

Statement by Linda Wilson

**Opposition Statement pertaining to application [20/00539](#)
Temporary change of use of agricultural land to car park for a period of two
years to facilitate parking for Bellway/ Bluebells site, Rickstones Road.**

I live at **The Barn in Rectory Lane**, and strongly oppose this application. I make this statement from an emotional standpoint as this has been my home for 8 years.

My property is one of the two most badly affected by the Bellway/Bluebells site works underway. With only five properties in Rectory Lane, we are already overwhelmed by the rollout of this development, and further flagrant disregard of this “questionable” and additional, associated application means we now also have to contemplate the destruction of a beautiful field for a two year period, to facilitate parking as an oversight and afterthought excluded from the original development application, to accommodate its site workers.

Aside from the 19 objections already lodged against this application, covering the logical aspects such as poor choice of location, exploitation and negative depletion of the green wedge, other available site options for parking solutions that should be considered first, there is importantly also the heartfelt voices that would be muted in ignorance of the further damage to wildlife, including some protected species, irreparable damage and impact of an ancient protected lane and its renowned John Ray walking route, if this application is approved.

The written objections promote many other possible parking solutions as a preference, without such hideous consequences to wildlife, scenery, social well being of those that live in or use the area, and notwithstanding perhaps furthermore, the hidden agenda that several objectors have mooted that there will never be a return of the field for agriculture.

I ask councillors to consider the latter as a real suspicion of many, and not without cause.

The location plan illustrating the application raises many questions itself, EVEN if this were the only solution for site parking. It shows the locked metal field gate that is already in place, and pedestrians and walkers already use this.

Not one objection has been raised against any increase of footfall use of Rectory Lane. So the question is why can't the site workers use this?

Why would the applicant propose to destruct and dismantle an agricultural field with a hoggin pathway running the entire length of the field with a bridge across the ditch close to my property to access the site, when just some [25m away is Rectory Lane](#) running adjacent for all to use?

Furthermore, and given the salient aforementioned point, if any green field was temporarily approved for car parking, the question then would be why not the immediate next field down?

This field has a completely screened off corner with a very tall hedgerow again next to the lane, has the same immediate pedestrian access via the existing field gate, and would be visible only by approach from the golf club dirt track?

It is only a few feet further than the proposed location and would be completely shrouded. Surely this would be a better option as a very last resort if another site for parking cannot be found.

On this basis alone, it is unsurprising that there is popular belief of a cynical plan that the field will never be returned to agriculture.

Please refuse this highly contentious application for its bish, bash, bosh, ill thought out, terrible impact potential, and possible future intentions.

Linda Wilson