

**The Mullin Automotive Museum**

---

**OBJECTION – Speaking Notes**

---

1. There are two separate and unrelated reasons to reject this application; process and substance.

**PROCESS**

2. Paragraph 5.68 of the Officer's report says that "this is a major development proposal and has attracted considerable public interest with strongly held opinions on either side of the argument as to whether the scheme should be approved or refused."
3. The Officer then summarises the objections and states "...these arguments have some merit and would point towards a refusal of consent."
4. This alone provides a proper basis to reject the application. This is a deeply controversial application with many arguments on both sides and hundreds of passionate individuals involved. A planning appeal will provide a forum in which all those involved in this application will have a fair opportunity to fully articulate their position. In the **wholly exceptional** circumstances of this case, a rejection leading to an appeal is the fairest way to proceed.

The reality is that the tens of thousands of cars will be using unsuitable local roads with severe adverse effects on the public interest.

iv) **Heritage Restoration**

The approach adopted in the Officer's Report is legally erroneous in both of the alternatives he offers.

**6. Absence of Crucial Information**

- i) Detailed Travel Plan
- ii) Financial Information (Business Case)
- iii) Draft S.106 agreement

**Anthony Crean QC**

25<sup>th</sup> March 2019



## Appendix B

Mr John Mitchinson, Chairman of Great Tew Parish Meeting addressed Members and advised that he had been a resident of Great Tew for 22 years and Chairman of the Great Tew Parish Meeting for six years.

At their meeting in February, the Parish Meeting had received a full presentation followed by a question and answer session followed by a further consultation in December and there had been a clear majority in favour of the application. An application that has been one of the most controversial I've had to deal with – lots of arguments on both sides. Whilst concerns were raised about the impact on traffic, it was hoped that the cap of 200,000 visitors, proposed by Enstone District & Uplands Conservation Trust, would be adhered to.

Members had been impressed by the nature of the plan which was bold, ambitious, offers an innovative solution for the site and incorporated involvement from one of the worlds most prestigious architectural firm. Members had discussed the significant contribution through the S106 including the restoration of Tew Park, affordable housing and car parking in Great Tew. Money set aside for an and provision of parking in Great Tew.

Mr Mitchinson highlighted that the location was the geographical centre of the British motoring industry. William Morris started in Oxford, British Leyland, Silverstone and Renault FI have been located in the area and in addition this would be an education focused museum and celebrates some of the most important and beautiful cars ever built whilst pointing towards the inevitability of a car less future.

The economic benefits included the potential for 300 job vacancies to be filled by local people living in the area and £13m gross value added, primarily in tourism. The Parish Meeting had felt that there had been good consultation and communication and many concerns had been shared about the preservation of a tranquil rural environment throughout the process and there was a good 'trade off' between the benefits and impact. This offers genuine cultural value and less disruptive than housing estates or business parks. The Applicants have shown willingness to engage address concerns, limitation of visitor numbers, promotion of shuttle busses and landscaping plan will ensure lowest possible noise and visual impact on the surrounding area. A majority of members recognised that this was well funded and designed and a rare opportunity which would transform this brownfield site into a cultural landmark and something that West Oxfordshire would be proud of.

**Driving Centre, Enstone Airfield. 18/03319/OUT**

- This is a very bad proposal. It is totally contrary to WODC and National policy
- It has extremely limited benefits for our community but significant disadvantages for local people.
- This proposal does not follow the principles laid out in the Local Plan.
- Policy E2, Supporting the Rural Economy has requirements such as, *diversification which is fully integrated with an existing farm business*. Clearly this proposal fails that test.
- There will be considerable visual and noise impact. Corporate events after sunset will create significant light pollution as well as noise
- The traffic forecasts are vastly understated. Soho Farmhouse has shown that once approved there is no control whatsoever over actual traffic volumes or flows.
- There is simply no road infrastructure to support what will almost certainly be 400,000 visitors a year. If you approve this scheme Mullin will do everything in its power to maximise visitor numbers regardless of the price local people will pay
- Siting the museum at Enstone Airfield would be wrong. Enstone is not a suitable site. The plan is opportunistic rather than strategic and integrated
- It does not constitute a *sustainable development*.
- This proposal fails the test of the Local Plan Objectives
- C01 requires *new development which will improve the quality of life of local communities and where the need for travel by car can be minimised*. Mullin does not do that
- The plan fails CO 10 requiring that land is not released for development until the supporting infrastructure is secured.
- This proposal totally ignores and is completely detrimental to the aims of CO11 '*maximise the opportunity for walking, cycling and the use of public transport*'
- Although slightly modified from the original plan this proposal still calls for residential units to be built on good agricultural land currently under active management. By any measure this is 'greenfield land' and a haven for wild life.
- It is obvious to everyone that these residential units will contribute almost nothing to visitor numbers at the museum and therefore could not contribute to the ongoing viability of the museum
- These holiday homes for the very rich are there simply to generate cash for the renovation of a private house. They have nothing to do with the museum.

## Appendix D

Mr Steve Ferrelly, Chair of Westcote Barton Parish Meeting addressed Members and advised that this proposal had been considered at the past two parish meetings – both in its outline form and its current form. Attendees had objected to the application on two grounds – the S106 funding and the effect of traffic on the area.

The Planning Officer has suggested that there be a cap on the number of vehicles travelling to and from the site at 334 vehicles per session. A session is a two hours session in the proposal which has a start time and would equal 334 cars arriving at the same time. That number of cars parked nose to tail would be circa one mile long limiting the number of vehicles per session was welcomed, the numbers stated in Condition 6 of the report presented some problems. Based on that number of vehicles a session, and with a suitable stopping distance applied, the queue of traffic would be 5.8 miles long. A 23m meter gap estimated between each car would equal a two second timeframe to stop prior to hitting the car in front. If you extend the gap to 5 seconds between each car, which may not be enough time to cross the road, the line extends to 14.8 miles – quite a considerable distance

It was felt that the B4030 was recognised as the major route into the site and runs from Bicester to Enstone. Three sets of traffic lights existed along the route which protected the bridges because they were too narrow for two vehicles to pass at the same time and parked cars would restrict the traffic flow to a much slower speed. Imagine how much congestion this 14.8 mile queue will have as it arrives or departs the site. Through those villages a number of the houses are either built on the road or had driveways that you had to drive into or reverse out of. Combine this with the 14.8 mile long queue of cars, how would individuals cross the road, reverse into your drive or get to the shops? I would hope you would consider that as being an impact on the environment or the health of the community.

## Appendix E

Mr Kieren Hedigan and Mr Gerrard Eveden, a representative from Fosters & Partners, on behalf of the applicant Mr Mullins, addressed Members.

Mr Hedigan advised that he had been a Fulbrook resident for over 20 years and his family had a history with the area. He stated that the officers report is a comprehensive document and speaks for itself. He explained that Mr Mullins was a 78 year old philanthropist and entrepreneur & happens to own one of the greatest car collections and wants to share it with us. He is passionate about the past, present and future of the personal transportation.

The museum would transform a brownfield site and would be open to the public all year round. What we have in mind does not exist anywhere else in the world.

With regard to jobs, this development would provide opportunities for local people, such as craftsmen and mechanics for many years to come. He reminded Members that despite the emotion, no professional consultees had objected. The proposal would include a well designed visitor programme and the applicant was willing to facilitate a Traffic Forum to which parish councils, Renault Formula 1 representatives of Soho Farmhouse and other interested parties could be invited to raise any traffic concerns.

The CEO of visit England said “given the national significance of this planned application and the importance of tourism in the local economy I hope you will give the mullin proper consideration”. She compares the Mullin to the V&A in Dundee and the Turner museum in Margate. To create this you need someone with a car collection and the willingness to share this well beyond their lifetime, a site which can only be improved and which already has permissions for automotive activity, convince Britain’s greatest living architect to design it and build it, all without a penny of public funds. This is exactly what is before you today.

Gerrard Eveden, Board Member and Director of Foster & Parters addressed Members and stated that it was rare to meet anyone with the passion that Peter Mullin had. He was not only trying to create something for the benefit of others but was willing to share his amazing collection. He had seen the collection first hand and had spoken at length with Mr Mullin and felt that this proposal would deliver a first class museum. He highlighted that the development was now almost entirely located on the brownfield site, which would transform a rundown airfield and create a wonderful, parkland experience and an environmental, living museum. All aspects of the site had been designed to be linked so could not exist alone – a functional and physical link. Foster & Partners were often cautious about the projects they took on however, in this case they were 110% behind producing this project and he urged the committee to consider approving this unique opportunity.