

GENERAL MATTERS	Comment	Response of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy Manager
<p><b>Defence Estates</b></p>	<p>Reference to the brief being produced at the request of the Under Secretary of State for Defence should be deleted and the page containing this sentence should be re-issued. In any event there is no need for this sentence to be included in the document and to retain it may suggest that you are seeking to infer the Minister’s endorsement to a document which he has not seen.</p> <p><b>1.2</b> The Council is already aware that the sites are being sold separately and the text requires amendment to reflect this. The first sentence should indicate that DE&amp;S Caversfield has been on the market since early July.</p> <p><b>1.4</b> Reference to Policy EMP4 is not clear in the context of the paragraphs that follow.</p>	<p>Officer notes of the meeting with the Under Secretary of State for Defence record the Minister asking for</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Defence Estates to speed up the Crichel Down process</li> <li>2 For a Conservation Area Management Plan to be produced for the whole site</li> <li>3 For a Development Plan produced by a “close working group” comprising Defence Estates, English Heritage and the Council.</li> </ol> <p>Both English Heritage and Tony Baldry MP, the only other attendees at the meeting, also confirm that the Minister asked for a Development Plan. This also accords with the use of the term “Development Strategy” in the DCMS document <i>Disposal of Historic Buildings; guidance note for Government departments and non-departmental government bodies</i> (1999), which cites a Development Plan as needed to analyse the development potential of a site prior to disposal. There is no inference in the text that the Minister has seen or endorsed the document. Whilst officers do not agree that the Minister did not ask for such a document, whether he did or not is immaterial, as this Council always produces such Planning Briefs / Informal Development Principles for major sites in the District as they come onto the market and considers it to be its duty, as the Local Planning Authority, to do so here.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: That reference at paragraph 1.2 be amended to say that the document was prepared <u>following</u> the meeting with the Minister.</p> <p>Defence Estates put the Domestic site on the market in early July 2009 and, we are advised, intends to put the Technical site and flying field on the market subject to the outcome of the Crichel Down process.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: That paragraph 1.2 be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Section 1.4 refers to the Policy context in terms of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan (CLP) 1996 and the Non Statutory Cherwell Local Plan (NSCLP) 2004. RECOMMENDATION: To avoid confusion, references to EMP4 should include the relevant local plan source whether it is the CLP or NSCLP.</p>

	<p><b>1.4</b> Penultimate paragraph to is not clear as to which site is being discussed. The sites are distinct units of occupation and separate planning units and it is likely to confuse to state otherwise, and to indicate access to the two sites being linked.</p> <p><b>2.2</b> As the reference and inclusion of RAF Bicester in describing the proposed sale could give the wrong impression to both former owners and prospective purchasers it is potentially prejudicial to the consideration of both sites. The Council should please make clear in the document that DE&amp;S Caversfield and RAF Bicester are shown and described throughout as quite distinct and separate sites. The document needs to make clear that there are two sites under discussion – DE&amp;S Caversfield (part of the former historic domestic part of the airfield) and the current airfield RAF Bicester, the boundary which could be shown on a separate plan.</p> <p><b>Site plan</b> It was understood that landowners other than MOD are not included in the brief, yet land outside MOD's ownership is shown on the plan.</p> <p><b>Fig 2</b> This again shows land not within either DE&amp;S Caversfield or the RAF Bicester site boundary – to the north of the Caversfield site (intruding onto land used by USVF), to the south of the bomb stores and also public highway between DE&amp;S Caversfield and RAF Bicester.</p> <p><b>Figure 3</b> is again not accurate in relation to the boundary.</p> <p><b>2.4</b> There is no indication why a flood risk assessment would be needed or for which site. Is the word 'not' missing from the text?</p>	<p>As set out in Section 1.1 of the Planning Brief, the document covers the flying field, the technical site and the domestic site.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Text be expanded to clarify that it is agreed between the parties that historically the site was one planning unit and further that the Council considers the whole of RAF Bicester to be one planning unit where sui generis military use of the airfield is carried on, the nature of which encompasses a range of uses including offices etc, all of which exist and are used to fulfil the military use of the site. The planning decisions required to provide for new ownership and uses, creating separate planning units, need to be considered from this base line. Defence Estates has decided to sell the site in phases, but this is not the only way in which it could be done. Indeed, there would be distinct advantages to the sale of the site as an entirety, as this could allow for cross subsidy.</p> <p>Land outside MOD's ownership is included in the conservation area but is excluded from the sale and the therefore the provisions of the Brief do not apply. RECOMMENDATION: The plans in the document be amended to ensure all land outside MOD ownership is excluded from the document.</p> <p>The text is correct. PPS 25 advises that a Flood Risk Assessment is required to accompany an application in Flood Zones 2 and 3 or an application in Flood Zone 1 that is classed as a Major Development (ie residential development of sites greater than 0.5 h and commercial development greater than 1h), which this would be.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Text be expanded to this effect.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Section 3</b> As the Conservation Area Appraisal is so recent reference to a dated consultants report – CgMs – appears unnecessary and could be seen to be giving undue weight to something that is not Policy.</p> <p><b>3.4</b> Suggest anecdotal hearsay about buried archaeology and reference to Bomber Command Heritage be removed – the Land Quality Assessment does not support this supposition and there is no evidence base for it.</p> <p><b>Figure 4</b> Refers to a ‘proposed’ boundary.</p> <p><b>Para.3.8</b> Reference could be made to the Land Quality Assessments for the two sites, which identify these issues.</p> <p><b>3.11</b> Reference to DE&amp;S Caversfield being used for glider pilot accommodation may not be appropriate when the caravans have an existing use.</p> <p>Penultimate para – please delete ‘temporary’ in relation the Air Training Corps (ATC) building which, as previously advised on 2 July, is ‘modular’. It is not clear why a move to a newer building would be desirable as the ATC current accommodation is also not part of the historic fabric and is a permanent structure – a move from bld 34 to another building would not mean the existing building would not be re-used.</p> <p><b>Fig.6</b> Text not clear, in particular as to which land is being described and reference to powered flight. It is understood a safeguarding plan has been lodged with the Council.</p> <p>In relation to the list of documents stated as required for a Listed Building Consent or Conservation Area Consent it</p>	<p>The Council commissioned the report from CGMS and LDA to establish, through independent advice, whether there was any development potential on the technical site and flying field. Its conclusions were reported to the Executive and informed the preparation of the Non Statutory Plan and remain valid today as there has been no material change.</p> <p>The Brief clearly attributes the statement to Bomber Command Heritage. RECOMMENDATION: A further qualification be added to refer to the existence of the Land Quality Assessment, which this Council has not seen and cannot comment upon.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: <i>Proposed</i> be removed from the reference to Conservation area extension, as this has now been designated.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Reference to the Land Quality Assessment, which the Council has not seen, be added.</p> <p>There is no planning permission or Certificate of Lawful Use for the caravans. It is the role of the Brief to point out suitable alternatives to avoid caravans being parked on the airfield, of which this is one.</p> <p>Defence Estates intention is to offer the Air Training Corps alternative accommodation on the Domestic site and alternative accommodation could also be identified on the technical site. RECOMMENDATION: reference to a <i>temporary</i> building be replaced by reference to a <i>modular</i> building.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The safeguarding plan, which has recently been received, be added to the document</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The wording be changed to state that not all the</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>may be more helpful to indicate that not all the information as set out would be needed for all applications but 'may include for example....' depending on the nature of the application.</p> <p>The management guidelines, if more formal and comprehensive, could provide the necessary guidance, as the 2003 guidelines do for DE&amp;S Caversfield.</p>	<p>listed information will be needed for all applications.</p> <p>The Management Guidelines incorporate ALL the 2003 Guidance and extend and elaborate upon that guidance.</p>
<p><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b></p>	<p><b>Highways and Transport</b></p> <p><u>Transport Assessment</u> A robust Transport Assessment will be required which must consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed information of the level of traffic generated by the site's existing uses</li> <li>• Site history</li> <li>• Traffic generation for the proposed development(s);</li> <li>• Assessment of existing public transport, pedestrian and cycle links</li> <li>• Accident records (previous 5 years)</li> <li>• Provisions of off-site infrastructure and financial contributions towards enhancing local services and towards the Bicester Integrated Transport Strategy.</li> <li>• Travel Plan for site(s)</li> </ul> <p><u>Transport financial contributions</u> Contributions towards the Bicester Integrated Transport Strategy will be required, at this time (August 2009) the figure is around £6,500 per additional average 2 way movement at peak times (varies per use) per residential unit or 100m2 for other uses i.e. B1 use. Public transport subsidies will also be required to continue/enhance existing services, provide new services or divert existing services to serve the proposed sites.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: Elaboration as to what the Transport Assessment should include be added.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: As this information is useful to a potential purchaser, reference to the transport financial contributions that will be sought be included.</p>

	<p>Public transport infrastructure will also be sought i.e. Real Time Information, bus shelters, flags etc.</p> <p><u>Other information</u> The footways, roads, landscaping areas etc within the site are privately maintained; therefore I would expect any future development(s) to carry on this arrangement; although a Private Road Agreement may be required between a developer and the Local Highway Authority. If the roads etc were to be offered for adoption a significant and costly amount of work would be required to bring this infrastructure up to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council Transport Planners and Development Control Highway engineers on site and in a meeting and a number of detailed points were discussed.</p> <p>The site must accord with government guidance (PPS25) and incorporate a sustainable drainage system.</p> <p><u>South East Plan</u> The proposed site should comply with the relevant transport policies within the South East Plan.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure and Service Provision</b></p> <p>Many services are at capacity and so can not cope with a population increase in Bicester. Residential development including that created out of existing buildings would need to make contributions to service infrastructure so the existing population is not disadvantaged. Further work would need to be done to identify the full impacts of development, assess whether new and/ or improvements to the full range of County services and facilities would be required to accommodate the additional demands, with costs, phasing and funding sources identified to feed into the district's</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: Text be added.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Text be added to reflect the detailed points raised.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The aspiration for sustainable drainage may be compromised due to the built up character of the sites and the existing road, but reference should be added as an aspiration.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Text be added.</p> <p>The Developer Contributions sought will vary according to the land use and, as this is not known at this stage, it is premature to be prescriptive in this respect. RECOMMENDATION: Reference be included to appropriate planning obligations associated with any future redevelopments needing to be agreed prior to the granting of planning permissions and prospective developers being encouraged to talk to Cherwell District Council and the County Council prior to concluding a purchase or the submissions of planning proposals.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>infrastructure delivery plan. We would like to expand Paragraph 4.13 deals on developer contributions to be more prescriptive in terms of likely requirements, in line with the comprehensive planning brief used at the former RAF Upper Heyford. At least it should say that appropriate planning obligations associated with any future redevelopments would need to be agreed prior to the granting of planning permissions. Prospective developers should be encouraged to talk to Cherwell District Council and the County Council prior to the submissions of planning proposals.</p> <p>There should be a comprehensive list of all of the buildings and their location (by plan).</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: A comprehensive list of buildings cross referenced to a plan be included.</p>
<p><b>Bicester Town Council</b></p>	<p>Whilst the document appears to be mainly about the technical site, including the airfield, there are several references to the domestic site scattered throughout the document. This makes the document confusing and it is often difficult to clearly see the focus of the Brief in respect of each of the sites.</p> <p>As the domestic site is already on the market and therefore presumably subject to its own planning brief it would be easier if the domestic was treated separately the combined technical and airfield sites, albeit within the same planning brief as what happens to both sites and how they relate in the future to improve the quality of life of the expanding number of people living and working in Bicester.</p> <p>Perhaps most importantly, with the recent announcement that Bicester is one of four designated eco towns in the country, it is important that the RAF Bicester Planning Brief promotes, fits into and compliments our eco town status and the master planning for Bicester, that is currently being developed by central government and all three tiers of local government.</p>	<p>Because the Council considers the site to be one planning unit and considers there are advantages to it being sold as one, particularly to enable cross subsidy from the Domestic site to the Technical site, it is important that all relevant information is provided within one document to avoid potential purchasers gaining only a partial picture.</p> <p>There is not already a planning brief for the Domestic site: this is the relevant document. The final document will be properly desk top published and therefore with suitable graphics and colour will aid navigation through it.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The synergy with the Eco-Town be emphasised.</p>

<b>Launton Parish Council</b>	The Council resolved that it wholeheartedly supported the brief and regarded it as an excellent piece of guidance.	Noted
<b>English Heritage</b>	<p>I understand that the Council's timetable to produce this brief has been prompted by the marketing of the domestic site, currently occupied by the Defence Equipment &amp; Supplies (DE&amp;S) agency, by Defence Estates. However, potential purchasers of the DE&amp;S site already have access to fairly comprehensive guidance about the planning constraints and opportunities relating to this site, as set out in the recent (2008) Conservation Area Appraisal and in the management guidelines (drafted for this site in 2000 and revised in 2003).</p> <p>I note that the brief includes conservation management guidelines for both parts of the MOD site, and incorporates the guidelines for the domestic site. However, for future owners, it may be more practical to have guidelines which are specific to their area of ownership. Given your timetable for producing the brief, I would suggest de-coupling the guidelines from the brief, so that there is greater flexibility in the way that they are presented. This would also allow the guidelines to be a 'live' document which can be regularly reviewed in the light of changing circumstances. I suggest that the structural survey at Annex 2 is omitted and made available separately, if necessary, as it is likely to be superseded by other more accurate and comprehensive surveys, based on a full inspection of all the listed buildings. I think that further work is required to give the document greater clarity and a more positive tone. It will be important to have this in place whenever the technical site and airfield come to be marketed (subject to the rights of former owners).</p>	<p>Neither the Conservation Area Appraisal nor the 2003 Management Guidelines anticipated the sale of the domestic site; nor do they deal with the planning policy background in relation to change or potential alternative uses. For this reason it is considered essential that a Planning Brief for the domestic site is prepared to inform potential purchasers. The Management Guidelines are updated to anticipate alternative non military uses and it is considered that these would also be of interest to potential purchasers in assessing their obligations in relation to the management of the site and so are included so that potential purchasers may understand the complete picture from one comprehensive document.</p> <p>The existing Management Guidelines were elaborated upon for the domestic site and extended to cover the technical site and the flying field for the first time. Very little comment on the content has been provided by either English Heritage or Defence Estates, other than that more work needs to be done. The advice of English Heritage in particular would be valuable. Due to the difficulty of accessing the technical site it is likely that information on it will filter through gradually and that the Management Plan for the technical site will, by necessity, as EH describes, become a 'live' document.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: For this reason, the advice regarding de-coupling the Management Plans for the technical site and the domestic site is recommended. The document should be split into 2: Part A Informal Development Principles should continue to cover both parts of the site. Part B The Management Plan should deal with the domestic site and the technical site separately, so that the technical site document can be updated as information becomes available. However, it is disappointing that neither English Heritage nor Defence Estates has used the opportunity and time presented by the preparation of this document to engage in this process and it is to be hoped that both parties will now do this with some sense of urgency, so that a document can be prepared in readiness to inform for a future owner of the technical site.</p>

	<p><b>1.2</b> The reference to the document being prepared at the request of the Minister could be mis-construed and best omitted.</p> <p><b>1.4</b> Deals with the policy context. The draft does not appear to present the full picture and consideration needs to be given to including other policies such as Policy BE6 from the South East Plan and those in the adopted Local Plan relating to the historic environment. Steve Williams can advise further, if required.</p> <p><b>1.4</b> Now that a site for an Eco-town has been confirmed at north-west Bicester, it would be relevant to confirm if there are any opportunities for synergy between the proposed eco-town and the technical/airfield and domestic sites.</p> <p><b>1.6</b> Status of the document. Will this brief be simply an 'interim' guidance document, pending the LDF?</p>	<p>Please see the response to a similar point made by Defence Estates on page 1. RECOMMENDATION: That reference at paragraph 1.2 be amended to say that the document was prepared <u>following</u> the meeting with the Minister.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.17 of the South East Plan supports Policy BE6: Management of the Historic Environment and refers to regionally historic features and sites including the defence heritage of the region. RECOMMENDATION: the following sentence be inserted at the end of the second paragraph in Section 1.4: <i>"Policy BE6 of the South East Plan encourages proposals that make sensitive use of historic assets through regeneration, particularly those that bring redundant or under-used buildings into an appropriate use."</i></p> <p>The presence of an Eco-town nearby will clearly bring economic and other benefits and open up a wider range of opportunities for the future of the site. RECOMMENDATION: In view of the proximity of the proposed Eco-Town, reference to the potential synergy with the Eco town be included.</p> <p>The Draft Planning Brief has been prepared to provide informal guidance in determining proposals for the reuse of the RAF Bicester site. It sets out Cherwell District Council's aspirations for the site and the future uses that are considered appropriate. The Brief is issued without prejudice to the consideration of future planning applications on the site. The purpose of the document is to set out the planning parameters for the site so that both vendor and any prospective purchasers are aware of the planning context, constraints to development and what the Local Planning Authority considers appropriate in terms of land use, amount and appearance of development. The document has been the subject of public consultation, amended as appropriate and once approved by the Council's Executive it will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications on the site.</p>
<p><b>Bomber Command Heritage</b></p>	<p>Thank you for an excellent document.</p> <p>Supports the Strategy for Central Oxfordshire to become a</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>



	<p>world leader in education, science and technology.</p> <p>Strongly supports the stated need to avoid piecemeal development that does not preserve the landscape and setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The stated possible uses of light industry, manufacturing and storage are discounted later in the document.</p> <p>Considers a comprehensive framework plan to be essential.</p> <p>Makes several corrections / additions to the section on special importance and statement of significance. Requests reference to the site being also the “premier surviving example of an operational training unit”.</p> <p>Asks that the reference to buildings / structures being the only ones remaining of their type or best preserved national examples be emphasised with reference to the 16 Constrained Areas as Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 41 Grade II Listed Buildings.</p> <p>The DCMS Protocol reference to financial considerations not being the over-riding criterion in determining disposal of the site will now be incorporated into all EH documentation relating to this process.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The section on special importance and statement of significance is already fulsome and although interesting the suggested additions add little of substance.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Reference to those that are the best preserved national examples be included.</p> <p>Noted. This is not a matter for the Brief.</p>
<p><b>Bicester Vision</b></p>	<p>Some 4 million visitors a year come to Bicester Village, nearly a third from overseas, so there is potential to make these dual sites a positive additional attraction for visitors to the town.</p> <p>We believe it will be very difficult for the MOD in this market to find one purchaser prepared to take on and deliver what is outlined within the planning brief, so we would urge the Council, at an early stage, to forge stronger working</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: Reference to the synergy between the various uses be referred to at paragraph 2.3.</p> <p>Noted. Defence Estates has contributed to the preparation of the Brief, but further co-operation in the preparation of the management plans for the technical site will be sought.</p>

	relationships with the MOD Defence Estates department to ensure that there can be a more cohesive approach towards interested parties.	
<b>BBOWT</b>	There may be significant scope for enhancement for biodiversity across the site, including for protected species such as barn owls (one is currently known to inhabit the bomb stores), badgers, newts and bats.	RECOMMENDATION: The text be amended accordingly.

FLYING FIELD	Comment	Response of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy Manager
<p><b>Defence Estates</b></p>	<p><b>4.2</b> Reference to the re-introduction of powered flight is not understood, when powered flight has not ceased.</p> <p>There is no public access to either site and references to this need amendment. Neither does the lease to the current occupier of the airfield require it. Suggest the sentence relating to 'continued public access' is deleted.</p> <p>Reference to Upper Heyford, a Cold War base, is not clear and also not clear whether decisions taken on planning issues at other sites can be enforced elsewhere. Also not clear how uses ancillary to the airfield, including temporary or permanent storage, could 'not be countenanced' – further clarity may be required if car storage is meant.</p> <p>All the buildings could continue in use as ancillary to the use of the airfield for flying.</p> <p><b>4.7</b> It may be considered unreasonable to expect new owners and occupiers at RAF Bicester to provide unrestricted access to what may be private spaces. Heritage Open Days in relation to either site would surely be at the invitation of the new owner/s occupiers – it is questionable that this can be imposed.</p> <p><b>4.8</b> It is believed the garrison status comes from the Depot at Bicester.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: Reference to the <i>re-introduction</i> be removed. The substantive point remains valid.</p> <p>The text refers to access being enjoyed by the public as members of the Windrushers Gliding Club. RECOMMENDATION: Reference to future public access be reworded to ensure it is clear that to be compatible with continued aviation use access needs to be controlled.</p> <p>The reference to car storage at RAF Upper Heyford is relevant in that it was found to cause harm to scheduled ancient monuments and the open character of the flying field, both of which are transferable to RAF Bicester. Legal precedent that could restrict the use of a site is relevant to potential purchasers. The reference to outdoor storage in the text does not refer only to car storage but to any outdoor storage associated with the use of the buildings and it is therefore relevant that potential purchasers should be aware of such limitations that it is anticipated would be controlled through the planning process and the Management Plan.</p> <p>The continued use of <u>all</u> the buildings on the technical site as ancillary to the flying field is possible but it is more likely that a mixed use development will ensue and the Planning Brief needs to cater for this eventuality.</p> <p>There is no reference to requiring unrestricted access. The text seeks public access to the technical site though a museum / heritage centre and to the domestic site through special Heritage Open Days. Given the national importance of the site, this is not considered an unreasonable aspiration to seek through the Management Plan.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Reference to the garrison town be removed.</p>

	<p><b>4.9</b> The walls are not in danger of collapse – please delete reference to this, as requested previously and clarified by English Heritage in their earlier comments.</p> <p>The tone of paragraph 4.9 could be made more positive and it is not clear why certain sections are underlined.</p> <p><b>4.10</b> The Council may wish to refer to the PPS</p> <p><b>4.11</b> The land between hangar 137 and the re-aligned Skimmingdish Lane could be developed.</p> <p>The use of the phrase ‘deliberate dereliction of duty’ is an unfortunate one and one the Council may wish to reconsider. Also the statement that English Heritage did not visit the site between 2003 and 2008 may be better left out,</p>	<p>The letter dated 19 February 2009 from English Heritage’s Inspector of Ancient Monuments described the bomb stores as having some smaller gables with no base and that it was “possible to move one wall by hand” and that they presented “a danger to unauthorised persons”, requiring perimeter fencing and advice regarding signage warning of dangerous structures. RECOMMENDATION: The wording be changed to specifically refer to the content of that letter.</p> <p>This paragraph is a statement of fact. The section on the Council not ruling out serving an Urgent Work Notice or Repairs Notice is underlined to draw potential purchasers’ attention to the powers open to the Council once Crown Immunity is removed by sale of the site. Since this has a direct bearing on the value of the site, it important that potential purchasers are under no illusion when making an offer.</p> <p>It is currently PPG 15 and 16 which guide planning decision on the historic environment and archaeology respectively. The Draft combined PPS is currently only a consultation document and it would not be appropriate to second guess what the final document might say or when it might be published.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.3.2.6 of the CGMS report states “<i>The only area where a significant development opportunity exists lies to the south of the old line of Skimmingdish lane (ie beyond the technical site boundary) where there is an area of previously used land running down to the new by-pass</i>”. This is referred to at paragraph 4.11 but is not the same area of land as “between hangar 137 and the re-aligned Skimmingdish Lane”. Development here would disturb the spatial symmetry of the layout and mask the defence structures within it and for those reasons is not considered suitable.-</p> <p>English Heritage has not commented upon the inclusion of this reference to it nor to the inclusion of reference to its correspondence. RECOMMENDATION: The reference to dereliction of duty be replaced with “inadequate maintenance of protected buildings and structures over a</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>as would reference to a specific letter from English Heritage?</p> <p>Again, with the statutory Listing descriptions, and the recent Conservation Area Appraisal, rehashing comments made in a consultants report in 2003 may not appear helpful.</p> <p>The final paragraph appears to shut the door on meaningful discussions between potential purchasers of the Caversfield site with regard to any new buildings or extensions, which may not be considered positive or helpful.</p> <p>These comments on new buildings could be considered at odds with the comments relating to building 112 on the RAF Bicester site in relation to coherence and quality of the buildings.</p> <p><b>4.12</b> There are more at least 5 access points into DE&amp;S Caversfield and RAF Bicester and a further access with consent but not yet built at Caversfield.</p>	<p>prolonged period”.</p> <p>The content of the CGMS report remains relevant in determining the potential for future development.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.11 explores potential opportunities for new development on the Domestic site and concludes that, for a number of reasons explained in the text, these are not considered suitable.</p> <p>Building 112 is an unlisted fuel tanker shed, of which there are a number of others on the technical site, and occupies a position where it obscures the view from the central axis onto the flying field. Preliminary opinions expressed by English Heritage concur with the Council’s view that the conservation area could be enhanced by its removal.</p> <p>The views of the Highway Authority have now been received and the document updated accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b></p>	<p><b>Highways and Transport</b></p> <p>The existing (main) access to the site via Skimmingdish Lane (A4421) which is currently used by the Gliding Club will meet the required visibility standards of 4.5m x 160m (50mph speed limit) once all the vegetation within these vision splay have been cut back/down (and maintained). Currently vision to the left is obstructed. Assuming the number of vehicles using this access remains similar no alterations may be required. However, a right turn lane may be required at this access if there is a significant increase in traffic movements.</p> <p>There is a footway/cycle link on the opposite side of the Gliding Club entrance along Skimmingdish Lane, if this site</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: The advice of the Highway Authority be incorporated into the document. A site visit and meeting have subsequently been held with County Council transport planners and highway engineers and the following has been agreed and incorporated into the Brief:</p> <p>A right turn lane will be desirable if the traffic movements increase to over 500 movements per 12 hour period, which is the current threshold. Access for major events, such as air shows, would need to be from this entrance and would be subject to a routeing agreement.</p> <p>A footway will be required from the roundabout along the north side of A 4421 as far as the entrance to the flying field.</p>

is to be developed a similar link must provided along the frontage of the site with crossing facilities (subject to type of development i.e. remains as a gliding club only may not seek improvements).

**Countryside**

The document covers recreation, access and public rights of way information in some detail. The Brief does not require reinstatement of the cross-flying field paths and I can appreciate this perspective given the desire to see aviation retained on this site. We will check that there is no legal requirement to reinstate the routes - but would anticipate that continued use as a flying field precludes this. I would be keen for any development of the site to adopt the principles of the Oxfordshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan and our guidance note about Countryside access and development. South East Plan policies for rural urban fringe (SE Plan policy C5), countryside access and public rights of way management (C6), as well as green infrastructure (CC8) and management for an urban renaissance (BE1) are all relevant in this location.

I would be keen for the site to add to the walking or multi-purpose recreation in the area - so for example it would be good for the development to provide the means for the proposed flying field perimeter path to be made easy and enjoyable to use, and also connecting this path and the site to the surrounding areas of population and connecting public rights of way. If there was the will and opportunity to go a stage further it would be good to see the whole site providing a rural country park experience instead of just a perimeter path. This may not include the flying field when that is operational, but could mean that the perimeter path and its surrounds form a wide and accessible 'green belt' around the site to serve as a significant recreation and habitat facility for the area.

RECOMMENDATION : Reference to relevant policies be included.

Establishing a country park on the site is not compatible with continued aviation use. Public access to the flying field needs to be managed to ensure public safety and therefore some controls and management will be required. In the event that aviation use does not continue, the opportunity for further future public access to the flying field can be explored.

	<p><b>Ecology</b>  It is good that you have had a phase 1 habitat and initial protected species survey carried out for this site and also that you have identified the designated sites in the vicinity and on site (the flying field is a LWS). I note also that you have identified the landscape character types defined in OWLS and the Cherwell District Landscape Assessment. The favoured development options for the site are to retain the flying field for aviation. It is also stated that alternative uses should "not result in the erection of any structure, either temporary or permanent on the open flying field". Other uses suggested (e.g. temporary festivals, outdoor concerts, markets and shows) should only be considered if it can be demonstrated at planning application stage that a development will not adversely impact on the biodiversity interest of the flying field and that any adverse impact can be adequately mitigated and compensated for. The development of the rest of the site has the potential to impact on biodiversity and landscape (as identified in this document) so you should ensure this is appropriately investigated and mitigated for as part of any planning application.</p>	<p>Noted. The impact of development on the biodiversity of the site will be considered at planning application stage and the intention is that a Management Plan will be agreed for the site, which will deal in detail with biodiversity issues.</p>
<p><b>Bicester Town Council</b></p>	<p>Bicester Town Council supports the provision of a mix of open space community and heritage activities that conserves this very important historical site which, as well as its modern military history, can be traced back to Romano-British and pre-Roman archaeology. We note that little in the way of archaeological surveying has been carried out and feel this is an omission in the brief. It is important that this rich heritage is not only conserved but given voice. At the same time RAF Bicester is a vital and important open space that must be sustained so it can continue to provide and extend the wide variety of healthy and complimentary outdoor activities it supports.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist has called for a watching brief and this will be a condition of any planning approval. Reconciling public access with continued aviation is a matter that needs careful consideration and is addressed in the Brief</p>

	<p>Alongside our general comments we specifically support the continued use of RAF Bicester as a heritage site and for gliding / flying activities as the best way of ensuring its long term future as a vital and valuable open space. We further believe that the airfield as the most complete airfield in from the early age of aviation in the country and is of national and international significance. As such this heritage needs to be conserved. We are not convinced that the planning brief is completely clear about the acceptable future uses and concerned that the advice states that “the setting of the listed buildings should not be interpreted too narrowly” as this can be interpreted in many ways, some of which, in our opinion, could be detrimental to the retention of the open space and heritage.</p>	<p>A number of potentially acceptable uses are indicated for the technical site and the domestic site.</p> <p>PPG15 and case law defines the setting of listed buildings.</p>
<p><b>Windrushers Gliding Club</b></p>	<p>There is no way a large gliding club can operate without permission for caravans on-site, <b>absolute necessity</b>.</p> <p>There is no way one can have the public meandering around the site and across the airfield. An uninsurable risk and not something the CAA or other supervisory bodies would accept. Our lease requires other users, eg the public, to be Members and this brings them all into line with the rules etc. We will have no issue with open access to the technical site so long as the public cannot wander into danger on the airfield site</p>	<p>The caravans do not have planning permission nor a Certificate of Lawful Use. The existing location of the caravans is unacceptable due to the harm it causes to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the aircraft hangars, which are listed buildings. The brief states at paragraph 3.11 that alternative overnight accommodation will need to be identified. This could be within converted buildings on the Domestic or Technical site or stationing of caravans within hangars. Any external stationing of caravans on a temporary or permanent basis within the site will need to demonstrate that no harm is caused to the character or appearance of the conservation area, to the scheduled ancient monuments or to the setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>The Brief does not refer to the public being able to meander across the airfield. It refers at 4.3 and 5.4 to the existing model used by Windrushers Gliding Club , requiring those having access to be members of the club, to unrestricted public access putting lives at risk and states that a similar model will need to be agreed between interested parties to ensure public safety.</p>



<p><b>English Heritage</b></p>	<p><b>3.4</b> Has a reference to buried archaeology 'including remains of large aircraft structures and large items'. Unless there is evidence for this statement, it may be better to omit it.</p> <p><b>3.12</b> Deals with constraints associated with continued aviation use. Can the brief define more clearly those areas, including the small safety strip to the west, which would need to be maintained as open space if flying is to continue (e.g. by means of a map)?</p> <p><b>4.2</b> Dealing with the use of the flying field needs to give greater attention to possible conflicts between aviation and other uses, particular increased leisure use of the airfield. EH experience at Kenley Aerodrome suggests that there can be serious safety issues where gliding and leisure uses co-exist on an open airfield.</p>	<p>This text was included at the request of Bomber Command heritage, albeit no evidence was submitted. RECOMMENDATION: In the light of lack of evidence at present to substantiate the claim, the reference to buried archaeology be omitted.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The Flight Consultation map, which is now available, be included and the text expanded.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Reconciling the aspirations for public access to the flying field as a major recreational resource for Bicester and ensuring public safety with the continued aviation use is a significant issue to be grappled with. It is the role of the Brief to flag up the expectation that the public will be able to have continued access to parts of the flying field, albeit in a controlled manner as at present. Exactly how this is to be achieved will depend upon the future use and future ownership and the details can be negotiated once these are known.</p>
<p><b>Bomber Command Heritage</b></p>	<p>The surrounding landscape may also contain evidence of the extended fabric of the site, which will require further investigation.</p> <p>20<sup>th</sup> century Conflict and Industrial Archaeology in the UK has grown to be recognised as important.</p> <p>Emphasise the importance of views, vistas and an open site. Highlight the protected species more.</p> <p>There is a need for a watching brief to monitor developments that could adversely affect the Aerodrome. Cannot assume that there is no radiation from buried aircraft instruments.</p>	<p>The former extent of the historic airfield is broadly understood from historic maps. Any remains outside the airfield have either been destroyed by later development in the south or affected by agricultural operations in the north east.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The important views and vistas are indicated on Fig 4, consistent with those identified in the adopted Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist has called for a watching brief and this will be a condition of any planning approval.</p>

	<p>BCH supports the retention and development of Windrushers Gliding Club providing it is in keeping with the atmosphere and heritage aims. The heritage centre / museum such as that proposed by BCH would incorporate some limited aviation use, including gliding, and has wider public access and benefit. Public access is central to BCH.</p> <p>Period “tail dragger” aircraft benefit from into-wind, omni-directional take off and landing.</p> <p>Some panels between the flying field and the technical site need to be removed and replaced with suitably designed gates for access and emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>The Council is seeking the retention of aviation use and the operational and safety requirements of this need to be reconciled with all other uses.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Any boundary between the technical site and the flying field will be dependent upon the future use and will be a component of a future application, but until future uses are known neither the location of such a boundary nor its design can be determined. RECOMMENDATION : Reference be added to the need to put in place measures ensure that the public does not trespass from one part of the site to another in an unauthorised or dangerous manner..</p>
<p><b>Bicester Vision</b></p>	<p>The Board of Bicester Vision supports the overall concept of some form of aviation museum, whilst retaining flying use on the technical part of the airfield. There is the opportunity, with the help of European or Heritage Lottery funding to create a live museum campus which encompasses a new museum for Bicester, the concepts of Bomber Command, flying of light aircraft, gliding and a living outdoor museum focussing on some of the history of central Oxfordshire.</p> <p>There is the opportunity, in this context, to look at strengthening linkages with the town itself across the ring road. For most residents there has only been limited access to the site over many years so future plans do need to open it up to more flexible and welcoming public use.</p>	<p>The support of Bicester Vision for the potential of the technical site to deliver such a concept is welcomed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8 seeks additional pedestrian routes between the site and Bicester and from the flying field in particular. Reconciling increased public access with continued aviation use is a matter that needs careful consideration however.</p>
<p><b>BBOWT</b></p>	<p>Both Stratton Audley Quarry and the flying field is a proposed Local Wildlife Site; we welcome that is not</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: The need for BBOWT to undertake a full ecological survey and the potential for BBOWT to play a part in the Management</p>

	<p>considered appropriate to develop this area, but it would be useful to highlight in the brief the need for any future use of this area to be sympathetic to its wildlife interest. The proposed LWS at the flying field has yet to be fully surveyed and it would be useful if, through the planning process, access to the site for survey can be facilitated. Any ecological survey of the site for the purposes of planning would also be useful to inform this process.</p> <p>In addition, the Project provides management advice to the owners of LWSs, and we would therefore be able to contribute to the production of the management plan for this area if it was felt that this would be useful.</p> <p>As stated in the planning brief, further ecological survey work will be needed to identify any protected species using the site, and to identify opportunities for biodiversity enhancements.</p>	<p>body is added to the Brief.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------

TECHNICAL SITE	Comment	Response of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy Manager
<p><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b></p>	<p><b>Highways</b></p> <p>The existing (gated) access serving the technical site is located just off the roundabout of the A4421 (towards Stratton Audley)/A4095 &amp; Skimmingdish Lane – in my opinion this access is unsuitable for any significant increase in traffic movements, due to the visibility available, speed of traffic (turning movements), access geometry etc; therefore it is likely a restriction on the type of redevelopment and associated traffic movements generated will be required/imposed. However, if significant improvements are provided i.e. reduction in speed limit, increase in visibility, measures to deter rear shunts for turning vehicles, adequate protection within de-acceleration to deter HGV parking, pedestrian &amp; cyclist links (with controlled crossing points) etc such restrictions may not be required. Please note any proposals will require a safety audit to be carried out by an independent party.</p> <p>If an access is to be considered to the north of the site via the Bicester Road (towards Stratton Audley village), this will not be supported by the Local Highway Authority due to its location i.e. Bicester Road/A4421 junction has its poor visibility and geometry.</p> <p>Depending on the type of development that comes on in the future a Travel Plan will be appropriate to reduce the reliance on the private car.</p>	<p>The access from Buckingham Road into the Technical site should ideally be retained for pedestrian and emergency use only. However, if the speed limit along Buckingham Road was dropped to 30 mph and a right turn lane was provided, subject to a safety audit, such restrictions may not apply.</p>
<p><b>English Heritage</b></p>	<p><b>4.3</b> States that ‘the concept of a history of aviation museum in association with the active use of the flying field...would be warmly supported’. EH agrees that an aviation museum</p>	<p>Whilst paragraph 4.3 states that a museum on the history of aviation together with continued aviation use is the Council’s preferred option, it also states that cultural, sporting and community uses (events, theatres,</p>

	<p>on part of the site may be appropriate, provided that it is viable and adequately resourced to maintain any assets; however, many museum proposals have failed due to funding problems. EH would like to see greater attention given to what other (non-museum) uses would be considered appropriate. It would be helpful to tabulate the advice about alternative uses, so that potential purchasers can see more clearly the constraints and opportunities related to individual buildings. The penultimate sentence of 4.3 could be interpreted as ruling out non-aviation uses on the technical site; we suggest that this is reworded in a more positive - non-aviation uses should be considered on their merits.</p> <p><b>4.8.</b> Suggest that the sentence referring to the negativity associated with the former garrison town is omitted.</p> <p><b>4.11</b> This doesn't read very convincingly in regard to opportunities for new development. The first sentence refers to the 2003 CGMS/LDA study focus 'primarily' on the technical site/flying field. The first sentence of the last paragraph says the 2003 study did not examine the development potential of the domestic site, with a final sentence concluding that 'there was no scope for new development on the domestic site'. There needs to be some explanation on the decision-making events regarding the two potential sites referred to and dismissed. It would be helpful if 4.11 could be expanded and sub-divided, with enabling development dealt with as a separate issue (see below). It would be helpful to clarify whether</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is any potential for development on the perimeter of the technical site, for example on the site of the coal yard, where some of the original buildings have been removed,</li> <li>• and in the elongated piece of land which lies</li> </ul>	<p>galleries, music venues, indoor pitches, training, cycling, go-karting, roller skating, climbing walls, markets, fundraising and circus are given as examples of suitable uses) in addition to employment, workshops, offices, light manufacturing or bulk storage and a limited number of buildings to residential use or accommodation for glider pilots. To tabulate each potential use for each of the buildings on the site with associated constraints and opportunities would be a very large task and one which would not necessarily be helpful as each building cannot be considered in isolation but as part of the coherent group where the interrelationship of buildings and uses and the spaces between the buildings is important. RECOMMENDATION: The penultimate sentence be reworded to say that non-aviation uses will be considered on their merits.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The sentence be omitted.</p> <p>The CGMS study did not look at the domestic site because at that time it was not known that this part of the site was to become surplus to defence requirements. It did look primarily at the technical site. However it also looked at a small area of land in MOD ownership outside the Technical site (in that it is outside the perimeter fence and is south of the original alignment of Skimmingdish lane). Therefore these statements are both correct and not contradictory. The final sentence that there was no scope for development on the domestic site is the conclusion of the analysis by Council officers described in that paragraph.</p> <p>The CGMS study did not identify the former coal yard as being suitable for development. In officers' opinion new development here would disturb the symmetry of the master plan and the setting of listed buildings.</p> <p>This is the piece of land referred to above and in paragraph 4.11 of the Brief quoted from the CGMS report as having potential for development in</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>between the old line of Skimmingdish Lane and the current road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If development is considered unacceptable in these areas, it would be helpful to say why.</li> <li>• In relation to enabling development, 4.11 should refer to EH's updated guidance, published in September 2008. This would support the Council's argument that the criteria for enabling development are not met in this case.</li> </ul>	<p>as " <i>the area between the line of old Skimmingdish lane and the present by pass</i>". See above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The issue of enabling development be sub-divided into a separate paragraph with reference to English Heritage's 2008 Guidance. This document includes a Policy that defines Enabling Development as needing to meet ALL of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a It will not harm the heritage value of the place or its setting</li> <li>b It avoids detrimental fragmentation of management</li> <li>c It will secure the long term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose</li> <li>d It is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid</li> <li>e sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source</li> <li>f It is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place and that its form minimises harm to other public interests</li> <li>g the public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies.</li> </ol> <p>English Heritage's support for the Council's argument that the criteria for enabling development not being met in this case is welcomed.</p>
<p><b>Bomber Command Heritage</b></p>	<p>More could be done to emphasise the number of listed buildings and the number described as making a positive contribution to the conservation area.</p> <p>Asks whether the reference by English Heritage to the technical site being "the most worrying heritage site on the whole government estate" could be emphasised.</p> <p>Considers reference to the extent of repairs required seems</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: A composite list of buildings be included cross referenced to the location plans at Figure3.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.3 <i>Heritage at Risk and Buildings at Risk Register</i> sets out the current position accurately and correspondence from English Heritage is quoted (which Defence Estates suggested should be removed). It is considered that the wording accurately describes the situation and needs neither reduction nor expansion.</p> <p>The repairs detailed in Appendix 2 are the result of one day's survey by</p>

	<p>understated.</p> <p>Considers that the use of Urgent Works Notices should not be necessary.</p> <p>BCH is aware that the internal services require systematic replacement. External services may be nearing life expiration.</p> <p>Alterations to buildings should be reversible and in keeping with the site as a whole.</p> <p>The introduction of mixed uses would cause problems with site security and the valuable content of a heritage centre / museum.</p> <p>Building 112 should be retained if this is an original building.</p> <p>Reference to the 2003 CGMS report needs to be clearer as to what they would permit.</p>	<p>the Council's consultant structural engineer and, as far as is possible in the time made available for access to the site, are considered to be an accurate snapshot of the condition of the buildings and the repair works required at that time. This will be updated as further information becomes available.</p> <p>The use of Urgent Work Notice and Repairs Notices are procedures open to the Council once the site is sold by the Crown. Should a programme of repairs not be agreed, it is open to the Council to invoke such powers and it is appropriate to make potential purchasers aware that such powers exist.</p> <p>Noted. This is not a planning matter, but is dealt with in the Management Plan.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that consent would be given to inappropriate works to protected buildings and approved works would not therefore need to be reversible. The Management Plan deals with the detail of what would be acceptable.</p> <p>Mixed use cannot be ruled out at this stage and would be acceptable in planning terms. It is the role of the Brief to consider all potential uses and once the future uses are known, the synergy and / or tensions between them will need to be dealt with through the planning process and an agreed Management Plan.</p> <p>Building 112 is unlisted and is one of several fuel tanker sheds. It is considered that its demolition would enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area by opening up the vista along the central axis from the technical site to the flying field.</p> <p>The quotations from the CGMS report are considered to be clear. RECOMMENDATION: The issue of enabling development be sub-divided into a separate paragraph with reference to English Heritage's 2008 Guidance.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Emergency entrances along Buckingham Road should be re-opened to avoid possible traffic congestion at the entrance near the A421 roundabout.</p> <p>BCH would need a fuller schedule of works than listed at Appendix 2</p>	<p>Access from Buckingham Road can only be limited for reasons of highway safety.</p> <p>Appendix 2 is included to provide snapshot of the condition of the buildings at a point in time for general information. Any prospective purchaser would need to undertake a full structural survey to satisfy for him/herself of the repair costs to inform any financial offer for the site.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



DOMESTIC SITE	Comment	Response of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy Manager
<p><b>Oxfordshire County Council</b></p>	<p><b>Highways</b>  The majority of the existing accesses serving the site appear acceptable off Skimmingdish Lane, but may require visibility improvements.</p> <p>The junction of Skimmingdish Lane and the A4421 does not appear to be to standard in terms of visibility; in addition joining the A4421 can be delayed due to the number of vehicles travelling past, which is something that will require further thought.</p> <p>However the re-use of the access via the A4421 (Buckingham Road) raises a safety concern due to the busy and fast nature of this road and the closeness of the A4421/A4095 roundabout i.e. risk of rear shunts due to turning vehicles; therefore a restriction on its use or the number of vehicles using this access may be appropriate.</p> <p>The location of this site is away from the majority of Bicester and is in need of significant improvements in terms public transport, pedestrian and cycle links to reach the closest local infrastructure and services. Another area of concern is the how pedestrians etc will cross the A4095 and the A4421</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: The advice of the Highway Authority be included in the Brief as advised plus as follows:  Use of the existing, disused and proposed but not implemented access points from Skimmingdish Lane will acceptable subject to keeping the sight lines clear of vegetation.</p> <p>If the speed limit along Buckingham Road were to be reduced to 30mph the visibility splay would be reduced to 4.5m x 90m, which should be achievable. Oxfordshire County Council will investigate such an extension, but developer contributions would be required towards the costs of amending the traffic order.</p> <p>The road layout and hard surfaced areas are a key component of the historic character of the site. A car parking management plan will be required to demonstrate that the number of car parking spaces required by standards current at the time can be accommodated on the existing amount of hard standing. In the event of a shortfall of space for parking the Council will expect a Travel Plan and the management of spaces to address the issue.</p> <p>The access from Buckingham Road to the Domestic site should be for pedestrians only.</p> <p>A bus stop should be provided on the east side of A4421 Buckingham Road within the existing deceleration lane (this is considered not to pose an obstruction to traffic due to infrequency of obstruction and deceleration of traffic).</p>

(to reach Technical site) and the type of measures required i.e. controlled crossing, reduction of speed limit etc.

Links within the site (and improved transport links) should also be taken into consideration as well the existing routes the community of Caversfield currently enjoy i.e. if a residential development is sought, it would be appropriate to have pedestrian/cycle links through site to the A4095.

Depending on the type of development that comes on in the future a Travel Plan will be appropriate to reduce the reliance on the private car and developer contributions will be sought towards improvements to public transport. It is unlikely the roads within the site would be offered for adoption so a private road agreement will be sought.

**Policy**

Economic

Bicester is situated in the Central Oxfordshire sub-region and is expected to be one of the main locations for development. Policy CO1 of the South East Plan (SE Plan) says that the strategy for Central Oxfordshire is to strive to be a world leader in education, science and technology by building on the sub-region's economic strength. The main thrust of policy CO2 of the plan is that priority should be given to development which supports these sectors and that additional land for employment will be provided where justified at Bicester for the expansion and relocation of existing local firms to foster knowledge based industry. There is currently a variety of employment activity on the site including office, laboratory and storage. Any continuation of employment use on the site would need to be focused around knowledge-based industry, supporting and growing our high technology businesses and high value employment, to be consistent with the aspirations of policy CO2 of the SE Plan and County Council objectives. It is

A pedestrian crossing with a central refuge will be required to enable pedestrians to cross both east west and north south to this point. There is a permissive path running within the southern boundary of the Domestic site, which egresses close to the roundabout and runs to cross the A4095 near the roundabout. A controlled pedestrian crossing should be provided subject to a safety audit, but the preference would be that signalisation at this roundabout be avoided.

RECOMMENDATION: Reference to the SE Plan policies and the County Council's comments be included.

important that any land allocated for employment growth here helps to achieve a balance of housing and employment which takes into account of the other development locations in and around Bicester. In terms of suitable employment B1 and B2 uses would be likely to generate a number of quality jobs, traditionally B8 uses generate relatively few, low-skilled jobs and would be likely to contribute little to achieving regional and local economic development objectives.

Residential

Other possible uses that are considered for the site are residential in the form of flats and/or a retirement community or nursing home. Policy CO3 of the SE Plan looks to locate 4,900 dwellings in Bicester over the plan period from 2006 to 2026 therefore some housing at the site would be consistent with this policy. Development of the site to contain a retirement community or nursing home may also be welcome. Social and community services, working with Cherwell, have identified that 2 sites housing a potential 60 units each are needed to support the current and future population up to 2029. However our assumptions are based on current population of the town and this of course would grow if the North West Bicester 'eco-town' is developed. It is also unlikely that smaller villages and rural parts of Cherwell will be able to have viable Extra Care Housing (ECH) schemes to meet local populations so we can also assume that urban centres like Bicester will have to develop more ECH to meet needs from surrounding areas. We estimate this could require a further scheme of c80 units. Therefore we would support the principle of using this site for an ECH scheme. However, as the site evolves we would require more information on the type of development envisaged as examination of the sustainability of the site and suitability of existing buildings would be needed. The site is situated on the edge of Bicester and any ECH development would require improvements to public transport in order to foster

RECOMMENDATION: Reference be included to the potential for a 60 unit nursing home or Extra Care Housing in addition to existing references to various forms of residential use.

	accessibility to services in line with policy SP3 of the SE Plan.	
<b>Bicester Town Council</b>	<p>In terms of the use of buildings on the domestic site, while we welcome the condition to treat the site as a single location, we feel that there is an underlying emphasis on conversion to houses and flats without providing the opportunity to use the site for alternative purposes, for example as a commercial or educational campus, which we believe would be in keeping with the need to stimulate a wider range of local skills and jobs opportunities. We would also welcome strengthening the need to retain and not compromise the open green planning of the site.</p> <p>Specifically we would like to see the brief making clear the retention of the ATC, in an appropriate building on the domestic site with access to outdoor assembly and training facilities</p> <p>.</p>	<p>A full range of potential uses is given in the brief, including commercial or education campus.</p> <p>The open campus nature of the site is referred to as a key characteristic of the site not to be compromised.</p> <p>The brief states that this use can be relocated within the domestic site or the technical site.</p>
<b>English Heritage</b>	<b>3.5</b> The final sentence [regarding the wedge of undeveloped land between the Domestic site and Bicester] requires clarification. It would be helpful to identify this area on a map.	RECOMMENDATION: a plan indicating the areas required for take off and landing be inserted.
<b>Bomber Command Heritage</b>	Is there a case for including the wedge of farmland to the south of the Domestic site in a revised conservation area review?	The Conservation Area Appraisal has recently been reviewed and extended. It is considered that, based upon existing information, the appropriate area of historic interest has now been included. This area lies outside the RAF Base and is farm land. It is afforded some protection by virtue of being within the setting of the conservation area.
<b>Bicester Vision</b>	We believe that the domestic site should be considered for a mixture of small business units, conference facilities and residential use, either by way of refurbishment or redevelopment to reflect the existing character of this 23 acre site. This in turn could create a land value to offset	These land uses are proposed in the Brief. The reference by Bicester Vision to cross subsidy is what the Council is seeking, however, unfortunately the release onto the market of the domestic site prior to the technical site makes cross-subsidy unlikely.

	some of the costs of restoring buildings on the technical area of the site.	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES	Comment	Response of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy Manager
<p><b>Defence Estates</b></p>	<p>It is perhaps a lost opportunity not to have taken forward detailed guidelines for the airfield in slower time and consult on them as a stand-alone document, as exists and works well for DE&amp;S Caversfield. If these were produced on a more formal basis for RAF Bicester it is felt this would be a positive contribution to understanding the site and the particular importance of the various elements.</p> <p>It may also be more helpful, rather than attaching a descriptive snapshot document as currently presented at App.2, to include instead the Listing descriptions. This would remove the need for descriptions of the buildings to be repeated or re-interpreted, when the Listings already provide a comprehensive description.</p> <p><b>5.3</b> There is street lighting.</p>	<p>The existing Management Plan for the Domestic site DE&amp;S Caversfield has been embodied in full within this document and expanded and elaborated upon and it is disappointing that English Heritage has not acknowledged that or commented upon the additional content. The Draft Brief circulated included the start of work on a new Management Plan for the technical site, but there are specialist buildings and defensive structures on the Technical site and flying field on which further work is required before the Management Plan for this part of the site can be concluded. It is disappointing that neither English Heritage nor Defence Estates used this consultation time as an opportunity to engage in the process of expanding upon the draft Management Plan for the Technical site further.</p> <p>It is recommended earlier in this document that the advice of English Heritage on having the Management Plan for the technical site and flying field as a living document should be accepted, so this will be de-coupled pending further work. However, it should be understood by all parties that this work still needs to be taken forward with some urgency if a Management Plan fit for purpose is to be available to inform any future purchaser / occupier of the Technical site.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> List descriptions, reflecting the buildings at the time of listing, can be added to the Structural report for clarity, but the structural engineer's descriptions of the buildings are up to date, providing a snapshot and are useful in this context and should remain.</p> <p>The text does not state that there is no street lighting, but that adoption of the roads could require unsympathetic works including atypical street lighting to be installed to bring the roads up to adoptable standards and</p>

	<p><b>5.4</b> It is unclear why public access would be required.</p> <p>English Heritage has provided guidance on when Listed Building Consent would be required and the amended draft document could reflect this.</p> <p><b>5.20</b> The buildings are in the ownership of the Ministry of Defence, not Defence Estates.</p> <p>There is no CPH plant on DE&amp;S Caversfield. There is currently a district heating system at Caversfield but this is not linked to RAF Bicester.</p> <p><b>Appendix 2</b> is a snapshot and could be held separately – some of it is inaccurate – for example there appears to be some confusion as to what is slate and what are asbestos cement tiles. The document is also not complete. As this will be a living document removing it from the management guidelines and holding separately as background information may be more practical.</p> <p>The photograph taken in June this year of building for 146/7 has been provided to the Council’s Conservation Officer and this should be substituted, as one taken in 2008, showing a quite different situation, has inadvertently crept into the draft.</p>	<p>this would not be desirable.</p> <p>The text states that public access to the technical and domestic sites will be sought and that this might be by way of museum / heritage centre and on the technical site and through Heritage Open days on restricted occasions on the domestic site. As these are sites of national importance, this does not seem an unreasonable aspiration.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The text be amended to indicate that LBC for internal works would only be required where the works would affect the special character of the building..</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The text be amended accordingly.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The reference to CHP plant be changed to <i>district heating system</i>. However, due to its under-utilisation, the aspiration to link it to the technical site should not be dismissed at this stage.</p> <p>The document is incomplete because Defence Estates was not able to offer access to all the buildings on the technical site on the day of visit. RECOMMENDATION: The advice that the Management Plan for the Technical site be de-coupled as a live document has been accepted and the structural engineers report will be appended to this. It is to be hoped that both English Heritage and Defence Estates will engage constructively in expanding the Management Plan for the technical site urgently and that matter such as the identification of particular materials can be agreed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION : The photograph provided by Defence Estates be included unless a more recent photograph can be located.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>Bicester Town Council</b></p>	<p>We are also concerned that the brief affords the opportunity for the scheduled buildings on all the sites - technical, airfield and domestic to simply be made wind and water tight and left redundant. This, in our view, represents a minimalist approach and precludes the opportunity for these important historical buildings to be given a new lease of life in keeping with the future development of Bicester.</p>	<p>The Management Plan deals with the repair and maintenance of the buildings and not just bringing them up to a wind and weather tight condition.</p>
<p><b>English Heritage</b></p>	<p><b>Section 5.</b> An additional section could be added here relating to the bomb stores and other scheduled structures. This could incorporate the advice in Chris Welch's letter dated 19 February 2009, which offered advice on repairs and management of the bomb stores and control of ivy on buildings.</p> <p><b>5.2</b> (Soft landscape management) contains several statements about trees that may need to be modified in the light of further discussion and research. Early photographs show the site virtually devoid of trees, and it is possible that tree planting was only introduced later. There are many self-sown trees and the tree cover in some parts of the technical site is over-dense.</p> <p><b>5.8.</b> It would be desirable to establish an on-site archive of photographs and drawings, as part of the comprehensive management plan. Images of many of the buildings are already available in the National Monuments Record (this coverage is mainly in black and white, dating from 2000, and covers domestic site, technical site and airmen's housing). Additional photography and recording may be required in advance of any works of demolition or alteration. Guidance on recording is available in <i>Understanding historic buildings: A guide to good recording practice</i> (English Heritage, 2006).</p> <p><b>5.15</b> I am not aware of any evidence for the original colour</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION: An additional paragraph including the advice of English Heritage's Monuments Inspector be included.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: A paragraph be inserted to explain that English Heritage advises that early photographs show the site virtually devoid of trees and that one photograph recently seen shows the trident road layout flanked by hedges. Nevertheless the mature trees are a characteristic feature of this and other air bases of the era and add to the attractive campus environment, albeit that some works will be required to over mature and self seeded species.</p> <p>Section 6 of the Brief states that a level 2 photographic survey will be required as a condition of any planning or listed building consent. The intention is that the Management Plan will require a dossier of such material to be established. RECOMMENDATION: cross reference to the provisions of Section 6 be inserted and reference to the English Heritage publication made and the availability of the NMR to inform the Management Plan.</p> <p>The recommendation, earlier in this report, in response to English</p>



	<p>of the hangars. It is likely that the colour scheme changed through time, and it may be necessary to choose between alternative schemes (eg pre-WWII scheme or camouflage scheme?). It is agreed that further paint analysis is required.</p> <p><b>5.17</b> The final statement should be modified by the addition of ‘...where this would affect the special interest’.</p> <p><b>5.21</b> This refers to a comprehensive Conservation Management Plan. Presumably this would include the flying field and defensive structures as well as the technical and domestic sites. This section could refer back to the Conservation Area Appraisal, which includes a section on management proposals at section 11.</p> <p><b>Section 6</b> This appears to be incomplete. 6.5 and 6.6, as drafted, need considerable further work to clarify when consents would be required and what supporting information would be necessary.</p>	<p>Heritage’s comment that the Management Plan for the technical site should be a “living document” has been accepted, so that the results of further paint analysis can be included in the document as and when they are available. In the interim the Council will advise those wishing to undertake painting that this should continue the current colour regime to maintain consistency across the technical site.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The wording be added, as advised, that listed building consent will only be required for internal works that would affect the special interest of the building.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Reference to the flying field and defensive structures also being subject to the Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan be added, for the avoidance of doubt. However these areas would be unlikely to be subject to any future Article 4 Direction, which is the thrust of this paragraph.</p> <p>This section has now been completed.</p>
<p><b>Bomber Command Heritage</b></p>	<p>The war time camouflage paint colours should be subject to further research before determining whether they can be restored.</p> <p>BCH is supportive of including public art.</p> <p>The Management Board or Trust is appropriate but BCH would like to know the composition and consider it should be heritage led.</p>	<p>The recommendation, earlier in this report, in response to English Heritage’s comment that the Management Plan for the Technical site should be a “living document” has been accepted, so that the results of further paint analysis can be included in the document as and when they are available. In the interim the Council will advise those wishing to undertake painting that this should continue the current colour regime to maintain consistency across the technical site.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The composition of the Management Board would be subject to discussion but the Council would be seeking all interests on the site to be represented and also local democracy.</p>

