

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL (CDC) - POSITION STATEMENT AS OF 1ST JULY 2019 ON APPLICATION REF: 18/00825/HYBRID HEYFORD PARK DRAFT MASTER PLAN

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

Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD

Preamble

The military use at RAF Upper Heyford ceased in 1994. Over the next 20 years numerous applications were made seeking permission to either develop the whole site or large parts of it and several of them went to appeal. The most significant was application ref 08/00716/OUT. Following a major public inquiry that commenced in September 2008 the Council received the appeal decision in January 2010 that allowed "A new settlement of 1075 dwellings, together with associated works and facilities including employment uses, community uses, school, playing fields and other physical and social infrastructure (as amended by plans and information received 26.06.08)." A revised masterplan for the settlement area was approved in December 2011 (ref 10/01642/OUT)

The former base, which is approximately 505 hectares in total, was designated a conservation area in 2006, its primary architectural and social historic interest being its role during the Cold War. The nature of the site is defined by the historic landscape character of the distinct zones within the base. The designation also acknowledges the special architectural interest, and as a conservation area, the character of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, and provides the context and framework to ensure the setting and appearance of sections of the Cold War landscape are preserved. English Heritage has

declared the former RAF Upper Heyford to be Britain's best-preserved relic of the West's long Cold War against the Soviet Union.

Policy Background

Paragraph 7 of the NPPF makes it clear the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It goes on in para 11 to say there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that permission should be granted unless any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

There remains a need to undertake a balancing exercise to examine any adverse impacts of a development that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of it and also the harm that would be caused by a particular scheme in order to see whether it can be justified. In carrying out the balancing exercise it is, therefore, necessary to take into account policies in the development plan as well as those in the Framework. It is also necessary to recognise that Section 38 of the Act continues to require decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan and the Framework highlights the importance of the plan led system as a whole.

The Development Plan for Cherwell District comprises the saved policies in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031-Part 1 (CLP 2031). In addition a Neighbourhood Plan has been examined by an Inspector and recently approved at referendum that also forms part of the statutory development plan for the area. In this case, the application site falls within the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan covering 11 parishes in the central part of our district, with Heyford Park at its centre. It has reached the stage where it must now be given significant weight

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that in dealing with applications for planning permission the local planning authority shall have regards to the provisions of the development plan in so far as is material to the application and to any material considerations. Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination shall be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is also reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 11 which makes it clear that the starting point for decision making is the development plan.

The development plan contains a wide range of policies applicable to development proposed at Heyford Park:

Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 (CLP)

Policy PSD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy SLE 1: Employment Development

Policy SLE 3: Supporting Tourism Growth

Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections

Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution

Policy BSC 2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land-Brownfield land and Housing Density

Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing
Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix
Policy BSC 7: Meeting Education Needs
Policy BSC 8: Securing Health and Well-Being
Policy BSC 9: Public Services and Utilities
Policy BSC 10: Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision
Policy BSC 11: Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation
Policy BSC12: Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities
Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change
Policy ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy and Allowable Solutions
Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction
Policy ESD 4: Decentralised Energy Systems
Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy
Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management
Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)
Policy ESD 8: Water Resources
Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment
Policy ESD 11: Conservation Target Areas
Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement
Policy ESD 15: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment
Policy ESD 16: The Oxford Canal
Policy ESD 17: Green Infrastructure
Policy INF 1: Infrastructure
Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford (PV5)

Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (Saved Policies)

Policy S29: Loss of existing village services
Policy TR1: Transportation funding
Policy TR7: Development attracting traffic on minor roads
Policy C18: Development proposals affecting a listed building
Policy C21: Proposals for re-use of a listed building
Policy C23: Retention of features contributing to character or appearance of a conservation area
Policy C25: Development affecting the site or setting of a schedule ancient monument
Policy C28: Layout, design and external appearance of new development
Policy C30: Design Control
Policy C31: Compatibility of proposals in residential areas
Policy ENV12: Development on contaminated land

Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031 (MCNP)

Policy PD3: Development adjacent to Heyford Park
Policy PD4: Protection of Important Views and Vistas
Policy PD5: Building and Site Design
Policy PD6: Control of Light Pollution
Policy PD7: Designation of Local Green Spaces
Policy PH3: Adaptable Housing

Policy PH4: Extra Care Housing
Policy PH5: Garage and Waste Storage Provision
Policy PH6: Parking for Existing Dwellings
Policy PC2: Local Employment
Policy PC3: Health Facility
Policy PC4: New Cemetery

The key policy, Policy Villages 5 (PV5), identifies the former military base as a strategic site in the rural area for a new settlement in which approximately 1,600 dwellings are proposed, in addition to the 761(net) already permitted and approximately 1500 jobs. The policy also goes on to lay down specific design and place making principles including avoiding development on more sensitive and historically significant sites, retain features that are important for the character and appearance of the site, encourage biodiversity enhancement, environmentally improve areas, integrate the new and existing communities and remove structures that do not make a positive contribution to the site's special character. An inset map in the CLP Pt1 identifies an area at Heyford with potential for additional development.

The policy boundary area extends the brownfield development area to include greenfield land in order to meet the full objectively assessed housing needs of the District. The CLP Pt1 requires a comprehensive integrated approach to the development of Heyford in order to achieve a lasting arrangement where a new settlement will be provided but at the same time conserving the heritage interests of the site associated with its Cold War history.

Prior to the CLP Pt1's Examination in Public an agreement was reached between the Council and the main landowner at Heyford, the Dorchester Group (DG) over certain principles of developing the former base and a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) signed. To achieve the comprehensive integrated approach that the Local Plan policy requires for the site, work began on a Framework Plan jointly commissioned by CDC and DG following the adoption of the CLP Pt1 in July 2015. The purpose of the Framework was to establish a clear context for development of the former base, as non-Statutory Policy Guidance, which was to be used in support of the CLP Pt1 in the determination of future planning applications relating to the site. However, following receipt of legal advice received on timescales and consultation requirements, and the need to resource it, the Framework was not progressed.

It was subsequently agreed with DG that they would undertake a masterplan exercise through the development management system. As a result, significant preparatory work was undertaken and a hybrid application submitted to the Council in May 2018 proposing a mixed form of development that includes the large part of the proposed residential allocation from Policy Villages 5 together with an allocation for employment as well as other social and physical infrastructure. Since submission negotiations have carried on to reach agreement on some key areas of the proposal, namely highways and traffic issues, education, health care, heritage and ecology. This document forms an appraisal of that application and the Council's position statement. I have started by assessing it against the main policy requirements and criteria of CLP PV5

Housing

1. Number of homes – approximately 1,600 (in addition to the 761 (net) already permitted
2. Affordable housing – at least 30%

The current application proposes 1,175 dwellings and 60 care units which together with the 296 (ref: 16/02446/F) and 79 (ref: 15/01357/F) currently proposed by Dorchester and Pye respectively, gives a grand total of 1610 units. There is also the missing parcel (15) which you identified on the composite plan with a capacity of 49 units. However, I am not convinced that these totals accurately reflect what has been developed when you take into account development of the former proposed school site (P5), Building 485 and 488 (P6) plus those current of growth deal sites. I would like this clarified please.

I also consider there to be an issue with regard to parcel 17, Huw Jones field adjacent the sewage farm. Half the field is shown as white land. This is not acceptable. I am not saying it should be allocated for residential use but its non-allocation raises the issue of whether the allocation of 1600 units should now be in the region of 1510 as a guesstimate. I will come back to this point later.

In terms of affordable accommodation, the Councils Strategic Housing Officer (SHO) has raised concerns about the overall numbers proposed, 348 rather than 352, and the mix. For clarity our preferred mix based on 352 affordable units and a 70/30 split between rented and shared ownership would be as follows:

Affordable rent

38 x 1 bed maisonettes
24 x 2 bed maisonettes
96 x 2 bed houses
56 x 3 bed houses
20 x 4 bed houses
8 x Extra Care/Older persons housing
4x 2 bed fully wheelchair adapted bungalows

Shared Ownership

8 x 1 bed flat/maisonettes
10 x 2 bed flat/maisonettes
46X 2 bed houses
36 x 3 bed houses
3 x 4 bed houses
2 x Extra Care/Older persons housing
1 x 2 bed fully wheelchair adapted bungalow

Reference is also made to Low cost/Reduced Cost Market Housing but there is no policy to support this in CDC therefore all of the Intermediate units should be provided as shared ownership.

Other issues raised by the SHO include:

- 50% of the affordable rented units should meet the Building Regulations Requirement M4(2) Category 2: Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings requirement. Additionally, 100% of the affordable housing units are to be built the government's Nationally Described Space Standard (Technical Housing Standards). The wheelchair unit should conform to M4 (2) Category 3 of building regs accessibility requirement.
- The affordable units should be located throughout the development in small clusters containing between 10 and 15 units per cluster.
- A minimum of 1 parking space per property for each of the one bedroom units and 2 parking spaces per property for all other units is required

CDC is happy that Heyford Regeneration in its role of Registered Provider will take on the affordable units.

Employment

3. Land Area – approximately 120,000 sq. metres
- 4 Jobs created – approximately 1,500
- 5 Use classes – B1, B2, B8
- 6 Any additional employment opportunities further to existing consent to be accommodated primarily within existing buildings within the overall site where appropriate or on limited greenfield land to the south of Camp Road.

This hybrid application seeks to refresh the existing planning permission granted at appeal in 2010 for all the existing uses as indicated on the drawing N.0111_22-1L Change of Use Plan (as amended by the Secretary of State's decision letter) and therefore in line with the policy to accommodate employment uses in existing buildings.

The proposed uses reflect the policy and the Creative City concept (CCC) the requirement for high quality employment opportunities. The CCC also makes use of existing buildings, again in line with the PV5. However, as you know, from the design and heritage perspective the indicative scheme is not considered acceptable and needs to be modified to retain the prominence of the hardened aircraft shelters in this character area. To that end I am happy to arrange a further meeting with my conservation officer and Historic England to discuss details although I think you had a pretty good steer at the site walk about from the two of them. If you go ahead with the redesign please include a heritage impact assessment (HIA) of the proposal.

In addition to the CCC a number of other employment uses are proposed namely the adjacent commercial parcel of 2.3ha; the car processing operation with 20.3ha plus all the other building associated with the use; the use of the flying field and QRA for filming; plus all the quasi-employment uses such as health, education, community use, core visitor destination, control tower, etc. In short it is my view that that the quantum of development

is exceeded. All these uses are outside of the land identified in the CLP with potential for development and all on the flying field and you will recall whether the scale, type and location of employment and storage proposed for the flying field would harm the character of the Conservation Area and setting of Listed Buildings was at the heart of the 2008 Public Inquiry. The proposal is contrary to the policy in the CLP that in order to avoid development on the most historically significant and sensitive parts of the site, new development is to be focused to the south of the flying field and on limited greenfield land to the south of Camp Road (and one greenfield area to the north of Camp Road, east of Larsen Road). Even 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 being kept back from the northern edge of the indicative development areas. So it appears to me the proposal is contrary to the CLP allocation.

You also do not include building 133 which I think should be identified although it is my opinion this should be reconsidered as a residential site as originally approved. Buildings 3008 and 3009 seem to be lost from their nil/heritage use. This is not acceptable especially as one has the operating blast doors. However the thought has occurred to me during processing that a superior heritage asset might be 2010. Can thought be given to this becoming a public heritage asset?

Turning to the extent of the filming area, it is my view that the impact is harmful to ecology. I am advised by my ecology colleagues they see the impact as causing significant harm. So far as I am aware, nothing has come back to us following our meeting on 11th October 2018 with Peter Shepherd. I will touch on this again below.

I also query the use of QRA and a potential conflict with the occupier there and the potential heritage use of the HASs 3009 and 3008, and 2010.

One final comment, the relationship of the employment areas to the surroundings is unclear and may cause harm. For example visually on the western boundary of the car processing area; the eastern edge of parcel 23 with the Southern Bomb Stores (SBS); and in the relationship between employment and residential uses. Our experience from the BCA car wash and the relationship of the new housing adjacent the nose dock sheds is not good.

A Filming Strategy was being prepared by Pegasus to demonstrate how harm could be minimised and a mitigation plan set out. This was to include details of the filming operation, hours of use, lighting (please refer to MCNP Policy PD6), etc. This, I think will be necessary to persuade me to support this part of the proposal. Having said that, I think I share the view that what is being proposed could be an exciting addition to and enhancement of the local economy. I hope to be able to support the proposal when it is formally considered by the Council but need the evidence from you to demonstrate it will not cause harm and any harm can be mitigated.

My final comment on the numbers to be employed on site is your figures are conservative. From discussions with BCA recently, they will be expansionist and I do not think you have taken into account the potential from some of the other quasi-employment uses to generate jobs.

Infrastructure Needs

All development proposals will be expected to contribute as necessary towards the delivery of infrastructure provision through onsite provision or an appropriate off-site financial contribution to:

8 Education – provision of a 2.22 ha site for a new 1-1.5 form entry primary school with potential for future expansion, if required, and contributions to primary and secondary school place provision

9 Health – contributions required to health care provision

10 Open Space – sports pitches, sports pavilion, play areas, indoor sport provision

11 Community Facilities – nursery, community hall, local centre/hotel, a neighbourhood police facility

12 Access and Movement – transport contributions and sustainable travel measures as detailed below, countryside access measures, fencing along the boundary of the new settlement and the flying field

13 Utilities – contamination remediation, improvements to the water supply and sewerage network, as well as other utilities, may be required.

8. Education

I appreciate the difficulty caused by this requirement and the work undertaken so far by DG and their architects to satisfy the requirement of OCC whilst at the same time avoiding harm to heritage assets. I appreciate the extensive discussions we have had on this matter and the participation of OCC, the school, its governors and Historic England, and recognise we need to come to a conclusion particularly on the provision of the additional primary school.

Notwithstanding my objection to the primary school going on the flying field, at our meeting in August 2018 I think it was concluded by me that the use of the Victoria Alert area (parcel 31) was acceptable to the majority of parties subject to design, conditions and other requirements OCC may have. I have still not had OCC's final comments but think, on balance, this part of the scheme can be carried forward although I suspect the County requirements may be somewhat onerous on the Heyford Park Free School if they take the project on. I remind you we met at Speedwell House in November and Jane Farrow gave a robust analysis of the issues surrounding school use of the hangers and the challenges to be overcome. My recollection was a follow up meeting was to be arranged with the architect but that is still awaited.

My concerns about "paraphernalia" remain but may be overcome by agreement to limit planting and siting of equipment externally and by imposition of conditions. To that end I have still not seen the project report prepared by the School Principal and submitted to the Regional Commissioner. Has it been sent to OCC? This may address, I assume, some of the other concerns expressed by the County in terms of overall educational provision at Heyford Park.

And when this part of the scheme is resubmitted a specific heritage assessment will be required.

9. Health

Policy V5 requires contributions towards and of course the MCNP supports provision of a health centre. PV5 does go on to say health care facilities will be supported as part of a neighbourhood centre. It would also be helpful if the OCCG adopted a consistent approach and made clear what they require, if anything, at Heyford. At the moment providing a financial contribution is made in line with CDC's SPD than I think the scheme will be in compliance. I am aware Simon is producing a specification for OCCG to consider and hope that will be shared.

Looking at the current proposal, I support Historic England's view that there is currently no justification for the loss of Building 315, the A frame hanger. A HIA would be required to provide evidence for its demolition.

I am inclined to the view that rather than full blown health centre at Heyford Park, a more modest proposal will suffice be it a pharmacist with ancillary facilities, a satellite surgery (and I appreciate you are in discussions with Bicester practices on this) or a more robust community centre with accommodation for health uses and visitors.

The allocation of parcel 20 for commercial use seems excessive and unnecessary, even if the demolition of Building 315 is permitted. If demolition was permitted it seems the extra care facility could be better located here and parcel 19 (if demolition was permitted) used for residential.

10. Open Space

The Sports Park (parcel 18) is on land outside of the PV5 allocation but is not in itself a reason to object providing we are satisfied it does not cause harm or conflict with other policies in the CLP relating to development in the countryside. The actual provision on there is somewhat unclear.

Sport England in fact commented on this, saying "The planning Statement (5.1 & 8.66) and the plans refer to new playing fields but there is no details, whilst it is an outline application, it would be help to understand, if there has been any thought to the sports to be played and who will be responsible for their maintenance/ownership of the playing fields; Details of S106 contributions for sport; and Details of the indoor sports"

Their criteria for submitting information on planning applications is set out in the attached document

www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy (see Annex B)

And of course they have a holding objection with us..

My recreation colleagues requested the following contributions at the time:

“Onsite Outdoor Sports Provision Commuted sums:

Tennis/netball/basketball court - £27,468.25

Bowling Green - £173,303.86

Cricket Square - £ 53,197.08

Football pitch, senior - £70,195.95

Football pitch, junior - £61,589.12

A commuted sum will also be expected for the Onsite Indoor Sports Facilities – to be confirmed when the type of provision is decided.

For the Sports Pavilion, a commuted sum is requested based on a 6 changing room facility with 3 football pitches which is £718,715.70.

These figures are all as per the 2018 SPD.”

Having spoken to Sport England in depth on the Phase 9 296 scheme, I think it would be in everyone’s interest to meet at Heyford and have another look at what is proposed and where., probably in the middle of July if that is convenient.

I know before she left that Sharon Bolton was very keen to explore an all-weather pitch with you that could be used by the school and community and for a wider variety of sports rather than just grassed based recreation.

Pavilion: dare I point out the one for use in association with the cricket pitch has not yet been provided? Nor have the conditions to allow its use been discharged either. But it would be helpful to work out the requirements for the new one at the sports park and get a specification agreed in a s106.

Play areas: Some time ago I did request a schedule of play areas, existing and proposed.

On balance I welcome the Flying Field Park. Whilst this may appear a lukewarm response to a key part of the environmental improvements promoted by DG, I am advised it could cause harm to the ecology by my colleagues. Also, I see it as somewhat compensatory for the failure to provide the Cold War Park from the appeal scheme.

11 Community Facilities – nursery, community hall, local centre/hotel, a neighbourhood police facility

The local centre and hotel have been addressed by previous submissions and the exciting work I note that is well under way

In an ideal world I would like to see the community centre brought forward as part of a detailed proposal in the village centre at the heart of the settlement so we can properly assess its level of appropriateness and adequacy to serve the community. We would support a multi-use centre but as you know the Assistant Director; Communities, Community Services is concerned by incorporating religious use into such a hub. We also need to know what other facilities and space will be provided within such as social and health care

facilities. Contributions are required for the provision of the physical facility and funding of the Community Development Worker's Post for another 3 years.

With the development of the new community centre, the former site, and church, should be identified in the masterplan for housing.

Clarification on the police facility would be welcomed. You have seen their comments and request for financial contribution.

I have also been requested to secure allotments and cemetery in line with the MCNP and as requested by the new Parish Council. I note allotments have been vaguely included as part of the Sewage Plant buffer zone.

12 Access and Movement – transport contributions and sustainable travel measures as detailed below, countryside access measures, fencing along the boundary of the new settlement and the flying field

This is, to be blunt, the most significant issue that could preclude development at Heyford in my opinion. Comprehensive assessments have been done elsewhere and multiple exchanges between PBA, OCC, Highways England, CDC and DG. The following is a brief summary of where I think we are (as at 1st June 2019)

- M40 J10-revised roundabout designs agreed in principle; modelling to be agreed, meeting shortly between AECOM and OCC; time scale and cost still unclear (to me)
- Ardley being remodelled by PBA to calculate require mitigation
- Hopcrofts Holt-mitigation agreed
- B4027/A4260 junction-still being investigated
- Junction of B430 and road leading to Camp Road-scheme agreed
- Middleton Stoney- clearly mitigation is required.
 - I understand the original approved scheme under the lead appeal decision is to be implemented in near future(or at least requested)
 - Weight limit being investigated
 - Bus gate being investigated in terms of design and location.

Transport measures have been agreed in principle in terms of bus services to Oxford and Bicester, and Bicester train station; bus routes through Heyford; a scheme to enable a bus to turn in Heyford and return to Bicester; potential localised community bus service possibly linking to Lower Heyford train station and serving the flying field commercial units.

The opening of the Chilgrove Drive access to the flying field is something I think I have supported, in principle, from day 1. I think it leads to other issues about traffic on the flying field that was previously resisted but under current circumstances is something which on balance should be supported. And the route through the settlement linking Chilgrove to Camp road is acceptable.

I have mentioned previously I do not think the site provides sustainable transport routes within the site nor link to the external network of paths and cycle routes. I do not believe the settlement is designed to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport rather

than travel by private car, with the provision of footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks

13 Utilities – contamination remediation, improvements to the water supply and sewerage network, as well as other utilities, may be required.

It is recognised the applicant has undertaken substantial work to upgrade the sewage farm and remediate the site that has been heavily contaminated in places, The Council will continue to work with the applicant on these issues.

Fencing is a strange caveat in this clause but it does remind me that it is a requirement on you to provide a cat and dog proof fence. So far as I am aware the approved scheme has never been implemented.

Key site specific design and place shaping principles:

14 Proposals must demonstrate that the conservation of heritage resources, landscape, restoration, enhancement of biodiversity and other environmental improvements will be achieved across the whole of the site identified as Policy Villages 5

At the precise moment in time I am not convinced this principle is met.

Historic England (and the CDC Conservation Officer) is adamant that significant harm is being caused to heritage assets. HIAs are required for all the major demolition proposals such as Buildings 315 and 151, and the southern bomb stores. Further work is required to assess the visual impact along the southern taxi way.

In the absence of the report from Peter Shepherd I have strong objections registered by my ecological colleagues. However, I do believe this can be overcome and if it is demonstrated that biodiversity will be enhanced this objection will no doubt be withdrawn.

Environmental improvements required by the earlier permission have been limited in DG's tenure. I refer in particular to the absence of Portway, Aves Ditch and the circular walk. This site is at the hub of a network which could improve accessibility to the countryside for residents by linking up cycle ways, footpaths and the canal towpath. No Cold War Park has been provided. Substantial loss of mature trees have been allowed and not adequately replaced. In short I see little evidence of environmental improvement.

The approach to landscape needs more work. The referencing of local parks as inspiration for the approach to open spaces on site is not appropriate. This site needs a bespoke approach to spaces and reflects what is a bleak and open area, with austere landscape treatments to the centre and large mature trees only in areas away from the flying field.

15 In order to avoid development on the most historically significant and sensitive parts of the site, new development is to be focused to the south of the flying field and on limited

greenfield land to the south of Camp Road (and one greenfield area to the north of Camp Road, east of Larsen Road)

The masterplan fails to meet this principle in my opinion although I think it can to some extent be addressed. Earlier phases of development have been allowed on less sensitive sites at too low a density resulting in the spread of development on to the sensitive areas and well beyond the land identified on the CLP inset map.

I am personally not happy with some of the demolitions, particularly SBS. I also support Tom Foxall's concerns on the impact of development along the southern runway and making sure it is not a reflection of the current Dorchester housing model. And his concern about the effect of development on the Christmas Tree. Having registered my concern, I believe the design workshop you talked about could find a solution to some of the problems and I say again, it is my belief that the development area does not have to be so widespread if we have higher densities and develop sites like Building 133.

I will add another development site that has not been considered but should be. This is the existing community centre and church which if they are being replaced should be identified in the masterplan for housing.

16 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 being kept back from the northern edge of the indicative development areas

In short this element of the policy is almost disregarded by the masterplan proposal. My response is to refer back to the concerns of Historic England, do the landscape/visual assessments suggested and do a HIA.

17 The release of greenfield land within the allocated site Policy Villages 5 will not be allowed to compromise the necessary environmental improvements and conservation of heritage interest of the wider site

Of the three main greenfield sites covered by PV5, only two are under your control and one of those is only allocated for some 50% of its total size. I cannot stress enough the advice I am being given to make sure densities are high on the greenfield and less sensitive sites with the hope that the more historic assets like the SBS can be preserved.

18 The settlement should be designed to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport rather than travel by private car, with the provision of footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks. Improved access to public transport will be required

19 Development should accord with Policy ESD 15 and include layouts that maximise the potential for walkable neighbourhoods with a legible hierarchy of routes

20 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 extended former main runway as a public right of way on its original alignment

21 Layouts should enable a high degree of integration with development areas within the 'Policy Villages 5' allocation, with connectivity between new and existing communities

There is a lack of integration between the existing layout of the site, its important forms and its former function, and the new housing. A more literal interpretation of the history of the site is needed, so that the new built form on site connects both visually and functionally with what is currently an expansive open place interspersed with distinctive structures. The decision to develop so close to the flying field has to be justified to be acceptable under Policy PV5 of the adopted Local Plan, which seeks to concentrate development to the south of Camp Road. In order for development here to be acceptable, it must be of the highest design quality. What is currently proposed does not, in my view, go far enough in terms of reflecting the scale and massing and arrangement of the base.

One of the key ingredients to the character of the northern side of Camp Road is the feeling of openness. In order to preserve this, a route structure needs to be devised that maintains as much visual connectivity from Camp Road to the flying field as possible. Large buildings are present within the view, but the expansive gaps between them mean that view corridors across the site to the structures to the north and the countryside beyond mean that the sheer scale of the site is always 'with you' as you move past or through it.

I do not think the first phases of Heyford Park is as successful as I hoped it would be in terms of creating pedestrian and cycling routes. I am particularly unhappy to find Bovis have made some of their roads private and precluded direct access to play spaces and general permeability through the site. I think some elements of the masterplan are welcome for example to the flying field park. But I would like to see a more comprehensive strategy to create a sustainable network of paths through the new and existing settlement.

Not only that, but the layout should provide connectivity to the different parts of the settlement and beyond. So as well as looking at the scheme internally consideration needs to be given to, for example, routes from Phase 9 carrying on to Lower and Upper Heyford, and the Cherwell Valley. At the eastern end of the site there is an opportunity for reconnecting old routes. Of course much of this was considered in 2008 but at the time of writing one of the main strategies to re-establish Portway across the flying field has not come to fruition.

In terms of specifics, our former Urban Designer provided the following comments which you may want to review:

"Parcel 16 looks to be well-designed and in keeping with the overall theme of the development to the south of Camp Road, both new and existing. The generous swale should work well, as should the tree lined main street. Parcel 17 is similarly designed, although the northern edge of the parcel is currently shown as buildings facing onto the back of existing properties. 'Closing the block' here, with plots sharing a common rear plot line, is encouraged. The frontage to Camp Road on parcel 10 appears to work well in principle, although here the scale starts to become an issue. The transition from residential scale military accommodation to the south and operational buildings and officer housing to the north is stark; there is no gradation, with each side of the road having a distinct character. What is proposed dilutes this, as the frontage buildings are essentially too domestic in scale.

The development behind the frontage on parcel 10 can drop in scale in the middle as it will not be visible from outside, but built form that is going to be visible either across the flying field or from Camp Road needs to reinforce the larger scale and massing of structures on the base proper. The proposed green on parcel 10 would work better if it extended fully through the block, allowing views onto the rest of the base. Parcel 11 works well, with large structures to its western edge that 'hide' the smaller buildings within the parcel.

Parcel 12 (east) should be revised to use larger buildings along its western edge to continue the theme of bigger scale on important routes. What is proposed is still too domestic in scale, although it is noted that the general idea is to use scale here to reflect the existing building 172. Again, a more literal interpretation would help support the existing character. Parcels 19 and 35 work reasonably well, but how the spaces around the buildings proposed are accessed and managed will need careful attention as the design is developed in detail.

Parcel 21 is a good example of the approach that should be taken in other places across the northern site, close to the taxi ways and flying field. The use of large buildings to front onto the flying field edge is encouraged, as these are reflective of the kinds of structures visible in this setting. Parcel 12 (west) is less successful in this regard, with the frontage buildings undersized for their placement on the taxi way.

The creative city zone (parcel 23) should place more massive buildings against the edge of the taxi way, and the green spaces should run all the way through the parcel rather than being 'end stopped' by buildings. The retention of existing green spaces is supported as it helps give the impression that frontage buildings are in clusters. At this stage, the other residential and commercial parcels appear to work well."

22 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, including to any necessary capacity improvements around Junction 10 of the M40, and to the rural road network to the west of the site and around Middleton Stoney including traffic calming and management measures

I have touched on this above but in fairness to the applicant I do not think the scale of work to J10 of the M40 was quite envisaged when the CLP was being drafted. At the time of writing, a comprehensive package is being drawn up for this, Middleton Stoney and the rural road network. Sadly I still believe we are some way of an agreed mitigation package for each of the three main highways conundrums but I am aware that significant investment is being made in terms of resourcing using access to the Oxfordshire Growth Board Deal. I am also aware that OCC and the Growth Board see this as a priority.

23 Development will provide for good accessibility to public transport services and a plan for public transport provision will accompany any planning application

The public transport strategy is, I believe, close to resolution. To facilitate and prioritise it I understand some on site work is required to facilitate a return bus service between Bicester and Heyford. Also, a bus gate on the Middleton Stoney road to prioritise the bus service.

24 Design and layout should reflect the management and mitigation of noise impacts associated with the development

I touched on this issue above where I believe there are some spots in which the relationship between employment and residential sites is sensitive.

The EHO has advised a condition for a parcel specific Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP), which shall include details of the measures to be taken to ensure construction works do not adversely affect residential properties on, adjacent to or surrounding the site together with details of the consultation and communication to be carried out with local residents shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for each parcel as the development progresses.

Having studied the noise report provide in the ES he is satisfied with the approach and proposed plant noise levels and that individual parcels will have their own differing issues based on the location and relation to existing and proposed commercial/industrial uses. The report states that mitigation will be required based on these differing contexts. Therefore at the detailed application stage we would need details for each parcel of the proposed plant and mitigation for each parcel as it goes along. (Obviously there have been issues in the earlier stage with noise from existing businesses causing an issue for new residents and this should not be repeated).

Noise from road traffic is shown as negligible in table 13.19 however we have concerns that those properties along the proposed HGV route out of the camp could be affected by noise 24 hours from this traffic esp. parcel 23 which should be taken into account at the design stage and mitigation if required agreed with the LPA.

25 A Travel Plan should accompany any development proposals

Clearly a travel plan (TP) accompanied the application. But it is another thing to ensure the TP is in an acceptable form which unfortunately is not the case. OCC have submitted a comprehensive assessment culminating in an objection to the application. However, I understand you have engaged new specialist consultants to work with OCC to resolve matters.

26 The construction of the settlement on the former technical core and residential areas should retain buildings, structures, spaces and trees that contribute to the character and appearance of the site and integrate them into a high quality place that creates a satisfactory living environment

I repeat that the loss of the two A frame hangers runs contrary to this principle. Historic England would like to see the buildings retained and converted and put to an appropriate use. Their contribution is enhanced by being part of a 6 building set piece. If you intend to carry with their demolition a more thorough HIA is required.

27 Integration of the new community into the surrounding network of settlements by reopening historic routes and encouraging travel by means other than private car as far as possible

This issue has been addressed previously.

28 The preservation of the stark functional character and appearance of the flying field beyond the settlement 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 re-use of these to enable appropriate management of this area

The main part of the flying field and its character is preserved. But the areas around the southern runway and the adverse impact upon them have been highlighted by Historic England and the Conservation Officer. I also have reservations about the move west of the car operation into the more sensitive areas of the flying field and in to the setting of the listed nose dock sheds. At the moment I do not think there is an adequate justification for this and a further HIA is required.

29 The achievement of environmental improvements within the site and of views to it including the removal of buildings and 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, together with limited appropriate landscape mitigation, and reopening of historic routes

This principle is somewhat repetitive but in my view, any structure identified for demolition or removal needs a specific justification. It is my view that there are very few structures on site that do not in some way make a positive contribution to the sites special character.

30 The conservation and enhancement of the ecological interest of the flying field through appropriate management and submission of an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan, with biodiversity preserved and enhanced across the site identified as 'Policy Villages 5', and wildlife corridors enhanced, restored or created, including the provision for habitat for great crested newts and ground nesting birds in particular. A net gain in biodiversity will be sought

31 Development should protect and enhance the Local Wildlife Site (including the new extension to the south)

I have dealt with this point previously but I believe the ball is in your court. We need to agree a package of mitigation. We need to agree how there will be a gain in biodiversity. I am certainly supportive of the Flying Field Park in principle. The Cherwell Valley mitigation

package less so. And certainly the Local Wildlife site will be harmed of that there is no doubt. The Heyford area is also subject of a Conservation Target Area. As part of any mitigation package I would like to include a requirement for an Ecology/Environment Worker in the s106 agreement the reasoning being that a Local Wildlife Site is going to be directly impacted and that the development is in a CTA. In other words, this is needed to accord with our Local Plan policies ESD10 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment) and ESD11 (Conservation Target Areas). An Ecology/Environmental worker to be appointed on a 0.5 full time equivalent basis for a period of no less than 3 years

Although I have strong objections from BBOWT, OCC and my ecology colleague, with which I have some sympathy, I think this issue can be resolved and await Peter's report.

32 Visitor access, controlled where necessary, to (and providing for interpretation of) the historic and ecological assets of the site

In short, the evidence of heritage promotion is rather weak at Heyford with an absence of Cold War Park, significant delays in Heritage centre provision and appointment of a manager, no public routes, no signposting, etc. The offer made with the application has parts that look very tempting but will they be delivered? The concept of the zip wire has much support but it is my honest opinion that the tower will be an inappropriate structure not only on the flying field but in this rural setting. I think more clarity needs to be given on the structure's heights and construction and an impact assessment made on that basis. I have already said I welcome the Flying Field Park providing ecological mitigation and a maintenance plan can be agreed, although I see it only in part as a new initiative and as much a replacement of the Cold War Park. I do not accept the loss of the 2 HAS's from the existing heritage commitment, in fact my belief is more of the site should be given over to public access. Building 2010 is a case in point where it can be refurbished and become on site tour stop. I do not think the tours are promoted well enough and they should be more frequent. I expect to see Portway operational shortly and for Aves Ditch to be resolved obviously with the help of the paper Pegasus are to produce. I want to see a wider programme of interpretation of the Cold war history on site possibly bringing in the expertise of others, you may be aware that the National Archive at Kew is running events this year that could be borrowed for Heyford. The Heritage Centre was to be an educational resource but I have seen no evidence that is being promoted. But my main issue is with the Core Destination Centre. I believe Dorchester's desire to retain control over everything has fettered the heritage promotion of the base. I would like to see a Trust set up to run this asset with Dorchester represented but not operating.

33 Provision of a range of high quality employment opportunities, capable of being integrated into the fabric of the settlement, and providing that the use would not adversely affect residents or other businesses and would not have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding landscape, historic interest of the site, or on nearby villages

This principle has been addressed previously.

34 New and retained employment buildings should make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and should be located and laid out to integrate into the structure of the settlement

There has been limited new commercial building and little proposed. The retention of the existing structures has been one of the main successes following implementation of the appeal decision. My one concern is that in some areas paraphernalia has started to appear for example around the health operator where MRI scanner trailer units are scattered around, parking has started to become haphazard around some HASs, and the police seem to have extended their area of operation and fencing and bollards that should be stored in buildings are routinely left out.

The new buildings proposed for Creative City were to be redesigned to reflect the character and appearance of the Christmas Tree area. The present scheme has been criticised as inappropriately scaled. You were advised of the details following the walk around with Tom and Jenny last year.

35 A full arboricultural survey should be undertaken to inform the masterplan, incorporating as many trees as possible and reinforcing the planting structure where required

The principle of new planting has been agreed. The starkness of the flying field should be retained and new planting strategically located. Care over the Cherwell Valley ridge is required to balance the screening of the site whilst permitting some views through.

36 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 Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area

The Council have some concerns about the design for the next phases of development at Heyford. The standard residential unit permitted in the settlement area is not going to be supported in the Technical Area or on the Flying Field. We will be looking at larger scale buildings, possibly more industrial design construction and materials, etc. Again, this is not a surprise to you and I welcome your idea to host a design charrette for the southern taxi way.

37 New development should also preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Rousham, Lower Heyford and Upper Heyford Conservation Area, as well as the Oxford Canal Conservation Area, and their settings

To date I do not think the other conservation areas have other than a neutral impact upon their character and appearance. There is a potential to adversely effect Rousham with the sports park and if one day, for example, the play pitches are floodlit.

38 Development on greenfield land within 'Policy Villages 5' should provide for a well-designed, 'soft' approach to the urban edge, with appropriate boundary treatments

To date this principle has been respected as evidenced by the design code and housing built in phases 1 and 3 in particular and proposed on P9 and Pye. It will be a principle that will be continued by CDC. I must ask the question what is the proposed intention for the rest of Farmer Jones's land. It is in the red line application site. Details are required.

39 Management of the flying field should preserve the Cold War character of this part of the site, and allow for public access. New built development on the flying field will be resisted to preserve the character of the area

This principle has been largely adhered to by existing development at Heyford Park but English Heritage's removal of "the line in the sand" has given the impression, I think, that it is ok to overspill from the technical area onto the flying field. When the Local Plan was drawn up I wonder if the boundary line between the character areas was understood by the document. But it is what it says and "new build development will be resisted". At present I am not convinced the case has been fully made to justify what is proposed on parcels 12, 21, 29, 22 and 23 in terms of a capacity argument or by a HIA.

This is a case where the planning balance will need to be weighed and if the Council want 1600 dwellings and 1500 jobs some form of compromise will be made and I recognise that. But I remind you we are being showed by the Planning Case work Unit who will rigorously assess our policies and how they are being applied. And if they think there is a form of "maladministration" the application will no doubt be called in for a public inquiry, something we have avoided so far.

Public access is still limited but I do commend the concept of the flying field park. I would still like to see increased opportunities for people to get on to the site and experience the unique collection of buildings and austere atmosphere.

40 Landscape/Visual and Heritage Impact Assessments should be undertaken as part of development proposals and inform the design principles for the site

I think Tim responded to you positively on the landscape assessment and the planting proposals.

However, on HIAs I believe the application is light. I am conscious I have mentioned them several times in this statement. Although there is a broad assessment in the ES there is nothing detailed I can find for some important historic assets including the A frame

demolitions and the consequent impact of the Command centre from development; the SBS's; other demolitions; , effect on nose dock sheds, the southern taxiway, the open car processing area and I could carry on

HIAs are not only required by PV5 but also by the MCNP

41 Proposals should demonstrate an overall management approach for the whole site

I think we can say this is being complied with notwithstanding the application by Pye and for Phase 9. Of course there is a legal obligation on the site to be under single ownership. I would appreciate your views on that and whether you are in compliance with it.

42 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 facilities. Proposals should also provide for a heritage centre given the historic interest and Cold War associations of the site

I await the village centre scheme with interest and sincerely hope it is the success we all wish it to be.

I have to repeat that we need to resolve the issues associated with the community centre, place of worship and health provision. And I am more than happy to help with the latter and meeting the OCCG after they have considered Simon's latest specification whenever that is submitted.

You probably realise I have become more frustrated with the lack of progress to establish on site provision of facilities to exhibit and promote the historic importance of the site. I appreciate what is being proposed in the Core Visitor Destination Area. Can I ask for that to be brought forward early as part of the overall development?

What happens to Building 103? Can you clarify? It would make a very good Parish Hall!

43 The removal or remediation of contamination or potential sources of contamination will be required across the whole site

As per the ES report provided, each parcel will require further investigation and site specific reports to identify what remediation is required (if any), these reports shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to the remediation work starting. Once this has been carried out a confirmation report shall be provided to the LPA.

44 The scale and massing of new buildings should respect their context. Building materials should reflect the locally distinctive colour palette and respond to the materials of

the retained buildings within their character area, without this resulting in pastiche design solutions

I have addressed this principle previously but reiterate that the Council will expect to move away from the Dorchester house type used in the settlement area. I look forward to working with Tom, Jenny and yourselves at the charrette.

45 Public art should be provided

This is addressed or will be in the s106. I believe it is an outstanding matter on the lead appeal s106 as well.

46 Recycling and potential reuse of demolition materials where possible

Recycling is agreed I believe and will be a s106 requirement. I have revisited the documentation but cannot see a recycling strategy to cover things like reuse of demolition materials.

47 The provision of extra care housing and the opportunity for self build affordable housing in accordance with Policies BSC 3 and BSC 4

Self build is very aspirational for this phase of development but if there is an opportunity for provision the Council will be very supportive

As to extra care, I appreciate your proposal exceeds the CLP requirement and I am aware the MCNP Forum supports it. However to achieve it by demolishing Building 151 is not supported by any HIA.

48 Public open space should be provided to form a well-connected network of green areas, suitable for formal and informal recreation

49 Provision of Green Infrastructure links to the wider development area and open countryside

I see the green spaces but do not see them being well connected either within the site or to the surrounding area. I refer you to the comments of Paul Harris of OCC on this matter. I believe there is a real opportunity for Heyford Park to become a focus for routes through the surrounding area linking to the canal corridor, to the cycle network, to local and long distance paths and to destinations such as Bicester

50 Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site

51 Provision of sustainable drainage including SuDS in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), taking account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment development should be set back from watercourses

52 Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD1 – 5

I note the Environment Agency do not object to your application but recommend numerous conditions.

In addition they comment “the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (sept 2017) also suggests that various elements of the sewerage treatment plant are to be refurbished to address issues of capacity, reliability and monitoring following the redevelopment of the site. However there isn’t a clear plan on how this will be completed and phased to ensure the required capacity is in place prior to occupation of the dwellings. Therefore there are quite a few unknowns at present about the ability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate the flow from the site. It would be useful to have a phasing plan to show at what stage upgrades will be made in-line with when dwellings are planned to be occupied. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part1) Partial Review (July 2017) suggests an adopted strategy for 2,361 homes at former RAF Upper Heyford. It is very likely that the current flow permit (850m³/day MAX) will be exceeded. Therefore a variation of permit will need to be applied for via the National Permitting Service with likely revisions to the quality permits to ensure no deterioration in water quality in the effluent receiving waters. These tighter quality permits may require large upgrades the on-site STW.”

I am not sure there is documentation to demonstrate compliance with CDC LP climate change policies.

53 Development on the site will be required to investigate the potential to make connections to and utilise heat from the Ardley Energy Recovery facility to supply the heat demands of residential and commercial development on the site

An update on any connection would be appreciated

Upper Heyford is currently the closest development of any significance to the ERF and is a potential source of heat and electricity from a renewable source for both domestic and commercial buildings. The opportunity for heat and/or electricity to be supplied by the ERF should be revisited by the applicant, as circumstances may have changed since the 2014 study was completed, particularly as the ERF has now been operational for over 3 years.

54 An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features

Normal conditions will be imposed

55 In all instances development proposals will be subject to the other appropriate development plan policies.

Policy V5 has enough caveats to consider, I hope the answer to that is yes!!

Summary of Issues

Highways traffic and transport

- Offsite there is still much work to do as part of the highway network assessment but am informed by OCC that good progress is being made. Obviously the priority is M40 J10 and Middleton Stoney but other issues remain to be resolved including the B4280 corridor junctions.
- Mitigation package and costings need to be resolved.
- The new flying field access is welcomed and subject to minor modifications seems acceptable in principle
- Internal connectivity with priority for pedestrians and cyclists could be improved. As could connectivity to the surrounding footpaths and cycle ways. Historic routes need to be reinstated

Heritage Impact: Assessments are required for amongst other things but in particular:

- Demolitions of SBS; the A frame hangers
- The Creative City/Christmas Tree
- Southern taxi way
- The Observation Tower
- Impact of the car operation on the nose dock sheds
- The proposed educational site
- Core visitor destination centre
- And the encroachment onto the flying field contrary to POV5.
-

A presumption to refuse planning remains until these issues are resolved

The design guide for parcels 12 and 21 needs to be revised. A workshop, design competition or charrette can help overcome the concerns.

The design guide for parcel 22, Creative City, needs to be revised. A workshop, design competition or charrette can help overcome the concerns.

The loss of buildings 3008 and 3009 is not acceptable. Building 2010 should be considered as part of the heritage offer particularly in lieu of the HASs being permitted to commercial use in the Cold War Park Area.

Core Visitor Destination Zone: I would like to see this firmed up and managed by an independent Trust

The Filming Area: is considered potentially harmful to ecology and to residential amenity. A strategy to deal with the impact is required.

Education: Further information and resolution needs to be agreed on parcel 31.

Employment Development is in excess of the requirement of PV5

Residential Use: I would still like to see the housing assessment of development to date and revisit the density calculations for some of the proposed parcels. I still feel the extent of development on to the flying field is excessive. Furthermore, it does not take in to account redevelopment of the existing church and community centre site nor building 133.

Parcel 17: I have accepted the advice of my EHO that housing adjacent the sewage farm should not be considered. Again, theoretically this land could be used for some other proposed use and the alternative land made available for housing instead.

Ecology: Holding objections are in place and will remain so unless a mitigation and biodiversity enhancement package agreed.

Sports Park: Sport England has a holding objection. This could be resolved with clarification on what is being provided and when. A meeting between the three of us could potentially resolve matters quickly.

Community use and buildings: This needs clarity but again should be resolvable around a table with OCCG and my Community Service colleagues.

Conclusions

Although there is some negativity in my assessment, there is still an opportunity to resolve some of the broad issues such as ecology, education, sport, heritage and design whilst the highways issues are resolved

Broadly, the Council however welcomes Dorchester's proposed masterplan submission as a comprehensive and integrated approach in seeking to fully implement Policy Villages 5. In broad terms the proposals comply with the aim of the policy to provide 1600 dwelling and 1500 jobs.