

**From:** Tim Screen

**Sent:** 28 January 2020 15:02

**To:** Clare Whitehead

**Subject:** RE: 19/02550/F - Land to the east of M40 and south of A4095, Chesterton, Bicester, Oxon

The LVIA is a comprehensive and competently written document that complies with GLVIA 3 guidelines. In its judgement, defined under 13.8 Summary, the development will be assimilated into its surroundings, when considering visual and landscape effects / landscape mitigation proposals. In my opinion the site has low landscape sensitivity to change, and a visual effect ranging from neutral to moderate adverse at year 0 (BMD, the landscape consultant was involved in a lengthy PREAPP consultation process with CDC). However, the scale of the development is very large and unjustifiable, due to approximately 2/3 site acquisition for building and car park, a massive over development when compared to the adjacent Bicester Health Club and Spa. The LVIA guidelines must address the major issues of over development!

I am not sure if cumulative developmental harm has been addressed adequately in the LVIA: I note WSP's Environmental Statement Volume 1 Chapter 14 Cumulative Effects does not address development's combined effect with Bicester Health Club and Spa. Even the lighting's cumulative harm has not been addressed in this document.

Consider NPPF guidelines in respect of the scale of the development, community and environment:

1. *The NPPF sets out three dimensions to achieve sustainable development, these are economic, social and environmental considerations. High quality design and local character are repeating themes through the core planning principles. The NPPF also notes the importance that design 'evolves' in response to local issues and to the view of local communities and sets out principles in relation to conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.*
  - I. The development at approximately 2/3 of the site area and I therefore think that this is excessive over development compared to adjacent Bicester Health Club and Spa. Because of site is visually contained by boundary hedgerow and trees the development will mainly be experienced from the site's interior, from the perspective of visitors and visual receptors using the interior PRoW..
  - II. There is strong objection for this development from the local community.
  - III. The developer will argue that the landscape proposals provide landscape mitigation, amenity and wildlife habitat enhancement for nature. Specially the planting of native tree mixes and standard trees, wildflower areas established and managed under the landscape management plan.
2. *Policy ESD1 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change states that new development should ensure its resilience to climate change taking into account the known physical and environmental constraints and through the provision of green infrastructure*
  - I. Is the developer able to justify this development under this policy?

No further comments.

Regards  
Tim