**From:** Planning
**Sent:** 06 May 2016 11:27
**To:** Design Conservation
**Subject:** FW: Contact Form submission from article Residential permitted development on [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)

**Sent:** 06 May 2016 10:35
**To:** Planning
**Subject:** Contact Form submission from article Residential permitted development on [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk)

|  |
| --- |
| **Contact Form Submission** |
| **Article** | [Residential permitted development](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=10285) (10285)  |  |
| Name: | Tim Moore |  |
| Address 1: | 4 Raven Close |  |
| Address 2: | Upper Heyford |  |
| Town: | Bicester |  |
| Postcode: | OX25 5AN |  |
| Email address: |  |  |
| Comments: | Sir/Madam The RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal Section 8 Paragraph 8.2.3 identified a number of buildings of Local Significance, 10 of which are/were located around, or in the vicinity of, the Parade Ground. Of the 10 six have already been demolished, they were: (Building Number) 450 â€“ Unidentified original function; 459 â€“ 1920â€™s Single Sergeants Quarters; 465, 471, 474 and 483 1920â€™s Barrack Blocks (?), 474 was apparently the original Dining Room before conversion to a Barrack Block. Two buildings (455 and 457 â€“ 475 in document text) are being retained, albeit with modifications, for future use. Of the remaining structures of the 10, 485 - 1920â€™s Barrack Block is being put forward for demolition, as is 488 - the Art Deco Dining Room and Airmenâ€™s Institute. The loss of these last two icons of a former era seemingly goes against the aims and wishes of Cherwell District Councilâ€™s own conservation plans and wishes for Dear the former RAF station, whilst possibly conflicting with the mission statement of Dorchester Group. I have spoken to several residents of the redeveloped base and they too would not wish to lose both of the buildings but more specifically building 485. The logic behind and case for removing 488 seems to be the stronger, due to its state of disrepair and the number of new dwellings that could be built in its stead; the same cannot be said for 485 as its base area is significantly less. I strongly urge you to consider Building 485 to be a valued feature which should be retained, either for community use or converted to apartments. This building would perfectly frame the central feature of the development; it would help to preserve the history of the base whilst providing for either several flats/accommodation or as an asset for future generations. I thank your help and assistance in dealing with my concerns and look forward to hearing back from you in due course. Yours faithfully, Tim Moore  |  |