

Introduction

1. Objection is taken to this ill-conceived, ill-planned and ill-thought through scheme, termed by the developers “Hawkwell Village”, but which in reality is as far removed from a ‘village’ as is possible to imagine and like much of the application is dressed up purposefully to deceive the reader and the planning committee into believing that the vast development on a green field site is some kind of benefit to the wider population, when it is little more than a thinly veiled attempt at creating a blob of urban sprawl with the sole aim of maximising the profits of the developers behind the plan, whilst systematically attempting to ride rough shod over proper planning, environmental and local impact considerations and stifling any form of proper informed investigation and consultation into its impact.
2. The planning committee should be under no illusions from the many thousands of words and colourful pretty graphics deployed in the developer’s planning application; this scheme, if granted planning permission, would lead to the destruction of wild life, fields, villages and a way of life in North Oxfordshire, which has survived many hundreds of years, through wars, recessions, and many changes in local and national politics, but would finally be sacrificed to the greed and self-interest of property development, for the sake of property development and seemingly based on a flawed ‘consultation’ process which if allowed to stand, would support a planning application by stealth, seemingly enacted by developers attempting to carry out a substantial further land grab as they expand their plans well beyond that originally envisaged in the “Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1)” and would be conducted by attempting to stifle proper consultation and investigation into the effect of the plans and stifling any proper debate of the impact of such wide ranging plans.

Lack of proper notice and/or consultation

2. Sadly, the notice procedure adopted by the developers for this proposed development and supposed “consultation” is deliberately woeful and does not comply with either planning law or indeed any form of open justice, but instead seemingly reflects an

underlying theme of this application of attempting to force these plans through ‘under the radar’ without any proper form of careful consideration of the impact of such vast development or any proper “consultation” of those impacted by it, at all.

3. The only notice that has been provided to the many thousands effected by these plans, was for a select few houses in Bucknell and a select few houses within the road immediately abutting the site in Bicester to be provided with a notice letter. Upon what criteria these specific addresses were chosen or why other addresses and people were excluded is totally unclear, but the provision of notes to only a small proportion of people effected, coupled with the odd small A4 notice on a field effected is simply improper and inadequate in both law and also simple principles of fairness.
4. The vast majority of Bucknell itself, almost all of Bicester and none of the outlying effected villages, such as Ardley (directly effected by the traffic from the project travelling up to Junction 10), Caversfield (effected directly by abutting the project and the roads effected), Middleton Stoney (effected by traffic routes) or large swathes of Bicester, directly affected by either overlooking or abutting the proposed site, or effected directly by the vast increase in traffic (in particular those living off the Bucknell Road down through the Highfields estate or those living in and off the A4095 in both directions) have been notified of this application OR given any opportunity to comment or be involved in the consultation.
5. With a proposed development of this vast size, it would have been proper and indeed proportionate to have all effected addresses in all effected areas directly notified and advertisements undertaken advertising the plan and directing people to local meetings, where the proposals could be properly set out and questions about the detail of the development provided.
6. Indeed, it would be common and proportionate on a proposed development of this size to have undertaken proper 3D modelling and detailed models of the proposed site, so all those potentially effected can be aware and of the extent of the proposals and make an informed decision and input to the consultation process. This has instead been deliberately lacking in the present application, which instead is made up of thousands

of words and vague outline maps describing concepts, but lacking any real detail of the proposals or any proper investigation into its impact.

7. To have not notified ALL properties within these areas and in particular Bucknell, means there can be no proper consultation process at all. Only a very small number of people directly or indirectly effected by these plans appear to have been provided notice of it at all, which given the proposed size and impact of this development is simply not lawful nor followed any of the concepts of open and proper consultation which underpin planning Law. It is difficult to know how anyone could object to something that they are totally unaware exists, or perhaps that was the aim?
8. Secondly, the 'consultation' is further defective because the notices which were provided are dated the 4th of January 2022. In fact, all of those who received them in the village of Bucknell received them on the 11th of January 2022 and were then given 14 days to try and put into writing a response to many hundreds of pages of planning application, which the developers no doubt (judging by dates) had months, going into years to develop. That creates an imbalance and an inequality of arms between those with the wealth of the developers backing, who have had years to refine and support their application, to present it and on the other hand, those of normal people, effected by this development who are either given no notice, or only 14 days in which to respond to many thousands of pages. That inequality of arms is not only potentially in breach of planning law, but is clearly opposed to the spirit of planning consultation with the community.
9. The process adopted means that not only have those effected not been notified, but those who have, have had a woefully short time, to be able to read, understand and digest the material promoted by one side, let alone have any sufficient time to marshal thoughts, arguments and objections.
10. In addition, the seemingly deliberate shortage of time to respond and no doubt the deliberate timing of this application and consultation, aimed at landing just after the festive period, has meant that there has been insufficient time to for Parish Councils or the town Council to arrange and hold meetings or discussions let alone presentations of what the plans will mean to those effected.

11. Further, the nature of the application, which again has to assume deliberately deploys a vast amount of verbiage and spin, but is very short in any actual detail, means that it is almost impossible to properly consider and discuss the likely effect and impact of these plans. For example, there are no details as to where access roads to the new site are to be situated and how such access roads will connect with the existing infrastructure (other than generalised dots on a map). There appears as an example to be a floating access road on the West of the site, somehow connecting with the main Bicester Road up to Bucknell and beyond that down to Howes Lane, going around the West of Bicester, but there is no detail as to how these roads are going to be connected.
12. There is no detail as to what the supposed 'buffer' areas will consist of and where, other than vague concepts that large parts near the village of Bucknell may contain burial areas (presumably a large cemetery), but the rest is left purposefully vague, being possible sports grounds. There is for example, environmentally, a vast difference between a 200-metre-wide section of wild woodland on the one hand and on the other Astro-turfed, flood lit, concreted sports fields, with access roads, changing rooms etc, at more or less the bottom of the gardens of houses in Bucknell. But the application other than some pretty and inaccurate 'concept' pictures, lacks any of the detail which one would expect for a proposed development of this size.
13. In addition, there appears to be inadequate investigations or any investigation at all, into the effect of such a project on transport and roads in the area, basic planning matters such as proper study into the increase in traffic through the local villages, has not been undertaken, nor the effect of concreting over vast swathes of animal habitat on the animals and plant life in the present area, let alone any studies or seeming modelling on the effects of light, sound and environmental pollution from the site.
14. In short the application is full of key phrases and words, which it is no doubt hoped will impress a planning committee or the surrounding population, but lacking in any proper detail or modelling which could allow any proper informed consultation of the people or proper consideration by a planning committee of the details of this proposal and/or its impact.

15. Until such defects as there are in the application itself, the application process and consultation process are properly remedied then the Application should not be allowed to proceed any further.

The need for development of the size proposed?

16. At present Bicester and the surrounding area is in the midst of a large number of different large building projects, including Elmsbrook, Graven Hill, the completion of Kingsmere, and in the wider area the development of Upper Heyford and many others. These projects in combination have and are delivering many thousands of houses, yet there has been no pause to consider the impact that these projects are already having on the area, the economy of the area, the standard of living, the housing needs and infrastructure and utilities OR importantly any consideration of what they are likely to have on the infrastructure of Bicester and the surrounding area, now that a number of these developments are operating, nor their effect on the housing market and housing stock.
17. A basic check on open-source material shows that there are hundreds of these properties on new estates which remain unsold and remain unsold for long periods, which indicates that there is simply not the market for many thousands more houses built to a very similar specification to the mass which are already on the market. Neither this present proposal and planning application nor those already under development avoid suffering from the same fundamental problem, as none deals with the level or type of housing which is actually required (first time/social), nor does it deal with where precisely it is needed, nor does it actually have any plans for work creation or business/industry use.
18. The fundamental basis for any proposed development of this scale is whether there is firstly a recognised need for the size and type of development that is proposed and for it to be needed in the place where it is proposed it should be developed. Unfortunately, that is a need that can only be assessed properly on a unique development by development basis and at the time when the development is applied for, not relying purely on housing needs for a whole County, carried out years before.

19. The size, style and position of the proposed development is simply not justified. The wider planning needs and concepts encapsulated in the Oxfordshire plan, envisaged mixed use of developments, with employment and business being provided locally to support jobs for those in the housing, alongside the provision of social space, shops, education and medical provision. None of that is catered for in the present application or seemingly any consideration given to the impact of simply ‘dumping’ 3,100 households on the edge of an all ready heavily developed old Market Town, which has aging infrastructure and has lost many of its amenities, from the failing of the High Street, to the closure of the local Magistrates Court.
20. The constant provision of vast warehouses around Bicester, as presently appears to be the development plan, does not provide much if any real long-term employment and certainly for the space consumed, are very poor providers of job creation or self-sufficiency. Which in turn means that every single one of the new proposed 3100 households (or approximately 7,440 people – using purely average UK household size data, but approx 13,600 based on size of properties in development and the average children in the socio-economic group which the application is aimed at), will all have to have employment out of the area, due to the lack of superstores and proper shopping, it will in turn be a necessity for all of the proposed households to commute, to work, shops and even education, which in turn causes further strain on the now inadequate transport infrastructure of North Oxfordshire.
21. The provision of education, schools, play areas, countryside for the Children of this project has simply not been thought through or properly assessed and the present proposals run contrary to the ethos of the Oxfordshire Local plan and that of the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan.
22. Of those 3100 properties proposed, some 7,440 occupants (based on national average for socio-economic group the development is aimed at of 2.4 children per household) will be Children. Simply having a pre-existing “Gagle Brook Primary School” (capacity 210), which was forced to be adopted as part of the Elmsbrook planning application, will do nothing to be able to cater for the primary, secondary and then tertiary needs of the thousands of children who will be housed in the present vast extensions to Bicester (including the already permitted extension to the area directly

around the school), let alone the introduction of in excess of 7,000 more children in this proposal.

23. The problems around schooling, but also providing Children with things to do such as sport and play areas, let alone fields and woods to play in, have simply not been properly considered in the present plan at all and will have a vast knock on effect on other areas such as transport, as the movement of many thousands of children to different areas of Bicester for education will have a knock on effect on the amount of traffic using various connecting roads at various times and in turn will have a massive impact on those living close to the development or roads leading from the development but also those who are presently using school facilities in Bicester (none of which have been made aware, let alone consulted upon the impact to them of increased road use or increasing school sizes) or those effected by existing school traffic at existing schools.
24. But the point in relation to infrastructure, work, schooling, transport, water, is that no one has allowed the mass of construction of the last decade in and around Bicester and the subsequent vast expansion of Bicester itself, to actually bed down and to be able to assess properly the future impact and whether the infrastructure can actually cope with what is being developed presently before considering introducing another vast swathe of housing, with totally unknown consequences and potentially unforeseen consequences.

Transportation

25. As set out above, the present plans lack the required detail or indeed any form of proper coherent modelling as to the likely effect of the vast increase in vehicles on the transport and infrastructure in and around Bicester and the surrounding villages for any proper assessment of the impact of this plan to be concluded.
26. On average in the UK there are 1.2 cars per household, however, the socio-economic group that this development is clearly aimed at (and indeed the previous developments of Elmsbrook, Kingsmere and Upper Heyford were targeted at) according to the national statistics will be those in the 7th decile group upwards (i.e. the top 30% of those earning in the UK) where the average car ownership is closer to 2 vehicles per

household (although fortunately for the developers the average of large vehicles such as caravans or campervans is lower, although still not catered for in these plans). Meaning that this one development alone is likely to contribute a further 6,200 cars to the local roads.

27. 6,200 further vehicles on the already creaking A4095 Bicester ring road, the rat run of the Bicester Road up to and through Bucknell to Ardley, Junction 10 and beyond, the B4100 up to Baynards Green and the A43 and the A4421 across to Buckingham and Milton Keynes, Howes Lane across to Junction 9, the Middleton Stoney Road up to the A34 and Oxford and the A41 to Aylesbury and up to and including Junction 9, would mean that these roads, which at peak times are often in complete gridlock, would completely collapse.
28. The developers are clearly aware that the devastating and detrimental impact of so many additional cars is unarguable and would be catastrophic on the local infrastructure and instead attempt to counter this argument, rather than undertaking modelling of the impact of past developments and their actual car usage / ownership and model that against the predicted vehicular use of this project, instead the developers in their application blithely claim that few of the proposed household will need to use vehicles, as there will be public transport and cycle routes.
29. Such a concept is not only fanciful but has been proved to be wrong on the historical developments in and around Bicester and beyond, where similar promises were made at the planning stage.
30. In addition, as with every other recent project, there is the inbuilt suggestion that vehicle ownership will be discouraged by not providing garages and alike.
31. Frankly such arguments are utter nonsense in reality. The development will be some considerable distance from the train stations in the centre of Bicester and 'public transport' in the form of buses from the estate to the train stations, are infrequent, slow and impracticable for any one such as those with a trade to get between non-fixed work areas often with tools and equipment.

32. As a result, what will happen in reality will be that the households are forced to have at least two vehicles to transport occupants to work and / or school / shopping / commute. As years go on and those living on these estates change from the original purchasers, history shows that the new occupiers start to develop the housing to suit their needs and their needs will be to have parking and space for vehicles, caravans and alike (the nation will not suddenly stop using vehicles or caravans) and as such they will tarmac over gardens to form drives, if no parking is provided, they will simply park on pavement and roads (as there will be no enforcement on a privately owned estate) and /or add further garage space in gardens and front rooms.
33. On a practical example, if any of the planning committee is any doubt about car usage in supposed 'eco' estates, then one only has to travel through Elmsbrook (although still in its early stages) and therefore still not in second and third generation ownership, where the initial ideals of a scheme start to ebb away, or perhaps more accurately Kingsmere and Upper Heyford and slightly older and a better example, the Garden Quarter in Caversfield or Bure Park and see the mass of vehicles which travel through them at peak times and originate from them or look at examples further afield, such as the 'eco' estates in Milton Keynes which were developed with the concept of non-vehicular ownership, but which a decade or so on have proved to be developed on a completely false premise.
34. The reality is that no development can successfully manipulate, let alone force its future occupants to not use their own vehicles. As such this plan has to be considered realistically that it will add in excess of another 6,200 vehicles to the roads of Bicester and North Oxfordshire.
35. Although there has been, it would seem purposefully on the part of the developers no modelling undertaken to show the planning committee and indeed the public the effect of such vehicular increase on the surrounding roads. The reason of course why such proper modelling is absent, is that the results would be predictably horrifying. I would urge the committee, if they are in any doubt about its impact, to travel through Bicester and the surrounding area at peak times, to see how the present level of traffic (even with the slow build-up of traffic after a global pandemic) is having.

36. During rush hour or weekends when Bicester Village is at its busiest, the centre of Bicester and its access roads (with the traffic calming measures allowing access to only one carriage at a time on the Buckingham and Banbury Roads into Bicester from the North) is gridlocked. It can take 30 minutes to cross from one side of the town to the other. Junction 9 to the M40, which was envisaged in the Oxfordshire plan and Cherwell local plan as being developed to the extent that it would ease traffic congestion, has in fact had the opposite effect and the queue to get onto the roundabout above Junction 9 will often lead to tailbacks of 10-15 minutes or more during summer and peak times.
37. The present problems and vehicular carnage throughout Bicester is soon to be exacerbated by the coming onto line of further developments to the South of Bicester and the further expansion of Bicester Village, with its overflow car parks as far away as RAF Bicester, in Caversfield, to the north of the town.
38. The A34 to and from Oxford and fed directly by Bicester traffic is now at a standstill back to Kiddlington junction most mornings and evenings and when, as had happened pre-pandemic at least 6 times a year (and up to 2019 was increasing year on year), the M40 becomes blocked and traffic is funnelled through Bicester (giving a good idea of what an extra 6,000 vehicle movements looks like) the whole of Bicester enters a massive gridlock in all directions as the roads infrastructure simply collapses and stops functioning. Cars attempt to funnel away from the gridlocked main roads into the surrounding estates and with parked cars throughout these, those roads quickly become blocked and nothing is able to move.
39. But in addition, the plans submitted take no account of how the planned estate will interact with the present road infrastructure. There is no detailed plan as to where access points to the estate will be (save for vague dots on a zoomed-out map) and how they will connect to the Bicester Road up to Bucknell or the A4095 Ring Road. It appears in the vague, ill-conceived plans which are provided that it is suggested that there will be light controlled junctions at some access points. Such a plan can only have been conceived by developers with no local knowledge of the local area or who simply don't care about the impact of their plan on the roads and have simply looked at a map of the area believe that a junction at a certain point would fit.

40. The reality is that if a traffic-controlled junction were placed on the Bicester Road or the A4095 ring road (there are none at present), the log jam created would spread back in all directions, blocking the present roundabouts which allow the access roads into Bicester. If the plan is for further large Roundabout controlled access to the site, then the effect would also be the same and simply leave vehicles jammed in all directions.
41. What the developers don't seem to have appreciated and factored into these plans, is that the egress and ingress into a site of this size in the circumstances of where it is situated, is unprecedented, for planning in the Bicester area.
42. By way of example, the Elmsbrook development with two entrances onto a B-road out of Bicester is small in terms of development size in comparison to these present proposals and the position means it is not directly disgorging traffic onto the ring road, but onto a B-Road. Kingsmere, by contrast has multiple access points on 3 different roads, on three different sides of the project, including one access / ring road, which was specifically and purpose built for the role to disperse its traffic and another of the access roads, was the (at the time) relatively quiet Middleton Stoney Road.
43. In contrast, this proposed estate development is situated in an area already busy with traffic and which is fed by numerous other estates, such as Bure Park. It has two options, either it disgorges its 6,000 plus vehicles directly onto the small country lane that is the Bicester Road, leading from Bucknell to Bicester, such a plan for any access on this road is wholly inappropriate and simply lacks any forethought or planning, it is a small country lane which is incapable of handling the mass of traffic from the site OR alternatively it provides access directly onto the main ring road, which is already packed at peak times and would not be able to cope with further massed traffic or access points being formed (whether via lights or roundabout).
44. Such an estate will create a mass of vehicles which will (by human nature) seek to find the lines of least resistance to their journeys and with central Bicester blocked at peak times, vehicles will inevitably find their way through the surrounding villages. Taking Bucknell as an example, if an access point is provided to this proposed estate onto the Bucknell / Bicester Lane, cars and vehicles (including delivery vehicles, building, utility, removal vehicles servicing the estate) would be actively encouraged to use the

Bicester Road up to Bucknell to dissipate and get around/ away from Junction 9 and Bicester generally. The village simply can not handle the increased traffic that in excess of 6,000 extra vehicle movements a day would bring and would be consumed in vehicles.

45. To give a very vague model of how many extra vehicle movements that would bring through this small village, 6,000 vehicular movements a working day from the proposed estate would lead on average in the work day from 8am to 6pm to around 10 vehicles per minute passing through the village. But vehicles don't travel in even numbers throughout the day, but instead bunch in periods around rush hour in the morning and evening meaning during those periods in excess of 20 vehicular movements through the village each minute. Of course, if any form of proper transport modelling had been undertaken by the developers using independent experts in this field, they would have known this.
46. In the absence of any modelling being provided, I would again urge the committee to come and visit Bucknell during peak hours. Already the village is blighted by traffic from Bicester. Many occupants of Bicester, including the local Roads Traffic policing unit, have realised that due to the jams in Bicester it is quicker and easier to get onto the M40 via Junction 10 and this is easier if they travel from Bicester via the lane to Bucknell and up to the Ardley, thereby creating a rat run.
47. In peak hours hundreds of car movements occur now through this ancient village, few are journeys undertaken by those coming to or from the village itself, but instead by those cutting through. The village simply can not take any more traffic and the traditional lanes with their twists and turns, high hedge rows (although presumably they will be destroyed as part of the development) were formed in a different era, when the lane was used by horse and cart and are simply not capable of handling an increase in traffic, let alone such a drastically large increase in vehicular movements.
48. Once again, the developers avoid actually examining this issue let alone attempting to estimate the impact of such vastly increased traffic. Instead, they simply and blandly suggest that 'traffic calming' measures can be placed along the Bicester-Bucknell Lane in order to 'dissuade' traffic from using it. Frankly, such a suggestion is utter nonsense

and is insulting to the intelligence of those effected and the committee, once again such suggestions are formed by people who have no connection to the local area, let alone any knowledge of the effects of such a vast proposed development and it has no foundation in reality.

49. The reality is that Bucknell already has significant traffic calming measures in place, two restrictions to the two way traffic (i.e. creating a single lane) ingress and egress to the village at either side of the village, and 5 road ‘humps’, although they have the effect of ‘slowing’ slightly the traffic speeds, they have had absolutely no effect on the volume of traffic and never will, all the time that the journey remains considerably quicker and easier than trying to go through the centre of Bicester. Increasingly lorries and large commercial vehicles are directed by their ‘Sat-Navs’ to come through the village to get into and out of Bicester and this will be increased many hundred-fold, when the target address for the Sat-Nav’s algorithm is an address on an estate that is planned to abut Bucknell.
50. But also, the restriction on the carriageway width at the entrance and exit to the village, whilst successful at slowing traffic approaching the village, has the effect of causing long tail backs to enter the village, if the traffic volume were to increase dramatically, as they will with this new development, each traffic gate, will simply act as a pinch points to cause massive tailbacks into and out of the village, thereby causing vast noise intrusion to the many houses in Bucknell which abridge the road and lead up to the entrance / exit gates.
51. Matters are made worse in peak summer, when the customers attending the local public house use the Bucknell – Bicester Lane through the village and all the adjoining lanes as parking areas, causing predictable traffic chaos, however, if you then add the further ingredient of increased through traffic of many thousands of cars from this development, the village would be brought to a total standstill.
52. In addition, the increased traffic brings dangers to the villages’ more vulnerable road users, the children trying to cross what should be a Country Lane, to get across to the play area on the other side of the cross roads, the elderly who regularly use their motor scooters to travel into Bicester and the horse riders who at present daily use the road,

along with the mass of cyclist the village and road presently attracts and in the summer months the walkers trying to access the pathways and right of ways down the Bicester-Bucknell road. All would be run off the road by the dramatic increase in traffic that this development would bring.

53. An average summers day in Bucknell brings at least two elderly disability scooter users passing through heading to Bicester, two sets of horse riders, numerous tractors and large farm equipment going to local fields (especially in summer months), tens of cyclists passing through and numerous country lane walkers.
54. The increase in traffic that this development would bring is simply not something which can or would happily or safely mix with those elements and will lead to an increased a large increase in accidents occurring and the subsequent increase in serious accidents leading to death.
55. As the roads in Bicester become worse, so the problem with the road becomes worse, but if a further 3,000 households are put on the doorstep, then there would be a massive increase in vans, lorries, coaches, and large commercial vehicles trying to use the road which would I turn destroy Bucknell as a village and would have similar effects to the villages that this road feeds, such as Ardley and Middleton Stoney, Weston on the Green and beyond.
56. With increased road usage along this small village lane, brings with it a large increase in litter and environmental damage. Already, there is on a weekly basis rubbish thrown from passing vehicles from Bicester and 'dumped' along the lane, but also a massive environmental risk to the animals which live in the hedge rows and fields along the lane and use the lane as a crossing point between their environments (the fields and hedgerows on either side), to the humans effected by the massive increase in poisonous gasses from the vehicles.
57. The other side to the bland suggestion of further traffic calming measures being put in place to try and negate the extent of the traffic increase, not only does not work, but also thought has to be given to the villagers who have to use these roads to get in and out of the village. The further extensive measures which would be required to have any

form of impact on traffic levels (i.e. to put people off or dissuade them using this Country lane as a rat run) would have to be at such a restrictive level to have any impact on those coming to and from Bicester and this new estate, as to make it almost like a prison for the villagers themselves to be able to get in and out of their own village.

58. Once again, in summary, the ill-thought through and ill-conceived plan to add 3,100 new homes to what is presently Countryside will lead to a vast increase in traffic both in and around Bicester but destroying the nearby villages which are directly linked to roads with access points into the development. The only way to prevent the village lanes being overrun by the huge increase in traffic that this vast development would bring is to either, a) not to build such a vast amount of houses (and thereby dramatically reducing the number of vehicles in this rural part of Bicester) and b) not to have access points directly or close to the Bicester-Bucknell Road, along with significantly reduced numbers of households and restrictive measures to prevent the lane being used as a rat run up to Junction 10 or the B430 road down to the A34, all of which would in any event, impact negatively the lives of many villagers.

Environment

59. The likely environmental impact of this development has simply not been considered appropriately or at all by the developers. The developers choose to describe this housing estate under a pseudonym of being a “village”, it is not. Simply creating 3,000 houses and dumping them onto the Countryside, does not create a “village” it simply creates yet another housing estate for Bicester and one which seemingly has none of the character, history, or social cohesion that a village has.
60. But having such a mass of houses and people placed a matter of a few hundred metres from and in view of historic land, a listed Manor House and a number of historic and listed properties will as a result, cause irreversible damage to the local environment and the actual village which is here.
61. Such environmental damage comes from more obvious sources such as destroying the natural habitat of fields and hedgerows which presently support a mass of animal and

plant life, to destroying the farms that use the land presently to farm, both arable and livestock, to damage to the water course and water table and the natural flow of streams and flow of rainfall. But also, includes, noise damage from the noise created by such a mass of properties and their everyday use, fumes caused by traffic and machinery connected to the building and use of such an estate, to the damage caused to the environment by light encroachment or light pollution.

62. The concept that this estate is in some way an “Eco” option is simply a deception aimed at persuading a planning committee that in some way such a development is positive for the environment; it is not, a development of this size is vastly damaging, both short term (in the building) and in the long-term destruction of the natural environment.
63. At present the land which the developers seek to place this on is green belt agricultural land. There, are a number of farms, the fields which will be built on (or even sculptured by the developers) are presently grazed by cows and livestock and grow crops. It consists of large amounts of hedgerows, trees and wild areas. It is inhabited by hundreds of birds, insects and animals. These are real living things, not just words on the page of a develop and all would be destroyed, if this plan were to succeed and none could ever be returned.
64. If this development on this scale is allowed, all of this will be lost, the trees and fields taking carbon dioxide out of the environment and turning it into oxygen and acting as the lungs for those living around the area, will instead be concreted over, the animals will lose their environment and it will be replaced with concrete, tarmac, metal and glass of a solar farm and the only hint of the colour green, will be from the manicured and no doubt tarmacked footpath settings of sports fields or even the suggested burial grounds Or the plastic of the AstroTurf sport field, along with its floodlights, noise, cars accessing the grounds and concreted changing facilities.
65. Concreting over fields, hedgerows and plants, will kill the flowers that birds and insects use to eat and pollinate, put simply, the larger the project the larger and more widespread the destruction of the surrounding habitat. Hedgehogs, badgers, foxes, deer, bees, insects and numerous other creatures will lose their environment completely.

66. In the wider community, instead of growing and farming on a sustainable local level, another large source of food will be lost, and such food will have to be imported from further afield leading to greater pollution.
67. 3100 households along with flood lit pitches and walkways will cause massive light pollution effecting and damaging animals for miles around as well as effecting human beings and in particular the nearby Bucknell village, which is proportionately affected by light the closer that man made light producing environment encroaches to the village. On the present plans, floodlight from pitches, lights on manmade walkways and street lights and house lights emitting from the nearest homes, will all be less than the length of a football pitch away from the boundary of the village and will be a constant glow on the horizon for the village. If there is any doubt as to the effect of such light, simply travel around the link road around Kingsmede in the early evening and see the effect of light seepage from the sports pitches across the entire area, yet the plans have such light pollution on the present plans only the width of a small field away from the houses on the outskirts of Bucknell village.
68. 3100 properties with around 7,440 plus people will bring a vast amount of sound / noise pollution again effecting humans and animal life for miles around. Once again the village of Bucknell will be proportionately affected the closer the boundaries of this development are to the village itself and on present plans, with no real sound or light barrier (such as woodlands) between the village and the development the light and sound pollution created will be vast and unliveable.
69. Flood risk is a very real concern of this proposed development. For each meter of concrete, tarmac, or even Astro turf laid down by the developers and their machines, is a metre of field and soil that can no longer consume rain and flood water. The local village of Bucknell has suffered repeated flooding in recent years, due to a complex mixture of reasons, but linked ultimately to the increased development of Bicester and the strains that this puts on the water course and drainage downstream. Putting 3,000 plus households on fields that presently subsume flood, rain and run off water will store up an even greater flood risk, which has simply not been properly considered by the developers.

70. In summary calling something a village or labelling it as “Eco” doesn’t mean that the development has any real ecological credentials or that a housing estate becomes a “village”, and the planning committee should be under no illusions that the building of a vast estate on green field land does not produce a single benefit for the environment, but comes with a whole infinite list of damage and destruction which is wrought to the environment and those who live nearby from animals to humans and the bigger the development, and ones as vast as the present one, cause the most, the bigger the environmental damage and impact. The present plans, provide absolutely no environmental benefit but will instead destroy large tracts of farmland and animal habitats which will never be seen again.
71. In addition, knowledge of the impact of potential environmental damage and public opinion has developed significantly in the last few years and significantly from even when the Cherwell Local Plan was first developed and as such a full environmental impact survey by a properly qualified and independent assessor should be carried out, so the committee and indeed the local population is properly informed of the full effects of such a vast development on light pollution, noise pollution, environmental pollution and environmental and habitat damage, before any proper consultation can occur and any rational and reasoned decision made.
72. But to be clear; concreting over a field, let alone many fields, is not “environmental” or of ecologically beneficial to the environment in any shape or form and neither is putting a vast solar array across farmland which would otherwise house a mass of crops, and sustain animal and insect life. Destroying the local environment runs contrary to common sense and indeed recent Governmental policy at local, national and international level.
73. Proper sustainable development requires consideration of less densely populated housing over smaller areas and where possible the use of brown field sites, but also requires proper environmental mitigation, where some housing on green field areas is a necessity and cannot be avoided then there is an emphasis on proportionally larger use environmental mitigation measures, such as large areas of woodland, hedges, ponds, lakes and wildlife areas, being left untouched in and around the development and used to properly buffer the development from those who will be effected.

74. None of that has been dealt with within the present plans adequately or at all. The present plan seems to simply aim to pack the houses in as densely as possible (and therefore create as much profit for the developers as possible) whilst paying lip service only to environmental concerns, by somewhat ironically proposing to extend the planned area this development covers and then using that extended area to put in manicured areas of social use. Such as a cemetery and sports fields. Such a suggestion shows no insight as to the damage that such a large scale development causes, let alone any proper mitigation of that damage.
75. Although, sports fields, Astro-turf, cemeteries and manicured sculptured walkways are mildly more beneficial than concrete and tarmac and the metal and glass of a solar farm, it still destroys the natural and animal habitat and brings with it, its own pollution, such as the light pollution of the lighting for school or sports fields, noise pollution from the users of such areas and damage caused by the machines used in the upkeep of such areas.
76. In short simply dumping a sports field or a cemetery at the edge of the development does not mitigate the environmental impact of such a vast project and does not mitigate in any way the damage done by it or the impact it will have on the village next to it. The present proposals lack any consideration, let alone proper detailed assessment of the environmental impact of such a large development and how best to mitigate the damage caused.

Planning creep and extension of planning by stealth

77. Hidden away in the literature and maps provided alongside this application, it becomes clear that the developers have sought to go considerably beyond the site limits which had previously been indicated in the Cherwell Local Plan, developed after many years of consultation.
78. Although it is not clear or expressly stated in any of the literature provided by the developers, the 'land grab' of this development appears to lead to a suggested increase in the area for development by approximately 30% from the originally approved area

for development envisaged and consulted on for the Cherwell Local Plan and incorporated within the Oxfordshire Plan.

79. This is frankly and simply disproportionate, wrong in principle and seems to lack any planning law justification or housing need requirement.
80. The developers appear to justify this 'land grab' as somehow being for the benefit of the residents of the village of Bucknell who could then rest assured, they argue, that no further development of land between their development (Bicester) and the village could occur in the future. With the greatest of respect, such a justification is utter nonsense. It is no argument to develop land right up to the boundary of the village on the basis that it stops future development on the same land.
81. Indeed, the developers then attempt to sell this "land grab" on the secondary basis that it will allow them to create a buffer zone between development and Bucknell village and thereby, it is presumed, they are suggesting that they will mitigate some of the damage caused to the village itself.
82. Clearly that is simply an illogical suggestion. The original boundaries covering the extreme limits of any development area, envisaged a maximum development area, not an area which has to be met by a developer or in some way aspired to develop up to the boundaries of, nor one where the developer should or could develop with housing right up to the envisaged boundary.
83. Instead, the whole point and emphasis of the Oxfordshire plan and the included Cherwell Plan, was that such land which is developed should have within its boundaries, environmental considerations, trees, plants, wildlife areas, ponds and social use areas, such as parks and playing fields and play areas, as well as within the existing envisaged boundary a buffer zone between the development (most obviously and naturally made up of woodland, the wider the more effective) to cut down the environmental impact of sound, light and air pollution. What it doesn't envisage is the grab of further land simply in order for the developers to provide for the various things they are duty bound to provide in a plan and development of this scale.

84. The whole purpose for the developer's approach is clearly and obviously to maximise the number of households it can build and therefore the profits it makes whilst adding mitigation features in additional land it wishes to grab and destroy.
85. Put simply, the size of this vast plan is directly related to a number of the issues raised in this and other objections, the larger the development, the more traffic, the more damage to the local infrastructure. The larger the development the larger the damage to the environment, the larger the development the more impact on the nearby village etc and simply grabbing more land to destroy as part of this development is not an appropriate answer or suggestion.
86. The present plans are defective and considerably too large to be sustainable on any indicator and a considerably more modest development, containing more environmental mitigation and large buffer zone, contained at the very least, within the existing footprint envisaged by the Cherwell plan may well be a plan that could allow for some more sustainable development to occur, but the present plan falls far far short of that.

Expansion of the plan and the effect on the village of Bucknell

87. Bucknell village has around 260 people in it (under the last census), in under 100 properties, it has a historic Church, village hall, playing field, historic listed houses, a listed public house and Manor house, it is based around farming and the fields which surround it. In many ways, the village, despite gradual and sustainable growth, has changed little in hundreds of years.
88. By contrast the proposed development of a "Hawkwell Village" is no village at all but 3,100 households with over 13,000 people, that is not a village, but a creation of a whole new town in the green fields surrounding Bicester and attached like a boil to the skin of Bicester and in turn subsuming the existing actual village of Bucknell. A village by definition is "a group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area". These proposals by contrast are the size of a small town, simply grafted onto the existing urban sprawl of Bicester, and which, ironically if allowed, may not create a village, but would certainly destroy one in the form of Bucknell.

89. The proposed development presents a clear and present danger to the existence of this historic village and hamlet of Bucknell. Having an urban sprawl, a matter of metres from the village's boundary, introducing more than 50 times the number of people to this small area of Oxfordshire will simply lead to the destruction of this historic village and will be a precursor for the village being totally subsumed within Bicester, that is not right in common sense, or within planning aims or law.
90. I have tried to outline above a number of the effects which the presently proposed development will have on local hamlets such as Bucknell, from a massive and unacceptable increase in the use of quiet country lanes (two out of the three going through the village including the one upon which the solar farm is planned to be built are single track lanes), totally unsuited to the mass increase of traffic which this development will bring, to the effect of those living close by.
91. There will be a vast and unmitigated environmental impact to the village and its occupants, both in forms of noise, light and air pollution and a strain on the utilities, such as water and sewage.
92. The plans as presently presented envisage bringing the development right up to the boundaries of the village and the suggestion that present farmland along the rail track side of the development can be turned into some sort of mass cemetery abutting Bucknell.
93. The planning committee should be under no illusion, this plan if allowed, will directly lead to the destruction of Bucknell village and lead to Bicester subsuming a village in a way that has been prevented on all sides of Bicester to date and in all previous planning applications up to the present day. But further, it will blight the lives of many hundreds if not thousands of people in the wider communities, be it the areas of Bicester effected by the increase in traffic to the villages which will be used as rat runs by the mass of commuters that such a vast development brings.
94. With previous large-scale developments in and around Bicester, there has been some foundation and logic or even infrastructure to support it. Kingsmere was developed on the Southwest corner of Bicester in the 4th and last undeveloped segment of the Bicester

sphere. It was on the correct side of town to easily access the motorway and Junction 9. It brought the building of its own ring road bye-passing it and providing access to and from the site. It brought its own schools and a vast amount of land mitigation, to mitigate its effects on the eastern end of the nearby village of Chesterton. Graven Hill is being developed on Brown field ex-MOD land, with easy and direct access to the M40 and A41 to Aylesbury.

95. This proposed development is on the wrong side of Bicester for access, it is vast in size and has no natural access to the infrastructure or routes away from the estate, without funnelling traffic through the villages themselves. It gives no consideration to the damage it will cause to the local villages and people living in the area or the environment generally.
96. For all these reasons, the application in its present form and size, should be rejected.