

Neighbour Consultee List

Planning Application Reference:	17/01466/F
Location Of Development:	Heyford Park Parcel B2A Camp Road Upper Heyford
Proposed Development Details:	Addition of approximately 310m of metal 'field' style railings painted black (Retrospective)

Neighbour(s) Consulted

1. 10 Miller Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AQ
2. 116 Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AG
3. 22 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
4. 20 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
5. 18 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
6. 16 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
7. 37 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
8. 114 Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AG
9. 69 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
10. 67 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
11. 65 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
12. 14 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
13. 12 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
14. 5 Hart Walk Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AF
15. 10 Gibson Drive Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5TJ
16. 10 Keele Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AU
17. 8 Keele Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AU

- 18. 6 Keele Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AU
- 19. 4 Keele Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AU
- 20. 6 Goldman Drive Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AW
- 21. 3 Keele Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AU
- 22. 7 Miller Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AQ
- 23. 3 Corbett Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AS

1. Mr Tim Coggins
18 Broad Way Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AD
2. Mr Paul McCormack
5 Hart Walk Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AF
3. Sharon Keen
10 Gibson Drive Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5TJ
4. Mr Craig Emptage
7 Miller Close Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5AQ



From: Sharon Keen
Sent: 04 September 2017 14:48
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 17/01466/F.

To whom this may concern,

I wish to strongly oppose this application (17/01466/F.). Throughout the development of Heyford Park fences have been avoided wherever possible. The Design Code states properties should have open frontages, not fenced. The character of the area (Core Housing West) is inspired by Carswell Circle where there are no fences dividing public areas. Therefore this is to be a full planning application and not Reserved Matters to the original planning application as per the Bovis Homes phases this fence divides. Bovis Homes have stated the LPA that the fence is required to provide "a degree of safety guarding to protect their children from the swale areas" and they "would hope that the LPA would prioritise safety for the children over permeability aspirations". The swale areas have been deemed wild meadows and are safe. They are regularly mowed and eventually they will be planted with flowers. They are frequently used by children for play and recreation as designed. The LPA have however stated the fence must be permeable to allow the clear pathways through the development, hence the gaps. This renders the fence redundant. It simply does not make sense to have a public path running alongside a public (adoptable) road with a fence separating the two. This again presents dangerous scenarios as pedestrians using the (shared surface) roads would have nowhere to escape to if put in danger by a large vehicles or vehicles travelling at speed. This fence also separates the path from open areas such as the green next to the play area. It also creates small pockets of green where there should be large open areas, such as to the east of the fence where it meets Camp Road. This fence not only contravenes the Design Code of the Conservation Area but it is also inconsistent with the development. A small "timber trip fence" installed by Bovis Homes separates the children's play area from the swale and is deemed safe. Therefore this fence is not needed, otherwise the play area, which should be the safest area of all, is unsafe. It appears to have been installed for aesthetic reasons only which contravenes the Design Code of the Conservation Area. The design code clearly states this area is a linear park and is an informal open space as opposed to the formal village centre. It goes on to state it should be a wild flower meadow with wet grasses and roughly mown grass and street furniture would be of a simple informal style, with the material typically being timber. This fence is divisive which goes against the open space and makes the area very formal. It is in the style of the fencing at Blenheim Palace. Without prejudice, if this fence was required to keep children safe, it doesn't work. Small children can easily pass through the railings but adults caring for them cannot. This itself presents dangerous scenarios. Finally, if the fence is deemed as required to protect children from the meadow, then it should be between the wild meadow and the path, not between the path and the road.

R

Regards,

Sharon Keen
10 Gibson Drive, Heyford Park

From: Public Access DC Comments
Sent: 30 August 2017 11:55
To: Public Access DC Comments
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 17/01466/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 11:55 AM on 30 Aug 2017 from Mr Paul McCormack.

Application Summary

Address: Heyford Park Parcel B2A Camp Road Upper Heyford
Proposal: Addition of approximately 310m of metal 'field' style railings painted black (Retrospective)
Case Officer: Lewis Bankes-Hughes
[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul McCormack
Email:
Address: 5 Hart Walk, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5AF

Comments Details

Commenter Type: General Public
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Throughout the development of Heyford Park fences have been avoided wherever possible. The Design Code states properties should have open frontages, not fenced. The character of the area is inspired by existing dwellings where there are no fences dividing public areas.

The planning application states that the fence is to address "safety concerns". This statement is overly vague and also misleading.

Whilst the planning documents are inconsistent in their depiction of the fence, I assume that the fence supposedly serves two purposes: Firstly, to separate the two east-west "pedestrian link" footpaths from the swales; and secondly, to separate a footpath from shared driveways (part public, part private).

The first purpose is unnecessary as the swale areas have been deemed wild meadows and are safe. They are

regularly mowed and eventually, they will be planted with flowers. They are frequently used by children for play and recreation as designed. If some form of separation is deemed to be necessary, the fence should be low wooden fences to match the barrier near to the playpark as this is much more in fitting with the environment, planning guidelines and intent. I am aware that there has been some concern about the concrete areas of the swale, however, the proposed fence is completely ineffective in protecting these small areas.

The second purpose seems not to have any genuine "safety concern" and is only really to separate a public footpath from a shared driveway or surface street. I would argue that the fence creates more of a safety issue as it restricts the usable width of the footpath so a young child on a bike is more likely to fall into the fence rather swerve temporarily onto the driveway. If fences are not required outside the school on Camp Road then why would it be deemed a "safety concern" next to a driveway? Why was this not deemed a concern during the original planning process? Furthermore, in no way does the fence separate the main footpath from the swales so this cannot be the "safety concern". No fencing exists on the Broad Way side of the swale which-although it does not have public footpath-is used extensively by pedestrians and young children.

The proposed fence separates the path from open areas creating isolated pockets of green where there should be large open areas such as at the northern end of the fence where it meets Camp Road.

This fence not only contravenes the Design Code of the Conservation Area but it is also inconsistent with the development. A small "timber trip fence" installed by Bovis Homes separates the children's play area from the swale and is deemed safe. Therefore, the proposed fence is not needed, otherwise the play area, which should be the safest area of all, is unsafe. It appears to have been installed for boundary reasons only which contravenes the Design Code of the Conservation Area.

Without prejudice, if this fence is *really* required to keep children safe, it will not work. Small children can easily pass through the railings but adults caring for them cannot. This itself presents dangerous scenarios.

It is my opinion that the supposed "safety concerns" mentioned on the planning application form are at best overblown and at worst simply an excuse to prevent pedestrians using the private drives adjacent to the footpath.

This retrospective application uses vague and inconsistent "safety concerns" as an excuse to install

such an excessive and out-of-character fence and should not be approved. The design code makes it clear there should be open frontages and this area must "provide natural surveillance out over the open space".

From: Public Access DC Comments
Sent: 04 September 2017 16:57
To: Public Access DC Comments
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 17/01466/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 4:57 PM on 04 Sep 2017 from Mr Tim Coggins.

Application Summary

Address: Heyford Park Parcel B2A Camp Road Upper Heyford
Proposal: Addition of approximately 310m of metal 'field' style railings painted black (Retrospective)
Case Officer: Lewis Bankes-Hughes
[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Tim Coggins
Email:
Address: 18 Broad Way, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5AD

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour
Stance: Customer made comments neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:
Comments: As a Bovis Homes customer I am unable to object to this planning application as this is a restriction in the deeds. Therefore I would like to clearly state this is neutral comment.

I have spoken to other Bovis Homes customers in this area and I believe the Parish Council's reasons for objection reflect the views of the vast majority of residents who are not allowed to object.

I feel the developer is also causing confusion. The one comment in support of this application (at the time of writing) focuses on the segregation this creates, where it's clear the area should be open, and does not reference safety. The comment also states that the fence "will also be in keeping with the section of railings already in place near to the play area" but in fact these railings are the subject of this planning application.

Before reserving a home in the area we specifically waited for the plans opposite to be approved and they were, according to the design code, without this fence. It changes the character and the heritage of the conservation area.

On 17th July 2017 A Bovis Homes Director clearly stated to me "I did not state we were putting additional fencing in" but then these plans were published days later. In breach of planning control Bovis Homes continued completing the fence regardless. Developers must not think it is ok to do something then put in retrospective planning as a matter of course.

From: Public Access DC Comments
Sent: 22 August 2017 13:56
To: Public Access DC Comments
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 17/01466/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 1:55 PM on 22 Aug 2017 from Mr Craig Emptage.

Application Summary

Address: Heyford Park Parcel B2A Camp Road Upper Heyford
Proposal: Addition of approximately 310m of metal 'field' style railings painted black (Retrospective)
Case Officer: Lewis Bankes-Hughes
[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Craig Emptage
Email:
Address: 7 Miller Close, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5AQ

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour
Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:
Comments: I support the addition of the railings with the openings and gates as shown on the plan. This will provide good separation between the private driveways and the public footpath. It will also be in keeping with the section of railings already in place near to the play area.