



**SUPPORTING  
PLANNING STATEMENT**

**FORMER RAF UPPER HEYFORD  
HEYFORD  
OXFORDSHIRE**

Pegasus Planning Group  
Pegasus House  
Querns Business Centre  
Whitworth Road  
Cirencester  
Gloucestershire  
GL7 1RT

Telephone: (01285) 641717    Facsimile: (01285) 885115

PPG Ref:                      CIR D.0291

Date:                              October 2010

**COPYRIGHT**

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of **Pegasus Planning Group Ltd**

## **CONTENTS:**

Page No:

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS	2
3.	PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT	8
4.	ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	35
5.	CONCLUSIONS	39

## **APPENDICES:**

A	JANUARY 2010 'LEAD APPEAL' DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT
B	COMPARISON OF JANUARY 2010 'LEAD APPEAL' AND NEW PROPOSALS

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This supporting statement has been prepared by Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of the Dorchester Group in support of the outline planning application submitted to Cherwell District Council in respect of Former RAF Heyford Park, Bicester, Oxfordshire. This statement is not intended to repeat issues which are already comprehensively addressed in the Environmental Statement and the Design and Access Statement but rather is intended to summarise the key points arising.
- 1.2 The statement describes a small New Settlement on part of the Former RAF Upper Heyford and outlines the principal planning policy issues.
- 1.3 Section 2 of this report describes the nature of the proposals and gives the description of development having regard to the existence of a redevelopment scheme for the whole Base granted planning permission by the Secretary of State in January 2010 (APP C3105/A/08/2080594). This outline permission provides a form of baseline against which to consider this new application albeit this latest application does not extend across the whole of the previously consented site and is restricted to that part of the site known as the New Settlement Area (NSA). Where necessary this Statement will identify any major differences between the permitted scheme and the new proposals contained within this application.
- 1.4 Section 3 describes the planning policy context for the Former RAF Upper Heyford which underlies the preparation of these comprehensive development proposals.
- 1.5 Section 4 sets out a resumé of the additional supporting material and reports which accompany the planning application submission. This includes a full Environmental Statement and a Design and Access Statement which are required to ensure validation of the application.

## **2. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

- 2.1 Heyford Park is the name given to the former RAF/USAF airbase lying approximately 7km to the north west of Bicester on a limestone plateau just to the east of the River Cherwell and 3km to the south west of Junction 10 of the M40. The overall airbase site comprises of over 500 hectares. The Base, which originally dates from the First World War, has not been operational for over 15 years. The previous flying activities were enlarged considerably from its original pre WWII scale and it became a significant element in the defence of the realm during the Cold War of the 1950 and 1960s extending through to the 1980s.
- 2.2 Although the military use of the site ceased in 1994, the Base is entirely encompassed by a high security fence and access into the site is still achieved through security control gates from Camp Road. This East-West public thoroughfare splits the Base into two parts with the largest part lying to the North and being focussed on the Flying Field. To the South of Camp Road lies the main residential part of the Base.
- 2.3 In view of its historical importance in the Cold War Cherwell District Council specifically identified the whole Base as worthy of Conservation designation and this occurred in 2006. All the buildings within the Conservation Area are designed for military purposes and even the residential accommodation is not of a type which fits in comfortably with the character of adjoining villages. Notwithstanding this, the dwellings within the Base have a good demand from local tenants and the majority have been occupied since the MoD vacated the site in the early 1990s. Similarly, a significant number of the other military buildings have been occupied by commercial tenants operating until recently under temporary planning permissions. Consequently although Heyford Park still has the appearance of an Airbase it has operated for the last decade and a half as a self contained community comprising about 750 local residents and up to 1,000 employees.
- 2.4 The Base has been owned and operated since 1998 by the North Oxfordshire Consortium (NOC) which has been responsible for letting existing residential and non residential buildings whilst at the same time trying to devise a longer term solution in accordance with current planning policy (see below).
- 2.5 As will be noted below the current application represents a variation to an existing proposal for the redevelopment of the south eastern part of the Base known as the

New Settlement Area (NSA). A comprehensive outline application covering both the NSA and the more extensive Flying Field (FF) (together comprising the whole of the Base) was granted conditional planning permission by the Secretary of State in January 2010. This outline permission allowed for the permanent change of use of a significant number of buildings on the Flying Field subject to a number of robust conditions and obligations. It also permitted the redevelopment of the NSA for about 1,075 dwellings with a mix of new and retained dwellings, together with a mix of new build employment and some permanent changes of use of existing buildings to employment and community uses. A complete description of this January 2010 consent is appended at Appendix A. This current variation to the consented scheme primarily arises because the new proposal involves the retention of a much larger proportion of the existing dwellings on the site. As will be noted below this is permitted under the strategic policy at the Structure Plan level and within the more detailed Local Authority policies. The reasons for this revised approach are also set out in full below.

#### **APPENDIX A – JANUARY 2010 PLANNING PERMISSION DESCRIPTION**

- 2.6 The current scheme has been prepared to accord with the objectives of creating a long term planning solution for the site and comprises a mixed use new settlement of about 1,000 dwellings incorporating new dwellings and employment buildings within that part of the Base defined as the New Settlement Area, together with the change of use of some retained buildings and structures.
- 2.7 The scheme comprises a single hybrid planning application for all these activities incorporating both an outline application in respect of the erection of new buildings, and also the change of use of specified buildings across the application site. As the whole of the scheme forms part of a Conservation Area the use of an outline planning application is slightly unusual especially as central Government guidance recommends the use of full planning applications. However, in this case both the Planning Authority and the Secretary of State have previously accepted that a hybrid outline application is acceptable; along with planning conditions and Section 106 obligation the Planning Authority will have sufficient powers to control the appearance of the proposed new buildings. The proposed development within the New Settlement Area now includes the following uses:-
- 1) Class C3 (residential dwellinghouses): up to 1,075 dwellings (including the retention and change of use of the majority of existing military housing and the change of use of various buildings), comprising:

- a) *46 existing dwellings already benefitting from a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development for Class C3;*
  - b) *change of use of 253 dwellings to Class C3 (already subject to planning application 10/00640/F);*
  - c) *change of use of 12 dwellings along Dacey Drive to Class C3;*
  - d) *change of use of 2 dwellings along Dow Street to Class C3;*
  - e) *erection of 764 new dwellings;*
  - f) *demolition of 2 existing dwellings, no.'s 5 and 7 Portal Drive South; and*
  - g) *change of use of Building 485 to Class C3*
- 2) Class D1 (non residential institutions): change of use of various buildings to provide up to 5,820 sq.m of floorspace, comprising change of use of:-
- (a) Building 549 580 sq.m
  - (b) Building 572 680 sq.m
  - (c) Building 126 869 sq.m
  - (d) Building 129 241 sq.m
  - (e) Building 315 3,100 sq.m
- And erection of up to 350sq.m of new build Class D1 floorspace for a crèche
- 3) a Change of Use of Building 74 (4,020 sq.m) to a Class C1/C2 use
- 3) b Change of Use of Building 41 (1,662 sq.m) to a Class C1 use
- 4) Class A1 provision of up to 1,400 sq.m of floorspace, comprising of new build.
- 5) Class A3-A5 provision of up to 1,713 sq.m of floorspace in total, comprising :-
- (a) Building 455 1,177 sq.m
  - (b) Building 457 224 sq.m
  - (c) Building 103 312 sq.m)
- 6) Provision of 1 no. Primary School on 2.2 hectares.
- 7) Class B1 provision of up to 5,821 sq.m of floorspace in total, comprising:-
- (a) change of use of Building 100 557 sq.m
  - (b) change of use of Building 125 897 sq.m
  - (c) change of use of Building 123 1,847 sq.m
  - (d) change of use of Building 488 up to 1,500 sq.m
  - (c) erection of new build up to 1,020 sq.m

- 8) Mixed Class B2/B8 provision of up to 20,833 sq.m of floorspace in total, comprising change of use of :-
- |     |              |            |
|-----|--------------|------------|
| (a) | Building 80  | 2,198 sq.m |
| (b) | Building 151 | 3,100 sq.m |
| (c) | Building 172 | 5,135 sq.m |
| (d) | Building 320 | 3,600 sq.m |
| (e) | Building 345 | 3,600 sq.m |
| (f) | Building 350 | 3,200 sq.m |
- 9) Class B8 provision of up to 50 sq.m. involving change of Use of Building 158.
- 10) Change of Use of Structure 89a (10 sq.m) to a petrol pump station (sui generis use).
- 11) Provision of playing pitches and courts, sports pavilion plus incidental open space including NEAPS and LEAPS.
- 12) Provision of all infrastructure to serve the above development including the provision of the requisite access roads and car parking to District Council standards.
- 13) Removal of boundary fence to the south of Camp Road and partial removal of the fence to the north of Camp Road.
- 14) Removal of buildings and structures within New Settlement Area as detailed in separate schedule;
- 15) Landscaping alterations including the removal of identified trees within the Conservation Area (see separate schedule) and planting of new trees and off-site hedgerows and access track.

2.8 **Although not part of this application or the application site**, in terms of assessing cumulative impacts for the Environmental Assessment, the adjacent **Flying Field Area** has the following permitted uses and development as part of the grant of planning permission on appeal in January 2010 see references in Paras 1.3 and 2.5:

- 1) Change of Use for vehicle preparation and car processing comprising 17 hectares<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Clarification of what is meant by 'car staging', now referred to as 'car processing', may assist. This use consists of a mixture of office accommodation, technical workshops, ancillary facilities and areas of hardstanding in which cars are parked awaiting preparation and delivery. The car processing element itself comprises the inspection, valeting, washing, repairing, tyre replacement, processing and delivery of cars and other car processing activities as may be required from time to time.

- 2) Change of Use of Buildings 205 (111 sq.m), 234 (1195 sq.m), 1109 (200 sq.m), 3205 (142 sq.m), 3208 (142 sq.m), 3209 (142 sq.m), 3210 (142 sq.m) to Class B1 (Business) use.
- 3) Change of Use of Building 350A (20 sq.m) to mixed Class B1 (Business)/B8 (Storage) use.
- 4) Change of Use of Buildings 259 (372 sq.m), 260 (372 sq.m), 336 (800 sq.m), 337 (1388 sq.m), 354 (336 sq.m) and 1011 (239 sq.m) to Class B2 use.
- 5) Change of Use of Buildings 209 (1202 sq.m), 324 (397 sq.m), 3140 (408 sq.m) to mixed Class B1/Class B2 use
- 6) Change of Use of Buildings 221 (2391 sq.m), 325 (692 sq.m), 327 (702 sq.m), 328 (725 sq.m), 335 (769 sq.m), 366 (1656 sq.m) to mixed Class B2/Class B8 use.
- 7) Change of Use of Building 249 (3259 sq.m) to Class D1/Class B2/Class B8 use.
- 8) Change of Use of Buildings 210 (177 sq.m), 211 (378 sq.m), 212 (271 sq.m), 226 (169 sq.m), 237 (373 sq.m), 238 (119 sq.m), 239 (178 sq.m), 279 (169 sq.m), 292 (2070 sq.m), 1001-1005 (193 sq.m each), 1006 (524 sq.m), 1007 (162 sq.m), 1008 (318 sq.m), 1009 (24 sq.m), 1023 (372 sq.m), 1026-1038 (97 sq.m each), 1041-1048 (75 sq.m each), 1050 (144 sq.m), 1100 (34 sq.m), 1102 (138 sq.m), 1103 (177 sq.m), 1104 (89 sq.m), 1105-1106 (138 sq.m each), 1108 (348 sq.m), 1111 (367 sq.m), 1112 (60 sq.m), 1113 (177 sq.m), 1114 (37 sq.m), 1115 (149 sq.m), 1159 (156 sq.m), 1160-1167 (201 sq.m each), 1168-1185 (156 sq.m each), 1372 (600 sq.m), 1601-1625 (139 sq.m each), 2001-2009 (595 sq.m each), 3001-3035 (930 sq.m each), 3043-3051 (930 sq.m each), 3056 (912 sq.m), 3200-3202 (169 sq.m each), 3203 (60 sq.m) to Class B8 use.
- 9) Change of use of Building 299 (2676 sq.m) to a *sui generis* use as computer data storage.
- 10) Demolition of Building 3135 in the north-western corner of Airfield (also subject to Conservation Area Consent application).
- 11) Removal of identified parts of the boundary fence and partial replacement with 1.5 metre fencing in locations as identified on the Landscape Master Plan (also subject to Conservation Area Consent applications).
- 12) Provision of all infrastructure to serve the above development, including the provision of the defined access arrangements and car parking to Cherwell District Council standards.
- 13) Landscaping alterations including the removal of some trees within the Conservation Area (see separate schedule).
- 14) Reopening of Portway and Aves Ditch as public rights of way across the western part of the Airfield and the re-opening of a footpath around the eastern end of the Flying Field to link the northern and southern ends of Aves Ditch.



2.9 Although the current application only relates to revised proposals for the New Settlement Area the importance of achieving a comprehensive solution for the whole of the Base has been fully taken into account and the proposals for the Flying Field will be shown to be fully integrated with the new NSA scheme.

### 3. PLANNING POLICY ASSESSMENT

#### a) THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS

- 3.1 The relevant planning policies are considered in detail within the accompanying Environmental Statement (Chapter 5). It is not the intention to repeat that detailed analysis in this particular Statement. Instead, this section is intended to provide an overview and draw out some key themes and aspects of planning policy which are relevant to the proposed development.
- 3.2 Following the Secretary of State's announcement on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010 revoking Regional Spatial Strategies, the Development Plan for Heyford Park is now formed by the "saved" policies in the **Oxfordshire County Structure Plan (2016)** (approved December 2005), and the adopted **Cherwell Local Plan (1996)**. Under the terms of the current Local Development Framework the District Council has also prepared a Supplementary Planning Document in the form of a **Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief (RCPB)** which was adopted in March 2007 and which provides site specific policies and guidance.
- 3.3 It should be noted that the statutory Local Plan applying to the site dates back to 1996 but, because it predates the identification of this site in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan to 2011 (adopted in 1999), it contains no policies relevant to this application. Additionally there is the **Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan (NSLP) (2011)** which is a material consideration, but was abandoned by the Council before it reached statutory adoption. It is understood to have been adopted by the District Council for development control purposes but carries little statutory weight. It does contain some policies referring to the Heyford Park base but has largely been superseded by the RCPB (referred to in the preceding paragraph).
- 3.4 This section of the Statement considers first the "saved" Policies within the Oxfordshire Structure Plan, 2016 before then considering other specific policies contained within the Development Plan documents.
- 3.5 The planning application to which this Statement refers is based on a strategic growth policy for about 1,000 dwellings in accordance with **Policy H2** of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016. This Policy originates from an earlier version of the Structure Plan (covering the period to 2011) which identified the Base as a suitable location for development following the cessation of its military use in 1994.

3.6 Policy H2 'Heyford Park' of the Oxfordshire County Structure Plan 2016 provides the overarching policy for the site and anticipates the provision of a New Settlement on the site. The site specific nature of this policy is rather unusual but reflects its strategic importance. It states:-

**Heyford Park**

- H2 a) Land at RAF Heyford Park will provide for a new settlement of about 1,000 dwellings and necessary supporting infrastructure, including a primary school and appropriate community, recreational and employment opportunities, as a means of enabling environmental improvements and the heritage interest of the site as a military base with Cold War associations to be conserved, compatible with achieving a satisfactory living environment.**
- b) Proposals for development must reflect a revised comprehensive planning brief adopted by the district council and demonstrate that the conservation of heritage resources, landscape, restoration, enhancement of biodiversity and other environmental improvements will be achieved across the whole of the former Air Base in association with the provision of the new settlement.**
- c) The new settlement should be designed to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport rather than travel by private car. Improvements to bus and rail facilities and measures to minimise the impact of traffic generated by the development on the surrounding road network will be required.**

3.7 The supporting text is also important because, even though it does not form part of the development plan (and therefore does not carry the full statutory weight set out in Section 38(6) of the Act), it does indicate the approach which the County Council were expecting to take to development in this location particularly as regards to the scale of new housing development. The text states:-

- 7.7 Land declared surplus by the Ministry of Defence at the former Air Base at Heyford Park represents an opportunity to achieve an appropriate balance between environmental improvements to a rural part of Oxfordshire, conservation of the heritage interest from the Cold War, and re-use of some existing buildings and previously developed land located in the former technical and residential core area of the base. However, the scale of development must be appropriate to the location and surroundings. The**

County Council is opposed to the development of a large new settlement due to the site's relatively isolated and unsustainable rural location, the threat of urbanisation in a rural area, the location of the site in relation to Bicester with which it would compete for investment in services and facilities, and conflict with the objectives of Government planning policy in PPG13 to provide accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling and to reduce the need to travel by car<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, the Plan provides for modest development of about 1,000 houses. There are about 300 existing houses on the site of which some or all could be retained or demolished, but the total limit of about 1,000 dwellings will be the determining factor. This proposal has been recognised by the First Secretary of State as 'an exception to normal sustainability objectives as a means of facilitating the remediation of the former Air Base to enable the site to present a more environmentally acceptable face than it does now'<sup>3</sup>.

- 7.8** Proposals for development must be in accordance with a revised comprehensive planning brief for the site adopted by Cherwell District Council. Care should be taken to ensure that the heritage interest of the site as an Air Base with Cold War associations, landscape restoration and biodiversity are all taken into account in deciding appropriate measures. In revising the comprehensive planning brief, the District Council should continue to consult English Heritage and the developer on how heritage conservation issues should be addressed, including treatment of buildings from the Cold War era that English Heritage have recommended for protection. A conservation plan for the whole area of the Air Base is being prepared by the District Council in partnership with English Heritage, to enable appropriate decisions to be reached in revising the comprehensive planning brief.
- 7.9** In drawing up development proposals attention should be paid to ensure a satisfactory living environment is provided for future residents. Proposals should be designed to a high quality in accordance with policy H3 and will need to provide for appropriate on- and off-site infrastructure to meet the needs of the development in accordance with policy G3, including primary and secondary education, library facilities,

---

<sup>2</sup> In June 2003 the Secretary of State refused permission for proposals for development of a settlement on the site because he considered that the scheme did not comply with the development plan.

<sup>3</sup> Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 23 June 2003, reference APP/C3105/A/02/1080800.

**and public transport and other highway and transport improvements. Proposals should not provide for any further significant growth beyond that envisaged in policy H2.**

- 3.8 The proposed development at Heyford Park included within this application complies with the three policy criteria listed as part of Policy H2 especially when account is also taken of the conclusions of the Secretary of State in granting comprehensive permission on appeal in January 2010.
- 3.9 The **first criterion** in the Structure Plan policy is that the development should include proposals for 'about 1,000 dwellings'. The new planning application includes provision for 1,075 dwellings, which is within a 10% range of what is typically regarded as being reasonable in allowing for an element of flexibility in interpreting housing policies. This total arose as a result of discussions between the consultant team acting for North Oxfordshire Consortium and the Local Planning Authority when preparing the previous scheme which proceeded to appeal. The new application incorporates an identical number of dwellings albeit there is a proposal to retain more of the existing dwellings than in the previously approved scheme.
- 3.10 In this context the Structure Plan supporting text notes that there are about 300 dwellings already existing within the Base and that these could either be demolished or retained, in whole or in part; This point (which leaves the balance of demolition/retention of existing dwellings to the promoter) is repeated in Section 4.7.1 of the RCPB. As will be noted from the Master Plan, the proposal differs from the previously consented scheme in seeking the retention of most of the existing residential development to the north and south of Camp Road, save for the removal of a pair of dwellings to form a new access. The previously consented scheme for the NSA proposed the retention of all of the two storey Officer housing to the north of Camp Road and most of the single storey bungalows immediately to the north. The new proposals are similar to the previous Master Plan in this respect but avoid the demolition of two semi-detached bungalows by relocating an access. The main change arises to the south of Camp Road where the previous scheme proposed the demolition of the majority of the bungalows leaving only a small enclave of two storey terrace housing around Carswell Circle and its immediate environs. The new scheme not only retains Carswell Circle but also all the other individual houses to the south of Camp Road apart from a pair of semi detached bungalows. Whilst the new scheme proposes demolition of all the barrack style accommodation further to the east and is therefore similar with the previously approved Master Plan, the retention

of the bungalow area to the west of Carswell Circle reduces the overall number of new dwellings that need to be provided to comply with the Structure Plan policy, and at the same time, reduces the area available to achieve this.

3.11 The reason for this different approach is that, whereas the previous owners of NOC were private housebuilders who saw difficulties associated with satisfactorily upgrading the roads and services to adoptable standards, the new owners of NOC are able to adopt a different approach to these potential problems thereby allowing for the retention of the adjoining dwellings. Although most of these dwellings have little architectural merit, they are nonetheless a historic part of the Cold War Airbase and their location within the Conservation Area assumes that they contribute towards its historic importance; to that extent there is a presumption in favour of their retention. More importantly however, if the bungalows can be retained on the existing road pattern this brings with it substantial sustainability benefits especially bearing in mind that the existing dwellings are already let to tenants and provide adequate accommodation for over 300 families. The quality of the internal fittings can be improved for relatively modest sums thereby extending the overall life of these dwellings very considerably. Taking into account these two factors, together with the embodied carbon contained within their construction, the retention of the bungalows would appear to represent a more sustainable form of development as compared with demolition of these properties. Given that both Structure Plan and RCPB provide the developer with this flexibility then NOC believe it to be the most sustainable way forward and one which accords with the views of the vast majority of existing local residents. In this latter context local residents have been consulted about the proposal and practically all are fully supportive of a scheme which retains the bungalows since this gives them the opportunity of purchasing their own home in which they are currently living.

3.12 So far as complying with the remainder of the first criterion, the revised Master Plan provides all the “necessary supporting infrastructure” including a site for a new two-form entry primary school site (in approximately the same location as the previous plan); and appropriate community, recreation and employment opportunities. As with the previously approved scheme the community facilities include the retention of the existing village hall (upgraded), the retention of the existing church and the introduction of additional retail facilities in a new village centre. However unlike the previously approved scheme the recreational activities involve a new hierarchy of open areas throughout the development which are connected by green corridors.

The focus for recreational activity (and for the New Settlement as a whole) is a proposed new Village Green immediately to the south of the Local Centre and to the east of the primary school which will be readily visible from a realigned Camp Road. Employment opportunities are mainly provided on the Flying Field but are also concentrated around the “A” frame hangars which form an arc on the north-western edge of the New Settlement Area. The amount of new build employment floorspace has been reduced considerably when compared with the approved Master Plan but overall the quantum of employment across the whole Base will still meet the likely numbers of economically active generated by the New Settlement.

- 3.13 The final element of the first criterion of Policy H2 from the County Structure Plan relates to environmental improvements and the conservation of heritage interest in conjunction with its Cold War associations. The environmental improvements brought about by the proposed new Master Plan are similar to the previously approved Plan insofar as unsightly features such as the security fence around the residential areas, will be removed so as to be more compatible with a residential environment. Other buildings which have no obvious re-use value and which add little to the Conservation character of the site, are to be removed and replaced with new housing. However, most environmental improvements are on the Flying Field and will continue to be pursued under the terms of the existing planning permission. So far as conserving the military heritage of the site, the new proposals retain more of the housing together with all (except one) of those other non residential buildings which English Heritage required to be retained as part of the previous scheme. The current proposals allow for the retention of an additional two buildings with historic merit, over and above that previously approved by the Secretary of State.
- 3.14 The overall mix of uses achieved within the New Settlement Area and the blend between the existing and the new dwellings balances all the objectives set out in criterion one as well as achieving a highly satisfactory living environment.
- 3.15 The **second criterion** from Structure Plan Policy H2 indicates the proposals must reflect a Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief (RCPB) adopted by the Council. An RCPB was produced by the Council and adopted in March 2007 covering the whole of the Flying Field and the New Settlement Area. During the course of the Inquiry into the last (consented) appeal proposals the status and content of the RCPB was discussed at some length. However, differences between the District Council and NOC were almost entirely restricted to proposals on the Flying Field. For example,



the RCPB wished to remove some of the Hardened Aircraft Shelters to the north of the main runway; required the removal of most of the perimeter security fence; restricted the use of buildings to the north of the Flying Field; and sought the removal of sections of taxiway/runway to achieve ecological benefits. These issues were determined by the Secretary of State when issuing his appeal decision and in any event do not impact at all upon the New Settlement Area and the current proposals.

- 3.16 The only aspect where the RCPB has relevance to the current application is in relation to the identification and retention of buildings which add to the character of the Conservation Area. The RCPB (Figure 4) identifies two categories of building which make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The first category relates to buildings that are “required” for retention; all of these buildings are retained within the proposed new Master Plan. The second category relates to the identification of buildings which make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area where retention should “possibly” be sought. These two lists of buildings do not necessarily conform exactly to a similar list put forward by English Heritage. Nonetheless it is worth noting that, whereas the previously consented scheme lost three of these buildings from the latter category i.e. where retention should “possibly” be sought, only two are proposed for demolition in the new scheme. Consequently there is a net gain in the number of retained buildings which make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, including the partial retention of the Lamplighters Building and an ‘I Block’ building to the south of Camp Road.
- 3.17 The **third criterion** of Policy H2 promotes sustainable modes of transport. Such arrangements are fully incorporated in the development proposals particularly walking and cycling but also improvements to public transport links to Bicester and other locations. The details are fully set out in the accompanying Transport Assessment.

#### **Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief (March 2007)**

- 3.18 In accordance with Policy H2 (b) of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan the District Council has prepared a Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief (RCPB) which was adopted by the Council on the 5<sup>th</sup> March 2007 as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). At the time, NOC were critical of certain aspects of the RCPB, particularly where it did not appear to accord with PPG15 (at that time). However, as noted above, most of these differences arose as a result of proposals for the Flying Field and are not relevant to this amended application.



3.19 When considering the previous Inquiry the Inspector came to certain conclusions as regards the weight to be attached to this SPD (see Paragraphs 19.135 – 19.142). However, very few of NOC's criticisms of the RCPB specifically applied to policies and proposals for the New Settlement Area. These NSA policies are set out in Section 4 of the SPD entitled "Principles for a New Settlement". For the most part the revised scheme for the New Settlement Area involving the retention of more of the existing dwellings and the redesign of the areas of new build, conform very closely with the policies and supporting text contained within Section 4. This includes:-

- The extent of the settlement location.
- The extent of the Settlement Area.
- The securing of environmental benefits.
- Conserving the heritage interest of the site including protected buildings, unlisted buildings that contribute to the character of the Conservation Area, key spaces, tree planting, creation of distinctive character areas which preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
- Achieving a satisfactory living environment.
- Creating a sustainable Cherwell community.
- The component land uses comprising the New Settlement including, about a 1,000 dwellings, community facilities, recreational facilities, employment opportunities (incorporating car storage).
- Securing transport objectives by encouraging walking, cycling and the use of public transport, improvements to bus and rail facilities, and minimizing the impact of traffic on the surrounding network.
- The creation of an appropriate Master Plan identifying a proper spatial analysis, an integrated approach to design of the public realm, a network of routes, and a network of spaces.
- The creation of an acceptable built form including the scale and massing of buildings, materials, roofs, employment buildings achieving satisfactory architectural quality, treatment of residential boundaries and refuse bins and meter boxes.
- Achieving sustainability and the satisfactory design of the Settlement.
- Achieving acceptable car parking standards that meet the County Council requirements.
- Preparation of a Management Plan for retailed elements within the New Settlement Area.

- 3.20 The current revised application achieves all of these objectives in a satisfactory manner and NOC believe represents an improvement on the scheme which has currently been consented. The main difference between the two schemes is that the current application seeks to retain as many of the existing dwellings as possible with the result that this has generated a slightly different form of new development in the remaining areas. In addition the new Master Plan shows a different approach to open space provision; the previous scheme showed this primarily in the outer parts of the New Settlement, using existing open areas or pitches. The current scheme proposes the relocation of a larger area of centralised open space in the form of a Village Green on the former Parade Ground area, thereby forming a focus for the entire New Settlement.
- 3.21 The RCPB position on the retention or demolition of buildings is set out in Section 4.7.1.1. After indicating that a New Settlement of about 1,000 dwellings could either retain or demolish the existing buildings, it goes on to identify two areas of existing dwellings that are worthy of retention because of their contribution to the Conservation Area. Other dwellings are said to be of lesser architectural/historic importance and therefore there is no requirement to retain them. However, the RCPB goes on to note that:-
- “..... the public consultation strongly indicated that some of the current occupiers consider that the properties meet their needs and would like to remain in them.”**
- 3.22 It goes on to note that retention will not necessarily guarantee continued occupation by existing residents but that this matter should be settled between the landlord and tenant.
- 3.23 The reasons for retaining almost all of the residential properties have been set out in an earlier paragraph<sup>4</sup> and the latest NOC arrangements regarding the Management of these residential areas provides a better opportunity for retaining these structures which are still sound and provide good homes. Consequently the aim is to refurbish many of these properties and then to sell them either to existing tenants or to new residents. Existing tenants who qualify for affordable housing will either be located in the bungalows or within new build affordable housing accommodation elsewhere on the site. Preference will be given to local residents under the Council’s Local Lettings Policy.

---

<sup>4</sup> See paragraph 3.11 of this Statement

3.24 The retention of two significant areas of existing residential properties both north and south of Camp Road has necessitated a review of the housing designs, particularly south of Camp Road. The arrangements which have been put in place meet all the objectives set out in the RCPB and more importantly, allow the new development to be integrated with the retained development in an attractive manner which allows for the successful creation of a new community. Whilst it is neither feasible nor desirable to replicate the character of the existing military housing, there is an opportunity to create new character areas which will complement the existing street scenes and add to the overall character of the community as a whole. This approach is set out in more detail in the Design & Access Statement.

### **Development Plan Policy Resume**

3.25 The table below sets out a summary of the principal planning policies as set out in the Development Plan which apply to a consideration of these comprehensive development proposals:

#### Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016

<u>Planning Policy</u>	<u>Policy Context</u>	<u>Heyford Park Proposals</u>	<u>Compliance</u>
G2	Improvement of the quality and design of development	Proposals for Heyford Park will remove unsightly derelict buildings, and restore areas of the site for the benefit of residents, workers and tourism and create and enhance wildlife habitat.	Yes
G3	Providing infrastructure and service	Development proposals will provide for appropriate and necessary infrastructure, both on- and off-site. These include measures addressing, recreation, leisure, educational, health and community facilities, utilities and environmental improvements. These are addressed in more detail within the Environmental Statement and other documents supporting this application.	Yes
G6	Energy and resource conservation	Proposals incorporate best practice in energy efficiency and resource conservation commensurate with National, Regional and District guidance	Yes

		and policy	
T1	Improvement of travel choice and reduction of dependence on motorised travel	Proposals for Heyford Park will introduce and enhance public transport options for the locality and the wider district with the aim of reducing the need to rely on private motorised transport; this is further discussed within the Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement.	Yes
T2	Car parking	Heyford Park proposals have adopted a comprehensive approach to the provision and management of car parking spaces, with the aim of promoting sustainable travel choices, including the application of maximum parking standards.	Yes
T3	Public transport	Development proposals seek to increased use of public transport through the provision, encouragement and promotion of convenient, reliable, secure and high standard public transport services.	Yes
T4	Freight	The Heyford Park development will incorporate routeing agreements to minimise impacts of HGV traffic.	Yes
T5	Networks for pedestrians and cyclists	Networks of routes for pedestrians and cyclists will be promoted and developed	Yes
T6	Networks for motorised travel	Development proposals will promote and support a comprehensive strategy for the safe and convenient carriage of people and freight from and to Heyford Park	Yes
T8	Development to provide adequate access and to mitigate adverse transport impacts	Development proposals will seek the improvement of the surrounding highway network commensurate with the creation of an enlarged new community, (See Transport Assessment).	Yes
EN1	Development to contribute to the protection, maintenance and enhancement of Oxfordshire's landscape character	Proposals for Heyford Park will remove unsightly derelict buildings, and restore areas of the site for the benefit of residents, workers and tourism.	Yes
EN2	Promotion of biodiversity and protection of the sites of nature conservation importance	The significant ecological interests associated with Heyford Park will be protected, with significant enhancement to take	Yes

		place, see Environmental Statement for further elaboration.	
EN8	Development not leading to a deterioration in water quality	Proposals for Heyford Park will, through effective management, lead to the watercourses and water quality to be protected.	Yes
EN9	New development not leading to an increase in run-off which would exacerbate flood risk elsewhere	Proposals at Heyford Park will manage and mitigate for any potential flood risk through the use of appropriate attenuation, see Environmental Statement for further elaboration.	Yes
EN10	Water resources and waste water infrastructure	Development will provide adequate water resources and waste water infrastructure for the development, commensurate with utilities provision and requirements.	Yes
E1	New employment development provided in accordance with priorities of the plan	Employment uses not a priority of the plan, but will achieve economic growth.	Partially
E4	Small firms and local employment diversity	Development at Heyford Park will provide and encourage small scale business through the provision of a variety of scales of business premises.	Yes
E5	Tourism and culture	Tourism projects at Heyford Park will be based on the conservation, education and enjoyment of the site's historical significance and the presence of protected wildlife species and habitat.	Yes
H1	The amount and distribution of housing	Heyford Park will assist in meeting Oxfordshire County Structure Plan dwelling requirements to 2016.	Yes
H2	Heyford Park Site specific policy establishing the allocation of the site	In line with Structure Plan policy proposals provide for a new settlement, reflecting the Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief and policy and guidance relating to sustainable development.	Yes
H3	Design, quality and density of housing development	Housing development proposed at Heyford Park will be commensurate with National, Structure Plan and Local policy and guidance.	Yes
H4	Affordable housing	Heyford Park will provide for affordable housing at a level demonstrated by housing need within the District and Central Oxfordshire.	Yes

R1	Countryside recreation	Proposals provide opportunities to create new outdoor facilities which are appropriate in scale and are sensitive to the rural location.	Yes
R2	Access to the countryside and rights of way network	The existing network of public rights of way, including routes to neighbouring villages will be maintained and improved.	Yes
EG1	Proposals for renewable energy development	Development at Heyford Park will help meet Oxfordshire's contribution, acting to support development of a more dispersed and locally based pattern of energy generation and use.	Yes

**Cherwell Local Plan (1996)**

<u>Planning Policy</u>	<u>Policy Context</u>	<u>Heyford Park Proposals</u>	<u>Compliance</u>
H2	Housing Delivery	Proposals at Heyford Park accord with the housing trajectories for Cherwell District, assisting meeting of targets established within Structure Plan (and former Regional) guidance.	Yes
H4	Delivery of housing for the elderly and those with special needs.	Upper Herford will provide housing schemes for the elderly and people with disabilities, in locations within convenient reach of shops, community facilities and public transport.	Yes
H5	Affordable Housing	Heyford Park will provide for affordable housing at a level commensurate with Cherwell District and identified local housing need.	Yes
EMP4	Employment generating development in rural areas- development of an existing employment site is acceptable, subject to safeguarding amenity/landscape	Development is proposed to provide business units in accordance with use class B1, B2 and B8 as part of the creation of a mixed use new community in line with the Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief.	Yes
TR1	New highways, highway improvement works, traffic-management measures, additional public transport	Heyford Park will provide new highways, highway improvement, traffic-management measures, additional public transport	Yes

	facilities or other transport measures proceed will be provided as appropriate.	facilities or other transport measures detailed within the Transport Assessment.	
TR2	The minimization of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, cyclists and people with sensory and mobility impairments by securing segregated provision, controlled crossings or other measures as appropriate.	Proposals will minimize conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, cyclists and people with sensory and mobility impairments.	Yes
TR3	Provision of a Traffic Impact Assessment for development proposals.	This document is provided as part of the Transport Assessment undertaken as part of the planning application.	Yes
TR4	Public Transport	Increased use of public transport will be sought through the encouragement and promotion of convenient, reliable, secure and high standard public transport services.	Yes
TR5	Parking and Servicing provision	Development proposals will provide necessary highway safety requirements relating to access, turning, servicing and parking provision, including appropriate measures to reduce visual impact.	Yes
TR7	Minor Roads	Development proposals will minimise and mitigate the impact of the development on the surrounding minor road network.	Yes
TR9	Road hierarchy in residential areas	Development proposals will devise a hierarchical road network for Heyford Park, creating safe and liveable communities.	Yes
TR10	Heavy good vehicles - development that would generate frequent HGV movements through residential areas or unsuitable urban or residential roads and where traffic problems would adversely affect the amenity of residential areas or villages will not be permitted - minimisation of HGV movement by using rail	Lorry and freight traffic routing agreements to be agreed to avoid residential areas.	Yes
R4	The safeguarding of existing public-rights-of-way Network.	Proposals for Heyford Park will assist in enhancing and improving the network of rights of way in the	Yes



		locality	
R10	The extension of sporting and recreation facilities	Development proposals will provide recreation and leisure facilities commensurate to the size of the working and resident population in line with District standards	Yes
R11	Loss of sporting and other recreational facilities	Development at Heyford Park will maintain and enhance the level of sporting and recreational facilities for the benefit of the existing and new community.	Yes
R12	Minimum provision of public open space	Proposals at Heyford Park will meet Cherwell District Council's requirement for 2.43 Hectares (6 acres) of public open space per 1,000 population. This is detailed in the accompanying Design and Access Statement.	Yes
R15	Provision of village halls, sports fields, allotments and other local facilities.	Development proposals at Heyford Park will enhance and give additional provision of community facilities commensurate with Policy R15 and other applicable policies of the Local Plan and the Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief.	Yes
T1	Provision of new or improved facilities for tourists and enhancement of the area for tourism.	Heyford Park proposals will provide a heritage facility in recognition of the historical aspects of the site.	
C2	Species and habitat Protection	Existing grass and woodland habitats and associated species given due protection within development proposals in accordance with International, National and District policy and guidance	Yes
C7	Development will not normally be permitted if it causes demonstrable harm to the topography and character of the landscape	Proposals for Heyford Park will remove unsightly derelict buildings and restoration areas of the site for the benefit of residents, workers tourism and the creation and enhancement of wildlife habitat.	Yes
C28	Appropriate standards of layout, design and external appearance.	Development proposals comprehensively take account of the historical character of the site and advice on layout, design and external appearance, as explained in the Design and Access Statement.	Yes
C31	Compatible development in	The proposed mix of uses	Yes



	association to proposed residential areas.	replaces existing and provided proposed areas of residential amenity.	
C32	Development which fully considers the needs and requirements of disabled people.	Through comprehensive design all new and existing areas will be made accessible to disabled people, in accordance with National and District Council guidance and policies.	Yes
ENV1	Development likely to cause materially detrimental levels of noise, vibration, smell, smoke, fumes etc will not normally be permitted	Proposed uses have been assessed and mitigation measures provided as necessary where required to address any environmentally detrimental impacts.	Yes
ENV7	Protection of water quality of surface or underground water bodies	Water quality to be protected through mitigation and management of the hydrological environment	Yes
ENV9	Treatment and handling of surface water run-off and development impacting on watercourses and habitats	Through the evidence supplied within the Environmental Statement, development proposals at Heyford Park will mitigate for the effects of surface water run off on watercourses and associated habitats created by the development through the enhancement and provision of additional capacity as required for the development of a new community in addition management schemes will be put in place to provide effective stewardship of the hydrological environment.	Yes
ENV10	Proposals likely to damage or be at risk from hazardous installations.	Development proposals have addressed the presence of hazardous former pipelines and installations on the former airbase. See accompanying Environmental Statement for details.	Yes
ENV11	The placement and location of installations handling hazardous substances will not be permitted in close proximity to housing and other land uses	Proposals will place remnant Petrol, Oil and Lubricant facilities within Heyford Park out of use for the safety of residents, workers and the environment.	Yes
ENV12	Land contamination and measures to address possible threats to the environment and human health.	In accordance with National and District guidance and policy, a comprehensive assessment of the pollution threat created by	Yes

		Heyford Park's former use has been assessed, with effective measures outlined in the Environmental Statement for the mitigation of this threat.	
--	--	---	--

**Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011**

<u>Planning Policy</u>	<u>Policy Context</u>	<u>Heyford Park Proposals</u>	<u>Compliance</u>
UH1-UH4	Site specific policies for Heyford Park	Development proposals propose a new community 1,075 dwellings, community facilities and employment commensurate with Policy H2 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan and Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief.	Oxfordshire Structure Plan
H1a – 7	Housing	Accords with the housing trajectories for Cherwell District. Heyford Park will provide attractive new community.	Yes
TR1-6, TR8–11, TR16, TR19, TR36	Transportation network	Development proposals will provide necessary highway safety requirements relating to site design and access, facilitating a transport environment which encourages public transport	Yes
R2, R4, R6, R8 - 10a, R11- 12, T1	Sport, recreation, community and tourism opportunities	Development proposals will seek the creation of a heritage interpretation facility for Heyford Park. Improved access to the surrounding countryside will promote healthy activity amongst the residents and workers at Heyford Park.	Yes
EN1-3, EN5-7, EN11-12, EN15-28, EN30, EN34-49, EN51	Conservation and enhancement of the environment including the Rousham Historic Park and Conservation Area	Development proposals demonstrate the importance of nature conservation both of the site and neighbouring assets within the locality.	Yes
D1-D10, D12	Spatial and Building Design	Housing development proposed at Heyford Park will be commensurate with National, Structure Plan and Local policy and guidance. See Design and Access statement for more details.	Yes

OA1-2, OA5	Provision of services and facilities	Development Proposals at Heyford Park will provide suitable facilities and services for the provision of a mixed use community of 1,075 dwellings and associated employment.	Yes
---------------	--------------------------------------	--	-----

### **West Oxfordshire Local Plan**

- 3.26 Rousham Historic Park lies within West Oxfordshire District Council and as such the policies of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan represent a material consideration. The character, setting, amenities, historical context and views into or from the Grade 1 listed park are protect by Policy CO11 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2001, and also policy BE11 of the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 although it is difficult to see how the policy itself can apply across the administrative boundary. Moreover, as the Conservation Area now imposes statutory requirements on both the Local Planning Authority and the owners of the site (NOC), it is important to balance these with the objectives for protecting the setting of Rousham Hall. The removal of some of these structures identified by the previous Inspector will improve the impact of the Base on the outlook from Rousham Park but there is also a need to retain all those structures which do not detract from the character and appearance of the Cold War airfield.

b) **ENABLING DEVELOPMENT /POLICY & SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES**

3.27 Whereas previously the District Council had sought to portray Policy H2 of the Structure Plan as representing “enabling development” to achieve the environmental and cultural/historic objectives, NOC have always claimed that this does not accord with the definition of “enabling development” set out by English Heritage in its Policy Statement entitled “Practical Guidance to Assessment: Enabling Development and the Conservation of Heritage Assets” which was originally released in 2004 and was updated in June 2008. The introductory “Summary” on Page 11 to this document sets out a clear definition of “enabling development” as follows:-

**“Enabling development is development that is contrary to established planning policy, but which is occasionally permitted because it brings public benefits that have been demonstrated clearly to outweigh the harm that would be caused, and which could not otherwise be achieved. The key public benefits in the context of heritage assets is securing their long term future, but may include, for example, a degree of public access or contributions to biodiversity. Such public benefits are paid for by the value added to the land as a result of granting of planning permission for its development. “Enabling development” can therefore be considered a type of public subsidy. To limit the need for “enabling development”, local authorities should monitor the condition of the heritage assets and where necessary use the statutory powers to limit deterioration”.**

3.28 In the light of this definition NOC has never accepted that the Upper Heyford proposal represents “enabling development” since it is predicated in the County Structure Plan (Policy H2); whilst there may be an essential element of cross subsidy for dealing with the legacy of the Airbase in both environmental and cultural/historic terms, this is internalised within the policy itself.

3.29 This matter was discussed at the Planning Inquiry held in late 2008/early 2009 and the Inspector took the view (Paragraph 19.34) that, using one of the objectors’ description of the proposal :-

**“Policy H2 makes a carefully conditioned allocation of housing and supporting infrastructure. The policy makes the allocation conditional upon achieving environmental improvements and the heritage interest of the site as a military base with Cold War associations that should be conserved, compatible with achieving a satisfactory living environment”.**

3.30 She concludes in Paragraph 19.35 that:-

**“From the policy itself and from Paragraph 7.7 of its Explanatory Memorandum (which remains an important material consideration on its interpretation), it is clear to me that the scale of development should be limited to that necessary to secure those interest. The policy enables compliant types of development. Whilst some aspects of the context have changed since the 2003 appeal decision, I have no doubt that the current version of Policy H2 allows for a small New Settlement and only such necessary “infrastructure” as required to support it”.**

- 3.31 At various stages the Council has sought to argue that Upper Heyford is not a sustainable location. Again this point was examined by the Inspector at the recent Inquiry. She initially concluded (Paragraph 19.28) that:-

**“It appears to me unanswerable that where, unusually, a Structure Plan has a site specific policy, then one must assume that other general policies have been held to be complied with or are outweighed by other site specific considerations – in this case the need for an acceptable lasting solution to the future of the former Airbase. That principle was accepted at the last appeal. It cannot be right that if a proposal would satisfy a site specific policy it should fail if it does not meet others”.**

- 3.32 She returned to this point in Paragraph 9.148 concluding that in any event:-

**“..... on examining OSP Policy G1 it appears to me that many of its elements would be met. The proposed development would help meet market housing, affordable housing and employment requirements whilst protecting and in some respects enhancing the environment of the Conservation Area and the natural resources of the area, including County Wildlife site”.**

- 3.33 Where other factors were concerned she concluded (Paragraph 19.153) that:-

**“Taking account of a wider definition of sustainability than travel alone, the components of the lead proposal itself, mitigation works included in the Unilateral Undertaking and other matters than can be secured by condition, then I consider that the weaker elements of the “sustainability credentials” of the site would be acceptably addressed”.**

- 3.34 The Inspector’s general conclusions about the general sustainability of the Upper Heyford location were accepted by the Secretary of State (Paragraphs 37 to 39) in his decision letter.

c) **REGENERATION, AND ADAPTATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH CENTRAL GOVERNMENT ADVICE**

3.35 Whilst the Adopted and Approved Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 and the Cherwell Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief established the policy background for the development at the former RAF Heyford Park Base, there is a substantial body of additional work which supports this application (as referred to within the accompanying Environmental Statement and other documents). Moreover, there is substantial support in various central Government documents given to the nature of the proposals being put forward in this application. This sub section summarises these provisions briefly.

**General Objectives**

3.36 **PPS1** (Creating Sustainable Communities) emphasizes the critical role of planning and delivering the Government's wider macroeconomic, social and environmental objectives. It is the Planning Authority's responsibility to consider development in a positive and proactive sense by facilitating sustainable patterns of development when preparing Development Plans for their area (Paragraph 2). It goes on to suggest that there are four main aims for sustainable development including:-

- Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;
- Effective protection of the environment;
- The prudent use of natural resources; and
- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

3.37 These four aims should be pursued in an integrated way through a sustainable, innovative and produce economy delivering high employment levels, promoting social inclusion and personal wellbeing, in a way which protects and enhances the physical environment. Proposals should optimise resource and energy use and planning has a key role to play in the creation of sustainable communities which will meet the tests of time; create places where people want to live, and which will enable people to meet their aspirations and potential (Paragraphs 4 and 6).

3.38 Paragraph 19 goes on to suggest that authorities should seek to enhance any environment as part of development proposals and avoid significant adverse effects, pursuing alternative options which might reduce or eliminate any adverse impact.

- 3.39 Paragraph 21 specifically targets the prudent use of natural resources. It states that the broad aim should be to ensure that outputs are maximized whilst resources used are minimized (for example, by building housing at higher densities on previously developed land, rather than at lower densities on greenfield sites).
- 3.40 The general approach to delivering sustainable development is set out in Paragraph 27 and includes promoting urban and rural regeneration to improve the well being of communities, improve facilities, promote high quality and safe development and create new opportunities for the people living in those communities. Additionally policies should promote mixed use developments for locations that allow the creation of linkages between different uses and can thereby create more vibrant places.
- 3.41 Guidance within PPS1 also stresses the importance of good design which it states:-
- “..... ensures attractive usable, durable and adaptable places and is a key element in achieving sustainable development. Good design is indivisible from good planning”.**
- 3.42 It continues (Paragraph 34) by indicating that authorities should plan positively for high quality and inclusive designs for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.
- 3.43 The final section of PPS1 emphasizes the importance of community involvement encouraging both planning authorities and applicants to consult with those affected by the proposals. Paragraph 41 states that local communities should be given the opportunity to participate fully in the process for drawing up specific plans or policies and be consulted on proposals for new development.
- 3.44 NOC have addressed all these issues both in general terms and in the context of the Local Authority's own Development Plan and SPD policies which seek to interpret central Government guidance. In particular the revised proposals address the importance of adhering to the four main aims for sustainable development as well as addressing social cohesion, protection of the historic environment, good quality design, community involvement and generating an attractive new community by adapting the former Airbase. We believe that the approach which has been adopted in retaining more of the existing buildings but combining these with an attractive form of new development so as to bring about an overall improvement in the character of



the New Settlement, is one which fully accords with the general approach taken in PPS1.

- 3.45 One of the special circumstances affecting the Heyford Park development is the existence of a substantial community in its own right who already live within the New Settlement Area. Consequently these special circumstances have meant that preparing a lasting solution is especially sensitive; therefore NOC have sought to involve the community in both the existing and the new proposals to a very significant extent. The same applies to the existing business community already located on the Base. The Statement of Community Involvement and the high level of public responses to this exercise indicate a considerable level of local interest; a number of the points put forward in this process have been taken into account in the preparation of the application which also includes provision for the Council's Local Lettings Policy to influence the design and phasing.

Housing Provision: Retention, Tenure and Mix

- 3.46 This document contains the Government's latest housing objectives; these are laid down in Paragraph 9 which states that the aim is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live.
- 3.47 In terms of identifying suitable locations for new housing development, PPS3 Paragraph 36 indicates that in support of its objective of creating mixed and sustainable communities, the Government's policy is to ensure that housing is developed in sustainable locations which offer a range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. It goes on to indicate that priority should be given to the use of previously developed land and that all locations should make effective use of land, existing infrastructure and available public and private investment. As the former Airbase was previously owned by the Ministry of Defence it is also relevant to note that Paragraph 36 of PPS3 encourages early consideration of publically owned sites for housing development. It is clear that Heyford Park falls squarely within this advice in terms of its identification in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan. The redevelopment of this brownfield site also represents a satisfactory way of dealing with the legacy of its former military use whilst at the same time achieving a balance between the historic/cultural importance of the site and potential environmental benefits which can be achieved.



- 3.48 The redevelopment of the former RAF Airbase as a New Settlement for about 1,000 dwellings clearly forms an important component in the Structure Plan provision not only for Cherwell District Council area but also for Oxfordshire. The strategic location has now been identified for over 10 years, and whilst there have been delays in bringing forward a suitable application (for a variety of reasons), employment activities have continued to be attracted to the area thereby improving its sustainability credentials. The latest proposals for the New Settlement Area represent a sound and sustainable approach to the creation of a new community in this area whilst at the same time bringing about the benefits which are identified in Structure Plan Policy H2.
- 3.49 The importance of achieving good design and housing development is also emphasized in PPS3. The accompanying Design & Access Statement covers design matters in considerable detail. However, as this is an outline application with all matters reserved it is anticipated that much of the detail is appropriately dealt with at a future stage before reserved matter applications are submitted (on a phased basis) to the District Council. This matter was addressed by the previous Inspector who recognized that the DAS could not provide the level of detail necessary for reserved matter applications because of its scale but she expected the imposition of conditions relating to the preparation of Design Codes and further guidance to be approved by the Local Planning Authority before reserved matter applications were approved.
- 3.50 PPS3 also identifies the importance of achieving a variety of mix of housing sizes and tenures. This is deemed to be an important consideration for NOC and the new Master Plan seeks to achieve this while minimizing the actual physical changes which occur to the community. Existing residents will be able to benefit from the retention of the existing dwellings on the site and they may further benefit if they qualify for affordable housing under the Council's Local Lettings Policy. Such an arrangement will ensure that existing residents, who currently form the basis for the new community, are able to stay on site either in homes which they purchase or in new affordable housing units if they qualify under the Council's arrangements. The benefit of this proposal in housing terms is that it enables market housing to be introduced into the site whereas the present arrangements only allow for rented housing. By providing a broader range of housing tenures this will attract additional people to the site creating the sort of mixed community advocated in PPS3.

- 3.51 The overall density of the housing within the New Settlement Area comprises just over 30 dwellings per hectare which, even allowing for the removal of minimum housing densities from PPS3, represents an efficient use of a brownfield site. The relatively low density reflects the balance towards family housing (see Design & Access Statement). It also meets the general demand for housing within this area in terms of both open market and affordable housing. The creation of a community comprising primarily (both small and large) family housing also enables the Master Plan to be prepared in a way which more readily conforms with the surrounding Settlements within the rural area of North Oxfordshire.
- 3.52 In terms of deliverability the approval of this outline application by the District Council will enable NOC to progress with improvements and renovations to the existing stock whilst at the same time preparing Design Codes and reserved matter applications for the first phases of new development. This will need to be co-ordinated with the preparation of the Affordable Housing Strategy involving surveys of existing residents.

#### Conservation Issues

- 3.53 So far as historic and cultural heritage is concerned the designation of the site as a Conservation Area in April 2006 leads to a statutory duty to preserve or enhance all aspects of the character or appearance that define the area's special interest. There is no doubt that this decision has shifted the balance as between potentially conflicting objectives in Structure Plan Policy H2 as regards environmental/visual improvements as opposed to the protection of historic and cultural assets. This point was recognized by the Inspector reporting to the Secretary of State on the recent appeal. It follows that the designation requires the advice contained in PPS5 as regards both demolition of buildings and structures and re-use of retained buildings, to be fully taken into account.
- i. Demolition
- 3.54 On the first of these two issues the revised Master Plan proposals keep as many of the existing buildings as possible, particularly those which contribute most towards the overall character of the Conservation Area. This accords with the advice contained within the recently published **PPS5** (paragraph 7). In this context the revised Master Plan proposals seek to maximize the retention of buildings and structures within the NSA including:-

- 1) Those features identified as Scheduled Monuments in the NSA (100%);
- 2) Those features identified as Listed Buildings in the NSA (100%);
- 3) Those non-listed buildings identified by either English Heritage, or CDC in its RCPB, as making a significant contribution to the character of the Conservation Area and requiring retention (100%);
- 4) Those non-listed buildings which contribute in part to the character of the Conservation Area and which may “possibly” be retained (all retained apart from Buildings 459 and 474);
- 5) Those non Listed Buildings which contribute individually to a relatively minor extent but which nonetheless assist in the historical/cultural interpretation of the former Base i.e. all the existing dwellings retained (except for 2 bungalows).

3.55 Of these five categories all of the first three categories of building are retained. So far as the fourth category is concerned the current Master Plan proposes retention of two more buildings that were previously proposed for demolition but the loss of one that was previously to be retained giving a net gain of one building which constitutes to the historic character. So far as the fifth category is concerned the retention of more dwellings (discussed above) is significantly in excess of the previous scheme involved widespread demolition and redevelopment with new housing. A full list of the buildings to be retained and those to be demolished is contained within the Environmental Statement chapter on Archaeology and Cultural Heritage. As noted above all the Conservation Area Consents associated with demolition have been issued as part of the previous scheme; therefore only one additional Conservation Area Consent is to required (for Building 459).

3.56 So far as tree coverage is concerned, as agreed with the District Council’s arboriculturist, this relies primarily on the previous Tree Survey with Schedules which have been updated in a general sense. The aim of the Master Plan has been to minimize the loss of trees and the retention of more dwellings has allowed this to occur. A full list of the trees to be retained and removed is contained as a separate schedule to the planning application documentation.

i. New Uses

3.57 So far as the continued use of retained buildings is concerned, the proposed uses are all set out in the detailed description of development in Section 2 of this Statement. This accords with the advice contained in PPS5 requiring (wherever possible) alternative uses to be found for protected buildings. The list of uses for the retained buildings is broadly similar to the existing approved scheme. Appendix B

sets out a summary comparison which indicates the extent of uses permitted in the previous 2010 permission, as compared to that now applied for.

## **APPENDIX B: SCHEDULE OF FLOORSPACE CONSENTED AND APPLIED FOR**

### **Transport**

- 3.58 Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 promotes an integrated transport strategy. The development of Heyford Park must comply with this advice and so the lasting arrangement places a realistic and workable transport strategy as part of the development aspirations and proposals. Full details are set out in accompanying Transport Assessment.
- 3.59 The three key objectives of PPG13, as set out at paragraph 4, are to integrate planning and transportation at the national, regional and local level in order to:
- Promote more sustainable transport choices; proposals for Heyford Park will at offer a choice of mode of transport within and to the new community, both for residents and employees;
  - Promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling. With the opening of remnant footpaths and the creation of new paths and bridleways, Heyford Park and its new facilities will be highly accessible from the existing surrounding settlements by walking, in line with Paragraphs 75 and 78 of PPG 13 Transport. An internal footway cycleway network will be introduced to minimise internal private vehicular trips;
  - Reduce the need to travel, especially by car: The proximity of Heyford Park to Bicester allows opportunities for the enhancement and the provision of a new bus route, which incorporate some of the adjoining villages. Improved 30 minute services will be provided to Bicester and during the peak hour to Oxford via the station at Lower Heyford.
- 3.60 The principles of PPG13 have been incorporated into the planning application. Prospective residents of the development, and indeed those in the neighbouring settlements, will have access to the proposed employment, retail, leisure and community facilities, which will improve the sustainability credentials of this rural growth point in line with the advice in PPS7. The scale of development and the proposed mix of uses on the site itself offer opportunities for a more self-sustaining community without the reliance on private vehicles.

#### 4. ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

4.1 The planning application is supported by the following reports and statements.

##### **Environmental Statement (ES)**

4.2 The planning application is supported by a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as outlined in the ES. The EIA process is the mechanism by which project proposals are appraised in terms of environmental and socio-economic criteria, in addition to the engineering and technical considerations. The EIA process defines the context of the proposed development/project and examines the significant environmental effects together with any appropriate mitigation.

4.3 The purpose of the EIA is to establish the nature of the development proposed, and the environment in which it is likely to take place, so as to identify likely 'significant effects' that may arise by comparing the existing situation (baseline) with the situation once each stage of the development programme has been completed. The significance of effects during any construction phases associated with the proposals are also considered in the environmental impact assessment.

4.4 The document produced as a result of the EIA process is known as the Environmental Statement (ES) and is based on Parameters Assessment Plans issued to all specialist consultants together with the description of development.

4.5 The EIA Regulations (1999) require that any proposed development falling within the description of a 'Schedule 2 development' within the meaning of the Regulations, will require to be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment where such development is likely to have 'significant' effects on the environment by virtue of such factors as its nature, size or location (Regulation 2(b)).

4.6 The various elements of the proposed project at Heyford Park are considered to fall under different parts of Schedule 2 of projects which accompanies the EIA Regulations (1999).

4.7 The ES includes an assessment of the following issues as arranged in the following chapter order:

- Chapter 1 Introduction
- Chapter 2 EIA Methodology
- Chapter 3 Description of Development

- Chapter 4 Planning Policy Context
- Chapter 5 Transportation
- Chapter 6 Noise
- Chapter 7 Air Quality
- Chapter 8 Ground Conditions and Contamination
- Chapter 9 Water Resources
- Chapter 10 Landscape and Visual Character
- Chapter 11 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage
- Chapter 11 Hydrology and Hydrogeology
- Chapter 12 Ecology
- Chapter 13 Socio-economics
- Chapter 14 Cumulative Impacts

4.8 As part of the section dealing with cumulative impact the Environmental Statement sets out the way in which the revised proposals link in with the consented proposals for the Flying Field (which are not proposed for change in this application). This includes the access arrangements and the juxtaposition of uses where this is relevant.

4.9 The main aspects for consideration within each chapter, although not restricted to, are:

- Introduction
- Assessment Approach, including methodology and relevant policy considerations;
- Baseline Conditions, including a description of the site relevant to particular discipline;
- Key Impacts and Likely Significant Effects, including impact magnitude and sensitivity assessment;
- Mitigation and Enhancement, including analysis of residual effects post-mitigation;
- Non-Technical Summary of the findings

### **Flood Risk Assessment**

- 4.10 This is incorporated within the Environmental Statement.

### **Transport Assessment**

- 4.11 This is incorporated with the Environmental Statement.

### **Statement of Community Involvement**

- 4.12 The planning application is also supported by a Statement of Community Involvement. This Statement sets out the detail of pre-application consultation undertaken in conjunction with the community and other stakeholders. Public consultation took place in order to table and explain the revised concepts and proposals.

### **Design and Access Statement**

- 4.13 The Design and Access Statement prepared for NOC by Scott Brownrigg reflects the changes to the General Permitted Development Order introduced in August 2006 for all planning applications to include a statement on how design and access considerations have been incorporated into the proposals. The preparation of this Statement follows advice contained in Circular 01/2006 and by advice issued by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). The DAS also explains how the new build elements will integrate with the proposal to retain more of the existing dwellings and how this has affected the development of the design concepts.

### **Demolition Schedule and Plan**

- 4.14 A comprehensive schedule and accompanying plan details the buildings and structures to be the subject of Conservation Area Consent applications for demolition. The Demolition Schedule is only accompanied by a single new Conservation Area Consent application for Building 459, since all the other buildings and structures proposed for removal already have Conservation Area Consent following the recent Secretary of State decision. In the interests of transparency, it is also proposed to renew all these extant Conservation Area Consents with a single application.

### **Section 106, Draft Heads of Terms**

- 4.15 A draft statement of obligations has been prepared by Eversheds setting out Heads of Terms.

**Tree Retention and Removal Schedule and Plan**

- 4.16 A short report prefaces the submission of a full tree schedule and index plan which identifies the trees to be retained and those which are to be lost as a result of the proposed development.

**Sustainability Statement**

- 4.17 This Sustainability Statement describes the approach the design team has taken to integrate and consider sustainability during the design process. It presents the findings of a sustainability appraisal undertaken for the proposed Development to assess the extent to which the proposals accord with the principles of sustainable development and planning policy requirements. A summary of the sustainability features incorporated into the proposed Development is presented within this report. This report also sets out the proposed energy strategy for the Development.



## 5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 Taken overall the proposed application provides an improvement to the New Settlement Area forming part of the strategic mixed use development of a large, previously developed site. It fully accords with the principles outlined in Structure Plan Policy H2 and with central Government advice. The revised scheme demonstrates how a modest sized New Settlement can be constructed in accordance with the County Council requirements (as set out in the Supporting Text to the Structure Plan), whilst at the same time linking in with the established economic base and the opportunities provided on the Flying Field. The firms operating from these existing buildings already contain a significant number of employees and employers and there is the opportunity for controlled growth to occur elsewhere to match the increase the overall dwelling numbers over the next 5 to 7 years.
- 5.2 The current revision to the layout for the New Settlement Area has occurred because of the decision taken by NOC to retain as many as possible of the existing dwellings on the site. It will be apparent from the long history of this site that there is an existing community of residential tenants within the 300 plus dwellings and there is strong support for the retention of these homes within the redevelopment proposals for the rest of the NSA. The houses are for the most part in a sound condition, and whilst not characteristic of the North Oxfordshire area, are nonetheless already making good homes for families; with further improvements the economic life of these dwellings can be extended considerably without recourse to the unsustainable option of demolition. Consequently the revised Illustrative Master Plan has been recast to ensure that the new development is fitted in around the retained dwellings in a manner which allows for proper integration and the creation of new character areas.
- 5.3 The reason that NOC are able to adopt an approach including the retention of many more dwellings is primarily because they have adopted a different approach to the access and servicing arrangements as compared with the previous scheme. Whilst some of the existing highways will be offered for adoption, most will be retained in private ownership with a Management Company. Details of this Management Company will be provided in the Section 106 obligation. This solution avoids the need to replace the highway network completely because construction for adoption purposes cannot be secured on the majority of these existing roads. As a consequence a new arrangement involving private management generates a more sustainable solution to the redevelopment of the Base as a whole.

- 5.4 In conjunction with this new approach the Master Plan proposes a better focal point of the NSA by providing a better solution to the schooling and community facilities centred around a new Village Green. We believe that this combination of changes will bring about a more attractive and sustainable community in which existing residents will want to stay and where new purchasers will be looking to acquire new homes.
- 5.5 In addition to the residential and community aspects of the NSA, the new Illustrative Master Plan incorporates employment opportunities primarily within the existing retained buildings on the edge of the Flying Field. Together with the opportunities offered on the Flying Field as a result of the Secretary of State's recent appeal decision, the overall balance of new economically active persons compared to the number of jobs will provide an opportunity to provide a balanced community.
- 5.6 Social inclusion will be encouraged by the provision of 30% affordable housing, primarily in new build accommodation. The proposals set out in the Heads of Terms (to be embodied in a Section 106 obligation) will first involve a study of existing tenants to find out those who qualify for affordable housing. This will then be followed by a phased decanting programme to ensure that these residents are provided with new affordable houses within the Base. Those residents who do not qualify for affordable housing will be given the choice of either purchasing their bungalow in an improved or unapproved state; or the opportunity to purchase one of the new dwellings or rent in the private residential market. In this way NOC are satisfied that it will be able to deliver the Council's Local Lettings Policy. Other proposals for improved community facilities on or off site are broadly as set out in the existing Section 106 obligation associated with the recent appeal, although some will be subject to minor amendment and agreement with the Council.
- 5.7 Taken overall NOC believe that the current proposals represent an excellent lasting solution to the legacy created by the former military use of this area. The military appearance of the NSA can be transformed by the introduction of new housing in the manner shown on the Illustrative Master Plan, whilst at the same time bringing about environmental improvements which retain the important historic and cultural assets associated with this former Cold War Airbase.

## APPENDIX A

### JANUARY 2010 'LEAD APPEAL' DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

### **Schedule of development permitted (as referred to in Condition 5):**

The proposed **New Settlement Area** includes the following uses and development:-

1. Class C3 (residential dwelling houses): up to 1,075 new dwellings (including the retention of some existing military housing), to be erected in 2 and 3 storey buildings, together with change of use of Building 455 (1177 sq.m);
2. Class D1 (non residential institutions): change of use of building 457 (224 sq.m) to a nursery/crèche, building 549 (580 sq.m) to provide accommodation for a Community Hall and building 572 (680 sq.m) to provide accommodation for a Chapel; Buildings 126 (869 sq.m), 129 (241 sq.m) and 315 (3,100 sq.m) to provide a Heritage Centre up to 4,200 sq.m, together with associated car parking.
3. Change of Use of Building 74 (4,020 sq.m) to Class C1/D1 use as a hotel / conference centre of up to 4,150 sq. metres.
4. Class A1 retail provision of up to 743 sq.metres floorspace, and change of use of Building 459 (270 sq.m) to Class A1 retail.
5. Change of Use of Building 103 (312 sq.m) to Class A4 Public House, provision of up to 340 sq.metres of Class A4 floorspace in total.
6. Provision of 1 no. Primary School on 2.2 hectares.
7. Erection of 6 no. Class B1 (a), (b) and (c) buildings comprising up to 7,800 sq.metres of floorspace, together with change of use of Buildings 100 (557 sq.m) and 125 (897 sq.m) to Class B1.
8. Change of Use of Buildings 80 (2198 sq.m), 151 (3,100 sq.m), 172 (5,135 sq.m), 320 (3,600 sq.m), 345 (3,600 sq.m), 350 (3,200 sq.m) to mixed Class B2/Class B8 use.
9. Change of Use of Building 158 (50 sq.m) to Class B8 use.
10. Change of use of Structure 89a (10 sq.m) to a petrol pump station (sui generis use)
11. Provision of playing pitches and courts, sports pavilion plus incidental open space including NEAPS and LEAPS.
12. Provision of all infrastructure to serve the above development including the provision of the requisite access roads and car parking to District Council standards.
13. Removal of boundary fence to the south of Camp Road.
14. Removal of buildings and structures within New Settlement Area as detailed in separate schedule (Demolitions Schedule Table RD 4bd).
15. Landscaping alterations including the removal of identified trees within the Conservation Area (see separate schedule) and planting of new trees and offsite hedgerows and access track.

The proposed **Flying Field** area will include the following uses and development:

1. Change of Use for vehicle preparation and car processing comprising 17 hectares.
2. Change of Use of Buildings 205 (111 sq.m), 234 (1195 sq.m), 1109 (200 sq.m), 3205 (142 sq.m), 3208 (142 sq.m), 3209 (142 sq.m), 3210 (142 sq.m) to Class B1 (Business) use.
3. Change of Use of Building 350A (10 sq.m) to mixed Class B1 (Business)/B8 (Storage) use.
4. Change of Use of Buildings 259 (372 sq.m), 260 (372 sq.m), 336 (800 sq.m), 337 (1388 sq.m), 354 (336 sq.m) and 1011 (239 sq.m) to Class B2 use.
5. Change of Use of Buildings 209 (1624 sq.m), 324 (397 sq.m), 3140 (408 sq.m) to mixed Class B1/Class B2 use.
6. Change of Use of Buildings 221 (2391 sq.m), 325 (692 sq.m), 327 (702 sq.m), 328 (725 sq.m), 335 (769 sq.m), 366 (1656 sq.m) to mixed Class B2/Class B8 use.
7. Change of Use of Building 249 (3259 sq.m) to Class D1/Class B2/Class B8 use.
8. Change of Use of Buildings 210 (177 sq.m), 211 (378 sq.m), 212 (271 sq.m), 226 (169 sq.m), 237 (373 sq.m), 238 (119 sq.m), 239 (178 sq.m), 279 (169 sq.m), 292 (2070 sq.m), 1001-1005 (193 sq.m each), 1006 (524 sq.m), 1007 (524 sq.m), 1008 (318 sq.m), 1009 (24 sq.m), 1023 (372 sq.m), 1026-1038 (97 sq.m each), 1041-1048 (75 sq.m each), 1050 (144 sq.m), 1100 (34 sq.m), 1102 (138 sq.m), 1103 (177 sq.m), 1104 (89 sq.m), 1105-1106 (138 sq.m each), 1108 (348 sq.m), 1111 (367 sq.m), 1112 (60 sq.m), 1113 (177 sq.m), 1114 (37 sq.m), 1115 (149 sq.m), 1159 (156 sq.m), 1160-1167 (201 sq.m each), 1168-1185 (156 sq.m each), 1372 (600 sq.m), 1601-1625 (139 sq.m each), 2001-2009 (595 sq.m each), 3001-3035 (930 sq.m each), 3043-3051 (930 sq.m each), 3056 (930 sq.m), 3200-3202 (169 sq.m each), 3203 (60sq.m) to Class B8 use.
9. Change of use of Building 299 (2676 sq.m) to a *sui generis* use as computer data storage.
10. Demolition of Building 3135 in the north-western corner of Airfield (also subject to Conservation Area Consent application).
11. Removal of identified parts of the boundary fence and partial replacement with 1.5 metre fencing in locations as identified on the Landscape Master Plan (also subject to Conservation Area Consent applications).
12. Provision of all infrastructure to serve the above development, including the provision of the defined access arrangements and car parking to Cherwell District Council standards.
13. Landscaping alterations including the removal of some trees within the Conservation Area (see separate schedule).
14. Reopening of Portway and Aves Ditch as public rights of way across the Airfield.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **COMPARISON OF LEAD APPEAL AND NEW PROPOSALS**

**Upper Heyford  
New Settlement Area - Accommodation Schedule  
Comparison**

Ref	Item	Lead Appeal	Latest masterplan	Notes
<b>1)</b>	<b>Class C3 (residential dwellinghouses): up to 1,075 dwellings (including the retention and change of use of the majority of existing military housing and the change of use of various buildings), comprising:</b>	<b>1,075</b>	<b>1,075</b>	<b>Masterplan in progress to achieve preferred mix. Cannot be more than 1075 in total.</b>
(a)	<a href="#">Existing 46 dwellings already benefitting from a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development for Class C3:</a>	n/s	46	Note as above.
(b)	change of use of 253 dwellings to Class C3 (already subject to planning application 10/00640/F);	n/s	253	
(c)	change of use of 12 dwellings along Dacey Drive to Class C3;	n/s	12	
(d)	change of use of 2 dwellings along Dow Street to Class C3;	n/s	2	
(e)	erection of 762 new dwellings; and	n/s	764	
(f)	demolition of 2 existing dwellings, no.'s 5 and 7 Portal Drive South.	n/s	-2	
(g)	Change of Use of Building 455	1177 sq.m	n/a	
(h)	Change of use of Building 485	n/a	595 sq.m.	I block building, assumes 12 x unit conversions
<b>2)</b>	<b>Class D1 (non residential institutions) comprising change of use of:-</b>	<b>5,694</b>	<b>5,820</b>	
(a)	Building 549	580	580	Community hall
(b)	Building 572	680	680	Chapel
(c)	Building 126	869	869	Heritage centre
(d)	Building 129	241	241	Heritage centre
(e)	Building 315	3,100	3,100	Heritage centre
(f)	Building 457	224	n/a	Now Class A3/A5
(g)	New build		350	Creche
<b>3)</b>	<b>Class C1/C2 use</b>	<b>4,020</b>	<b>5,682</b>	<b>Note Class C2 use is additional</b>
	Change of Use of Building 74 (4,020 sq.m) to a Class C1/D1 use.	4,020	n/a	
	Change of Use of Building 74 to a Class C1/C2 use.	n/a	4,020	Residential Home
	Change of Use of Building 41 to a Class C1 use.	n/a	1,662	Student accommodation
<b>4)</b>	<b>Class A1 provision</b>	<b>1,013</b>	<b>1,400</b>	
	Building 459	270	n/a	Now to be demolished
	New Build	743	1,400	Building typology to be defined
<b>5)</b>	<b>Class A3-A5 provision</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>1,713</b>	
(a)	Building 455	n/a	1,177	No new build proposed
(b)	Building 457	n/a	224	
	Building 103	312	312	
	New Build	28	0	
<b>6)</b>	<b>Provision of 1 no. Primary School on 2.2 hectares.</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>Same quantum</b>



7)	Class B1 provision, comprising:-	10,333	5,821	
(a)	change of use of Building 100	557	557	TVP office
(b)	change of use of Building 125	897	897	
(c)	new build	7,803	1,020	New 3 storey building to the south of Building 52
	new build extension Building 100	416	n/a	
	new build extension Building 52	660	n/a	
(d)	change of use of building 123	n/a	1,847	
(e)	change of use of building 488	n/a	1,500	Lamplighter building: Assumes 50% demolition of 2,973 sq.m building
	Not needed for 52, 77/78			Already have separate permanent consent, part of baseline
8)	Mixed Class B2/B8 provision, comprising change of use of :-	20,833	20,833	Same quantum
(a)	Building 80	2,198	2,198	
(b)	Building 151	3,100	3,100	
(c)	Building 172	5,135	5,135	
(d)	Building 320	3,600	3,600	
(e)	Building 345	3,600	3,600	
(f)	Building 350	3,200	3,200	
9)	Class B8 provision of up to 50 sq.m. involving change of Use of Building 158.	50	50	Same quantum
10)	Change of Use of Structure 89a (10 sq.m) to a petrol pump station (sui generis use).	10	10	Same quantum
11)	Provision of playing pitches and courts, sports pavilion plus incidental open space including NEAPS and LEAPS.	n/a	n/a	Not net effect on development areas
12)	Provision of all infrastructure to serve the above development including the provision of the requisite access roads and car parking to District Council standards.	n/a	n/a	Not net effect on development areas
13)	Removal of boundary fence to the south of Camp Road.	n/a	n/a	Not net effect on development areas
14)	Removal of buildings and structures within New Settlement Area as detailed in separate schedule (to be agreed);	n/a	n/a	Not net effect on development areas
15)	Landscaping alterations including the removal of identified trees within the Conservation Area (see separate schedule) and planting of new trees and off-site hedgerows and access track.	n/a	n/a	Not net effect on development areas