

Comment for planning application 21/01123/F

Application Number	21/01123/F
Location	Hatch End Old Poultry Farm Steeple Aston Road Middle Aston Bicester OX25 5QL
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings. Construction of replacement business units and associated external works. (Re-submission of 20/01127/F)
Case Officer	James Kirkham
Organisation	
Name	Martin Dale
Address	Cedar Court,Water Lane,Steeple Aston,Bicester,OX25 4SB
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Cherwell District Council Planning application 21/001123/F Thank you for the opportunity to write concerning this development. Please note that though this is being sent on the same day as the Steeple Aston Open Meeting concerning this I am sending it prior to attending the meeting and the following are my own objections or comments. - Whilst the developers have commissioned two excellent reports on the state of trees and the ecology of the site with which they no doubt would comply , they have not considered properly nor is there any factual report of the effect of the redevelopment on the whole human environment of the village. - The developer's use of the word "significant " to describe the 1.4% reduction in the proposed square footage is a loose use of english to say the least. This being the case reading the section on transport shows an equally fluid and manipulative use of language designed to stop the reader seeing the truth of the situation. I object to this practice and it should be taken into account when checking the planning application by Cherwell District Council The Need for the development itself - The proposers state that there is a need for such development in North Oxfordshire. They offer not facts to corroborate this. They show no proof or research to show this. It is stated as "a given". It is not a given and generalized statements such as this are misleading. The developers should be asked to show proof of this. Until they do offer such proof the development has no validity and should be at the very least postponed until such evidence is available. - It is relevant to say here that the current buildings which have been available the Hatch End site have not been inundated with people wishing to use them despite being commodious and available! That does not speak of any "need" for such a site. - There are four major developments of industrial accommodation in Bicester at the moment. There is no need for a small rural site with dubious transport links to be built. Transport issues during the building of the site Access for large articulated lorries through Steeple Aston or Middle Aston via any route is hugely difficult. All of us in the village have watched the odd lorry which has mistakenly taken such routes in the past, getting completely stuck at corners. One rare lorry getting stuck once is one thing but a continuous number of them is quite another! - In addition there is a particularly thin section of road at the northern end of Paines Hill which is bound to cause problems for all with any sized delivery lorry let alone large articulated ones. The traffic situation at Steeple Aston Primary School during arrival and departure times would be untenable and unsafe for children for at least one hour either side of the those times. The children's school coach need to be taken into account plus the delivery of children to the the school by other means. The roads in Steeple Aston currently used by the bus show serious wear regularly. With the sustained use of heavy traffic, rutting and holes etc. would be aggravated by the number of delivery vehicles. -Because of this there is a need for a limitation of weight for delivery transport for reasons of : width; danger with regard to the school children; size ;damage to roads in the area. As a result the following suggestion is perfectly feasible: - Were the development to go ahead then a system such as is used widely in the Alps to transport large tree trunks should be undertaken namely: For large items normally transported on large lorries - these should be offloaded at Oxford Airport and transported to the site slung from suitable helicopters. There is space for landing at the site. This may immediately be met with the comment that it is out of the question because of expense. I would point out that expense of the development is totally irrelevant within the context of this objection and should be seen as such by those who grant or withhold permissions. Expense is the problem of developers. Transport Issues if the site is developed as proposed. - The developers are at pains to point out that public transport access for the site is good and that people will use it. Again there is no research to prove this. Others before me have already pointed out that the site is significantly far enough from the railway station and bus stops that people would not use these especially in inclement or cold weather. It is ridiculous to say that they would. -</p>

Whilst public transport links from north and south exist there are no east west public transport links at all . (The once weekly mid morning Barton bus service is irrelevant here.) Since Hatch End - assuming that it were proven to be needed which I doubt - could appeal to people from Upper Heyford and Bicester and the Barton's(east /west) as well as Oxford, Kidlington and Deddington(north /south) it is obvious that the use of private cars etc. would be high and the idea that people would walk or cycle is derisory. Some hardy souls might but the majority would not. Common sense tells one that this is so. It would be worth researching this before any building were undertaken. - It is a truth that can be seen by all that during business hours delivery vehicles , probably mostly vans but not necessarily so , would be accessing the site at all times thus exacerbating the issues already mentioned. Emissions The developers point out that the reduction of parking places from over 90 in the previous plan to 79 in in the current one helps "reduce emissions". This is nonsense. Right now and in the 10 years I have lived here there have been very few vehicles indeed on the site. Thus 79 vehicles or maybe more is not in any way a reduction it is an addition. The manner in which language is manipulated to make it seem that the impact on the area will be minimal in both the overall proposal and particularly within the section on transport bears much much further study and questioning. After my current reading of the plans I shall continue to do study them and if further issues arise as a result and within the time frame offered for comments and objections I shall write again pointing those out. With thanks to you for undertaking the task of assessing the proposal and my objections. Martin Dale

Received Date

10/05/2021 17:35:45

Attachments