

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	Jozsef SZELPAL
Address	70 Charlotte Avenue, Bicester, OX27 8AN
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Dear Decision-makers, Merry Xmas and Happy New Year! Here we are again, 3rd time but with a slightly different story. Firethorn... again.... And the story is peppered with ignorance, arrogance and greediness. I wish to object to this application for the following reasons: 1.) The traffic impact of the extra 530 homes - for Elmsbrook residents and potential residents of those future homes. The updated submission simply does not satisfy the concerns previously raised by Elmsbrook residents - it still ignores the bottlenecks - which limit flow to one-way, and slowing to give-way in turns - on both Charlotte and Braeburn Avenues. The junctions will be significantly overwhelmed at peak times, and the whole area and community will suffer the impacts. All the other issues previously noted, with unrealistically low traffic levels in the simulations compared to reality, and nonsense results, remain unresolved - but the bottleneck issue alone is enough to show the assessment can't be trusted. 2.) 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 Eco-town. 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 Eco-town requirements which would then be detrimental to the amenity existing residents have (and future NW Bicester residents should have too). 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! Furthermore, to better understand, I have a contract with SSE as an individual household with written parameters. Now this Firethorn company intend to interfere and alter my contract with SSE which could result of financial loss for me. If I receive lower temperature of water to heat my house, then I have to use more energy which is more expensive and financially unsustainable - not just for me, but other household too on this Eco-town estate. 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</p>

out of the proposed 530. Thank you very much for the opportunity to express my grave concerns. Hopefully this application again will be rejected with a very strong word of advise to Firethorn - Respect the rules and the Elmsbrook Community. Kind Regards, JS

Received Date

25/12/2021 21:22:29

Attachments