

Planning Application: 23/02827/F

Heyford Park: Use of the Eastern Part of the Southern Taxiway and adjacent Hush House building for Car Processing Operations.

I wish to submit an objection to the above planning application

Firstly, the Transport Assessment dated April 2024 concludes that the impact from a previous use of the site is no more than 25 transporters movements per day. This should be doubled to 50 movements per day. The consultants have confused 'transporters' with 'transporter movements' in a technical note from a previous planning permission (ref:18/02169/F). A further reading of the note makes this clear.

Secondly, this previous permission included a significant intensification of use. 849 car spaces were added to the site to total 2,984, representing a 40% increase in capacity. It was, nevertheless, argued that the impact would remain the same because the previous occupant intended to load the transporters more efficiently. Transport Development Control's response stated that '*no evidence is offered to support this claim. However, it is considered that an increase in HGV movements proportionate to the increase in capacity would not bring about a significant adverse impact on the surrounding network*'.

An increase in car transporter movements proportionate to the increase in capacity means that the application site would generate up to 70 car transporter movements per day (50+20) along Camp Road. The number of transporter movements would increase from 102 to 172 per day (a 69% increase) and the total number of HGV movements from 267 to 337 per day (a 26% increase). **Given the 10.5 operational hours of the site, an extra 70 transporter movements per day equates to one HGV every two minutes through the village centre, over half of which would be car transporters.** Even an extra 50 transporters equates to one HGV every two minutes (267+50÷10.5). In contrast to the previous application, this would bring about a very significant adverse impact through the new community.

Thirdly, the impact from the application site (6.5 ha) has been estimated using the same ratio of land area to transporter movements as for the consented site (27.9 ha) - see table 5.2. There is insufficient information to estimate this reliably - no plan or map to show the 27.9 ha site's capacity for car storage nor that of the 25.4 ha used at the time of the survey, ie. number of car spaces on usable hard standing. This is necessary to ensure an accurate assessment. Table 5.2's estimated impact of 24 transporter movements per day is not corroborated by the impact from previous use of the site and suggests that it is also unrealistic.

The January TA indicates a further intensification of use from 2,984 to 3,800 car spaces (still stating an impact of 24 transporter movements!) but fig. 4.1 in the April TA has 3,049 car spaces (65 more than the previous planning permission ref 18/02169/F). This change is not referred to and requires clarification.

The TA does not take account of the HGVs from Gate 7 which turn west towards the Cherwell Valley villages. If the 'turn left' signage at Gate 7 and compliance with the routing agreement is successful, this would generate additional HGV traffic through the village centre.

To summarise, the current TA's conclusions on the previous impact of the application site are incorrect. The TA's process for estimating the impact of this application in relation to the larger site also appears to be incorrect and requires further information. Occupation of this site for car processing should be refused because it does not comply with the site use specified by the Heyford Park Masterplan. Cherwell's planning officer curtailed the previous temporary permission to April 2023 for this very reason. More importantly, the community should not have to suffer a possible 50-70 extra transporter trips per day on top of the already high number of existing HGVs and transporters using the village centre - 267 trips per day surveyed in December rising to 293 surveyed in March. The cumulative impact would be severe and have unacceptable environmental and safety issues for residents. No evidence has been provided for the contractual break clause to move the car processing to another site or where it would move to. This would, in any case, be a disincentive to the delivery of the bus loop and the school.

Kind regards,

Emily Daly

Transporter/HGV movements are daily 5-day average.