

Walnut Bank, Bell St, Hornton. OX15 6DB - 14/5/21

Dear Cherwell Planning Team

Ref 21/00517/F – Wroxton MX Track

Thank you for inviting comments of the revised LVIA which I have listed below.

In summary, it seems yet again that this is a one-sided view of the site and its impact viewed through the rose-tinted spectacles of the Somerset-based agent of the applicant, rather than someone who has to live near, see, hear and experience a motocross racing track ¾ mile from their front door.

The premise of this agent's report is that the site, as it exists today, is the starting point: this is fundamentally wrong. The starting point should be 10 years ago before the development started and, certainly, at least 4-5 years ago when the major, transformative earthworks and raising of jumps higher than the surrounding area were created.

Reference: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – two documents, dated 1 April 2021

1.8 “The motor X track uses the natural landform which rises and falls throughout the field”. How would a newcomer know this unless fed this erroneous information? The current track does not use natural landform as there has been extensive excavation and raising of the land in many areas. This was proven, without question, in evidence submitted to object to the track's flawed LDC application in autumn 2020. That is why they had to withdraw that application. And this remains one of the main thrusts of objections to this planning application - that this land - and this business - have been developed significantly over the last 5 years, without permission.

3.2 “As the track is technically a mud circuit there would be little difficulty returning the field back to agricultural grassland.”

Bear in mind that this would require the removal of buried waste as evidenced by other responses to the application, and the reshaping of the land back to its original landform. Plus, the removal of an underground drainage system built for the track. We also do not know how many fuels have leaked into this site from large drums and other storage systems.

3.5 “There are no buildings or areas of hard standing within the site and only a single access track.”

This statement is completely contradicted by the author on page 4 – 3.10: “There are no permanent buildings within the Motor X site other than the Race Marshall shelters and mobile toilets.”

As can be seen by almost all pictures submitted previously by me and others, and indeed those which form part of the SLD report, there are many buildings and other permanent structures on site: marshals' huts and staging, fencing, buried skips, and portaloos in a permanent enclosure.

3.6 “The local villages are relatively distant from the site and local topography and local hedges and trees form a physical and visual screen from the motor X track”

Distance is relative but a baseline should be established and in my view 0.72 of a mile from my front door is not relatively distant. Perhaps from Mr Steele's desk in Somerset he sees things in a slightly different way. Hornton Parish Council and numerous other objectors have already demonstrated, beyond doubt, that this circuit is wholly visible from the public footpath, from three roads (including an A road), from the homes at Wroxton Heath (at the edge of this larger field site), from the Indian Queen restaurant on the adjoining A422 and from Hornton Grounds Farm and B&B.

Reading this LVIA report, when I got to 3.18 and read Mr Steele's desktop assessment of the village where I live my blood boiled!

“Description: The majority of the village is set within the northern and southern flanks of a small valley.
Effected: No

Due to intervening topography, local buildings, and tall vegetation. Therefore, this will not require further impact assessment”

The report’s conclusions are that nothing and no one is impacted significantly enough to worry about, and his tone of writing sets out to reinforce this with words such as negligible, low impact, slight or minimal adverse, neutral and so on. In view of the hundreds of objections and extremely well-researched evidence that has been submitted to the contrary, this is utterly insulting and preposterous.

He has read and believes that the land is used for agricultural use (3.46 and elsewhere) yet provides no evidence. It is not returned to agricultural use between events. The people who live alongside the field edge of this site testify to this, as do hundreds of other locals.

Reference: LVIA Figure Sheet Rev 1.

Every one of the 4 viewpoints is described as:

“Motor X Track – The track is an established feature in the local landscape and the majority of the track is located in the ‘lower’ parts of the field.”

Mr Steele fails to understand that it is the many new high points which are the cause of so many problems: the noise created from 40+ machines revving before the start and racing over triple jumps and the like – higher than the surrounding land, revving at full throttle.

Has Mr Steele not read the hundreds of objections on the portal and the Consultee submissions from local parish councils?

This Viewpoint at location 5 is conveniently taken by the entrance gate where anyone driving is focussed on the bend in the narrow, pot-holed, lane not the landscape to the left.



If you choose to move 130 yards back up the road the view is vastly different. I took the following picture from my car on 13/5/21, but you can’t see this from Somerset!



As I said at the start: the premise of this report is that the site as it exists today is the starting point which is fundamentally wrong.

Given that the entire LVIA submission, on behalf of the applicant, seems to be merely an official attempt to endorse misinformation supplied by the client, I see little point in me itemising the other inaccuracies and misinformed claims and statements.

Please, Cherwell Planning Team, regard this LVIA submission in the same light as the other submissions by this applicant who is willing to ignore the rules – on all fronts – peddle misinformation and sanction agents to stretch facts to an incredible degree in the face of vast, substantiated evidence to the contrary from multiple sources. As such, this is a repeat of the applicant's approach adopted for the LDC application last year.