

## Objection to Planning Proposal Application 21/04275/OUT – Hawkwell Village

Referring to the document entitled 'Environmental Statement: Non-Technical Summary':-

Para 2.13 The construction of 3100 houses will be likely to result in additional traffic movements from 6,200 cars. There is insufficient detailed information on how this increase in vehicular traffic will affect the road network to the North and West of Bicester. The A4095 is a major route through Bicester, which will be adversely affected to a significant extent by the use of signalised pedestrian crossings.

There is mention of a pedestrian underpass, but no mention of the need for a underpass for cyclists. In order for there to be safe access for pedestrians and cyclists, there need to be underpasses at both ends of Lords Lane.

Para 2.14 There is no mention of what are the "proposals for well-designed measures to manage traffic". It is clear that the road humps in Bucknell village have not significantly reduced Bucknell Road being used as access to and from the M40 motorway. This development is likely to increase the use of Bucknell Road being used for access to the M40, to the detriment of the residents of Bucknell village.

Para 4.1 ". . no significant adverse socio-economic effects . ." are mentioned, but there is no mention in para 2.8, 'The Proposed Development', of a GP surgery. The construction of 3,100 homes will be filled by a population of 6,000 – 10,000 people. 10,000 is the approximate number of patients served by each of at least two of the current GP surgeries in North Bicester. Without plans for an GP surgery at Hawkwell Village, these already overstretched GP surgeries will be unable to cope with a new influx of this number of patients.

".. timely provision of supporting facilities . ." In the Kingsmere development, it was several years after the commencement of construction before the primary school was opened, or even before the local shopping area was functional. How will it be ensured that this "timely provision" will be made?

Para 4.2 "Major beneficial effects are also predicted to the labour market on a local to regional scale . .". Although the Hawkwell Village proposals will result in a larger development than that at Kingsmere, there is only a comparatively small number of employment opportunities on the Kingsmere estate and without significant industry at the Hawkwell site, this can hardly be considered to be an accurate assessment of the likely employment opportunities.

Para 4.3 The suggestion that "positive health impacts" will result from this development may indeed be true for people currently resident in sub-standard or inner-city housing, but there has been insufficient detailed analysis of the effects of living on what could be considered to be a flood plain (viz. at least one pond within the area of this site), nor of the effects on the Bure Park residential area of water run-off from the higher elevation of this site.

Para 5.1 ". . transport effects . . have been carefully modelled . ." There is no mention on the effects of a likely 6,000 car movements via Vendee Drive towards the A41 to Oxford, or via Bucknell Road, via Bucknell village to access the M40 motorway.

Para 5.2 There is no mention of what is considered to be a "'reasonable' walking distance" of "everyday facilities and services". If it's a 10 minute cycle ride to the centre of Bicester, that equates to a 20-30 minutes walk. How many people will walk this distance on a regular basis, and especially if they may be ill and need to get to a GP surgery?

Para 5.3 “ . . mitigation measures . . will include . . regular wheel cleaning / dirt control.”  
Since this is an ongoing problem on Vendee Drive resulting from the Kingsmere construction traffic, how will it be ensured that this does not happen during the construction of the Hawkwell Village ?

Para 5.4 It is well-known that the use of roundabouts ensures the maximum traffic flows, sometimes with the aid of traffic lights on the roundabout, and that a traffic light controlled cross-roads can often cause tailbacks, so how can a “traffic signalised cross roads . . increase the junction capacity.” ?

Para 5.5 Since the use of traffic calming such as road humps in Bucknell village has not significantly reduced the volume of traffic using the Bucknell Road to access the M40 (I have been a regular cyclist using the Bucknell Road through Bucknell village since 1989, i.e. before the M40 was extended beyond Oxford and past Bicester), proper traffic reduction measures need to be introduced in order to reduce traffic numbers through Bucknell village.

Para 5.6 Without precisely defined effective proposals, this statement is completely unsubstantiated.

Para 5.7 The statement that housing not being delivered elsewhere is an argument for constructing housing here is not a valid argument.

Para 6.1 Construction at the proposed Hawkwell Village site, in relation to dust emissions, will severely affect both the Elmsbrook residential area and the north end of the Bure Park residential area, since the prevailing wind is predominantly from the West or South-West.

Para 6.2 Since any releases of dust are highly likely to be blown across the Elmsbrook estate and the northern part of the Bure Park estate, the “resultant impacts” are hardly likely to be “Negligible”.

Para 7.1 “Potential construction noise impacts are localised, and temporary in nature.”  
However, they will be significant for the residents of Elmsbrook and the northern part of the Bure Park estate. There is no indication of the duration of construction of the proposed Hawkwell Village. The Kingsmere estate development started nearly 10 years ago and the 1575 houses planned for construction there have not been finished yet. With 3,100 houses planned for Hawkwell, on a similar timescale, this suggests that the “temporary nature of construction work” could last for 20 years.

Para 7.2 “The potential post completion noise effects on existing sensitivities are limited to noise from road traffic.” “ . . the impact on those dwellings [on the outermost parts] will be Negligible.” Since the opening of Vendee Drive, the impact of traffic noise on the housing to the South-East of Howes Lane has been significant and is already a problem for residents there. The increased traffic movements as result of this Hawkwell Village development will cause an even more significant impact to residents in the Howes Lane area and, even if the currently stalled realignment of Howes Lane goes ahead, there will be a need for a very significant noise reduction construction in order to alleviate this. No such construction has been detailed.

Para 7.3 Noise pollution during the construction phase could not in any way be considered to be “Negligible” to the residents of Elmsbrook and Bure Park, when you consider that reconstruction work to the Bicester to Oxford railway line by Chiltern Railways (completed in 2015) could regularly be heard in North-West Bicester (on the Greenwood Homes estate).

Para 8.3 The landscape of Bicester 1 is classed as having an overall landscape value of “medium-low”. Which national countryside body has made this assessment?

The site “comprises common place arable fields with limited recreational value”. Arable fields rarely have recreational value but may have a very significant value in ensuring food security in a global context, where the worsening effects of climate change are starting to have a significant effect on global food production. Surely we should be increasing the amount of land in food production, not reducing it?

In addition, what has not yet been felt is the effect on food production as a result of the conflict in Eastern Europe, together with the possibility of this conflict spreading West through Europe.

“The natural habitats of the site’s watercourses, hedgerows and mature trees are of local landscape and ecological value.” If you destroy these during construction or as a result of this proposed development, it can take many tens, if not hundreds (in the case of mature trees), of years to regenerate.

Para 8.7 Even in this assessment it is stated that the effect of “impacts on the landscape character” will remain “Moderate-Minor Adverse” after 15 years. This statement tends to reinforce my last comment on para 8.3.

Para 8.8 “. . . development provides landscape benefits . . . which includes a net gain in habitats . . .” How can an urban development provide a net gain in wildlife habitats?

Para 9.1 What detailed evaluation of increased rainfall run-off from this development has been carried out? Since it is at a higher elevation, to what extent will the Bure Park LNR and housing on Bure Park be affected by the increased rainfall run-off from this development? Has the likelihood of more extreme weather events resulting from climate change been taken into account?

Para 9.2 “Watercourses are not of particular botanical interest.” To whom? To the developers? The whole area of this site has especial ecological value and reference to the Great Crested Newt in the pond on this site is made in paragraph 9.4.

Para 9.4 How will the effect of construction on the habitat of the Great Crested Newt be monitored? No mention is made of this.

Para 9.5 Without detailed study of the current bird species present on this site, carried out for at least one whole year, how can “adverse effects” be “not considered to be significant alone”?

Para 9.6 “There are no negative effects on any species or habitats of greater than minor adverse significance predicted”, but in paragraph 9.5 it states that “adverse effects” are considered to be “more significant up to a moderate level when considered cumulatively with farmland habitat losses associated with other developments”, which is a contradiction of this statement.

There is no definition of exactly what are the “biodiversity targets for a range of locally important habitats and species”.

Para 10.1 “It is anticipated that there will be no operational effects on archaeological assets”, but there are no details of any archaeological investigations carried out to establish this. This needs to be done before the start of proposed construction.

Para 11.1 “During the construction phase, potential impacts comprise of contamination of surface water and flooding and changes to baseline drainage hydrology.” Where are these

quantified? What will be the effects of these impacts on Lords Lane, Bure Park estate and Bure Park LNR?

Para 11.3 “The site lies in an area of generally low flood risk and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.” How has this been quantified? Has the effect of climate change and more extreme weather events, involving high levels of rainfall over short periods of time been taken into account?

Para 12.1 There is much mention of mitigation of adverse effects especially during the construction phase, but there is little detail given, so how can the effects of proposed mitigations be properly evaluated?

Para 13.2 There is mention of “steps to work towards a carbon zero development”. There needs to be zero carbon development from the start of the development or it will never be achieved.

Para 13.3 “The environmental effects from cumulative development will be negligible and not significant”. These have not been quantified.

The mention of “long-term beneficial effect through lowering emissions as well as reducing energy demand” not only during construction but also “once operational” seem to overlook the fact that there are currently NO emissions from this site and NO adverse environmental effects.

Para 14.1 “This EIA has found that the Proposed Development would have few residual effects of more than minor significance, whether adverse or beneficial.” Since these residual effects have not been examined fully or quantified in detail, this cannot be stated truthfully.

Para 14.3 Traffic impacts have not been examined in full. There is no mention of traffic impact on Howes Lane and Vendee Drive and the A41/A34 road to Oxford, which some years ago had already reached 110% of capacity during rush hours. Nor is there any mention of the likelihood of increased traffic using Bucknell Road to access the M40 motorway and the effect of that on the inhabitants of Bucknell village.