

## Planning Application: 23/02827/F

### **Heyford Park: Use of the Eastern Part of the Southern Taxiway and adjacent Hush House building (1368) for Car Processing Operations. Temporary Planning Permission for 5 years.**

LHPC wishes to submit a further objection with supplementary information.

We support the previous objections from the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum, Heyford Park Parish Council and Middleton Stoney Parish Council.

#### **1. Unacceptable Impact of HGVs on the rural villages**

The MCC vehicle survey in the TA shows a total of 90 HGVs (transporters + OGV1 + OGV2) to/from Gate 7 to/from Upper Heyford village to the West. This should not be happening. HGVs have a severe impact on the sensitive rural villages around Heyford Park, particularly where roads and pavements are narrow and traditional houses have no set back. It is also relevant that surrounding villages have received no traffic calming from Heyford Park in line with the S106 obligation dated 2011 because OCC has still not made this available.

#### **2. Unacceptable Impact of Car Transporters and other HGVs through HP's Village Centre**

Heyford Park has undergone a transformation since the first permissions for car processing were granted. This is a relatively recent and material consideration. Camp Road now forms the centre of a new community and provides access to the school, to shops and other leisure facilities. The granting of this application would significantly increase the number of car transporters through the Village Centre – a number which is already far too high.

The MCC counts show that the site at Gate 7 already generates an average of 90 car transporters along Camp Road through the Village Centre each weekday. The counts also show an additional 150 HGVs (OGV1 and OGV2). This means that currently 240 HGVs, including 90 car transporters, travel through Heyford Park's Village Centre on an average weekday. This is unacceptable. As well as the noise and pollution, there are safety implications, particularly in view of the proximity of Heyford Park Free School to Camp Road. Three serious accidents were recorded on Camp Road in 2020.

#### **3. The estimated 25 car transporters a day generated by the application lacks credibility.**

Car processing on this site has been the subject of three previous temporary permissions. **The first (13/01599/F)** in May 2014 until May 2019. It appears (from the documents relating to the second permission) that this was for storing 2,135 cars which would generate 25 car transporters a day.

**The second (18/02169/F)** in May 2019 until Dec 2021 was an **intensification** of the previous use, adding a further 849 car spaces to total 2,984 and increasing cars processed from 6,000 to 8,000 per year. It was stated that the number of transporters would remain the same because of more efficient loading?

**The third (20/03638/F)** in Dec 2020 until April 2023. The time extension was curtailed from 2024 to 2023 because of the HP Masterplan.

The present application is another **intensification** of use adding a further 816 car spaces to total 3,800.

Yet it is argued that the site would still generate only 25 transporters a day – the same number as the original permission in 2013 – even though 1,665 car spaces have been added since that time. This is illogical and no explanation has been given.

#### **4. Car Processing at this Location is not Supported by the Heyford Park Masterplan**

While this application is for storing 3,800 cars, the applicant has requested storage for 10,000 cars. We understand that the remaining car storage benefits from an existing permission in another location at Heyford Park. It is unclear which permission and whether this would have a further impact on the Village Centre and surrounding villages.

**(a)** What is clear is that the use of the present site for car processing does not accord with the recently approved Heyford Park Masterplan.

The two previous applications for this site were permitted on the basis that the car processing would be relocated in line with the Heyford Park Masterplan.

18/02169/F: 'The Council were considering a Masterplan for HP in which *the applicant would be relocated to the west of the site so any harm from the proposed continued temporary use would be short term*'.

20/03638/F: The temporary extension was permitted on condition it ended a year earlier in April 2023. The officer's report states that "The rationale for extending this temporary consent is to enable the masterplan accompanying the new Hybrid consent to be agreed, for the S106 planning obligation agreement to be finalised and for *alternative space to be made available for the cars storage businesses to relocate to. Bearing in mind that a resolution to grant permission has already been agreed, it is not reasonable to assume that it would take more than three years to resolve matters and make alternative land available.*

**(b)** The S106 obligations for the Masterplan require Chilgrove Drive to be completed to binder course level prior to the first occupation of any commercial unit or dwelling within Masterplan Area A. (See Para 2.1 and 2.2 of Schedule 16). Hush House and other parts of the site fall into Masterplan Area A. Chilgrove Drive is already urgently needed to remove the current level of HGVs from the Village Centre and should be installed before any further development generating HGVs.

#### **Summary**

**The planning application should be refused for the following reasons:**

**The site use in this location does not conform to the Heyford Park Masterplan. It also fails to conform to the S106 obligation which requires that the Chilgrove Drive HGV access road is installed before the occupation of any commercial unit in the Masterplan Area A.**

**The number of 25 car transporters generated by this current application lacks credibility and requires further explanation. Even if accepted, this would add 50 car transporter trips to the existing 90 along Camp Road. The result would be an average of 140 car transporters plus 150 HGVs travelling through the Village Centre each day. This would be a blight on the new community.**

**The MCC counts show that HGVs from the site are travelling to and from the west through the rural villages. Lower Heyford and other villages are not built to accommodate HGVs and should not have to experience the attendant noise, pollution and safety risks.**