

Comment for planning application 23/03428/OUT

Application Number	23/03428/OUT
Location	OS Parcel 7921 South Of Huscote Farm And North West Of County Boundary Daventry Road Banbury
Proposal	Outline planning application for the construction of up to 140,000 sqm 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	Chris Wentworth
Organisation Name	Graham Robb
Address	136 Main Rd,Middleton Cheney,Banbury,Oxon OX17 2PW
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>Please note - this does not include my emphasis in the doc so I have also attached tried to attach this as a separate file to ease your reading of it .</p> <p>Cherwell Planning 23/03428/OUT</p> <p>I object to the proposed development on the following grounds :</p> <p>A) Planning principles for the area This are extracts from the relevant Policy with my notes in italic of my objections against relevant headings.</p> <p>Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement - Opportunities will be sought to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations, through the restoration, management or enhancement of existing landscapes, features, or habitats and where appropriate the creation of new ones, including the planting of woodlands, trees, and hedgerows.</p> <p>5.2.28 Development will be expected to respect and enhance local landscape character, securing appropriate mitigation where damage to local landscape character cannot be avoided. Proposals will not be permitted if they would:</p> <p>1 Cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside . This development is urban impingement to the east of the A361 and to the north of the A422 on current open fields and historic ridge and furrow. The proposal will not enhance the landscape currently visible to either from Banbury or from the A422 road or from the public footpaths/ country park.</p> <p>2 Cause undue harm to important natural landscape features and topography</p> <p>The Greystoke site area (163 acres) and the noted 'other land in the control of the applicant ' (a further 20.3 acres) combines valley sides and the start of the Cherwell floodplain. Further building will increase likelihood of rapid run off and downstream flooding. So, the existing proposed build has, I must assume, to be just the first step of development which will further damage the natural landscape on the escarpment slope.</p> <p>This is unallocated agricultural land which sustains an important ecology in soil , flora and fauna and this development would be a significant disruption to the green infrastructure of the area.</p> <p>3 Be inconsistent with local character.</p> <p>The proposal does nothing to 'secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape on the urban fringe'. Rather it will mark a further extension of the 'warehouse canyon which now is forming along the M40 and destroy an undeveloped rural environment.</p>

B Comments on the applicants reports

1) Transport

The applicant estimates 6300 2-way trips per 24 hours when operational including 2200 HGV trips. Clearly the significant lorry traffic servicing the proposed warehouses will place significant additional traffic pressures on an already very busy J11 roundabout and by consequential feedback on the roundabouts towards Banbury.

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. I do not see plans for The application is right in my view in suggesting few would walk to work at the site using the M40 underpass and so the whole development will be against the council policy of minimising car traffic.

I see no modelling of demand for bus stops servicing the site.

This (M40 Junction to Hennef way) is already an area subject to Air Quality concerns - so this additional source of vehicle particulates should not be allowed.

2) Employment

The applicant notes

13.9.4 The operational effect (permanent jobs, contribution to economic output, business rates revenue and wages of on-site employees) is considered to be significantly beneficial in EIA terms.

But even a cursory viewing of the existing warehousing and office stock shows Banbury has an oversupply - warehouses standing empty and offices , even in the centre, unoccupied. This development is not going to generate the sort of economic benefit described.

3) Flood risk

The applicant notes:

a the likely increase in permanent impermeable area and increase in discharge to local watercourses and blockages of drainage networks during the operational phase.

It also notes that the River Cherwell failed its most recent water purity tests (2019) . Further runoff risks exacerbating water quality in the headwaters of the Thames.

I am not familiar with the detailed geology, but the Cherwell flood plain will have at the very least pockets of impermeable clay and an existing high water table. The flood prevention structures in place to the west of the site were not modelled on such extensive additional impermeable surfaces - especially as we are now seeing more high intensity rain episodes (with associated high surface water discharge) as climate change impacts . The proposal does not address this in any meaningful way.

Graham Robb 19 Dec 2023

Received Date

19/12/2023 10:26:16

Attachments

The following files have been uploaded:

- OUT.pdf