

Rachel Tibbetts

From: Jane Wright [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 June 2022 08:01
To: Planning
Cc: Jane Birnage
Subject: Objection to Planning Application- 22/01340/OUT

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam

Having tried and failed to lodge my objection to this application online, I am emailing you directly. The website failed to recognise that I had entered my name and comments and I was not able to submit my objections.

I wish to 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 any use other than open countryside. Indeed, there are hectares of land already identified for employment land in the district that have not yet had any planning permission sought. The Local Plan clearly sets out the need to supply jobs close to where they are needed, and there are no employment needs identified in this location. 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 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.

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

From an ecological view, light pollution, air pollution and noise pollution would have a major detrimental effect on the local wildlife. Owls and bats particularly are very sensitive to light and noise. The area is well used by various species of wildlife, particularly owls and bats, and being so close to Stoke Woods, a well-known ancient woodland, this development would harm both flora and fauna. Wildlife needs corridors to connect to other pockets of suitable surroundings. This development would destroy the connecting corridors between Stoke Woods, Stoke Bushes and Little Stoke Woods. Wildlife do not thrive in isolated pockets and so would eventually die out.

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.

The visual harm of this development would be especially felt by the residents of Stoke Lyne village and the many people who travel here to seek out peace of the countryside for recreational, health giving walks and exercise. The many people who travel from the local surroundings to walk in Stoke Woods amongst the ancient woodland would have their peaceful idyll shattered. Again, Bicester, as a Garden Town does not have many woodlands within an easy reach and so this development would affect many more people than just the local Stoke Lyne resident

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.

This proposal forms part of a set of applications, including the National Infrastructure Freight Rail Interchange and the Albion warehouse developments, 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 predominantly flat area would be catastrophic

I object to this application in the strongest possible terms.

Jane Birnage
Manor Grange, Cottisford, NN13 5SW