

From: dc.support@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Sent: 06 June 2022 10:23
To: DC Support
Subject: New comments for application 22/01340/OUT

New comments have been received for application 22/01340/OUT at site address: Os Parcel 6124 East Of Baynards Green Farm Street To Horwell Farm Baynards Green

from Luke Munday luke.munday@ssssltd.com

Address:
Garden Cottage,Swifts House Farm,Street From Baynards Green To Bucknell,Stoke Lyne,Bicester,OX27 8RS

Comment type:
Objection

Comments:
I am writing a letter of objection regarding the outlining planning application listed.

I am a local resident but my office is based In Baynards Green Industrial estate. I have been travelling into the site for the past 15 years, and as a Stoke Lyne resident I have travelled the B4100 up to the Baynards green roundabout for the majority of this time.

Such a Vast Development - With a proposed c80 acres of arable land being destroyed to build what looks to be super-sized Regional or Central distribution hubs is not only contravening the Cherwell Local Plan (2011- 2031) for Spatial Strategy which is focused on the 'strict control of development in open countryside' but it is fundamentally going to change the whole outlook of this wonderful landscape.

Each one of the proposed buildings has a capability (based on the parking bay drawings) of holding c200 lorries in each of the 5 building hubs at any one time. This is a lot of potential HGV lorries - My concerns with this level of development are the following:

1) Employment - Yes, the development will of course bring more job opportunities but the economic benefit suggested by the developer is just not required within the Bicester area, an area that does not suffer from a high unemployment level. It would surely be for more pertinent for the developers to consider building such vast warehouses in areas that require significant employment opportunities - there is still 52 hectares of allocated land in the area for which planning has not yet been sought, this should be developed before unallocated land is developed. The area of Baynards Green is notoriously difficult to recruit people to especially as there are no public transport routes. Employees would therefore have to travel to site from a distance, in their own or possibly shared vehicles which will further increase Traffic congestion and numbers, and therefore detrimentally impact the environment. As a country we have targets to reduce emissions why would we accept a development that would only increase the need for private vehicle usage.

2) The increase in Traffic - these are massive distribution hubs and although putting in 2 roundabouts on the B4100 will allow the arctic lorries the ability to enter the industrial hubs without queuing on the road, it will not alleviate the already significant traffic build up on the B4100 up to the roundabout, especially from the stoke woods direction. At this junction the A43 and M40 traffic is at its worst and the congestion build up can be so significant that traffic is queueing to enter this round-about from as far back as Stoke woods, that is close to a mile in queue length. This level of congestion happens often. The M40 Jnc 10 entry and exit are simply not good enough to handle the increased level of congestion, and this increased level of traffic will further increase this risk of accidents at the bottle neck points. These are likely to be 24/7 warehouse fulfilment centres, filling and indeed refilling lorries multiple times a day to get out on the road delivering. This is a huge amount of additional traffic on the road in a location where it is already heavily congested.

3) Noise and Light pollution - the Noise associated with this level of operation is going to be detrimental to the local area and local residents, loading and unloading of lorries, engine noise and increased road noise. The proposal discusses sympathetic noise reduction hedgerows trees etc. but realistically these will take years to reach a level where they might be of some benefit. In addition, the amount of light emitted will be significant and this level of light pollution will certainly have an impact on the local residents and the surrounding villages. In addition, this would be extremely detrimental to all houses that have windows and gardens facing the proposed development.

4) Impact on the B4100 and Bicester - If Lorry drivers decide to avoid the traffic delays of joining the A43 or M40 at jnc10, or decide the shortest and easiest route to junction 9 of the M40 or their first drop off, is down the B4100 and through Bicester then this is the route they will follow. This is a huge amount of additional traffic impact on the roads and noise impact travelling into Bicester and surrounding towns and villages.

5) The environmental impact - This is open countryside, the loss of arable green land to more industrial developments are unacceptable, the visual intrusion into the landscape and the hedgerow destruction will be significant - In terms of wildlife the developer has proposed suggestions to redevelop habitats but this does not prevent the destruction of their original and existing habitats. These proposed habitat relocations will take years before we can see any actual success of these recommendations and that is of course if habitat survival is actually achieved.

- Endangering Barn Owls from Nesting - Barn owls have nested successfully in our grounds for the last 5 years, and we have video and photographic proof of this. We have a huge concern that the building of such a large development in such close proximity with such a strong light and noise output would actually obstruct the Barn Owls ability and desire to nest in our grounds which therefore contravenes the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 - The legal regulation states that it is an offense to intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct a barn owl nest, resting place, or feeding habitat

7) The knock-on implication of a proposal of this scale and size if given permission to proceed will set a dangerous precedent for any future development applications.

In summary I feel that the community, the landscape and the environment would be better served by this planning application being denied. The economic benefit would also be better served by moving these planning proposals to an area with higher unemployment that would fundamentally benefit and deliver against an actual economic need.

Case Officer:
David Lowin

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..