

Mr Andrew Lewis
Cherwell District Council
Planning, Housing & Economy
Bodicote House, Bodicote
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 4AA

Direct Dial: 0207 973 3632

Our ref: P00905351

20 July 2020

Dear Mr Lewis

T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 & Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990

HEYFORD PARK CAMP ROAD UPPER HEYFORD BICESTER OX25 5HD Application No. 18/00825/HYBRID

Thank you for your letter of 30 June 2020 regarding further information on the above application for planning permission. On the basis of this information, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Historic England Advice

When we last commented on these proposals, in our letter of 18 May 2020, we outlined a number of concerns. The greatest of these was that development on parcels 11, 12, 21 and 23 would harm the distinctive military character of the Flying Field which forms the most significance part of the conservation area. While we acknowledged that a design charrette had suggested interesting and innovative approaches to this issue this work had not been formally incorporated into the planning application.

We also reiterated ours concerns expressed in our initial letter of 9 July 2018 regarding the scale of development around the HAS in the south east corner of the flying field (the creative city), the proposals for a school on the Victoria Alert Area and the extent of demolition proposed.

The Proctor and Matthews strategy document

In response to concerns raised by ourselves and others about the form of housing proposed the applicants have a submitted a strategy document prepared by Proctor and Matthews, one of the practices contributing to the charrette. This outlines broad development principles for the parcels in question. This proposes a low bund and that houses fronting the flying field have pitched green roofs to continue the effect of a bund. This idea has much to recommend it and there is clearly the potential to develop







the concept into a fully worked up scheme of innovative houses that could respond positively to the character of the flying field. However the current document is a broad concept and there is much work to be done, particularly concerning the street layout architectural approach and ensuring a positive connection between the housing and flying field. Furthermore, while this document sets out interesting ideas its status is unclear; at present there is no means of ensuring that the design strategy has any bearing on what is actually built on these sites. The surest way of ensuring design quality would be to work up a full application for this part of the site, or at least the elements directly fronting onto the flying field. Until and unless it can be demonstrated that there is a solid mechanism for ensuring that the good ideas set out in the design strategy are delivered if these plots are built out the concerns we have consistently raised about development on these plots still stand.

The school site

The proposals for the school have again evolved since we last commented and it has become apparent how problematic it is to fit a school which meets the County Council's requirements onto this site. The requirement for a 8400 metre square soft PE area would inevitably entail the loss of a large section of the hard-standing connecting the three Victoria Alert shelters, which would severely compromise the legibility of this part of the site. While we are content with bringing the school building closer to the southern hanger and linking the two with a single storey structure we are concerned that at present the area of hard standing to be retained is subject to achieving the school's target areas of soft external spaces and there remains the possibility of an intrusive fenced car park in the middle of the hard standing. The parameter plans need to be clearer and ensure that enough hard-standing is retained to make the original purpose of the Victoria Alert Shelters apparent if our concerns regarding the school are to be fully addressed.

The scale of development in the Creative City and the issue of demolitions

Our concerns regarding the scale of development proposed for the creative city and the lack of a clear and convincing justification for the demolition of buildings identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area, particularly A-type hanger 150 and Squadron HQ 370 still stand.

Conclusions

While positive steps have been made to amend the proposals insufficient progress has been made to fully address the issues that we raised in our letter of 18 May. Therefore the position we set out at length in that letter, namely that we considered that the harm to the significance of the Upper Heyford Conservation Area would be high, and that we did not consider the harm to be clearly and convincingly justified, remains unchanged. Our position remains that that we wish our advice to be treated as an objection unless







our concerns have been fully addressed.

Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 189, 190, 192, 193, 194 and 196 of the NPPF. We think this application is capable of being amended to address our concerns, but were this application to be recommended for approval in its current form please treat this letter as a formal objection.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duties of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess, and section 72(1) to pay special attention the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 also requires that you determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If, however, you proposed to determine the application in its current form, please treat this as a letter of objection, inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.

Please contact me if we can be of further assistance.

Yours sincerely



E-mail: richard.peats@HistoricEngland.org.uk

cc: Jenny Ballinger, Cherwell DC



