

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	Martin Keighery

Address	250 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 1ED
----------------	--------------------------------------

Type of Comment	Objection
------------------------	-----------

Type	neighbour
-------------	-----------

Comments	<p>MIDDLETON STONEY PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO: APPLICATION 18/00825/HYBRID HEYFORD MASTERPLAN This is the formal response of the parish council to the revised Heyford Masterplan application. Our principal concern is with the increased traffic implications for our village. We are grateful for the openness of CDC and OCC officers in explaining the further mitigation proposed, but we do not think this is sufficient. We therefore oppose this proposal and urge the Planning Committee to reject it. Our starting point is that there is already severe congestion in the village, notably at the signalised junction of the B430 and B4030 which is harming and the safety of villagers and adding to pollution. Indeed in commenting on the separate Great Wolf proposed application, the Local Highways Authority noted 'There is currently severe congestion at the junction' which would be further exacerbated by additional traffic. This would be 'contrary to paragraphs 103, 108 and 109 of the NPPF, Cherwell Local Plan SL E4 & Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4 Policy 17'. Turning to the current proposal we note that even the proposed developers accept that with their proposed package of mitigation, the situation would be best be 'no worse than the current situation without development'. We believe that it is long overdue that the situation is improved by both OCC and CDC, not just 'made no worse' by the ever-increasing development affecting the community here. While there are elements of the proposed mitigation we welcome, we believe that the development would exacerbate a position which is already deeply unsatisfactory. Over many years, the community of Middleton Stoney has been detrimentally affected by new developments all around it and there is a feeling in the village that enough is enough. Our community needs to be given adequate consideration. Our community should be allowed to enjoy the sustainable and environmentally pleasant lifestyle that planners insist are provided for the inhabitants of new developments. OVERALL TRAFFIC VOLUMES: For residents who live adjacent to the roads in Middleton Stoney, traffic queues in the morning and evening rush hour are common. On the Ardley Road, residents experience 35, 000 vehicle movements each week with queuing from the traffic lights back</p>
-----------------	--

out of the village past the 30mph zone and indeed the start of the 40mph zone. Thus the proposed routing of the traffic from Upper Heyford will increase traffic flows significantly. An extra 1000 car journeys from residents from Upper Heyford would mean a 25% increase in vehicles. The pollution alone from that increase should be sufficient to confirm the unsuitable nature of the proposed mitigations. Dealing with the key elements of the proposed mitigation in turn: HGVS We welcome the proposed weight restrictions on the Bicester Road. We believe these are already long overdue. However, we consider this to be only a partial solution, and so consideration should be given to weight restrictions on the B430. The proposed restriction on the Bicester Road would at best manage 25% of the HGV traffic and there are no guarantees it would not simply re-route HGVs onto the North/South road instead. There are currently c2500 HGV movements a week through the village. Were the proposal be accepted, we would like to see the proposed routing agreement on construction traffic, and associated enforcement/monitoring activities to ensure it does not pass through the village. Although a routing agreement exists for businesses at Upper Heyford, the InHealth HGV regularly passes through the village and without enforcement we fear many others will simply ignore the restriction. NEW BUS SERVICES: Again we welcome in principle the suggestion of a new, improved bus service from Heyford to Bicester, but are not convinced that it will encourage sufficient passenger numbers and divert traffic from Middleton Stoney. At least initially, it will only be twice a hour and with extremely low numbers on the existing 250 service most residents are likely to choose to use their cars. We have not seen a convincing palns from the developers which would encourage people to transfer from private cars to public transport, and understand there is no camera number plate recognition enforcement available in Cherwell to enable the proposed plans about what will happen when the s106 subsidies from OCC run out. Even if the bus gate enforcement were to work, the likely outcome is simply to divert significant car use and HGV traffic down Ardley Road. Many of the cars will then simply turn left into Bicester Road, adding to long delays at peak times. Finally, we fear that the result of the proposed mitigation would render the existing 250 service uneconomic, depriving Middleton Stonet residents of their service to and from Oxford. CYCLE LANE: This is welcome in principle but ignores the fact that cyclists will be forced to ride flanked closely by the large HGVs as well as large numbers of cars through a narrow and congested junction at MS. This is unlikely to encourage many new cyclists. We believe it better to provide an off-road segregated cycle tarck on the whole route even if that necessitates narrowing the road for traffic in places. TRAFFIC CALMING: We note that the developers are proposing s106 support for neighbouring villages, but not through Middleton Stoney even though the traffic consequences here are likely to be amongst the most severe. we think this is inequitable and if the proposal be approved it should be on the basis that MS be allocated a comparable amount of s106 funds for traffic calming measures. OTHER ISSUES: There are several other measures which could easily be taken to mitigate the consequences of this development. One suggestion is a pedestrian crossing at the signalised junction to make it easier for children and others to access the playground. Again, this is something we feel is long overdue and are surprised that both OCC and CDC's transport planning to date and feel it should be installed regardless of any future development at Heyford Park. 2 FINAL POINTS: Implications of Covid 19: We are living through an extraordinary pandemic which will have far reaching implications. These will inevitably include the public's unwillingness to use public transport. It also calls into question the financial viability of developers. Were the development to proceed, the parish council would wish to be consulted on and notified regarding the trigger points on the achievement of which the various mitigation measures are implemented. Our concern is that the development will either stall or take much longer and the proposed mitigation will not happen. So for this reason we would: 1] Urge the Council to REJECT the proposal at this time until the longer-term implications of the pandemic are clear. 2] Work with the Middleton Stoney community to work towards installing measures outlined above, especially the HGV restriction, REGARDLESS of any Heyford Park development. CONSULTATION WITH PARISH COUNCIL: We strongly regret that there has not been better and more engagement with the formulation of these proposals. It is a clear and serious affront to local democracy that we were unaware of the detailed planned mitigation until the formal consultation on the application. We are grateful to Cllr. Corkin, Andrew Lewis[CDC] and Joy White [OCC] for their belated efforts in the last week for facilitating discussion on the proposals, but feel strongly that it is unreasonable to expect parish councils to plough through thousands of pages to find passages of relevance to them. We therefore reiterate our call to CDC to make the planning process consultation much more user-friendly. CONCLUSION Middleton Stoney Parish Council has drawn up a draft policy to promote a clean, safe, healthy and pleasant environment in the village. These proposals fail to support these aspirations, are a step in the wrong direction and so we urge the Council to reject them. MSPC

Received Date

10/08/2020 18:51:14

Attachments