

HYBRID PLANNING APPLICATION

ADDENDUM TO PLANNING STATEMENT

**INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING
& S106 HEADS OF TERMS**

HEYFORD PARK, UPPER HEYFORD, OXFORDSHIRE

ON BEHALF OF DORCHESTER LIVING LTD

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004**

Prepared by: Pegasus Group

Pegasus Group

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

T 01285 641717 | **F** 01285 642348 | **W** www.pegasuspg.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

PLANNING | **DESIGN** | **ENVIRONMENT** | **ECONOMICS**

CONTENTS:

Page No:

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND EXPLANATION OF CHANGES	3
	Original Application Description of Development	3
	Revised Application Description of Development	4
	Amendments to Red Line Application Site Boundary	6
	Amendments to Composite Parameter Plan	7
	Amendments to Demolition and Change of Use Plan	10
	Amendments to Building Heights Parameters Plan	11
	Amendments to the Existing and Proposed Fence Plan	11
3.	AFFORDABLE HOUSING STATEMENT	13
4.	PLANNING OBLIGATIONS	14
5.	PLANNING ASSESSMENT	18
	Principle and Quantum of Development Proposed	18
	Residential	20
	Employment	24
	Cultural Heritage	27
	Landscape and Visual Amenity	34
	Ecology and Biodiversity	37
	Social and Community	41
	Transport and Access	42
	Flood Risk and Drainage	46
	Sustainability and Energy	47
	Summary	48
6.	THE OVERALL PLANNING BALANCE	50
	The Decision Making Framework	50
	Designated Heritage Assets and NPPF Paragraph 14 Footnote 9 Assessment	50
	Summary on approach to Decision Making Framework	56

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Addendum Planning Statement has been prepared by Pegasus Group on behalf of Dorchester Living Ltd (“the Applicant”).
- 1.2 The Statement is in support of a hybrid planning application for the comprehensive delivery of a new vision for Heyford Park comprising of an integrated development of new homes, a ‘creative city’ with new employment, enhanced heritage and visitor facilities and opportunities, ecological and green infrastructure, combined with provision of new social and community facilities and infrastructure on land at the Former RAF Upper Heyford airbase, Heyford Park, Oxfordshire (“the Application Site”).

2018 Hybrid Planning Application

- 1.3 The Applicant submitted a Hybrid Planning Application (“the Original Application”) in April 2018, which was duly registered by Cherwell District Council (“the Council”) on 17th May 2018 and given the reference 18/00825/HYBRID.
- 1.4 The Original Application has been the subject of formal consultation by the Council and there have been numerous stakeholder meetings with various interested parties and statutory consultees over the last two years to continue to progress and resolve matters including transport, heritage, education and ecology amongst others.
- 1.5 As a result of these negotiations, the Applicant proposes to amend the Original Application through a number of changes to the description of development, the application site boundary and the parameter plans which, together, comprise a number of revisions which are hereafter referred to as the “Revised Application”.

Purposes and Structure of the Addendum Planning Statement

- 1.6 This Addendum Planning Statement details and explains the changes made to the Revised Application, and then considers the relevant National and Local Planning policies against which the application should be determined with particular reference to the adopted policies contained within the Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031); and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹ and the Planning Practice Guidance.

¹ As updated by the Government in February 2019

1.7 This Addendum Planning Statement is not intended to duplicate matters already referred to previously in the Original Application and elsewhere in the updated supporting documentation, rather it provides a comprehensive overview of the land use and planning merits of the development to be considered against the relevant planning policies and other material considerations pertinent to this Revised Application.

1.8 The Structure of this Addendum Planning Statement is as follows:

- **Section 2: Amendments to the Proposed Development** – Provides a summary of the proposed development in the Revised Application and explains the nature of the changes made to the Original Application;
- **Section 3: Affordable Housing Statement** – Provides an updated summary of the proposed housing mix in the Revised Application in the context of the Local Plan policy and on-going discussions with the Council;
- **Section 4: Planning Obligations** – Provides an updated Heads of Terms for a Section 106 Agreement;
- **Section 5: Planning Assessment** – Provides an updated assessment of the Revised Application in the context of the extant planning policy of the Development Plan and other material planning considerations; and
- **Section 6: The Overall Planning Balance** – Considers how the various planning considerations should be balanced and the weight to be given.

1.9 This Addendum Planning Statement should be read alongside the suite of technical documents that accompanied the Original Application, and also the updated documents that accompany this Revised Application which comprise:

- Updated Description of Development and accompanying Schedules;
- Updated Design and Access Statement;
- Updated Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- Updated Environmental Statement Addendum (with updated Transport Assessment and Flood Risk Assessment);
- Heritage Impact Assessment.

2. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND EXPLANATION OF CHANGES

Original Application Description of Development

2.1 The Original Application proposed the following description of development:

"A hybrid planning application consisting of:

- **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 floor space (Class A1);**
 - > **670 m2 comprising a new medical centre of (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 sky tower with zip wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up to 100 m2 (Class D1/A1/A3);**
 - > **1,000 m2 energy facility/infrastructure with a stack height of up to 24 m (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.**
- **the change of use of the following buildings and areas:**
 - > **Buildings 357 and 370 for office (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, 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 and 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."

Revised Application Description of Development

2.2 The Revised Application proposes the following description of development:

A hybrid planning application consisting of:

- 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);
 - > 2,415 m2 of new school building on 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 to 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.

• the change of use of the following buildings and areas:

> Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8);

> Buildings 217, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3055, 3102, and 3136 for employment use (Class B8);

> Buildings 2010 and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1);

> Buildings 73 and 2004 (Class D1);

> Buildings 391, 1368, 1443, 2005, 2006, 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, including 2.1 ha for filming set construction and event parking (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.

2.3 The Revised Application description set out above proposes the following changes to the description of development:

- 1) A specific limitation of new build floorspace in the new school site of 2.4 ha;
- 2) The deletion of Buildings 357 and 370 for Class B1a office use;
- 3) The removal of the change of use of Building 3008 for filming and heritage activities (instead, a continuance of its current lawful use for Class B8);

- 4) The addition of Building 73 for Class D1 use;
- 5) The removal of the specific stipulation for 'education use' of Building 2004, although the Use Class remains as originally applied for as Class D1;
- 6) The addition of Class D2 use with ancillary A1-A5 uses, to the Class D1 previously applied for, for Buildings 2005 and 2006;
- 7) The removal of the change of use of Building 366 for Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use (instead, a continuance of its current lawful use for Class B2/B8);
- 8) The specific inclusion within the 76.6ha of up to 2.1 ha for filming set construction and event parking which was previously shown on the Composite Parameter Plan but not expressly referred to in the Description of Development.

Amendments to Red Line Application Site Boundary

- 2.4 Following discussions with the Council, two additional development parcels within the settlement area have now been included in the Revised Application site area. However, it is important to note that the overall number of proposed new dwellings to be constructed across the site as a whole has not increased as a result. This has included the sites of the Chapel and Community Centre to the south of Camp Road (new Parcel 39) and the site of Buildings 132, 133 and 149 (new Parcel 40) within the Trident Area to the north of Camp Road.
- 2.5 There has also been a change to include a small area of land between the boundary of Letchmere Farm and Building 3204a on the Flying field to the north, involving land already within the Applicant's control.
- 2.6 A minor change to the presently undeveloped area of Village Centre South to the south of Camp Road has also been undertaken to increase its site area to reflect the latest position (Parcel 38).
- 2.7 There has been a further change to exclude the land for the A Frame hangar Building 315 which is now proposed to be retained rather than demolished and to retain its existing B8 permitted and lawful use.

-
- 2.8 The area of land to the south west of the site area has now also been excluded given the negotiations with the Council and Sport England to relocate the proposed Sports Park to the south east of the masterplan area.
- 2.9 An area to the south of the Trident Area (former Parcel 35) has now been consented under a separate planning permission and is therefore removed from this Revised Application.
- 2.10 The changes to the Revised Application's red line application site boundary have therefore comprised:
- 1) Inclusion of the sites of Buildings 132, 133, 149, 549 and 572 for residential development;
 - 2) Increase in size of remaining parcel at Village Centre South to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment;
 - 3) Inclusion of strip of Flying Field boundary land to the north of Letchmere Farm for structural landscaping purposes;
 - 4) Removal of site of Building 315 to facilitate its retention for continuing commercial Class B8 use;
 - 5) Removal of an area of land to the south of the Trident area (former Parcel 35) which now has a separate freestanding planning permission; and
 - 6) Removal of previous Sports Park area to the west of Parcel 16 (and its relocation to Parcel 18 towards the south east of the overall masterplan site, with no additional changes to the red line site boundary being required in this regard).

Amendments to Composite Parameter Plan

- 2.11 A number of changes have been made to the Composite Parameter Plan in the Revised Application.
- 2.12 A number of the changes relate to amendments to the proposed density of residential parcels, arising from a reduction of capacity of 40no. dwellings in Parcel 23 on the Southern Bomb Store site and a consequent increase in the capacity of 40no. dwellings across Parcels 11, 12, 21 and new Parcel 39.

2.13 Further changes to the housing proposed arise from the 27no. new dwellings that had previously been consented from the existing Phase 8 reserved matters approval (towards the southern part of Trident area) were previously included within Parcel 35 (Parcel 35 is no longer within the application redline). These 27no. dwellings are therefore now proposed to be accommodated within new Parcel 40.

2.14 Again, it is important to note that although the density and capacity of certain residential parcels has been amended in the Revised Application, the overall number of new dwellings proposed across the Revised Application site area has not changed in total, and remains as before at 1,175 dwellings.

2.15 In summary, these changes comprise:

- 1) Parcel 11 – increase in number of dwellings proposed from 80no. in the Original Application to 84no. dwellings in the Revised Application, and inclusion of additional Primary Vehicular Access route;
- 2) Parcel 12 – increase in number of dwellings proposed from 120no. in the Original Application to 123no. dwellings in the Revised Application, and inclusion of additional Primary Vehicular Access route in Parcel 12 West;
- 3) Parcel 16 – an area of community orchard and allotments is now shown to the west of the Parcel and the central area of open space has been enlarged;
- 4) Parcel 17 – the residential area has been reduced to allow for the incorporation of a Sports Park to the south, although the proposed dwelling numbers on the parcel remain unchanged at 62no. The Primary Vehicular Access arrangements have also been amended in the Revised Application in association with the relocated Area of Community Uses (Parcel 34);
- 5) Parcel 18 - relocation of Proposed Sports Facilities and a reduction in its area to 4.2ha, with lighting to extend hours of use to be provided in the relocated area;
- 6) Parcel 20 – revised in site area in the Revised Application so as to exclude the A Frame Building 315 which is now proposed to be retained and remain in Class B8 use as per its lawful permitted use;

- 7) Parcel 21 – increase in number of dwellings proposed from 102no. in the Original Application to 122no. dwellings in the Revised Application, the demolition of Building 370 is now included in the Revised Application so as to facilitate its demolition and redevelopment should the Design Charrette exercise conclude that its removal would result in an improved design solution for this parcel;
- 8) Parcel 22 – the site area of Creative City has been reduced from 11.2 ha in the Original Application to 11.1 ha in the Revised Application in recognition of the Primary Pedestrian/Cycle Route which is routed through this area and will need to be fenced on both sides to maintain security for the commercial operations either side. Addition of structural landscaping strip to the south of the Parcel and Letchmere Farm;
- 9) Parcel 23 – reduction in number of dwellings proposed from 470no. in the Original Application to 430no. dwellings in the Revised Application;
- 10) Parcel 25 – change to some site boundaries of the car processing area to pull the area away from the Grade II listed nose dock sheds situated to the south of the site area, although the overall extent and site area remains at 20.3ha;
- 11) Parcel 28 – The Flying filed Park area has increased from 20.3ha in the Original Application to 20.5ha in the Revised Application due to changes in the shape of the New School site (Parcel 31) and the Core Visitor Destination Area (Parcel 29);
- 12) Parcel 29 – change in site boundaries, with removal of Building 366 from the Revised Application site area and incorporation of Buildings 2005 and 2006 within the amended Core Visitor Destination Area. Site area reduces from 4.2ha in the Original Application to 3.6ha in the Revised Application;
- 13) Parcel 31 – change in site boundaries for the school site following detailed discussions with the County Education Authority, site area remains at 2.4ha;
- 14) Parcel 32 – the addition the change of use of Building 73 within the Parcel for Class D1 use;

- 15) Parcel 33 - removal of landscaping strip shown to the west of Chilgrove Drive which was outside the application site in the Original Application;
- 16) Parcel 34 - this area of community uses has been relocated from the south west of the masterplan area to now be located in the south east in association with the relocation of the Sports Park (Parcel 18);
- 17) Parcel 35 - deletion of the Parcel and the 27no. new dwellings that had previously been consented from the existing Phase 8 reserved matters approval (located towards the southern part of Trident area);
- 18) Parcel 37 - deletion of Parcel and removal of Building 357 as part of detailed discussion with County Education Authority concerning the adjacent proposed new school site;
- 19) Parcel 38 - increase in site area to reflect the current build out and development of Village Centre South;
- 20) Parcel 39 - new parcel with the addition of 13no. dwellings;
- 21) Parcel 40 - new parcel with the addition of the 27no. dwellings (which now removed from the former Parcel 35);
- 22) General - the existing Public Rights of Way notation has been removed from the Composite Parameters Plan as no changes are proposed in this regard other than the addition of new routes as shown in the Key. There is now no longer need to seek the closure of the PROW 388/4 which was previously required to facilitate the development of the Sports Park when it was proposed to be relocated towards the south west of the masterplan area in the Original Application.

Amendments to Demolition and Change of Use Plan

2.16 A number of changes have been made to the Demolition and Change of Use Plan in the Revised Application:

- 1) Buildings 315 and UH40 are no longer listed for demolition;
- 2) Building 317 is no longer listed for demolition in Parcel 20, as it has already been demolished;

- 3) Demolition of Buildings 79, 133, 205, 370, 357, 385, 457, 549 and 572 are now included;
- 4) Demolition of Buildings 132, 149, 195, 205, 359, 360a, 370b, 370c, 371, 385, 416, UH41 and UH75 are now included under Permitted Development (PD);
- 5) Change of Use of Buildings 2005 and 2006 to Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use (rather than the D1 use in the Original Application);
- 6) No longer apply for the change of use of Building 3008 to Class D1/Sui Generis use, instead now retain its now current lawful use as Class B8;
- 7) No longer apply for the change of use of Building 366 to Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use, instead now retain its now current lawful use as Class B2/B8;
- 8) Change of Use of Building 73 to Class D1 use.

Amendments to Building Heights Parameters Plan

2.17 The majority of changes to the Building Heights Parameter Plan in the revised Application relate to consequential changes to Parcel sizes and areas:

- 1) Parcel 22 – the northern entrance to the Creative City has been amended so as to remove new building heights in views from the north from the Flying Field. Also, the extent of higher new build development has been limited to be no more than 10.5m in the southern employment area near to Chilgrove Drive, and also limited to be no more than 10.5m in height on the common boundary to the west with Parcel 21;
- 2) Parcel 31 – a new area of building height is shown for the new school buildings, restricted so as to be no more than 10.5m in height;

2.18 Other changes reflect changes to the Parcel boundaries as previously described under the Composite Parameter Plan above

Amendments to the Existing and Proposed Fence Plan

2.19 A number of detailed amendments have been made to the proposals, principally relating to fence-lines proposed in and around the Car Processing Area (Parcel

25) and also the south western corner of the Flying Field in the vicinity of Camp Road.

3. AFFORDABLE HOUSING STATEMENT

- 3.1 In recognition of the operation of **Local Plan Policy BSC3** and **Policy Villages 5**, the proposals include affordable housing of different tenures and accommodation types across 30% of the overall dwellings.
- 3.2 The Revised Application proposes to increase the affordable housing provision from 348no. dwellings proposed in the Original Application to 352no. dwellings, in accordance with the updated Table 3.1 below:

Table 3.1 Proposed Affordable Housing Mix (Revised Application)

Property Type	Planning Application Proposal
1 Bed	46
2 Bed	176
3 Bed	92
4 Bed	23
1/2 bed ECH / Older People Apartments	10
2 Bed Bungalows	5
Sub Total	352

- 3.3 The proposed affordable mix summarised above in Table 3.1 is subject to continuing negotiation and discussion with Cherwell District Council.
- 3.4 As has been the case on earlier Dorchester phases, it is intended that the units will be provided by Heyford Regeneration in its role as a Registered Provider with the overall provision and control of the affordable units forming a principal obligation within the S106 Agreement.

4. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

4.1 Since the submission of the Original Application, there have been continuing negotiations involving key stakeholders on the appropriate type and extent of contributions related to the following areas in line with the operation of **Policy Villages 5**:

Education

- provision of a new 1.5 entry primary school on a minimum 2.2 ha site as shown on the Composite Parameter Plan (or, in the alternative, agreeing to make a suitable site available for OCC with contributions for a school to be provided to OCC specification);
- contributions towards secondary school places which will consist of an expansion to the existing Heyford Park Free School sites to facilitate an additional 1.5 form of entry (or, in the alternative, providing a financial contribution to OCC);
- contribution towards special education needs.

Open Space

- Provision of a mixture of community orchard areas and allotments;
- Provision of sports pitches to meet CDC requirements, to an agreed quantum;
- Provision of sports pavilion/changing rooms facilities;
- Indoor sport provision, consisting of on-site provision (or, in the alternative, providing a financial contribution for off-site provision);
- Provision of childrens' play areas to meet CDC requirements, to an agreed quantum and specification.

Community Facilities

- Provision of community hall/youth facility to an agreed specification;
- Funding towards the provision of a community worker;
- Provision of a neighbourhood police facility.

Health Care

- Provision of an extra care facility to an agreed specification;
- Provision of an on-site healthcare facility of a minimum of two multipurpose treatment rooms with ancillary utility, waiting and reception space.

Access and Movement

- Contributions towards public transport provision in the form of a bus service contribution and bus infrastructure to agreed amounts;
- Undertaking Travel Planning initiatives;
- Contributions towards off site highway works to improve highway junctions, including safety improvements contribution to A4260/B4027; Middleton Stony junction improvements; Ardley/Bucknell junction improvements; B430/minor road junction improvements; Chilgrove Drive S278 scheme; M40 Junction 10 improvements;
- Contributions towards rural traffic calming schemes, including Lower Heyford, Ardley, Somerton and Fritwell;

Heritage

- Provision of a Flying Field Park to an agreed specification;
- Provision of a Control Tower Park to an agreed specification;
- Provision of a Heritage Centre and a Heritage Centre Manager, to an agreed specification;
- Provision of an Observation Tower on the Flying Field, to an agreed specification;
- Provision of Heritage Tours to an agreed specification;
- Baseline building condition surveys and wind and watertight works programme for buildings and structures on the defined Flying Field area;
- Provision of exhibition space in Building 1443 to an agreed specification;

- Refurbishment of Victor Alert Area buildings and structures to an agreed specification;
- Refurbishment of the Control Tower to an agreed specification;
- Provision of the Heyford Trail to an agreed specification;
- Provision of Interpretation Boards to an agreed specification.

Ecology

- Provision of on-site ecological mitigation measures to an agreed specification and quantum;
- Contributions towards and/or provision of off-site ecological mitigation measures to an agreed specification and quantum;
- Provision of a cat-proof fence on the boundary of the settlement area and the Flying Field to an agreed specification.

Library

- Contribution towards library provision.

Waste Management Contributions

- Contribution towards waste management provision and services.

Bin Contributions

- Contribution towards the provision of recycling and waste bins for households.

Recycling Centre

- Contribution towards the provision of recycling centre facilities.

Apprentices

- Contribution towards apprenticeship opportunities.

Public Art

- Contribution towards public art provision on site.

4.2 These proposed obligations are in addition to the provision of affordable housing as set out in **Section 3**.

5. PLANNING ASSESSMENT

5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This section provides an analysis of the proposal against the extant Development Plan and those matters which are material to the determination of the planning application at a national and local level.

5.2 To assess whether the Proposed Development would meet the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and other material considerations, the key planning issues are considered to be:

- Principle and Quantum of Development Proposed;
- Residential;
- Employment;
- Cultural Heritage;
- Landscape and Visual Amenity;
- Ecology;
- Social and community;
- Transport and Access;
- Flood Risk and Drainage; and
- Sustainable Construction and Energy.

Principle and Quantum of Development Proposed

5.3 The Revised Application Site (with the limited exception of the existing sewage treatment works to the south east) lies within a strategic allocation as expressly defined by **Policy Villages 5** of the adopted Development Plan.

5.4 **Policy Villages 5** sets out a clear requirement that, as part of the strategic allocation of Heyford Park, approximately 1,600 new dwellings will be delivered as part of the Council's delivery of new housing across the plan period in line with

Policy BSC 1; and that there should be approximately 1,500 jobs created on a land area of approximately 120,000 m² (or 12 ha).

- 5.5 The importance of this strategic allocation in meeting the housing needs of the District is emphasised in Paragraph C.291 of the Local Plan which states that:

“The site is allocated in this Local Plan as a means of securing the delivery of a lasting arrangement on this exceptional large scale brownfield site, whilst additional greenfield land is now allocated in the context of meeting the full objectively assessed housing needs of the District by realising the opportunities presented by the development of this new settlement. The former airbase currently has planning permission for a new settlement of some 1,075 homes (gross), and Policy Villages 5 provides for additional development through a combination of the intensification of the density of development on the less sensitive previously developed parts of the site, and new, limited, greenfield development in areas that would be complimentary to the approved development.The policy allows for residential development focused to the south of the flying field, avoiding the most historically sensitive parts of the site, and on limited greenfield land to the south of Camp Road....”

- 5.6 The Proposed Development as shown in the Revised Application Composite Parameter Plan will deliver 1,175 dwellings of the 1,600 allocated in **Policy Villages 5**.

- 5.7 The remaining 425 dwellings proposed in the **Policy Villages 5** allocation are to be expected to be brought forward in the following manner:

- Phase 9 site, land south of Camp Road – a current application (16/024446/F), also submitted by Dorchester, has been the subject of a Council resolution to grant permission for 296 dwellings in September 2018;
- Pye Homes site, land north east of Camp Road – a current application (15/05037/F) has been submitted by Pye Homes for 79 dwellings and has been the subject of a Council resolution to grant permission in October 2017;
- Parcel 15, land to the north of the Pye Homes site, which is owned by a third party landowner, which applying similar development densities to that approved by the Council on the adjacent Pye Homes site, would be

expected to yield 50 dwellings. No planning application has been submitted on this land parcel to date.

- 5.8 The mix of employment land uses proposed in the planning application, comprising a combination of change of use of appropriate built structures which do not currently have the benefit of planning permission, and the new build associated with the Creative City proposal are expected to yield 1,500 jobs assuming full occupancy. Whilst the proposed 'Creative City' (11.1ha) and employment area to the south (2.3ha) total gross area amounts to potentially 13.4 ha, which is in excess of the approximately 12ha employment land area noted in Policy Villages 5, the area has been planned so as to retain existing heritage assets meaning that a less efficient layout and density will be achieved. This is due to a large part of the central area, and now also the northern entrance area of the hardstanding in the Revised Application in response to heritage constraints, is proposed to be left open (as indicated on the revised Building Height parameter plan), such that the net land area proposed in Creative City for new build is nearer to 5.95 ha. Therefore, adding the additional 2.3ha of the employment area to the south to the net Creative City area results in 8.3ha, which is well within the Policy Villages 5 indicative employment area.
- 5.9 The specific considerations arising from the proposed residential and employment areas are considered subsequently in this section.
- 5.10 However, as a matter of principle with regard to the quantum of development proposed, the Proposed Development will achieve the delivery of the required number of dwellings (1,600) and create approximately 1,500 jobs as set out in Policy Villages 5. The Proposed Development therefore derives **support** from **Policy Villages 5** in respect of this consideration.

Residential

- 5.11 With regard to residential considerations specifically, **Policy Villages 5** has a number of specific requirements.
- 5.12 The first is that the number of homes to be delivered should be approximately 1,600. This consideration has been addressed above under the 'Principle and Quantum of Development' and shown that this is capable of being achieved.
- 5.13 The second is that affordable housing should be provided of at least 30%. The applicant is willing to agree to this and a specific affordable housing mix is being

discussed with the Council as noted within Section 3 of this Statement. The Revised Application has amended the proposed affordable housing mix and also increased the number of affordable homes to be provided to 352 homes in response to ongoing discussions. This Policy requirement will therefore be met and is to be secured through provisions in a S106 Agreement.

- 5.14 The Proposed Development will assist in delivering **Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution** by contributing 1,175 dwellings towards the overall allocation at Heyford Park of 1,600 additional dwellings, which therefore represents the delivery of over 5% of Cherwell's overall housing requirement over the plan period.
- 5.15 **Policy BSC 2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land – Brownfield Land and Housing Density** sets out an expectation to make effective and efficient use of land through encouraging re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, requiring at least 30 dwellings per hectare 'net density' unless there are justifiable planning reasons for lower density development.
- 5.16 The Proposed Development includes substantial areas of brownfield land for residential development, indeed of the 1,175 dwellings proposed in this Revised Application, 935 dwellings (or 80%)² are to be located on brownfield land. Given that the site has been the subject of a strategic allocation in the Local Plan, it is reasonable to conclude that the site should be regarded as a sustainable location. This first part of Policy BSC2 is therefore achieved.
- 5.17 With regard to the second part of Policy BCS2 encouraging at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net density, overall the gross residential areas proposed in the Revised Application amount to 34.02ha. This results in a gross residential density of 34.5 dwellings per hectare, a figure which is materially in excess of the minimum 30 dph net density area. The net density figure is difficult to calculate at the present time given the outline nature of the proposals, but will be in all likelihood be even higher than the gross density after areas of landscaping, play areas and higher order roads have been discounted from the land area as is in the case when calculating net density.

² The Original Application had proposed 886 (75%) of the dwellings on brownfield land. The increase in the proportion in the Revised Application in large part reflects the incorporation of additional residential development parcels in the settlement area.

5.18 It is also worthy of note that where some of the proposed greenfield parcels may yield gross residential densities slightly lower than 30dph in specific cases, the Council, when approving the greenfield Pye Homes planning application in October, 2017 stated:

“8.19 It is noted we have objections to the development on grounds of density but what is proposed complies with the CLP where the Council sets out its approach to housing to reflect local circumstances (para 47, NPPF). Taking the site area as a whole the density is about 30 dwellings per hectare. To reduce density would be tantamount to being an under-development. It could have been higher but the sites includes a disproportionate amount of highway within the red line application site and retains strong green corridors to the east and along the main access road, and a large area of open space at the heart of the site. Furthermore, special attention has to be paid to ‘the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness’ in historic environments (NPPF para 131). In this case, the proposed development is reflecting the character in this location, at a reasonable density and avoiding harm. It is therefore, in this case, compliant with the NPPF and the design and conservation policies and of the Council and with policy BSC2.”

5.19 The Pye Homes application was deemed, in the case of a greenfield site outside but bordering the Upper Heyford Conservation Area and within the **Policy Villages 5** allocation, to be acceptable by the Council in terms of a gross density of only 24.7dph (79 dwellings over a stated application site area of 3.2ha)³.

5.20 **Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing** requires that all qualifying developments will be expected to provide 70% of the affordable housing as affordable/social rented dwellings and 30% as other forms of intermediate affordable homes. Whilst 35% affordable housing is stated as normally being sought outside of Banbury and Bicester, as noted previously, in the case of the Former RAF Upper Heyford, **Policy Villages 5** specifically states that at least 30% affordable housing will be required. Both of these requirements are proposed to be met through proposed obligations in the S106 agreement and with a proposed mix as set out in Section 3 of this Statement.

³ For comparison, the Proposed Development assumes Parcel 15 may be brought forward at an equivalent 26 gross dph, Parcel 16 at a higher 29 gross dph, and Parcel 17 at a gross 28dph. Again, the net densities achieved are likely to be higher. Parcel 13 is a special case given its linear relationship to the officer housing within the Conservation Area and these 6 dwellings are at a gross density of 13 dph.

- 5.21 **Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix** states that the Council will not only aim to increase the supply of housing but to encourage a mix that can help improve the functioning of the housing market system, make it more fluid, and enable households to more easily find and move to housing which they can afford and which better suits their circumstances.
- 5.22 Whilst a specific mix is proposed as part of the Affordable Housing delivery as noted previously in Section 3 of this Statement, the mix of dwellings assumed in the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Assessment 2014 reproduced in the explanatory text to Policy BSC 4 is only effectively a starting point and that, when considering individual development sites, the individual mix for a specific development site should reflect *'the nature of the development site and character of the area, and the up-to-date evidence of need as well as the existing mix and turnover of properties at the local level'*.
- 5.23 Given that the Proposed Development is an outline planning application in respect of the new build residential parcels, and that its build out is expected to take potentially around 10 years up to 2030 depending upon market conditions, it is regarded as premature to seek to fix a specific housing mix with regard to the open market homes. This mix would be better determined at Reserved Matter stages when applications are brought forward for detailed consideration.
- 5.24 In addition, **Policy BSC 4** sets an expectation that larger housing sites of at least 400 dwellings will be expected to provide a minimum of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings. This level of provision is justified in the explanatory text by reason of making support and care facilities operationally viable.
- 5.25 The Proposed Development has made provision for 60 extra care dwellings on Parcel 19, located so as to be close to the amenities and facilities of the Heyford Park centre and with level and good pedestrian access to the heart of the scheme, the proposed new medical centre, but also to the public amenity offered proposed large Destination Park on the Flying Field. In order to provide flexibility of care and use, a mixed use of Class C2/C3 is applied for, allowing for a range of levels and types of care to be provided.
- 5.26 **Policy BSC4** is therefore met by virtue of the proposed mix of affordable housing being proposed (which will be secured via S106 obligations), a mix of open market housing (which will be agreed at reserved matter stage but the variety of residential opportunities and scales is shown in the accompanying Design and

Access Statement across the development), and the provision of 60 extra care dwellings in use Class C2/C3.

- 5.27 With regard to the spatial distribution of the residential parcels across the Proposed Development, as the Design and Access Statement demonstrates, it has been held by independent masterplanning consultants who were jointly appointed by Cherwell District Council and Dorchester that the provision of the 1,600 dwellings would, of necessity, have to extend beyond the 'Areas with potential for additional development identified under Policy Villages 5' as shown on the Local Plan Inset Map. This a matter that is returned to under heritage considerations.
- 5.28 Overall, having regard to the above policies, the housing components of the Proposed Development derive **support** from their compliance with the Development Plan in particular in respect of **Policy Villages 5, Policy BSC 1, Policy BSC 2, Policy BSC 3 and Policy BSC 4.**

Employment

- 5.29 With regard to employment considerations specifically, **Policy Villages 5** establishes several specific requirements.
- 5.30 The first is that the number of jobs to be delivered should be approximately 1,500. This consideration has been addressed above under the 'Principle and Quantum of Development' and shown that this quantum is capable of being achieved.
- 5.31 The second is that the employment land area should be approximately 12ha (or 120,000 sq,m). Again, this consideration has been addressed above under the 'Principle and Quantum of Development' and shown that whilst the area of gross employment land proposed in Creative City and the employment parcel to the south is potentially higher at 13.4ha, given the design approach to retain and re-use existing heritage assets in the form of the 7 Hardened Aircraft Shelters, and the heritage influenced design objective of maintaining the layout by retaining the large central area of hardstanding, and now also the northern entrance from the southern Taxiway as proposed in the Revised Application, a less efficient layout has resulted than would otherwise have been the case (the net area will be nearer to 6ha). It is therefore appropriate that the gross employment area has slightly increased in a positive response to securing a long-term future for these heritage assets, whilst respecting their setting in an appropriate manner.

- 5.32 Third, Policy Villages 5 further notes that employment should be in Use Classes B1, B2 and B8. This mix of Class B employment uses has been strongly reflected in the Proposed Development through a mix of changes of use of existing buildings together with up to 35,175m² of new build employment in the proposed Creative City area. In addition, given the site's attractiveness as a film set location, the potential for outdoor filming has been recognised and is proposed in areas of principal filming interest centred on the QRA to the west (Parcel 27 west) and the Northern Bomb Stores to the east (Parcel 27 east). In addition, areas of hardstanding to the east of the Application Site have been shown as having potential for outdoor filming activities. Taken together, this represents a positive response to ensuring a mix of employment opportunities and the ability to generate an exciting 'Creative City' which will bring together various creative industries in a cohesive and secure environment.
- 5.33 Fourth, Policy Villages 5 indicates that any additional employment opportunities should be accommodated primarily within existing buildings within the overall site where appropriate. This policy requirement has been respected by incorporating the reuse of seven buildings on the Flying Field for proposed Class B8 use, including the four Hardened Aircraft Shelters in the North West corner and three other structures (Parcel 26), in addition to the change of use and re-use of the seven Creative City Hardened Aircraft Shelters for Class B1b/c, B2/B8 use (Parcel 22), and further Use Classes for filming, heritage interpretation and education for certain other structures as detailed in the description of development. This is in addition to the existing re-use of many structures and buildings across the Flying Field as explained in Schedule 2 which accompanies the Revised Application.
- 5.34 The Proposed Development will assist in delivering the objectives of **Policy SLE 1** in seeking to locate housing and employment in close proximity and to deliver an increase in the amount of employment land in the District.
- 5.35 The accompanying Environmental Statement (ES) addresses the potential effects of the Proposed Development with regard to socio-economic considerations (ES Chapter 5). It concludes that there will be:
- **Major beneficial effects** with the generation of jobs within the construction sector during the construction phase and beyond, with an estimated construction cost of £240m as an absolute minimum, and supporting over 200 jobs directly over the 8 year construction period, with a further 142 indirect jobs and 81 induced jobs;

- **Major beneficial effects** arising from the generation of between 1,244 and 1,728 jobs in the operation phase arising from the Proposed Development, although this is slightly to be significantly greater when filming is in progress. These would additional jobs to the 1,148 jobs which are estimated to be on site at the present time.

5.36 The Original Application submission contained an **Economic Benefits Report** prepared by Pegasus Group. The main findings from this analysis were as follows:

- **Direct construction-related employment:** The proposed development could support around 518 temporary jobs per annum during the 9-year build timeframe, on-site and in the wider supply chain.
- **Permanent employment:** Overall, once it is built and fully occupied, the proposed development will support around 1,450 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs on site.
- **Contribution to economic output:** The overall contribution to economic output (gross value added) is estimated to be around £92.9 million per annum once the additional floorspace is built, or £800 million over the next ten years (present value).
- **Growing labour force:** Around 1,619 economically active and employed residents are estimated to live in the new dwellings once the site is fully built and occupied. If residents show a similar employment profile to the existing working age population of Cherwell, over 50% could be working in higher value occupations.
- **Household spend:** Once fully built and occupied, the households are estimated to generate expenditure in the region of £38.6 million per annum.
- **Increased Council Tax income:** The construction of the new homes could generate around £2.0 million per annum in additional Council Tax revenue.
- **New Homes Bonus revenue:** The proposed development also has the potential to generate in the region of £6.0 million in New Homes Bonus

revenue for Cherwell District Council and £1.5 million for Oxfordshire County Council.

5.37 In addition to the quantitative analysis, the scheme can make a significant contribution towards achieving economic development objectives:

- At the **District Council level**, Cherwell District Council aim to make the district a prosperous place, where all residents can enjoy a good quality of life. To achieve this, they aim to focus on areas such as: transport, education, sustainability, housing and employment.
- At the **Local Enterprise Partnership level**, The Oxfordshire LEP want to make the area a vibrant, sustainable, inclusive, world-leading economy, through innovation, enterprise and research. The South East Midlands LEP aims to build on its reputation as a premier location for growth, innovation, creativity and world-leading technologies.
- At the **national level** the UK government want to drive economic growth, creating an economy that boosts productivity and earning power throughout the UK.

5.38 These are significant material considerations which weigh heavily in favour of the Proposed Development, which derive Development Plan **support** from **Policy Villages 5** and **Policy SLE1**.

Cultural Heritage

5.39 One of the core principles underpinning the Proposed Development is the objective of improving access to the heritage assets present at Heyford Park. These proposals are set out in the accompanying **Heritage Vision document**, which has been updated in the Revised Application.

5.40 The accompanying Environmental Statement (ES) addresses the potential effects of the Proposed Development in the Revised Application with regard to both archaeological and cultural heritage (**ES Addendum Chapter 9**). The Revised Application also includes a Schedule of Significances of Building and Structures to be demolished (**Schedule 1A** in the Revised Application documentation). The Revised Application further includes a **Heritage Impact Assessment** statement. This comprehensive assessment of the heritage assets satisfies the requirements of **NPPF paragraph 189** and **Policy ESD 15** in providing an assessment of both

the significance of the heritage assets on the Application Site and their setting together with an evaluation of the impact of the proposal on the identified assets.

5.41 In establishing the baseline conditions for the consideration of Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, **ES Addendum Chapter 9** identifies the diverse range of heritage assets within the Application Site and the wider area with the key designated heritage assets being:

- RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area;
- Scheduled Monuments within the former RAF Upper Heyford:
 - The Hardened Telephone Exchange;
 - The Battle Command Centre;
 - The Quick Reaction Alert Area (QRAA);
 - The Northern Bomb Store and Special Weapons Area; and
 - The Avionics Maintenance Facility.
- Grade II Listed Structures within the Former RAF Upper Heyford:
 - Three Nose Docking Sheds;
 - Squadron Headquarters Building 234; and
 - Control Tower Building 340.
- Registered Parks and Gardens outside of Former RAF Upper Heyford:
 - Middleton Park (Grade II) (c.900m south of the Application Site); and
 - Rousham House with landscaped gardens (Grade I) (c.2km to the south west of the Application Site).
- Rousham Conservation Area, which lies immediately to the west of Former RAF Upper Heyford.

5.42 The Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Assessment contained in **ES Addendum Chapter 9** provides a proportionate level of detail to enable the significance of

the heritage assets affected by the Development Proposals to be comprehensively assessed in line with the requirements of **NPPF paragraph 189**.

- 5.43 The Assessment concludes that when coupled with the proposed mitigation, the effect of the Proposed Development (during construction and operation) upon the Character Areas, Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments within the former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area would be a slight to moderate adverse. The effect of the Proposed Development, following mitigation upon the Rousham Landscape and Conservation Area (during operation) is considered to be slight or at most moderate adverse.
- 5.44 In addition, the **Heritage Impact Assessment** identifies that in respect of the heritage harm identified, all fall within either the very lowest end of the spectrum or at the lower end of the spectrum of 'less than substantial harm' (whilst the Core Visitor Destination Area will have a beneficial impact on the buildings and will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area).
- 5.45 These levels of adverse effects and harm fall well below the threshold of substantial harm outlined in **NPPF paragraphs 194 and 195⁴** and therefore fall to be considered under the **NPPF paragraph 196** test concerning less than substantial harm being weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 5.46 With regard to heritage matters specifically as set out in **Policy Villages 5**, the first design and place shaping principle requires that proposals must demonstrate the conservation of heritage resources across the whole of the site as identified as **Policy Villages 5**. The proposed development continues a process of change for the site, which will involve some loss of buildings and changes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although many of the effects will be mitigated to a lower degree of significance, there will be an overall slight to moderate adverse effect for the Conservation Area as a result of the amount of change to designated heritage assets. This can nevertheless be balanced against the significant beneficial effect of increased public access to the site and the provision of information about its history and significance, and the results of the process of investigation and record being brought into the public domain.
- 5.47 The second design and place shaping principle in **Policy Villages 5** seeks to "focus" new development to the south of the flying field and on limited greenfield

⁴ The consideration of the NPPF paragraph 196 'less than substantial harm' test is undertaken later in this Planning Statement in Section 6.

land to the south and one area to the north of Camp Road, in order to avoid development on the most historically sensitive parts of the site. This principle has been respected in preparing the masterplan for the Proposed Development, with residential development largely focussed on greenfield land and, where it is necessary for new employment and residential development to be located on brownfield land, they have been situated towards the south of the flying field itself, so as to avoid significant impacts to the most historically sensitive parts of the site.

- 5.48 The third design and place shaping principle states that the areas proposed for development adjacent to the flying field will need special consideration to respect the historic significance and character of the taxiway and entrance to the flying field, with development kept back from the northern edge of the indicative development area. The Revised Application has reduced the number of dwellings proposed on Parcel 23 to 430⁵ in order to allow for a more flexible design approach. There has been ongoing dialogue with Cherwell District Council and Historic England since the submission of the Original Application in order to refine a design approach for the most appropriate areas for development, and it has been agreed by all parties that a Design Charrette approach will inform and then set out an appropriate design response for the more sensitive residential parcels located adjacent to the southern taxiway (Parcels 12, 21 and 23). Given that the planning application is in outline with all matters reserved for the new development parcels consisting of new built development, it is expected that the Design Charrette preferred approach will be incorporated into a set of design principles and parameters that will be incorporated into the S106 agreement.
- 5.49 The fourth design and place shaping principle states, inter alia, that the release of allocated greenfield land will not be allowed to compromise the necessary environmental improvements and conservation of heritage interest of the wider site. This principle has been adhered to, as is demonstrated in the accompanying Design and Access Statement. Further, it is proposed that all landowners make a reasonable and proportionate contribution towards the package of heritage interpretation measures as set out in the S106 Heads of Terms earlier in this Planning Statement.
- 5.50 The 15th design and place shaping principle seeks the preservation of the stark functional character and appearance of the flying field beyond the settlement

⁵ The Original Application had proposed 470 dwellings in Parcel 23.

area, including the retention of buildings of national interest which contribute to the area's character (with limited, fully justified exceptions) and sufficient low key use of these to enable appropriate management of this area. The vast majority of the former flying field will be maintained in its current state, with selective low key use of buildings many of which already have the benefit of planning permission for re-use. As noted in the **ES Addendum** in Chapter 9, all buildings of national interest are being retained. Further, as the ES Landscape and Visual impact assessment notes in Chapter 7, the intervisibility and interrelationship between the most sensitive Cold War receptors within the Application Site would be maintained with the Proposed Development in place.

5.51 The 16th design and place shaping principle seeks to achieve environmental improvements within the site and of views to it including removal of buildings or structures that do not make a positive contribution to the special character or which are justified on the grounds of adverse visual impact, including in proximity to the proposed settlement. The principal environmental improvement delivered by the Proposed Development will be allowing public access into the heart of the site adjacent to the main runway with enhanced visitor facilities in the Core Visitor Destination area. The Proposed Development has proposed a number of demolitions of modest structures within some the development parcels to facilitate new development⁶, but more generally the decision has been made to work with the existing heritage assets as far as possible and to re-use existing buildings. A good example of this approach is in the Creative City Parcel 22 where the existing Hardened Aircraft shelters are to be reused and, where new build additions are proposed, these are sited so as to maintain the original pattern and open central hardstanding area⁷.

5.52 The 19th design and place shaping principle requires visitor access, controlled where necessary to the historic and ecological assets of the site, including providing for interpretation. As noted above, the Proposed Development proposes creating a substantial new public Flying Field Park and Control Tower Park at the heart of the site, further controlled visitor access to specific areas of the Flying Field as a component of heritage tours, and a new Core Visitor Destination Area to the north of the southern taxiway reusing existing buildings and structures. Further details are set out in the accompanying Revised Application Heritage Vision statement.

⁶ See Schedule 1 which lists the various structures proposed to be demolished.

⁷ See Revised Application Design and Access Statement

- 5.53 The 23rd and 24th design and place shaping principles state that new development should reflect high quality design that responds to the established character of the distinct character areas where this would preserve or enhance the appearance of the various Conservation Areas in the locality of the application site. Again, as noted previously, the accompanying Revised Application Design and Access Statement sets out a design approach comprising of a character area approach towards the new development parcels, and as noted earlier, the applicant is committed to working with Cherwell District Council and Historic England via an ongoing Design Charrette process to secure an appropriate design response to the more sensitive new build parcels along the southern taxiway.
- 5.54 The 26th design and place shaping principle notes that the management of the flying field should preserve the Cold War character of this part of the site, and allow for public access. It also states that new built development on the flying field will be resisted to preserve the character of the area. This principle repeats the desire for preserving the Cold War character of the flying field and to allow for public access. As noted previously, the most significant parts of the flying field have been preserved and the intervisibility and interrelationship between the most sensitive Cold War receptors would be maintained with the Proposed Development in place. There are also significant gain proposed in terms of public access including the provision of the substantial and centrally located Flying Field Park the Control Tower Park.
- 5.55 However, the final element of this 26th design and place making principle is not, and was not, capable of being achieved. The Areas with Development Potential proposed by the Council in the adopted Local Plan Inset Map included two specific locations (Parcel 10 and Parcel 12) which demonstrably must have involved some 'new build development on the flying field' (assuming that the wording of this particular design and place making principle was to have meant the 'flying field' as previously defined in the previous 2010 lead appeal). If that assumption on definition of the 'flying field' and interpretation was indeed the case, then the policy would be rendered internally inconsistent and incoherent in this limited regard. A more reasonable interpretation of this policy must therefore be that the 'flying field' was to be redefined to the effect that it would be that part of Policy Villages 5 lying outside of the new settlement area as however delineated in response to this new policy. It is therefore open for the 'flying field' to be redefined to be that part of the former airfield site which would continue to lie outside of the new settlement.

- 5.56 Applying this interpretation to considering new built development on the flying field, the only two new built structures that are proposed on the newly refined and redefined 'flying field' would be the Observation Tower of up to 30m height to the south of the main runway and the proposed new primary school building proposed within Parcel 31 to meet the County Education Authority's requirements. The original ES, the ES Addendum heritage assessment, and the Heritage Impact Assessment have variously considered the impact of the Observation Tower and the new school building on the character and appearance of those parts of the Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area. They conclude that the Observation Tower would result in a slight adverse impact during construction and a moderate/slight beneficial impact during operation given the provision of a new aerial vantage point to appreciate the Cold War landscape; whilst the new school building in Parcel 31, with the associated demolition of Building 357, is assessed in the Heritage Impact Assessment as having less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at the very lower end of the scale.
- 5.57 With regard to heritage specifically, the 27th design and place shaping principle requires that a Heritage Impact Assessment should be undertaken as part of development proposals and inform the design principles for the site. Such an approach has been undertaken throughout the application process with the applicant involving liaison and consultation with Cherwell District Council and Historic England. A Heritage Impact Assessment has also been submitted with the Revised Application.
- 5.58 The 29th design and place shaping principle requires that proposals should provide for a heritage centre give the historic interest and Cold War associations of the site. A new heritage centre is included within the Proposed Development as part of the Core Visitor Destination Area in Parcel 29. Further details of the enhanced heritage and tourism vision are set out in the accompanying Revised Application Heritage Vision statement, and the operation of the centre is further set out in the Heritage Management Plan Heads of Terms which also accompany the Revised Application.
- 5.59 The 41st design and place shaping principle states that an archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of development on archaeological features will be required. A review of archaeological field evaluation on the site is contained within the accompanying Environmental Statement within Chapter 9.

5.60 In this manner, it has also been demonstrated that the Development Proposals will comply with the fifth bullet point of **Local Plan Policy ESD 15** which requires new development proposals to:

“Conserve, sustain and enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) including buildings, features, archaeology, conservation areas and their settings and ensure new development is sensitively sited and integrated in accordance with advice in the NPPF and NPPG.”

5.61 The Original Application had proposed a Sports Park towards the south west of the masterplan area which had the potential for some light pollution impact on the Rousham Conservation Area. This Sports Park has now been relocated in the Revised Application to the south east of the masterplan area and, as such, will no longer have any impact on Rousham Park. There is now full compliance with **saved Local Plan Policy C11** on Rousham Park whereby new buildings and structures will be strictly controlled to ensure that they are not visually prominent from the Park, and that the visual integrity of the Park has been given careful consideration where there is a change of use of agricultural land.

5.62 The preservation and safeguarding of the remaining heritage assets according with the requirements of **saved Local Plan Policies C23 and C25** has been considered under Policy Villages 5 above.

Landscape and Visual Amenity

5.63 **ES Chapter 7** and ES Addendum Chapter 7 provides a comprehensive assessment of the Landscape and Visual Amenity implications of the Revised Application and responds to the policy requirements set out in **Local Plan Policies ESD 13, BSC 10** and the key principles outlined in **Policy Villages 5** together with **saved Local Plan Policies C11 and C28** and the guidance in **NPPF Core Principles**.

5.64 With regard to landscape and visual amenity, **Policy Villages 5** requires in the first design and place shaping principle that proposals must demonstrate the conservation of landscape.

5.65 The Revised Application is accompanied by a comprehensive ES which considers potential effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and nature conservation in Chapter 8.

- 5.66 The seventh design and place shaping principle requires the retention and enhancement of existing Public Rights of Way, and the provision of links from the development to the wider Public Rights of Way network, including the reinstatement of the historic Portway route across the western end of the of the extended former main runway as a public right of way on its original alignment.
- 5.67 This requirement for an enhanced Public Rights of Way network is shown to be delivered in the Proposed Development by virtue of, amongst other matters, the reopening of the Aves Ditch route and the formation of new routes throughout the Proposed Development (the Portway route is already planned to be reopened under existing obligations which are in the process of being implemented by the Applicant). The accompanying Revised Application's Design and Access Statement in Section 4 demonstrates how the provision of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways and developing an integrated network has been an integral part of designing the infrastructure for the site.
- 5.68 The 22nd design and place shaping principle states that a full arboriculture survey should be undertaken to inform the masterplan, incorporating as many trees as possible and reinforcing the planting structure where required.
- 5.69 The planning application is accompanied by a full arboricultural survey in Appendix 3.1 of the Original Application's ES. In addition, as is explained in the accompanying Green Infrastructure Strategy, additional planting has been proposed in suitable strategic locations to reinforce the planting structure in a manner which is sympathetic and respects the overall character and appearance of the flying field and the Conservation Area designation.
- 5.70 Further, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Chapter 7 of the ES and ES Addendum notes that the Proposed Development would help to fulfil some of the Landscape Strategy guidelines sets out within the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Strategy, insofar as it would contribute to the objective 'establish tree belts around airfields' and notably 'maintain the sparsely settled rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development in and around existing settlements'.
- 5.71 The 25th design and place shaping principle states that development on greenfield land within Policy Villages 5 should provide for a well-designed, 'soft' approach to the urban edge with appropriate boundary treatments. This approach has been fully incorporated into relevant greenfield parcels across the Proposed

Development which include the provision of landscape frameworks and a lower density of residential development on the relevant housing parcels. Proposed planting, in accordance with the Green Infrastructure Strategy would help to integrate the Proposed Development with the existing landscape framework, fulfilling Landscape Strategy guidelines published by Oxfordshire County Council.

- 5.72 The 35th design and place shaping principle requires that public open space should be provided to form a well connected network of green areas, suitable for formal and informal recreation; whilst the 36th design and place shaping principle seeks the provision of Green Infrastructure links to the wider development area and open countryside. The accompanying Revised Application Green Infrastructure Strategy develops an approach which fully accords with these 35th and 36th design and place shaping principles and demonstrates how this Green Infrastructure approach can be delivered by the Proposed Development.
- 5.73 With regard to **Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement**, the policy seeks opportunities to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape through the restoration, management or enhancement of existing landscapes, features or habitats and where appropriate, the creation of new ones, including the planting of woodland, trees and hedgerows. It has been demonstrated in the accompanying Revised Application Green Infrastructure Strategy and also the Environmental Statement and ES Addendum Chapter 7 that the Proposed Development will provide opportunities to enhance the character and appearance of the landscape, including significant opportunities to plant new trees and hedgerows as appropriate whilst working with and integrating with the existing landscape framework evident at the site.
- 5.74 Policy ESD 13 also requires in the second paragraph that development respects and enhances the local landscape character. It has been demonstrated in the accompanying Environmental Statement and ES Addendum Chapter 7 that the Proposed Development is appropriate to the character of the local landscape of the site and offers suitable landscape mitigation in terms of visual and landscape amenity.
- 5.75 Finally, Policy ESD 13 states that development proposals should have regard to the Councils' Countryside Design Summary Supplementary Planning Guidance, and the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study, and be accompanied by a landscape assessment where appropriate. Again, as has been previously noted,

the application is accompanied by a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in the accompanying ES, and the aforementioned guidance has helped to inform the accompanying Green Infrastructure Strategy.

5.76 **Policy BSC 10: Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision** encourages sufficient quantity and quality of, and convenient access to open space, sport and recreation provision through, inter alia, ensuring that proposals for new development contribute to open space, sport and recreation provision commensurate to the need generated by the proposals.

5.77 The accompanying Revised Application's Green Infrastructure Strategy, and also the Revised Application's Design and Access Statement, demonstrate how the Proposed Development will deliver the required standards of open space, sport and recreation provision in an appropriate and readily accessible manner.

5.78 **Policy BSC 11: Local Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation** and **Policy BSC 12: Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities** both set out guidance and thresholds for the provision of varying facilities. The accompanying Revised Application's Design and Access Statement and Green Infrastructure Strategy set out the suggested provision that will be made as part of a coherent and integrated approach across the Proposed Development in order to meet these policies' requirements.

5.79 In this manner the Development Proposals are fully in accordance with the landscape parameters set out in **Local Plan Policy ESD 13**, the **Key site specific and place shaping principles 1, 7, 22, 25, 35 and 36 of Policy Villages 5**, as well as the recreation objectives contained in **Local Plan Policy BSC 10, BSC 11** and **BSC 12**.

5.80 The **Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan** made in May 2019 identifies a zone of non-coalescence in **Policy PD3** and this is respected by the Proposed Development which does not encroach upon the identified Zone. Off-site ecological mitigation is proposed in part of this Zone which is entirely consistent with this Policy.

Ecology and Biodiversity

5.81 With regard to ecology and biodiversity interests, **Policy Villages 5** requires in the first design and place shaping principle that proposals must demonstrate enhancement of biodiversity will be achieved across the whole of the site. This

consideration is repeated in the 17th such principle where a net gain in biodiversity is again stated as being sought.

5.82 The application is accompanied by a comprehensive ES and ES Addendum which considers potential effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and nature conservation in Chapter 8.

5.83 Whilst a number of adverse effects of significance at a site level in the absence of mitigation have been identified in the ES (in respect of certain grassland habitats, reptiles, great crested newts, and breeding birds⁸), a number of mitigation and enhancement to compensate for these adverse effects have been proposed as part of the Proposed Development.

5.84 Specifically, the ES sets out in Section 8.6 further mitigation and enhancement for these otherwise adverse effects, which encompasses measures to avoid, minimise or compensate for residual impacts of the proposed development beyond that already included in design mitigation. These include:

- The creation of up to 27.35ha of unimproved calcareous grassland which currently supports arable farming located adjacent to the western edge of the Application Site;
- Additionally, a total of 31.21ha of species-poor semi-improved grassland will be brought under management to increase its diversity:
- Creation of a permanent cat proof fence along the northern edges of Parcels 30 and 28, and northern and eastern edge of Parcel 23, continuing along the southern edge of Parcel 24, such that the risk of predation by domestic cats on reptiles, great crested newts and breeding birds north of Parcel 28 is unlikely to materially increase.
- to mitigate for potential effects of disturbance on breeding curlew from the proposed filming use of Parcel 27, a LEMP will set out prescriptions which will dictate the types of activities to be avoided and periods when no activity on the filming area will be allowed.

5.85 More detail is set out in the ES and is updated in the ES Addendum with regard to each of these proposed mitigation measures.

⁸ See Table 8.2a of the ES Addendum Chapter 8 which sets out a summary of the significance of the effects in the absence of specific mitigation.

- 5.86 Overall, the change in biodiversity value has been calculated through the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator as is explained in the ES Addendum Chapter 8. Including the mitigation proposals will result in a final Habitat Biodiversity Impact Score of +10.84, which indicates that the Proposed Development will deliver a net gain in biodiversity⁹. The requirements within **Policy Villages 5** for a net gain in biodiversity will therefore be achieved.
- 5.87 The **Policy Villages 5** 17th design and placemaking principle also requires appropriate management and the submission of an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan. As is explained in ES Addendum Chapter 8 on Ecology, a LEMP is to be submitted and agreed by the Council and this submission and agreement by the LPA can be secured by way of a planning condition. The Proposed Development will therefore comply with this requirement.
- 5.88 The **Policy Villages 5** 18th design and placemaking principle requires that development should preserve and enhance the Local Wildlife Site, including the new extension to the south. As the ES Addendum Chapter 8 notes, there would be a reduction in the extent of the Local Wildlife Site, however the grassland habitat lost will be compensated for by the creation of 27.31ha of unimproved calcareous grassland habitat with good connectivity to existing grassland habitat within the Application Site, and a further 31.21ha of grassland enhancement. As such, and as already noted, there will be an overall net gain in biodiversity as a result of the Proposed Development.
- 5.89 With regard to **Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment**, a further 12 criteria are stipulated. Taking each in turn:
- A net gain in biodiversity will be achieved as noted above;
 - The number of trees will be significantly increased due to the Proposed Development establishing a number of strategic buffers in appropriate locations, these are detailed in the accompanying Green Infrastructure Strategy;
 - Soils will be reused as appropriate on the site as part of the Proposed Development. This is matter that can be the subject of a planning condition;

⁹ See ES Addendum Chapter 8, Section 8.9, paragraph 8.9.4

- The adverse impact on biodiversity has been adequately mitigated and compensated for, such that there has been an increase in net biodiversity;
- There is no damage or loss to a site of international value;
- There is no damage or loss to a site of national importance in terms of biodiversity or geological value;
- Whilst there would be some damage to a site of biodiversity value of regional or local significance, the case is made that the benefits arising from the Proposed Development would clearly outweigh the harm it would cause to the site (principally by virtue of the delivery of a strategic housing and employment allocation) and the loss can be mitigated so as to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. This policy test is therefore capable of being met, although this does involve a balanced planning judgement, and is one that is returned to in the concluding section of this Statement;
- The Proposed Development includes provision of features to encourage biodiversity, including the retention of significant areas of nature conservation value, retention and enhancement of ecological corridors as an integral component of the wider Green Infrastructure provision as evidenced in the accompanying Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- A comprehensive set of ecological and habitat surveys accompanies the planning application, as evidenced in the baseline assessment work undertaken as part of the accompanying ES;
- An air quality assessment has been undertaken as part of the accompanying ES;
- The applicant is content to have appropriate planning conditions/obligations imposed to secure a net gain in biodiversity; and
- The requirement for monitoring and a management plan is noted and agreed so as to ensure the suitable long term management of the site.

5.90 Therefore, the various requirements of **Policy ESD 10** are either met or are capable of being met by the Proposed Development.

5.91 With regard to **Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas**, this applies to where development is proposed within or adjacent to a Conservation Target Area.

As noted in the ES Chapter 8, this is not the case in respect of the Application Site, albeit there are two designated Conservation Target Areas within 2km of the site. Nevertheless, the objectives behind this Policy will not be harmed by the Proposed Development.

5.92 **Policy ESD 17: Green Infrastructure** identifies measures to maintain and support the District's Green Infrastructure network. As is demonstrated in the accompanying Green Infrastructure Strategy, careful consideration has been given to developing a green infrastructure network which is integral to the planning of the new development. Opportunities have been taken to maintain and extend green infrastructure links to form a multi-functional network of open space, providing opportunities for walking and cycling and connecting to the wider countryside beyond.

5.93 Sites of importance for nature conservation have been protected as far as possible in the Proposed Development and, where unavoidable harm has been identified, a range of mitigation and compensation measures have been identified that will result in a net gain in biodiversity.

5.94 The Proposed Development therefore gains **support** from **Policy ESD 17**.

5.95 The **Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan** made in May 2019 identifies a zone of non-coalescence in **Policy PD3** to the west of Heyford Park which expressly allows for ecological mitigation within this identified zone.

Social and Community

5.96 With regard to social and community considerations, **Policy Villages 5** through the 29th Design and Place Making Principle requires that a neighbourhood centre or hub should be established at the heart of the settlement to comprise a community hall, place of worship, shops, public house, restaurant, and social and health care facilities¹⁰.

5.97 The Proposed Development responds in a positive manner to address the need for social and community facilities in the following manner:

- The existing consented Village Centre South scheme (which comprises of a hotel, restaurant/bar and a market hall link) and the approved reserved

¹⁰ This 29th Design and Place Making Principle also states that proposals should provide for a heritage centre given the historic interest and Cold War associations of the site; this matter has been considered previously under the Heritage considerations section of this Planning Statement

matters approval for Village Centre North (comprising of retail units and a foodstore with residential apartments above, and use of Building 100 for B1 purposes) is being complemented by the provision of a further mixed use area comprising a mix of A1-A5, D1 and D2 uses on Parcel 38. This includes provision of up to 925 sq.m of community buildings (Class D2) located on Parcel 38 and also Parcel 34 adjacent to the proposed Sports Park;

- The creation of a new medical centre up to 670 m² (Class D1) on Parcel 20;

5.98 All the facilities listed in the 29th Design and Place Making Principle are therefore proposed to be met in the Proposed Development. Further details are contained in Section 4 of the accompanying Revised Application's Design and Access Statement and will be secured as appropriate through S106 obligations as summarised in Section 5 of this Statement.

5.99 **Policy Villages 5** also requires that education facilities be provided, including provision of a 2.2 ha site for a new 1.5 form of entry primary school with potential for future expansion. This requirement is proposed to be located on Parcel 31 and the Revised Application proposes a new school building of up to 2,415m², with the additional change of use of Building 2004 to Class D1 use to enable its use for education purposes as part of the overall school site of 2.4ha.

5.100 Secondary school provision will be enhanced by extensions to the existing Free School sites as noted in the Planning Obligations Heads of Terms set out in Section 4 of this Statement. The Proposed Development includes provision for up to 2,520 m² of additional facilities on the two current Free School sites (in Parcel 32 west and east).

5.101 The **Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan** made in May 2019 also supports the provision of a new health facility in **Policy PC2**.

Transport and Access

5.102 Matters of Transport and Access are considered by way of the Transport Assessment contained in **ES Addendum Chapter 6**.

5.103 With regard to **Policy Villages 5**, there are eight Design and Place Making Principles that particularly relate to transport and access matters.

- 5.104 The 5th Design and Place Making Principle states that *'The settlement should be designed to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport, with the provision of footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks'*. The accompanying Revised Application's Design and Access Statement in Section 4 demonstrates how the provision of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways and developing an integrated network has been an integral part of the infrastructure for the site. Provision for public transport has also been designed from the outset in discussion with Oxfordshire County Council to design routes suitable for bus services with run through the development.
- 5.105 The 6th Design and Place Making Principle requires that development should include layouts that maximise the potential for walkable neighbourhoods with a legible hierarchy of routes. As noted above, the Revised Application's Design and Access Statement at Section 4 describes the development of a pedestrian network within the site, including proposals for a variety of walking routes and opportunities. These include the Upper Heyford Trail, comprising of a circular walk around the Flying Field perimeter and an off-road north-south linear pedestrian route from the existing Trident area direct to the Destination Park providing a safe and convenient route for pedestrians.
- 5.106 New walking opportunities will be provided within the Destination Park itself.
- 5.107 Furthermore, a number of measures are to be provided to provide good accessibility by foot and cycle across the development, including ensuring low traffic speeds within internal road layouts, sufficient 'overlooking' and surveillance of routes to provide a sense of safety and security for users, and appropriate signage and crossing points of roads through the development.
- 5.108 The 7th Design and Place Making Principle seeks the retention and enhancement of existing Public Rights of Way, and the provision of links from the development to the wider Public Rights of Way network, and the reinstatement of the Portway route across the western end of the site. The Revised Application's Composite Parameter Plan includes reinstating the historic route of the Portway, and also an eastern alignment along part of the former Aves Ditch, which will provide links from Camp Road to the circular Upper Heyford Trail.
- 5.109 The 8th Design and Place Making Principle requires that layouts should enable a high degree of integration with development areas with connectivity between new

and existing communities. This will be achieved, for the reasons as already noted under the 6th Design and Place Making Principle.

5.110 The 9th Design and Place Making Principle requires that measures to minimise the impact of traffic generated by the development on the surrounding road network will be required through funding and/or physical works. The accompanying updated **Transport Assessment Addendum** and the **ES Addendum Chapter 6** consider in considerable detail the likely effects of the increase in traffic on the surrounding road network. The overall effect of the Proposed Development on pedestrians and cyclists, including pedestrian amenity and delay is likely to be minor and beneficial as a result of the proposed improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure in the area. A package of highway improvements and travel planning has been identified and is being agreed with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), Highways England (HE) and Cherwell District Council (CDC). These measures will mitigate the effects of traffic generated by the Proposed Development within the application site such that the effect on driver delay should not be significant.

5.111 Highway improvement measures on the wider network have been identified in technical consultation with Highways England and Oxfordshire County Council at the following off-site highway network and junctions:

- safety improvements contribution to A4260/B4027;
- Middleton Stony junction improvements;
- Ardley/Bucknell junction improvements;
- B430/minor road junction improvements;
- Chilgrove Drive S278 scheme;
- M40 Junction 10 improvements; and
- contributions towards rural traffic calming schemes, including Lower Heyford, Ardley, Somerton and Fritwell.

5.112 Further details of the transport modelling and mitigation package is set out in the accompanying **Transport Assessment Addendum** appended to the Revised Application **ES Addendum**.

5.113 The 10th Design and Place Making Principle requires provision for good accessibility to public transport services and a plan for public transport provision. As explained in the **ES Transport and Access ES Addendum Chapter 6**, a number of measures are proposed to enhance accessibility to public transport. These include:

- provision of new bus stops;
- contributions towards public transport in the form of a bus service contribution and bus infrastructure to agreed amounts.

5.114 The public transport strategy will be subject to refinement as the development progresses and the public transport measures will be secured by way of S106 obligations.

5.115 The 12th Design and Place Making Principle states that a Travel Plan should accompany any development proposals. A full Residential Travel Plan and a full Commercial Travel Plan have been prepared and were submitted with the Original Application as part of the accompanying Transport Assessment. Further work has been undertaken by the Applicant's team with Oxfordshire County Council's travel plan team to prepare a revised Framework Travel Plan which will be submitted for approval.

5.116 The 14th Design and Place Making Principle seeks the integration of the new community into the surrounding network of settlements by reopening historic routes and encouraging travel by means other than the private car as far as possible. These requirements will be met as have already been noted above, in that the Portway and Aves Ditch will be reopened as part of the Proposed Development, and there are improvements proposed to the walking, cycling and equestrian routes, as well as a package of public transport measures.

5.117 Turning to consider **Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport Connections**, as has already been noted above, the Proposed Development will make financial or in-kind contributions to mitigate the transport impacts of the development; and the development facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. It has been demonstrated in the Transport Assessment that, subject to a package of mitigation measures, the roads that serve the development will not experience a severe traffic impact.

5.118 The Development Proposals are therefore fully in accordance with the requirements of **NPPF paragraph 32** and relevant **site specific and place shaping principles 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 14 of Policy Villages 5**. They also accord with **Policy SLE 4**.

Flood Risk and Drainage

5.119 With regard to flood risk and drainage, **Policy Villages 5** requires under the 37th Design and Place Making Principle that account should be taken of the Council's Flood Risk Assessment for the site.

5.120 The Revised Application is accompanied by an updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (**see ES Addendum, Appendix 10.1**) with an assessment of the potential effects on surface and groundwater more generally also undertaken (**see ES Addendum, Chapter 10**).

5.121 The FRA confirms that the entirety of the Application Site is within Flood Zone 1 and at low/negligible risk of flooding from all assessed potential sources of flood risk.

5.122 The surface water drainage system to be installed as part of the Proposed Development will intercept and manage rainfall run-off and discharge surface water to the surrounding streams, at rates equivalent to a pre-development/undeveloped scenario. Accordingly, the effect of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development on surface water drainage was considered to be of 'negligible' significance in the ES.

5.123 Accordingly, the Proposed Development will be in accord with the relevant criteria contained in **Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management** in that the planning application is accompanied by and the design informed by a site-specific FRA, that development represents appropriate development in the context of its nature and the existing flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and therefore would not give rise to flooding either within the Application Site or elsewhere.

5.124 The 38th Design and Place Making Principle requires the provision of sustainable drainage including SuDs. The inclusion of SuDS principles within the Proposed Development accords with **Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs)**.

5.125 In addition, the Development Proposals are in further compliance with **Policy ESD 10** in that the proposed surface water drainage strategy includes a SuDS treatment mechanism to minimise the risk of pollution from surface waters affecting watercourses.

Sustainability and Energy

5.126 With regard to specific sustainability and energy considerations, **Policy Villages 5** requires under the 39th Design and Place Making Principle seeks the demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary compliance with the requirements of polices ESD 1-5.

5.127 A Sustainability and Energy Statement accompanied the Original Application which considered how the Proposed Development would be designed to comply with national and local policies relating to environmental sustainability, energy use and efficiency and carbon dioxide emissions.

5.128 The Sustainability & Energy Statement demonstrates how the proposed development aligns with the range of local sustainability objectives, including:

- Optimising energy demand where possible, through using the nationally recognised energy hierarchy principles, and through masterplan design principles such as orientation of buildings and incorporation of open spaces;
- Providing a proportion of the development's energy supply by potentially using low carbon and renewable energy sources that are feasible at the Site, such as Solar PV panels, solar water heating, or air source heat pumps;
- Making provision for an energy facility within the masterplan to facilitate future potential on site energy generation, subject to feasibility;
- Appropriate surface water management to protect the receiving waters from pollution and reduce the risk of flooding, including the use of permeable paving SuDS;
- Protecting local air quality and limiting noise and lighting pollution, by providing mitigation measures to minimise potential polluting effects across the construction and operational phases of the development;

- Appropriate management of construction and operational waste by managing material extraction, sustainable transport of materials, managing construction waste through a potential SWMP, and managing operational waste in line with CDC's waste collection requirements;
- Retaining, enhancing and creating new habitats to preserve the ecological setting of the Site, through several measures including the creation of up to 30 ha of grassland habitat to support a range of taxa such as reptiles, breeding birds (including skylark and potentially curlew), invertebrates, bats and other mammals;
- Reducing the consumption of natural resources and greenhouse gas emissions through sustainable energy, water and materials procurement strategies, as well as considerate construction practices; and
- Promoting sustainable travel modes (including walking, cycling and public transport) as an alternative to private car use and enhancing existing services, such as new bus services and shared footways/cycle ways to promote active travel.

5.129 In this manner the Development Proposals comply with **Policies ESD 1, ESD 2, ESD 3, ESD 4 and ESD 5** and the associated **Design and Place Shaping Principles 38 and 39 of Policy Villages 5**.

5.130 The 40th Design and Place Making Principle requires the investigation of the potential to utilise heat from the Ardley Energy Recovery facility. As is recorded in the Original Application's Sustainability and Energy Statement¹¹, a previous study in 2014 has investigated the potential to supply heat from Ardley EfW to the Upper Heyford site which showed that such a connection would not be financially viable and has not therefore been considered further. The **Policy Villages 5** requirement to assess the potential has therefore been fulfilled.

Summary

5.131 The above analysis and consideration of compliance with policies of the Development Plan has identified compliance, save for limited conflict with heritage design and place making principles embedded within the 42 such principles set out in Policy Villages 5.

¹¹ Sustainability and Energy Statement, paragraphs 4.3.2 - 4.3.3

5.132 The following section of the Statement proceeds to consider an overall planning balance which should be applied in determining this planning application.

6. THE OVERALL PLANNING BALANCE

6.1 This section of the Planning Statement explains how the decision maker should approach the determination of this application, before going on to identify the issues that need to be weighed in the overall planning balance.

The Decision Making Framework

6.2 If it is demonstrated that the proposals accord with the Development Plan then they should be approved without delay, in accordance with the normal operation of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and NPPF paragraph 11 paragraph (c).

6.3 Even if the decision maker were to consider that there is some conflict with any part of the Development Plan, then consideration needs to be given as to whether NPPF paragraph 11 (d) is engaged.

6.4 It is noted that there are restrictive policies applying for the purposes of NPPF footnote 6 (i.e. designated heritage assets), and it therefore appropriate at this point to consider whether the proposed development accords with the NPPF provisions with regard to the historic environment in the first instance.

Designated Heritage Assets and NPPF Paragraph 14 Footnote 9 Assessment

6.5 The accompanying ES in Chapter 9, ES Addendum in Chapter 9, the Schedule of Significances for Buildings to be Demolished, and the Heritage Impact Assessments, taken together provides information with regard to the significance of the historic environment and fulfils the requirement given in NPPF paragraph 189 which requires the applicant *"to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting"*. As is also required by paragraph 189, the detail and assessment set out in the above heritage-related documentation is considered to be *"proportionate to the asset's importance"*.

6.6 Assessment of any harm will be articulated in this Planning Statement in terms of the policy and law that the proposed development will be assessed against, such as whether a proposed development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, and articulating the scale of any harm in order to inform a balanced judgement/weighing exercise as required by the NPPF.

6.7 In order to relate to key policy, the following levels of harm may potentially be identified:

- **Substantial harm or total loss.** It has been clarified in a High Court Judgement of 2013¹² that this would be harm that would “*have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced*”; and
- **Less than substantial harm.** Harm of a lesser level than that defined above.

6.8 It is also possible that development proposals will cause **no harm or preserve** the significance of heritage assets. A High Court Judgement of 2014 is relevant to this¹³. This concluded that with regard to preserving the setting of a Listed building or preserving the character and appearance of a Conservation Area, ‘preserving’ means doing ‘no harm’.

6.9 Preservation does not mean no change; it specifically means no harm. *GPA 2: Managing Significance* states that “*Change to heritage assets is inevitable but it is only harmful when significance is damaged*”. Thus, change is accepted in Historic England’s guidance as part of the evolution of the landscape and environment. It is whether such change is neutral, harmful or beneficial to the significance of an asset that matters.

6.10 As part of this, setting may be a key consideration. For an evaluation of any harm to significance through changes to setting, this assessment follows the methodology given in *GPA 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets*, described above. Again, fundamental to the methodology set out in this document is stating ‘*what matters and why*’. Of particular relevance is the checklist given on page 13 of *GPA 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets*.

6.11 It should be noted that this document states that:

“setting is not itself a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation”¹⁴

6.12 Hence any impacts are described in terms of how they affect the significance of a heritage asset, and heritage values that contribute to this significance, through changes to setting.

¹² EWHC 2847, R DCLG and Nuon UK Ltd v. Bedford Borough Council

¹³ EWHC 1895, R (Forge Field Society, Barraud and Rees) v. Sevenoaks DC, West Kent Housing Association and Viscount De L’Isle

¹⁴ Historic England, 2017, *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition): The Setting of Heritage Assets (paragraph 9)*

- 6.13 With regards to changes in setting, GPA 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets states that *"conserving or enhancing heritage assets by taking their settings into account need not prevent change"*.
- 6.14 Additionally, it is also important to note that, as clarified in the Court of Appeal¹⁵, whilst the statutory duty requires that special regard should be paid to the desirability of not harming the setting of a Listed Building, that cannot mean that any harm, however minor, would necessarily require planning permission to be refused.
- 6.15 Proposed development may also result in benefits to heritage assets, and these are articulated in terms of how they enhance the heritage values and hence significance of the assets concerned.
- 6.16 In considering whether the Proposed Development will cause harm, the ES Addendum Chapter 9 and the Heritage Impact Assessment together comprehensively consider the impacts of the Revised Application on heritage assets.
- 6.17 The ES Addendum assessment concludes that, after mitigation and enhancement measures, there will be the following adverse residual effects:
- **Slight to Moderate adverse** effects on the Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area as a result of new buildings, increased visitor traffic and changes to the character of different Character Areas within the conservation area;
 - **Slight to Moderate adverse** effects on the Rousham Conservation Area as a result of light pollution arising from the Proposed Development;
 - **Moderate to Large, and Large, adverse** effects resulting from the relocation of the car processing area to an area of **National Significance** comprising the setting of the Avionics building and the HAS structures to the north;
 - a number of **Slight adverse** effects following mitigation/enhancement measures, including to the setting inside sub-Character Areas of **national significance** on the Flying Field resulting from the proposed new Observation Tower and zip-wire, increased numbers or visitors and activity levels and visibility of proposed visitor attractions, the relocation of the car processing area, the proposed filming activities, and the new housing proposed in Parcel 10, redevelopment of area in vicinity of the Battle Command Centre (Scheduled Monument), the Hardened Telephone Exchange (Scheduled Monument), the Avionics Building (Scheduled Monument) and the setting of listed Nose Dock sheds (Listed buildings);
 - one **Moderate adverse impact** arising to **regional significance** heritage asset from the demolition of the A Frame hangar Building 151 in the Technical area;

¹⁵ Palmer v Herefordshire Council & Anor [2016] EWCA Civ 1061 (04 November 2016)

- one **Minor adverse impact** arising to a **national significance** heritage asset from the demolition of Building 357;
- one **Moderate adverse impact** arising to a **national significance** heritage asset from the demolition of Building 370;
- a number of **Slight adverse impacts** on sub-Character Areas of **regional significance** arising from impact to military character from proposals in adjoining areas, proposed changes of use in the Core Visitor Destination Area and visitor numbers, filming activities, residential development in Parcels 12 and 21, new residential properties resulting in loss of character, and additional facilities for the school;
- a number of **minor adverse impacts** on sub-Character Areas of **local significance** arising from the establishment of a zip wire, filming activities, relocation of the car processing area, residential development in Parcels 10, 11, 12, 16, and 23, creation of sports park in Parcel 18, close care dwellings in Parcel 19, medical centre in Parcel 20.

6.18 The guidance set out within the PPG states that substantial harm is a high test, and that it may not arise in many cases. Whilst the Proposed Development seeks a number of changes which will affect heritage assets across what is a very large application site of some 450 ha, the PPG makes it clear that it is the degree of harm to the significance of the asset rather than the scale of development which is to be assessed. In addition, it has been clarified in both a High Court Judgement of 2013¹⁶ that substantial harm would be harm that would “*have such a serious impact on the significance of the asset that its significance was either vitiated altogether or very much reduced*”.

6.19 As such, it is considered that the adverse effects on the built heritage of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area (including the Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments contained therein) will be, at worst, Slight to Moderate adverse with a number of minor adverse effects to specific areas of the site of varying levels of significance.

6.20 Further, reference to the conclusions of the accompanying Heritage Impact Assessment indicates that the harm caused will also be at the very lowest, or lowest, end of the spectrum of ‘less than substantial harm’:

Building 133 (Parcel 40)

- Less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at the very lower end of the spectrum.
- No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

Building 151 (Parcel 19)

- Less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at the lower end of the spectrum.

¹⁶ EWHC 2847, R DCLG and Nuon UK Ltd v. Bedford Borough Council

- No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

Buildings 549 & 572 (Parcel 39)

- Less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at the very lower end of the spectrum.
- No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

Nose Dock Sheds

- Less than substantial harm to the Listed Buildings via change to setting at the lower end of the spectrum (albeit entirely reversible).

Parcel 21 (inc demo of Building 370)

- Less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area towards the lower end of the spectrum of the spectrum.
No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

Parcel 22 (Creative City)

- Less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at the lower end of the spectrum.
- No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

Parcel 23 (Southern Bomb Stores)

- Less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at the lower end of the spectrum.
- No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

Parcel 29 (Core Visitor Destination Area)

- Beneficial impact on the buildings (as non-designated heritage assets).
- Enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

Parcel 31 (Education Site) (inc. demo of Building 357)

- Less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area at the very lower end of the spectrum.
- No impact on any of the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments across the site.

6.21 Having regard to the heritage impact analysis in the ES Addendum and the Heritage Impact Assessment, it is therefore concluded that the level of harm identified, although of significant weight in certain instances, falls well short of what may be properly regarded as substantial harm to any of the identified heritage assets taken as a whole, as the significance of the whole of the Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation, nor the Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments contained therein is neither vitiated altogether nor is very much reduced. Neither does the adverse effect vitiate or very much reduce the significance of the Rousham Conservation Area and Landscape. The relevant test in the NPPF therefore falls to be considered under NPPF paragraph 196.

6.22 As noted previously, NPPF paragraph 196 applies a planning balance whereby the *'less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset... should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'*

6.23 In the case of the Revised Application, there are a considerable range of public benefits, both heritage and non-heritage related which are summarised below and articulated in greater detail later in this Section of the Planning Statement:-

- Cultural and educational benefits arising from increased facilities and numbers of visitors to the site, assessed as a **major beneficial effect** in an area of **national significance** from a heritage perspective;
- Relocation of car processing site and retention and reuse of hangers, a **minor beneficial effect** in an area of **national significance** from a heritage perspective;
- The reuse and maintenance of buildings in the former Victor Alert area, a **moderate beneficial effect** in an area of **regional importance** from a heritage perspective;
- The removal of the existing car processing area away from the southern taxiway, a **moderate beneficial effect** in an area of **local significance** from a heritage perspective;
- Securing the future reuse and maintenance of HAS buildings 3052 -3055; assessed as a **major beneficial effect** in an area of **national significance** from a heritage perspective;
- New use of HAS buildings 3036-3042 with removal of car processing activities, a **moderate beneficial effect** in an area of **national significance** from a heritage perspective;
- **Significant social benefits** arising from the provision of 823 new **open market homes**, significantly boosting the supply of housing, which is of importance to maintaining the Council's districtwide housing trajectory in representing between 7% and 30% of the Council's any one year supply of housing up to 2031;
- **Significant social benefits** arising from the delivery of 352 new **affordable homes**;
- **Significant social benefits** arising from the **expenditure on construction and investment in the area**, including 518 direct construction roles and indirect/induced jobs supported pa during the construction phase;
- **Moderate economic benefits** resulting from the provision of homes for **economically active people** which will increase annual household expenditure by £38.6m per annum;
- **Significant economic benefits** arising from supporting the delivery of **new employment comprising of 1,450 FTE jobs** directly supported on site, worth £800m to the economic output contribution over a 10 year period;
- **Limited economic benefits** arising from provision of **60 close care units**, resulting in £12.5m worth of health savings over a 10 year period from reduced GP visits, hospital admissions and care home costs.

- **Moderate environmental benefits** arising from provision of substantial areas of **public open space/green infrastructure**, including the provision of a Flying Field Park (which is greater in scale than the Spice Ball Country Park in Banbury);
- **Moderate environmental benefits** arising from enhancements to biodiversity and substantial areas of native planting in appropriate areas of the perimeter of the Flying Field.

6.24 In addition, the **ES Addendum** in Chapter 9 Table 9.32a identifies a considerable number of **Slight to Moderate beneficial effects** across **National, Regional and Local Significance** sub areas of the Conservation Area resulting from the measures intended to facilitate wider public appreciation of the Cold War Heritage and the central area of the Flying field.

6.25 There are further **Slight to Moderate Beneficial** effects identified to be derived from the continued use and maintenance of various structures in areas of **National** and **Local-Regional** significance.

6.26 It is therefore considered that, even when applying significant weight to the harm variously identified to the designated heritage assets (as required by the Planning Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act), the test applied in NPPF paragraph 196 is carried in favour of the Revised Application's Proposed Development given the substantial weight attached to the heritage, social, economic and environmental benefits which the proposed development would deliver. The various harms identified to the designated heritage assets are clearly and demonstrably outweighed by the public benefits.

Summary on approach to Decision Making Framework

6.27 Specifically with regard to legislation relating to the Built Historic Environment, this is primarily set out within the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* which provides statutory protection for Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

6.28 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:

"In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State, shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

6.29 In the 2014 Court of Appeal judgement in relation to the Barnwell Manor case¹⁷, Sullivan LJ held that:

“Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given “considerable importance and weight” when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise.”

6.30 Recent judgement in the Court of Appeal¹⁸ (‘Mordue’) has clarified that, with regards to the setting of Listed Buildings, where the principles of the NPPF are applied (in particular paragraph 196, see below), this is in keeping with the requirements of the 1990 Act. Therefore, having passed the NPPF paragraph 196 test for the reasons noted above, the requirements of Section 66(1) will have also been met.

6.31 With regards to development within Conservation Areas, Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

“In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

6.32 Scheduled Monuments are protected by the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 which relates to nationally important archaeological sites. Whilst works to Scheduled Monuments are subject to a high level of protection, it is important to note that there is no statutory duty within the 1979 Act to have regard to the desirability of preservation of the setting of a Scheduled Monument.

6.33 Notwithstanding the statutory presumption set out within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Area) Act 1990, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that all planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.34 Having set out the framework for decision making, the positive benefits and adverse effects are identified which should be taken into account in reaching an

¹⁷ East Northamptonshire District Council v SSCLG (2015) EWCA Civ 137

¹⁸ Jones v Mordue Anor (2015) EWCA Civ 1243

overall planning balance in the event that the Proposed Development is found not to comply with the Development Plan taken overall.

The benefits associated with Proposed Development

6.35 If the Proposed Development were granted planning permission, it would secure important benefits that would respond to all three dimensions of sustainable development (social, economic and environmental) as summarised below.

The social benefits

6.36 Significant weight should be afforded to the provision of **open market homes**. Appeal Inspectors have consistently attached significant weight to this in other appeal decisions recognising the inadequate levels of house building in recent years, which is affecting the availability and affordability of housing across the country.

6.37 We are in a continuing housing crisis and the NPPF includes the Government's national policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing where it is needed (NPPF paragraph 59). The Proposed Development would deliver homes where they are needed, consistent with this objective.

6.38 As well increasing the availability of open market housing, the proposals would make provision for a significant number of new **affordable homes** (352 dwellings) and this should also be afforded significant weight.

6.39 Achieving the delivery rates of new housing, both open market and affordable, at Heyford Park is of strategic importance to the Council in terms of its overall spatial strategy, given that away from Banbury and Bicester, *'the major single location for growth will be at the former RAF Upper Heyford base which will deliver 3,361 homes.'*¹⁹

6.40 This importance is reflected in the Local Plan Housing Trajectory 2011-2031, which identifies over the period 2018/19 – 2025/26, 150 dwellings completion, which continue to the end of the plan period at 2030/31 at between 141-140 dwellings. In terms of overall significance to the district-wide housing trajectory, the Heyford Park site is expected to deliver between c.7% and 30% in any one of year of Cherwell's housing land supply.

¹⁹ Paragraph A.11, 4th bullet point, Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, July 2015

- 6.41 The Proposed Development also provides for significant **new community infrastructure**. This includes the creation of a new medical centre up to 670 m² and new retail provision of up to 929 sq.m, in addition to new sports facilities and community buildings. These proposed facilities have been strongly supported by the local community as evidenced in the accompanying Community Engagement Report and is therefore a matter which should be afforded moderate weight.
- 6.42 The Proposed Development will also result in **improved walking, cycleway and equestrian opportunities** through enhancements to on site and where appropriate funding for off site enhancements. A number of measures are also proposed to enhance public transport accessibility both within the site and through onward bus services. Given the lack of availability of public funds for maintaining rural public transport at the present time, this commitment to service provision should also be afforded moderate weight.

Economic Benefits

- 6.43 Significant weight should be afforded to expenditure on construction and investment in the area.
- 6.44 The NPPF at paragraphs 80 and 82 explains that planning decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. It states that "significant weight" should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity. This is particularly important where Britain can be a global leader in driving innovation, and provision should be made for clusters or networks of creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. The Proposed Development, which is promoting a Creative City concept, in addition to storage and distribution operations, fully chimes with these latest Government economic objectives and priorities.
- 6.45 Following the recent recession, the Government placed a major emphasis on the construction industry to "kick start" the economy. There has been a clear push on planning for growth through national policy initiatives including the NPPF, which was intended to stimulate growth in the economy. More recently we have the economic uncertainty surrounding Brexit which requires continued prudence.
- 6.46 It is widely recognised that housebuilding has knock-on effects for other sectors which leads to increased demand for building materials and equipment at the

construction phase as well as domestic furniture and carpets etc following completion. This generates/sustains employment in other sectors. The construction industry also stimulates lending in financial markets, another important sector in the UK economy. The Economic Report appended to this Planning Statement has estimated that over £245m will result from the estimated construction investment over a 9 year build programme, with £34.6m GVA of economic output added per annum during the 9 year build programme.

- 6.47 The construction industry is also reliant upon a constant stream of new sites to keep people employed and to maintain delivery rates. The LPA's strategic housing requirement will require an increase in construction activity to be maintained across the plan period, indicating that **new construction jobs** will be created locally. The Economic Report appended to this Statement estimates that there will be 518 direct construction roles and indirect/induced jobs supported per annum during the build phase. Moderate weight should be attached to the newly created construction jobs.
- 6.48 Further, moderate weight should be attributed to the provision of **homes for economically active people** noting that this is a location where new residents can help to sustain services including public transport, by bringing additional expenditure to the area on a day to day basis. The annual household expenditure is estimated to increase by £38.6m per annum. It also provides potential workers for the existing and proposed business at Heyford Park.
- 6.49 Significant weight should be attached to the benefits of supporting the **delivery of new employment**. The accompanying Economic Report indicates that 1,450 new FTE jobs will be directly supported on site. The economic output contribution from jobs directly supported on the site over a 10 year period is estimated to amount to £800m.
- 6.50 The proposals will also provide economic benefits through the **provision of 60 close care units**. There are £12.5m estimated health savings over a 10 year period arising from reduced GP visits, hospital admission and care home costs. Further the provision of housing to meets demands of an ageing population and enabling older people to move can release family housing in an area, thereby helping to provide increased housing stock to attract more economically active people into an area and increasing household expenditure. The accompanying Economic Report estimates that this additional total expenditure over a 10 year period would add £8.5m. Limited weight should be attached to this as a benefit.

Environmental benefits

- 6.51 The scheme would deliver **public open space/green infrastructure** which will be accessible to new and existing residents. The proposed provision includes not only new playing field/sports provision in excess of the standards required but also the provision of a new Flying Field Park and Control Tower Park (totalling 24.4ha (which as a comparison is larger than the Spice Ball Country Park in Banbury (approx. 19ha)). The new Flying Field Park at the centre of the site is significant too from a heritage perspective as it will allow public access to the heart of the flying field with views of the scheduled monuments to the north, views of the listed Control Tower and a full appreciation of the size of the main runway. Given both the scale and the historic significance of the proposed green infrastructure provision in excess of Local Plan standards, it is considered that this should be afforded moderate weight.
- 6.52 The Proposed Development would assist in securing **enhancements to biodiversity**, both on site and off site. There will be a net gain in biodiversity. It will also involve **substantial native planting** within areas of the perimeter of the Flying Field. This should be afforded moderate weight.
- 6.53 Overall it can be seen that the proposals will deliver a range of benefits which, taken together, weigh heavily in its favour.

The adverse effects to be weighed in the balance

- 6.54 The adverse effects relate mainly to the environmental dimension to sustainable development.
- 6.55 The impact of the Proposed Development on designated and undesignated **heritage assets** has already been appraised in the context of footnote 6 to Paragraph 11 of the NPPF in this Planning Statement. In summary, it has been concluded that there would be moderate/large adverse effect to the setting of the Scheduled Avionics building, slight to moderate harm to the setting of a number of structures of national importance, slight harm to the setting of those of regional importance and slight harm to the setting of those of local importance as noted in Table 9.32a of the ES Addendum Chapter 9. This harm should be afforded significant weight. Overall, Slight to Moderate harm has been identified to the impact on the character and appearance of RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area, and also to the Rousham Conservation Area. This harm should

be afforded significant weight, notwithstanding that the NPPF paragraph 196 test has been applied and passed previously.

6.56 The proposals would, in part, involve development on greenfield land which would give rise to a **loss of countryside**, but such losses are inevitable if the housing needs are to be met across the District. Further, the adopted Development Plan has identified and allocated the parcels proposed for housing in the Proposed Development as Areas with potential for additional development. The Revised Application's sports park is now proposed to be provided on greenfield land also within Policy Villages 5 allocation. Therefore, at most only limited weight should be attributed to the loss of countryside.

6.57 As noted previously, assessment work continues with the statutory bodies with regard to identifying a package of highway improvements and travel planning so as to mitigate the effects of traffic generated by the Proposed Development, such that the effect on driver delay should not be significant. There may still be residual effects on the highway network post mitigation and, until these are quantified further, limited weight should be afforded to this consideration.

6.58 In the event that the LPA or other parties consider that there would be greater levels of residual harm, then that harm still needs to be weighed in the overall planning balance. In the context of the *Suffolk Coastal* judgement and s.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, it is considered that the benefits of the scheme are still capable of being over-riding considerations in this case.

Other considerations

6.59 There are no other grounds to resist development on this site which cannot be avoided, mitigated, or controlled through planning conditions and obligations.

Compliance with the Development Plan

6.60 The proposals would be in general accordance with the Development Plan. The proposals would accord with the spatial strategy of the Core Strategy and in particular Policy Villages 5 when taken as a whole.

Overall Conclusion

6.61 Following this analysis, the conclusion is drawn that the proposals are acceptable because they are in general accordance with the Development Plan when read as a whole.

6.62 Even if the decision maker concludes that there would be some conflict with the Development Plan, for the reason set out above, other material considerations by virtue of the public benefits outline above assessed and weighed in the overall planning balance, would clearly indicate that planning permission should be granted in accordance with S38(6).

6.63 To summarise on the overall Planning Balance:-

1. The proposals will deliver a range of social, economic and environmental benefits which can be afforded varying levels of weight as identified below. These include:-

- Provision of Open Market Housing – Significant
- Provision of Affordable Housing – Significant
- Provision of on-site infrastructure, including new community infrastructure – Moderate
- Provision of off-site infrastructure, including enhanced public right of way connectivity and public transport accessibility - Moderate
- Expenditure on construction and investment in the area – Significant
- Creation of construction jobs - Moderate
- Providing homes for economically active people – Moderate
- Provision of Public Open Space – Moderate
- Enhancements to biodiversity and green infrastructure – Moderate
- Provision of heritage interpretation, enhanced heritage centre, enhanced public access and trails – Moderate
- Refurbishment and bringing back into long-term beneficial use a Grade II listed Control Tower - Moderate

2. The potential residual adverse impacts have been identified and these should also be afforded varying degrees of weight as follows:

- Loss of countryside – Limited
 - Landscape and visual impact of the development – Limited
 - Impact on the character and appearance of the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area – Significant
 - Increased traffic and driver delay on surrounding roads – Limited²⁰
3. All other identified impacts can be avoided, mitigated or addressed through Planning conditions and/or Planning obligations.
 4. It can be demonstrated that the proposals would be in general accordance with the Development Plan when read as a whole and should therefore be approved.
 5. Even if there was found to be some conflict with the Development Plan, any such harm would be demonstrably outweighed by other material considerations as summarised in this Planning Statement, which would clearly indicate that permission should be granted in accordance with S38(6).

²⁰ Pending conclusion of transport work on an appropriate package of highway improvements and travel planning

