

# 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>	Rob Fellows
<b>Address</b>	8 Tayberry Close, Bicester, OX27 8AU
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour

**Comments**

I would like to Object to the application as it stands, due to some of the critical details which have appeared in this update or remain from the initial application submission. Thank you, so much, for reading this, and listening to all of the points raised by local residents. Firstly, I would like to raise the issue of True Zero Carbon house builds, as per Elmsbrook homes. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 clearly states: "Any development proposals as part of the Eco Town scheme should ensure the below: Land North West of Bicester Transport and Access 31036/A5/ES2021 April November 2021 - A zero-carbon development as defined in the Eco Towns PPS and Eco Bicester One Shared Vision." along with: "Policy Bicester 1 ensures that the Eco Town scheme will be designed as an exemplar which incorporates best practice and provides a showcase for sustainable living." .and: "All proposals for development across the Eco Town site will be required to meet the Eco Town development standards set out in Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco Town and make a degree of contribution towards transport mitigation measures." Similarly, the North West Bicester Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) "sets out the minimum standards to be achieved by proposed development across the Eco Town. It is encouraged that developers exceed these standards where possible and will be expected to apply new higher standards that arise" Therefore, it is extremely worrying to read the Financial Viability Assessment summary, stating that True Zero Carbon home building would be a non-viable option - and that this, and many other points (which crop up throughout the update docs, such as the Local Services contributions) are now the subject of a future viability assessment meeting with the Council. It gives the impression that the developers are suggesting that the additional eco features - those necessary to ensure NW Bicester Ecotown could meet Zero Carbon estate-wide in the future - are hoped to be "removed from scope" - despite being such a core principle/requirement - presumably citing the rise in cost of materials and their supply chains in 2021, due to covid/Brexit, as the main reason? Yet - according to building industry insiders - the impacts of this are likely to resolve during 2022. Has this been acknowledged and factored in? If the Council were to allow this, it would set a damaging precedent - for future parts of NW Bicester Ecotown, and for all future housing developments - by implying that energy usage (and its wider reaching impacts on e.g. climate change) is waivable. What further concessions might then be sought, by any developer? Secondly, I wish to highlight the Objections which are raised in the review document responses from the Elmsbrook Residents' Traffic and Parking Group and the Bicester Bike Users' Group. Both indicate that the scheme, as-proposed, still falls far short of providing adequate infrastructure for cars (electric and otherwise!), bikes and pedestrians; and the traffic impact analysis issues have simply not been addressed by the new Technical Note - in fact, yet more flaws are highlighted. I believe this is all resolvable - I have done my best to assist by sharing information with some of the parties involved, and would gladly provide further support, if I can, and if such would be wanted. But the implication of the actual traffic levels, when the much lower modelled ones will create "moderate" congestion, is that it would actually create very "severe" congestion - and I would note that this not only goes against all sane planning principles, it also goes completely against the Eco ethos of the estate, as traffic congestion will only increase local pollution levels. Thirdly, I note that the proposal still intends to develop buildings up to and over the Masterplan's stated maximum height of 12m. The maximum height of the nearest buildings on Phases 3 and 4, and in particular the closest row at the end of Phase 2, are 9m tall at the maximum - therefore, it would be unfair on these homes and visually incongruous if anything close to them reaches more than 9 metres height. Furthermore, it appears that the proposed number of homes will also increase the

population density in this part of the Ecotown - again, this goes against the Masterplan, which describes how the housing density should decrease as the development moves away from Lords Lane/the Ring Road (as happens across the phases on Elmsbrook). Finally, I would like to add my voice to all the points others have raised, particularly one which is almost outside the scope of the applicant, but crucial nonetheless: regarding the future of the District Heating System - this must be made right, for existing Elmsbrook and all future homes connecting to it - and there seems to be a tragic lack of acknowledgement that it is not currently being run as it was designed to be, as an end-to-end system: it seems very likely that designing the future wider-coverage system would need an accurate assessment of the true operations, rather than the design theory, in order to avoid risking significant heating issues for all homes - i.e. regarding a guarantee that existing temperatures will be maintained at existing costs to ensure that existing homes continue to receive an adequate heating and hot water supply. I implore the Council to do what it can: to relay this information to the parties concerned with the future system development, and so enable the best performing future system: one that can act as a model for future ecotowns, rather than issues being swept under the carpet (as it currently is). Thank you.

**Received Date**

23/12/2021 10:06:47

**Attachments**