

# Comment for planning application 21/01123/F

Application Number	21/01123/F
Location	Hatch End Old Poultry Farm Steeple Aston Road Middle Aston Bicester OX25 5QL
Proposal	Demolition of existing buildings. Construction of replacement business units and associated external works. (Re-submission of 20/01127/F)
Case Officer	James Kirkham
Organisation	
Name	JAYNE TAYLOR
Address	1 The Old Forge Studio,Paines Hill,Steeple Aston,Bicester,OX25 4SQ
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I am objecting to this application on the following grounds: Transport Statement The Transport Statement includes the following Section 6.2.5 States that there is likely to be a peak demand of parking spaces of 53 vehicles Whilst there is plenty of car parking within the confines of the proposal, I believe that it fails to fully recognise or take into consideration the route that these additional cars will take getting to this location - Most surrounding roads are single track, so an additional 53 cars will have an impact on the traffic especially around the times for the nursery &amp; school drop off and pick up. When combining this with the consideration that the application is for Class E use - the site could also see a restaurant, caf, nursery, gym and other retail units renting these units - (Whilst I appreciate that some of these options are unlikely, it remains feasible) if this is the case, there will be additional peak times and additional traffic throughout the day and possibly evening / night. The mitigation is that there is public transport within easy reach - I would content that whilst both the bus and train services are regular they are not frequent - someone coming to a gym, nursery or retail unit is not likely to consider the use of public transport and therefore I do not agree with this prediction. Section 4.3.5 Details TRICS Trip rates for HGV movements for the development Whilst I do not contest the movement of HGVs expected, I reaffirm my previous objection that the roads leading to the site are not suitable for additional HGV movements - the roads leading to &amp; from the site from Steeple Aston - the preferred route for all traffic) is already heavily use by local agricultural traffic, school traffic (including school bus pick-ups) and general residential traffic. Construction traffic will cause congestion and issues with general vehicle movement. Section 5.2.2 States that there will be users / employees that are local What is the current local take up for the units currently occupied ? The populations of both villages is small - how many local employees do the developers expect, against their provision of 24 units and 79 car parking spaces ? Section 7.2.5 States that it is expected to only be an overall net increase of 42 car journeys and that this will be a negligible change. Figure 6.1 states a peak parking accumulation of up to 53 spaces in use - this would indicate at least 53 additional car journeys ? In addition, if, with Class E usage, units are used for retail, gym, nursery, caf of restaurant use, surly they will struggle to survive as a business if traffic journeys are this low. Whilst I appreciate that the Developer is likely to state that it is unlikely that such businesses will rent these units, again I would argue, it is still feasible. Construction Traffic Management Plan Section 5.2.7 Preferred &amp; Alternative Construction Route Both the preferred and alternative construction routes are via narrow roads with extensive residential on road parking - neither are suitable for construction traffic Section 6 Mitigation Measures Whilst it is appreciated that these have been included - all listed are standard working practices and will do nothing to reduce the risks and disruption of additional HGV traffic through a rural area. PLANNING, DESIGN, ACCESS AND HERITAGE STATEMENT Section 2.18 states This application proposes the demolition of all of the existing buildings, retaining and re-using existing floor slabs where possible and constructing purpose-built units with a total floor area of 2,214.81 sq.m of Class E and B8 commercial space. Class E &amp; B8 include the following The new Class E effectively amalgamates the former Class A1 (retail), Class A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants/cafes), B1 (offices) along with health/medical uses, crches, nurseries (all formerly D1 uses) and indoor sports/recreation (formerly D2 use). Permission is not required to change between any of the uses within the new Class E. This creates the opportunity for units to be allocated to businesses that will create their own substantial traffic. It is appreciated that this may be low risk, however, it remains a risk The application has stated that the current units are well below standard and therefore we can expect that there will be a bigger demand with the new units and all the additional traffic and people this will bring Currently, based on the site map that is visible from the road it looks like there are</p>

only 6 units currently operating within site. The new plan is for 24 units & if we only see 2 people per unit & assume they all use cars then this is at least 48 cars without visitors, if we assume that 50% are units allocated to retail or similar (where short term visitors will be frequent) then this will substantially increase short term traffic. Section 4.24 states: In consideration of the above, it is concluded that in terms of paragraph 109 of the NPPF, the development will not cause an unacceptable impact on highway safety nor will the impacts on the road network be severe and thus the application should not be refused on highways grounds. I disagree with the above statement - See information above. I believe that the impact on the local area and road network will be severe and that especially at peak times around school start & finish times, there will be an increased danger to pedestrians. In addition, there will be an impact to residential traffic and an increase risk of damage to roads and to buildings within the heritage site Section 4.3 States: Finally, there were no objections to the previous scheme on highways matters including traffic and parking. I find this statement untrue as specifically my submission objected on highway matters and both the Parish Councils raised concerns as detailed in section 2.10 ? Overall, I am aware that the site has had previous planning permission and acknowledge that this revised application creates a like for like foot print, however, based on current use and expected use (all new units occupied) there will be a considerable increase in traffic in an area that does not have the infrastructure to support such an increase. This combined with the significant range of possible business options that could move to the new site and the additional occasional traffic that this may bring, creates an unacceptable change in the overall area. In addition, the proposals for the construction phase of the development, will likely cause congestion and traffic issues in what are essentially single track roads to the site with HGV's, agricultural traffic and school transport traffic causing issues. On this basis I object to this application

Jayne Taylor

**Received Date**

26/04/2021 18:21:48

**Attachments**