

# Comment for planning application 21/01630/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	21/01630/OUT
<b>Location</b>	Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2 Caversfield
<b>Proposal</b>	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
<b>Case Officer</b>	Caroline Ford
<b>Organisation Name</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Katy Soar
<b>Address</b>	23 Braeburn Avenue, Bicester, OX27 8BP
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I wish to object to this updated application. The updated submission simply does not satisfy the concerns previously raised by Elmsbrook residents. There are multiple issues with this application, including: 1/ In the executive summary of the Financial Viability Assessment, it states that to build the proposed homes to "True Zero Carbon" is non-viable. Yet this is Development Principle 2 of the NW Bicester SPD (see page 18, section 4.2.3 onwards) - i.e. one of the crucial founding principles of the Ecotown. It would be unacceptable for the proposed application to be allowed to break this, purely in order to get more homes built. The Developer is a commercial enterprise and if their financial model does not work, they need not build, others will do so. CDC should not compromise their ecotown requirements which would then be detrimental to the amenity existing residents have (and future NW Bicester residents should have too). 2/ The updated application does not adequately demonstrate that the traffic impact of the development will not be severe. In particular, the response to the issue of bottlenecks on Charlotte and Braeburn Avenues has used an extrapolation from a reference (DMRB TA 79/99) that does not actually allow for bottlenecks causing the flow to be "one way, in turn", nor for cars parked on roadsides. The figures are therefore not answering the question; and not accurate. There are also new examples of anomalous results in the update. The traffic impact analysis and trip generations are based on a model which traffic surveys and monitoring have shown to vastly underestimate the actual traffic levels; there has even been an official traffic survey in 2021 - yet this has not been used. As a result, the previous Objection still stands - that the quoted figures for junction flow rates will be significantly higher than the reports predict - and the true impact of 530 more homes being forced onto the existing network will be devastating for driver delays and queue lengths, against National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) principles. 3/ Connection to the District Heating System appears to now be the future plan, but Firethorn state that part of the solution involves the supply and return temperatures being reduced as a first step. As all Phases on Elmsbrook have experienced significant issues with their heating, such that the plumbing contractors are deliberately ignoring the System Designer's setup instructions - purely so that residents in many homes can get their homes warm enough to meet Building Regulations minimum temperatures for health/wellbeing, then we would suggest that any temperature reduction for all homes might cause further issues with homes not being warm enough. There appears to be a significant issue with the existing system, which has never been fully acknowledged and resolved - we would like to see a Condition applied that forces the consultants employed to actually assess the existing set up, from the homes' perspective, before making changes to what they think is implemented - because the original design isn't! 4/ Various residents' previous objections noted the lack of any new Local Services or linking up with/contributing to existing ones. There is nothing new provided in the Update: there is one comment which says Local Services are "to be considered as part of the viability assessment." We can only see the Executive Summary for the latter, which contains absolutely no mention of whether Local Service considerations (of any kind) have been included, or what they might be - so we can't assess this. But based on the above, it appears that nothing new is being added. 5/ Waste Water - the planning conditions proposed by Thames Water are not mentioned anywhere in the response, and do not appear to be enough: they seem to be an "agreement to agree" - potentially not strong enough for contract law, and we are concerned. There is no stipulation in the conditions recommended by Thames Water of even a feasibility study to determine the performance, delivery and financial viability of the drainage for homes beyond the 49th out of the proposed 530.</p>

**Received Date**

20/12/2021 11:35:21

**Attachments**