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 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

Address

Name

Fotios Hatzigeorgiou

Meadow Cottage, The Green, North Aston, Bicester, OX25 6HT

Type of Comment

Objection

Type

neighbour

Comments

I am registering my objection to the busgate proposal contained in the above application for the following reasons The amount of traffic passing through North Aston has increased significantly in recent years and it has been suggested that this application would result in a doubling of the amount of vehicles passing through the village at peak time. As a village and from a personal view I am already concerned at the level of traffic along the Somerton Road and the speed at which many vehicles pass through the village. Any increase in this, let alone a doubling of the number of cars as has been predicted, would significantly increase the risk to pedestrians and children in the village. It would also lead to a significant rise in noise and air pollution and would be very detrimental to the quality of life of the all the residents. Furthermore the road between Somerton and North Aston, with its sharp bends and narrow corners, is unsuitable for the predicted volume of traffic, it is barely tolerable now during certain times of the day with large cars speeding through the village, both as a cut through to the Banbury/Oxford Road and on their way to the Tews, SOHO and further on the Chipping Norton The crossroads at the main road is frequently the scene of accidents and any pressure on this junction as a result of more traffic coming through North Aston will inevitably increase the number of accidents occurring at what is already an accident black spot. To avoid this junction, it is also likely that a number of vehicles would use Middle Aston Lane, which is a single track road, used by many pedestrians and cyclists, and totally unsuitable for any increase in vehicles. The amount that has been mentioned for traffic calming measures (50k) is totally insufficient to fund the calming measures which would be required to safeguard the residents and our way of life. There does not appear to be any coherent strategy for traffic management in the Cherwell Valley as a whole and there is no clear rationale for this proposal, which seeks to solve a problem with traffic at one end of the Cherwell Valley, by merely shifting it to the other end of the Valley, onto roads which are totally unsuitable, and with no thought to the impact on the surrounding villages. I hope that

Committee will take the concerns outlined above very seriously and reject this application.

Received Date

21/09/2020 19:49:43

Attachments