

Comment for planning application 20/01127/F

Application Number	20/01127/F
Location	Hatch End Old Poultry Farm Steeple Aston Road Middle Aston Bicester OX25 5QL
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of replacement business units, ancillary hub and associated external works.
Case Officer	James Kirkham
Organisation Name	Zoe Taylor-Clarke
Address	The Cottage,Paines Hill,Steeple Aston,Bicester,OX25 4SQ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Dear Sir/Madam We would like to add our objection to the planned development of Hatch End. In essence, the site will become a business park, incongruous to a small village location. It seems obvious that the proposed plan is more fitting for a small town with a suitable supporting infrastructure in place to support such a development. The scale of the proposed plan is not in keeping with the needs of the village and the disadvantages seemingly outweigh the advantages to the local population. A renovation of the existing buildings, using the current footprint, with single storey sympathetic structures seems far more sensible. We would concur with all the other points made by the numerous residents, namely: 97 car park spaces. Too few to service the site. Ergo worst-case scenario (which is the baseline consideration) employees will park on Fir Lane and within an already crowded village. We agree with the suggestion that employees will use the bus/train/cycle mode of transport is flawed for the reasons already given by other residents. Therefore it seems likely that employees will be looking to park their vehicles along Fir Lane/in the village. The suggestion that there are adequate alternative transport services for the site seriously undermines the entire proposal and the developers' understanding of travel habits and connections. Walking to Lower Heyford train station (when you could drive your car to your front door) is a naively optimistic assumption, particularly in the winter months. The location of Hatch End (proposed business park) to the primary school, playschool, youth center, playground, village hall is clearly inappropriate. As it stands the vehicle pressures on this area of the village are already hazardous during peak travel periods. Children have to cross from the car park to the school, often crossing behind parked cars. Many near misses have happened over the years. Cars have not been so lucky, causing quite a few minor incidents where parents are forced to park on the road/hunt out a parking spot. On a daily basis, (during term time) vehicles create a bottleneck at the top of Paines Hill where the road converges with North Side by the church. The passing point only allows one vehicle due to the parked cars and the width of the road. The addition of any daily vehicle flow along these roads will see cars backed up along North Side and Paines Hill. Demand for office space. With an expected 30 - 50% of office workers expected to WFH post Covid 19, one must question if there is the demand for such a development? It is reasonable to assume that many of the existing business parks (Bloxham, Long Hanborough, etc) will have empty units as the way we work changes. Sensible countryside planning calls for developments to maintain or enhance the environment and to meet the social-economic needs of the local area; this proposal seems to go against this fundamental guiding principle. Zoe & Mike Taylor-Clarke</p>
Received Date	06/06/2020 14:19:30
Attachments	