

# Comment for planning application 21/01224/OUT

Application Number	21/01224/OUT
Location	Land at former RAF Bicester Bicester Oxfordshire OX26 5HA
Proposal	Outline planning application for Automotive Experience Quarter comprising Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2), Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F) and vehicle circuits (Sui Generis) with all matters reserved aside from that of access).
Case Officer	Rebekah Morgan
Organisation	
Name	Czeslaw Adamczyk
Address	20 Montgomery Road,Caversfield,Bicester,OX27 8FG
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>OBJECTION I am submitting my objection to this proposal by Bicester Motion for an Experience Quarter on the site of the former RAF Bicester Airfield. My objection is specifically in respect of the vehicle circuits being proposed, on the grounds that it will result in significant, unacceptable noise pollution. I am not a NIMBY; I support progress and welcome change where it benefits the community and the country, so I am not objecting to the whole proposal as regards "Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2), Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F)". My objection is to the "vehicle circuits (Sui Generis)". I shall nevertheless be commenting on other aspects of the proposal where I believe there is a correlation to the vehicle circuits. INRODUCTION Having read through the 70-page Planning Statement Document prepared by Edgars for the proposed Experience Quarter and other documents, what concerns me is the lack of detail and what is not included, albeit that I accept this is an outline application at this stage. It appears that the applicants are taking the view that the opportunity for visitors to have a motor circuit experience for an hour or two, or attending a one day event is more important that the adverse effect that such a proposal will have on local residents' health and wellbeing. The document outlines the benefits that will be brought to the area but fails to fairly mention any negative impact / dis-benefits and, as such, appears to be one sided. It also contains outdated information e.g., in section ( ) 2.2 it refers to data from the 2011 Census in respect of population when more recent data could have been used e.g., the Cherwell District Summary 2020. One would question why this is the case -could it be to show the application in a more favourable light? CONSULTATION Whilst the document gives details of public consultation in section 6, it is disappointing that Bicester Motion has not been more proactive in consulting with the very people who are most likely to be affected by this proposal, namely the residents living in the close proximity. The first time my attention was drawn to this application was when I saw some notices on 9th August 2021, which had been place on lampposts in Thompson Drive, and then on 10th August I received a letter through my door addressed to "all Caversfield residents" (originator unknown) with information on how to view the planning application on-line. I would question whether the proposed vehicle circuits will in fact be "sui generis" (that's to say, "of its own kind / unique" for those of us who don't use legalese) - in a couple of places in the document it states that the circuits are "motorsport inspired" (in 3.5 &amp; 3.7). It is the circuits that give rise to my objection to having what is likely to be a motorsport circuit in such close proximity to my home, and many other homes, on the grounds that it is extremely likely, if approved, to result in unacceptable noise affecting all properties in the vicinity. USEAGE PERTAINING TO PROPOSED TRACKS In 2.16 it claims "..The site comprises Previously Developed Land (PDL)." Whilst perhaps factual, I question the appropriateness of this statement as in 2.19 it goes on to state " the site has historically accommodated a variety of temporary buildings and airplane parking/storage." The relevant wording here is temporary, suggesting that the buildings were not intended to be permanent. Whereas in 8.10 it states "The proposed tracks are motorsport inspired but are not designed to cater for multi car racing events and are designed for driver training, time-trials and testing as well as demonstration and experience activities. Demonstration of road legal vehicles", having such a wide range of activities, would suggest that the tracks are extremely likely to have a considerable amount of usage and frequency. In 9.76 it states the "Restoring and repurposing the historic perimeter track by giving it a new purpose ..". This suggests a change of use. In 9.136 it states ". It has always been the aim of Bicester Motion to retain the aviation activities at that site and make sure the any proposed development is compatible with it." And yet in 9.56 it states - ".. Where safety dictates it to</p>

be necessary, bunding at a maximum of 1m height will be situated to facility safety barriers at certain locations on the track". In 9.87 it states "In regard to the proposed tracks within the airfield, development has striven to retain the characterful openness of the airfield. New tracks will not be raised, will be largely invisible from ground level, and limited bunding proposed (max 1m in height) will not result in undue harm. The LVIA states that "Overall, it is considered that the tracks will not cause unacceptable harm to the openness of the flying field." Accepting there are separate areas allocated to the three vehicle circuits and to the grass runways and clearance zones (picture on page 31 of Landscape Character and Visual Impact Assessment) I would question whether these are so close that they could be a hazard to each other when aircraft take-off and landing.

**HEALTH AND WELLBEING** The promotion of health and well-being is mentioned several times in the document, which is particularly relevant as regards noise (see 9.93 to 9.101) which the applicant appears to acknowledge this by stating ". Policy BSC 8 (Securing Health and Well-Being) seeks to promote and health and well-being. Whilst the policy does not specifically refer to noise, the explanatory identifies that planning decisions can have an effect noise which contributes to health and well-being." I suggest that the noise pollution from the proposed Experience Quarter, specifically relating to the vehicle circuits, will adversely affect the health and well-being of many living in proximity i.e., the villages of Caversfield, Launton and Stratton Audley as well as Glory Farm and Southwold parts of Bicester. Another point is that most persons attending the experience days are not likely to attend an experience day or event every day, but the local residents will potentially be subjected to the noise every single day.

**NOISE** This brings me to my main reason for objecting to the proposal, namely the issue of noise. The word "noise" appears in the document 34 times - mostly in Section 5 - Pre-application Engagement, Section 7 - Relevant Planning Policy, and Section 9 - Relevant Material Consideration. I suggest that the applicant is acutely aware that this is perhaps the most significantly problematic aspect for consideration in their application that needs to be overcome. In the "Noise impact assessment - SPL Track Environmental" states that a mixture of vehicles will use the track ".in the most part, road silenced engines" which suggests that it does not preclude use by vehicles with engines that are not road silenced. It also suggests "The facility is not proposed for major racing activities". The word "major" suggests that the applicant may intend to hold "non major" racing activities. In 9.97 it states " It is also apparent that normal circuit activities will not have a significant adverse impact upon residents ". I challenge this statement as I have on a number of occasions experienced the noise from the site with cars racing around the existing track, the most recent being on 11th August, even whilst I was composing these comments. Whilst it may be suggested that the level of noise may be within acceptable limits, according to legislation / regulations, it is not the level of noise but the type of noise being emitted that is the problem - it is the backfire / loud popping of some vehicles going into bends and the whiney acceleration coming out of bends that are extremely annoying. In my opinion, the noise that I have experienced from the track is "noticeable and very disruptive" which, under the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) requires action to be taken to prevent the noise. Others who have commented on this proposal, have likewise, amongst other reasons, identified noise from the vehicle circuits as the reason for objecting to the proposal.

**NUISANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS** It could be argued that unacceptable noise is not only a nuisance, but it contravenes: - Article 8 (Schedule 1 Part I) of the Human Right Act 1998 - Right to respect for private and family life. Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence, and Article 1 (Part II) Protection of Property - Every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. Being subjected to noise pollution is disrespectful on the part of the person causing the noise and impacts on the peaceful enjoyment by persons subjected to the noise, of their property. A not insignificant concern is of course not just about the actual noise pollution from the vehicle circuits but the potential consequences of the adverse effect on the value and saleability of properties in close proximity, which directly affects me and many other properties.

**SUBMISSION** Whilst I note that Edgars letter to the Planning Department dated 15/04/2021 has used the wording "vehicle demonstration tracks" as opposed to "vehicle circuits", I have not noted any details to suggest that the envisaged use would be different in any way and question whether this is just semantics. My objection to the proposal by Bicester Motion for an Experience Quarter on the site of the former RAF Bicester Airfield is specifically in respect of the vehicle circuits being proposed, on the grounds that it will result in significant, unacceptable noise pollution. I am not objecting to the Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2), Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F) IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED I would ask that, if the proposal granted for the vehicle circuits, that all options be explored in order to mitigate and reduce to a minimum the noise from their use, before permission is granted and that permission is made subject to certain provisos which may include: - a comprehensive noise management plan approved by Cherwell District Council and subject to regular review regulating the number of days and times for permitted track usage noise reducing measures for vehicle, e.g., only vehicles with road silenced engines to be used engagement with the community to ensure that timely information regarding venue activities is communicated to residents tracks not to be used for racing activities (Noise Impact Assessment only specified "major" racing activity) the use of

the tracks is not to affect operational flying activities (the applicant claims that flying operations will not be affected, but unless such a condition is made, it would not be enforceable) track to be constructed from noise reducing road surface noise reducing / acoustic fencing / barriers to be installed around the perimeter of the site no charges to be made for parking of vehicles visiting the site / attending any activities or events on the site (this is intended to stop visitors to the site parking on roads in the vicinity which causes problems for residents)

**Received Date**  
**Attachments**

12/08/2021 20:20:09