

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	Linda Griffiths
Organisation Name	Graham Robb
Address	136 Main Rd,Middleton Cheney,Banbury,OX17 2PW
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I am not a Cherwell resident, but I pass this proposed development site most days, know it well and know how much the proposed development will impact on residents of W Northants Council as much, if not more than the residents of Cherwell District Council.</p> <p>I am responding to the significant additional supplements lodged by Greystoke CB during autumn 2022 and would make the following further objections. My original objections lodged in summer 2022 still stand.</p> <p>1) The Site The map "illustrative site layout" submitted by Greystoke makes clear that in addition to the building for which this application was made , the company identifies a site boundary and "other land in the control of the applicant" which suggest that a phase two would allow approximately a further development approximately a third more in area. Councillors need to make decisions about this application in the light of an evident intent by Greystoke to expand in future. I can see no justification in allowing either the current or any future applications.</p> <p>2) SE1 Vol 2 "Transport" I would ask Cherwell Council to be assured and sure that the transport modelling and proposed mitigation includes all related travel and not just 'journey to work' calculations . Clearly the significant lorry traffic servicing the proposed warehouses will place significant additional traffic pressures. The proposal identifies cycle parks as a key attribute of the development, which is welcome, but then appears to omit any provision for dedicated cycleways into Banbury. Mixing Cyclists and heavy traffic flows on the M40 Roundabout , on the A 361 or A422 is bound to increase the chance of accidents, while the existing route under the M40 to Gateway entails crossing the A361 which will become significantly busier under these plans. The plan is right in my view in suggesting few would walk to work at the site using the M40 underpass and so appears to rely on a short term funded bus subsidy as an alternative to increased car traffic.</p> <p>3) SE1 Ecology analysis (section7) The current land use is modified grassland which as evidenced sustains a range of mammals (for example I note 1000+ bat movements recorded) and birds (including, remarkably, a passing Osprey) . The site includes some 42 hedgerows. I wish to challenge the framing of the 'ecology analysis' which takes not account of the basis of all the higher ecology - the soil. This grassland has been farmed continuously since , it is reasonable to assume, Anglo Saxon times. The ridge and furrow still evident speaks to that longevity and to a minimal modern deep ploughing regime. The soil therefore is well established and balanced to sustain this grassland and hedgerow / tree habitat. But this landscape element based on a soil evidently in balance to various degrees with the land usage, is not an isolated island but part of the scarp edge ecology running N - S bordering the Cherwell Valley. This development would , despite the mitigation proposed, do permanent damage to the soil and to the patterns of migrating mammals and birds identified. I therefore challenge the claim that this development would only limit ecological damage to the local site .</p> <p>4) Visual Impact</p>

The Cherwell Adopted Planning criteria includes this section

Proposals will not be permitted if they would:

Cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside

Cause undue harm to important natural landscape features and topography

Be inconsistent with local character

Impact on areas judged to have a high level of tranquillity

Harm the setting of settlements, buildings, structures, or other landmark features, or

Harm the historic value of the landscape.

I do not see any way in which the Greystoke proposal can meet these criteria especially the first one.

I welcome the chance to see the further analysis lodged as part of this process. These comments are in addition to my original objection. Nothing has changed my view that this proposal should be rejected by Cherwell District Council as contrary to the principles of its planning criteria.

Received Date

26/11/2022 17:34:29

Attachments