

# Evidence EH-2:

## Extractive Summary of Evidence EH-1 – “Evidence of D M Mason” Report

*(Summary extracted by R. Fellows, due to original document being >10,000 words; the following is a slightly edited version of the conclusions, i.e. Section 10, as this was still >1,100 words.)*

1. Report produced by David Miles Mason, a Director of D M Mason Engineering Consultants Ltd, instructed by Elmsbrook Traffic and Parking Group.
2. This Evidence supports reasons for refusal 2 and 3 of the planning application made by Firethorn Development Ltd (Firethorn) to Cherwell District Council (CDC) for Outline planning application for residential development on land adjacent to the Exemplar Scheme, NW Bicester Ecotown.
3. The A4095 Southwold Lane/B4100 Banbury Road junction is proposed to be reconfigured as a traffic signal controlled junction. If these works will not be implemented until much of the development in north west Bicester is underway, this will disproportionately impact the Elmsbrook development.
4. In the Transport Assessment accompanying the planning application, the vehicle trip generation for the site used is 40% of the person trip generation. The North West Bicester Supplementary Planning Document states that the aim is to achieve an overall modal share of not more than 50% by car. The Transport Assessment analysis is therefore designing for only 80% of the trip generation from the site which is envisaged in the SPD. Such a design cannot be considered robust.
5. The Exemplar Site has not yet reduced to a 40% car mode travel share despite the site being occupied for some time. A modelled 40% car mode share at the opening of the Appeal site is wholly unrealistic.
6. The Transport Assessment (using the Bicester Traffic Model to forecast future years of traffic growth) shows anomalies: negative flows, and highly unexpected traffic flows; these may cause significant errors.
7. The Transport Assessment gives details of the junction modelling output for the B4100 junction with Charlotte Avenue reflecting the 40% trip generation by car modelling. The maximum RFC is 0.87. The Highway Authority noted that the Charlotte Avenue junction is pushed over the acceptable capacity threshold.
8. If traffic signals were installed, the maximum DOS is stated as 86.9%. When the DOS reaches 85% to 90%, queues and delays can grow quickly to very high levels.
9. Counts undertaken give higher total flows at the B4100/Charlotte Avenue junction than modelled in the Transport Assessment. The junction analysis in the Transport Assessment is inadequate.

10. Until the vehicle flow and junction modelling issues are resolved, it is not appropriate to grant planning consent for the Appeal development as the present modelling of the B4100 Banbury Road/Charlotte Avenue junction is sensitive to the input data.
11. A Technical Note addresses the removal of carriageway narrowings on Charlotte Avenue. The methodology for the calculation of the assumed vehicle flow on Charlotte Avenue is unsound. The proposed cycle facility and footway widths are incorrect. The proposed solution to the removal of carriageway narrowings is incorrect for the needs of all road users. Until the impact of the carriageway narrowings is resolved, planning consent to the Appeal development should not be granted.
12. A Technical Note suggests carriageway widening north of Gagle Brook School. There is no analysis of the impact on all road users of this carriageway widening. Until the impact of carriageway widening is resolved, planning consent to the Appeal development should not be granted.
13. A parking survey undertaken adjacent to Gagle Brook School indicates a need for between 41 and 60 car parking spaces for school purposes. The Draft Travel Plan for the school assumes a similar figure. These cars would stretch from the school to the Banbury Road/Charlotte Avenue junction. This would cause a long carriageway narrowing. The impact of this narrowing has not been tested. Until the impact of carriageway narrowing is resolved, planning consent to the Appeal development should not be granted.
14. The Appellant, the Planning Authority and the Highway Authority have not shown that the impact of the multiple issues raised in this Evidence have been resolved. The impact of any one of these issues could be severe. Together, the impact of these issues as they are at the date of the committee report is very probably severe.
15. Members were right to have grave concerns about the proposals. Members acted appropriately in not determining the application at the 12 January, 2023 committee and subsequently resolving to refuse permission at the 9 March, 2023 committee.
16. It is unacceptable to impose traffic problems on an existing residents in designing a proposed scheme. Until robust testing is undertaken, planning consent to the Appeal development should not be granted.
17. The currently proposed construction Access E has visibility splays which do not meet standards. Until there is adequate resolution of the problems at proposed Access E, planning consent should not be granted for the Appeal development.
18. There is a possible solution to make the proposed construction Access E into a permanent access to the two sites.
19. The development access proposals presently envisaged fail on a substantial number of counts. The impact of these failures will be severe for present and future occupants of the Exemplar scheme and the proposal scheme.
20. Until such time as these failures are resolved, the Inspector is respectfully requested to not grant planning consent for the Appeal development.