Comment for planning application 18/00825/HYBRID

Application Number 18/00825/HYBRID

Location

Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD

Proposal	A hybrid planning application consisting of: • 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 of 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 D1); > 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	Paul Jolly
Address	5 Hall Close,North Aston,Bicester,OX25 6HR
Type of Comment	Objection
Туре	neighbour
Comments	I remain opposed to this application. My understanding is that the proposal has, since my last comment, not been amended in any material way, rather the developers have simply stated what *possible* funding might be available. Emphasis on possible. My objections remains as before therefore, because the application has not materially changed. There remains no clear rationale for the diverting of traffic from one part of the valley to another. I, along with the majority of residents of North Aston, have concerns with the *current* levels and danger of traffic in North Aston and surrounding villages, let alone a situation in which these would increase. The proposed route through North Aston is entirely unsuitable for the planned increase in traffic: more traffic would significantly increase the risk to life for road users as well as village residents. With regards to the possible funding, the 50,000 that *might* be available to North Aston represents merely a token gesture rather than a genuine and substantive proposal for how traffic safety/calming could be implemented. I am reliably informed that such an amount would barely cover the cost of installing a single chicane at one end of the village. A single chicane represents a very small percentage of the measures that would be appropriate/necessary. Therefore, this cannot be taken as a serious or genuine response to mitigate the concerns that I and others have previously raised with the proposal.
Received Date	17/09/2020 13:13:02
Attachments	