

Summary of Internal Consultation Responses

Countryside Service

The unilateral undertaking agreed for previous application and appeal re countryside access measures on Flying Field and off-site measures should still stand. If these conditions in the unilateral undertaking, and the unilateral undertaking itself, remain binding then no further action needed - but if not then objections should be raised.

Archaeology

The area concerned lies within an area of some archaeological interest as highlighted by the archaeology and cultural heritage chapter of the EIA included with the application. This document highlights that the area of proposed development has been subject to considerable ground disturbance associated with its use as an airbase over a number of years. It is therefore considered unlikely that archaeological deposits would survive intact within the area.

The area does contain a number of buildings proposed for demolition which are related to the Cold War use of the site which are of importance in the understanding of this period and we would recommend that the advice of the District Councils conservation officer be sought to determine whether these buildings will require further recording prior to any demolition on the site.

The possibility of archaeological finds occurring during the course of construction in less developed areas should be borne in mind, in which case the applicant is asked to notify the County Archaeologist in order that he may make a site visit or otherwise advise as necessary.

Minerals Consultation Areas

No objection.

County Ecologist

The development should include biodiversity enhancements within the built environment and the development design as recommended in the Ecology chapter of the EIS. Examples include, creation of habitat for bats and birds in buildings, bird & bat boxes and green roofs.

Therefore any mitigation / enhancement measures need to be shown on the relevant architect's drawings and referred to in other reports (e.g. drainage). The developer also needs to be aware of the significance of the bat

maternity roost and the mitigation and enhancement which will be required; I would expect more detail on this.

I believe it is also expected that the developer will extend the Local Wildlife Site at the east end of the flying field (e.g. by scarification of the runways) but I couldn't find a mention of this in this application.

A planting scheme should also be submitted which includes species mix (species should be of local provenance and appropriate to the local area), plant sizes, planting layout & spacing and methods of establishment. The developer could use the Oxfordshire Wildlife & Landscape Study to choose suitable plant species.

The management of green space within the development needs to be secured for the duration of the development. The management plan and its implementation should be funded by the developer and be designed in accordance with any required biodiversity mitigation or enhancement measures. This should be made clear in the Heads of Terms for the S106 legal agreement.

Social and Community Services

Under the extant planning permission we secured contributions towards adult day care facilities and library facilities in Bicester. The same would be necessary for the proposed development.

Children young People and Families

Primary and a secondary school position remains as it was before. The primary school would need to be built initially at 1.5 form entry (270 pupils 5-11 years) but a site of a size suitable for a 2 form entry school should be made available in case of the need to increase the size if generation rates are higher on the Park. Secondary school children would attend school in Bicester. At present the cumulative developments affecting provision in this area show that there is a sustained need for a third secondary facility in the town. Contributions from this development would be pooled to provide the necessary places on this site in the SW Bicester development.

OCC Early Years provision for 3 year olds would be provided in the nursery class of the new school.

At present the Children's Centre operates out of leased space in a community building. Ultimately it would operate out of the new school using the community facility outlined in the OCC Primary School brief. It would need to be designed to facilitate this use but to be capable of use by other users when not used as a Children's centre.

It is anticipated that the following demand for Special school spaces would be generated by the following developments combined using our standard multipliers.

Site	Houses	School population	(Special)
Heyford Park	1,076	468	4.7
SW Bicester, Kingsmere	1,585	692	6.9
Eco Town	400	174	1.7
Gavray drive	500	218	2.1
Total			15.4

This requirement would generate one class for 8 pupils at a Special School and 8 places at a special resource base at the secondary school. It is most likely the additional class at a special school would be provided at Bardwell School, Bicester.

The youth service is currently subject to a reassessment of functions and the type of facilities the County will provide in future. There is unlikely to be a designated Youth Centre for Heyford Park but it would be served by one of the hub Youth centres, in this case The Courtyard, Bicester. Any contributions gained would be used to enhance facilities to serve the additional population.

A meeting is soon to take place with the consultant working for the Free School promoter on this site. The purpose of the meeting is for an update on their proposal which they believe is almost ready for submission to DfE. Our position remains as set out in the report to Capital Programme Board on 6th January 2011.

Transport DC

Do not object to the proposed application provided that the requirements in the extant legal agreements are carried through into the proposed legal agreements. Will however seek to negotiate with the applicants to simplify the agreements where opportunity arises.