 access to emergency vehicles would be impacted.
6. The profile of the development, and its height above the existing level, would be completely incongruous to the natural landscape and beautiful surroundings. Combined with the latter and the need for maintenance sheds, down-lighting and the necessity for constant activity such a proposal would bring, it is akin to asking to place a new industrial estate in the area.
7. Finally, it brings no benefit to the local community at all.

I do sincerely hope that these concerns can be addressed in the appropriate manner and that they are considered in context to any decision on the final outcome of the application, along with the doubtless numerous other issues raised by fellow residents of the area.

Best regards

James McMillan.