

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	Chris Rae
Address	110 Camp Road,Upper Heyford,Bicester,OX25 5AG
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>The plans are inappropriately located and the size and mass are illogical and inappropriate for the situation and location. Any approval in current form is without due regard for the local geography and there is no attempt to blend this within the environment.</p> <p>The current village boundaries will be completely wiped out, this is not acceptable in the current location. A complete out of town development could be achieved but in a more appropriate location - the need to replicate the monstrosity warehouses at J11 is a complete fallacy. The proposals are effectively dropping a town scale development into a rural village location which has no apparent justification that has been put forward(?).</p> <p>The road network and infrastructure is not well catered for as it currently stands. The impact of such a behemoth of a development should be looked at in the round - what happens in Bicester, the A41, J9 of the M40, the A43 and the B4030 as a result of this development and not just J10 of the M40. Any such development WILL impact these junctions, which are already under strain, and will also increase traffic on the local B roads which are not suitable for goods, HGV's and additional traffic loads and are already in a state of disrepair and neglect; this is compounded by the Authority failing, and being found wanting, in implementing the obligations for additional routes off of Heyford airbase. This compounds the complete lack of confidence in the Authority to manage and administer a development of this size, especially given it is inappropriately located.</p> <p>By implementing this development, and on such a monstrous size, the vehicle movements through the surrounding villages and even Bicester town will result in a serious hazard and risk to local residents and children. Is this what the Authority endorses? Is this what the Developer will turn a blind eye to for profit margins?</p> <p>There is no sound logic in the site appraisal location other than pointing to the M40 location, if this is the case it would be more appropriate to group this with the rest of the mess of warehouses at J11. A concession of green land, natural habitats, walking routes, areas of greenery for mental stimulation and health and well-being in villages is illogical, ill placed and ill conceived.</p> <p>The ESG's of the development are not clear and there is no real regard for meeting minimum industry standards, especially if the Developer and Authority are instant on putting these huge warehouses in a rural location as opposed to out of town as elsewhere (yes they are in a rural location before you query as other comparable developments, i.e. J11 are in a town location). Minimum requirements that are not being addressed and therefore given no confidence that this will be a sustainable development are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- net zero embodied carbon as per Paris proof targets of UKGBC- net zero in operation as per UKGBC standards (in conjunction with the BRE) without greenwashing and using a Regos tariff to counter offsetting- EPC A- Assessment of Part L in line with 2021 standards that are coming into effect- Minimum 30% carbon offset BER vs TER

The acoustics and hours of operation should be limited so as not to have any impact whatsoever on the current residents in surrounding villages and parishes, this will impact the surrounding wildlife and current homeowner and property owner enjoyment. This does not constitute sustainable development and the development. This again points to this being the inappropriate location and the impact on mental well-being as a result of this plant, general operation and excess vehicle movements, not to mention the additional air pollution in the surrounding vicinity and the vehicle movements routes. Will the Authority ignore the well-being of all residents to favour a development that is incorrectly located with a site location appraisal lacking in acknowledgement of the infrastructure, surrounding residents, sustainability impacts and also the overall picture on sustainable development?

The proposals are being presented as an employment opportunity and therefore a stimulus to the local economy. This stimulus only occurs if employment comes from within a local radius. There are no proposals addressing this to avoid jobs going to wider regions and against adding single modes of transport into the equation and thus adding more strain on the transport network at wider nodes which are not appropriately addressed. There should be no approval of this application given that there are no guarantees on local employment or social value reinvestment, which are what the basis of these applications are made upon - having a workforce from Swindon, Gloucester and the West Midlands are not conducive to sustainable development and the carbon impact will not be tracked in any way.

All of the above combined shows that this application should not be approved as:

- The transport and infrastructure network has failed to be fully considered, with wider node impacts not considered fully
- The local village networks are not appropriately considered as they will become rat runs and unsafe, particularly for families and children who already reside
- The ESG's are undefined / substantiated
- Impact on health and well-being of locals and the local region are not considered
- Habitat impact and displacement is not appropriate when balanced with the size of development
- Local employment opportunities are not guaranteed and neither is the stimulus to the region
- The development does not constitute sustainable development, this is compounded with all of the above points

Finally, it is abundantly clear that there has been little regard to the visibility of these hideous warehouses that will blight the countryside. If the Developer and Authority had any due regard the mass would be less, the scale would befit the location, i.e. rural!!, the height would not exceed the surrounding residential spaces, the views of green landscaping areas that contribute to mental well-being and offer exercise routes would not be blighted and the appearance of these disgusting architectural monstrosities would see them dressed similar to the hangers that exist on the airbase at Heyford so as to be less disruptive - the fact that they are not points to an ill conceived development and a desire to protect a profit margin over provision of a sustainable and balanced development.

The proposal doesn't appear to be in keeping with the local plan.

With the above in mind the application should not be approved.

Received Date

10/06/2022 15:41:29

Attachments