**From:** Public Access DC Comments
**Sent:** 27 June 2018 22:59
**To:** Public Access DC Comments
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 18/00825/HYBRID

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

Comments were submitted at 10:59 PM on 27 Jun 2018 from Mr Neil Bouse.

|  |
| --- |
| **Application Summary** |
| **Address:** | Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD  |
| **Proposal:** | Demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1; Outline planning permission for up to 1,175 new dwellings (Class C3); 60 close care dwellings (Class C2/C3); 929 m2 of retail (Class A1); 670 m2 comprising a new medical centre (Class D1); 35,175 m2 of new employment buildings, (comprising up to 6,330 m2 Class B1a, 13,635 m2 B1b/c, 9,250 m2 Class B2, and 5,960 m2 B8); 2.4 ha site for a new school (Class D1); 925 m2 of community use buildings (Class D2); and 515 m2 of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2); 30m in height observation tower with zip-wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up of 100 m2 (Class D1/A1/A3); 1,000 m2 energy facility/infrastructure with a stack height of up to 24m (sui generis); 2,520 m2 additional education facilities (buildings and associated external infrastructure) at Buildings 73, 74 and 583 for education use (Class D1); creation of areas of Open Space, Sports Facilities, Public Park and other green infrastructure; Change of Use of the following buildings and areas: Buildings 357 and 370 for office use (Class B1a); Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8); Buildings 217, 3102, 3136, 3052, 3053, 3054, and 3055 for employment use (Class B8); Buildings 2010, 3008, and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1); Buildings 2004, 2005 and 2006 for education use (Class D1); Buildings 366, 391, 1368, 1443, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use); Building 340 (Class D1, D2, A3); 20.3ha of hardstanding for car processing (Sui Generis); and 76.6ha for filming activities (Sui Generis); the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified in Schedule 2; associated infrastructure works including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road  |
| **Case Officer:** | Andrew Lewis  |
| [Click for further information](https://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications/centralDistribution.do?caseType=Application&keyVal=P8IT8PEMMSY00) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Customer Details** |
| **Name:** | Mr Neil Bouse |
| **Email:** |  |
| **Address:** | 8 Bourne End, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5AE |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments Details** |
| **Commenter Type:** | Neighbour |
| **Stance:** | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | Dear Sirs,We would like to raise the following comments regarding the Heyford Park Hybrid Planning application.We strongly object to the proposed development on green field sites within the proposed perimeters of Heyford Park. Green fields should only be built on it exceptional circumstances and this threshold is not met when there are considerable brown field sites available within the Heyford Park curtilage.The transport plan appears positive in some aspects and troublesome in others. Opening Chilgrove Drive to HGV's is positive, however this needs to be developed at the earliest opportunity. Camp Road is overrun with laden HGV's at all times of day and night, with them damaging road safety features that have already been installed plus creating a dangerous environment for children attending Heyford Park School sites. Re-routing HGV's at the earliest opportunity will greatly improve the area and increase road safety for all.Increasing the frequency and availability of buses is vital to the sustainability of the development, with the current provision inadequate. Establishing a bus link to Heyford Train station is a positive addition to the current transport plan, however this needs to be incorporated into the train timetables. Currently the only evening transport provision back to this area is the train, however it is currently not feasible as there are no transport provisions from the train station to Heyford Park and no footpaths linking the two.The provision of buses under the plans are split in two, with one serving Oxford, albeit hourly, and the other Bicester. As mentioned above the current bus provision is not adequate enough, but I also believe that maintaining an hourly service between Heyford Park and Oxford also is not adequate. The proposed route for the Bicester service through Heyford Park differs from that of the Oxford service and I fail to see the reasonings. Camp Road is the main throughfare, but the proposed route diverts this service from Camp Road onto Izzard Road through an area of new development and back to Camp Road, whilst the Oxford service remains on Camp Road. Izzard Road is flanked by existing residential properties and provides access to the Heyford Park Free School specialisms Campus. During school hours there are high numbers of school children of all ages in the vicinity of this proposed route, coupled with parents collecting their children, school buses and on occasion minibuses from other schools attending inter-school events. At peak times Izzard Road is already heavily congested and difficult to manoeuvre through at times, adding a public bus on a 15 minute timetable with further add to the congestion and reduce the safety of those using the roads. There is also a proposal to expand the school site on Izzard Road (parcel 32 West) which will further increase road and foot traffic, coupled with increased traffic from the proposed development (parcels 34 and 16).The traffic through Heyford Park has increased drastically with the development in its current state and is served by an outdated road network designed many years ago and to serve less traffic than current levels. Having reviewed the available documents there do not appear to be plans to adequately develop the road network to meet the expected demands. The junction of Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive/Ardley Road/Middleton Stoney Road is an incredibly busy junction located on a dangerous bend. Other than instating Chilgrove Drive to HGV's, it would appear that no further improvements are planned. The same applies for the junction of the Middleton Stoney Road and B4030. This is an incredibly busy junction with traffic at its current levels. During certain times of the year, when verges are not cut back, it is also incredibly hazardous with visibility at a minimum. Building a further 1175 dwellings and the associated increase in traffic from this, the planned employment opportunities and respective visitors will further increase the associated risks at the above mentioned junctions.There are proposals to extend the Heyford Park Free School Specialisms Campus on Izzard Road. The current building is not in keeping with the development and dwarfs residential properties. Further extending this site, at its current level and exterior design, will reduce the influx of natural light to the area, but also further change the appearance of the area due to the cladding that has been used.We live on the Bovis development, which in comparison to the rest of the development, is already densely populated with very little break between built up areas. Whilst on documents it appears that there is a sports field located in the area, this is not open to the public so as such should not be considered either a public space nor a green area for the development. Having reviewed the plans, other areas have buffer zones, I.e. allotments and an orchard, but the Boris end of the development has very little green space built in, coupled with proposals for it again to be the site of the densest level of occupation. There is very little relief at present, further heavy development will change the character of the area and make it feel very over crowded. Green spaces will protect wildlife, maintain the character of the area and differentiation between villages in the surrounding area, rather than further encroach. Buffers will also protect existing wildlife.Presently there is an enclosed dog park, adjacent to Camp Road. This facility is very popular with locals and allows them a safe environment to walk their dogs and allow dogs to interact with others. Under these proposals this space is due to be developed, without a replacement planned. Whilst there are plans for a communal park on the site of the airfield, this will not provide the safe and enclosed environment that we have presently. |