**From:** Public Access DC Comments   
**Sent:** 06 November 2018 17:00  
**To:** Public Access DC Comments  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 18/00484/OUT

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 5:00 PM on 06 Nov 2018 from Mrs Helen Fellows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Summary** | |
| **Address:** | Land North And Adjoining Home Farm Banbury Road B4100 Caversfield |
| **Proposal:** | Outline planning permission for up to 75 homes, pedestrian and cycle routes, creation of new access point from Charlotte Avenue, provision of open space, play space, allotments, orchard, parking and associated works. |
| **Case Officer:** | Caroline Ford |
| [Click for further information](https://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications/centralDistribution.do?caseType=Application&keyVal=P5Y1WMEM0N100) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Details** | |
| **Name:** | Mrs Helen Fellows |
| **Email:** |  |
| **Address:** | 8 Tayberry Close, Bicester OX27 8AU |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments Details** | |
| **Commenter Type:** | Neighbour |
| **Stance:** | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | - The proposed development lies in the area designated for the NW Bicester Ecotown, so should follow the requirements laid out in the the "North West Bicester Supplementary Planning Document": e.g. the SPD clause 4.24, 4.25 and 4.42 require developments to achieve zero carbon emissions, water neutrality measures, Minimum Fabric Energy Efficiency Standards (FEES) and Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 (CSH5). It would be inappropriate and hypocritical to allow any new developments in the area designated for the Eco-Town that do not meet these criteria. Although section 6.32 of the planning statement suggests that there is the intention to comply with the SPD, it is not clear how or whether this will be achieved in practice and most of the planning documents do not mention any intention for these houses to be eco-houses.  - There is not enough parking provision in the proposed plans for residents of the proposed development or their visitors. This may have knock-on effects on existing Elmsbrook residents, with people from the proposed development parking dangerously or inconsiderately in Elmsbrook. This is discussed in more detail below.  - It is not fair for residents of the proposed 75 homes to access their property via Charlotte Avenue or Braeburn Avenue unless they contribute to its maintenance in the period before the road is adopted.   - Any developers building on this site should contribute towards the local facilities and the local management organisation, matching the per person/household contributions to community development that have been and continue to be paid by A2Dominion, as all residents will benefit from local facilities, community and events.  - It would also not be fair if the residents of any building on this site were not subject to the same covenants as other residents of NW Bicester  - The development would cause a great deal of extra traffic past Gagle Brook school and noise for Elmsbrook residents if traffic from the proposed development were allowed to travel south down Charlotte Avenue, past the school and through Elmsbrook Phases 1 and 2: There needs to be a method of stopping cars from getting from the proposed development to phase 1 to prevent this.  - The construction traffic would be extremely disruptive to existing Elmsbrook residents. In particular, it would be dangerous to allow any construction traffic to travel south down Charlotte Avenue, past the school or through Elmsbrook Phases 1 and 2. Instead, it would be much shorter and disturb fewer residents to go north along Charlotte Avenue to the B4100.  - I have seen hares in the fields either side of the site where this development is proposed (both in the field between home farm and phase 1 Elmsbrook, and in the field south of phase 4 Elmsbrook): it is therefore likely that there are hares living in or travelling through the proposed site.  - The proposed development would be visually intrusive into open countryside and the Church of St Laurence: it would become the main thing that can be seen from the B4100 end of the church and would spoil Elmsbrook residents' views of the church and fields. At present, the church is visible from many different points on the edge of Elmsbrook phase 2 and beyond, whereas the proposed plans would mean that it was only visible directly along the avenue proposed for this development.  - It is unclear what consultation has occurred with the Elmsbrook residents' association. We are members of the association, but have not been asked for our views and the developers have not discussed this with residents at the residents' association meetings.  Additional notes on parking:  The SGR1 plan, in clause 4.1.6, quotes the Oxfordshire Residential Road Design Guide which it says: "states that one allocated car parking space per dwelling will be acceptable at the North West Bicester Eco Town... Additional unallocated off plot car parking may also be provided up to a maximum of one space per dwelling." While this is true, Elmsbrook Exemplar phase HAS NOT used the eco-town specific opt out clause (Note 2) which is quoted - it uses the specification in Section B2, Table B1 - which provides a much greater number of allocated and unallocated spaces. DESPITE this, there are still significant parking issues on Elmsbrook Phases 1 and 2 due to a huge deficit between required spaces and provision, and this causes regular dangerous and inconsiderate driving and parking.   NB: the Elmsbrook Exemplar phase Travel Plan (November 2011) only contains data and analysis for travel FROM the estate - no evidence re visitors coming TO the estate. Looking at the design for SGR1, it is clear that they have provided 1 space each for 2-3 bed homes and 2 spaces for the (20-30%) 4 bed homes; and no other spaces. There is no mention of Visitor spaces in the Travel Plan document, and none visible on the site design. This is approximately TWICE as constraining on parking.  We therefore see no way in which the SGR1 development, as proposed, could do anything other than (a) suffer, internally, from the same dangerous and inconsiderate parking issues seen on Elmsbrook, and (b) potentially add to parking and other travel issues on the wider estate through its single vehicles access at the top of Charlotte Avenue.   It seems very much like parking provision is being minimised using the excuse of "green/eco" principles to provide less spaces - for both residents and visitors - and thus enable more properties to be squeezed onto the same site. The assumption underlying this is, sadly at this time, simply unrealistic: some home purchasers will indeed be of that mindset (ourselves included) - but you can't design based on an accumulated set of such assumptions: some people just want to buy a house in a nice area, and won't pay heed to number of cars "hoped for" by the developers. The same was true for Elmsbrook Phases 1 and 2, and the parking/bus passage issues are the result. |