

Rachel Tibbetts

From: Bob Neville
Sent: 08 December 2020 08:51
To: DC Support
Subject: FW: Objection - (Certas Fuel Depot) Planning application 20/02453/F

From: Jonathan Cantlay [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 December 2020 01:04
To: Councillor James Macnamara <James.Macnamara@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Maurice Billington <Maurice.Billington@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Andrew Beere <Andrew.Beere@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; Councillor Hugo Brown <Hugo.Brown@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Phil Chapman <CouncillorPhil.Chapman@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor John Broad <John.Broad@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Colin Clarke <Colin.Clarke@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Ian Corkin <Ian.Corkin@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Chris Heath <Chris.Heath@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Simon Holland <Simon.Holland@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor David Hughes <David.Hughes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Mike Kerford Byrnes <CouncillorMike.KerfordByrnes@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Cassi Perry <Cassi.Perry@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Lynn Pratt <Lynn.Pratt@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; Councillor George Reynolds <George.Reynolds@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Barry Richards <Barry.Richards@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Leslie Sibley <Leslie.Sibley@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Katherine Tyson <katherine.tyson@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Barry Wood <Barry.Wood@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor Douglas Webb <Douglas.Webb@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Councillor George Reynolds <George.Reynolds@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Bob Neville <Bob.Neville@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; David Peckford <David.Peckford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>; Sarah Stevens <Sarah.Stevens@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection - (Certas Fuel Depot) Planning application 20/02453/F

Dear Councillors & Planning Officers,

Please accept this email communication in support of my previously submitted objection to 'A fuel depot including ancillary offices, the installation of plant and hardstanding (20/02453/F).

Having now had the opportunity to study the Executive Summary of Proposals and Recommendation, I am encouraged to see that a significant number of the points raised in my original objection have been acknowledged.

My overall and heartfelt opinion is that the proposed location is wholly inappropriate for a fuel storage depot with a 24/7 operation. It would indeed be far from consistent with the tranquil rural character/appearance and would be extremely detrimental to what is in essence an area that lies on the periphery of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. A proposal of this sort is entirely out of place in such a location or indeed, a location that is quite so proximate to an area with this unique designation.

It is equally of great concern that in section 2, para 2.5, the executive summary confirms the proximity of rivers/tributaries (For Brook) that would be at potential risk of contamination and lasting damage should any leak occur.

I strongly disagree with the statement made in support (section 6, para 6.2) that the company provides a useful service to the surrounding community in the supply of heating fuel. The community is already well served by local suppliers, namely Red Horse Vale - this proposal would prove detrimental to their own modest business model which is far more in-keeping with the local community and its needs.

I must also voice concern for another local business set to be severely impacted in the form of Hornton Grounds Farmhouse Bed & Breakfast and potentially the Farm Shop - both of which my family, extended family and I support as customers and guests.

I agree with the comment made within the same section as detailed below:

The conclusions of the submitted Transport Statement that the proposals would have a "negligible impact on the local highway network and villages surrounding them" are disputable; given that the A422 road goes directly through two villages (Wroxton and Drayton) and includes something close to a 90 degree bend in Wroxton village where the road also narrows considerably.

A so called "negligible impact on the local highway network" in my mind is absolutely disputable. This statement is completely at odds with what I have already witnessed on the stretch of the A422 closest to the proposed site.

I am a regular user of this road and have witnessed numerous incidents/accidents or their aftermath. I happen to use this route during the early hours of the morning as part of my regular journey to my place of work. In recent weeks I have witnessed the very situation highlighted in my original objection; an articulated HGV at a standstill resulting from loss of traction/inability to regain forward momentum and subsequent breakdown half way up the steep and increasing twists and turns of the incline known as Sun Rising Hill. Given the scale of the ensuing traffic problem created behind this lorry as it struggled to hold its position and not roll back into the growing queue of vehicles, I would imagine that Highways or the local Police will have record of this incident and numerous similar others.

Utilisation of this route by the current volume of HGVs is a cause for concern, to increase this in the form of a significant number of articulated HGV flammable liquid tankers invites disaster. In recent days during the early hours of the morning, negotiating Sun Rising Hill in a domestic vehicle due to fog and freezing conditions has necessitated extreme caution let alone attempting it in a 44 ton tanker.

I do not believe the route is in any way suitable for increased volume of such HGV traffic due to lacking infrastructure to support it. For such a steep descent, I am not aware of any emergency escape lane/arresting/friction material that would assist an HGV with brake issues/failure or indeed to maintain traction - particularly when climbing the hill with a liquid load shifting and as such, reducing load/traction to the main drive wheels of the vehicle.

It does seem that my traffic/highway related concerns are well supported, recognised and documented within the list of Objections section 6, para 6.2 with some prime examples below:

1.

o

- § Detrimental impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties including Grade II listed Hornton Grounds Farmhouse, and properties within the villages along the Stratford Road (A422).
- § The site is not on a designated HGV route and has poor links to the M40 motorway; with HGV vehicles having to travel through residential areas of surrounding villages and Banbury to reach the M40.
- § The A422 is already a hazardous route with history of accidents, and the risk of accident would be increased as a result of additional HGV movements to and from the site.
- § Increased HGV traffic would only exacerbate heavy volumes currently experienced within villages along the A422; having significant implications for Wroxton, Drayton and Sun Rising Hill; in terms of pedestrian safety, vehicle movements and potential for damage to be caused to properties through vibrations from passing HGVs.
- § Route up Edgehill and Sun Rising Hill not appropriate for large HGV tanker movements.

Existing permissions at the site limits HGV movements to just 10 lorries per day entering the shared access. **A marked increase would therefore be observed (158 tankers per week/29 per day)**

- § The condition of the road is poor now with signs of subsidence this extra load of large vehicles daily would exacerbate this.

Negative impacts on the Cotswold AONB and surrounding valued countryside, through noise and light pollution affecting the dark skies currently experienced.

•

There is immense passion that exists to resist the proposal amongst the local community, not least on my part as, if approved, would cause me to call into question the continued safety and suitability of the place I currently call home; the place originally chosen to raise my young family.

Thank you for considering my opinions and reasoning behind my firm objection to this proposal.

Regards,

Jonathan

Jonathan Cantlay

Angel Cottage

West End

Hornton

OX15 6DA

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..