

# COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Cherwell District Council

**Application No:** 19/01740/HYBRID-2

**Proposal:** This application comprises a 'hybrid' planning application comprising: - Outline planning permission (all matters reserved except for access) for up to 23,400sq.m of B1 development (Use Classes B1a and/or B1b and/or B1c); highway works (including provision of a new roundabout at the junction between Vendee Drive and Wendlebury Road); creation of a wetland and landscaped areas; and associated infrastructure works. - Full planning permission for a health and racquets club, associated access and car parking, outdoor tennis courts, air dome, outdoor swimming pool, spa garden and terrace, and associated landscaping.

**Location:** Land Adj To Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton

**Response date:** 17<sup>th</sup> March 2020

---

This report sets out the officer views of Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) on the above proposal. These are set out by individual service area/technical discipline and include details of any planning conditions or informatives that should be attached in the event that permission is granted and any obligations to be secured by way of a S106 agreement. Where considered appropriate, an overarching strategic commentary is also included. If the local County Council member has provided comments on the application these are provided as a separate attachment.

---

**Following the submission of additional information, this response updates OCC's previous responses to the application. All previous comments continue to apply other than where addressed below.**

**Application No: 19/01740/HYBRID-2**

**Location:** Land Adj To Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton

---

## **General Information and Advice**

### **Recommendations for approval contrary to OCC objection:**

IF within this response an OCC officer has raised an objection but the Local Planning Authority are still minded to recommend approval, OCC would be grateful for notification (via [planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk)) as to why material consideration outweigh OCC's objections, and given an opportunity to make further representations.

### **Outline applications and contributions**

The number and type of dwellings and/or the floor space may be set by the developer at the time of application, or if not stated in the application, a policy compliant mix will be used for assessment of the impact and mitigation in the form of s106 contributions. These are set out on the first page of this response.

In the case of outline applications, once the unit mix/floor space is confirmed by the developer a matrix (if appropriate) will be applied to assess any increase in contributions payable. The matrix will be based on an assumed policy compliant mix as if not agreed during the s106 negotiations.

Where unit mix is established prior to commencement of development, the matrix sum can be fixed based on the supplied mix (with scope for higher contribution if there is a revised reserved matters approval).

### **Where a S106/Planning Obligation is required:**

- **Index Linked** – in order to maintain the real value of s106 contributions, contributions will be index linked. Base values and the index to be applied are set out in the Schedules to this response.
- **Security of payment for deferred contributions** – An approved **bond** will be required to secure payments where the payment of S106 contributions (in aggregate) have been agreed to be deferred to post implementation and the total County contributions for the development exceed £1m (after indexation).
- **Administration and Monitoring Fee - £6,623**  
This is an estimate of the amount required to cover the extra monitoring and administration associated with the S106 agreement. The final amount will be based on the OCC's scale of fees and will adjusted to take account of the number of obligations and the complexity of the S106 agreement.
- **OCC Legal Fees** The applicant will be required to pay OCC's legal fees in relation to legal agreements. Please note the fees apply whether an s106 agreement is completed or not.

**Application No: 19/01740/HYBRID-2**

**Location:** Land Adj To Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton

---

## Transport Schedule

### Recommendation:

#### **Objection for the following reason(s):**

- Access to the site via the Wendlebury Road roundabout does not give priority to cycling and pedestrian movements: contrary to Oxfordshire Cycling and Walking Design Standards as well as Policy Bicester 10 of the Local Plan.
- Vehicle Tracking for the Health and Racquets club needs revision and the barrier control point must be set back to accommodate a large vehicle whilst not overhanging the cycle/pedestrian facility.

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)	£598,404.24	October 2019	Baxter	The Strategic Highway Infrastructure contribution (SEPR)
Highway Works (2)	£50,000	October 2019	Baxter	Towards highway safety improvement measures at Vendee Drive roundabout
Public transport services	£375,000	October 2019	RPI-x	Towards bus service enhancements to extend a local bus service to/from this site at peak times
Public transport infrastructure ( <i>if not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement</i> )	£10,000	October 2019	Baxter	A bus Shelter including a standard flag pole and information case
Travel Plan Monitoring	£3,280	October 2019	RPI-x	Travel plan monitoring fees of £2,040 for the B1 employment floorspace.
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,036,684.24</b>			

## **Key points**

- Improvements are required to the site access roundabout that would give cycling and walking a more preferred mode of transport as per the provisions within Policy Bicester 12 of the Local Plan.
- Bus stop infrastructure and a contribution towards public transport improvements are required in order to make the site accessible by bus
- The site would need to make a proportionate contribution towards the South East Link Road
- Vehicle tracking at the Health and Racquets club access needs revision.
- Siting of the barrier control at the Health and Racquets club access is not adequately set back to allow for a large vehicle to sit whilst not overhanging the footway.
- OCC's points of objection to the previous TA have been overcome.
- Provision of electric charging bays

## **Comments:**

The updated TA assesses 2 different development scenarios as stated in paragraph 1.4. These are;

- Scenario 2: B1 development (16,800sqm) and the Health and Racquet Club on Site A, and
- Scenario 4: B1 development (27,000sqm) and Health & Racquet Club across Site A and B.

In our previous response, we said that as well as a scenario reflecting the development proposed by this application, there should also be a scenario that considers both applications together should they both be given permission. For robustness this has been revised under Scenario 4 to be 27,000 square metres of B1a development and 5,869 square metres of Assembly and Leisure. None of the scenarios are therefore sufficient to cover this.

A covering letter from the development's planning consultants, Quod dated January 2020, submitted with the application, explains that the descriptions of the development have been amended such that the total quantum could never exceed what this assessment has presented. It further asserts conditions that CDC could impose to limit the development such that the assessment would be considered adequate

In the TA, at paragraph 4.1.3 it states that the maximum proportion of B1a (office) floorspace in all cases would be limited to 35%. This reflects the calculations of trip generation put forward in the TA, B1a being the highest trip generator of the B1 uses. If this site were to be granted permission this condition would need to be applied.

## **Access Arrangements**

Access from the employment part of development is proposed off a new standard roundabout as a replacement of the consented mini roundabout in order to provide a

safe and suitable access to the Bicester 10 Phase 2 site. The new roundabout would serve the Wendlebury Road (North and South arms), site access and the Vendee Drive link road shall form the east and west arms respectively. This arrangement shall require the development to dedicate some of the land to highways in order to realign Wendlebury Road and also accommodate the new roundabout.

This roundabout design was a subject of initial consultations where it was considered an acceptable arrangement in terms of capacity and safety for those accessing or egressing the site. It has however been assessed against provisions of continuing pedestrian and cyclist movements in consideration that this is on Sustrans Route 5 where local and national cycling needs to be catered for.

The county council's adopted cycling design standards requires considerations to be made to new roundabouts within development. In order to slow traffic and also to give priority to cyclists, roundabout entries are required to be radial rather than tangential, a layout that encourages and maximises cycling and walking. There is the possibility that some additional land within the blue line might be required for the extent of the adoptable highway works. A more compact style roundabout has been recommended at this location. Should the applicant be agreeable to such a compact roundabout the Highway Authority's objection shall likely be removed.

The applicant has submitted revised access arrangements (illustrated by the DTA Drwg Nos. 19539-16 and 19539-17). Notable with this arrangement are improvements to the existing pedestrian and cycling facilities to include a 3m shared use along the site frontage on Wendlebury Road right up to the A41/Pioneer Way junction toucan crossing. It is noted that a short section of this provision shall be constrained by land take where a 3m wide shared use could not be achievable. It is agreed that any narrowings along this has facility must be short and must not be less than 2.5m wide.

As part of the pedestrian/cycle improvements along Wendlebury Road the applicant has expressed a willingness to implement raised crossing treatments across accesses along Wendlebury Road. However, apart from the David Lloyds club access, the drawings do not indicate whether the other access points shall benefit from such a raised crossing for cyclists and pedestrians. Accesses to the Thames Water treatment facility and those serving the garden centre need to be clearly indicated that these shall have raised platforms including give-way markings on the approach from the side roads. This feature would give priority to pedestrian and cyclist crossing movements over side road vehicular traffic, making it more convenient to these sustainable travel users. In accordance with Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards priority should be given to the cycle way across each of the access points. They would also benefit from vehicles approaching these access points at reduced speeds.

These shall be implementable via section 278 obligations secured under s106. OCC shall require detailed work plans to be submitted showing the extent of these arrangements.

There is a footway being proposed along the development's northern boundary, which I assume is an access for pedestrians and cyclists into the Health and Racquets club and also wider employment site. My concern with this, lies in its termination with Wendlebury Road where it is not clear how the connection to the shared facility along

Wendlebury Road shall be achieved. The applicant must revise this arrangement to facilitate and improve connectivity in order to maximise walking and cycling links in accordance with the design principles of Policy Bicester 10 of The Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 and also in accordance with para 108 (b) of the revised NPPF.

## **Layout**

This HYBRID application is seeking outline planning permission for the employment element of development and full permission covering the Health and Racquets club and associated highway works. Therefore, at this stage, the detailed design and layout for the employment site shall not be evaluated at this stage. My focus is thus centred on the Health and Racquets club under this consultation.

*Vehicle Tracking* – Appendix L contains illustrations of vehicle tracking along the reconfigured Wendlebury Road and the proposed roundabout as well as the David Lloyd site access (Drwg No. 19539-11-04). Tracking for the David Lloyd site access has utilised a 9.93m long refuse truck. Whilst the vehicle used is not one of the largest refuse wagons, I notice a kerb overrun to the north of the access.

It is noticed from the Masterplan in Appendix A (under Drwg No. 18022-SK-024 Rev D) and from another David Lloyd Proposed Site Plan ref: A-PL-09-010 Rev P01 that access to the DL club shall be barrier controlled. In light of this, I would like to see swept path exercises showing a refuse truck manoeuvring into and out of site in the presence of entrance barriers.

In addition to this, and again being mindful of the raised table access crossing that has been proposed, I wish to draw attention to the likelihood of having a vehicle overhanging the pedestrian/cyclist facility in trying to gain access. I strongly suggest that this should be set back further into the site to accommodate at least two vehicles as well as storage and swept path allowance for servicing vehicles.

The proposed site plans do not indicate provision of electric vehicle charging points for any of the parking spaces. In line with the revised NPPF, para 110 (e) requires that developments should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.

*Cycle Parking* – The site layout plan only shows the location of cycle parking within the Health and Racquet Club but does not indicate how many these shall be and/or whether they shall be covered. From the indicative site plan (Drwg No. 18022-SK-024 Rev D) there are only 5 sheffield stands which can accommodate not more than 10 bicycles. I see this is an under-provision that does not encourage use cycling as a mode of transport. *Table 25* in the TA makes reference to cycle parking standards but fails to include standards for D2 land uses. According to these, a cycle stand is required per 20sqm of floorspace. The TA has not indicated the massing (in terms of floorspace) that the Health and Racquets Club shall take. However, the applicant has agreed to make provision for 30 cycle parking facility which must be covered. I believe there is sufficient space within the layout to accommodate the extra number of stands.

*Bus stop* – the revised site access plans now show an indicative location for a southbound bus stop along Wendlebury Road. Its siting has been reviewed and

deemed acceptable. The applicant shall need to provide a hardstanding as part of the s278 off site highway improvements. A contribution towards associated infrastructure such as a bus shelter including a standard flag pole and information shall be secured via s106.

### **Accident Appraisal**

There have been a number of accidents at the A41/Vendee Drive roundabout in the last 5 years, mainly minor and near misses, but a double fatality more recently that is currently being investigated. Some northbound vehicles appear to fail to give way to vehicles on the roundabout circulatory. Additional vehicles through the junction generated by the development proposal will only exacerbate any risk.

OCC are developing a scheme that comprises of gradual speed reduction measures on the northbound approach to the roundabout. Measures to gradually reduce road speed from 70mph through to 40mph are currently considered. Such measures would include associated marking and signing and lane improvements. Provision of a gated hardstanding area for police enforcement vehicles is also considered here. This package of measures is estimated to cost circa £50,000.

In recognition that this development will put additional trips through this junction, it is reasonable to expect the current safety risk to be exacerbated. As such this package of measures is deemed appropriate for this development to remediate. Whilst the development has shown a willingness to make a proportionate contribution towards enhancing road safety along the A41 corridor, because this is the only allocated site yet to come forward, it is hence appropriate for the full funding to be secured by this development. In a separate email, the applicant has agreed to offer up to £25,000 towards safety improvement measures around the Vendee Drive roundabout.

### **Public transport**

The Highway Authority welcomes the applicant's commitment to improving the site's accessibility to public transport. The revised TA has stated acceptance to make contributions towards the following in order to improve the sites accessibility to bus services as requested by the HA in their previous response;

- Public transport service contribution of £375,000 indexed from October 2019 to extend a local bus service closer to the development.
- Public Transport infrastructure contribution of £10,000 indexed from October 2019 using Baxter index for a bus shelter including a standard flag pole and information case.

In the Revised TA the applicant has shown a willingness to provide a bus stop for a local bus service serving the site and a safe position for the bus stop will need to be incorporated into the design and indicated on the highway works plans.

### **Traffic Impact Assessment**

#### Traffic generation and distribution

In order to derive the trip rates for the proposed development, trip generation based on TRICS database surveys for 'Science Park' has been calculated, as well as a

'Knowledge Industry' mix of 35% B1a and 65% B1c. These mixes have been calculated for both Scenario 2 and Scenario 4. Due to the scale of Scenario 4 has the most impact so I have focussed on this assessment.

In our previous response, OCC did not consider the use of Cambridge Science Park and Begbroke Science Park representative of the situation in Bicester in terms of trip rate comparison. For robustness, it was suggested that a sensitivity test of 10% uplift be applied to the Science and technology trip rates. This has been applied in the revised TA and subsequently our objection on this has been removed.

Trips related to the Health and Racquets club have been estimated using TRICS. In our previous response we queried some of the sites used. This has been addressed and the resultant trip rate is considered acceptable where further sites, considered to be directly comparable have now been included. To make assessment more robust, it was agreed that all trips associated with the Health and Racquets club should be treated as primary trips, even when it is acknowledged that some of these are likely to be secondary in the form of linked and pass-by trips.

The journeys to work distribution have been sourced from the 2011 census dataset for Cherwell 015 output area, similar to what was considered reasonable and also adopted by the neighbouring employment developments. Assignment of trips on the road network is also acceptable.

Utilising these trip rates on the proposed development scenarios, Scenario 4 shows to generate more demand on the local road network. Similarly, AM peak arrivals are higher for the Science Park than the Knowledge Industry. On the other hand, the Knowledge Industry is forecast to generate higher flows than the Science Park in the PM peak. It is therefore reasonable to assess both peak periods for their worst-case scenarios.

#### Highway Capacity Assessment

On the basis of the parameters above, operational appraisal of the highway has been undertaken, assessing the impact of the proposed development traffic at the site access junction, Vendee Drive roundabout and the A41 corridor. Beyond this study area, it has been shown that the material impact from this development would be significantly low as not to require junction assessment.

*Health and Racquets Club Access* – Access modelling has been undertaken using Junctions 9. Model results are presented in *Table 27* of the TA. This shows that the access shall operate within capacity in assessment years 2026, 2031 with and without the SEPR.

*Site access Roundabout* – All traffic associated with the employment site shall be using this roundabout for access. As such, *Table 28* is an output summary of the operations of this roundabout taking into consideration that assessment in the AM peak is for the Science Park land use whereas the PM peak has used the Knowledge Industry demand. This table also shows that the roundabout shall operate within its designed capacity in all assessment years.

*A41 Highway Corridor* – The A41 Corridor between Vendee Drive roundabout to the Middleton Stoney Road/ Kings End roundabout is a series of closely spaced junctions, the majority of which are traffic signal controlled. It was agreed in our previous response that besides the A41/ Wendlebury Road junction, all other junctions in the corridor needed to be modelled together. It was considered that because of the varying tidal channelling of traffic in the AM and PM peak periods, the operation of the A41/ Wendlebury Road junction is critical to the proposed development and should be assessed in isolation of the rest of the corridor. Whilst this was not carried out, but instead modelled as part of the corridor, the applicant has (as requested by OCC) undertaken a sensitivity assessment where 100% of the A41 southbound traffic has been assigned to the Vendee Drive roundabout. As such, this junction has shown to operate with spare capacity in all assessment years.

Tables 32- 36 showcase modelling outputs for the A41 Corridor across the base and future year scenarios. Para 6.6.3 incorrectly references these Tables. Modelling outputs however show that in all assessment years, the northern A41 corridor junctions (i.e. A41/ Oxford Road/ Services junction and the Oxford Road/ Pingle Drive junction) shall operate outside of their capacities even with the development scenario 2, assumed to generate the least traffic. Under development scenario 4, the outputs show further deterioration of the junction capacities compared to scenario 2 in both 2026 and 2031 with/without the SEPR.

Junction performance in 2031 shows a relative improvement with the introduction of the SEPR. Taking the Oxford Road/ Pingle Drive junction for example in Table 36 shows the junction's Degree of Saturation as 95.2% in 2026 increasing to 102.4% in 2031 which then slightly falls to 99.7% with the SEPR in place. This clearly shows that however modest the impact of this development has on the network, the A41 Corridor is already saturated. Modelling demonstrates that the SEPR would bring some relief to the road network.

## **Transport Strategy – Policy**

### *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*

Revised NPPF para 108:

“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that: ...

c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.”

Revised NPPF para 109:

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”

Revised NPPF para 111:

“All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a

transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.”

“All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.”

#### *Cherwell District*

Cherwell Local Plan Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections:

“The Council will support the implementation of the proposals in the Movement Strategies and the Local Transport Plan to deliver key connections... New development in the District will be required to provide financial and/or in-kind contributions to mitigate the transport impacts of development.”

It should be noted that Site B extends beyond the area allocated for Bicester 10 to include the chicken farm to the south, but in this context should be regarded as an extension of the allocation. In the Cherwell Local Plan under Policy Bicester 10: Bicester Gateway it states:

“Infrastructure Needs...

Access and Movement – M40, Phase 2 improvements to Junction 9. Contributions to improvements to the surrounding local and strategic road networks, including safeguarding land for future highway improvements to peripheral routes on this side of the town.”

However, M40 Phase 2 improvements to Junction 9 have now been completed.

Under Key site-specific design and place shaping principles it states:

- “Layout that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing development particularly the mixed-use urban extension at South West Bicester to the west, the garden centre to the north, and, further to the north, Bicester Village retail outlet and Bicester town centre.
- Provision and encouragement for sustainable travel options as the preferred modes of transport rather than the private car, and provision of a Travel Plan. Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for.
- Provision for safe pedestrian and cyclist access from the A41 including facilitating the provision and upgrading of footpaths and cycleways that link with existing networks to improve connectivity generally, to maximise walking and cycling links between this site and nearby development sites and the town centre.
- Accommodation of bus stops to link the development to the wider town.
- Maximisation of walking and cycling links to the adjoining mixed-use development at South West Bicester as well as the garden centre to the north.
- Contribution to the creation of a footpath network around Bicester.

- A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities.”

*Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4)*

In Oxfordshire County Council’s Local Transport Plan 4, Policy BIC1 in the Bicester Area Strategy states:

“BIC1 – Improve access and connections between key employment and residential sites and the strategic transport system by:

- Continuing to work with Highways England to improve connectivity to the strategic highway. We will continue to work in partnership on the A34 and A43 strategies, as well as Junctions 9 and 10 of the M40 to relieve congestion
- Delivering effective peripheral routes around the town.

Southern peripheral corridor: provide a South East Perimeter Road to support the significant housing and employment growth in Bicester. In the longer term, link capacity issues along Boundary Way are assessed as being a major transport issue for the town. Land is safeguarded at Graven Hill for the section of road to the south of this site, joining the A41 at the Pioneer Road junction – this prevents development on the land that would be required, but does not remove the need for full assessment, justification and planning processes to be undertaken. This will need extending westwards to join the A41 north of M40 Junction 9. The preferred alignment for this extension has been approved as a connection from the Little Chesterton junction across to Graven Hill. The solution will also include a new link through the South East Bicester development site from the A41 Pioneer Road junction up to Wretchwick Way, providing connectivity through the site, in particular for buses.”

The cumulative impact of Local Plan growth development in Bicester will be severe if appropriate contributions are not secured from all development sites towards the strategic transport infrastructure required to mitigate the increase in transport movements.

Strategic transport modelling demonstrates the benefits that the South East Perimeter Road (SEPR) will bring to the A41 /Oxford Road:

- The A41 Oxford Road is a key corridor in Bicester where junctions along its length are impacted significantly as a result of the growth of Bicester, including Bicester 10. The Application Site will increase the proportion of peak hour traffic through this corridor.
- The SEPR has been identified as a key piece of strategic infrastructure that will bring direct relief to the A41 corridor, thereby facilitating improved operation of junctions directly impacted by Bicester 10.
- Modelling has demonstrated the benefits that the SEPR would bring to the A41. In the AM peak:
  - Over 1000 vehicles (pcu’s) that would otherwise use the A41 Oxford Rd northbound through Vendee Drive would route via SEPR (eastbound)

- Around 930 vehicles (pcu's) that would otherwise use A41 Boundary Way and turn left on A41 Oxford Rd southbound past Bicester 4, would route via SEPR (westbound)
- Therefore, over 1930 vehicles (pcu's) would use the SEPR that would otherwise route along A41 past the Bicester 10 site.

It is acknowledged however that the capacity released on the A41 by the SEPR will itself encourage some traffic that might otherwise choose NOT to use the A41, to divert along the corridor. When taking diverted traffic into account, the net reduction in traffic on the A41 would be around 1130 pcu's.

At present the western section of the proposed SEPR is not fully funded and so contributions towards this are required for mitigating Bicester Gateway's proposals. Other future developments in the area would also be expected to contribute, as did Phase 1 (16/02586/OUT) of development at Bicester 10. The required contribution has been determined in accordance with the Cherwell Developer Contributions SPD (February 2018) using a formula that has been used to negotiate with Bicester 4 developers.

#### SEPR Western Section

X = £21.3m (October 2015 cost estimate) for SEPR Western Section

Y = £585,127.83 (estimated held or secured s106 contributions)

Z = £14,185,800 (notional 66.6% match funding)

E = 7463 peak hour trips calculated from Bic 4, Bic 10 and Wretchwick Green.

[Wretchwick Green = 1773. Bicester 4 = 2,032. Bicester 10 = 3658.]

The cost estimate was taken from the "Preliminary ecological appraisal, planning advice and engineering feasibility for the South East Perimeter Road" document that can be downloaded from the County Council's website [here](#).

Under section 8.2, the costing for the preferred southern alignment (option 2) is estimated at £15m engineering (structures cost) and £6.3m new highway costs.

The revised TA has responded with the applicant willing to make proportional contributions towards Strategic Highway Infrastructure in accordance with the policies set out above. A contribution rate of £874.86/peak hour (vehicle) trip, similar to that applied to Bicester 4 is deemed proportionate, amounting to £598,404.24 from this development. This contribution shall be secured under a s106 obligation.

#### **Travel Plan**

Two travel plans have been submitted with this application, a framework travel plan for the employment floorspace which is being proposed for the site and a travel plan for the David Lloyd Sports and Racquet Club. They have both been checked against our approved guidance. Our comments on the submitted travel plans are included below.

The TA states that “Application 2 will not come forward unless the development proposed by Application 1.” Any site occupiers of this additional employment floorspace in application 2 who are above travel plan thresholds will also be required to develop their own travel plans which are based on and in accord with the site wide framework travel plan targets and objectives.

*N.B. Please provide answers to any questions that require a response. A failure to do this will inevitably lead to delays.*

#### Framework travel plan comments

The Framework Travel Plan has been prepared under separate cover, setting out additional measures to maximise the opportunities of the site employees to travel to and from work via sustainable modes and presents a strategy to reduce the modal share of single occupancy driving.

As a framework travel plan has already been produced to cover the site that this proposed development will occupy it will just need to be updated to include this additional employment floorspace which is being proposed as part of this application.

Any site occupiers of this additional employment floorspace who are above travel plan thresholds will also be required to develop their own travel plans which are based on and in accord with the site wide framework travel plan targets and objectives.

- Once the makeup of the site has been decided the framework travel plan will be updated to include this information. This will include details of cycle parking, car parking etc. A site plan will be added to the framework travel plan.
- Para 4.1 The aim of this travel plan is to reduce single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips made to and from the site. As car share may be one way of achieving this aim this should be changed from private car to reflect this.
- Para 5.2 Targets, a target needs to be specified for all modes for each year in which a survey will take place, usually years 1, 3 and 5, these should be given in both percentages and actual numbers. Please also specify a target for reducing SOV trips made to and from the site.
- Para 6.1.2 Each individual unit that is required to produce a travel plan should do so within three months of occupation this include carrying out their own baseline survey.

A link to our guidance is included below.

<https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/roadsandtransport/transportpoliciesandplans/newdevelopments/TravelAssessmentsandTravelPlans.pdf>

#### **Construction Travel Management Plan (CTMP)**

A CTMP will be needed for this development, given the traffic sensitive nature of the potential approach routes on the wider strategic road network e.g. A41. We would normally expect the CTMP to incorporate the following in detail:

- The CTMP must be appropriately titled, include the site and planning permission number.
- Routing of construction traffic and delivery vehicles is required to be shown. This includes means of access into the site.

- Details of and approval of any road closures needed during construction.
- Details of and approval of any traffic management needed during construction.
- Details of wheel cleaning/wash facilities – to prevent mud etc, in vehicle tyres/wheels, from migrating onto adjacent highway.
- Details of appropriate signing, to accord with the necessary standards/requirements, for pedestrians during construction works, including any footpath diversions.
- The erection and maintenance of security hoarding / scaffolding if required.
- A regime to inspect and maintain all signing, barriers etc.
- Contact details of the Project Manager and Site Supervisor responsible for on-site works to be provided.
- The use of appropriately trained, qualified and certificated banksmen for guiding vehicles/unloading etc.
- No unnecessary parking of site related vehicles (worker transport etc) in the vicinity – details of where these will be parked and occupiers transported to/from site to be submitted for consideration and approval. Areas to be shown on a plan not less than 1:500.
- Layout plan of the site that shows structures, roads, site storage, compound, pedestrian routes etc.
- A before-work commencement highway condition survey and agreement with a representative of the Highways Depot – contact 0845 310 1111. Final correspondence is required to be submitted.
- Local residents to be kept informed of significant deliveries and liaised with through the project. Contact details for person to whom issues should be raised with in first instance to be provided and a record kept of these and subsequent resolution.
- Any temporary access arrangements to be agreed with and approved by Highways Depot.
- Details of times for construction traffic and delivery vehicles, which must be outside network peak hours.

The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plan.

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

**£598,404.24 Highway Works (1) Contribution** indexed from October 2019 using Baxter Index. Towards the South East Link Road

**Calculation:**

The formula used in the following calculation is taken from the adopted Cherwell Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (Feb 2018) and OCC's emerging Developer Guide. OCC are available to discuss the assumptions used in this calculation further with the applicant.

$$\text{Strategic transport contribution} = (X - Y - Z) \div E$$

Where,

X = Cost of Scheme(s)

Y = Held/Committed funding

Z = LGF Funding/Alternative Funding

E = Expected Growth contributing to the SEPR

#### SEPR Western Section

X = **£21.3m** (October 2015 cost estimate) for SEPR Western Section

Y = **£585,127.83** (estimated held or secured s106 contributions)

Z = **£14,185,800** (notional 66.6% match funding)

E = **7463** peak hour trips calculated from Wretchwick Green = 1773. Bicester 4 = 2,032. Bicester 10 = 3658.

The resultant contribution per peak hour trip therefore = £874.86

Contribution requested from Bicester 10 phase 2 is therefore **£598,404.24**

#### **Justification:**

The Transport Assessment shows that the network along the A41 corridor on which the development site sits is already under strain in the opening year of 2026 from the cumulative impact of growth. This strain will continue to grow until a trigger point when the South East Perimeter Road will be required before 2031, in order to provide relief to the A41 corridor.

As a result, a Strategic Transport Contribution from the Bicester 10 Local Plan growth allocation is required, in addition to any local mitigation that may also be necessary. It is considered that the most appropriate piece of strategic infrastructure for this contribution to be allocated against is the South East Perimeter Road, as the site will directly benefit from its construction. This is supported by the independent transport consultant commissioned by Cherwell District Council specifically to provide advice relating to this case. The western section is one of three sections of the SEPR all of which shall be part delivered by developments around Bicester. This link shall run between the western end of the Graven Hill safeguarded route and the A41 north of Wendlebury, which would be under 2km from the proposed development. This is illustrated by Figure 2 of the Bicester Area Strategy in LTP4.

**£50,000 Highway Works (2) Contribution** indexed from October 2019 using Baxter Index. Towards improvement of highway safety along Vendee Drive roundabout including the A41 Corridor. Further details of the scheme including costing shall follow.

**£375,000 Public Transport Service Contribution** indexed from October 2019 using RPI-x

#### **Towards:**

Bus service enhancements to extend a local bus service to/from this site during the major peak times – which are assumed to be 0700-1000 and 1600-1900 Mondays to Fridays over a period of 5 years

**Justification:**

Whilst the development appears to be close to the Park and Ride and also to the bus stops along the A41, much of the development is far from these facilities if the actual walking route is put into perspective, particularly where there is need to cross the A41 to the northbound bus stop or the Park and Ride.

The provision of a guaranteed bus service closer to the site at journey-to/from-work times provides employees with some certainty of departure times, especially after work. The walking distance from the site to the northbound bus stop on the A41 is not only in excess of the recommended 400 metres from much of the site, but it also requires both carriageways of the A41 to be crossed on foot. In addition, the arrival times of buses on the main road service from Oxford cannot be predicted with any degree of reliability due to variable traffic congestion.

Demand for travel to/from work on-site can be expected to be almost entirely in the morning and peak hours. Contributions are therefore required to cover the estimated cost of extending a local bus service to/from this site during the main journey to work times. Contributions have already been sought from the nearby Bicester Business Park, to the north of this site and it is expected that, the additional service shall be extended to serve this development with provision of a new suitable bus stop on either side of the Vendee Drive link road between the roundabouts. This is requested over a period of 5 years as this is estimated as the length of time for it to become commercially viable.

The provision of an on-site bus service is seen as being a much more attractive proposition than the long walk, across a busy dual carriageway road to a bus stop with a highly variable bus service. The Council wishes to encourage the use of modes other than the car for journeys to work in the Bicester area.

**Calculation:**

Similar to contributions requested from other developments, calculations are based on £50 per bus-hour. Six morning arrivals on Mondays to Fridays and six departures in the evening equates to £300 per working day (3 hours am and 3 hours pm) or £75,000 per annum. The cost for five years would be £375,000.

**£10,000 Public Transport Infrastructure Contribution** indexed from October 2019 using Baxter Index

**Towards:**

A bus Shelter including a standard flag pole and information case on the Vendee Drive link Road east of the Vendee Drive roundabout.

**Calculation:**

The £10,000 is the procured cost of a 3-bay bus shelter to include a flag pole and information case, installation and commuted sums for maintenance.

**£3,280 Travel Plan Monitoring Fee** indexed from October 2019 using RPI-x

**Towards:**

Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution for both the framework travel plan as part of the outline site and a separate Travel Plan David Lloyd club development for a period of 5 years after the occupation of the site.

**Justification:**

The travel plan is a document that is bespoke to the individual development, reflecting the site's current and predicted travel patterns, opportunities for sustainable travel, and targets for improving the proportion of sustainable travel associated with the site.

NPPF Paragraph 36 states that all developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan.

The travel plan aims to encourage and promote more sustainable modes of transport with the objective of reducing dependence upon private motor car travel and so reducing the environmental impact and traffic congestion. A travel plan is required to make this development acceptable in planning terms and is to be secured by condition.

Therefore, the monitoring that will be charged for will be specific and relevant to this site alone.

**Calculation:**

The fees charged are for the work required by Oxfordshire County Council to monitor travel plans related solely to this development site. They are based on an estimate of the officer time required to carry out the following activities:

- 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.

Oxfordshire County Council guidance – 'Transport for new developments: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans' sets out fees according to the size of the development.

The estimate is based on three monitoring and feedback stages (to be undertaken at years 1, 3 & 5 following first occupation), which would require an expected 51 hours of officer time at £40 per hour for the outline site. Total £2040. Similarly, the Health and Racquet club would require an expected 31 hours of officer time at £40 per hour for the outline site. Total £1240

Note that this is considered a fair rate, set to include staff salary and overheads alone.

**S278 works**

The following are required to provide safe and suitable access to the development:

- Vehicular access onto site – signed S278 agreement prior to commencement, delivery prior to occupation

- Shared use cycle/footway on Wendlebury Road and along A41 north of its junction with Wendlebury Road – To be agreed and signed S278 agreement prior to commencement, delivery prior to occupation
- Realignment of Wendlebury Road to form a standard roundabout between Vendee Drive link road and Wendlebury Road which shall also form access to the development - signed S278 agreement prior to commencement, delivery prior to occupation
- A new single bus stop on a suitable location including shelter along Wendlebury Road.

**Planning Conditions:**

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

1. Condition to Cap the B1a floorspace and also the overall quantum of development to 35%
2. Condition limiting Application 2 (Outline application site) from coming forward unless development for Application 1 has been delivered.
3. Condition for detailed site access including vehicle and pedestrian access to both the Employment and Health Club sites.
4. CTMP
5. Cycle parking for the Health and Racquets club
6. Electric vehicle charging slots
7. Estate roads, parking and turning areas

**Officer's Name: Rashid Bbosa**

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

**Date: 19 February 2020**

---

**Application No: 19/01740/HYBRID-2**

**Location:** Land Adj To Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton

---

## **Local Lead Flood Authority**

### **Recommendation:**

No objection subject to conditions

### **Key issues:**

Outstanding EA objection to be addressed and evidence provided this has been withdrawn.

### **Conditions:**

#### **SuDS:**

No development shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using sustainable drainage methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detailed design prior to the use of the building commencing.

All construction shall be as per that detailed in the following documents and drawings:

- S1358 - Ext - 34B - Tech Scheme Option 8 Drainage Layout
- FRA (Issue 3) - Main Body Text (PART 1 OF 11)
- Appendix A (PART 2 OF 11)
- Appendix B (PART 3 OF 11)
- Appendix C (PART 4 OF 11)
- Appendix D (PART 5 OF 11)
- Appendix E (PART 6 OF 11)
- Appendix F (PART 7 OF 11)
- Appendix G (PART 8 OF 11)
- Appendix H (PART 9 OF 11)
- Appendix J (PART 10 OF 11)
- Appendix K (PART 11 OF 11)
- MicroDrainage Half Drain Down Times are to be confirmed and ensure they conform to standards.
- Outstanding Environment Agency objection to be addressed and evidence provided that the EA accept the proposal.
- David Lloyd area of the site calculations to be checked and clarification provided.

#### **Reason:**

To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal.

## **Completion and Maintenance of Sustainable Drainage – Shown on Approved Plans**

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the sustainable drainage scheme for this site has been completed in accordance with the submitted details. The sustainable drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in perpetuity in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan. The management and maintenance contractor details are to be provided.

### **Reason:**

To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and maintained thereafter.

### **Detailed comments:**

No objection subject to satisfactory justification/explanation of the above listed conditions.

**Officer's Name: Adam Littler**

**Officer's Title: Drainage Engineer**

**Date: 12 March 2020**

---

**Application No: 19/01740/HYBRID-2**

**Location:** Land Adj To Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton

---

## **Archaeology Schedule**

### **Recommendation:**

Comments

### **Comments:**

The submitted amendments do not alter our original comments.

**Officer's Name: Richard Oram**

**Officer's Title:** Planning Archaeologist

**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> January 2020

---