

Andrew Lewis,
Development Management,
Planning and Economy,
Cherwell District Council,
Bodicote House
Banbury

4th June 2020

Application No: 18/00825/HYBRID

Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum wishes to comment on the above planning application.

As you know, the applicants – Dorchester Group – are an associate member of the MCNP Forum, and we have had discussion about some aspects of the proposals with them, although further debate has been limited by the current pandemic. It is accepted that the Full Member organisations – the parish councils – as the majority group in the Forum, have the right to make their views known on matters affecting Heyford Park, acknowledging Dorchester’s potential conflict of interest.

This is very likely the single most important planning application affecting the MCNP designated area. The Heyford Park strategic site is, after all, the reason that the MCNP came into existence, and will continue to be the focus of development activity for many years. While the Forum has been and remains broadly supportive of the development, several of our member parishes have asked us to support the concerns that they have submitted on their own behalf.

We have the following comments in addition to those we made previously in respect of the original 2018 submission:

1. We are pleased that a new medical centre remains in the masterplan, albeit on a revised site (parcel 19), and that MCNP policy PC1 can support this.
2. We continue to request that a site for a cemetery be found on or adjacent to Heyford Park, as per MCNP’s policy PC3. We consider that it should be the responsibility of the applicants whose housing (including an extra-care housing scheme) generates the need for a new cemetery, to negotiate with adjacent landowners if necessary to find a site that can be earmarked within the masterplan, and that its development within a specified time be a requirement of a S.106 agreement.
3. Efforts to minimise light pollution from development at Heyford Park must continue to be made as detailed schemes are submitted for approval. MCNP policy PD6: Control of Light Pollution should be used by CDC to ensure that such efforts continue and are compliant, particularly in respect of future employment-related development, together with the

impact of street lighting and any high-level lighting.

4. At the time of writing we note that there is a conflict between the Masterplan Composite Parameter Plan which shows in parcel 22 a Combined Heat and Power Plant together with a stack of up to 24m., and para. 5.130 of the Addendum to the Planning Statement, which states that the Plant is no longer proposed. Having already brought this to your attention, **we await further information before commenting further, for which we may need additional time.**
5. We have concerns regarding the proposed use of hangars in parcel 26 and access routes to them, in respect of the impact of noise on neighbouring residential properties. We support the concerns of Somerton Parish Council and local residents that their use should be governed by restrictions on night-time and weekend use.
6. We are also concerned about the impact of increased usage of existing footpaths and bridleways, which are to become "leisure routes", as detailed in both Somerton and Fritwell PC's submissions. MCNP Forum requests that the S.106 agreement should include financial provision for works of upgrading or relocation of the routes concerned, together with mitigation measures including screen planting.
7. We request that restrictions should be applied on hours of use and on types of vehicles using the perimeter road where it runs alongside the Portway. We support the concerns of parish councils that both existing and new uses within the strategic site are likely to cause noise and other nuisance, particularly to Somerton and Fritwell parishes, and that restricted hours of use should be a feature of the S.106 agreement.
8. MCNP Forum supports the particular concerns expressed by Lower Heyford, Ardley with Fewcott and Kirtlington Parish Councils that the volume of traffic generated by development at Heyford Park will continue to increase and have an impact on the quality of life for residents, especially those in dwellings fronting the respective through-routes, the B430 and B4030. We ask that ongoing discussions on mitigation measures in these villages, and in Somerton and Upper Heyford, be satisfactorily resolved as a condition of approval of this application.
9. We support the requests for HGV weight limits to be introduced on all minor and unclassified roads passing through affected parishes, as detailed in the submissions from the respective parish councils.
10. We support the view expressed by Heyford Park PC that the proposed new community centre should have a capacity suitable for the final population size of the development. A review of the proposed floor area should be undertaken as a condition of approval.

**Yours sincerely,
Martin Lipson
Chairman, MCNP Forum**