

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	Annie Savage
Address	Middle Cottage, St Marys Walk, North Aston, Bicester, OX25 6AA
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>North Aston objects to the Middleton Stoney traffic mitigation proposal on the undernoted basis: The objective/justification for the scheme is unsubstantiated in the widest of contexts and the purpose unclear other than the preferencing of Middleton Stoney village (popn 331 in 2011) in the context of traffic flow. The original travel plan (Peter Brett 2015) stated that the travel plan aimed to "reduce congestion and pollution and create a healthier, more attractive environment for Heyford Park" and yet this proposal simply moves that congestion and pollution to the end of the valley affecting North Aston, Somerton and Ardley and will undoubtedly make for an unhealthier and less attractive environment. North Aston objects to the Middleton Stoney traffic mitigation proposal on the undernoted basis: The objective/justification for the scheme is unsubstantiated in the widest of contexts and the purpose unclear other than the preferencing of Middleton Stoney village (popn 331 in 2011) in the context of traffic flow. The original travel plan (Peter Brett 2015) stated that the travel plan aimed to "reduce congestion and pollution and create a healthier, more attractive environment for Heyford Park" and yet this proposal simply moves that congestion and pollution to the end of the valley affecting North Aston, Somerton and Ardley and will undoubtedly make for an unhealthier and less attractive environment. As TN35 makes clear, the proposal forces a substantial amount of traffic through the route least able to cope with it for unexplained reasons. It is difficult to understand what the busgate will succeed in doing other than moving traffic along the valley but we fail to see to what end. Although calming measures in certain locations may result, mitigation will not occur. This appears to be a cosmetic measure which benefits a very small number of homes, possibly by enhancing the saleability of Heyford Park properties and may well respond to commercial interests of the developers whilst causing significant detriment to Ardley, Fritwell, Somerton and North Aston. The road network in the valley and particularly through Ardley, Somerton and North Aston is inadequate for the massive increase in vehicles set out in TN035. There is no evidence of a safety assessment in and around these villages and at this point no definitive</p>

statement as whether the plan restricts travel in both directions within the limited zone or is this ambition for southbound only? Whilst we would welcome Section 106 funding to manage the already overloaded and dangerous flow with or without the Busgate scheme, an estimated (probably conservative) increase exceeding 100% is untenable. The traffic analysis considers volume alone and ignores speed, safety, pollution, threat to wildlife and capacity of the route to manage. No reference to the additional traffic during the 11 years construction period is made. The road from Somerton via North Aston to the extremely dangerous Fox junction, where fatalities have occurred, is considered hazardous on the following grounds: The roads are narrow and single file in places There is an absence of footpaths within long stretches of the villages in question The canal and river bridges have weight restrictions and are single flow There are a number of blind bends Hazardous parking by the canal is frequent There are a number of concealed entrances along the entire route The Somerton canal bridge is extremely hazardous and poses a threat to walkers There is an absence of footpaths along the route from Somerton to North Aston Continuous potholes and damage arising from underground streams create extremely hazardous road surfaces Flooding of the valley between Somerton and North Aston occurs not infrequently and creates significant difficulty for drivers North Aston has no bus service and the only access to public transport is via a dangerous mile walk with no footpath or streetlighting to the Fox junction There are a number of dangerous crossings to access footpaths and bridleways Middle Aston Lane is a dangerous single track road and there is reason to expect drivers who wish to avoid queuing at the Fox junction will adopt this route. Somerton and North Aston appear to have a higher proportion of houses immediately adjacent to the main roads through the village, all minor B roads, and yet by encouraging traffic in the other direction, vehicles will have the benefit of using A roads. Much of the carriageway through Somerton/North Aston road is reduced to single lane traffic North Aston is a conservation village and the majority of houses are situated on the main road where speeding and traffic flow is already at a dangerous level. There is a growing number of children and pet owners and as an agricultural village, several businesses are involved with animals and livestock, in particular one which drives/trains young horses and riders and has been subjected to danger and abuse from motorists obliged to reduce speed. Although the Busgate scheme affords the benefit of a cycle route to residents around Heyford Park and Middleton Stoney, a large number of cyclists use the Somerton Road through North Aston and yet despite a national agenda encouraging children to cycle to school, this is too dangerous at current levels. Again we refer to The Heyford Park travel plan which stated "support for safe cycling and walking and road safety improvement at Heyford Park" and TN 35 evidences the fact that the proposed busgate scheme results in the absolute opposite for those in the path of the diverted traffic. Evidently Dorchester Group is proposing to sacrifice the safety and wellbeing of residents, many long term, who live in the valley for the wellbeing of Heyford Park only. Is CDC really prepared to support such an inequitable outcome? The volume and speed of traffic through North Aston is already of enormous concern. Abuse by motorists has led to erosion of the Village Green and the level of risk for residents, their parked vehicles and cyclists is already too high. This is of particular concern for children. We therefore strongly object to the proposal which leads to an unacceptable increase in traffic through the village. North Aston will be adversely affected by Heyford Park and requires assistance to mitigate the significant hazards presented by the development including but not limited to the rejection of the Middleton Stoney traffic mitigation proposal. As TN35 makes clear, the proposal forces a substantial amount of traffic through the route least able to cope with it for unexplained reasons. It is difficult to understand what the busgate will succeed in doing other than moving traffic along the valley but we fail to see to what end. Although calming measures in certain locations may result, mitigation will not occur. This appears to be a cosmetic measure which benefits a very small number of homes, possibly by enhancing the saleability of Heyford Park properties and may well respond to commercial interests of the developers whilst causing significant detriment to Ardley, Fritwell, Somerton and North Aston. The road network in the valley and particularly through Ardley, Somerton and North Aston is inadequate for the massive increase in vehicles set out in TN035. There is no evidence of a safety assessment in and around these villages and at this point no definitive statement as whether the plan restricts travel in both directions within the limited zone or is this ambition for southbound only? Whilst we would welcome Section 106 funding to manage the already overloaded and dangerous flow with or without the Busgate scheme, an estimated (probably conservative) increase exceeding 100% is untenable. The traffic analysis considers volume alone and ignores speed, safety, pollution, threat to wildlife and capacity of the route to manage. No reference to the additional traffic during the 11 years construction period is made. The road from Somerton via North Aston to the extremely dangerous Fox junction, where fatalities have occurred, is considered hazardous on the following grounds: The roads are narrow and single file in places There is an absence of footpaths within long stretches of the villages in question The canal and river bridges have weight restrictions and are single flow There are a number of blind bends Hazardous parking by the canal is frequent There are a number of concealed entrances along the entire route The Somerton canal bridge is extremely hazardous and poses a threat to walkers There is an absence of footpaths along the route from Somerton to North Aston Continuous potholes and damage

arising from underground streams create extremely hazardous road surfaces Flooding of the valley between Somerton and North Aston occurs not infrequently and creates significant difficulty for drivers North Aston has no bus service and the only access to public transport is via a dangerous mile walk with no footpath or streetlighting to the Fox junction There are a number of dangerous crossings to access footpaths and bridleways Middle Aston Lane is a dangerous single track road and there is reason to expect drivers who wish to avoid queuing at the Fox junction will adopt this route. Somerton and North Aston appear to have a higher proportion of houses immediately adjacent to the main roads through the village, all minor B roads, and yet by encouraging traffic in the other direction, vehicles will have the benefit of using A roads. Much of the carriageway through Somerton/North Aston road is reduced to single lane traffic North Aston is a conservation village and the majority of houses are situated on the main road where speeding and traffic flow is already at a dangerous level. There is a growing number of children and pet owners and as an agricultural village, several businesses are involved with animals and livestock, in particular one which drives/trains young horses and riders and has been subjected to danger and abuse from motorists obliged to reduce speed. Although the Busgate scheme affords the benefit of a cycle route to residents around Heyford Park and Middleton Stoney , a large number of cyclists use the Somerton Road through North Aston and yet despite a national agenda encouraging children to cycle to school, this is too dangerous at current levels. Again we refer to The Heyford Park travel plan which stated "support for safe cycling and walking and road safety improvement at Heyford Park" and TN 35 evidences the fact that the proposed busgate scheme results in the absolute opposite for those in the path of the diverted traffic. Evidently Dorchester Group is proposing to sacrifice the safety and wellbeing of residents, many long term, who live in the valley for the wellbeing of Heyford Park only. Is CDC really prepared to support such an inequable outcome? The volume and speed of traffic through North Aston is already of enormous concern. Abuse by motorists has led to erosion of the Village Green and the level of risk for residents, their parked vehicles and cyclists is already too high. This is of particular concern for parents of young children. We therefore strongly object to the proposal which leads to an unacceptable increase in traffic through the village. North Aston will be adversely affected by Heyford Park and requires assistance to mitigate the significant hazards presented by the development including but not limited to the rejection of the Middleton Stoney traffic mitigation proposal.

Received Date

03/08/2020 13:27:03

Attachments