

**Application no: 21/01630/OUT**

**Location:** Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2 Caversfield

---

## Transport Schedule

### Recommendation:

#### Objection for the following reasons:

1. Some inaccuracies and omissions in the Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement mean that it is not possible to fully assess the impact of the development in accordance with paragraphs 109 and 111 of the NPPF.
2. Some of the works to provide safe access are outside the red line and not on adopted highway, meaning that the development may fail to provide safe and suitable access to the site for all users in accordance with paragraph 108 of the NPPF
3. The site will create a desire line across the B4100 to the local church, and no safe crossing is offered by the development, contrary to paragraph 108 of the NPPF

If despite OCC's objection permission is proposed to be granted then OCC requires prior to the issuing of planning permission a S106 agreement including an obligation to enter into a S278 agreement to mitigate the impact of the development plus planning conditions and informatives as detailed below.

### S106 Contributions

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Amount £</b>	<b>Price base</b>	<b>Index</b>	<b>Towards (details)</b>
Highway works 1	47,289	Dec 2020	Baxter	Improvements to junction of Charlotte Ave/B4100
Highway works 2	278,330	Dec 2020	Baxter	Improvements to junction of B4100/A4095
Ped/cycle infrastructure	362,465	Dec 2020	Baxter	Improvements to cycle route between site and town centre/stations
Public transport services and infrastructure	696,118	Dec 2020	RPI-x	Improvement of bus services and infrastructure at NW Bicester
Travel Plan Monitoring	2,832	Dec 2020	RPI-x	Monitoring the travel plan over its life

Public Rights of Way	50,000	July 2021	Baxter	New public right of way and improvements to public rights of way in the vicinity of the site
Ped/cycle bridge	<b>TBC</b>			The provision of a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the watercourse into the adjacent site to the west

Other obligations:

- Proportionate contribution to Major Infrastructure costs (primarily the strategic link road/A4095 diversion through the NW Bicester allocation)
- Off site highway works (see below)
- Vehicular and ped/cycle connections into Elmsbrook (required as these are not public highway)
- Participation in North West Bicester Bus Forum
- Measures to ensure the delivery of the ped/cycle bridge
- Ped/cycle connections to adjacent site

**Key points**

- Further information and clarification needed on access points
- Visibility splay for construction access appears to cross third party land. Clarity needed on construction access to western parcel.
- Inadequacies in the Environmental Statement, particularly around assessment of construction traffic
- Inaccuracies in the TA regarding sustainable transport accessibility
- Crossing of the B4100 to Caversfield Church is required
- Connection to adjacent parcels needs to be secured
- Further work needed to identify suitability of spine road for additional traffic, and any mitigation measures needed.

**Comments:**

**Introduction**

The application is in outline only, for 530 dwellings with all matters reserved except access. The application form proposes a total of 1082 car parking spaces and 1025 cycle parking spaces. The dwellings would be split over two sites, either side of the NW Bicester Exemplar site (Elmsbrook) spine road, and adjacent to the existing Elmsbrook development. The transport assessment assumes that there would be approximately 400 dwellings on the western parcel, and 130 on the eastern parcel. The site is within the NW Bicester Policy allocation area, although the NW Bicester Masterplan, which accompanied the SPD, did not include any housing on the eastern parcel.

### Access arrangements

The eastern parcel is proposed to be accessed via an already constructed cul-de-sac off the spine road, just south of the bus-only link. This is referenced as Access A in the TA. Vehicle traffic from this parcel would therefore access via Charlotte Ave, and not Braeburn Ave.

The Western parcel is proposed to have three accesses: Access B immediately south of the bus gate and almost opposite Access A, would provide access to a limited number of dwellings - assumed to generate 37 two-way trips in the am peak, and 33 in the pm peak. The indicative masterplan shows that only 11 buildings would use this access, although some of these may be apartments.

Access C would provide one access to the remainder of the western parcel, immediately north of the bus gate. The other access into this parcel, Access D, would lead into the street network within the existing Elmsbrook development, which leads onto the spine road (Braeburn Ave) immediately south of its junction with the B4100. Traffic from accesses B and C would only be able to access the development via Braeburn Ave.

The TA states that there would be no vehicular connection between Accesses B and C (which would allow drivers to bypass the bus gate), although bollards may be used to permit emergency access.

The access via Charlotte Ave is more constrained by geometry and passes via the primary school and local centre. Also, its junction with the B4100 is more likely to experience congestion than the Braeburn Ave/B4100 junction. It is therefore important to minimise access via Charlotte Ave. The number of dwellings accessible from Access B should be limited by condition, and there should be a condition preventing a link between Accesses B and C. There should be no need for an emergency vehicular access between the cul de sac(s) off Access B and the rest of the western parcel - it should be cycle and pedestrian access only, to avoid the possibility of abuse.

It should be noted that the spine road is not yet adopted highway, although from the Site Location Plan, the land required for the accesses, right up to the adopted highway on the B4100, appears to be within the red line of the application, which suggests that the applicant has permission from the landowners to carry out the necessary works. I note that this red line application boundary does not match with plan 4600-1100-T-009 Rev C (Site accesses A, B and C), which shows that some of the works required to change the geometry of the existing cul de sac at Access A, and to provide the visibility splay for Access C, would be outside the application area. **This needs clarification.** OCC would seek for these works to be secured via a S106 agreement.

With regard to the layout, the vehicle swept path analysis is incomplete - no SPA has been provided for Access A, nor has the right turn out for Access B, and the right turn in for Access C been provided. Access B shows that the refuse vehicle entering the site would need to cross well over into the path of opposing vehicles on the spine road and

take up nearly all of the width of the access. This is likely to cause conflict with vehicles and cyclists exiting Access B to turn right, and the risk that vehicles may need to reverse, causing a safety risk.

At access C, the exiting refuse vehicle would take up nearly all the carriageway of the spine road, with risk of conflict particularly for cyclists, who would be on carriageway at this point. **Further information is required, to provide the missing SPA, plus revised geometry or demonstration of sufficient forward visibility to avoid conflicts, and in particular the need for vehicles to reverse, or cyclists to have to get onto the footway.**

Our preference would be for the geometry of accesses B and C to be such that it prevents or at least deters movements towards the bus only link. Signage for the bus link will need to be moved as part of the works and the TRO amended by OCC. **Further details are required.**

The existing ducting in place for the future installation of enforcement cameras at the bus gate will need to be moved as part of the works.

It is noted that the applicant would, as part of the works, provide footway along the western side of the bus only link.

Access D leads directly into the road network of the existing Elmsbrook development. Swept path analysis should be provided of this entire route, showing car passing refuse vehicle, to show that it is suitable for connection to 200+ further dwellings. This access should have a 2m footway on both sides. **Further information required.**

### **Construction access**

Permission is also sought for a construction access into the eastern parcel directly off the B4100 in the approximate position of an existing field access. The construction of this access will require a S278 agreement. I have no objection to this access in principle, provided adequate visibility can be provided. However, I note that the necessary visibility splay to the north crosses a ditch that is not within the highway boundary. The applicant would need to obtain title to this land for the purposes of the S278 agreement and it can't be assumed this is possible. The visibility splay does not appear to be within the red line.

### **Reason for objection**

It is assumed that construction access into the western parcel would be off the spine road. Access B would not be acceptable as vehicles would have to pass the school and village centre. Access C has awkward geometry and we would need to see swept path analysis for a maximum size artic, which I do not think would be achievable. Access D would not be appropriate as it passes through residential streets. **Further information is required.**

No widening is proposed to provide a right turning lane for construction vehicles into the site. To improve safety and avoid congestion it may be appropriate for permitted movements to be left in-left out only.

I consider that the Environmental Statement's assessment of the impact construction traffic is inadequate. It dismisses the need to assess construction traffic on the basis that the number of vehicles will be much less than the traffic associated with the development in operation. This takes no account of the different nature of the traffic. This also applies to the noise and vibration assessment, where construction traffic is not considered. It is notable that there are no dedicated cycle facilities on Braeburn Avenue, placing cyclists on carriageway, and therefore more likely to be affected by construction traffic. **Further information is required**

### **Sustainable transport connectivity/transport sustainability**

Some of the information in the TA is inaccurate in terms of distances to local facilities, giving the impression that the site is more accessible by sustainable transport than it actually is. For example, the distances in Table 4.2 don't correspond with the plan showing distances. The nearest shops are beyond the acceptable walking distance. At 4.5 the description of rail services does not show how some of the London services are now routed to Bicester Village instead of Bicester North. The TA also claims that there is a continuous off carriageway cycle route to Bicester North station, which is not the case. Even with the planned improvements to the roundabout at the B4100/A4095 junction, there is still a substantial gap in safe cycle provision on Banbury Road. **Reason for objection**

In isolation, the site is in a location where there is a limited choice of travel by sustainable modes. However, as part of the North West Bicester masterplan, it would be better connected to local facilities. It is for the planning authority to decide whether the site is considered on the assumption that the rest of the NW Bicester masterplan will be built out, or whether it has to be considered in isolation.

The Transport Assessment relating to this states that “this development has incorporated a range of measures to ensure sustainability principles are met, reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and increase adaptation to climate change” but there is no explicit mention of how it intends to do so with consideration to walking and cycling.

Bicester has an adopted Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). The current Bicester LCWIP, published in 2020, shows clear opportunities for linking into;

- off-road connecting routes,
- high-traffic routes,
- quiet off-road routes and
- connecting routes via the B4100 – A4095.

Any new developments need to demonstrate how their site provides high quality active travel connections and deliver or contribute towards schemes required through the LCWIP. This site is in an ideal location for the reasonable continuation of this network as the Site falls on the boundary of the network where the 'High-Traffic' route BR8 terminates nearby along Banbury Road. This route will connect the site with the town centre by for those walking and cycling, and links to BR6, which connects to Bicester North rail station.

Much (but not all) of BR8 has cycle provision but will need upgrading to meet LTN 1/20 guidelines including but not limited to the following;

- Route signposting and wayfinding, and
- Physical separation and protection from high volume motor traffic i.e. using Orca kerbs.

The route within Elmsbrook is not continuous and does not meet LTN 1/20 standards.

LTP4 (Connecting Oxfordshire Volume 8 Part ii) supports the request of linking into these routes by explaining that is essential to provide high quality access to key locations by walking and cycling. Policy **BIC1** (Improve access and connections between key employment and residential sites and the strategic transport system by: *Delivery effective peripheral routes around the town*) supports this in saying:

- "Cycle-friendly measures must be incorporated into all new road schemes and new housing developments. It is essential that new developments are planned with cycling in mind and with facilities to make cycling both convenient and safe. This will link in with developing a connected, comprehensive cycle network across the town.
- We will review walking networks and focus capital improvements on routes with the greatest potential for increasing the numbers of people walking, particularly where improving the pedestrian environment would support economic growth and reduce car use."

Policy **BIC2** similarly align with this request by saying:

- "We will work to reduce the proportion of journeys made by private car through implementing the Sustainable Transport Strategy by: *Identifying a number of new sections of urban pedestrian and cycle routes to better connect residential developments with the town centre and key employment destinations* (Bicester Sustainable Transport Strategy)."
- This includes "A direct link from the centre of North West Bicester (Eco Town) to Bicester North Station and onwards to the Launton Road industrial estate;".

A contribution is requested to support the necessary improvements supporting the relevant parts of the Bicester LCWIP network.

I note the application makes no commitment to provide a pedestrian crossing on the B4100 to allow residents to access Caversfield Church. This will be the local place of worship for the allocation, there being no other place of worship in the NW Bicester masterplan, and will therefore be a need for a safe crossing. A signalised crossing was requested in relation to the previous planning application on the eastern parcel, to be implemented by the developer under S278. **Reason for objection**

### **Public transport**

Oxfordshire County Council requires applicants to make provision for public transport improvements, either through financial contributions towards enhanced services or direct delivery of infrastructure works. This is in line with our policy position to secure 'good growth' and maximise the opportunity for new and existing residents to make sustainable travel choices.

The Transport Assessment has reviewed the existing public transport provision in the area around the proposed site. Table 4.3 refers to 'local routes', although it would appear this stretches to all services in Bicester – some of which do not operate in close proximity to the development. Of the routes listed in the table:

- only services E1 and 505 operate within 1km of the site;
- service 18 operates five times per day, not twice in the peak hour as suggested, and to no location north of Bicester town centre (it no longer serves Bicester North station);
- service 25A is now renumbered service 250 is does not operate north of Bicester town centre;
- service S5 now terminates at Glory Farm and does not serve Ambrosden, except on Sundays; and
- services 22 and 23 no longer exist.

The assessment is therefore significantly out of date, incorrect and misleading in that it presents a much more comprehensive picture than is the case in reality. The Council had provided the applicant's consultants with an updated bus service map and details in January 2021, but this does not appear to have been taken into account in the TA.

In addition, the future of service 505 is currently in doubt as the existing contract between Stagecoach and West Northamptonshire Council for this route is due to expire in January 2022, with no additional funding currently identified.

Table 4.4 contains incorrect details of rail service frequencies:

- From Bicester North, the current frequency of trains from this station to London Marylebone is three per hour at peak times and two at off-peak times, with one train per hour to/from Birmingham; and
- From Bicester Village, the frequency of trains is two per hour to London Marylebone and Oxford.

The bus connection information for Bicester North is largely irrelevant as there are no direct buses from the site to the station. Only services E1 and 505 provide connections to Bicester Village station. Services 8, 22 and 23 no longer exist.

The total cost of providing an effective and relevant bus service to the North West Bicester strategic allocation of 2,600 units has been calculated at £2,990,064. Taking this site as a proportion of that allocation, the total contribution requested from this application is **£609,513.04** *for the improvement of bus services and infrastructure in North West Bicester*. This will be index linked as per the Council's standard practice and it is proposed that payment is made in three broadly equivalent annual instalments commencing on 1<sup>st</sup> occupation.

It is agreed that the current location and condition of bus stops on Braeburn Avenue and Charlotte Avenue should be sufficient for the purposes of the additional development.

Service E1 is currently provided by Grayline Coaches under a direct arrangement with A2Dominion, although the Council has an option to take control of the service if required. At the appropriate time the funding situation for the service will be reviewed and consideration given as to whether service improvements or maintenance of the existing frequency is most appropriate. In the longer term the service is expected to be extended through the wider North West Bicester allocation and increased in frequency and hours of operation.

### **Public rights of way**

There is a network of public rights of way to the north and northwest of the site. Connection to this network is referenced within the NW Bicester masterplan, which shows a ped/cycle route from the adjacent site to the west, crossing the watercourse into the site, and leading to a new right of way at the western tip of the western parcel. The red line area extends in a 'finger' towards the watercourse, presumably to facilitate the link. However, I am concerned about the proximity to an attenuation feature. **Further information is required** to demonstrate this is an appropriate location for a crossing of the watercourse, and to establish the likely design and cost of the bridge, as this site must contribute proportionately to its cost.

Although this site does not have any public rights of way (PRoW) across it, there are public footpaths nearby that will be impacted and that is not included in any parameter plans, plus the development needs to support active travel and healthy lifestyle choices. A S106 contribution will be necessary to enable the development to be acceptable in planning terms, plus more work to tie the development into LCWIP and active travel networks using roads and other carriageways.

Please see the image of PRoW in the vicinity of the site below. A s106 contribution of around **£50k** is requested towards countryside access mitigation measures. At this stage it is clear that the site will need to be connected to the footpaths to Bucknell to the north



(pink routes). This will mean a new offsite pathway will need to be negotiated for walkers and possibly cyclists and created plus measures on the existing footpaths to Bucknell. An indicative alignment of a new route is shown at point D.



In terms of onsite provision the site needs to be permeable for all non-motorised users (NMUs) with clear, safe and preferable 'green' routes connecting play and public open spaces with homes, community spaces and onward connections to Bicester and other developments within the overall 'Ecotown' development area. These circulatory/permeable routes should be designed to be safe and easy to use all year round and provide the opportunity for connections from outside the site to be made. There needs to be a commitment to this at this stage with the detail subject to condition

The principle and indicative alignment of NMU circulatory routes needs to be agreed at an early stage, and these will need to be provided to LTN 1/20 standard and managed in perpetuity. This will need to be secured through the S106 agreement.

In general terms the site needs to be permeable for all non-motorised users (NMUs) with clear, safe and preferable 'green' routes connecting play and public open spaces with homes, community spaces and onward connections to Bicester and other developments within the overall 'Ecotown' development area.

### Site layout

This application is in outline only, so detailed comments are not offered on the layout of the indicative masterplan. The following are high level comments only:

- Connection point needed at western tip, to provide link to new PRoW towards Bucknell (see above). A link to this point would need to be dedicated.

- The connection to the southern boundary of the western parcel (marked 11) would need to be secured by condition or legal agreement. This connection is referenced in the NW Bicester masterplan as a ped/cycle route. This is to ensure connectivity across NW Bicester including to the new PRoW to the north.
- The connection to the northern boundary (marked 11) would also need to be secured - this is on a desire line to a play area within Elmsbrook and would provide a traffic free route.
- Two of the connection points indicated from the eastern parcel would not connect into adopted highway and therefore could not be guaranteed without agreement with the adjacent landowner. The connection point at nearest to the southern tip of the eastern parcel is considered to be very important in minimising walking/cycling distances for residents. Without it, the walking distance/direction could be a deterrent.
- The perimeter paths are welcomed and important.
- Clarity is needed on which are pedestrian and which are pedestrian/cycle routes
- Roads within the development must be designed to allow speeds of no more than 20mph. The main access road running the length of the western parcel is too straight. There must be no lengths of straight road more than 70m without some features to calm traffic.
- Given the likely traffic volumes within each parcel, if speeds are reliably <20mph, on carriageway cycling provision would be acceptable within the parcels.
- 2m footways would be required, and these will need to run across private driveways and side roads i.e. pedestrians have priority.

#### Advice from Road Agreements Team

Trees must not conflict with streetlights and must be a minimum 10 metres away and a minimum 1.5m from the carriageway. Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection. Given the number of trees indicated it would be helpful that the proposed street lighting is provided as trees will have to be located at least 10 metres away to ensure the streetlights can perform effectively.

Trees within the highway will need to be approved by OCC and will carry a commuted sum. No private planting to overhang or encroach the proposed adoptable areas.

The visitor parking bays parallel to the carriageway, can be adopted but accrue a commuted sum. Any other bays (echelon or perpendicular) or private bays will not be considered for adoption.

No property should be within 500mm to the proposed highway. No doors, gates, windows, garages or gas/electric cupboards should open onto the proposed highway.

No Highway materials, construction methods, adoptable layouts and technical details have been approved at this stage. The detailed design and acceptable adoption standards will be subject to a full technical audit.

Minor residential roads that serve four or less properties will not be considered for adoption. Roads serving 5 or more houses can be considered for adoption but will need

to meet adoptable criteria set out in the OCC Residential Design Guide Second Edition (2015).

The Highway boundary needs to be checked with OCC Highway Records ([highway.records@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:highway.records@oxfordshire.gov.uk)) to determine whether or not it coincides with the site boundary at the proposed access junction. The highway boundary is usually identified along the roadside edge of the ditch.

OCC require saturated CBR laboratory tests on the sub-soil likely to be used as the sub-formation layer. This would be best done alongside the main ground investigation for the site but the location of the samples must relate to the proposed location of the carriageway/footway.

### **Car and cycle parking**

The TA states that car and cycle parking is not detailed in this application but will be in accordance with CDC and OCC standards. OCC will be looking to ensure that there is sufficient visitor parking space within the development, and for a high level of good quality cycle provision. The overall number of parking and cycle parking spaces eventually approved may be different from the number specified in this planning application.

### **Refuse collection**

It is noted that some refuse vehicle swept path analysis has been provided for typical elements of layout. However, this appears to overrun kerbs, which would be unacceptable.. Full swept path analysis for the whole site will be required with reserved matters planning application(s).

### **Traffic impact**

Baseline traffic counts and turning movements were provided to the applicant by OCC, taken from the Bicester Transport Model. Following preapplication discussions it was agreed that the most recent version of the model would be used. This has a base year of 2016 and was updated in 2018 to include the Heyford Park (Policy Villages 5) allocation. This model was validated and approved by OCC, and as part of the scoping of this TA, further sense checks were carried out.

Appendix C of the TA sets out the assumptions regarding development and infrastructure included in the BTM scenarios. The assessment for this development uses the 2031 model scenario, which includes the new link road diversion of the A4095 under the new railway bridge, which is expected to be completed in 2024. The baseline includes the quantum of development at NW Bicester expected to come forward by 2031, according to the Local Planning Authority's Annual Monitoring Report, but the traffic flows in the model from this development have been removed.

To assess the impact of this development, the estimated development traffic has been added manually to the baseline traffic flows, according to an assumed distribution agreed

with OCC. The methodology for calculating the vehicular trips includes a level of containment that is perhaps more appropriate to the situation when the rest of the masterplan is built out, but the resultant trip rates per dwelling are considered to be acceptable for the location.

The TA has assessed the proportionate impact of the development on nearby junctions. The three junctions where the development has the most significant impact are the A4095/B4100 junction, where a scheme of improvements is being developed by OCC taking the traffic from the development into account, the junction of Braeburn Ave/B4100, and the junction of Charlotte Ave/B4100. The latter two have been assessed in detail using standard junction modelling software. However, the model output reports have not been provided. According to the summary, the Braeburn Ave junction has good capacity to accommodate the traffic from the development, while the Charlotte Avenue junction is pushed over the acceptable capacity threshold in 2031.

Contrary to the assertions of the TA, in its current form, I do not consider there is sufficient capacity at the Charlotte Ave junction to accommodate the traffic from the development. The applicant has put forward a scheme of signalisation, but OCC would not necessarily accept this particular scheme. It has long been accepted that this junction would need to be signalised in the future, but due to the proximity, it will need to be carefully designed and modelled in conjunction with the upgraded A4095/B4100 junction. A proportionate contribution is therefore requested towards the future upgrade of this junction.

For completeness, and to verify the above, the applicant must provide the PICADY model output for both junctions. **Further information required.**

A proportionate contribution is also requested towards the improvement of the B4100/A4095 junction.

The modelling assumes that the A4095 diversion is in place, because it is included in the 2031 BTM scenario. There is reasonable certainty of it being delivered by 2024, but a condition is recommended restricting the amount of development that can come forward before it is opened. Previous modelling has shown that it is required prior to 900 homes at NW Bicester to avoid severe congestion at the junction of Lords Lane/Howes Lane/Bucknell Road.

Comments are made in relation to M40 J9 and J10. It is anticipated that Highways England will provide a response to these points.

The TA does not assess the impact of development traffic on the Elmsbrook spine road. Local objectors have highlighted the congestion experienced currently, particularly at school start and finish times. The roads have been designed with tight geometry and narrowings to slow traffic down, with one long narrowing only 4.1m wide, north of the school. It is debatable whether the road was designed with the eastern parcel in mind, since the NW Bicester masterplan shows no dwellings on this site. Safety issues due to lack of formal crossing points have also been highlighted, and the applicant has offered

a contribution towards a zebra crossing. **Further work should be carried out by the applicant to assess the suitability of the link for the development traffic and NMUs, and this may result in further mitigation being required.**

Other comments regarding the Transport chapter of the Environmental Assessment:

- Table 6.1 - The sensitivity of receptors has no consideration of cyclists, or workplaces
- Table 6.5 - Why has Braeburn Ave been classed as 'moderate sensitivity' when it has houses directly fronting the road?
- Table 6.2 - the criteria for magnitude of change should be expressed in terms of a percentage increase, as in para 3.17 of the Guidance.
- 6.81 - recent survey data shows that overall traffic levels in Oxfordshire are only approx 3% lower than pre-Covid.
- Pedestrian amenity has been expanded to pedestrian and cycle amenity, using the guidelines for pedestrian amenity set out in the guidelines - this is not appropriate for cycling, as cyclists cannot use footways.
- There is an inequate description of cycle facilities on Braeburn and Charlotte Ave
- No assessment of construction traffic as it is assumed to be lower than operational traffic, but this does not take vehicle type into account. No justification/calculations are shown to demonstrate how the volume of construction traffic has been estimated.

## **Travel Plan**

The sustainable travel options to residents should be promoted to residents. The Travel Plan and Travel Information Pack will help to reduce / limit SOV use while promoting active and sustainable travel.

The cycle parking is welcomed.

Will EV charging be provided?

The submitted Travel Plan does not meet OCC requirements and will need to be resubmitted for approval prior to occupation. The detailed comments section below provides further details. The size of the site will also trigger requirements for a monitoring fee.

OCC Travel Plan and Travel Information Pack guidance documents are available [online](#).

Travel Plan comments:

- Add the estimated / planned date of occupation;
- Add the anticipated number of residents;
- Add first / last service information for public transport;
- Add a predicted mode share using Census data;
- Targets should set out a reduction in SOV mode share;
- Targets must be set for each year in which monitoring is to take place;
- Mode share targets can be set using Census data, updated and agreed with OCC after the baseline survey;

- Year 1 survey must be undertaken after full occupation; and
- Add commitments that:
  - All surveys will be analysed and submitted to OCC within one month of survey completion;
  - The name and contact details of the TPC will be sent to the Travel Plans Team at OCC ([travelplan@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:travelplan@oxfordshire.gov.uk)) as soon as they have been identified;
  - If targets are not met at the end of the initial period of monitoring, the Travel Plan should be reviewed, new measures introduced and monitoring extended for another two cycles; for example where monitoring has taken place in Year 1, 3 and 5, if targets have not been met monitoring should continue in years 7 and 9; and
  - Once it has been approved, any changes to the Travel Plan, in particular the targets, must be made in agreement with the Travel Plans Team at Oxfordshire County Council.

A fee will be required to cover the monitoring of the travel plan.

**S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):**

**Highway works contributions as detailed above**

**Towards:** Off site highway works needed to provide capacity to support the wider development (including this site) north of the railway.

**Justification:** The works were identified as part of the transport assessment carried out to inform the NW Bicester Access and Travel Strategy, which supports the NW Bicester SPD. The site is part of the NW Bicester development north of the railway, and would only be acceptable in the context of that development, and therefore must make a proportionate contribution to the cost of the works necessary to support this development. The TA shows that there is a significant impact on both junctions where contributions are requested.

**Calculation:** The amounts of the contributions have been calculated on the basis of 530/2600 of the total contribution identified as being necessary for development north of the railway.

**Public Transport Service Contribution as detailed above**

**Towards:** the cost of serving development at NW Bicester north of the railway by bus.

**Justification:** The bus service was identified as part of NW Bicester Access and Travel Strategy, which supports the NW Bicester SPD. This site must make a proportionate contribution to the cost of the public transport necessary to support this development.

**Calculation:** The amounts of the contributions have been calculated on the basis of 530/2600 of the total contribution identified as being necessary for development north of the railway.

### **Public Rights of Way Contribution as detailed above**

**Towards:** Off site public rights of way improvements and new public right of way, in the vicinity of the site

**Justification:**

These are considered necessary to provide opportunities for leisure/health walking and connections to the nearby village of Bucknell, for residents of the wider NW Bicester development north of the railway. The routes will be easily accessible by residents of this site.

**Calculation:** A desk estimate of the costs of the improvements has been carried out - further details will be provided. Note that this is more than when first estimated in connection with the masterplan. A proportionate contribution will also be sought from other application north of the railway.

### **Travel Plan Monitoring Fee as detailed above**

**Towards:** The cost of monitoring the travel plan over a 5-year period.

**Justification:** The travel plan requires surveys to be carried out and revisions to be made as appropriate over its life. To be effective, this requires monitoring by council staff.

**Calculation:** The fee is based on an at-cost estimate of the staff time required.

### **S278 Highway Works:**

An obligation to enter into a S278 Agreement will be required to secure mitigation/improvement works, including:

- Informal crossing of B4100 and linking footway to improve access to Caversfield Church – further details required.
- Construction access to the site.

**Notes:**

This is to be secured by means of S106 restriction not to implement development (or occasionally other trigger point) until S278 agreement has been entered into.

The trigger by which time S278 works are to be completed shall also be included in the S106 agreement.

Identification of areas required to be dedicated as public highway and agreement of all relevant landowners will be necessary in order to enter into the S278 agreements.

S278 agreements include certain payments, including commuted sums, that apply to all S278 agreements however the S278 agreement may also include an additional payment(s) relating to specific works.

### **Planning Conditions:**

In the event that permission is to be given, the following planning conditions should be attached:

**Cycle parking:** Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted, covered cycle parking facilities shall be provided on the site in accordance with details which shall be firstly submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the covered cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development.

*Reason - In the interests of sustainability, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Construction Traffic Management plan:** Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved CTMP.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Travel Information Pack:** Prior to first occupation the development a Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the first residents of each dwelling shall be provided with a copy of the approved Travel Information Pack.

*Reason: To ensure all residents and employees are aware from the outset of the travel choices available to them, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Travel Plan:** Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a Travel Plan, prepared in accordance with the Department of Transport's Best Practice Guidance Note "Using the Planning Process to Secure Travel Plans", shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details.

*Reason - In the interests of sustainability and to ensure a satisfactory form of development, in accordance with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*



**Restriction on occupations prior to the opening of the Strategic Link Road (A4095 diversion) - wording TBC**

**No vehicular access to be permitted within the site between Access B and Access C**

**Informative:**

Please note, the Advance Payments Code (APC), Sections 219 -225 of the Highways Act 1980, is in force in the county to ensure financial security from the developer to off-set the frontage owners' liability for private street works, typically in the form of a cash deposit or bond. Should a developer wish for a street or estate to remain private, then to secure exemption from the APC procedure, a 'Private Road Agreement' must be entered into with the County Council to protect the interests of prospective frontage owners. For guidance and information on road adoptions etc. please visit our website.

Prior to the commencement of a development, a separate agreement(s) must be obtained from Oxfordshire County Council's (OCC) Road Agreements Team for the proposed highway works (vehicular access, new footway links, bus infrastructure, pedestrian refuge island, carriageway widening and new right-turn lane) under S278 of the Highways Act 1980. For guidance and information please contact the county's Road Agreements Team via <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/contact-road-agreements-team>.

**Officer's Name: Joy White**

**Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner**

**Date: 6 July 2021**