

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	Bryan Eagle
Address	38 North Street, Banbury,,Banbury
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I have reviewed the Amendment information provided by Greystoke GB Ltd for their application 22/01488/OUT and I object to this development.</p> <p>The key impacts on the Banbury/Grimsbury area remain, and haven't been sufficiently addressed so I think the application should be turned down and if possible a decision to prevent a reapplication made. Driving this through, as Frontier Park was, would have many detrimental outcomes for the people of Banbury and would open the A361 corridor to Banbury up for a spate of further speculative applications. I do have concerns that the work by our local Councils to review these applications risks overwhelming their resource, and I am sure the developers know this.</p> <p>To detail my objection to the revised Application:</p> <p>I do not think that the local infrastructure (J11 of the M40 roundabout, Hennef Way or the A361) can cope with additional traffic both during any construction work or after, when more lorries, vans and employee journeys will be the key outcome for local communities. The additional traffic will further affect air quality and along Hennef Way, and this is a major issue. There is a large Tarmac-owned aggregate depot on Hennef Way and this in all probability will be the source for building materiel, further adding to the air pollution that Banbury residents and especially Grimsbury residents live with. As far as I know this issue isn't being addressed in any meaningful way at County or District Council level despite having been discussed a good couple of years ago, with monitoring action promised.</p> <p>The Frontier Park development on the A361 close to J11 of the M40 has provided a template for the disruption any construction work using the locality will cause. As a daily user of that road I would say that the building of Frontier Park has been a major inconvenience and source of disruption to the many people who use the A361 as their primary access to Banbury or to the M40 itself. If the site becomes operational then this will continue. Frontier Park has not been let so far and only the warehouse/distribution buildings have been completed. The additional developments within the approved plan there haven't been started. The arial photos here prove this; https://dtre.com/search/properties/26586-fp217-frontier-park-banbury</p> <p>This gives me no confidence that the developers will complete their design to its full. I think that it is likely that empty promise-amendments to Applications will leave local Councils powerless to enforce higher cost no-economic-benefit parts of any approved Application.</p> <p>In addition the Frontier Park buildings have left the only large public open space in Banbury (the Flood Defence park) with a backdrop of warehouse walls, rather than the views across fields that were there before. One more example of development reducing the quality of peoples lives.</p> <p>I do not think there is a coherent strategy around road traffic levels and the associated pollution in the Banbury area and this Application should flag this up. The parcel hub at the old Alcan site on Southam Road, the hub behind the Waitrose supermarket at the "town" end</p>

of the Southam Road, the new Amazon etc hub being built on Ruscote Avenue...all provide Banbury's inadequate roads with more delivery van traffic and pollution than is reasonable. These hubs have only appeared in major size in the last couple of years and the many delivery vehicles make local roads very busy and polluting. Adding more traffic from yet another warehouse development is wrong for the residents of Banbury and another reason to turn the Application down.

Finally, the Amendment does not do enough to protect local wildlife. There is an assumption that displaced wildlife will magically repopulate post development. This is not so, local diversity will be lost and for the period of any construction will be decimated so no chance of those environment specific species returning. Whilst some more adaptable species will return in time, the changed/limited environment will mean that other will not.

I feel that Cherwell should turn this Amendment and the Application that precedes it down for the good of the town, its people and its environment. The alternative is to set a precedent for Banbury to become a warehouse town and to expect a series of similar Applications the result of which bring nothing to the local community.

Bryan Eagle

Received Date

29/11/2022 13:12:12

Attachments