

# Comment for planning application 21/03266/F

Application Number	21/03266/F
Location	OS Parcel 2636 NW Of Baynards House Ardley
Proposal	Site clearance, construction of new site access from the B4100, permanent and temporary internal roads, an internal roundabout and a foul drainage station, diversion of an existing overhead power cable and public right of way, and soft landscaping
Case Officer	David Lowin
Organisation	
Name	Paul Buckle
Address	2 The Close,Stoke Lyne,Bicester,OX27 8RZ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Dear Sir / Madam Please accept this formal objection to the planning application reference 21/03266/F on the following grounds: The application for "Site clearance, construction of new site access from the B4100, construction of permanent and temporary internal roads including a bus layby and a foul drainage station, diversion of an existing overhead power cable and public right of way, and soft landscaping" is being sought in in parallel to two other applications 21/03268/OUT and 21/03268/OUT and is fundamental to the other two but is intrinsically part of the same project. On this basis, the objections put forward are directly linked to those of the previous objections submitted by me against the other two. Policy and sustainability During the construction of the M40 and subsequent expansion of the A43, there were clear statements presented indicating that these projects were created as transport corridors and not development corridors. The planning application is for distribution centres. These generally employ low paid staff in roles that have limited development potential. The Government's ambition is for a high tech, high wage economy. This is at odds with the published industrial policy currently in place. Furthermore, these distribution centres help boost the gig economy, which by definition undermines the high street economy, small businesses and start ups in the retail sector. Oxfordshire and the immediate areas in Northamptonshire and Buckinghamshire are low unemployment areas. The last published statistics of unemployment rates as a percentage of the population show that the rate of unemployment in Cherwell is both lower than the average for Oxfordshire and lower than the national average - there is therefore no need to create employment opportunities where there is no identified need. These sites would therefore likely attract employees from beyond the local area undermining the government's own policy of encouraging employers to source locally to help lower the carbon footprint and reduce traffic congestion. This proposal would act against both of these policy elements as well as contravene what the employment data is currently telling us. This proposal also undermines the Government's environmental policies in using arable land currently in use for food production and with a substantial impact on local communities and local wildlife. The Government's own policy is that exceptional circumstances need to be proven for development to take place in open countryside. It also contradicts the agreements the Government signed up to in the recent COP 26 climate summit. Bicester and the surrounding areas, to the south at 'Bicester Gateway', to the east at 'Symmetry Park Bicester M40 J9' and to the North East at Axis Junction 9. Older developments which are, and have been extended, include outlets at Charbridge Lane, Telford Road and Launton Road, and on the A41 near Ambrosden. All of these have been constructed on open countryside. This application would, in my view, exceed the justified use of open countryside for this purpose and is, potentially, an alarming breach of the 'exceptional circumstances' required for planning permission to be granted for similar projects. The businesses that have moved into these recent developments have left vacant sites, as yet undeveloped or reemployed. This clearly suggests that the development model is not one that increases economic activity, merely moves it from existing industrial parks to new developments that destroy open countryside. Finally, the local infrastructure is now struggling under the added pressure. The roads near the proposed development are already regularly at a stand still as are local services. The existing road network, in particular the B4100 leading to Baynards Green Roundabout and the Roundabout cannot cope at present with the traffic - there are at present regular and lengthy queues on the A43 on either side of the Baynards Green - and would not cope with the increase in traffic. The proposed site is not accessible via sustainable transport other than from Stoke Lyne and Baynards Green. There are no cycle lanes nor public transport routes that could feed travel to the site safely and or effectively.</p>

There have been several fatalities on the B4100 in recent years, at least one involving a cyclist. The proposed site is not allocated for employment use or any other use other in the Cherwell local plan. There approximately 52 hectares of allocated employment land in the district for which planning permission has not yet been sought. Surely these areas should be developed before unallocated land is considered for development. It is our opinion that this region has already developed more than it's fair share of Cherwell's commitment to planning approvals in support of Government policy and proposals. The population in the region has low employment and would likely benefit from improvements to education rather than the provision of low skill, low tech and low paid jobs. Damage to the environment and countryside The countryside in this area is in balance between the wildlife, farming and local residents. There will be considerable loss of habitat by way of wildlife corridors and hedgerows, both of which, the government has acknowledged are in decline to the detriment of our environment. The food chain for local wildlife is affected at every step. For example, grass verges provide habitats for small mammals that in turn feed raptors. Insects and invertebrates, sources of food for birds and some mammals, depend on the grasslands for food. These elements of the ecosystem are supposed to be protected by Government policy and should be respected, particularly when considering the promises the Government signed up to at the recent COP 26 Summit. Food production for humans is essential particularly as populations increase and other regions of the world lose their ability to produce food because of climate change. Food production, alongside water, are considered to be the most likely reasons for conflict for future generations. Flood risk assessment (noted in the Environment Agency's response) indicates that the development in the proposed location will increase the risk of flooding. I note that the only floodplain in the Stoke Lyne area parish was drained in the 1970s (with substantial loss of species) and that this increased the flood risk in Buckingham to the extent that flood protection had to be built in Buckingham. Light pollution has a detrimental and sometimes fatal impact on wildlife. The proposed development will require lighting during the hours of darkness, without interruption, notwithstanding the noise and light emissions from the heavy and smaller vehicles that will enter and egress the sites continually. Increases in light pollution, noise and activity are elements linked to the deterioration of mental health. The area is currently dark at night and the proposed development will likely illuminate the surrounding area affecting local wildlife and the local environment. The increase in traffic, assumed to be almost continuous, at the proposed site, will increase the amount of noise and pollution from vehicles operating at the site and those entering and departing from the site. The pollution will be most likely blown towards Stoke Lyne as the prevailing wind is generally aligned with Stoke Lyne from the position of the proposed site. A reduction in air quality is, I believe, contrary to the governments objectives as poor air quality is directly linked to respiratory diseases such as COPD and asthma. The proposed site is in open countryside and is not suitable for this type of large industrial development. The proposal suggests that the countryside is already obstructed by the A43 and M40. I think this to be inaccurate, and will, if the system allows the upload of documentation (else it will be posted to the CDC offices), provide photographic evidence that demonstrates that from any number points in Stoke Lyne, there is an uninterrupted view of the countryside well beyond Ardley and Fritwell. Indeed, some of these photographs were taken to intentionally include moving Heavy Goods Vehicles (including articulated lorries) on the B4100 along the perimeter of the proposed site as well as the A43. Assuming the average height of such a vehicle is 4 -5 metres, and the proposed buildings 23 metres, the photographs provide a very clear guide on how the gigantic buildings proposed by this application will obstruct the open countryside that is so intrinsic and valued in this region of the country. The visual intrusion and damage to the character of the area would be dramatic at best. The construction of such buildings near Stoke Lyne would be detrimental to the character of the village itself. It would impact unfavourably on the ambience surrounding St Peter's church and church yard, the former a Graded 2 - star building. As I understand it, there are at least 12 grade 2 listed buildings or structures in the immediate area (Information from Historic England) and the proposed structures would represent and adverse impact on the setting of a listed building and its surrounding environment. This area attracts a large number of ramblers from around the country as well as walkers from the local area. The bridle paths and footpaths are kept extremely well by the local farmers and estates. The local development will undermine this element of the local environment as it is noted that where these developments take place, adjoining paths become derelict, unkempt and a depository for rubbish. There are plenty of alternative brown sites in this country that would have a much lesser impact on our environment, wildlife, the wellbeing and mental health of the local residents. Other points to note There is an underlying feeling that the proposers have not engaged directly with the local residents. A more recently published proposal saw the majority of the residents receive a leaflet outlining the proposal. There does not appear to have been a similar level of engagement with Stoke Lyne residents. Yet there is mention of engagement with consultees in the form of retail outlets at the services station which is questionable as these businesses do not or are unlikely to represent the interests of the local population. Stoke Wood, which is just to the South of the proposed site is owned by the Woodland Trust. There is no reference to consultation with the Woodland Trust in relation to this proposal nor other interested

organisations whom we intend to contact, for example the Ramblers Association and English Heritage. There appear to be 7 residential properties that have been omitted from the maps and or references in the proposal. These include the two properties at the north East end of the village, Willowbrook, The Cottage, Swifts House, Swifts House Lodge, The Branch House, Piccadilly House and cottage. The cumulative impact of developments in the area, when taking into consideration the Dorchester new Town, the work to upgrade junction 10 of the M40 and proposals for a strategic rail/freight interchange at Ardley, are unacceptable and unsustainable by the local infrastructure and its residents. Conclusion The proposal appears to counter the national economic, environmental, sustainability and local planning policies. The potential damage in contrast to the perceived/suggested benefits is too high a cost for this planning application to be granted. I respectfully request that this application be turned down. Yours faithfully Paul Buckle

**Received Date**

31/01/2022 20:50:47

**Attachments**