

# Comment for planning application 21/00922/OUT

<b>Application Number</b>	<input type="text" value="21/00922/OUT"/>
<b>Location</b>	<input type="text" value="Land West Of Foxden Way Great Bourton OX17 1QY"/>
<b>Proposal</b>	<input type="text" value="OUTLINE Planning Application with all matters reserved save for access for up to 9 First Homes"/>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<input type="text" value="James Kirkham"/>
<b>Organisation Name</b>	<input type="text" value="Ivan Miller"/>
<b>Address</b>	<input type="text" value="Old Bakehouse, Swan Lane, Great Bourton, Banbury, OX17 1QR"/>
<b>Type of Comment</b>	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
<b>Type</b>	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
<b>Comments</b>	<p>A major cause of opposition to this development among its many critics is the inappropriate location within a network of narrow lanes. The siting raises concerns around safety and congestion in these lanes which the applicant seeks to address in the Transport Technical Note in various ways. Some of these attempts rest on the suggestion that there are many alternative options to the car and the misleading and incorrect claims used to support that argument have been robustly challenged in the many objections previously submitted including my own. Not one of the contentious claims in the document has been corrected or even addressed by the applicant but I will hold back from restating them and merely indicate that they still stand and that the lack of response from a developer who professes to "work alongside local communities" is rather telling. Such was the wealth of junk information in the document that it wasn't until reading through it again that I was able to fully digest the TRICS report with which the document concludes. Predictions made by the applicant regarding the additional traffic which will be generated by this development are based on this report which draws on 21 days of traffic surveys in supposedly comparable areas and speculates that the nine additional houses and the 16 associated vehicles shown on the masterplan will generate six journeys during peak hours. The report is presented as a rigorous and scientific document and I'm sure that TRICS is a useful tool in the right hands but scrutiny of the methodology applied in this instance reveals flaws that cast serious doubt on the conclusions. A simple check of the filters used to select the sample group along with a visual review of the various survey locations on google maps shows key differences in at least three critical areas that render comparisons on traffic flow meaningless. These are car ownership, the provision of public transport and the proximity of key amenities. Firstly, if the car ownership statistics are combined for all survey groups the sample range has car ownership in a range of 0.96 to 1.36. Department for Transport information (document NTS9902) indicates that the 'Rural Village, Hamlet and Isolated Dwelling' classification had the highest car ownership figure of all categories at 1.63 in 2002/03 rising to 1.77 in 2020. More specific ONS census data shows the Cropredy ward matching that exactly at 1.63 in 2001 so it is safe to assume that it will have risen to 1.77 in line with the DfT figures. Note that the 16 parked vehicles shown on the applicant's masterplan correspond with that 1.77 figure (although the neat positions in which they are parked on the plan is clearly less realistic). Secondly, the availability of public transport in the sample areas is a crucial factor as it would clearly have an effect on car use. There is no indication of this because the selection is missing PTAL data so no meaningful comparison with Great Bourton's public transport is possible although it is hard to imagine any of the sample group having poorer public transport options given the denser conditions in those areas. Finally, there is no factoring in of the effect of local amenities in reducing reliance on car travel. In the absence of such data it is possible to conduct a basic comparison by considering a round trip on foot to buy milk. This exercise exposes major disparities between the sample areas and Great Bourton where it would involve a 41 minute round trip. Using google to time a route on foot to the nearest shop in the first five survey locations on the list would give comparable times of: (1) 6 minutes, (2) 4 minutes, (3) 6 minutes, (4) 2 minutes and (5) 26 minutes. It would also be worth comparing the opening hours of the stores. The Bridge Store in Cropredy is open from 8am to 6pm during the week and until 2pm on Sunday which appears unlikely to be better than opening times offered by (1) Morrisons Daily, (2) Lidl, (3) Nisa, (5) Coop. I was unable to verify the opening hours of (4) The Corner Shop but even if the opening hours were shorter it does have the advantage of being 38 minutes closer. All in all the TRICS report is worse than worthless as it has the veneer of diligence but is actually an attempt to mislead. This is yet more evidence of a cynical scheme which should not bear serious consideration, please refuse this application.</p>

**Received Date**

30/03/2022 22:01:11

**Attachments**