

Comment for planning application 21/03267/OUT

Application Number	21/03267/OUT
Location	OS Parcel 0006 South East Of Baynards House Adjoining A43 Baynards Green
Proposal	Outline planning permission (all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of buildings comprising logistics (Use Class B8) and ancillary Office (Use Class E(g)(i)) floorspace and associated infrastructure; construction of new site access from the B4100; creation of internal roads and access routes; and hard and soft landscaping
Case Officer	David Lowin
Organisation Name	Colin Smith
Address	9 Hodgson Close, Fritwell, Bicester, OX27 7QB
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I strongly oppose this outline planning application for 280,000 sq. metres of warehousing. My concerns are: What is the business case and why is the land not part of any local Plan? The Land in question is not part of any Local Plan (e.g. Cherwell Local Plan 2040) so why should it be considered at all having not established by Planning Authorities the site is suitable for large-scale commercial development? The Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum (MCNP) raises a number of valid concerns in their objection response as do the affected Parish Councils on behalf of their residents. From the submissions made thus far to this outline planning there is an unproven demand for such a development As the pandemic eases, it is already evident from ONS data that on-line shopping is reducing making this development speculative at best. Significant warehousing capacity has recently been introduced around both Jct 11 M40 at Banbury and in Bicester that has not been occupied so again what's the justification for this? There is also the potential for the Oxfordshire Strategic Rail Freight Interchange less than 3 miles from the site (on the B430 adjacent to the Chiltern Railway line out of Ardley) of this application of up to 603,850 (!) square metres of distribution & logistics. The artist's impression of this site shows that the warehousing is larger than the footprint of the village Ardley with Fewcott (A-w-F). To have one of these developments in such rural settings is un-acceptable but two would be a disaster for A-w-F and Fritwell & the other local villages. Loss of Green Space, Biodiversity, rural outlook and significant increases in traffic congestion, light, noise & air pollution: There are major concerns from consultee organisations and individuals about the loss of Bi-Diversity. Off-setting to Piddlington is an insult to local (to the applied for development) village communities. Berks, Bucks & Oxon response to this application details their specific concerns for biodiversity losses which are very pertinent. The site is a rural green space - farmland - albeit carved in two by the A43 - why would concreting this over been seen as progress for an unsubstantiated business case? Such a warehouse facility would indeed most likely be a 24 x 7 operation with massive increases in both commercial vehicles and employee cars with the resulting increased congestion for surrounding local villages (Ardley, Fewcott, Stoke Lyne, Fritwell, Bucknell, Bainton, Hardwick, Hethe & others). Such a development would also increase noise light & air pollution. Employees for the businesses would most likely come from outside the immediate villages and therefore would increase traffic volumes to the Jct 10 hotspot, as Public transport in this area is virtually non-existent. Junction 10 of the M40, even with the millions spent upgrading it recently have shown it is still causing 15-30 minute delays in traversing the junction at peak times to or from the A43 even before such a development is built. Jct 10 has not & remains not fit for purpose. This also permeates back into increased volumes of traffic through local villages as noted by many objectors' responses. Lorry tip overs on the Northbound exit roundabout. whilst reduced are still evident and these cause major congestion to the whole surrounding area and back down the motorway. Water and Flooding concerns: Major concerns that flooding responses from CDC and the Local Flood Authority are little more than tick box inputs and that a bigger picture review by them on how such a development would impact flood wise on the surrounding villages, not just the site, should be sought with both Thames & Anglian Water. I can't believe that yet again Anglian Water deny that they have any responsibility for dealing with waste water in the area & Thames Water response echoes that the development site comes under Anglian Water for waste water. (This is exactly the same situation re Anglian Water/Thames Water + the tick box approach from the (Oxfordshire) Local Flood Authority and CDC that we find ourselves in Fritwell in regard of the 28 House Cala Development on the edge of Fritwell on CDC - 21/02180/REM Planning Application. There is no big picture</p>

thinking for the surrounding village/area when it comes to assessing the potential impact of surface water drainage flooding by the relevant statutory bodies.) Thames Water to it's credit also notes there are no water main or foul water connections to the site and requests a condition for this to be discussed formally prior to next stage planning. In conclusion I can't see the business case is anything more than speculative versus the harm/destruction it would do to the rural/greenspace and the quality of life (traffic, air pollution, loss of green space, wildlife, biodiversity) for residents of the surrounding villages. I object!

Received Date

23/04/2022 13:12:33

Attachments