

# Comment for planning application 18/00825/HYBRID

<b>Application Number</b>	18/00825/HYBRID
<b>Location</b>	Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>A hybrid planning application consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1;</li><li>• 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 zipwire 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.</li><li>• 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 &gt; 76.6ha for filming activities, including 2.1 ha for filming set construction and event parking (Sui Generis);</li><li>• the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified in Schedule 2.</li><li>• associated infrastructure works, including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road.</li></ul>
<b>Case Officer</b>	Andrew Lewis
<b>Organisation Name</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Louise Arnold
<b>Address</b>	The Beech House, Station Road, Lower Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5PD
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour
<b>Comments</b>	<p>I understand that the proposed development would give rise to an anticipated 4000 extra vehicular journeys each day along Station Road in Lower Heyford. Station Road is a small, residential B road which leads onto Rousham Bridge, an historical asset which is also very important in the setting of Rousham House, a Grade 1 listed building. The road is very important for the village, and is the location for the village shop, railway station and boatyard. It is also very important for tourism; many visitors to the area arrive via Heyford Station or Heyford Wharf. Even given the existing volume of traffic along Station Road, crossing the road is becoming increasingly dangerous for residents, including small children. The National Planning Policy Framework, the Cherwell Local Plan and the Oxfordshire Transport Plan all refer to the importance of local communities, the impact of development on health and quality of life and the need to protect local heritage and character. We would ask that Cherwell District Council support and act in accordance with these stated national and local policies and principles and ensure that no further damage is done to the village of Lower Heyford as a result of the proposed development. I understand that the proposed development would have a disproportionate traffic impact on Lower Heyford when compared with some other local villages. It would therefore seem reasonable to ask that the proportion of Section 106 funds allocated to Lower Heyford for traffic calming measures should also reflect this imbalance. If Lower Heyford is to receive up to 70 times more development traffic then some other local villages then this should be reflected in the funds it receives from the Section 106 pool for traffic calming measures. It seems unfair that a village which is anticipated to receive an extra 12 vehicular movements per daily peak hour should receive the same Section 106 traffic calming funds as Lower Heyford, which is anticipated to receive an extra 853 vehicular movements per daily peak hour. Moreover, the somewhat elongated form of the village of Lower Heyford also means that drivers on the B4030 lack the visual cues which might otherwise cause them to slow down naturally. This means that the need for traffic calming measures is even more essential in this village than it might be in other</p>

locations. In addition, given the enormous impact which this development would have on traffic through Lower Heyford, we would strongly request that: 1. if the development were to be approved, a routing agreement be put in place with the developer to ensure that all development traffic be routed directly from and to the M40 and should not be permitted to pass through Lower Heyford to access or exit the development site; 2. a weight restriction be placed on Station Road/ Rousham Bridge. Much damage has been done to this wonderful heritage asset in recent years because of the weight of traffic passing over it, and we also regularly experience burst water pipes on Station Road because the road simply is not built for the weight of traffic passing over it. I believe that Lower Heyford Parish Council have already agreed to finance a weight restriction on Station Road, and this move would also support Oxford County Council's traffic policy to deter HGVs from using inappropriate minor road through villages. The fact that a bus gate and weight restriction are planned at Middleton Stoney indicates that there is no reason why HGVs should need to access Bicester from the B4030 and that the principle of a weight restriction between Rousham Bridge and Bicester has been agreed. A weight restriction should therefore not cause any concerns which have not already been resolved in relation to the planned restriction at Middleton Stoney.

**Received Date**

02/06/2020 20:49:44

**Attachments**