

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	Dominika Gruszka
Address	5 Middleton Road,Bucknell,Bicester,OX27 7LZ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I strongly object to this development on the following grounds: 1. Insufficient notification of the development. National planning policy framework 3.16.c requires early engagement between plan makers and local communities. It is unacceptable that the developers of this large building project should deem it unnecessary to alert residents within the village of Bucknell other than through a single poster on a lamp post in the village that most residents did not see until close to the original deadline for comments. In the age of the internet, and a very active local parish, one can only assume this minimal attempt at 'engagement' was strategic, hoping that local residents would have insufficient time to coordinate their responses effectively. This in turn implies the developers have something to hide, which is corroborated by the responses that have since been logged by local residents. 2. Scale of the development. I note that this development is a recent iteration of an earlier plan dating back 10 years that was significantly smaller in scale. No reasonable justification is given for the significant expansion of the current project over that originally planned. This becomes even more difficult to understand given that the town of Bicester and its environs has seen other massive building projects (e.g. Kingsmere, CALA homes, Great Wolf Resort at Chesterton, a potential rail freight terminal at Ardley) most of which have yet to be completed. Hence, the true impact of these ongoing developments cannot be used by the developers of 21/04275/OUT to forecast the effects on local road infrastructure, water management and the natural environment. 3. Road congestion as a result of this new development with knock-on effects on air and noise pollution. The development would need new road infrastructure built in order to connect to the Bicester ring road. I note that this new road development has yet to be authorised and so on these grounds alone the plan should be rejected until all impacts on the Bicester road infrastructure are resolved. For example, the A4095 roundabout that leads to the staggered junction on Howes Lane is a vehicle bottleneck currently during morning and evening rush hour. This is one of the major routes taken by traffic to and from the M40. This bottleneck becomes impassable when either Junction 9 or 10 on the M40 become blocked. The additional traffic resulting from the development will make a bad situation untenable for local residents, both within Bicester and surrounding villages. 4. Destruction of our local heritage. The new development will make the village of Bucknell a suburb of Bicester, destroying its independent historic status which dates back to the Norman conquest. We are a small community with an active parish council, a 17th century village pub, numerous listed buildings and a village hall that regularly hosts local events. This new development will destroy our village community. Moreover, some of the amenities such as the sports centre will border the village itself, generating both light and noise pollution in addition to the traffic associated with these amenities. 5. Air quality. The village of Bucknell already has to contend with the significant noise and air pollution associated with the M40 and the Ardley incinerator, both less than a mile from the village. This massive new development on the doorstep of the village will further deteriorate our living environment. 6. Flooding. The village of Bucknell is prone to</p>

flooding. Thames Water Authority have already commented on the additional burden this development will place on the local water network. This alone warrants rejection of the plan. The water network infrastructure (foul water and surface water) is insufficient for current residents let alone 3,100 new ones. To allow such a development will condemn local residents to even greater flooding risk. 7. Natural environment. The new development and its impact on the water network, air quality, light and noise pollution, will have a negative impact on local biodiversity. The area surrounding the village of Bucknell, which includes Hawkwell Farm, is rich in deer, rabbit, frogs, grass snakes, pheasants and birds of prey (in addition to numerous other bird species). Such a massive development can only diminish the habitats of these species and hence impact the natural environment of local communities.

Received Date

08/02/2022 13:13:30

Attachments