

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	SARAH-JANE 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/OUT on the following grounds linked to my objections to planning proposals:- application number 21/03267/OUT: application number 21/03268/OUT: 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 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. Undermines 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</p> <p>https://www.theclimatecoalition.org/greenrecovery UK NATURE PROTECTION: Nature is a front line defence against climate impacts, including floods, and natural biodiverse ecosystems are more carbon rich and more resilient to climate impacts. Governments across the UK should put ambitious nature restoration targets in law. In England, delivery should include designating 30% of land and sea to be strongly protected and well managed for nature by 2030 and the creation of ambitious Nature Recovery Networks. Governments across the UK should increase native woodland cover, restore peatlands, wetlands and oceans and create more green space where people live; governments must also end burning of unsustainable bio-energy and help farming across the UK to be netzero and nature friendly by supporting agro-ecological food production and agro-forestry and introducing measures to significantly reduce pesticide and fertiliser application. PROTECT & RESTORE ECOSYSTEMS GLOBALLY: The UK must be at the forefront of efforts to halt and rapidly reverse the decline of biodiversity and nature globally, given nature's vital role in limiting catastrophic climate change and ensuring our future generations' ability to produce food, to have enough water, to remain healthy, and to thrive. The UK can lead the way by pushing for an ambitious and comprehensive Global Biodiversity Framework to restore habitats and species, supported by action plans, at COP15 of the Convention on Biological Diversity and at the final round of negotiations for a Global Ocean Treaty in 2021, and by introducing due diligence legislation to ensure commodities are only imported to the UK that are produced sustainably and do not drive deforestation, conversion of other ecosystems or human rights abuses. Bicester and the surrounding areas have been extended and 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 local infrastructure around Baynards Green 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. As a family we have to leave 30 minutes of our scheduled time in order to get our children to school in Brackely. We also have to wait in Brackley for the traffic to subside in order to make our return journey home to Stoke Lyne as the queues are 3 miles stacked back to the Cottisford exit on the southbound of the A43. The proposed site is not accessible via sustainable transport other than from Stoke Lyne and Baynards Green.</p>

There are no cycle lanes nor public transport routes that could feed travel to the site safely and or effectively. There have been several fatalities on the B4100 in recent years, at least one involving a cyclist. 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 and water 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. Light & noise 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. Mental Health issues - 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. Air quality - 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. 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 an 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 with our historic links to Flora Thompson and "Larkrise to Candleford". 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:- It is felt that the proposers have not engaged directly with the local residents of Stoke Lyne. 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 an ancient and medieval woodland, 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. Missing residential properties - there are 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. 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 SARAH-JANE BUCKLE

Received Date

10/02/2022 18:38:37

Attachments