**From:** Caroline Clapson
**Sent:** 28 February 2018 18:14
**To:** Matthew Parry
**Cc:** Jenny Barker
**Subject:** 17/02534/OUT | OUTLINE - The construction of a business park of up to 60,000 sq.m (GEA) of flexible Class B1(a) office / Class B1(b) research & development floorspace; parking for up to 2,000 cars; and associated highways, infrastructure and earthworks

Dear Matt,

As discussed here are the Bicester Delivery Team’s comments on this application. Given that you will receive comments from other relevant Council sections (e.g. Planning Policy, Design and Conservation), I will confine my response to key areas of interest for the Bicester team in no particular order as follows:

1. Construction Apprenticeships

Any S106 agreement should seek a target number of  180 construction apprenticeships  and the submission of an Employment Skills and Training Plan  line with Appendix 13 of CDC’s Adopted Developer Contributions SPD. This seeks 3 apprenticeships per 1000 sq m of floorspace. I suspect that the applicants may baulk at this figure so we should treat it as a starting point for negotiations. The key objective is to get to a figure which is realistic and deliverable for all parties. Given their Non Technical Summary states that there will be considerable scope to provide training and apprenticeships and work experience in a range of construction tasks on the site, I would not expect to see any opposition to this from the applicant.

1. Design of Future Development

I note that various documents including the Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement  state that the development will be developed to a high quality design and use high quality architecture. The D and A Statement includes an indicative masterplan. However there is an issue with this - as I see it the problem is 2 fold -  firstly we have a highly visible, large (13.1 ha), gateway site to Bicester which will be developed out on a building by building basis over 8-9 years (Non Technical Statement) and yet the application only applies for outline consent including access arrangements. Therefore CDC has no way of knowing exactly how the site will end up looking, nor the quality (or otherwise) it will employ in its design. I therefore think given all these factors (phased build out, long timescale of development, size of site, gateway location and not forgetting Bicester Policy B4 imperatives of requiring “A distinctive commercial development that provides a gateway into the town” and “A high quality design and finish, with careful consideration given to layout,  architecture, materials, colourings and building heights to reduce overall visual impact” that we need to ensure that there is  a mechanism through S106 (or condition)  that will allow  a comprehensive and holistic approach to be secured by CDC to the design of the site, including principles of GI, building design, heights, materials, connectivity throughout and beyond the site, etc) to ensure that what is envisaged in policy B4 is achieved. Parameter plans on their own will not achieve this. I would suggest we need something along the lines of requiring the applicant to provide a detailed masterplan for the site to be submitted to and approved in writing by CDC prior to the submission of any reserved matters application and that all subsequent RM applications will need to reflect what is in this document. Otherwise how can we be sure that the site will be developed comprehensively to a consistently high quality?

1. Sustainable Transport

I have read the D and A and Framework Travel Plan. The 2 are not joined up, in that while the Travel Plan talks about encouraging people to use modes of transport other than the car and having a priority network of pedestrian and cycle routes, the D and A makes no mention of prioritising non car modes of travel. In other words, there is nothing in the envisaged design philosophy of the site that gives us any idea how the design of the site will allow the aspirations of the Travel Plan to be fulfilled. Another concern is that in line with Policy B4, we really do need to understand how their envisaged layout will enable a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing development particularly at South West Bicester , the garden centre and Bicester town centre and Bicester Village and other transport hubs through the provision and upgrading of footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks to improve connectivity generally and to develop links between this site,  nearby development sites and the town centre.  Again this could all be dealt with as part of the masterplanning process for the site -  but it is the explicit lack of acknowledgement of this as an issue at this stage which is concerning. Also -  if they are proposing 2000 spaces (does this comply with OCC’s parking standards -  sounds a great deal to me, especially as the Park and Ride site is just down the road) surely we should be asking for some electric charging points / spaces -  I couldn’t see that there was any reference to this anywhere. I know this will be dealt with at the RM stage but I would have expected to see this referred to along with cycle stands etc.

1. Travel Plans

No doubt OCC may make some comments here but  in a Framework Travel Plan I would have expected to see a number of audiences identified and then a menu of potential actions for each ie, employer, employees, and visitors to the site. The TP only really talks about a dialogue with employees through surveys. Surely the dialogue needs to be with employers as well as employees and visitors as it will be the employers that will have the most leverage to effect change in their workforce and visitors. Also the TP talks about doing a Travel survey 3 months after 50% of the development is occupied and then producing an updated  travel plan 1 month after the survey has been completed. But as noted in the Non Technical Summary, this is not one development but will comprise of several developments over many years, hence I do think that we need to be securing one travel plan per office building and then the associated actions that come with that. I would also want to see much firmer wording  /  commitment to implementing mitigating measures if modal shift targets are not achieved. I assume you will be seeking a contribution towards travel plan monitoring as part of any S106 agreement. (Also a side issue -  The Travel Plan talks about the site having good accessibility to public transport nodes including **underground stations**….in several places, which suggests the approach set out may be generic rather than bespoke).

1. Public Art

The Planning Statement notes that there will be limited opportunities for the development to support the social and cultural wellbeing of the Town. I would beg to differ -  in line with Policy Bicester 4, we should be seeking a Public Art contribution from this development. You may wish to talk to Nicola Riley about what form that might take.

I hope this is helpful, but do come back to me if you would like to discuss.

Kind regards,

Caroline

**Caroline Clapson
Bicester Infrastructure Delivery Lead
Bicester Delivery Team, Place and Growth Directorate**

Ext. 1514
Direct Dial: 01295 221514
caroline.clapson@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

My usual days of work are Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.
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