

I object to this application in the strongest possible terms.

The site is not allocated as employment land in the Local Plan, and has not been identified for development or any use other than open farm land and countryside. The total area for the Tritax site is vast and equates to over 60 football pitches, this increases when taken alongside the Albion proposal on adjacent land.

The Local Plan sets out the need to supply jobs close to where they are needed; there are no employment needs identified in this location, indeed, local employers closer to Bicester are struggling to recruit, many warehouses lie unoccupied.

Local Plan Para B.39 (page 43) clearly states 'Where existing employment sites have good transport links for commercial vehicles and the proposed use of these sites accords with the Local Plan we will encourage new development here to ensure the efficient use of land on these sites and in our towns, avoiding the need to use valuable countryside.' The existing road network is unsuitable for the inevitable massive increases in HGV use which will cause major hardship to local residents, as well as increased risk of serious accidents. I am concerned that huge numbers of trucks and HGVs accessing this site through 24 hours will inhibit traffic flow and potentially risk delaying emergency vehicles needing to travel to local villages and to the M40. This site is not accessible by public transport and would rely on the use of the private car, further increasing the traffic load on a road network that already fails to cope. The site is not adjacent to any significant town and any proposal that workforce might cycle from the nearest conurbation – Bicester, is unlikely and risible.

The scale of development proposed would put particular pressure on the run-off water system, increasing the risk of flooding in the surrounding areas and villages. Infiltration basins alone will not deal with sudden and extensive rainfall, leading to drainage into the present ditches and the few culverts. Close to the site are water courses taking field drainage and feeding into the Great Ouse and that are already known to cause flood problems downstream. I am also concerned that the sewage and dirty water system would be insufficient to cope with the proposed usage.

On a site that is essentially flat, light pollution, air pollution and noise pollution would have a major detrimental effect on both the local population and wildlife. I believe that the stated baseline measures for these in the application are suspect. A site that has security lights 24/7 will be visible from afar and seriously and negatively impact the surrounding area.

Noise from vehicles working – including reversing into bays with requisite alarms sounding - throughout the day and night will cause immense stress and constant disruption to the local residents and banish any wildlife. Reversing tonal alarms work from 82-107 decibels and 'white noise' alarms around 75-102 decibels. The daytime ambient noise in the countryside is around 45 decibels so this constitutes a serious intrusion. The flat topography of the land would mean that visual and audible nuisance would be unacceptable; bunding with tree planting is unlikely to effectively screen for very many years, if ever. The height of warehousing would create a wall of

industrial buildings visible from each direction but particularly those dwellings around Baynards Green and from many of the houses in Stoke Lyne village and Swifts House.

Sustaining biodiversity was a key issue in the COP26 agreement; this proposal runs contrary to this. The area is populated by various wildlife species, many of which are already under threat - particularly owls, bats, hare, skylarks, sparrow hawks and deer. Provision of e.g. bird boxes is tokenism at best; habitats, including those of native flowers and invertebrates, and the wildlife corridors around Stoke Bushes will be destroyed forever. Pathways and bridle tracks that presently are enjoyed by many will become unusable and characterless. This development, should it proceed, would destroy what is currently an unspoilt rural/agricultural area which, despite relative proximity to the M40 and A43, retains the character and appearance of natural countryside/farmland. Local villages would be eviscerated and inhabitants forced to live alongside a huge and urbanised lorry park, operating 24 hours per day.

This proposal forms part of a set of applications that together represent a future for this area that would soon resemble the conglomerate of warehousing and distribution centres similar to that of DRFT on the A5 or the warehouse 'city' between Milton Keynes and the M1. Beyond the agricultural acreage taken by such a development, the visual impact of immense buildings in an essentially flat countryside area would be horrific.

I urge the committee to reject the proposal.