

KIRTLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE ON HEYFORD PARK MASTERPLAN APPLICATION

(Ref: 18/00825/HYBRID)

Date: 3rd June 2020

This is an update of a response submitted by Kirtlington Parish Council (KPC) dated 27th May 2020. During the intervening period, following the granting of an extension of time for return of Parish Councils' comments (an additional week, until the 4th June), KPC has been seeking further advice and has undertaken additional review of the submitted documents for the Heyford Park Masterplan application lodged by Dorchester Group. KPC has been liaising with our District Councillor (Ian Corkin), had a meeting (via Teams, on Monday 1st June) with Andrew Lewis (Cherwell District Council's case officer) and contacted our neighbouring parishes (Bletchingdon and Weston on the Green) and the Chair of the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum (Martin Lipson).

These actions were initiated following a meeting held on Tuesday 19th May (via Zoom) with presentations from Andrew Lewis and Joy White (Oxfordshire County Council's transport officer), which was attended by two representatives of KPC. From that meeting, KPC became aware that no Section 106 money would be offered to Kirtlington to help alleviate the effects of the increase in traffic passing through the village that must inevitably arise from the proposed development at Heyford Park. Given this serious omission, KPC still 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.

KPC's meeting with Andrew Lewis on 1st June was based upon KPC's intention to seek responses to the questions below (the text in italics below was offered as an agenda). Given that the questions were all on transport issues, Andrew offered to forward them to Joy and Jacqui Cox at OCC, who were unavailable to attend a meeting. A response to these questions is awaited.

- 1) *KPC would like to be presented with baseline data of current peak hour traffic counts, so that in the future, when further counts are undertaken (either by OCC or funded by KPC), we can gauge what effects development in the area (not only at HP) and the mitigation measures being proposed, are having on flows through Kirtlington.*
- 2) *We intend to compare this up-to-date baseline data of traffic counts against the transport data gathered for the recent Jersey Cottages application (Ref: 17/01688/OUT).*
- 3) *What is the estimated increase in traffic passing through Kirtlington arising from the proposed development at Heyford Park?*
(Note: It has been suggested that there would be "no demonstrable increase in traffic arising from the development", which we find wholly unbelievable and difficult to communicate to parishioners without demonstrable evidence. Kirtlington residents regularly inform KPC that they have noticed a marked increase in traffic passing through the village at peak times, particularly in the last two years. Whilst KPC does not have the technical expertise to query to validity of the traffic data, it would appreciate an explanation of the data that could be related back to anxious residents).
- 4) *KPC would like to be presented with understandable data on the supposed destinations of Heyford Park residents or the catchment area for employment uses on the site (not just those using HGVs)? Can it be quantified how much traffic (or what percentage of flow) has been modelled as going from Heyford Park to/from the destinations of Bicester, Banbury, Oxford, and Witney, or, if easier, the quantity of traffic modelled to go east, north, south or west from Heyford Park?*

- 5) *KPC requests evidence/data on how the Section 106 monies being offered for traffic calming measures to the surrounding affected villages has been apportioned (i.e. outcome of discussions between OCC and Dorchester Group)?*
 (Note: The funds that KPC understands as being offered are £50k each to Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford and Ardley, plus £25k to Somerton and Fritwell, thus £200k in total, with Middleton Stoney receiving improvements to specific junctions, e.g. The Jersey Arms junction, and other measures, as opposed to money specifically for unidentified traffic calming.)
- 6) *Can other ways of distributing the available S106 money be investigated, that would be more equitable? For example, could the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum hold the money, for each of the associated 11 villages to submit qualifying schemes and justifying their bids (to MCNP or OCC) for the money?*
- 7) *Is the S106 money from the first phase of Heyford Park (Ref: 10/01642/OUT) still available, e.g. £50k was earmarked for the Barley Mow/Mill Lane project at Upper Heyford, but this has not progressed since a meeting with OCC on 18th November 2018?*
- 8) *Table 1.1 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (page 14) suggests that Upper Heyford's portion of the S106 money will be delivered via Phase 9 – Ref: 16/02446/FUL, however, if money from the 2010 permission is still available, then should the money from the 2016 application be reallocated to Kirtlington?*
- 9) *It is anticipated that as and when the Hopcroft's Holt junction is improved (between B4030 and A4260) this will provide a quicker option for traffic from Heyford Park (and from Upper and Lower Heyford) to the west and south. However, this will make the Bunker's Hill junction (between the A4095 and A4260) even more difficult to get out of during the morning peak. The timing of improvement works to these two junctions is of great importance to Kirtlington residents, so can advise us the timescales for these works?*
- 10) *Notwithstanding the downturn in usage of the bus service during the current pandemic, is it possible for KPC to be provided with data on the numbers of users of the 250 service to/from Kirtlington (via OCC from Thames Travel)?*
 (Note: KPC appreciates that the current bus service is only in existence courtesy of funding from Dorchester Group and that funding will be withdrawn in a couple of years. The removal of the Oxford route from the bus service, which will not only affect Kirtlington, but Bletchington too, together with the recent closure of our village shop, will no longer make Kirtlington a sustainable village. This is an issue that will not be lost on prospective developers who will seize upon an opportunity to reinstate these lost facilities on the back of a large housing scheme in the village. When the prospect of providing a doctor's surgery at Heyford Park 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). Regardless of whether funds for a surgery at Heyford Park become available, the lack of a bus service to Heyford Park will also reduce the accessibility of all the other facilities to be provided on the Park (schools, shops, public open space, etc).
- 11) *What routes will be permitted for all employment users of Heyford Park (not just HGV usage), particularly those wishing to travel to the south or west of the Park?*
- 12) *Can KPC have copies of all routeing agreements made with the employment users of Heyford Park?*
 (Note: 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). Enforcement was brought about through the actions of Kirtlington residents, though KPC commends Dorchester Group on the efficiency this matter was dealt with when brought to their attention).
- 13) *Can KPC have a copy of the Construction Traffic Management Plan for this phase of works?*

KPC would like to support the application being put forward by Dorchester Group, but as traffic-related issues are the overwhelming concern of those Kirtlington residents that front onto the A4095, and there are no discernible benefits being offered in response to the likely negative impacts that we believe will arise from traffic generated by the proposed development, our objection remains.

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 to reclaim our village for our parishioners as effectively as possible. This will surely also reflect positively upon Dorchester Group for supporting new techniques that they themselves can incorporate in future planning proposals.