**From:** Public Access DC Comments   
**Sent:** 01 June 2018 20:32  
**To:** Public Access DC Comments  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application 18/00825/HYBRID

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 8:31 PM on 01 Jun 2018 from Mr Sean Barnard.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Summary** | |
| **Address:** | Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD |
| **Proposal:** | 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); 2.4 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 with a stack height of up to 24m (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; Change of Use of the following buildings and areas: Buildings 357 and 370 for office use (Class B1a); Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8); Buildings 217, 3102, 3136, 3052, 3053, 3054, and 3055 for employment use (Class B8); Buildings 2010, 3008, and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1); Buildings 2004, 2005 and 2006 for education use (Class D1); Buildings 366, 391, 1368, 1443, 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 (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 |
| [Click for further information](https://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications/centralDistribution.do?caseType=Application&keyVal=P8IT8PEMMSY00) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Details** | |
| **Name:** | Mr Sean Barnard |
| **Email:** |  |
| **Address:** | 1 Hart Walk, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5AF |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments Details** | |
| **Commenter Type:** | Neighbour |
| **Stance:** | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| **Reasons for comment:** |  |
| **Comments:** | We would like to object to the proposed planning permission, especially in regard to parcel of land 17. Our objections are on the following grounds;  1. Document 09191529 is inaccurate. It states that we (1 Hart Walk) were consulted regarding the proposed development. While we were aware of some of the continued building works, i.e. restaurants and shops, at no point we're we ever consulted with regard to the proposed plans.   2. Our house currently overlooks parcel 17 and we have unobstructed views of the countryside south of Upper Heyford. The construction of 62 dwellings in this parcel will destroy the view and our privacy. Had we been warned about the plans when we bought the properly in 2016 we would not have proceeded with the purchase, however Dorchester Living assured us that no plans were in place and the fields in front of our house weren't going to be built upon and the house was sold to us as a 'Field View Property' not a 'Temporary Field View Property'.  3. The noise and disturbance caused by the ongoing build of 62 homes on our door step is not unacceptable. We specifically moved to this property for its isolation and privacy. In addition, once the plot is completed, we will have people walking past our property at all times of day and night to reach the local amenities, plus all the additional noise from people walking back from the bar / restaurant after closing time. It will completely change the type of property we own and intrude on our right to privacy.   4. The new development will cause a loss in value of our house with the removal of the current views and the elimination of the privacy and isolation. Who will be responsible for loss in equity?   5. There is simply no need to build on the farm land in front of our house. Why do these new properties need to be built on farm fields that are still in use, there are plenty of available space on the old airbase.   6. Most importantly, we would also like to object on the grounds that the distance between the plot and the sewage treatment plant is too close. Anglia Water published the following recommendations regarding Encroachment Risk Assessment on Sewage Treatment Works and distance from proposed developments.  <http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/_assets/media/121212_Asset_Encroachment_Risk_Assessment_Methodology_publish(1).pdf>  In it they show maximum distances reached for an odour footprint of 1.5ouEm³ - the odour concentration advised in the Environment Agency's H4 Guidance for assessing odour risk from treatment works and how these distances increase in line with population growth. Given the proposed plot will increase the population by almost 3,000 people and given that there are currently well over 2,000 people living in Upper Heyford at the moment, this moves the risk up to the 5,000 - 10,000 population bracket and in turn means the minimum distance from the sewage treatment plant to maintain a low risk needs to be at over 400m. As you can see from the attached image with the unsafe zone at 400m added, this means that not only do we and all the current houses in Hart Walk, Wellington Road, Duvall Park and more fall into the medium risk bracket, but so does the free school. This reason alone should stop any grants to plan as it clearly shows it would be damaging to the environment and affect the well-being of local residents and school children whose health should be paramount.   <https://www.involved.events/images/400m.jpg> |