

# Comment for planning application 21/03267/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	21/03267/OUT
<b>Location</b>	OS Parcel 0006 South East Of Baynards House Adjoining A43 Baynards Green
<b>Proposal</b>	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
<b>Case Officer</b>	David Lowin
<b>Organisation Name</b>	
<b>Name</b>	James Cridland
<b>Address</b>	Fransann Cottage,48 Greenway,Caulcott,Bicester,OX25 4NF
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>The justification by the applicants for this development appears at first glance to be very well reasoned on economic and other bases. However, there are many reasons why it should not and cannot be approved. It cannot be reasonably argued that this development has benefit for the vast majority of people who will be affected by it. Junction 10 has been through several redesigns over the years; none have successfully addressed the bottleneck that causes major delays not just to those using the M40/ A43 but also the up- and down-stream roads and villages nearby (not least the B4100). The extra traffic caused within a several mile radius will undoubtedly diminish the quality of life of residents as well as road users, which has been diminishing already as a result of increased built space at Bicester, Heyford Park and other developments. As other objectors have pointed out, there are many other freight yards and storage facilities within a very short distance already - along with others in the pipeline including the proposed development to the East of Heyford Park, less than 2 miles South West - hence it is difficult to see any urgent need for it. There will be a large number of extra vehicle movements for freight purposes; public transport will not be able to offset the increased car journeys required for staff movements, as there is no direct route to the site from any large conurbation, hence this will further increase the carbon burden. In light of the legally binding climate commitments made by this country at COP21, and the recent terrifying projections as to how far wide of these commitments we are 7 years later, any non-critical development that cannot demonstrate carbon neutrality should be denied. While the site may sit next to two main roads, the loss of it to development of any kind will represent further erosion of the rural environment and agricultural land. There are many other reasons. But in essence the development goes against both the spirit and the letter of many categories of the National Planning Policy Framework - a framework designed to strike the right balance between economic growth and quality of life for the general public - as well as common sense. I very much hope it will be rejected.</p>
<b>Received Date</b>	03/11/2022 17:03:44
<b>Attachments</b>	