

Case Officer: Andrew Lewis

Applicant: Dorchester Living Limited

Ward Fringford And Heyfords

Councillors Councillor Patrick Clarke, Councillor Ian Corkin, Councillor Barry Wood

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);
 - 929m² of retail (Class A1);
 - 670m² comprising a new medical centre (Class D1);
 - 35,175m² of new employment buildings, (comprising up to 6,330m² Class B1a, 13,635m² B1b/c, 9,250m² Class B2, and 5,960m² B8);
 - 2,415m² of new school building on 2.45ha site for a new school (Class D1);
 - 925m² of community use buildings (Class D2); and 515m² of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2);
 - 30m in height observation tower with zip-wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up of 100m² (Class D1/A1/A3);
 - 1,000m² energy facility/infrastructure (sui generis);
 - 2,520m² 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 2.1ha 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; and
 - associated infrastructure works, including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road.
-

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This report provides an update following the application being considered at Planning Committee on 5th November 2020.

2. Scope of Delegation

- 2.1 The resolution of the Committee was “that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director for Planning and Development to grant permission for application 18/00825/HYBRID subject to:

1. The following conditions (and any amendments to those conditions deemed necessary to be agreed in consultation with the Planning Committee Chairman and the Lead Member for Planning):

1. Statutory Time Limit (outline) – TL
2. Phased Reserved Matters – PC
3. Change of Use
4. Compliance with Plans
5. Phasing Plan – PC
6. Reserved Matters (affordable housing)
7. Design Codes – CON
8. Levels – PC
9. 1175-dwellings max
10. Landscaping per phase
11. Tree Protection
12. Landscaping
13. LEMP
14. CEMP-biodiversity
15. Protected Species Check/Updated surveys – CON
16. Cat/Dog Proof fence
17. Site Clearance (nesting season) – TL
18. Habitat Boxes – CON
19. Demolition (prior contractual commitment) – TL
20. Demolition
21. Building Recording – PC
22. Archaeology
23. School
24. Construction traffic
25. Green Travel Plan
26. Parking Strategy
27. Wheel Washing
28. CEMP-general
29. Working Hours
30. Noise 1
31. Noise 2
32. Lighting Strategy
33. Waste Management Strategy
34. No open storage
35. Plant to be internal
36. Compounds
37. Strategic Surface Water Management Scheme:
38. Surface Water Management Scheme (Phases):
39. Completion and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage-Shown on Approved Plans:
40. SuDS – Design Documentation Plans:
41. Environment Agency-Remediation Strategy
42. Environment Agency-Verification Report

- 43.Environment Agency-No infiltration
- 44.Environment Agency- foul water drainage scheme-1
- 45.Environment Agency- foul water drainage scheme-2
- 46.TWU-Protection Zone
- 47.TWU—Piling method statement
- 48.Sports Park 1
- 49.Sports Park 2
- 50.Community use of sport
- 51.Flying Field- Strategies for parking, lighting, signage, waste and fencing:
- 52.Flying Field- Parking/Storage
- 53.Flying Field- Runways and Taxiways:
- 54.Flying Field- Car Processing1
- 55.Flying Field- Car Processing 2
- 56.Flying Field- Filming production management plan
- 57.Flying Field- Filming-Photo record
- 58.Flying Field- Filming-noise

2. The completion of a planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as substituted by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 to secure the following (and any amendments as deemed necessary to be agreed in consultation with the Planning Committee Chairman and the Lead Member for Planning):

Education:

- provision of a new 1.5 entry primary school on a minimum 2.2 ha site as shown on the Composite Parameter Plan (or, in the alternative, agreeing to make a suitable site available for OCC with contributions for a school to be provided to OCC specification);
- contributions towards secondary school places which will consist of an expansion to the existing Heyford Park Free School sites to facilitate an additional 1.5 form of entry (or, in the alternative, providing a financial contribution to OCC);
- contribution towards special education needs.

Open Space:

- Provision of a mixture of community orchard areas and allotments;
- Provision of sports pitches to meet CDC requirements, to an agreed quantum;
- Provision of sports pavilion/changing rooms facilities;
- Indoor sport provision, consisting of on-site provision (or, in the alternative, providing a financial contribution for off-site provision);
- Provision of children's' play areas to meet CDC requirements, to an agreed quantum and specification.

Community Facilities:

- Provision of community hall/youth facility to an agreed specification to include Parish Office;
- Funding towards the provision of a community worker;
- Provision of a neighbourhood police facility.

Health Care:

- Provision of an extra care facility to an agreed specification or financial contribution to healthcare provision;
- Provision of an on-site healthcare facility of a minimum of two multipurpose treatment rooms with ancillary utility, waiting and reception space with financial contribution to primary healthcare provision.

Access and Movement:

- Resurvey traffic flows in the surrounding area and undertake remodelling;
- Form a working group to formulate a strategy for traffic mitigation in the surrounding area;
- Contributions towards public transport provision in the form of a bus service contribution and bus infrastructure to agreed amounts;
- Undertaking Travel Planning initiatives;
- Contributions towards off site highway works to improve highway junctions, including safety improvements contribution to A4260/B4027;
- Middleton Stony junction improvements; Ardley/Bucknell junction improvements; B430/minor road junction improvements; Chilgrove Drive S278 scheme; M40 Junction 10 improvements;
- Contributions towards rural traffic calming schemes including in Middleton Stoney, Lower Heyford including Caulcott, Ardley with Fewcott, Somerton, North Aston, Chesterton, Kirtlington, Bucknell and Fritwell and the contributions to be proportionate to the impact of traffic on the revised modelling outcome;
- Introduction of HGV restrictions on B4030 at Middleton Stoney and Lower Heyford;
- Routing agreements for all HGV traffic going to or departing from Heyford Park

Mitigation measures to be introduced at the earliest opportunity.

Heritage:

- Provision of a Flying Field Park to an agreed specification;
- Provision of a Control Tower Park to an agreed specification;
- Provision of a Heritage Centre and a Heritage Centre Manager, to an agreed specification;
- Provision of an Observation Tower on the Flying Field, to an agreed specification;
- Provision of Heritage Tours to an agreed specification;
- Baseline building condition surveys and wind and watertight works programme for buildings and structures on the defined Flying Field area;
- Provision of exhibition space in Building 1443 to an agreed specification;
- Refurbishment of Victor Alert Area buildings and structures to an agreed specification;
- Refurbishment of the Control Tower to an agreed specification;
- Provision of the Heyford Trail to an agreed specification;
- Provision of Interpretation Boards to an agreed specification.

Ecology:

- Provision of on-site ecological mitigation measures to an agreed specification and quantum;
- Contributions towards and/or provision of off-site ecological mitigation measures to an agreed specification and quantum;
- Provision of a cat-proof fence on the boundary of the settlement area and the Flying Field to an agreed specification.

Library:

- Contribution towards library provision.

Waste Management Contributions:

- Contribution towards waste management provision and services.

Bin Contributions:

- Contribution towards the provision of recycling and waste bins for households.

Recycling Centre:

- Contribution towards the provision of recycling centre facilities.

Apprentices:

- Contribution towards apprenticeship opportunities.

Public Art:

- Contribution towards public art provision on site”

- 2.2 It is considered the terms of the delegation have now been met by virtue of the completion of an appropriate s.106 Deed on 8 September 2022 and after consultation with the Planning Committee Chairman and the Lead Member for Planning.

3. Post Committee Matters

- 3.1 This report focusses on the officer recommendation and subsequent discussions that have taken place in respect to conditions and the S106 agreement.
- 3.2 At the time of the original Planning Committee consideration, there remained detailed points of negotiation with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) as the Local Highway Authority that required resolution through the imposition of conditions and by way of S106 obligations. A ‘headline’ list of suggested conditions to be imposed should planning permission be granted was presented to Committee in 2020 along with a preliminary list of required heads of terms and financial contributions to be secured by planning obligation in a S106 legal agreement. The report explained that negotiations on the heads of terms were continuing and in some instances were dependent on the outcome of ongoing traffic modelling at the time, which could alter the approach to strategic transport contributions.
- 3.3 The negotiation and drafting of the S106 have been subject to significant time lapse, which has resulted in the delay in determining this planning application and issuing planning consent in accordance with the Planning Committee resolution. This has been due to protracted negotiation on the drafting of the S106, which is a substantial agreement given the size and complexity of the proposals.
- 3.4 One issue of importance for the Council is to secure social housing. An affordable housing framework plan (AHFP) has been produced to demonstrate how 30% provision will be secured overall and at what stages in the development. This has been seen and agreed by the CDC Strategic Housing Officer. It arises mainly from the developer seeking to promote a scheme of housing for rent on the first phase of development under this permission (phase 10 overall) as a result of which only 19% of that phase will be social housing and below the agreed provision range of 25-35% per phase. All subsequent phases are shown in the AHFP to make up this slight deficit and therefore in compliance with the schedule to provide affordable housing. There is also agreed a provision of extra care homes, but the developer has yet to determine whether they will be C2 or C3 use. If it is C3 then the developer has agreed that they will provide 30% of them as affordable units.
- 3.5 The Strategic Housing Officer advises she is happy with the Affordable Housing Framework and draft S.106 and that there is sufficient flexibility to amend the proposals, by agreement, should there be a need to do so in future.
- 3.6 Annex 1 sets out within a table the ‘headline’ list of suggested conditions in the left-hand column with cross-references to where those matters are addressed in the agreed conditions, which are set out in the right-hand column. Areas of change are also highlighted in the right-hand column where it was ultimately determined and

agreed with the applicant that matters would best be addressed in the S106 Agreement, or would more appropriately be addressed at Reserved Matters stage, or for any particular reason were no longer deemed necessary with explanations provided in appropriate instances.

- 3.7 Annex 2 sets out within a table the draft S106 Heads of Terms (HoT) in the left-hand column and the agreed S106 HoT in the right-hand column.

4. Other Post Committee changes, submissions and representations.

- 4.1 The main change in the Council's planning policy is the adoption of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) Partial Review – Oxford's Unmet Housing Need but that Plan does not affect the current application.

- 4.2 Since the Committee resolution the Government have updated and issued a new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in July 2021. In general terms the NPPF re-focuses on design quality, protecting and enhancing the environment, and promoting sustainable development.

- 4.3 Additionally, a new insertion has been made (as paragraph 198,) that sets out that local authorities should, when considering applications to remove or alter a historic statue, plaque, memorial or monument (listed or not), have regard to the importance of their retention in situ and, where appropriate, of explaining their historic and social context rather than removal. This follows a ministerial statement entitled Protecting our Environment in January 2021 by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government. In it, the SoS stated: "Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework already states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 195 also requires that where development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss." It also reminded Local Authorities to consult closely with Historic England. In this case at Heyford the Council had already followed this advice.

- 4.4 The new changes focus very much on heritage minutiae such as historic statues, plaque, memorial or monument and led to the Government amending Part 11 (heritage and demolition) of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO), to ensure the demolition of a statue, memorial, or monument ("a commemorative structure") that has been in place for at least 10 years on the date of any proposed demolition, requires Planning Permission from the 21st April 2021. Whilst there is no definition of what comprises a statue, memorial or monument, it evidently has to be 'commemorative' in nature.

- 4.5 The aim of the change is to ensure that commemorative structures are not removed without proper consideration and public consultation, and to explore whether retention and explanation of them is an alternative or appropriate approach. This has been a strategy broadly followed by the Council so for example, the commemorative stone to 20th Fighter Wing of the USAF has been retained outside the Heyford Park Heritage Centre (Photo below).



- 4.6 Furthermore, as part the Council's decision, the applicant will be obligated to produce records of art, freestanding boards and facilitate trails to allow for the spread of information to educate and inform, which follows the main thrust of this national policy. Also, when detailed applications are submitted for consideration, if further matters of commemoration come to light, the Council will be able to consider them at that time. Such changes have not raised any new material issues in respect to this proposal that would require reassessment.
- 4.7 At Committee late representations were made by Daniel Scharf (Oxford Trust for Contemporary History) repeating that the site is the best-preserved remains of the Cold War in the UK and the (2010) appeal was allowed only to conserve the heritage. He goes on to say the Secretary of State should determine the application and not the Council.
- 4.8 The matters raised by Mr Scharf were addressed in the report and Committee were also advised the application needed to be referred to the Planning Casework Unit (PCU) to decide, after consideration by the Secretary of State, whether the application should be called in or not. The Council were subsequently informed on 10th December 2021 that after carefully considering his call-in powers "*The Secretary of State has decided not to call in this application*" ... and that... "*He is content that it should be determined by the local planning authority.*" It is understood a second challenge may have been made to the PCU by Mr Scharf which was again rejected.
- 4.9 Subsequently Mr Scharf has challenged whether the Council has followed the guidance on conserving and enhancing the historic environment and in particular quotes paragraphs 194 and 195 from the NPPF (2021) where proposals affect heritage assets. These paragraphs are set out below for ease of reference:
194. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to

understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

195. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 4.10 The main thrust of Mr Scharf's challenge that there is a lack of qualified heritage assessment is simply incorrect. There was already a wealth of information on the base produced over the years at Heyford. But for this application there was reproduced as Annex 3 the statement of competence for the consultants who have worked on this proposal which includes Oxford Archaeology and Pegasus planning consultants, but with expertise in heritage and other environmental specialisms. They are two organisations who have been involved with assessing heritage matters at Heyford for many years and have built up a wealth of knowledge of the site. As stated, Heyford has been subject of numerous studies in the last 20 years or so and as part of the current application documents were submitted including a full environmental statement, heritage strategies and impact assessments. These described the significance of heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail was considered proportionate to the assets' importance and sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.
- 4.11 Historic England have been closely involved from the pre-application stage and our consultation with them extends beyond the statutory requirements. In fact, after representations from the Council, a reassessment was made of the flying field (Research Report no 74-2017) but this did not result in any further scheduling or listing of assets on the base.
- 4.12 In support of his challenge, Mr Scharf quoted a case in planning law (England and Wales High Court (Administrative Court) Decisions-Cross, R (On the Application Of) v Cornwall Council [2021] EWHC 1323 (Admin) (21 May 2021)). In this case the High Court quashed planning permission granted by Cornwall Council for a home in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty also designated as a heritage coast. In essence the Planning Committee of Cornwall Council granted planning permission in this highly sensitive area, contrary to strong advice from the planning officer.
- 4.13 Their decision was challenged on the grounds that it failed to give reasons for its decision to depart from the recommendations in the Officer's report, in particular with regard to the impact on the AONB, and that it failed to determine whether or not the proposed development accorded with the Development Plan. The Judge said the resolution passed gave no reasons why the Committee departed from the planning officer's recommendation and there was "no adequate explanation of the decision to grant planning permission".

- 4.14 That decision is different from this application at Heyford Park in several importance aspects, as here the Committee determined the application in accordance with the Development Plan, and unless material considerations indicated otherwise, as required by planning law. Also, the Officer's report set out where there may be cases of harm and where elements of the scheme may deviate from the Plan and explained and justified them in the consideration of 'planning balance'.
- 4.15 Arising from the current tension in Eastern Europe, mention was also made by Mr Scharf of the conflict in Ukraine and the increased interest in the Cold War from which RAF Upper Heyford emerged in the post-Second World War period. But then again, the relevance to the Council's planning decision is minimal. The Council's position remains as set out in the Local Plan and that the importance of the site is reflected in the decision to preserve the character and setting of the former base.
- 4.16 Mr Scharf also refers to the Oxfordshire Joint Statutory Spatial Plan (OJSP) 2050 and claims Heyford to be one of three heritage sites in the County mentioned therefore underlining its importance. In fact, the allegation is erroneous but that is not to denigrate its status as a significant heritage asset and one that is highly valued in our district and beyond. It should also be noted that on 3rd August 2022 it was announced that work on the OJSP 2050 would cease with immediate effect.
- 4.17 Returning to the NPPF and the effect of proposals on heritage assets, paragraph 197 states:

"In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."

Officers are satisfied this advice has been followed in this case.

- 4.18 Before issuing the decision, Officers notified Mr Scharf advising that as it appeared to be complying with the original Committee resolution, it was likely that planning permission would be issued under the delegated powers of the Assistant Director for Planning and Development. In response, Mr Scharf repeated his opinion that the applicant's heritage strategy does not befit the site and that any approval would be contrary to Government policy.

5. Summary

- 5.1. Apart from the above concerns raised by Mr Sharf, which Officers are satisfied have been thoroughly assessed and appropriately considered and responded to, there have been no other material changes in circumstances or considerations since the Committee resolution (changes to policy, etc). which in the view of Officers would trigger a requirement for it to be referred to the Committee for reconsideration and there is therefore no necessity to return this application to the Committee.

5.2. This application seeks to bring forward allocation Policy Villages 5 of the Council's current Local Plan. On the basis of the resolution of the Committee, satisfactory details in respect of all updated conditions and S106 obligations have now been agreed, with any amendments to those conditions deemed necessary agreed in consultation with the Planning Committee Chairman and the Lead Member for Planning, and on this basis, the decision can now be issued.

Case Officer: Andrew Lewis

DATE: 3rd August 2022

Checked By: Andy Bateson
Alex Chrusciak

DATE: 8th September 2022
8th September 2022

Authorised By: David Peckford

DATE: 9th September 2022

Annex 1 – Conditions

Draft list of conditions (headlines)	List shared with Dorchester
1. Statutory Time Limit (outline) – TL	1. Yes
2. Phased Reserved Matters – PC	2. Yes
3. Change of Use	3. Yes
4. Compliance with Plans	4. Yes
5. Phasing Plan – PC	5. Yes
6. Reserved Matters (affordable housing)	6. No-Now included in s106 as affordable housing framework
7. Design Codes – CON	7. Yes, but amended to allow design code to be submitted in tandem with reserved matters
8. Floor Levels – PC	8. Yes
9. 1175-dwellings max	9. No – Agreed as unnecessary
10. Landscaping per phase	10. Yes
11. Tree Protection	11. Yes
12. Landscaping	12. Yes
13. LEMP	13. Yes
14. CEMP-biodiversity	14. Yes
15. Protected Species Check/Updated surveys – CON	15. Yes
16. Cat/Dog Proof fence	16. Yes
17. Site Clearance (nesting season) – TL	17. Yes
18. Habitat Boxes – CON	18. Yes
19. Demolition (prior contractual commitment) – TL	19. Yes
20. Demolition	20. – Yes
21. Building Recording – PC	21. No - Included in s106 Flying Field Management Plan
22. Archaeology	22. Yes
23. School	23. Yes
24. Construction traffic	24. No – included in s106 routing agreement
25. Green Travel Plan	25. No – included in s106
26. Parking Strategy	26. No – now included in C28 - CEMP
27. Wheel Washing	27. No – now included in C28 - CEMP
28. CEMP-general	28. Yes
29. Working Hours	29. Yes
30. Noise 1	30. Yes
31. Noise 2	31. Yes
32. Lighting Strategy	32. Yes
33. Waste Management Strategy	33. Yes
34. No open storage	34. Yes
35. Plant to be internal	35. Yes
36. Compounds	36. No – now included in C28-CEMP
37. Strategic Surface Water Management Scheme:	37, 38 and 39 now revised updated and merged into one condition
38. Surface Water Management Scheme (Phases):	
39. Completion and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage – Shown on Approved Plans:	
40. SuDS – Design Documentation Plans:	40. Yes

41. Environment Agency - Remediation Strategy	41. Yes
42. Environment Agency - Verification Report	42. Yes
43. Environment Agency - No infiltration	43. Yes
44. Environment Agency - foul water drainage scheme - 1	44 and 45 - revised and merged into one condition
45. Environment Agency - foul water drainage scheme - 2	
46. TWU - Protection Zone	46. Yes
47. TWU - Piling method statement	47. Yes
48. Sports Park 1	48-No-included in s106 agreement
49. Sports Park 2	49-No-included in s106 agreement
50. Community use of sport	50-No-included in s106 agreement
51. Flying Field- Strategies for parking, lighting, signage, waste and fencing:	51-Yes
52. Flying Field- Parking/Storage	52-No secured by s106 agreement
53. Flying Field- Runways and Taxiways:	53
54. Flying Field- Car Processing1	54. Yes
55. Flying Field- Car Processing 2	55. Yes
56. Flying Field- Filming production management plan	56. No - included in s106 agreement
57. Flying Field- Filming-Photo record	57. No - included in s106 agreement
58. Flying Field- Filming-noise	58. No - included in s106 agreement
	As a result of the changes the conditions listed above have now been re-numbered from 1 to 42.
	In addition, there are 20 Planning Informatives.

Annex 2 -S106 Agreement

Committee Report	S106 obligations
<p>Affordable Housing:</p> <p>30% of the residential development to be affordable housing, 352 units in total as set out in the attached table although the final tenure and mix is subject to negotiation:</p> <p>Education:</p> <p>Provision of a new 1.5 entry primary school on a minimum 2.2 ha site as shown on the Composite Parameter Plan (or, in the alternative, agreeing to make a suitable site available for OCC with contributions for a school to be provided to OCC specification);</p> <p>Contributions towards secondary school places which will consist of an expansion to the existing Heyford Park Free School sites to facilitate an additional 1.5 form of entry (or, in the alternative, providing a financial contribution to OCC);</p> <p>Contribution towards special education needs.</p> <p>Open Space</p> <p>Provision of a mixture of community orchard areas and allotments.</p> <p>Provision of sports pitches to meet CDC requirements, to an agreed quantum; - Provision of sports pavilion/changing rooms facilities;</p> <p>Indoor sport provision, consisting of on-site provision (or, in the alternative, providing a financial contribution for off-site provision);</p> <p>Provision of children's' play areas to meet CDC requirements, to an agreed quantum and specification.</p> <p>Community Facilities</p> <p>Provision of community hall/youth facility to an agreed specification;</p>	<p>30% of the dwellings will be affordable with a 25-35% range on each phase except phase 10 which will be 19.5% and phase 11 which will be 40.5%</p> <p>The site has been slightly amended to 2.4ha Details to be agreed at 150 units To be available at 450 units</p> <p>£3,136,628.00 in 2 tranches towards expansion of Heyford Park Academy or Bicester</p> <p>£407,023 towards Bardwell School, Bicester</p> <p>1.039ha to be provided in accordance with specifications prior to 100 dwellings or commencement of phase 16</p> <p>Specification to be agreed before 100 dwellings occupied. Provision of 4.2 ha of sports pitches and pavilion before 300 dwellings occupied</p> <p>Provision of a flexible sports hall by 800 dwellings, specification to be agreed by 450 dwellings, or financial contribution of £335.32 per dwelling</p> <p>Provide at least 4 LEAPs and at least 5 LAPs And after 800 dwellings a NEAP</p> <p>To provide a community centre after 340 dwellings occupied</p>

<p>Funding towards the provision of a community worker;</p>	<p>£91,005-00 before commencement of development</p>
<p>Provision of a neighbourhood police facility.</p>	<p>Provision of a 30sqm facility in a multi-use building</p>
<p>Health Care</p>	
<p>Provision of an extra care facility to an agreed specification</p>	<p>Not to Occupy any Dwelling until the location of the Health Care Facilities within the Site; and the Health Care Facilities Specification has been approved and provided before occupation of 150 dwellings or payment of £1,010,880-00 before 500 dwellings are occupied</p>
<p>Provision of an on-site healthcare facility of a minimum of two multipurpose treatment rooms with ancillary utility, waiting and reception space with financial contribution to primary healthcare provision.</p>	<p>Not to Occupy any Dwelling until the location of the Health Care Facilities within the Site; and the Health Care Facilities Specification has been approved and provided before occupation of 150 dwellings or payment of £1,010,880-00 before 500 dwellings are occupied</p>
<p>Access and Movement</p>	
<p>Contributions towards public transport provision in the form of a bus service contribution and bus infrastructure to agreed amounts;</p>	<p>Bus Service Contribution- £2,179,238 Public Transport Infrastructure Contribution-£25,428</p>
<p>Contributions towards off site highway works to improve highway junctions, including safety improvements contribution to A4260/B4027;</p>	<p>Cycle Route Contribution-£1,141,724 Local Weight Restriction Contribution-£69,967 Middleton Stoney Traffic Mitigation Scheme Contribution-£1,181,087 M40 Junction 10 Contribution-3,936,662</p>
<p>Contributions towards off site highway works to improve highway junctions, including safety improvements contribution to A4260/B4027;</p>	<p>Road safety improvements: £78,733 towards safety measures at the junction of North Aston Road and the A4260 arising from the impact of the Development £74,740 towards safety measures at safety measures at the junction of the A4260 and B4027</p>
<p>Undertaking Travel Planning initiatives</p>	<p>£2,478 towards the cost of monitoring the travel plan for the Development</p>
<p>Undertaking Travel Planning initiatives</p>	<p>Travel Plan initiatives will include payments towards green travel vouchers, provision of information packs, and employment of a travel plan coordinator</p>
<p>Village Traffic Calming Contribution: Middleton Stony junction improvements; Ardley/Bucknell junction improvements; B430/minor road junction improvements; Chilgrove Drive S278 scheme; M40 Junction 10 improvements; · Contributions</p>	<p>Allocation of £75,000 per village for Fritwell; Ardley; Somerton; North Aston; Chesterton; Middleton Stoney; Lower Heyford; Kirtlington and £37,500 in respect of Bucknell and £25,000 in respect of Upper Heyford only</p>

towards rural traffic calming schemes, including Lower Heyford, Ardley, Somerton, North Aston, Chesterton, Kirtlington and Fritwell

Heritage

Provision of a Flying Field Park to an agreed specification

A scheme for the provision of the Flying Field Park to comprise maintained areas of grassland, 3km of walking and cycling routes and Interpretation Board

Provision of a Control Tower Park to an agreed specification

Control Tower Park comprising its layout, planting and programme for delivery and Control Tower refurbishment by 600 dwellings

Refurbishment of the Control Tower to an agreed specification

Provision of the Heyford Trail to an agreed specification; · Provision of Interpretation Boards to an agreed specification.

Within 12 months of the opening of the Flying Field Park or Control Tower Park, a total of eight new Interpretation Boards will be designed, procured and installed through the Parks to provide information on the site including. key history, key views, buildings and ecology.

Provision of a Heritage Centre and a Heritage Centre Manager, to an agreed specification

Not to Occupy more than 650 Dwellings until the New Heritage Centre is Constructed and open to the public fund the appointment of the Heritage Centre Manager

Provision of an Observation Tower on the Flying Field, to an agreed specification

Provision of Heritage Tours to an agreed specification;

52 heritage tours a year

transport for the carrying out of heritage tours in accordance with the Heritage Management Plan

Baseline building condition surveys and wind and watertight works programme for buildings and structures on the defined Flying Field area; · Provision of exhibition space in Building 1443 to an agreed specification;

Within 12 months of the grant of Planning Permission to carry out the Building Condition Survey

Refurbishment of Victor Alert Area buildings and structures to an agreed specification; ·

Not to Occupy any more than 225 Dwellings unless and until a scheme for the refurbishment and use of the Victor Alert building has been submitted; and any more than 400 Dwellings unless and until buildings 2005-2007 comprising the Victor Alert Building have been refurbished and

	are available for use; any more than 800 Dwellings unless and until buildings 2008-2009 comprising the Victor Alert Building have been refurbished and are available for use; any more than 900 Dwellings until Building 1443 has been refurbished to provide an exhibition space in conjunction with a scheme of restoration to make the building safe
Ecology ·	
Provision of on-site ecological mitigation measures to an agreed specification and quantum; · Contributions towards and/or provision of off-site ecological mitigation measures to an agreed specification and quantum	Prior to Occupation of 150 Dwellings to agree ecology scheme
Provision of a cat-proof fence on the boundary of the settlement area and the Flying Field to an agreed specification.	Required by condition 16
Library ·	
Contribution towards library provision.	121,842
Waste Management Contributions	
Contribution towards waste management provision and services. Bin Contributions · Contribution towards the provision of recycling and waste bins for households. Recycling Centre · Contribution towards the provision of recycling centre facilities.	Strategic waste contribution-£95,575 Recycling Centre Contribution-£5,875-00) Refuse Collection Contribution- (£106-00) per Dwelling
Apprentices ·	
Contribution towards apprenticeship opportunities.	Not to Commence the development until a training and skills plan been approved 93 apprenticeships to be provided
Public Art	
Contribution towards public art provision on site	Not to Occupy any more than 150 Dwellings until the Public Art Scheme is submitted and not to Occupy any more than 300 Dwellings until the Public Art Scheme has been approved and to deliver the approved Public Art Scheme before the occupation of any more than 800 Dwellings Contribution of £175,250

Annex 3 Statement of Competence

LOGO	SPECIALISM	STATEMENT OF COMPETENCE
	Planning Environmental Impact Assessment Urban Design Socio Economics Landscape and Visual Impact	<p>Pegasus Group (Pegasus) is the consultancy that has compiled this Environmental Statement. This consultancy was established in 2004 and has over the years expanded to a company that seeks to deliver "good development" across the whole of the UK. Pegasus is a multi-disciplinary planning consultancy that works in the fields of planning, landscape and design, environment, heritage, transport and economics.</p> <p>Pegasus is Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) "Quality Mark" Accredited and its Environmental Statements (ES) and the processes that it undertakes to create them are subject regularly to external review via this accreditation to ensure that all Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) are legally compliant and applies best practice. This ES has been coordinated by a Member of IEMA and a Chartered Environmentalist.</p> <p>The Economics team at Pegasus leads on socio-economic analysis as part of EIAs, regularly undertaking demographic and economic research around the country to support planning applications. The team is comprised of demographers and economists. Pegasus is a member of the Institute of Economic Development.</p> <p>Pegasus has three offices which are Registered Practices with the Landscape Institute (Cirencester, Leeds and Birmingham). Our Landscape Architects regularly prepare Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIA) as part of EIA. The LVIA has been prepared by a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute to ensure compliance with best practice methodologies.</p>
	Transport Air Quality Noise	<p>PBA has a dedicated transport team that specialises in undertaking transport planning, modelling and appraisal for development schemes, including land development, regeneration and infrastructure projects. PBA's transport team includes experienced staff, who have relevant academic and professional qualifications, including those who hold Transport Planning Professional (TPP) and those who are Chartered Members of the Institute of Highways and Transportation (CMIHT). In addition, PBA holds corporate membership of the Transport Planning Society (TPS) and the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport (CIHT)</p> <p>PBA has a dedicated air quality team that specialises in undertaking air quality assessments for development projects, including land development, regeneration, energy and infrastructure projects. PBA typically undertakes in excess of a hundred air quality assessments each year. All of PBA's air quality team have suitable academic and professional qualifications, including being registered with the Institution of Environmental Sciences (IES) and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM).</p> <p>PBA has a dedicated acoustics team that specialises in undertaking noise and vibration assessments for development projects, including land development, regeneration, energy and infrastructure projects. PBA typically undertakes in excess of 150 noise and vibration assessments each year. All of PBA's acoustics team have suitable academic and professional qualifications, including being registered with the Institute of Acoustics (IOA). PBA are sponsor members of the IOA.</p>
	Ecology	<p>BSG Ecology regularly completes Ecological Impact Assessments (EclIA) for major developments in accordance with Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) guidance.</p> <p>BSG Ecology has a detailed understanding of the requirements of the regulations governing EIA in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. BSG Chartered Ecologists provide support to all stages of EclIA, from preliminary ecological assessment to screening and scoping inputs, baseline survey, biodiversity-friendly design, mitigation and impact assessment. BSG also provides support in the discharge of ecological planning conditions, with regard to habitat management and monitoring.</p>
	Cultural Heritage	<p>Oxford Archaeology (OA) has significant experience of carrying out EIA and ES works at Upper Heyford having produced EIAs for the site or component parts of it in 2007 (Heyford Park Development), 2010 (Heyford Park Development) and 2016 (separate reports for developments at Camp Road and the Southern Bomb Stores). In addition to these works OA has produced numerous other assessments, characterisation projects and fieldwork projects on the site over the past ten years. Major projects have included a Conservation Plan of the whole Airbase (with Philip Masters at ACTA) in 2005, a Landscape Character Assessment of the Airbase south of the Cold War Zone (with ACTA) in 2006 and proof of evidence and expert witness services for a Planning Appeal in 2008.</p> <p>In addition, OA has extensive and long-standing experience of the EIA process. OA was at the forefront of the establishment of the methodology for such surveys through their work on the EIA for the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (now HS1) through London, Kent and Essex between 1989 and 1993. OA has continued to work extensively on similar projects, both through its dedicated Heritage Management Services Department and through specialist staff based at our Cambridge and Lancaster offices. Over the past 28 years OA has produced numerous EIA surveys including major housing and commercial developments, power generation schemes and large-scale infrastructure including national rail, airport and primary road schemes.</p>
	Hydrology & Flood Risk Ground Conditions	<p>Hydrock is a multi-disciplinary engineering consultancy and specialist land remediation contracting business. We have a proven track record of supporting clients on the delivery of significant mixed-use regeneration projects for over 20 years. The Hydrock team includes experienced staff, who have relevant academic and professional qualifications including Chartered Water and Environmental Managers and Members of the Chartered Institute of Water and Environmental Managers.</p> <p>Hydrock provides support to clients throughout site development from the initial acquisition, to the planning process and then through to on-site assessment and delivery. As part of this we undertake geo-environmental assessments for schemes to evaluate the potential impact to stakeholders and the surrounding environment. These assessments are reported within supporting technical documents (desk study, site investigation and remediation strategy) and then assessed in the context of the development within the ground conditions chapter. Where appropriate, in the context of the site and scheme, mitigation measures to address any potential impacts are evaluated and recommended to ensure impact to stakeholders are minimised.</p>