

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	Helen Fellows
Address	8 Tayberry Close, Bicester, OX27 8AU
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I wish to continue my Objection to this development as it is currently proposed in this update. However, if the issues raised by myself (below) and others are resolved and the application updated, I would be in support of the development. 1. The proposed development goes against Development Principle 2 because it is not True Zero Carbon. All houses in the ecotown area should be True Carbon Zero as per the masterplan. While I am pleased to see that the high-level summary re Climate Change states the Operational Phase will "target Zero Carbon", the Financial Viability Assessment concludes that True Zero Carbon is not financially viable. Letting a developer build unsustainable houses in an ecotown based on a Financial Viability Assessment cannot be allowed: it goes against the ethos and whole principle of the NW Bicester Ecotown. Issues with supply and prices should never allow developers to "get round" these fundamental points to maximise profits! 2. The proposed development will not even meet the minimum environmental standards that will be mandatory from 2025. If the proposed plans went ahead, the houses within the Firethorn "ecotown" sold in 2025-7 would be less environmentally friendly than the worst new houses available elsewhere. 3. 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. As I stated previously, I think it would be much better to build additional connection(s) to the wider road network, to aid keeping local traffic speeds slow but avoid any risk of serious congestion, danger to children and thus also reduce increasing local air pollution. 4. In my previous Objection, I wrote: "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, rainwater harvesting, solar panels, 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." I still don't see any conditions/requirements regarding materials sourcing or solar panel generation 5. I note there has been no attempt made to reconcile the Masterplan requirement for ALL homes to be within 400 m of a Bus Stop, with what is now briefly mentioned in points 6.117-6.118 of the "NWBicester ES Addendum" - that only MOST homes on the Western and Eastern Parcels of the proposed development would be. Is there no way that, perhaps also via additional junction(s) to access the proposed Parcels, this could not be achieved - at least in future when there is enough bus usage to require a second bus, which could go via a slightly different route? 6. I would like to repeat 3 unaddressed queries from my previous Objection: - 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." - 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 and very simple to achieve. - Furthermore, could the proposed footpaths be connected to the footpath to Bucknell early in the building process, and could the developer commit to trimmer 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 cheap and</p>

easy to achieve and a nice 'up front' gesture, bearing in mind the disturbances Elmsbrook residents will endure once construction commences! Thank you very much.

Received Date

23/12/2021 16:19:57

Attachments