

There are compelling reasons why the application should be refused as the proposal comprises inappropriate development within the open countryside. Overall, the proposal is contrary to both local and national planning policies and does not first and foremost comply with the definition of **sustainable development**. In particular in my opinion the following harm will result if this application goes ahead. It will fail to achieve sustainable development, it will fail to build a strong competitive economy, it will fail to promoting sustainable transport, it will fail to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and most importantly it will fail to meet the challenge of climate change.

In July 2021, the Government published the latest version of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF is the Government's planning policies for England and sets out how they are expected to be applied. Paragraph 2 of the NPPF states that "Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraphs 7 and 8 confirm that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which comprises of economic, social and environmental dimensions. Whilst the NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development, paragraph 11 reaffirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It should also be noted that the NPPF of July 2021 has been significantly changed from its earlier incarnation and it now requires any planning decision to mitigate climate change and adapt to its effect. It therefore seems reasonable to assume that it's the government's intention to have climate change and its effects, foremost in the decision making process.

Furthermore in order to meet the sustainable development threshold, planners must ensure that they strike a strategic balance between the economic, environmental and social elements, when deciding on the outcome of a planning application. Planners cannot view an application in isolation, **as all new developments will impact upon and alter the effects of previous developments**, and especially so in this application, **because the success of this planned development relies heavily on vital, shared local and national infrastructure** and given the extent of similar developments in the Bicester area its overkill. As a result it is difficult to understand how this application could possibly be **viewed as meeting the criteria of sustainable development**. It is difficult to comprehend how it fits with Cherwell's balanced plan-making, and how its approval would meet the three overarching objectives of sustainable development namely; economic, social and environmental, in any way that could be viewed as achieving a mutually beneficial outcome and **therefore must be rejected**.

Other important considerations to take into account include, **highway safety and promoting sustainable transport, building a strong local economy, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and water usage**.

The NPPF identifies that planning permission should be refused on highways grounds, if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The volume of traffic using the B4100 has been increasing in recent years and it is noticeable that queues for the Baynards Green intersection, are getting longer and more common outside of rush hour. Given the plethora of developments taking place across the Bicester area, the impact on the cumulative traffic volumes and congestion, is almost guaranteed to get worst for the foreseeable future. This will result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, add to increasing congestion and will have knock-on impacts on pollution. It is understood that the site will be entered via an access point from the B4100 with new a roundabout situated on a fast single lane busy highway. How is this compatible with the orderly flow of traffic along what is a de-facto main

arterial route into Bicester Town. Both the NPPF and Cherwell local plan envisages climate friendly modes of transport that reduce reliance on personal car use. The local plan emphasises good public transport along with attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks with supporting facilities. This proposal does little to promote these alternative forms of transport. Lastly during construction the proposed development will result in significant movements along what is a constrained part of the highway network and it will have a severe residual impact on other traffic and safety.

The local plan emphasis the need to ensure diversification of the economy and lever on Bicester's unique location to develop high tech/innovative/knowledge based industries. As per the local plan, the Council aim to promote development opportunities for innovative commercial development in connection with the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. Cherwell is an important component of the Oxford - Cambridge Arc and hence has a key role in shaping our areas development and truly delivering transformational change. The local plan highlights the fact that development needs to encourage and support projects that seek to provide high skilled/higher wage jobs, apprentices and training opportunities. Sadly to-date, development appears to have allowed the commercial market to deliver what it wants to deliver, which has resulted in the construction or planned construction, of a disproportionate number of large logistical storage units. There is real danger that the logistics sector is being given pre-eminence over other sectors and thus a further increase in warehouse provision of this nature, would have the effect of severely unbalancing the local economy and effectively put an end to the realisation of the local plan. For avoidance of doubt I have extracted a small section from the local plan Policy. Employment proposals at Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington will be supported if they meet the following criteria: 1) Are within the built up limits of the settlement unless on an allocated site 2) They will be **outside of the Green Belt**, unless **very special circumstances** can be demonstrated 3) Make efficient use of **previously-developed land** wherever possible 4) Make efficient use of existing and underused sites and premises increasing the intensity of use on sites 5) Have **good access**, or can be **made to have good access**, by public transport and other sustainable modes 6) Meet high design standards, using sustainable construction, are of an appropriate scale and respect the character of its surroundings 7) Do not have an adverse effect on surrounding land uses, residents and the historic and natural environment. By what criteria does a development of this nature qualify as having met the criteria of **special circumstances**? Furthermore it's also within the Green Belt and it's not an allocated site identified within the local plan and is next to ancient woodlands.

Whilst I do not live in the district, I do visit the area on a weekly basis and enjoy the wonderful walks, trails and bridle paths, as a consequence I am desirous of maintaining the rural characterisation, of the landscape and the peaceful tranquillity of the village of Stoke Lyne and Stoke Woods. This new development would significantly change that balance and lead to additional noise, light pollution and traffic. Currently a constant humming from the A43 can be heard whilst walking between the areas of Lower Farm and Stoke Bushes and a development of this nature would likely add to that noise and bring light pollution. A leisurely walk around the area also reveals the huge number and variety of plant, pollinators and wildlife, who forage and make their homes in the connecting corridors between Stoke Lyne, Stoke Woods and Stoke Bushes. The ecological impact of this scheme, with the potential for a significant biodiversity loss has not been properly addressed and mitigated.

Under government guidance on determining planning applications, it is stated that the courts have taken the view that '**material considerations**' in planning should be concerned with '**land use in the public interest**'. In light of recent disastrous heatwaves in Australia, Canada, USA, Greece, Spain, Italy, Russia and other countries and the appalling floods in Germany, Belgium, Holland as well as

nearer to home in London, it is clear that maintaining our green spaces and in fact improving them is vital. Climate change has meant that such extreme weather should now be expected (in Canada the 1,000-year heatwaves are now expected every 7 years) and the temperature of the planet is going up from the current 1.1 °C (likely to reach 1.5 °C around 2030 according the recent IPCC report). It is clear that the likely damage in and human suffering from future extreme weather conditions must now be considered a 'material consideration' and 'land use in the public interest' in the Bicester area, must take into account prevention of and adaptation to such likely scenarios. The same government guidance also states that; the local planning authority may depart from development plan policy where material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed. This power is contained in article 32 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) England Order 2015. I respectfully propose that the current huge number of climate disasters all around the World and the certainty that similar disasters will befall the UK, and therefore the Bicester area in the very near future, should be a material consideration. That being the case it would follow, that this would allow the local planning authority to decide not to follow the Local Plan and to determine there should be no development in the area subject to the application. Another significant point is the fact that Cherwell has declared a climate emergency and committed to action to address this. It should be noted that In addition, to Cherwell's commitment the recently updated NPPF 2021 (paragraph 11a) now requires decisions to **'mitigate climate change... and adapt to its effects'**. It is safe to assume that this commercial development will be predominantly covered with hard surfacing, so rainwater and particularly storm water (not forgetting the impact of climate change) will likely run off the land more quickly into the drains (not sure about responsibility for keeping the drains and other infrastructure in good order) and ditches. This will intensify the amount of water that the drains and ditches need to carry. Where existing ditches and drains cannot cope with the increased speed of flow, it is inevitable that there will be an increased chance of flooding, spilling onto the highway and adjoining land. Accordingly, the proposal is not sufficiently robust in explaining how the proposal mitigates and adapts to the threats posed from climate change

In conclusion this proposal is contrary to both local and national planning policies and does not first and foremost comply with the definition of **sustainable development and must be rejected**