

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Date Sent</u>	<u>Expires</u>	<u>Reply</u>
Upper Heyford Parish Council	16.08.2017	06.09.2017	01.09.2017
Local Highways Authority (OCC)	16.08.2017	30.08.2017	25.08.2017
Heyford Park Residents And Community Development Association	16.08.2017	06.09.2017	
Landscape Services (CDC)	16.08.2017	30.08.2017	25.08.2017
Oxford Trust For Contemporary History	16.08.2017	06.09.2017	

From: Public Access DC Comments
Sent: 01 September 2017 17:17
To: Public Access DC Comments
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 17/01466/F

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

Comments were submitted at 5:16 PM on 01 Sep 2017 from Mr Jack Goodman.

Application Summary

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

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jack Goodman
Email:
Address: Hillside Cottage, High Street, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5LE

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Councillor
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: The Upper Heyford Parish Council objects to this retrospective application for the following reasons:

Background: This area is described as the SUDs corridor, Swales, Linear Park and Wild Meadows.

- 1) Bovis Homes have stated to Cherwell District Council that the fence is required to provide "a degree of safety guarding to protect their children from the swale areas" and they "would hope that the LPA would prioritise safety for the children over permeability aspirations". CDC made it clear there must be permeability which renders the fence redundant. This also contradicts Bovis Homes claims the linear park will be constructed according to plans and will be safe.
- 2) The children's play area constructed by Bovis Homes is right next to a swale and simply separates the children from the swale with a small timber trip fence. This is deemed as safe despite the trip hazard, so a much larger

fence is not needed elsewhere.

3) This style of fence does not stop children easily running through it, however makes it harder for adults caring for them.

4) The character of the area is inspired by Carswell Circle where there are no fences dividing public areas.

5) This fence divides open green areas, such as the area to the right of the fence near Camp Road, and completely land locks at least one green area between the fence and private gardens. It has not been thought through but hastily constructed; hence the retrospective full planning application going against the agreed and approved design code

6) The Design Code makes clear that direction to users of the informal wild meadow area will be made by shrub and herbaceous planting and not formal fences. It states any required street furniture should be timber, not formal metal style fences.

7) Fences have been avoided in all areas of the development where possible.

8) The Design Code states that all dwellings in front of the Wild Meadows will provide natural surveillance out over the open space. This formal metal fence is clearly not natural, unlike what is in the approved plans.

9) Paths running alongside public (adoptable) roads do not have metal fences separating them. Given the roads are shared surface pedestrians may need to use the path to escape vehicles that have not seen them.

10) Emergency vehicles would have no way to access the open green space, kickabout area or play area without accessing private drives which would be confusing in an emergency situation.

11) The Design Code states "The linear park will be presented as an informal open space". This was supported by existing residents before the new development but this fence segregates communities. Even though Bovis Homes have been forced to include small gaps the intended segregation is still clear and is some find this intimidating, given the style of the fence the gaps are not very visible.

12) Without prejudice, if this fence is required, then it needs to be between the meadows and the path, not the path and the road. Otherwise the vast majority of users of the area will not be safe guarded.

From: Nichols, Chris - E&E [<mailto:Chris.Nichols@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>]
Sent: 25 August 2017 14:14
To: Lewis Bankes-Hughes
Cc: Planning; Plater, Roger - E&E; Cllr Ian Corkin
Subject: Planning Application No.17/01466/F. Heyford Park.
Importance: High

Dear Lewis,

With reference to the above consultation it is considered that the proposals will have no adverse impact on the surrounding transport network. The County therefore has no objection to this planning application.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Best regards,

Chris Nichols
Transport Development Control
Oxfordshire County Council
07392 318878

This email, including attachments, may contain confidential information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender by reply and delete it immediately. Views expressed by the sender may not be those of Oxfordshire County Council. Council emails are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
<http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>.

From: Tim Screen
Sent: 25 August 2017 14:01
To: Lewis Bankes-Hughes
Subject: 17/01466/F - Heyford Park Parcel B2A Camp Road

Lewis

In consideration of the Fence Key Plan UPP2 -02-300.

I have no objections as long as 2 demountable bollards are installed, with padlocks, to the cycle path near plot 115, in order to prevent vehicle access. This should allow contractor and emergency vehicle access when required.

Regards

Tim

Tim Screen CMLI
Landscape Architect

Cherwell District & South Northants Councils



01295 221862



01295 221878

<mailto:tim.screen@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk>

www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk

www.southnorthants.gov.uk

www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil

www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil

Follow us on Twitter: @Cherwellcouncil

Follow us on Twitter : @SNorthantsC