

Comment for planning application 21/02467/F

Application Number	21/02467/F
Location	OS Parcel 0005 And Part OS Parcel 1300 0878 And 7566 Banbury
Proposal	Erection of mixed-use development including a 240-bed hotel, 4-storey office building and roadside services including 2 no hot food restaurant drive-throughs, a coffee shop drive-through and a petrol filling station with ancillary retail store
Case Officer	Bernadette Owens
Organisation Name	Richard Bee
Address	Thornhill House, 23 Middleton Road, Chacombe, Banbury, OX17 2JF
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>This is essentially a resubmission of the previously rejected proposal (17/01044/F) and I include below the comments that I made on that proposal. As far as I can see there has been nothing that would change the situation since the rejected proposal and this should again be rejected. Some additional points: - I see no need for any additional petrol station, hotel or fast food capacity in Banbury - we are already very well served and this will be quite a way 'out of town' so only accessible realistically by car. - I see no evidence that any increase in traffic on the A361 and the J11 roundabout will be managed. If there is any issue on any of the entry roads to J11 the whole area becomes gridlocked. This is only going to get worse with HS2 traffic. - The application states that this is not to provide capacity for traffic from the motorway - I simply do not believe the statement. Where else is the site going to get business. - the application refers to working to enhance bus coverage. I see no evidence that this will happen - in fact we already know that there is a further risk to the already reduced bus service in Chacombe if traffic on the A361 increases. Comments made on proposal 17/01044/F - which I believe remain valid to the current proposal. 1. The proposed motorway services and hotel on the Banbury 15 site do not fall within the category of usage (B1, B2 and B8) recommended for the site by DEFRA in the report to Cherwell District Council (CDC) in June 2015 The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 published in 2016 does not refer to usage of the site for uses other than those proposed in the DEFRA report. Also the Banbury Vision and Master Plan (Dec 2016) describes the site as '..a new strategic mixed use site which should assist in providing for advanced engineering and knowledge based industries.' None of these mentions use of any part of this site as a motorway service station or hotel. 2. From the publicly available documents, it seems that the applicants have not made any meaningful analysis of the impact of the proposed service station on local traffic. The Department of Transport figures for traffic on the stretch of the A361 between the M40 and the South Northants border (http://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/cp.php?la=Oxfordshire#99237) show an average of 7743 vehicles per day for 2016. Assuming daily vehicle visits from the motorway to the services of between 4000 and 8000* per day this gives an increase of between 8000 and 16000 vehicle movements daily which would give flows of 15700 and 23700 vehicles daily i.e. in excess of two to three times the current rate (These figures do not include traffic movements to and from the offices and distribution centre on the site). The proposed 'improvements' to Junction 11 are wholly inadequate to deal with such an increase. The proposal to widen the A361 to provide a further 75m of dual track on the approach to J11 is unlikely to be adequate for such an increase of traffic associated with the services. Likewise, the proposal to include traffic lights at the point of entry of the A361 to the M40 J11 roundabout will only cause further backing up of traffic on the J11 roundabout and backing down onto the slip-road and M40 and also into Hennef Way. These problems will be compounded by the growing number of distribution centres in Banbury, the proposed new offices and distribution centre on the site and the increases in traffic in the area due to HS2 construction. I suggest it is impossible for Banbury Town Council (BTC) to support the proposal for motorway services as, in their Vision and Master Plan, they make reference to the difficulties of traffic already encountered in the area of the town and the motorway and the lengths they will need to go to address it. To add anything up to another 16,000 daily vehicle movements to the already busy J11 roundabout will make an already problematic situation critical and have significant impact on movement of traffic between Banbury and J11, particularly for anyone seeking to approach Banbury from the East along the A361. The need for a roundabout on the A361 for access to the site will only back up traffic travelling on the road to Banbury from the East back towards the Chacombe junction. This in turn will lead to the probability of the usage of Chacombe as 'rat run' to</p>

access the A422 via Middleton Cheney. The road through Chacombe to Middleton is not suitable for any such an increase in traffic. The quality of the road surface of this road is already poor and will deteriorate further if a large increase traffic were to use it. As the approaches to J11 on the A361 and A422 become even more congested, traffic is highly likely to be diverted via Overthorpe and Cropredy to use the other bridges over the M40 (which is already happening today at peak times). Both of these are narrow rural roads not suitable for an increase in traffic. *Derived from publicly available texts - applicants have given no public indication of anticipated visit numbers to the facility. 3. The Travel Plan for the development gives details ways of encouraging site workers to use public transport. It demonstrates a lack of due diligence in developing the proposal, and also a complete lack of local knowledge on the part of the developers and their advisors. The Plan refers to the Stagecoach 500 bus service and suggests building new stops either side of the A361. These proposals were obviously made without any discussion with Stagecoach. Even basic enquiries would have discovered that Stagecoach had, in fact, proposed to reroute the 500 service such that it would in future not come through Chacombe and along the A361. This was claimed to be due to timetables being disrupted by traffic congestion on the A361 on the approach to J11! Chacombe residents have been successful in resisting this proposal to a degree and the service will continue to run through the village, but only hourly and not at all on Sundays - this is for a six-month trial and is not guaranteed for the future. Also, the proposal that workers will be willing to walk to the site from Gateway Shopping Centre after having caught a bus there seem fanciful. 4. There is no real need for motorway services at Banbury as there are already such amenities 13.7 miles N and 11.5 miles S of J11. 5. In summary, the proposal for motorway services and hotel is ill-conceived, poorly prepared and shows a lack of awareness by the developers of the impacts it will have on the locality. In my view, this proposal should be rejected. As shown above, the development of a motorway services and hotel in addition to the offices and distribution centre is not essential and has the potential to severely and adversely affect surrounding communities and their economy. In particular, BTC should have major concerns at the potential for restricting movement to and from the town from the M40 and the East and the impact that this may have on the economy of the town and surrounding areas.

Received Date

10/08/2021 16:17:47

Attachments