

Comment for planning application 21/01630/OUT

Application Number	<input type="text" value="21/01630/OUT"/>
Location	<input type="text" value="Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2 Caversfield"/>
Proposal	<input type="text" value="Outline planning application for up to 530 residential dwellings (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	<input type="text" value="Caroline Ford"/>
Organisation Name	<input type="text" value="Farrah Ching"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="6 Sage Street,Bicester,OX27 8DE"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<input type="text" value="I object to this application and am disappointed to see that the updated Firethorn documents failed to address the key issues raised in the previous consultations. I am very concerned that Firethorn was asking to get away with violating the Bicester Econ Town Design Principle regarding Zero Carbon homes based on the lofty 'justification' of making their desired profit. I am also alarmed by their erroneous assessment of traffic impact and the foreseeable real-life dangers it would pose if the application, as it stands, was to go ahead. To start with, there was a blatant disregard of the Council's Eco Town plans. Instead a 'financial viability assessment' was put forward to 'justify' building cheaper homes without meeting the 2025 New Homes laws and Zero Carbon requirements. Even more astoundingly, the 'justification' made was also based on flawed assumptions, i.e., the overestimation of land purchase value and bleak sales revenue projections. And perhaps the failure to provide details of joining the District Heating System could be seen as just another example of the developer's lack of commitment to the Eco Town Design Principle? Another serious issue concerns the inaccurate and unrealistic assessment of traffic impact with reference to the objections based on actual traffic surveys. While how the new figure was calculated remains a mystery (without any explanation provided), it is obvious that the analysis has shown the WRONG section of Charlotte Avenue. It was therefore not too surprising to jump to the misguided conclusion that the traffic impact of the extra 530 homes on the Charlotte and Braeburn bottlenecks was manageable. As residents, we can clearly see that the proposed traffic lights on the B4100/Charlotte Avenue junction would NOT solve the problem without building a new junction onto B4100."/>
Received Date	<input type="text" value="21/05/2022 15:19:54"/>
Attachments	