# HERITAGE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

### APP/C3105/W/23/3326761: OS Parcel 1570 Adjoining and West of Chilgrove Drive, and Adjoining and North Of, Camp Road, Heyford Park

### Prepared by RPS on behalf of the Appellant and Cherwell District Council

1. This Heritage Supplementary Statement of Common Ground (HSoCG) has been agreed between RPS Heritage, acting on behalf of the Appellant and Cherwell District Council.
2. This Statement has been provided to set out all heritage matters of agreement and those matters of dispute between the Council and the Appellant in this Appeal. It is supplementary to the principal Statement of Common Ground agreed between the parties and does not repeat any items that have been agreed within the principal Statement of Common Ground.

### Relevant Heritage Assets and Significance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Agreed Position** |
| Reason for Refusal | The following extract from Reason for Refusal 1 is relevant to this SoCG:  *The site’s relationship to the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area and the views into and out of the Conservation Area would cause harm to the setting of designated heritage assets. Such environmental harm is considered to be less than substantial, but the harm caused is not outweighed by the public social and economic benefits*.  The reason for refusal identifies harm to the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area, which contains various individual designated and non-designated heritage assets. |
|  |  |
| Policy | Significance is defined in the NPPF as:   * *The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.* |
| National Policy tests | Where harm is identified, this would be “less than substantial”, engaging paragraph 202 of the NPPF. Paragraphs 194,199, 200 and 203 are also relevant to the determination of the appeal proposals.  The parties’ position on harm is set out below. |
| Significance of relevant heritage assets: | |
| Development of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area | The airfield developed across four key phases:   1. As a First World War airfield 2. As a Second World War airfield 3. As a Cold War SAC base 4. As a “hardened” airfield during the Cold War   These phases are still evident in the different building typologies within the Conservation Area.  Parts of the Conservation Area (primarily those parts south of the Flying Field that had previously been residentially occupied) are currently being redeveloped to provide additional residential development and related facilities. Buildings within the Flying Field are primarily being re-used for commercial purposes. |
| RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area | * The highest significance of the Conservation Area is drawn from its historic interest as one of the best-preserved Cold War airbases for the deployment of fast jets. * This significance is drawn from the structures and landscaping within the Conservation Area, including he interconnection between the various structures, landscaping and facilities. * The Conservation Area also possesses architectural interest which is derived from the particular function and design of the various structures and their spatial arrangement. |

### Contribution of setting to significance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **The LPA’s position** | **The Appellant’s position** | **Matters of Agreement** |
| RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area | The setting of the conservation area is open and rural in character. The rural surroundings clearly echo the general openness of the Flying Field and contribute to the significance of the conservation area as a former RAF/USAF airbase. The surrounding rural character remains intact despite modern redevelopment of those parts of the former airbase previously residentially occupied by the RAF/USAF with new residential and related buildings.  Whether viewed from the west, north or east, the majority of the Conservation Area that comprises the Flying Field is viewed across open fields generally rising gently to a plateau area comprising the Conservation Area, which is occupied only sparsely by the former military buildings and structures within. | * The setting of the Conservation Area is mainly rural in character and includes agricultural uses. It also includes some historic and modern residential development. * There is a clear contrast between the character of the Flying Field and the land beyond. * The setting of the Conservation Area reflects the imposition of the airfield on this historic, agricultural landscape, but does not strongly contribute to its significance. * The Site forms part of the rural setting of the Conservation Areal but makes no contribution to its significance. | * Any matter of agreement from Column 2 can be added here |

### Impact of Development

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **The LPA’s position** | **The Appellant’s position** |
| RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area | The harm caused to the significance of the conservation area falls at the mid-level of ‘less than substantial harm’, as that term is defined and used in the NPPF and NPPG. | The development will have no impact on the significance of the Conservation Area, or any non-designated heritage assets within it. |
| Mitigation | Not applicable. Future reserved matters application(s) could afford an opportunity to potentially reduce the level of ‘less than substantial harm’ caused but, through its permanence, could not remove such harm. | Future reserved matters applications provide the opportunity to further refine the design of the development to respond to the setting and significance of the Conservation Area. |

**Signed on behalf of Cherwell District Council:**

………………………………………………..…………. Dated: ………………….

**Signed on behalf of the Appellant**

………………………………………..………..………. Dated: ……………….