

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 (buildings 2,3, 4,5 and 6 as use classes E(g) (i), E(g) ii and E (g) iii and Building 1 under Class B8) and associated external works. (Re-submission of 20/01127/F)
Case Officer	James Kirkham
Organisation	
Name	Stuart John Ferguson
Address	Merlins,Fir Lane,Steeple Aston,Bicester,OX25 4SF
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>In the recently submitted addendum on traffic, the estimates of increased car travel seem false/unrealistic. If 85 people were to work at the site the probability is that close on 85 persons will arrive, from scattered origins, in approx 85 cars, with most of the arrivals occurring between 8 and 9. It may be that an additional 85 cars per hour is regarded by highways as trivial but this is very different than the 12 per hour seemingly calculated by the applicant. For better or worse the road is very congested now at school start and finish times, owing to the large numbers of pupils arriving/departing by car. Finally, the document takes no account of visits to and from the site by visitors/customers/delivery vehicles etc. It is of course impossible to know how many will access the site from the North rather than through Steeple Aston but arrivals from/departures to the majority of places, eg Oxford/Kidlington, Bicester, Woodstock and Middle Barton/Chipping Norton directions will route via Steeple Aston. Turning to pedestrian access, recall that originally highways did request an extension of the pavement in Steeple Aston to the site, and only changed their mind after opaque (to me) discussions with the developer. Clearly it would be an expense, but the stretch alongside the site would be relatively easy to achieve. It is not impossible alongside Dr Radcliffe's school either, although the verges on either side are becoming increasingly damaged owing to car parking and as things stand it will become dangerous for pedestrians walking along an inevitably busier road rather than a pavement. The developer comes close to admitting that 100% of employees will come by car but still considers that 13% are expected to come on foot/bicycle. For a rural environment with employees likely to travel some distance this seems optimistic. Nevertheless, their document states, 'Moreover, safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for pedestrians, which reflects the rural area and no recorded personal injury collisions in anyway related to the movement of pedestrians in proximity to the site'. (I am not sure this is correct as I recall that a child was injured by a car outside the primary school a few years ago, or des proximity to the site not include proximity to the school?). In any case this does not deal with the situation as will be, with significant increases in traffic at certain peak times. As I understand school transport provision, children in Middle Aston are not entitled to transport to school as they are within the 2 mile limit, and thus highways/education department would expect them to walk to school along a significantly busier road than at present, in particular along the stretch from the site entrance to the school. The applicant is in effect arguing that safety of others is no concern of theirs and presumably therefore if a pavement is needed highways should pay for it. In summary I object on the grounds that insufficient mitigations are proposed to ensure safety of all. This could be rectified by decreasing the number of permitted employees, and thus car journeys, and/or providing a pavement (would employees wish to walk along a dark road for nearly half a mile after work in winter?)</p>
Received Date	23/02/2022 17:37:14
Attachments	