

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	David Lowin
Organisation	
Name	Mr Craig Mitchell
Address	Willow Brook,Street Through Stoke Lyne,Stoke Lyne,Bicester,OX27 8SF
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>OBJECTION The proposal put forward, firstly and fundamentally does not form part of the local plan, the site is not allocated as employment land within the plan and is also not identified for development. The application attempts to respond to this citing in its planning statement the exceptional circumstances and urgent need for land to accommodate logistics space. There is no exceptional need in this location! There is also no particular employment need within the area, most recent statistics for unemployment rates show that Cherwell is lower than the average for Oxfordshire and also lower than the national average. There is therefore no need to create employment opportunities. Whilst there may be requirements for further logistics space there is still a plentiful supply of suitable locations which are in the local plans and ear marked for development. This proposal alongside the Albion Land application which I objected to several weeks ago will completely change the landscape of this predominately rural setting. The applicants own visual impact assessment confirms that the site will be visually intrusive from numerous of the photo viewpoints that it chose to use, for not only the short term but for the full life cycle of the site. Increase in traffic within the area will be considerable and their own assessment is that there will be an additional 363 HGV vehicles on the B4100 North of the site access as a result of the development in an 18-hour period. This equates to over 130,000 additional HGV's per annum as a result of the development. Noise and light pollution will be considerable, and the application seeks to sidestep this issue by assuring the reader that management and operational controls will reduce this to an acceptable level, with suggestions of 'turning engines off' and 'minimizing reversing beeper's' which operate at times in excess of 100db. Item 4.12 of Framtons Community Statement states that 'the use of reversing beepers should be minimised where possible' yet they come up with no tangible method of how this will be done or maintained. Frampton's Community Involvement has not been extensive enough or fully inclusive, on page 4 (attached) of their Statement of Community Involvement our property is on the very edge of their leaflet drop area and yet we are with the exception of 'Lone Barn' one of the closest and most affected to the Southeast of the proposed development. Is this the extent of their consideration for the local community that they consider ourselves and number 28 'The Cottage' outside of importance? Clearly it is an oversight on their part, but it does bring into question how many more oversights lie within the body of their application and the statements that they put forward. They subsequently state in 4.14 that with the exception of 'Lone Barn' no other properties are within 'Close Proximity' of the site. This is a very poor choice of phrase, and it also has no clear definition of distance. Given the sheer scale of this development we are close enough to be considered in every sense. The building will be very visible from our property with light and noise being a factor and nuisance. So, to dismiss our properties as not worthy of consideration by stating that we are not in 'Close Proximity' is very typical of this application which seeks to brush over very important issues. Perhaps if the writer can find a defined distance that 'Close Proximity' represents or failing that they should be qualifying their own interpretation of the phrase. Whilst I understand the need for objections to planning applications and the like to not be a personal viewpoint but one that finds legitimate grounds that in some way takes the application outside of planning policy. It is very hard as a local resident who will be severely impacted by this development if it were to go ahead to not become emotionally motivated by the prospect. This is not helped by having spent considerable time filtering through some of the documents and submissions on behalf of the developer. ES appendix 09.7 has Wireline EDP 4 (attached) with a picture just</p>

along the road from my property showing the outline of the proposed development which has really brought home the scale and impact that this will have on the rural area that we live in which will be completely changed and harmed beyond recognition. I urge the committee to REJECT this application

Received Date

06/06/2022 10:26:12

Attachments

The following files have been uploaded:

- ES Appendix 09.7 Wirelines EDP 4 (3).pdf
- Statement of Community Involvement (2).pdf