

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	Paul Buckle
Address	2 The Close,Stoke Lyne,Bicester,OX27 8RZ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Dear Sir / Madam Bicester and the surrounding area continues to be subjected to rapid development with apparent disregard for the impact on the environment, flood risk and the destruction of countryside and wildlife habitat. Particularly when the infrastructure by way of schools, hospital, roads and local amenities are already under pressure and barely able to cope. There are thousands of air bnb sites in the surrounding area, second homes and empty properties feeding personal incomes and investments that in turn lead to the requirement for more and more housing. This appears to be at odds with the governments COP 26 commitments to protect the natural heritage of the UK and make housing more accessible and fair. Bicester and the surrounding area have expanded rapidly in the last 20 years, swallowing the areas of Bure Park, Chesterton and the so called Eco town that failed to become an Eco town and continues to be built on. Bicester has already provided its fair share of housing in Oxfordshire and should be spared further growth, particularly as amenities required to support the increase in population are no longer able to cope. The roads around Bicester are constantly congested at before, during and after rush hour. Bus services to the villages have been cut all bar token gestures of once weekly services, we are simply increasing the number of vehicles, pollution (regardless of the type of transport) in terms of noise and light. You only have to drive down our country lanes to see the dramatic increase in rubbish to demonstrate that the local infrastructure and services are not able to cope with the increase in local housing. There is no sustainable transport or plans for sustainable transport to the proposed site. I recall the promise of a trolley-bus or tram to the the 'Eco town' that never materialised. The population that will live in the proposed housing developments will more than likely need to commute. This area and surrounding counties are low unemployment areas. The increase in commuters will substantially increase the carbon footprint and damage the health and wellbeing of the local residents and wildlife. There are plenty of alternative brown sites earmarked for development in this country that would have a much lesser impact on our environment, wildlife, the wellbeing and mental health of the local residents Damage to the environment and countryside: The countryside in this area is in balance between the wildlife, farming and local residents. There will be considerable loss of habitat by way of wildlife corridors and hedgerows, both of which, the government has acknowledged are in decline to the detriment of our environment. The food chain for local wildlife is affected at every step. For example, grass verges provide habitats for small mammals that in turn feed raptors. Insects and invertebrates, sources of food for birds and some mammals, depend on the grasslands for food. These elements of the ecosystem are supposed to be protected by Government policy and should be respected, particularly when considering the promises the Government signed up to at the recent COP 26 Summit. Food production for humans is essential particularly as populations increase and other regions of the world lose their ability to produce food because of climate change. Food production, alongside water, are considered to be the most likely reasons for conflict for future generations. Flood risk assessment (noted in the Environment Agency's response)</p>

indicates that the development in the proposed location will increase the risk of flooding. I note that the only floodplain in the Stoke Lyne area parish was drained in the 1970s (with substantial loss of species) and that this increased the flood risk in Buckingham to the extent that flood protection had to be built in Buckingham. Light pollution has a detrimental and sometimes fatal impact on wildlife. The proposed development will require lighting during the hours of darkness, without interruption, notwithstanding the noise and light emissions from the heavy and smaller vehicles that will enter and egress the sites continually. Increases in light pollution, noise and activity are elements linked to the deterioration of mental health. The area is currently dark at night and the proposed development will likely illuminate the surrounding area affecting local wildlife and the local environment. If this development is to go ahead, it should be built with housing that requires minimal heating, has thermal insulation that is so effective that it requires little or no energy input. New schools and the expansion of the Horton or local health centre, sports facilities such as tennis courts and football pitches, cycle lanes from Bicester to all the surrounding villages as well as regular bus services should be insisted upon as conditions for any future development. The housing must fit in with the local surroundings and be built using renewable locally sourced materials that minimise the carbon footprint and the labour should be strictly local. Conclusion The proposal appears to counter the national economic, environmental, sustainability and local planning policies. The potential damage in contrast to the perceived/suggested benefits is too high a cost for this planning application to be granted. I respectfully request that this application be turned down. Yours faithfully Paul Buckle

Received Date

01/04/2022 11:09:00

Attachments