

## Objection to Planning Application 23/03428/OUT

We wish to object to the proposal put forward in the above planning application for the development of 140,000 sq m of employment floor space (use class B8 with associated offices and facilities) together with the associated infrastructure works necessary to implement such a large scale development.

There are multiple reasons for objecting to the proposed application however the most pertinent would be that the overall site is not allocated for development in the current Cherwell Local Plan. In fact, the site was expressly excluded from the proposed plan by Mr Nigel Payne, an Inspector appointed to review the local plan by Her Majesty's Planning Inspectorate. Accordingly the site was excluded from being a nominated site within the final local plan. Further more, having reviewed the proposed land allocations in the Cherwell 2040 Local Plan this plot is once again expressly excluded from being allocated for any development.

Not only is this site not allocated for development, a good enough reason to refuse the application in any event, but one has to ask why is this additional warehousing needed. The plot immediately opposite the subject site to the west of the A361 which has been partially developed for warehousing remains vacant and has done since completion some years ago. Surely this is an indication of the lack of demand for any additional warehousing around Banbury despite what the applicants might think.

Any proposal to develop on this site is therefore contrary to the provisions of the Cherwell Local Plan and in particular the following policies –

C.155 – this policy highlights the supply of employment land already available in Banbury and states that Bicester will be the focus for new employment land over the course of the current local plan.

C.128 – amongst other guidance this policy sets out the need to manage growth in a way that will not cause unacceptable harm to important natural and historic assets and the need to manage traffic congestion.

C.129 – this policy expressly refers to the need to minimise the impact of new development on the natural environment.

The subject proposal is clearly contrary to these policies and outside the areas identified for development within the current Cherwell Local Plan.

In addition to the key point on policy we also object to the subject proposal on the following additional grounds -

### 1. Visual impact

Given the location of the site under consideration, to the east of junction 11 of the M40 where the landscape very markedly changes from being urban to being rural, any development of this scale will simply be a scar on the landscape. The view heading east up the A422 is rural in outlook with a clear break from the existing development bordering the west of the M40. Any large scale development on the east of the M40 will have a negative effect on this view and significantly detract from the transition from the urban landscape into a more rural landscape. At night the light pollution from a development of this scale will only serve as a constant reminder of this scar on the landscape. Bluntly, the proposed development will be an eyesore.

## 2. Traffic Impact

Traffic congestion on the Junction 11 roundabout has been a factor in the determination of many planning applications over recent years. Any additional development that is outside of the already allocated sites will only add to the amount of traffic that requires to enter and exit Banbury and its environs via this single roundabout. All traffic from the new development to the west of the M40, plus that already generated from Banbury and the surrounding villages was already putting this junction under strain. Add in the impact of the 1000s of truck movements from HS2 depots up the A361 at Chipping Warden, up the B4525 at Greatworth and the concrete batching plant at Sulgrave this will simply put the single point of access over the point of maximum capacity. Any additional development, particularly at the scale proposed, will only serve to create gridlock at this key junction. This in turn will simply drive traffic off the main arterial routes through the surrounding villages with the corresponding negative impact on residential amenity. Interestingly Thames Valley Police have made the same observation and referenced the Junction 11 interchange as already being over capacity.

## 3. Sustainability

A key tenet of the NPPF is sustainable development. It is very apparent from the scale of the application submitted that this development is far from sustainable, in fact it is the direct opposite. The loss of 75 ha of rural farmland when there are other brownfield sites available for development already allocated in the local plan is hardly sustainable development and on this reason alone this application should be refused.

## 4. Loss of Biodiversity

The impact of losing 75 ha of rural farmland on the local biodiversity barely needs any explanation. At a time when focus on our environment and natural surroundings never been higher how can an application of this size and scale be approved.

In summary the subject application is contrary to the Local Plan and will have a significant negative impact on the surrounding area on the basis of the reasons outlined above. For all of these reasons we object to this application and request that this application be refused.