**From:** Public Access DC Comments   
**Sent:** 30 October 2018 09:36  
**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 9:36 AM on 30 Oct 2018 from Mr George Bennett.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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:** | Mr George Bennett |
| **Email:** |  |
| **Address:** | 94 Charlotte Avenue, Bicester OX27 8AN |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments Details** | |
| **Commenter Type:** | Neighbour |
| **Stance:** | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | My previous comment has not appeared in document list, so I am logging it again:  Although I support the building of much needed housing, I cannot lend my support to this development in its current form for a number of related reasons.  As a resident of neighbouring Elmsbrook I am firm supporter of sustainable housing and transport. However, this proposed development rides roughshod over those principles, not only in and of itself but also with its reliance on the infrastructure of Elmsbrook. The Bicester Ecotown is a worthwhile venture, but it is saddening to see that the first development to be planned next to it (before the Exemplar is even finished) will not adhere to the same level of planning restrictions that are making Elmsbrook such a success. In its current form, the plans dilute the gains of the eco town exemplar and have the potential to remove them altogether. Given that Elmsbrook is the 'Exemplar' of NW Bicester then it would follow that subsequent developments match or exceed its achievements, the evidence for this aspiration is sadly lacking from the proposals.  I would like to highlight some of the ways that I believe the development would be detrimental to the sustainability of the local area, although this is not an exhaustive list.  Transport: Pedestrian/Cycle ways are not the same as dedicated cycleways, and the connection to Home Farm is meaningless for travel to Bicester due to the lack of any safe pathway along the B4100, I note that the crossing is also proving a sticking point and that a perceived 'urbanisation' is trying to be avoided. I argue that the provision of safe and useable pedestrian access from the development to the church and Caversfield and potentially along the B4100 is a necessary result of the developments, to object on the principle of urbanisation is shutting the door after the event. The proposed crossing to the church, requires a minimum of the island, from the data provided it is clear that it is a busy road and protection is required for pedestrians.  Charlotte Avenue is effectively a 4m wide road, claims that is is 6m ignores the many useful pedestrian crossings which make it effectively a 4m wide way. On this basis it is worrying that the only vehicular access to the proposed development is via Charlotte avenue, which is not only narrow but also currently privately maintained. Would the new development contribute to the upkeep? Clearly car transport should be avoided to be in keeping with the Exemplar and NW Bicester grand plan but the plans indicate that the only access to bus travel will be by walking back into Elmsbrook (a distance claimed to be 200m but this is from the development access point and would be much longer for the average resident). I believe this would be too long a distance for elderly or disabled residents to cover to reach the bus, which has limited running times, therefore the current plan forces car transport. I see no evidence of the provision of car sharing in the new development, analogous to the eCar scheme in Elmsbrook. This would be a suitable way to limit car ownership and traffic. Cycling provision is also sub standard, I see only the outdoor racks int he plan which offer insufficient protection of bicycles against weather and theft. Bikesheds akin to those in Elmsbrook should be considered.  Energy:The CO2 footprint of the is an open point. No reference is given to the potential to link the development to the existing district heating network, which surely is the correct means of addressing this issue as well as lowering the running costs of the system. I note that in the sustainability document, the only concrete measures listed are maximisation of south facing facades and use of high efficiency boilers. The former could be a risk for summer overheating of vulnerable residents and the latter merely describes the minimum requirements of Part L of the Building regulations. The requirement should be Level 4 of the code for sustainable homes, in keeping with the NW Bicester guidelines. I could not find any reference to this requirement which would also address a number of other issues I am raising such as the previously mentioned bike sheds.  Flooding/water consumption:The plan shows no building on the pluvial flood area to the east and south east of the plot, however no firm plan is given to extend the measures implemented in Elmsbrook to alleviate the flood potential, i.e. through rainwater collection and permeable surfaces, although the latter does seem to be recommended but is not required. The discussion about the rainwater collection and use for flushing etc seems to be ongoing with resistance from the developer. Please ensure that such measures are taken, again code for sustainable homes or even Passivhaus stipulation would cover many of these topics. I note that the Environment Agency have also objected to the plans with concerns about flooding risk. I note also that rainwater harvesting has seemingly been rejected by the developer, which is disappointing and indicative of a more general disregard for sustainability principles when it impacts their profit.  Sustainability summary: Code for sustainable homes must be included as a pre requisite for any development which plans to benefit from the infrastucture of the eco town.  Regards,   George Bennett |
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