

Comment for planning application 22/01340/OUT

Application Number	22/01340/OUT
Location	Os Parcel 6124 East Of Baynards Green Farm Street To Horwell Farm Baynards Green
Proposal	Application for outline planning permission (all matters reserved except means of access (not internal roads) from b4100) for the erection of buildings comprising logistics (use class b8) and ancillary offices (use class e(g)(i)) floorspace; energy centre, hgv parking, construction of new site access from the b4100; creation of internal roads and access routes; hard and soft landscaping; the construction of parking and servicing areas; substations and other associated infrastructure.
Case Officer	
Organisation	
Name	James Holden-White
Address	6 The Close, Stoke Lyne, Bicester, OX27 8RZ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>As a local resident whose quality of life will be severely diminished by this project (view, noise, emissions, traffic congestion, impact on the night sky due to light pollution) I object in the strongest possible terms to this proposal. The proposal is not consistent with the Cherwell District Council local plan. This proposal should not be considered in isolation but with a view to planning applications currently in the preparation stage by Albion, to develop a site of a similar size on adjacent land and by developers to create a site of the same combined size again on the other side of junc 10 M40 at Ardley, (Siemens) inclusive of the strategic rail freight interchange, a very short distance away. There is also application for considerable urban expansion at Bucknell and cumulatively such development is incredibly significant and would totally transform the landscape and local area to its detriment, ultimately transforming countryside to industry and urbanisation. The proposed site for the Tritax Symmetry proposal is greenbelt and was previously deemed unsuitable for such development. It would have a significant impact on the ecology and biodiversity of wildlife and habitat in what is currently unspoilt and farmed countryside and flood risk would be inevitable if such enormous sites were developed in proximity to each other. Previous planning application for similar development of this area were dismissed on appeal (18/00672/OUT) and the criteria in dismissing the plans at that time still apply. Indeed, it is absurd that such a number of resubmissions can now be proposed incorporating a much larger area for distribution development than that which was previously applied for and dismissed. The cumulative size of the proposed developments being at least 4 times larger than that which was previously rejected. Allowing one would set a precedent and would make further developments inevitable, (which is no doubt why the developers are taking it in turns to apply so that applications are constantly being presented to the planning committee.) It is not necessary to develop land for logistical distribution at Ardley / Stoke Lyne due to the existence of substantial logistical developments already built/being built close to junction 9 and junction 11 of the M40, both of which are only 10 mins drive from junction 10. Brownfield sites such as Upper Heyford or the MOD logistical base at Bicester are much more appropriate if further such development is genuinely needed in due course (the MOD land is already supported by an existing if dormant rail connection) but there is no local logistical or employment need for this development on the site proposed, which is much harder to reach than Junc 9 from Bicester and Junc 11 from Banbury and which already have public transport access. Due to the number of developments in proximity to junc 9 and junc 11 it would not be conducive to the Government's commitment to 'levelling up' or COP26 to allow development of junc 10 as well. To have all three junctions in a row changed from transport and traffic corridors to distribution hubs would be utterly excessive. The local area is already incumbered by the presence of the Motorway and service station, the presence of a McDonalds drive through which has led to a dramatic increase in littering on the parish verges and the development of the Elmsbrook eco town and HS2 which have led to a significant increase in traffic congestion. This often leads to dangerous tail backs on the M40 and traffic jams on the B4100 to Baynards Green. Access roads and the relentless HGV traffic will make the situation intolerable and as there is a very low level of unemployment locally (below the average nationally and within the county locally) it is extremely likely that workers will commute from some distance away, adding to the congestion and pollution in the Stoke Lyne basin which has air quality already adversely affected by the motorway and the Ardley incinerator. The application is also flawed as it fails</p>

to recognise the significance of Stoke Woods, a medieval coppice very popular with dog walkers in close proximity to the proposed development and a number of listed buildings within Stoke Lyne and Bainton Parish. A number of dwellings within close proximity to the site have not been included in the maps supplied on the Tritax site. This development is inappropriate and totally unnecessary. Further, I understand that an application for a conservatory to be added to Lone Barn, abutting this proposed development was declined as it was felt by the planning committee at the time that it was not in keeping with the local area. How much more so this proposal, which would impact so much more significantly? The planning committee set a precedent at that time and need to be true to it. On the 12th May the BBC reported on the Government considering a reform of planning laws in England (www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-61400935) 'Gove pledges votes on neighbours extensions but leaves question mark over housing target.' This report suggested 'street votes' by neighbours (those affected) could be introduced as an alternative to traditional forms of planning permission. The report is in relation to the building of dwellings and the Government reaching its target of 300,000 new homes a year, but Mr Gove, the levelling up secretary, is quoted as saying "Hitting a statistical target" was not the only measure of success, particularly, "if the homes that are built are shoddy, in the wrong place, don't have the infrastructure required, and are not contributing to beautiful communities." - This application is not in respect of dwellings but the same principles apply and the local community voice should have sway: It is in the wrong place, the materials and design are not in keeping with the countryside, the infrastructure is not in place, developing such would be incredibly disruptive and increased traffic and emissions would diminish the air quality for local people putting public health at risk. This proposal would ruin a beautiful community by turning green belt land into a brightly lit, noisy, concrete, tarmac and steel eyesore. An unacceptable impact on the landscape and environment, the tranquillity of the country side and mental health of residents.

Received Date

15/05/2022 17:56:45

Attachments