

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	Bradley Cross
Address	11 Tarragon Terrace,Bicester,OX27 8FS
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I wish to object to this updated application, as I did previously in July 2021. The updated submission simply does not satisfy the concerns previously raised by Elmsbrook residents. NW Bicester is an Ecotown, yet this application asks to avoid the cost of building True Zero Carbon homes. This is completely unacceptable and undermines the work already done and that the residents of Elmsbrook are trying to upkeep. If their scheme isn't viable with a True Zero Carbon build, someone else will soon propose one that is - the "eco principles" stipulated by the Masterplan should not be abandoned and cannot be with clear conscience for the future of the planet/environment! The updated application does not clearly or accurately show that the traffic impact of the development will not be severe. Furthermore i feel it is being ignored at the expense and the safety of the residents of Elmsbrook. Tthe roads on Elmsbrook could not support the traffic levels which 530 extra homes would add to them, nor is there any evidence to argue this. The strange anomalous results seem to be explained as "because the model says so" - surely a model which could be trusted would not give so many unrealistic results and should be peer reviewed by multiple experts? The road bottlenecks in the estate are not mentioned or dealt with properly, which are already a safety hazard for residents. I wish to continue to object to this application, until the very serious matter of an accurate assessment of future traffic flows has been undertaken. We already see queues and delays on the B4100 and Charlotte Avenue at morning rush hour that are longer than predicted for 2031! This should be investigated and plans put in place to rectify. The two junctions would be significantly overwhelmed at peak times, and the whole community would suffer the impacts. The report says simulations are used because they could not do a traffic survey - but Mode Transport did a traffic survey for Elmsbrook, in September 2021 - this data could be used/extrapolated from. I am concerned at the mention of modifications to the District Heating System - when all phases of Elmsbrook have had heating issues showing that the end-to-end system design is flawed: this needs to be assessed properly by the consultants involved, before they re-design based on bad information! Just recently wc 13.12.21 the entire community lost hot water and heating for almost 24 hours, this cannot be allowed to happen and certainly must be reviewed and rectified before additional homes could be at risk. There is a lack of any detail regarding provision of Local Services - as previous objections pointed out. There is no mention of the viability of Waste Water infrastructure being checked: we have had sewage coming out of drains on several occasions on Elmsbrook, despite attempts to solve known issues. REFERENCES: The application's docs are here: https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Planning/Display/21/01630/OUT Financial Viability Assessment executive summary (NB: the rest of these are individual document links): https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Document/Download?module=PLA&recordNumber=145547&planId=1780638&imageId=45&isPlan=False&fileName=Land%20at%20North%20West%20Bicester%20-%20FVA%20NonTechnical%20Executive%20Summary%281%29.pdf - see especially points 2.8 onwards, on pages 3-7. Transport Assessment and Traffic Impacts - Parts 1 and 3 of the Technical Note: https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Document/Download?module=PLA&recordNumber=145547&planId=1785074&imageId=40&isPlan=False&fileName=211123%20-%20TN003-Velocity%20Consultation%20ResponsesPart%201%20of%203.pdf - see sections 3 and 6 (esp. pages 17-18 and 27-31). https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Document/Download?module=PLA&recordNumber=145547&planId=1785076&imageId=23&isPlan=False&fileName=211123%20-%20TN003-Velocity%20Consultation%20ResponsesPart%203%20of%203.pdf - see Attachment 7, esp. section 4.4 pages 18-20. (The reference in this can be found via the link below - see pages 10-11, esp. 3.6, for why their extrapolation cannot be used as intended - and NB the bottlenecks are less than 4.1 m, meaning two cars cannot safely pass. https://www.bradford.gov.uk/Documents/Hard%20Ings%20Road%20improvement%20scheme/3%20Public%20Inquiry%20Documents/Core%20Bundle/004%20-%20DMRB/TA%2079%2099%20-%20Traffic%20Capacity%20Of%20Urban%20Roads,%20Vol%205,%20Section%201,%20Part%203.pdf) Connection to the DHS and Local Services comments can be found in here: https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Document/Download?module=PLA&recordNumber=145547&planId=1785086&imageId=30&isPlan=False&fileName=31036%20A3%20HL%2021%2011%2023%20Letter%20CFord%20-%20FINAL%20DRAFT.pdf - see page 2, second bullet point; and middle of page 5. Thames Water's previous response is here: https://planningregister.cherwell.gov.uk/Document/Download?module=PLA&recordNumber=145547&planId=1716229&imageId=190&isPlan=False&fileName=From%281%29.pdf - see especially Water Comments, page 2.</p>
Received Date	20/12/2021 07:19:15
Attachments	