

Planning & Regulation Committee Monday, 30 November 2015

ADDENDA

4. Petitions and Public Address

<i>Item</i>	<i>Speaker</i>
County Councillor Charles Mathew (Eynsham)	6. Dix Pit , Stanton Harcourt – Application No. MW.0053/1
County Councillor Richard Webber (Sutton Courtenay & Marcham)	7. Hanson Building Products, Sutton Courtenay – Application No. MW/0135/15
Bryn Williams (Local Resident) Tony Castle-Miller (Local Resident) District Councillor Mike Kerford-Byrnes Martin Layer (Applicant) County Councillor Arash Fatemian (Deddington))))) 8. Duns Tew Quarry, Middle Barton –) Application No. MW0036/14)))
County Councillor Judith Heathcoat (Faringdon)	11. Commons Act 2006: Registration of Humpty Hill as a Town or Village Green

7. Section 73 application to continue the development of 'To crush, screen, blend and stock reject building blocks, furnace bottom ash and reject materials from concrete making to make material for block making' without complying with condition 5 to allow operations to take place 52 weeks a year at Hanson Building Products, Sutton Courtenay - Application No. MW.0135/15

Additional representations received in last two days

Steven Sensecall

"I live at Birches Farm House in Sutton, the access is to which is directly off the B4449. I heard earlier today that Oxfordshire Planning and Regulation Committee will tomorrow be considering a report from the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning) which recommends "that the County Council enter into a deed of variation to the existing routeing agreement for application MW.0053/15 to allow off-peak HGV movements on the alternative route to Oxford for concrete mixer trucks travelling to the Westgate redevelopment in central Oxford only, until the completion of roadworks on the Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts."

I write to object to this proposal in the strongest possible terms.

I note that the Committee Report considers a proposed modification to the approved route for vehicles associated with the concrete batching operation at Dix Pit. I note also that the developer has implemented the consent (MW.0053/15) but has found that journey times from the site into central Oxford are adversely affected by roadworks on the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts, "to the extent that concrete has been out of specification on arrival and has had to be returned" and that consequently, "the developer [Hanson] has proposed an alternative route, using the B4449 and the B4044 to reach Oxford from the west.

Comment: as I understand it, the current routeing agreement requires the concrete lorries to turn left out of Dix Pit; to travel along the B4449 to the junction with the A415; to turn right on to the A415; and then to join the A40 to Oxford at Witney. I have not seen any reference in the Committee Report to a problem with this part of the route; the issue arises further along the A40, past Eynsham as a result of the road works at the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts. That being the case, the only deviation required to the existing route is from Eynsham onwards. The alternative route should therefore be from the A40 roundabout on the north-east edge of Eynsham, southwards on to the B4449 and then eastwards over the Toll bridge i.e. avoiding Sutton all together.

In addition, I note that the proposed 'temporary' route "includes the B4449 through the village of Sutton, which is specifically protected from a significant increase in traffic intrusion by development plan policy"; that "the alternative route would only be used for the duration of the roadworks, only during off peak

hours (9pm-3pm) and only by vehicles carrying concrete to the Westgate redevelopment in central Oxford; and that Hanson has also asked for agreement that the alternative route can be used for empty vehicles returning from the Westgate, but that this is not considered to be justified.

Comment: I welcome the rejection of the suggestion that empty vehicles also need to be diverted; this clearly has no effect on the operation of Hanson's business.

I note from the main body of the report that "Transport Development Control have confirmed that the dimensions and characteristics of the B4449 do not make it entirely unsuitable for use of HGV traffic" (my emphasis); that "there is a slightly higher than average accident rate on the B4449 between Sutton and Eynsham due to a cluster of collisions involving HGVs near the bend by Bell Bridge" and that it is therefore recommended that "the dispensation is applied to full loads of concrete only rather than returning empty lorries"

Comment: the consultation response from Transport Development Control that "the dimensions and characteristics of the B4449 do not make it entirely unsuitable for use of HGV traffic" is hardly a ringing endorsement (!); I have been a resident of Stanton Harcourt/Sutton for 28 years and I am acutely aware of the accidents and near misses that have occurred on the bends through Sutton and at Bell Bridge, and of HGVs failing to adhere to the 30mph speed limit – on any reasonable view, the B4449 through and either side of Sutton is wholly unsuitable for HGVs. If the existing accident rate is already "slightly higher than average", a decision to allow a material increase in HGV traffic along this stretch of road can only make the position worse and could therefore tip the balance from "slightly higher" to "higher". Against this background, and in all conscience, a decision to accept the officers' recommendation in this case could be seen by some observers as nothing short of irresponsible.

The use of the alternative route for Oxford-bound loaded concrete lorries only would result in an average of 1 additional HGV movement every half hour on the B4449, based on an average of 10 movements per day within the six hour window proposed.

Comment: see above – 2 additional vehicles an hour "on average" (i.e. it is likely that at certain times of the day the frequency will be greater than 2 vehicles per hour) is 2 too many on a road that is already unsuitable for HGVs and where there is "slightly higher than average"

The report states that "it has been suggested that the problem could be addressed through the use of additives to the concrete to extend the length of time it can be transported for. The applicant has advised that the Westgate redevelopment does not accept concrete containing any additives."

Comment: I understand that the Westgate developer would be prepared to accept additives. The Council should at least ask the question itself.

If notwithstanding the compelling case made above, the Committee is minded to accept the officers' recommendation, **there should at the very least be a condition requiring Hanson to pay for the installation and ongoing maintenance of speed cameras in both directions through Sutton.**

I would be grateful if this email could be read out in full at tomorrow's Committee Meeting."

Lucy Newton

"I am contacting you about the meeting of the Planning and Regulation Committee that is due to take place on Monday 30th November, and in particular the item about the relaxation of the routing restrictions on Hanson concrete lorries making deliveries to the Westgate development. I was alerted to this by the BBC story on tonight's Oxford news.

As an Eynsham resident I would like my views to be represented at the meeting.

I completely support Cllr Mathew in his attempts to prevent this relaxation. The villages of Stanton Harcourt and Sutton are not suitable for this volume of traffic, as anyone who has visited these villages will know. These are B roads. Why can't the routing be adjusted so that the lorries travel directly down the A415 to the A420?

However, my concerns relate mainly to the routing of these lorries over the Swinford Toll Bridge. In my view, this bridge is unsuitable for heavy goods, as the lorries cannot pass over the toll bridge without forcing the traffic going the other way to stop. This causes delays while the traffic backs up and in the worst case scenario, total gridlock when two lorries meet each other in the middle of the bridge. It doesn't take a genius to work out that introducing extra concrete lorries into the mix (pardon the pun!) would not be a good idea.

I note the time restrictions that have been suggested. I can tell you that at 9.00, the traffic is regularly backed up past the end of my road (Hazeldene Close), which if you time this is about 25 minutes to the toll. Given that the concrete lorries would have priority over the roundabout, the chaos would worsen (and maybe the time delays would cause the concrete to set solid?).

In addition, 3pm is too late. A simple check with the (Oxfordshire CC) schools in Eynsham would reveal that they finish at 3.05; therefore the school run traffic would be heading back to Eynsham to be back by 3 (hopefully). I cycle to work, travelling along the A40, and whilst it is undoubtedly busy in the rush hour, there are no significant delays around Cutteslowe/Wolvercote when I come back at 2.30/2.45. I would assume that at the time the traffic alleviates on the toll bridge would be the same time that it alleviates on the A40 too, but I hope that OCC has carried out some research (at the expense of Hanson) to verify this before even considering this variation. The simple truth is, there is no easy or quick way to navigate into Oxford from West Oxfordshire in the rush hour, and believe me, I must have tried every possibility. Hanson have to accept this and schedule deliveries accordingly.

Another consideration is the bus route (S1) into Oxford. This is already regularly delayed over the toll bridge; is Hanson justified in asking bus passengers to be delayed further, when they are helping to get traffic off the road by using public transport?

In summary, I would like to express my view to the committee that this application should be opposed. Traffic in West Oxfordshire is already under intense pressure, with residents putting up with significant delays to their journey times. I do not believe the commercial benefit to Hanson should outweigh the residents of Sutton, Stanton Harcourt, Eynsham and surrounding villages, who are already bearing the brunt day in day out of the Cutteslowe/Wolvercote roadworks, especially when (as the papers indicate) Hanson were well aware of the roadworks and their likely impact when they agreed to do the work.

I await the decision of the committee with interest.”

Emma Miller (forwarded by the Leader of the Council)

“I hope you are well and do not mind me contacting you directly. I hope the intention of my email is not misinterpreted because I am truly grateful for the investments that have been made in the Oxford ring road. I heard on radio Oxford yesterday there is a petition to change the route of the Hanson lorries via the Swinford Toll Bridge and Sutton village.

I wanted to express my concern at this proposal. Sutton already has lots of lorries using this route from the Industrial estate in Stanton Harcourt and the local quarries. In my opinion many of these lorries are too big for this route already and I do not think it could sustain more HGVs. Since the roadworks have begun the Toll Bridge traffic has significantly increased and the larger vehicles do cause longer delays. Also, the roads in Sutton from a maintenance perspective could sustain more HGV traffic Thank you for taking time to read my email.”

Comments from the deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)

The case officer will address the points raised in each submission at the meeting.

Councillor Charles Mathew

Has reported receipt of over 50 letters/emails from local residents directly affected by this route variation and many more from other Oxfordshire residents.

9. Section 73 application to vary conditions 3, 6 and 14 of planning permission no. MW.0097/14 to extend the time period for the removal of all buildings, plant, machinery or structures and their foundations and bases, together with any hard standings, bunds of overburden, quarry waste or soil and complete restoration by 30th September 2016 at Wicklesham Quarry, Sandshill, Faringdon - Application No. MW.0134/15

Amendment by the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning).

A revised restoration scheme has been received requiring the following amendment to paragraph 75:

“The proposed developments set out in application nos. MW.0133/15 and MW.0134/15 are considered to be acceptable and in compliance with both development plan and developing policies and should be approved.”

No change to the printed recommendation.

10. The erection of a flat roofed mobile unit to provide catering facilities at Clanfield C of E Primary School, Main Street, Clanfield - Application No. R3.0096/15

Additional representations and comments from the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)

1. Received additional Comment from Clanfield Parish Council, after the case officer requested clarification from comments made by the parish council on the access arrangements during both construction and operational periods.
2. The case officer's clarification email explained how the site will be accessed during the construction and operational period if the application was approved. He also stated if minded to approve the application he did not consider it a material consideration to include a condition stating the road must be resurfaced.
3. Parish Council's amended response (20th November):
“Matthew, in response to your email, the Parish Council wishes to reiterate its robust objection to this planning application as advised to you previously. Any increase in traffic to the front entrance of the school is unacceptable and, were you to visit the site, the reason would be immediately obvious. You will see that residents living next door to the school have taken steps to protect the village green outside their properties

We have over recent years experienced the destruction of and damage to the village greens by staff and parents accessing the school; not only at its

front access but by the increased numbers of parents parking on the lower greens despite notices requesting that they do not. At the parish council's significant expense, the lorry park was extended to accommodate school parking and frankly, and are of the view that it is time that the County and or the school took financial responsibility for the impact of development of the school on this village and its residents. On many occasions we have raised these issues with the school and no effective response has been forthcoming.

At its meeting on Monday last, the parish council asked that I respond to you re this planning application and to re state its objection to any increase in traffic to the front entrance of the school which over the years has badly damaged the village green. As custodians of the registered village green it is the PC's duty to ensure that any damage done is re-instated, by those who have damaged it. Historically there were posts installed by the parish council dividing the green and the entrance to the school (along the causeway path) to protect the erosion of the village green. The Parish Council have historically worked with OCC and allowed tarmac to be laid to assist the vehicles using the front play area of the school as a car park, so that potholes do not become a safety problem and to protect the village green. I am sure you will agree that it is unreasonable of the County Council to expect Clanfield residents to fund the costs of the impact of continual development of the school as it has done to date, particularly when more than half of the pupils who attend do not live in this village.

I shall also be writing to the school requesting its co-operation with this and advising that, if they are unwilling to take action, the PC proposes to take appropriate action to restore and protect the village green and the footpath for residents outside the front school entrance."

4. Applicant's Agent Response to Objection (23rd November):
"This objection from the parish council is all very well and probably justified but once again it is extremely late in proceedings particularly as we deferred to the next meeting to answer concerns over the neighbouring tree. Within this volunteered extension of time the parish council could have put their case earlier giving us time to adequately respond to a matter that is obviously historic and is unlikely to be particularly affected by the limited change in vehicle movement about the school through the adjusted catering provision, as has been outlined by the school.
5. It appears to me that there is a much bigger issue involving vehicle movement in and around the school which involves catchment areas, public and school buses, and private cars a point that is made in the pc email, 'particularly when more than half of the pupils who attend do not live in this village'. I would think that the traffic volume is directly connected to the requirement for the catering unit."
6. The existing operational access to the school car park for staff and deliveries does cross registered village green on existing hardstanding track. The access provided runs south from the Bakery Lane parallel to the

A4095 (Main Street).

7. The additional consultation response from Clanfield Parish Council to record an objection to the application doesn't alter my recommendation. The vehicle movements associated with the development proposed will not involve an increase in the deliveries. The current arrangement sees hot meals prepared off site and delivered on a daily basis to the school. Depending on storage facilities installed, the applicant doesn't anticipate needing more than 1-2 deliveries per week delivered by van. The objection from the parish council also references the school's impact on the village green area to the south of the site. The development proposed is not linked to traffic movements by parents and staff using the village green and associated car park to the south of the site. Traffic movements during the construction period will not involve vehicle access via the main school access, nor the village green area.