

Rachel Tibbetts

From: dc.support@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Sent: 29 June 2021 12:29
To: DC Support
Subject: New comments for application 21/01630/OUT

New comments have been received for application 21/01630/OUT at site address: Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2 Caversfield

from Claire Hodson [REDACTED]

Address:
14 Sage Street, Bicester, OX27 8DE

Comment type:
Objection

Comments:

I would like to strongly Object to this planning application. In particular, there are several alternatives that should be considered regarding traffic provisions as the impact of this will be severe on the current Elmsbrook entrances. It appears particularly problematic that the additional 500+ homes will all be expected to use either of the two existing entrances, especially given that it is proposed that a new road should be developed for the construction traffic because of the impact this traffic will create on these entrances. If the entrances are unable to cope with an escalation of construction traffic it would seem illogical to assume that they will thus cope with the potential of 1000+ cars. The fact that a separate road for construction traffic has been proposed should make it clear that the increase in traffic, once the developments have been completed, will be more than the current entrances can manage. Furthermore, if a road has been completed for the construction traffic, why not use this as a mode of entrance / exit for the development? I strongly suggest planning is reconsidered to include an additional and separate entrance for these new phases of the eco-town.

Survey data has already shown that all models projected prior were significantly underestimating traffic in the area. For example, the Traffic surveys and Traffic Monitoring data from 2019 showed that the original model underestimated traffic in the 8-9am peak hour by 97% on Charlotte Avenue. It also underestimated traffic for the school by 417% and this was when the school was at only 20% of its full pupil capacity. Given the obvious increase in student numbers and residents this is a gross underestimation. Furthermore, the data that is currently being used for these predictions has not included the new developments in Bicester, once again proving that this will be a gross underestimation of the data provided. I should note that this is also bad practice.

Currently there is also a bus gate (adjoining Braeburn and Charlotte Avenue). Despite signs being in place to prohibit drivers from using this as a short-cut, many still do in both directions, at considerable speeds, and this will only become even more of a problem if stronger enforcement is not put in place. With the new development even more cars will drive through this 'restricted' route leading to an increase air traffic pollution for Elmsbrook residents, as well as the obvious problems of bottlenecks, parking, and congestion particularly at school drop-off/pick-up times. Given Bicester and Cherwell Council's Eco ethos I would assume they would want to discourage people from driving to the school and encourage walking and cycling instead. As such, better provisions for this and working restrictions should be put in place to ensure that those from the proposed Western development do not end up driving through to Charlotte Avenue and vice versa.

Finally, as Elmsbrook residents we pay a service charge for the upkeep of our estate. If the 500+ new homes are to be using and sharing these facilities it should be ensured that the new residents also contribute to this upkeep.

Case Officer:
Caroline Ford

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..