1. **Application Site and Locality** 
   1. Building 103 is constructed of red brick under a gabled slated roof. Built in the late 1920’s it is one of the oldest remaining buildings on the base although its history is not as well documented as others. It has served as a power station and housed emergency vehicles. For several years it was used by a company who repair, upgrade and convert narrow boats who have now relocated to their main base at Enslow.
   2. Building 315 is one of the A-frame hangers dating from about 1926 that circle the technical area and border the flying field. Upper Heyford is unique in having six, the largest collection of Type ‘A’ hangers in the country.
2. **Description of Proposed Development**
3. The current application seeks the discharge of Condition 5 (Travel Plan) of 16/01545/F.
4. **Appraisal**

Condition 5 requires a detailed green travel plan, prepared in accordance with the Department of Transport's Best Practice Guidance Note "Using the planning process to secure travel plans" and the emerging Oxfordshire County Council guidance on Developer Travel Plans (including an HGV routeing agreement), to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Oxfordshire County Council as Local Highways Authority objects to the discharge of this condition:

“The covering letter dated 10th January 2017 states that *“…for planning application purposes the changes in uses for Buildings 315 and 103 would be covered by the existing Commercial Travel Plan, as neither the proposed B8 storage nor the Heritage Centre would have more than 250 members of staff.”* The County agrees that that the activities in Buildings 103 and 315 will be covered by the overarching Commercial Travel Plan (CTP) for Heyford Park. However the CTP requires further improvement before it can be accepted as being fit for its intended purpose.

The CTP for Heyford Park was first submitted in November 2014 and the County has since commented in detail on improvements required. This has included a meeting between the County’s Travel Plan team and the developer’s consultant in February 2017 during which further improvements were identified. These included the inclusion of updated survey results, action tables and smart targets. **The County can not recommend discharge of this condition** until an improved Commercial Travel Plan is received for review.”

The LPA has tried to work with the applicant proactively and has requested revised information since the submission of this application (including on 02/03/2017, 07/03/2017, 09/03/2017, 13/04/2017, 23/05/2017, 26/06/2017, 30/08/2017, 11/09/2017, 13/10/2017 and 13/11/2017). The applicants had originally advised that this information was being prepared in May 2017 - unfortunately, no information has been forthcoming.

Having regard to all of the above, and in the absence of an acceptable travel plan, the details submitted for the discharge of this condition are considered to be inadequate and therefore should be refused accordingly.

1. **Recommendation**

**Refuse**

Condition 5:

The submitted travel plan is insufficient to discharge the condition as it does not meet the standards required by the Local Highway Authority. The Travel Plan would fail to promote healthy and sustainable travel options and would therefore be contrary to Policies SLE4, ESD1 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
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