

Comment for planning application 21/01630/OUT

Application Number	21/01630/OUT
Location	Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2 Caversfield
Proposal	Outline planning application for residential development (within Use Class C3), open space provision, access, drainage and all associated works and operations including but not limited to demolition, earthworks, and engineering operations, with the details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for later determination
Case Officer	Caroline Ford
Organisation Name	Helen Fellows
Address	8 Tayberry Close, Bicester, OX27 8AU
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I wish to Object to this development as it is currently proposed. However, if the issues raised by myself (below) and others are resolved and the application updated, I would be in support of the development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I wish to support the analyses submitted by Elmsbrook Traffic and Parking Group and Bicester BUG, regarding issues with the transport assessment and road network including bus and cycle provisions. In particular, I am concerned about the safety of schoolchildren given the additional number of cars that will have to drive past the school and the risk of long queues developing along Charlotte Avenue and Braeburn Avenue if the whole of the proposed development accesses the B4100 via Charlotte Avenue and Braeburn Avenue. I think it would be much better to build a third entrance to the estate from the existing layby near the north end of the proposed development, which could be used as the access road for the whole western and central area of the development. If bollards prevented vehicles other than bicycles, buses and emergency vehicles from driving from the central area of the development was only linked to Charlotte/Braeburn Avenue, this would also prevent through-traffic and encourage residents to walk or cycle to school and local amenities, avoiding worsening parking problems around Gagle Brook School.2. While I applaud the homes being "True Zero Carbon", this is applied to the overall estate, not to individual homes. I would like to see the developer commit in writing to optimise the 'eco' features for each and every home and ensure that every property is carbon zero. For example, every home should maximise the solar cell coverage and use harvested rainwater as much as possible.3. I would like to see a formal requirement or condition, to ensure that the construction is at least as 'green' in terms of materials, emissions from suppliers, recycling, minimising road vehicle trips, etc. as per the Exemplar Phase. I would also like to see a commitment that binds any contractors or subcontractors to do the same and to ensure that solar panels generate electricity that is either exported into the grid or used on site as soon as they are fitted. EIA Section 14, states: "Scope 3 Emissions: 14.66 there is likely to be an indirect, temporary moderate adverse effect which is considered to be Significant, without mitigation. Recommended mitigation measures are outlined below in paragraph 14.77." . "14.77 Other recommended measures include procuring locally sourced materials, and requiring suppliers to report on annual Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions. The CEMP should also outline the management arrangements to reduce road vehicle trips, seek to reduce the number and length of construction related transport movements, and seek to reduce GHG emissions from vehicle movements through training and best construction and logistics practice."4. I would like to see Firethorn (during the construction phase) and then the occupants of the new houses pay money towards the maintenance of Charlotte and Braeburn Avenues, until they are both completely adopted. This would seem to be fair if residents (or contractors) need to travel upon these to get in/out of the development, while the maintenance is currently paid for by phase 1-4 residents.5. In the original plans for North-West Bicester, it was intended that every house would be within 400 metres of a bus stop - see the NW Bicester 2010 Transport Assessment, section 5.6 'Travel by Public Transport.' Since the Firethorn DAS (V5) states in a core principle of "the design of the built environment with an ageing population in mind" (p15), I was expecting this requirement to be maintained. However, from quick measurement on the proposed development's "Illustrative Masterplan", it appears that a large number of homes towards the west end of the site will be outside of 400 m range from the nearest potential (Braeburn Avenue) bus stop. This is in fact stated within 'ES Chapter 6 TRANSPORT.pdf' in clause 6.105 - where it states that only "the majority" of homes would be within 400 m. In "Connecting Oxfordshire Volume 8 Part ii", the Bicester Area Strategy outlines 4 key aims for Bicester with respect to

the county, including: "BIC1 - Improve access and connections between key employment and residential sites and the strategic transport system." It seems to me that the estate road layout has not been designed with best bus routing options considered: I would ask that this be reviewed, to see if it could be improved. For example: could the road through this section become a 'spine road' and link to the B4100 via a new exit at what is currently a parking area, just at the end of Phase 4? - this might resolve vehicle traffic issues, and also allow a bus route within 400 m of every home. I would also note that, as it stands, the proposed development actually makes no attempt to contribute to the transport system in NW Bicester, at all. Will the developer make a commitment to contribute towards the future running of the E1 bus service, as the developer of Elmsbrook has done? 6. The consultation documents don't appear to commit to whether or not the proposed development will be part of the existing district heating system. The district heating system was developed based on the assumption that the whole of north-west Bicester would use it and presumably the district heating system will only achieve the full benefits for the environment if it is working at full capacity. If significant parts of the development do not use the district heating system, it will mean that the whole development will not be as efficient as it could be. I would like to see a condition made that Firethorn must work with the DHS on the Exemplar Phase (and either use it as is or improve it) such that the true optimum benefits are brought to all. 7. The DAS states an objective of "Ensuring appropriate treatment of the eastern extent of the Site, providing some separation from St Laurence's Church and Home Farm and allowing for view towards the Church itself." However, the eastern area of the development will unavoidably restrict the view of the church from some houses and parts of Charlotte Avenue/Braeburn Avenue. 8. How will the building work minimise disruption to wildlife (particularly hares, deer and badgers)? Hares are quite commonly seen in the fields around Elmsbrook but were not mentioned as being among the wildlife that was identified in the survey. I think this requires further study. 9. Would it be feasible to build the footpath alongside the wood before the central area is developed? I can't see any reason why not, and this would immediately be of great benefit to local residents. 10. Furthermore, could the proposed footpaths be connected to the footpath to Bucknell early in the building process, and could the developer commit to strimmer the footpath beyond the development to make the footpath easier to walk? This would allow NW Bicester residents to walk to The Trigger Pond pub in Bucknell, for example. This would be a nice 'up front' gesture, bearing in mind the disturbances Elmsbrook residents will endure once construction commences! 11. It appears that the main road in/out of the central/western parts of the development is through what is now a hedge, which will mean that part of the hedgerow will be lost. It is also unclear whether there will be sufficient good visibility at that junction without having to lose any more of the hedgerow. Please can this be addressed, holistically along with other comments regarding the road access points?

Received Date

29/06/2021 16:24:03

Attachments