

## KIRTLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE ON HEYFORD PARK MASTERPLAN APPLICATION

Date: 27<sup>th</sup> May 2020

Two representatives of Kirtlington Parish Council (KPC) attended the meeting held on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> May (via Zoom) for the Heyford Park (HP) masterplan application lodged by Dorchester Group (ref: **18/00825/HYBRID**). Following consideration of the presentations given by Andrew Lewis (Cherwell District Council's case officer), and Joy White (Oxfordshire County Council's transport officer), and a brief review of the submitted documents (primarily the Transport Assessment Addendum prepared for Dorchester Group by Stantec, dated March 2020), KPC submits the following response, together with a request for an extension of time so that we can provide an updated and hopefully fuller response in due course. KPC is seeking further advice from our District Councillors, neighbouring Parish Councils (Bletchingdon and Weston-on-the-Green), and co-members of the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum (MCNP Forum).

It is KPC's intention to put forward a case for funding towards road safety and traffic mitigation measures to help alleviate the harm to our village that we believe will result from the traffic generated by the proposed development at HP.

KPC would like to support the application being put forward by Dorchester Group, as it believed development of brownfield land at HP was preferable to the development of greenfield sites in Kirtlington. This was, of course, the main reason for KPC joining the MCNP Forum and working closely with Dorchester Group over many years. KPC is indebted to Dorchester Group for the support they provided to KPC during the recent appeals at Corner Farm (land at Lince Lane) and at Ryefurlong (land off Mill Lane).

However, KPC now considers that it would not be representing the views of the majority of residents of Kirtlington if it did not object to the current application on highway matters.

From our review of the virtual meeting and recently submitted documents, KPC is now aware that Kirtlington will not receive any Section 106 funding to help alleviate the effects of the increase in traffic passing through the village that must inevitably arise from the development at HP. To suggest that there would be "*no demonstrable increase in traffic arising from the development*" as stated by Joy White (OCC), is wholly unbelievable. Kirtlington residents have already noticed a marked increase in traffic passing through the village at peak times, particularly in the last 2 years. KPC does not have the technical expertise to query the validity of the traffic data.

KPC needs to be presented with the baseline data of current peak hour traffic counts, so that in the future, when further counts are undertaken (either undertaken by OCC or funded by KPC), we can gauge if development in the area (not only at HP) and the mitigation measures being proposed, are having an effect on flows through Kirtlington. We consider there may be merit in comparing these traffic counts against transport data gathered for the recent Jersey Cottages application at the northern end of Kirtlington (17/01688/OUT).

KPC would like to be presented with understandable data on the supposed destinations of HP residents or the catchment area for employment uses on the site, as it appears to be all to/from Bicester, a smaller proportion to/from Banbury, but very little traffic to/from Oxford, which is hard to believe.

KPC would also like to request a re-examination on the apportionment of S106 monies being offered for traffic calming measures. The funds that KPC currently understands as being offered are £50k each to Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford and Ardley, plus £25k each to Somerton and Fritwell, thus £200k in total. KPC also notes that Middleton Stoney will receive improvements to The Jersey Arms junction and other mitigation measures as opposed to money specifically for traffic calming. Is the distribution of equal sums,

to only five villages, out of the 11 within the MCNP Forum, fair? Distribution of the available money should surely be proportionate to the amount of traffic passing through each village or be based on the degree of harm arising from the HP development? Can Dorchester Group and/or OCC provide KPC with the evidence that has been used to justify the proposed distribution of this money? Could other means of distributing the available money investigated, such as pooling it in some way, for use across all 11 parishes of the MCNP? Should the MCNP group, or each of the 11 villages, submit schemes and then justify those schemes in a bid to OCC for their support?

A similar means of distributing S106 money was initiated for the first phase of HP (Phase 9 – 16/02446/FUL), which resulted in the Barley Mow project, though nothing has been heard of this since a meeting with OCC Highways (held on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2018). Is that first tranche of money still available, and can the Barley Mow scheme be implemented? If it is, then is Upper Heyford to receive an additional £50k or should their share be reduced by the amount allocated for the Barley Mow scheme, and that money reallocated to Kirtlington?

The removal of the current bus service (the 250 between Oxford and HP), which we realise is only in existence courtesy of funding from Dorchester Group, will not only affect Kirtlington but Bletchingdon too. The loss of the bus service, together with the recent closure of our village shop, will no longer make Kirtlington a sustainable village, a fact that will not be lost on prospective developers who will seize on an opportunity to reinstate the lost facilities on the back of a large housing scheme. When the prospect of providing a doctor's surgery at HP was suggested, this was seen as satisfying a latent demand in Kirtlington, as it would be accessible by bus, which is not the case for those surgeries that currently serve the village (Islip and Woodstock). The lack of a bus service to HP will reduce the accessibility of all facilities to be provided on the Park (schools, shops, public open space, etc).

Kirtlington has already been on the receiving end of issues arising from a lack of enforcement of routeing agreements that have been flouted (e.g. by Reason Transport), with enforcement only being implemented through the actions of Kirtlington residents. What reassurances can be given to KPC that such breaches of routeing agreements, made with the employment users of HP, will not occur in the future? KPC would like copies of all routeing agreements, as residents will be willing to monitor these.

We seek an extension to the CDC deadline for comments, as we would like to hold further dialogue on the issues raised above, and if time allows, to set up a meeting with Joy White of OCC to discuss the evidence behind the current distribution of funding (particularly to Somerton and Fritwell, whose traffic levels, despite the anticipated increase from HP, will never be as high as those through Kirtlington).

Traffic-related issues in Kirtlington form the overwhelming concern for our parishioners, and this further development will certainly have a large (negative) impact on the village. We are not anti-development, and support considered, beneficial and sustainable development, however, we can see no benefits for Kirtlington of the current proposals at HP, only harm.

Anthony Kirkwood and Mike Wasley at OCC Highways know of, and are engaged with, our attempts at actioning alternative place-making traffic calming ideas and realise we are not asking for handouts without reason. We are actively doing our best to find solutions using innovative ways given that recent evidence suggests that traditional methods are failing. We feel we are justified in our request for S106 funding because we will indeed be affected by the HP homes and business developments, and we will use the monies perhaps more effectively than any other parish. This will surely also reflect positively upon Dorchester Group for supporting new techniques that they themselves can incorporate in future planning proposals.