SUPPLEMENT TO OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S REGULATION 122 COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

| Location: | Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2 |
|---------------|---|
| | Caversfield |
| Planning Ref: | 21/01630/OUT |
| Appeal Ref: | APP/C3105/W/23/3315849 |
| Proposal: | Outline planning application for residential development (within |
| - | Use Class C3), open space provision, access, drainage and all |
| | associated works and operations including but not limited to |
| | demolition, earthworks, and engineering operations, with the |
| | details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for |
| | later determination |
| Date: | 09/06/2023 |

Additional information requested by Inspector:

Location of secondary school site in the North West Bicester masterplan

 A plan has been attached as Annex 1.

2. How the Household Waste Recycling Centre Contribution will be spent:

The nearest site to the proposed development in Bicester is in Ardley. The site is already at peak times up to 52% over capacity. The other 6 site in Oxfordshire are also over capacity.

The County Council has updated its Household Waste and Recycling Centre (HWRC) strategy to address the over capacity of sites which went out to consultation from 27 March 2023 to 8 May 2023. The strategy is currently progressing through the approvals process in OCC and is expected to be agreed by Cabinet before the end of 2023. Once approved an action plan will be produced.

Although the strategy in not yet ratified and the detail of delivery not yet clarified the process towards delivery is underway as it is clear that additional capacity will have to be provided to meet increasing demand. It is proposed that additional capacity will be delivered by a combination of expanding the footprint of existing sites, where the acquisition of additional land is possible, and by new centres when suitable land is identified. The contributions from the proposed development would be pooled with other S106 contributions and used to purchase land and provide the necessary infrastructure thereon. The contributions received by OCC can be held for 10 years and it is anticipated that additional capacity to serve the residents of the proposed development will be delivered within that timeframe.

The S106 specifies that the contribution has to be spent to serve the area of the site.

3. Cost estimate for the pedestrian/Cycle Infrastructure contribution

The route is identified in the Bicester LCWIP, but the design stage has not yet begun. A desktop costing exercise has been carried out, as set out below.

Banbury Road Pedestrian and Cycle Improvements

| Upgrade to provide parallel crossings north of the railway bridge and at Bure Farm | 83000 | |
|--|--------|--------|
| Provision of raised crossings over Lucerne Ave and side roads on | | |
| eastern side of Banbury Road | 161375 | |
| Formal consultations for speed limit and raised crossings | 3120 | |
| | _ | 247495 |
| Risk and contingency 20% | | 49499 |
| Design fee | | 24750 |
| Staff time, legal fees and statutory approvals | | 40721 |
| | | |

TOTAL

362465

4. More information to justify the amount of the Local Road Improvements Contribution

As explained at the Inquiry, no scheme for improvement of Elmsbrook Spine Road has been approved by OCC, as the road is currently still in private ownership. However, OCC was satisfied that sufficient widening could be achieved in future, once the road is adopted, to the narrow part of the Elmsbrook spine road north of the school (without affecting the trees) within a budget of £100,000. A desktop costing (shown below - Figure 1), shows that simple kerbline alterations could be achieved for around £72,000. However, other options being considered and discussed, would add expense.

The amount sought is also intended to include a contribution towards widening of the footway at the bridge south of the school, to provide an off-carriageway cycle facility, or an alternative solution: again, no particular scheme has been approved by OCC as the spine road is still in private ownership. In this case, a desktop costing has not been carried out, but an appropriate solution is likely to be more expensive than the widening discussed in the paragraph above. A contribution based on proportionate traffic impact would be sought from the adjacent development (currently the subject of an outline planning application) to supplement this contribution.

5. More information on how the Travel Plan Monitoring contribution has been calculated

As set out previously, the contribution is intended to cover the OCC staff costs of carrying out the following activities in three monitoring and feedback stages (at years 1,3 and 5 following first occupation):

- review the survey data produced by the developer
- compare it to the progress against the targets in the approved travel plan and census or national travel survey data sets
- agree any changes in an updated actions or future targets in an updated travel plan.

This has been estimated at 51 hours of staff time in total, at an hourly rate of $\pounds 55.53$.

Figure 1- Charlotte Avenue Widening

Initial Cost Estimate

| Item | Description | Quantity | Unit | Rate | Amount (£) |
|------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---|
| A | Site Clearance | | | | |
| 1 2 3 | Remove Existing Footway and Dispose Remove surface course from existing carriageway and dispose (planer) Remove existing ACO Kerb Drainage | 100 1 5 | m2 Item m | 20 1500 50 | 2,000.00 1,500.00 250.00 |
| D | Drainage | | | | |
| 1 | New ACO Drainage Kerbs | 5 | m | 500 | 2,500.00 |
| Е | <u>Earthworks</u> | | | | |
| 1 2 3 | Excavation of new carriageway Extra-over excavation in hard material Disposal of material | 20 20 60 | m3 m3 m3 | 10 30 40 | 200.00 600.00 2,400.00 |
| F | Kerbs, Footways & Paved Areas | | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 | New precast Concrete HB2/BN (125mm) Kerb Dropped Kerb New Carriageway surfacing New surfacing to footway | 20 2 100 80 | m Item m2 m2 | 70 65 150 100 | 1,400.00 130.00 15,000.00 8,000.00 |
| | Sub-Total Construction Costs Estimate | | | | 33,980.00 |
| 1.1 1.2 | Traffic Management Contractor Preliminaries | 2 25 | Weeks % | 2500 33,980.00 | 5,000.00 8,495.00 |
| | Sub-Total Construction Costs Estimate | | | | 47,475.00 |
| 2 | Project Design Fees | | | | |
| 2.1 2.2 | Project & Design Fees Other Consultants Fees | 11 1.5 | % % | 47,475.00 47,475.00 | 5222.25 712.125 |
| | Sub-Total | | | | 53,409.38 |

| 3 | OCC Project Costs | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|----|-------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Project management | 2 | Weeks | 1000 | 2,000.00 |
| 3.2 | Site Supervision | 2 | Weeks | 1500 | 3,000.00 |
| 3.3 | General Administration | 1 | Sum | 1000 | 1,000.00 |
| | | | | | |
| | Sub-Total Construction Costs Estimate | | | | 59,409.38 |
| | | | | | |
| 4 | Risks and Inflation | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 4.1 | General Risks | 20 | % | 59,409.38 | 11,881.88 |
| | | | | | |
| | Total Cost Estimate | | | | 71,291.25 |

-Masterplan Site Area Proposed NW Bicester Land Use Green Infrastructure Existing Woodlands and hedgerows Existing Water Corridor and Ponds Proposed Woodlands and Hedgerows Buffer Proposed Water Corridor Buffer Zone Housing Primary School Secondary School Secondary School Sports Pitches Existing Business (including green space the) Existing Farm Use (induding pren space the) Commercial/ Business Social/Community Retail Care Home/Hotel/Other Extra Care Housing (including green space toc) Centre Centre Water Treatment Proposed Retention Basins and Attenuation Ponds Proposed Swales Existing Herbage O Play Proposed groups of allotments **Proposed Connectivity** - Strategic Roads with segregated footpath/cycleway - Primary Roads with segregated footpath/cycleway Secondary Roads including footpath/cycleway ---- Off road footpath cycle ways

- Crossing under railway
- ---- Existing Bridle Path

