

**Case Officer:** Andrew Thompson

**Recommendation:** Approve

**Applicant:** Paragon Fleet Solutions Ltd

**Proposal:** Discharge of condition 5 (travel plan and draft routeing agreement) of 18/02169/F

**Expiry Date:** 24 October 2019

**Extension of Time:**

## **1. APPLICATION SITE AND DESCRIPTION OF APPROVED DEVELOPMENT**

- 1.1. The proposal relates to the permission which continued and extended the temporary planning permission to store cars on land at the former RAF Upper Heyford as part of the existing authorised car processing operation currently taking place there. At present 6,000 cars a year are processed here but this would rise to 8,000 if permission is granted. The expanded use was initially sought until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021 (some fourteen months past) by which time it was hoped a revised masterplan for the whole of Heyford Park would have been agreed, in line with the Policy Villages 5 of the Cherwell Local Plan, in which it is proposed to relocate the applicant's operation.
- 1.2. Since the original grant of the planning permission for the car storage use and other developments, a hybrid planning permission for a mixed-use further development has been granted under 18/00825/HYBRID with various reserved matter, full permissions and non-material amendments also approved alongside the discharge of several conditions. That consent, once completed, will virtually double the size of Heyford Park.

## **2. CONDITIONS PROPOSED TO BE DISCHARGED**

- 2.1. The application submission is to discharge Condition 5 of consent 18/02169/F. The condition states:

*"Within three months of the date of this decision a travel plan and draft routeing agreement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This agreed plan and agreement shall be adhered to for the lifetime of the development thereafter.*

*Reason: To ensure the effective control of HGVs entering and leaving the site, to comply with Policy SLE4 and Villages 5 of the Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework."*

- 2.2. The application was submitted on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2019 (within the three-month timescale) and was supported by a location plan, Ref: P18 1596 01 and Workplace Travel Plan (Ref: BR-702-0001).

## **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1. The following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

18/02169/F - Temporary change of use of the eastern part of southern taxi way for use in connection with established and lawful car processing operations. Approved 31 May 2019.

18/00825/HYBRID - A hybrid planning application consisting of:

- demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1;
- outline planning permission for up to:
  - > 1,175 new dwellings (Class C3);
  - > 60 close care dwellings (Class C2/C3);
  - > 929m<sup>2</sup> of retail (Class A1);
  - > 670m<sup>2</sup> comprising a new medical centre (Class D1);
  - > 35,175m<sup>2</sup> of new employment buildings, (comprising up to 6,330m<sup>2</sup> Class B1a, 13,635m<sup>2</sup> B1b/c, 9,250m<sup>2</sup> Class B2, and 5,960m<sup>2</sup> B8);
  - > new primary school building on 2.33ha site (Class D1);
  - > 925m<sup>2</sup> of community use buildings (Class D2); and 515m<sup>2</sup> of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2);
  - > 30m in height observation tower with zip-wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up to 100m<sup>2</sup> (Class D1/A1/A3);
  - > 1,000m<sup>2</sup> energy facility/infrastructure (sui generis);
  - > 2,520m<sup>2</sup> additional education facilities (buildings and associated external infrastructure) at Buildings 73, 74 and 583 for education use (Class D1);
  - > creation of areas of Open Space, Sports Facilities, Public Park and other green infrastructure.
- the change of use of the following buildings and areas:
  - > Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8);
  - > Buildings 217, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3055, 3102, and 3136 for employment use (Class B8);
  - > Buildings 2010 and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1);
  - > Buildings 73 and 2004 (Class D1);
  - > Buildings 391, 1368, 1443, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use);
  - > Building 340 (Class D1, D2, A3);
  - > 20.3ha of hardstanding for car processing (Sui Generis); and
  - > 76.6ha for filming activities, including 2.1ha for filming set construction and event parking (Sui Generis);
- the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified in Schedule 2; and
- associated infrastructure works, including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road.

Approved - 09/09/2022.

#### **4. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

4.1. OCC Highways - The following items were noted as requiring attention:

- Paragraph 3.2.3. The Travel Plan Pack and Travel Plan Leaflet will need to be submitted to the County's Travel Plans team for approval prior to distribution;
- Section 4. A plan showing all existing staff post code locations, rather than only those that are relevant to certain modes, would be informative;
- Paragraph 4.3.6 refers to Dorchester's proposals "...to reinstate the previously curtailed PRow...". It is assumed that this refers to the Aves Ditch and Port Way rights of way. This reinstatement is long overdue despite the County's numerous

requests. In their absence these routes cannot be counted as part of the network of footpaths around the site;

- Paragraph 4.3.8. States that “*It is generally considered that two kilometres is a reasonable distance for people to walk to work or nearby facilities and amenities.*” However, no source is quoted, and this is considered to be a demanding rather than a “reasonable” distance;
- Paragraph 4.3.13. States that “*The industry-accepted distance over which cycling is feasible for most of the population is 5-kilometres.*” However, again no source is quoted;
- Paragraph 4.3.16. It is not stated what a Strava Heat Map is. Figure 4.5 therefore has no meaning;
- Paragraph 4.3.32. The accessibility to bus travel for 14% of staff is considered low;
- Paragraph 4.4.7. States that “*The accessibility of the nearby railway stations mean that the site would be viable for staff working on an agency contract who may live further afield.*” It is not clear what this statement means;
- Paragraph 5.4.1. It is usual to analyse five years of personal injury accident (PIA) data rather than only three. The County’s PIA data is more up to date than that presented on the Crash Map website;
- Paragraph 7.2.1. Baseline mode split should be taken from a survey of existing staff rather than from the 2011 census;
- Table 7.2. It is not clear where how these targets have been derived;
- Section 8.1. It is not stated how much time input there will be from the Travel Plan Coordinator;
- Section 9.6. Bus ticket incentives could be offered to encourage the use of this mode of transport;
- Paragraph 9.7.1, d) It is not stated how car sharing will be rewarded;
- Paragraph 9.7.2, e) It is not clear how car sharing can reduce absenteeism;
- Figure 9.1. It is not clear what this figure is demonstrating;
- Section 10. It is not clear what informal monitoring entails;
- Section 11. The action plan is not detailed enough; and
- Section 12. A budget estimate and breakdown is required.

## **Travel Plans**

A Travel Plan has been submitted to discharge a planning condition associated with this site. The submitted travel plan will need further development to be able to do this. Reason for objection. Specific items that require attention are set out below:

- The overall number of employees has been included in the Travel Plan but no information has been provided about shift patterns and how many employees are on site at any given time or general hours of business. This information should be included;
- Paragraph 3.2.3. It would be good to offer employees a choice of how they wish to receive this information allowing them to opt for receiving it electronically if they prefer. This documentation should be sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council for approval;

- Paragraph 7.2.1. This site has been operational for a number of years and will continue to operate for a number of years. For the purposes of this Travel Plan it will be necessary to conduct a baseline survey. A realistic timescale for this is required and details should be included in the Travel Plan together with the employee survey;
- Employees home postcodes will be collected as part of the baseline survey and this information will be used to look at employees home locations and to highlight which forms of sustainable travel are available for their journeys to and from work. This will help to inform the TPC of the best areas for promotion and the most likely to be successful. Later in the travel plan it states that employee home postcode information is already available as it has been used to check car sharing potential. It is a shame that it was not also used to identify the most suitable routes for travel plan promotion purposes. Without consulting with employees it is not possible to say that car share is a viable options for employees travelling to and from the site;
- Table 7.2. Considering the high levels of SOV travel identified in the census data these targets are not very challenging. Targets should be revised once the employee survey has been completed with a more challenging target being introduced;
- Section 8. Contact details for the TPC should be sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council. The Travel Plan should state that this will happen;
- Paragraph 8.4.2. A commitment to formal monitoring is required. This will need to be annual and will need to take place at the same time of year as the baseline survey. A month after a survey has taken place a monitoring report will need to be sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council detailing progress towards achieving agreed travel plan targets. The Travel Plan will need to state that this will happen;
- Section 9.3. It is preferable to brand this as a Travel Information Pack for employees. It is not clear if there are any incentives being offered to encourage the uptake of sustainable travel to and from the site;
- No mention is made of what facilities are provided for employees that cycle to work, such as covered secure cycle parking, showers and lockers. These details should be included in the travel plan;
- The action plan provided in the appendices is quite limited. Measures should be grouped under headings such as measures to reduce SOV use, measures to encourage cycling, measures to encourage walking, measures to increase the uptake of car share etc;
- No details are provided of the car parking that is available on site and how this is managed. These details should be included together with details of parking provision set aside for employees who car share. A link to the County's Travel Plan guidance is included below.

### **Rights of Way**

Section 4.3 of the Travel Plan references the network of public rights of way in the area and the value of these routes for walking and cycling journeys once the walking and riding network as illustrated in figure 4.3 is delivered. However, the site owners have so far failed to meet the current and overdue requirements to reinstate Aves Ditch and Portway bridleways through the site and along Chilgrove Drive. This means that their potential for use as sustainable travel options is not relevant in relation to this Travel Plan. Given the direct connection between the whole site, the reopening of Aves Ditch and Portway, and this application, the

owners of the site need take immediate steps to meet their responsibilities in a timely manner.

## 5. APPRAISAL

- 5.1. The requirements of the Condition are noted alongside the development to which the condition relates. The Applicant's submission is also noted alongside the comments of the Highway Authority.
- 5.2. The application submission includes a routing agreement which was engrossed on 27 June 2014 by County Council Officers. The agreement shows access from Junction 10 of the M40 to the site via Camp Road. The route would not utilise small or inadequate roads and would use established roads, which have previously been deemed acceptable for construction traffic or formerly the airbase. As such the routing agreement as set out in Appendix C of the submission is considered to be acceptable.
- 5.3. Whilst the comments of the County Council are noted in respect of the Travel Plan, the condition and travel plan is to ensure the effective control of HGVs entering and leaving the site. In this respect therefore the entry and exit of the site in connection with the vehicle storage is considered to be acceptable. The comments with regard to the rights of way, in particular Aves Ditch and Portway bridleways are noted but the permission and condition relates to specific use of the site and is not relevant. It is noted that time has progressed, and the development has moved forward.
- 5.4. As such, it is considered that the submitted travel plan is considered acceptable for the management of the site at the time as required by the Condition.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

That Planning Condition 5 of 18/02169/F be discharged based upon the following:

### Condition 5

The application is supported by location plan (Ref: P18 1596 01) and workplace travel plan (Ref: BR-702-0001) including the routing agreement set out in Appendix C of the submitted travel plan.

The comments of the Highway Authority have been given full consideration however, having regard to the scope of the permission and the detail required by the condition, the proposals would ensure the effective control of HGVs entering and leaving the site.

As such the details of the submission are satisfactory to discharge the requirements of the condition subject to their ongoing implementation.

Case Officer: Andrew Thompson

DATE: 28 February 2023

Checked By: Andy Bateson

DATE: 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2023

---