Daniel Kleinman

Caversfield House

Caversfield

OX278TQ RE – Planning Application 18/00484/OUT 6th April 2018

Dear Paul Feehily and other interested parties,

I would have sent my comments regarding this application via the public access service but the link in your letter to me takes me to an error page. So I submit my comments by email and will do so in writing as well.

Bicester Eco Town development will provide many thousands of houses and is in process for many years to come. The proposed site here was excluded from any Eco Town plans but it will extend the Eco Town’s footprint on green fields and along the B4100. The proposed development is on land owned by the people who sold land for the Exemplar phase of the Eco Town. Having excluded this area originally it appears to me to be an attempt to further ‘cash in’ on the extensive building schemes going on around Bicester by after the fact, bolting this onto and extending the Eco Town Exemplar site. It is a money making exercise rather than a genuine attempt to address the need for new housing. The Eco Town is already vast and will be providing houses right next door to this application for the foreseeable future. I personally don’t understand the need for enlarging the agreed Eco Town plan building on more green-fields and reducing the green area around the agreed Eco Town development.

The Exemplar was meant to be of the highest standard, built with it’s surrounding environment in mind. This appears to counter that aspiration.

I erected a shot run of wooden fence 2 foot above my low stone boundary wall along the B4100 to shield Northside Lodge, part of my property, from the Eco Town building works opposite. This modest fence was a long way away from, and not within sight of, St. Laurence Church. The council forced us to take it down on the grounds that it interfered with St. Laurence Church and was not in keeping with the area. This development proposes 750 new build homes directly opposite St. Laurence Church, overlooking it and clearly visible from the church (unlike my now dismantled fence). I’m afraid I’m not fluent in planning speak or the opaque formal ways one must address these applications, but I have hope that there is one rule for all and the same criteria will be applied to this cynical application as was to my wooden fence. If this goes ahead it will not be possible to view St. Laurence Church without also seeing this development.

Further, another development by CALA 13/01056/OUT was proposed, appealed and dismissed (APP/C3105/A/13/2208385) not least due to the effect it would have on my historic property Caversfield House and it’s status and significance as a heritage asset. I draw your attention to the appeal dismissal and it’s conclusions. This current application is actually closer to Caversfield House and grounds and will have an even greater impact on it, and St. Laurence Church.

I would like to object in the strongest terms to this application.

My kind regards,

Daniel Kleinman