**Please send your objections to:** **east@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk** **OR post them to AVDC , Development Management, The Gateway, Gatehouse Road, Aylesbury, HP19 8FF*. Although it is best to present these reasons in your own words you can also download and use them direct from*** [***www.biertonvillage.org.uk***](http://www.biertonvillage.org.uk) ***Please add - or emphasise - any objections of your own.***

**Dear Sir/Madam, I object to Application 13/00391, Land E of Watermead, for the following reasons:**

1. Given that 2450 homes have been steamrollered through for Broughton Crossing, approval of a further 1,560 homes, this time between Bierton and Aylesbury, will surely mean that **Bierton** **will cease to be a village and will lose its community identity.** The Core Strategy Inspector said “The proposed Eastern Arc would have very serous impact on Bierton and Broughton Crossing. I think there is a very real danger that the new development would **swamp the existing settlements**, *despite any green buffers.”*: The Inspector’s concerns are just as relevant now!
2. This application makes a great virtue of its proposed **“**strategic**”** road linking the A413 and A418 and thus **directly conflicts with the District Council’s strategic rationale for developing 2,450** **houses at Broughton Crossing**. The road in Hallam’s new application is simply an estate road. It will join to the A418 *within* Bierton at a new T junction - with traffic lights - by the Bierton Allotments opposite Nos 57-61 Aylesbury Rd and quite near the 3 existing roundabouts! New traffic in all directions would surely **increase the number of vehicles already going through our village –** to/from Aylesbury, Leighton Buzzard, the new estate and schools**. The estate road** **would not relieve the town’s traffic** – it adds to traffic at the Elmhurst/Bierton roundabout on the ring road and negates any benefit at the Horse & Jockey. It’s just robbing Peter to pay Paul!
3. The road would instead encourage driving through a new housing estate, not round it, creating **conflict between the needs of new residents and through traffic.** This is bad planning and contrasts with Buckingham Park and Watermead where through traffic within has been avoided.
4. The land proposed to be built on has the highest agricultural value of any current application. Nearly half of the site is designated **‘best & most versatile land’**. The loss of this land would be against both local and national planning policy, *because there clearly are alternatives*. The Core Strategy Inspector considered this site to be **“the most** **sensitive” in landscape terms**. He described Fleet Marston as “flat and uninteresting”.
5. The application has **no separate** **employment area**, meaning the new homes would not be matched by an equivalent number of new jobs. As such, it is not a sustainable community. This serious flaw is similar to Quarrendon Fields, which was recently refused at public enquiry.
6. The lack of employment opportunities and not being near a rail station would lead to **excessive car use** for commuting – another indication of unsustainability.
7. AVDC has already found that **inadequate ecological surveys** have been undertaken in respect of breeding birds, bats and great crested newts. Consequently, AVDC should refuse the application.
8. The application will contribute less houses to meet the shortfall in 5 year land supply than Fleet Marston or Hampden Fields and is not needed to achieve AVDC’s target of 6,000 new homes.

**Given the obvious short comings of this Application, its conflicts with existing approvals, other development options and the emerging AVP, I urge the Council to refuse Application 13/00391/AOP.**