

# Comment for planning application 18/00825/HYBRID

<b>Application Number</b>	18/00825/HYBRID
<b>Location</b>	Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>A hybrid planning application consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1;</li><li>• outline planning permission for up to: &gt; 1,175 new dwellings (Class C3); &gt; 60 close care dwellings (Class C2/C3); &gt; 929 m2 of retail (Class A1); &gt; 670 m2 comprising a new medical centre (Class D1); &gt; 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); &gt; 2,415 m2 of new school building on 2.45 ha site for a new school (Class D1); &gt; 925 m2 of community use buildings (Class D2); and 515 m2 of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2); &gt; 30m in height observation tower with zip-wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up to 100 m2 (Class D1/A1/A3); &gt; 1,000 m2 energy facility/infrastructure (sui generis); &gt; 2,520 m2 additional education facilities (buildings and associated external infrastructure) at Buildings 73, 74 and 583 for education use (Class D1); &gt; creation of areas of Open Space, Sports Facilities, Public Park and other green infrastructure.</li><li>• the change of use of the following buildings and areas: &gt; Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8); &gt; Buildings 217, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3055, 3102, and 3136 for employment use (Class B8); &gt; Buildings 2010 and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1); &gt; Buildings 73 and 2004 (Class D1); &gt; Buildings 391, 1368, 1443, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use); &gt; Building 340 (Class D1, D2, A3); &gt; 20.3ha of hardstanding for car processing (Sui Generis); and &gt; 76.6ha for filming activities, including 2.1 ha for filming set construction and event parking (Sui Generis);</li><li>• the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified in Schedule 2.</li><li>• associated infrastructure works, including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road.</li></ul>
<b>Case Officer</b>	Andrew Lewis
<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Name</b>	Annie Savage
<b>Address</b>	Middle Cottage, St Marys Walk, North Aston, Bicester, OX25 6AA
<b>Type of Comment</b>	Objection
<b>Type</b>	neighbour

**Comments**

I have thought about the Middleton Stoney traffic mitigation scheme in the context of the section of the Chewell Valley running from the north end connecting Ardley to North Aston via Somerton and the south at Lower and Upper Heyford and in every way the valley is going to be affected very badly by the development at Heyford Park. That we know. To what extent was this really considered by the developers? It seems that the statements around the benefits for the Heyford Park residents in the traffic plan dated 2015 weigh all of them in favour and preclude any benefit for the residents of the entire valley, many of whom have lived here for many years. The stated aims which include safer environments for walkers and cyclists, a reduction in pollution and a more attractive environment may well be the case for the new occupants at Heyford Park but if the Busgate scheme proceeds, the polar opposite will be achieved at for the rest of us. Is that morally justifiable? It feels like a commercial decision. The route from Ardley through to North Aston and out to the crossroads at the Duns Tew crossing is already treacherous and in my view is unable to accommodate an increase in cars which not only have increased in volume in recent years but have little regard for speed limits or safety. From early in the morning the noise of motorists travelling through the village provides the soundtrack to our lives, only outperformed by their return on the evening run. We are already aware of a need for assistance from OCC Highways and funding from the developers and if the scheme is approved, Section 106 funding would be welcome but can only go a little way to make any difference to the safety of residents and the quality of lives. We have little in the way of footpath provision and whilst buses may be offered to Heyford Park residents, initially in the short term, I will watch with interest the attempts to persuade people away from their cars. Sadly residents of this village have to walk half a mile on a dangerous road with no footpath out to a junction with a road which has sustained 4 fatalities in recent years. The figures in the TM035Rev bear testimony to the anticipated increase in vehicles with no offer of alternative public transport. Cycling which is on the national agenda and I believe the MCNP

in the context of sustainability is simply not safe to risk. The road from Somerton is dangerous for many reasons and I simply do not understand why it is deemed acceptable to construct a diversionary system which knowingly pushes traffic onto minor B roads which are simply inadequate to cope. How does a new development justify preferencing one area in favour of the other when the risks are known and the potential for injury/loss of life already high? I have no alternative but to object. With no action to take traffic away from the valley altogether, it seems that we are facing an increase in traffic through North Aston of a disproportionate nature and yet the north end is least equipped to manage this increase. Looking at the figures, the traffic survey indicates that by 2031 we can anticipate an increase in excess of 100%

**Received Date**

03/08/2020 18:06:32

**Attachments**