

Comment for planning application 18/00825/HYBRID

Application Number	18/00825/HYBRID
Location	Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD
Proposal	<p>A hybrid planning application consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1;• 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 2.45 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 zip-wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up to 100 m2 (Class D1/A1/A3); > 1,000 m2 energy facility/infrastructure (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.• 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 > 76.6ha for filming activities, including 2.1 ha for filming set construction and event parking (Sui Generis);• the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified in Schedule 2.• associated infrastructure works, including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road.
Case Officer	Andrew Lewis
Organisation Name	
Name	Kildare Bourke-Borrowes
Address	Lower House, St Marys Walk, North Aston, Bicester, OX25 6AA
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour

Comments

As a resident of North Aston, I object to the Application on the following grounds:

1. The proposal would result over time in a substantial increase traffic through Somerton and North Aston (TN035) which will continue the seemingly inexorable 'traffication' of inappropriate small roads through rural villages caused by Heyford Park developments. The stated aim of the HP developers has always been that they will seek to minimise the impact of the development on neighbouring villages.
2. The Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan (2019) was negotiated, with the full participation of the developers, to control and mitigate the effects of the HP development. There is no mention in that Plan of a bus gate or other traffic re-routing schemes. This Application therefore is an opportunistic attempt by the developers to bypass the agreements crystallised and enshrined in the Plan.
3. North Aston is a Conservation Area (1988). The object of this designation is 'to manage change in order to protect or enhance the special character and appearance of the area'. Rerouting substantially more traffic through the Conservation area goes against the spirit, intention and aim of the Plan, and should not be allowed.
4. The road through Somerton is twisting and blind, and it then crosses the canal on a blind single-flow vehicle bridge, at the foot of which canal-visitors vehicles hover, offload and park. The Oxford-Banbury Canal itself has Conservation area status (2012), and already the amount of traffic at this very serious pinch-point mitigates against this status. The road then continues through two further single-file pinch points (river & mill stream bridges) where there are frequent badly managed traffic near-misses.
5. The road from the valley up to & through North Aston is narrow, often blind, with abruptly concealed entrances which constitute a series of substantial hazards to vehicles and pedestrians alike. The road is part of a national Cycleway; additionally many walkers use it, and there are no footpaths along it at all between the canal and the village. It is already dangerous.
6. The particular character of North Aston is that the majority of the population live in houses that are on the other side of the road from the village's major amenity - The Green. Already the increased volume of

traffic through the village makes this a seriously hazardous crossing, especially for children and elderly who visit and enjoy the amenity. More traffic = more danger for them. 7. The hazards at the 'Fox' crossing at the A4260 has been the subject of numerous representations to the Council over time. 8. Compared to this very serious series of hazards and disadvantages, the current route B4030 is largely a good road, with excellent sight-lines, has no dangerous pinch points, and goes through only one built-up area at Lower Heyford, the majority of whose population do not live on it. 9. I have seen no serious case made for the advantages of the current Application. The amount of traffic passing through Middleton Stoney will, it would seem, not be diminished. The proposal would allow freer access of buses between Bicester and HP, but we have seen no analysis assessing the actual time/flow benefits of this, and they are probably quite small. In summary, this is an ill-considered proposal, which will have very little beneficial effect for Middleton Stoney or bus-access to & from Bicester, and will have substantial detrimental effect on the small villages of Ardley, Somerton and North Aston, totally unnecessarily.

Received Date

03/08/2020 11:55:33

Attachments