

Comment for planning application 22/01488/OUT

Application Number	22/01488/OUT
Location	OS Parcel 5616 South West Of Huscote Farm And East Of Daventry Road Banbury
Proposal	Construction of up to 140,000 sq m of employment floorspace (use class B8 with ancillary offices and facilities) and servicing and infrastructure including new site accesses, internal roads and footpaths, landscaping including earthworks to create development platforms and bunds, drainage features and other associated works including demolition of the existing farmhouse
Case Officer	Samantha Taylor
Organisation Name	
Name	Bryan Eagle
Address	38 North Street,Banbury,OX16 3LH
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I live in the Grimsbury and Hightown ward, in the Conservation area of West, North, East and South streets. I object to the application on several grounds:</p> <p>1) as the proposed warehouse units are for sale/lease to the distribution industry they will require cheap low skilled labour. In practice this means a transient population with limited income and no concern or care for the community they rent accommodation in. By community, I mean Grimsbury, which is already full of bedsits, HMO's and rentals of various sorts. Each property that goes this way makes it far less likely that there are family homes and a balance of ages and diversities of residents. There are already many young men of EU descent who add nothing to the feeling of safety or community in the area. Petty crime follows this - a recent cannabis factory in West Street, fly tipping, unlicenced cars, racing cars at night, illegal escooters, etc. A policing issue the developers will say but back here in the real world it'll be another layer of anti-social activity borne by Grimsbury residents on a day to day basis.</p> <p>2) the development would add another burden to the already overloaded infastructure of both the Grimsbury and the M40 roads. Traffic blocks up very easily with even slight delays so adding a large distribution area to, well, more distribution businesses in the immediate area is not appropriate. My point applies to the proposed business's client vehicles and to the vehicles/footfall of the workforce.</p> <p>3) building the development would be a lengthy process and will cause even more traffic disruption whilst this is in progress with many more lorries, construction related journeys into and out of the site, as well as within the very large proposed area. This can be proven by the still incomplete distribution facility on the A361. The site has caused roadworks, delays and disruption. Should other agencies be required to contribute to the works (Oxfordshire Highways, Thames Water etc) then their resource cannot be guaranteed so there is an expectation of a delayed or drawn out build, all to the detriment of the local community.</p> <p>4) my next objection is faith. Previous developments (the A361 facility mentioned above) have been granted approval (forgetting Councillors objections at the time - you voted it through folks). However, the build, promising hotels, diverse units etc hasn't happened, all that has been built is a huge distribution block. The block at the A361 has made the Flood Defences public park an eyesore - the block dominates the skyline and removes any feeling of countryside from that green space. Painting it green as the developers have done is an insult, allowing it to be built shames those who approved the plans (just my opinion). So, for the proposed Nethercote site, I have no faith therefore that the developers, if given permission in any form would stick to their proposals, or that the Council have any teeth to prevent the development being whatever the developers costings said would be best for them. I understand that the developers have funds to pursue their application and I do not believe that the Council should look to appease them fearing a legal/drawn out saga. The Council are public servants after all and if the majority of residents are against the proposals I believe the developers should be told an unequivocal, no caveat no to their plans.</p>

5) environmentally the proposed development is a terrible thing as I am sure the Council, and the developers know. On environmental grounds it should not be approved.

6) the proposed development both in the building process and thereafter would be a significant detriment to the air quality of the locality and this means the Grimsbury area. Hennef Way, within a half mile of the proposed site has the worst air quality in the County (See Councillor Hannah Banfield for more on this). The Tarmac depot at Grimsbury Green (just off Hennef Way, less than a mile from the proposed site), has expanded its daily activities adding to the poor air local residents breathe. Oxfordshire County Council Planning accepted an air quality monitoring scheme for the Grimsbury area at their meeting of 28.2.22. Adding to the poor air local residents breathe when this can be averted is a public duty of representatives I'd think and a key reason for my objection to the proposal.

7). lastly, who benefits? Well not the residents of Grimsbury who I'm sure don't want more poor air to breathe, more interminable traffic delays and even more anti social activity. I don't think that Banbury benefits either, its being called a warehouse town and from above it certainly looks like one. The town centre is dying, the only new shops are EU food ones to cater for the transient workforce of these distribution centres. I'd urge Councillors to go to Leamington or to Stratford on Avon. Their town centres aren't dying and its not rocket science to see why.

Received Date

13/06/2022 14:05:33

Attachments