

Comment for planning application 21/04275/OUT

Application Number	21/04275/OUT
Location	Part OS Parcel 8149 Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm Lords Lane Bicester
Proposal	OUTLINE - with all matters reserved except for Access - Mixed Use Development of up to 3,100 dwellings (including extra care); residential and care accommodation(C2); mixed use local centre (comprising commercial, business and service uses, residential uses, C2 uses, local community uses (F2(a) and F2(b)), hot food takeaways, public house, wine bar); employment area (B2, B8, E(g)); learning and non-residential institutions (Class F1) including primary school (plus land to allow extension of existing Gagle Brook primary school); green Infrastructure including formal (including playing fields) and informal open space, allotments, landscape, biodiversity and amenity space; burial ground; play space (including Neaps/Leaps/MUGA); changing facilities; ground mounted photovoltaic arrays; sustainable drainage systems; movement network comprising new highway, cycle and pedestrian routes and access from highway network; car parking; infrastructure (including utilities); engineering works (including ground modelling); demolition
Case Officer	Caroline Ford
Organisation Name	
Name	Flo van Diemen van Thor
Address	Rose Cottage,6 Bainton Road,Bucknell,Bicester,OX27 7LT
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I wish to express my objections in the strongest possible terms against the proposed development of Hawkwell Village as submitted to Cherwell District Council under planning application reference 21/04275/OUT, received 23/12/2021. I do so on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Wholesale destruction of local wildlife habitats by developing greenbelt land2. Increased pollution, including air, light and noise in an area already under strain of the M40 motorway, rail line and incinerator3. Very significantly increased road congestion in an area with insufficient infrastructure under present traffic levels <p>1. Development of greenbelt land. The green belt around Bicester as a whole and the green belt land the proposal is seeking to destroy is known to sustain the habitats of badgers, bats, deer, rabbits, hedgehogs, breeding birds, hares, invertebrates and pollinators including bees. Uncommon butterflies which have been spotted include the purple emperor and the silver-washed fritillary. Of the above animals, bats, hedgehogs, hares, invertebrates and bees are now famous for being in dangerous decline, and even rabbit populations, once considered as pests, are now in serious danger of disappearing. Just taking rabbits as an example, in the space of 20 years, their numbers have dwindled by 60%. This has had a serious effect on the survival rates of rare plants, which benefit from rabbit's selective feeding habits, which in turn provide attract pollinators which are also in decline. The disappearance of hedges in traditional rural landscapes has contributed to a decline in hedgehogs and hares as well as birds. Although the proposal seeks to keep several hedges in place, because these would be surrounded by roads, houses and human activity they will not sustain wildlife in the same way they do now. Noise and light pollution will not only make habitats unavailable to wildlife, they are known to disturb the navigation patterns of bats, birds and mammals. From The Cherwell Local Plan 2011 - 2031: 'Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in our Villages & Rural Areas C.243 There is a need to manage the rural environment to create inclusive, sustainable communities and help meet the needs of those who live and work there. We wish to protect our built and natural environments and the character and appearance of our villages. C.244 The key environmental issues facing the villages and rural areas are: The need to protect the biodiversity of the rural areas. The impact of growth and new development in the rural areas may impact upon the quality, character and landscape setting of villages. The rural areas are not congested when compared to the towns but traffic is an issue in the rural area owing to the high level of commuting to larger urban areas.' The tokenistic green spaces in the proposed scheme do nothing to protect the biodiversity of our rural area - this development actively seeks to destroy it. It will impact negatively on the quality, character and landscape setting of Bucknell, and it will contribute beyond measure to congestion in the area (see point 3, below). Once this natural environment has been destructed, as it will be if you allow this development to go ahead, nothing will bring it back. I urge you to reject this proposal wholesale on the strength of this argument alone.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Pollution - air, noise and light The developers are wilfully ignoring that this development is to be built in an area which is already heavily polluted by its proximity to the M40 motorway,

the railway line, high traffic levels and especially the Viridor Incinerator at Ardley. In 2020 Bucknell Parish Council raised its deep concerns regarding the pollution caused by Viridor's incinerator at Ardley with local MP Victoria Prentis, who at the time was Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (14 February 2020 to 15 September 2021) and is currently Minister of State at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Available scientific, peer reviewed research - of which there is a wealth - into the pollution caused locally by incinerators should be cause for extreme concern. All relevant research has been supplied to and under consideration by DEFRA. Viridor's incinerator at Ardley emits PM2.5, PM0.1, NOx, dioxins, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, heavy metals and many additional toxins and carcinogens. All of the above are extremely harmful to human and animal health, and the above is just a handful of nasties that tall stack across the M40 treats us and surrounding area to on a daily basis. All of Bicester, and many surrounding villages are all in the path of this pollution. In 2010 the Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollution, Department of Health, stated that 'there are no absolute safe levels of PM2.5'. (The mortality effects of long-term exposure to particulate air pollution in the UK, Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollution, Dept of Health, 2010

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304641/COMEAP_mortality_effects_of_long_term_exposure.pdf) Since 2010 of course we have learned a great deal about the lethal effects of air pollution, including how children's health and development suffers. In 2020, the UK recorded its first tragic and preventable death of a 9-year-old due to local air pollution. If that is not frightening enough, it's the PM0.1 particles we need to worry about even more than the PM10 and PM2.5 particles. PM0.1 particles pass directly into the blood - and they make up over 99% of emissions from incinerator stacks. These particles bind to harmful substances such as carcinogens that are emitted at the same time and so become an exceptionally efficient distribution method for cancers, respiratory and other serious illness. Because PM0.1 particles are unregulated, incinerators do not have to report on them, and developers and planning committees can pretend it isn't happening. The proposed development, which will generate its own air, light and noise pollution, not least during years of construction, will be put directly in harm's way. By approving this development you will be willingly and knowingly cause serious harm to new residents' health, including increased risk of birth defects, respiratory illness and cancer: P.W. Tait et al. 2019. The Health Impact of waste incineration: A systematic Review. Aus. New Zea J. Public Health. Vol. 44, Issue 1, Pages 40-48 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-6405.12939> For the love of the people who will be buying or renting a property in good faith on the proposed development, reject this proposal and abandon all thought of building anything in harm's way. 3. Infrastructure and road congestion The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Appendix 8, Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out 26 transport projects ranging from East-West Rail Phase 2 (item 3) to no fewer than 15 pedestrian and cycle projects (items 26a through to 26o). None of these include connecting the proposed development to Bicester by means of pedestrian access, cycle paths or public transport. Of specific interest are items 20a-c, Improvements to Howes Lane/Bucknell Road junction, which is prioritised as critical. This is a known problem area now, which will only be exacerbated by putting several thousand extra vehicles on the road. Not only will residents themselves need to move about, they will generate traffic coming into the area through everyday activities such as deliveries and services they require. The same Local Plan acknowledges that 'key community challenges facing Bicester are the lack of sufficient services in Bicester for a town of its size' and identifies 'the need for an improved community hospital and police infrastructure; the need for improved library provision' (C21, p132) while also emphasising that Bicester has 'high levels of out-commuting' due to a lack of meaningful employment opportunities. The proposed planning for Hawkwell Village with its 3,100 new dwellings is highly focused on maximising residential development over creating meaningful employment beyond the service industry. The claim in the proposal that the development will lower traffic levels in the village of Bucknell is unfounded. This village is already under considerable pressure from SatNav suggested rat runs during congestion in the area, being along the shortest route to J10 of the M40 from this side of Bicester, and dangerous parking by the inconsiderate patrons of the Trigger Pond Pub. Of course the new development will put several thousand more vehicles on the local roads and exacerbate an already dangerous situation. Very tellingly, The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Appendix 8, Infrastructure Delivery Plan only mentions Queen's Avenue twice, (18a and 18b) and neither addresses the junction of Queen's Avenue and the Bucknell Road. This junction is at present almost impossible to navigate at busy times. However, it is the one junction residents from the Hawkwell Village will need to negotiate every time they drive into Bicester's centre to get anything other than a glass of wine in their local wine bar or the bare necessities from their small local supermarket. In other words, this too will be another green belt development that forces people into their cars to get anything done, including pursuing meaningful employment. This proposal will only increase the very significant traffic problems Bicester and surrounding area already suffer from and further add to the woes of residents backing onto Howes Lane. Leave these green spaces which we all need - human, animal - the last two years should have taught us to look after ourselves and our environment. Possibly even more importantly,

DO NOT consider putting more unsuspecting future residents in harm's way under the deadly smoke of an incinerator. I urge you to reject the proposed plans in their entirety and permanently.

Received Date

07/02/2022 15:05:43

Attachments