

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 | |
| Name | Steve Procopiou |
| Address | 3 Wintergreen Fields, Bicester, OX27 8BG |
| Type of Comment | Objection |
| Type | neighbour |
| Comments | <p>I wish to object to this planning application on the following grounds. 1. Firethorn appear to be trying to avoid the principle of building zero carbon housing. This makes a mockery of the whole Ecotown strategy and should not be permitted. 2. The developer is understating the impact of the extra traffic that will be generated by the new development. In particular, VTP assumes that people using the train will either walk or cycle. This is nonsense. Bicester North is a good 30 minutes on foot and Bicester Village station is around 45 minutes. There aren't continuous cycle tracks to either station, and the final part of the journey to Bicester Village is on busy roads with poor junctions. It is possible to get to the stations by bus, but the E1 doesn't connect to any trains and the 505 is a very limited service. Neither runs on a Sunday and the last bus is at around 7pm, so people will inevitably travel there by car. 3. VTP's traffic estimates include an allowance for passengers in a car/van - adjusted share 13.1%. While residents will car share, including this in the overall percentages incorrectly reduces the number of car journeys. The figure should be removed to get a more realistic estimate. 4. There should be no vehicle access from the new development onto Charlotte or Braeburn Avenue. The roads around the school are chaos at leaving time, with cars parked all around and parents thinking that they have priority over anything else on the road. Some parents living within 200 yards of the school drive there to take and collect their children. Adding access to houses 800 yards away will only exacerbate the problem. And despite the bus only signs, cars regularly use the bus lane in both directions now so that will also get worse. The temporary access points from the B4100 and the layby should be made permanent and the access points from Charlotte and Braeburn should not be built. 5. In VTP's response to Bicester BUG (VTP 1 of 3 5.7.3 and Figure 5.1), they claim that there is no bus stop on the Eastern side of the B4100. Had they rotated the Google Streetview by 180 degrees, they would have seen another bus stop on a lamppost in front of direction sign. As BUG says, access is along the grass verge (and under the sign). If this lack of attention to detail is typical of VTP's approach, can we rely on the rest of their projections? 6. Existing residents of Elmsbrook currently pay service charges to A2Dominion. Adding access to Elmsbrook to an additional 530 homes will inevitably result in higher service charges, yet there appears to be no process proposed to mitigate these extra costs. 7. In the document "Development Parameters Schedule and Plans" the Site Location Plan (page 15) shows a small extension to the application boundary, defined as "Other land under the applicant's ownership". This enables the footpaths from the Southern part of the Eastern section to join to the existing paths, avoiding the need to have further access points between that section and the existing development. On subsequent plans, this extension is not shown. It should be included in the overall application.</p> |
| Received Date | 23/12/2021 09:36:09 |
| Attachments | |