

## **MCNP (Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan) Forum**

**Response to Technical Note commissioned by Albion Land (AL) produced by DTA (David Tucker Associates) – Transport planning Consultants. Reference Planning Applications: 21/03267/OUT and 21/03268/OUT)**

### **Preamble**

MCNP Forum represents parishes in the vicinity of Junction 10 and consists largely of Parish Councillors. For reference, these are:

- Lower Heyford Parish Council
- Upper Heyford Parish Council
- Steeple Aston Parish Council
- Middle Aston Parish Meeting
- North Aston Parish Meeting
- Somerton Parish Council
- Middleton Stoney Parish Council
- Fritwell Parish Council
- Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council (lead parish for legal purposes)
- Kirtlington Parish Council
- Duns Tew Parish Council
- Heyford Park Residents Association
- Heyford Park Parish Council
- Dorchester Group (advisory capacity)

### **Modelling omissions**

We consider there are significant omissions in the modelling assumptions including:

- The potential OxSRFI development which in employment terms is advertised to employ 9,500 personnel. With related commuter traffic this will affect this junction, and this excludes significant road freight movements. Most of the traffic will be road freight as only three of the twelve planned warehouses will be connected to the railway, and only four trains per day will move freight and unload and load potentially up to 76 HGV containers for each of these trains per day.
- Additional planned phases of house building at Heyford Park and related traffic movements.
- The potential for the Hawkwell Village development near Bucknell adding a further 3,100 houses near to this junction and the concomitant traffic loading this junction.
- Commuters to the large Great Wolf Resort Park (currently under construction) passing through this junction.
- The annual impact of the British Grand Prix at this junction, as well as other events at Silverstone.

### **Baseline**

We fail to understand how any effective modelling can be undertaken at this junction without an annualised baseline of measured data at this junction which is consensually agreed a “failed

junction”, before considering modelling additional traffic flow for some very considerable developments. Ideally this baseline data would include light, air and noise pollution monitoring as well. Locals regularly experience very significant congestion at this junction, particularly when there are incidents on the M40. From our layperson perspective, we intuitively consider the proposal of increasing the roundabout by 15 metres an overly simplistic solution that surely cannot magically resolve these issues to the 2031 planning horizon.

“Joined up” thinking would suggest that to synchronise with the Cherwell Local Plan to 2040, this would be a more appropriate target?

Local communities would like to be reassured that the Bicester Traffic Model (BTM) realistically accounts for the issues at this junction.

### **Lack of completeness**

In our view, reference Section 10 (iv) and 10 (viii) citing additional notes will be provided “in due course” undermines the consultants position that (reference Paragraph 16) *“The appraisal clearly demonstrates that the proposed scheme fully mitigates the impact of the development...”*.

While we understand that this document purpose is to initiate further discussions with OCC, we fail to see that this report provides local residents the ability to assess this effectively, and does not justify this assertion considering this is an incomplete analysis by the report’s own admission. To be potentially wasting public money on evaluating this proposal without a more comprehensive analysis seems unjustified.

December 1<sup>st</sup> 2022

MCNP