

35 Falcon View
Greens Norton
Towcester
NN12 8BT

Objection to planning application

Dear Mr Dix,

I am writing to object to the application on the following grounds:

1. This is a cynical attempt to get an application through for the third time. Although the proposal only encompasses the northern site, the applicants are well aware that it would be difficult to refuse the southern site were the northern to go ahead. Indeed there is a clear link road shown on the proposal. The material considerations since the previous applications are unchanged.
2. It is outside the village boundary and as such would not fall within the local plan for the village.
3. The proposal is poorly linked to the village and will not increase quality of life for the majority of current residents. The path down Blakesley hill is only for able bodied people, unsuitable for mobility scooters and prams due to not just the width that is mentioned but incline and camber. Journeys on foot would therefore be indirect and be significantly longer than the metres stated in the report due to the winding roads and paths that would need to be negotiated. Most if not all journeys within the village would likely be by car adding to problems on Sycamore/Church view and the centre of the village at peak times. This is not accounted for in the traffic survey.
4. Further to the lack of sustainability in terms of foot travel the assertion that a bus at 7:20am returning almost 12 hours later is an acceptable and sustainable means of commute is laughable. There is no safe, lit footpath between the village and Towcester to access a greater bus network. The path running along the Towcester road was built by and maintained by local community efforts but is not of proper width or flat enough for pram/mobility use. People do not move to villages to use public transport. The transport strategy is woolly and unsustainable.
5. Visual impact from the westerly and southerly direction is unchanged from previous proposals and would be extremely visually intrusive in otherwise unspoiled countryside.
6. The field encompassing the proposed development is one for food production of suitable quality soil for such and should not be lost.
7. The southern boundary hedge (H2 in the ecological survey) belongs to the fields southerly to the proposed development and is not the boundary hedge of the field seeking to be developed. I therefore own the easterly stretch of the hedge and that hedge will not be touched. I realise that such boundaries are for reserved matters, but I want it noted at this stage for the avoidance of doubt. It is unacceptable to have my property discussed as part of a development for a third time.
8. The ephemeral water referred to in the ecological survey is in fact in the south east corner not the south west corner as stated. I understand from the community that the Benham Road gardens would regularly get flooded so the farmer installed land drains channelling run off into the corner. Far from being ephemeral, wildlife uses it year-round and it has never

completely dried up. On heavy rainfall (around a dozen times per year) the pond overflows and comes into the top corner of my garden, runs into a culvert that follows the village boundary at the back of the Falcon View gardens and emerges on Bradden road. The water then presumably continues a southerly course on to the wet lands of the pocket park. On extremely high rainfall or at snow thaw the culvert is unable to cope and the gardens flood. Through this winter we had standing water for a few weeks. Development of this site could pose a risk both to increased flooding of my property or risk depriving the pocket park of needed run off to sustain the habitats created there.

9. The ecological survey mentions badger activity and I can provide video evidence of nightly visits. Were this not publicly viewable I would provide locations of a fox den also. We have bats visit our garden nightly and have barn, tawny and little owls calling. We have mice, voles, shrews that the arable field provides prime habitat for. We counted over 10 species of butterfly in our field this summer; i.e. there is ecology here that would be disrupted and displaced by such a large development.
10. Pressure on local services: despite the huge amount of building going on in Towcester the local secondary is at capacity. Already there are not enough places to allow children within Towcester to attend school so there will be no chance when my child is of secondary age. The primary school, although some year groups have places others are already near full. No mention of capacity at the services are mentioned within this application. I understand the Drs surgery is also under pressure. This further adds to concerns around sustainability of the application when no investment in schools and infrastructure is forthcoming at local or national level.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Michelle Hiscutt