

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

District: Cherwell District Council

Application No: 19/01740/HYBRID

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: *23rd October 2019*

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.

Application No: 19/01740/HYBRID

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) as to why material consideration outweighs 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 - TBC**
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 be 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

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

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection

The information provided is insufficient to determine the traffic impact of the development:

- There are some queries with the methodology of the TA; a scenario reflecting the development covered by this application has not been modelled.
- Provisions made for pedestrian and cycle access are not considered sufficient to ensure that opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be taken up and that priority is given first to pedestrian and cycle movements (NPPF Paras 108 and 110)

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

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Highway works	TBC	TBC	Baxter	The South East Link Road – To be confirmed as the number of trips generated by the site is not agreed.
Public transport services	£375,000	October 2019	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
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 on the Vendee Drive link Road east of the Vendee Drive roundabout.

Travel Plan Monitoring	£3,280	October 2019	RPI-x	Travel plan monitoring fees of £3,280 for the B1 employment floorspace and Health and Racquet club.
Total				

Key points:

- Clarification is required where the application presents conflicting information with respect to the scenarios to be assessed and also the scale of development with respect to the site. A scenario reflecting the development covered by this application needs to be assessed.
- Improvements to pedestrian and cycle accessibility in the local and wider context to allow and encourage walking and cycling to the site
- Provision of a suitable location for a bus stop along Vendee Drive in order to facilitate an extended bus service closer to the site.
- We are not convinced that a robust trip generation assessment has been undertaken to satisfactorily lead to an accurate assessment of the impact on the network.

Comments:

Scope of Development

This application (referred to in the application documents as Application 1) is submitted in hybrid form seeking outline planning permission for up to 23,400 sqm of employment floorspace (B1 Use Classes) and full permission for a Health and Racquets Club. Application 2 (19/01746/OUT) seeks outline planning permission (with all matters reserved excluding access) for up to 10,200sqm of B1 development (B1a and/or B1b and/or B1c);

The TA assesses 4 different development scenarios:

- Scenario 1: B1 development (23,400sqm) across all of Site A;
- Scenario 2: B1 development (16,800sqm) across most of Site A, with the Racquets Club on the remainder of Site A;
- Scenario 3: B1 development (33,600sqm) across Site B; and
- Scenario 4: B1 development (27,000sqm) and Health & Racquet Club across Site A and B.

None of the above scenarios assess the development proposed by this application (**reason for objection**).

There should also be a scenario that considers both applications together should they both be given permission. For robustness this should be 33,600 square metres

of B1a development and 5,869 square metres of Assembly and Leisure. None of the scenarios are therefore sufficient to cover this.

Accessibility

Vehicular Access – The site is located along the eastern front of Wendlebury Road to which access shall be acquired. Wendlebury Road is a single carriageway road and is approximately 5.5m wide on the Site frontage, is unlit and currently subject to National speed limit. Wendlebury Road has a left in left out only junction with the A41 Oxford Road which is a strategic distributor road connecting Bicester with the A34 and M40.

The site is bounded to the north by an access road into the Thames Water treatment works which treatment works form the eastern frontage of the site. To the south of the site is a farmland.

A new 4-arm mini roundabout was agreed as part of the Bicester Gateway Phase 1 development and will form the principal site access to the B1 development on phase 1 (Phase 1b). The access for this application would require a new standard roundabout at approximately the same location, as the mini roundabout would not provide sufficient capacity. (The new roundabout would serve the Wendlebury Road (North and South arms), site access and the Vendee Drive roundabout link will form the east and west arms respectively.

Whilst this new roundabout was consented as a mini-roundabout (in Bicester Gateway Phase 1 development) as mentioned in para 3.2.2 of the Transport Assessment (TA), in order to make accessibility for traffic associated with Bicester Gateway Phase 2, it was considered appropriate for this to be upgraded to a standard /conventional roundabout. This arrangement may require the development to dedicate some of the land to highways in order to realign Wendlebury Road and also accommodate the new roundabout.

Walking and Cycling – The site benefits from a number of amenities within walking distance such as the Bicester Park and Ride and the Tesco supermarket. It also has the potential to be within reasonable walking and cycling reach of Bicester Village retail, Bicester Village train station and further into town subject to improvements being made to walking and cycling infrastructure.

These improvements would be in line with Bicester 10 Policy that states: “*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*”. The connection of the business park to the wider areas is not sufficient to ensure significant active travel, given the size of the development.

Paragraph 3.3.1 acknowledges discontinuity in the footway along Wendlebury Road but has limited the appraisal to this. Beyond Wendlebury Road, i.e. along the A41, the existing shared use footway/ cycleway on the eastern side is not suitably wide

enough to encourage and maximise use. The section of this shared use between the A41 signalised crossing towards Pioneer Way and Lakeview Drive is intended to be widened to 3m as part of the Bicester Office development application. This development is similarly required to make such improvements on the remainder of the stretch up to Wendlebury Road.

Wendlebury Road is a Sustrans cycle route (NCN51) without a dedicated cycleway in the vicinity of the site. The development here intends to provide a shared use facility for both cyclists and pedestrians (illustrated by Drawing No. 19539-13-01 Rev A) along the southern side of Wendlebury Road. Whilst this provision is welcomed, the 2.5m wide facility is however questioned especially where a significant amount of two-way cycling is expected. A width of 3m should generally be regarded as the preferred minimum on an unsegregated route, although in areas with contraflow cycling a wider facility should suffice.

This section of Wendlebury Road benefits from sufficient highway verges on both sides. For purposes of maintaining the standard footway/cycleway facilities, the applicant may explore widening of the carriageway given the resulting increase in traffic due to this development. This would in turn address Problem 1.01 as identified by the independent Road Safety Audit undertaken by Mott MacDonald.

The application claims to improve cycling provision. Paragraph 5.1.2 states that, *“where the foot-cycleway crosses the accesses to the Thames Water site and Bicester Avenue appropriate crossing details will be provided including dropped kerbs, tactile paving and appropriate signage.”* Drawing No. 19539-11-01 Rev A appended to the TA illustrates the intended arrangement of the foot-cycleway crossings. OCC do not approve of the proposed crossings and instead require that raised table treatments are utilised to create a more convenient and safer environment that prioritises non car travel. This should also include the health club access.

On a separate drawing, (Drawing No. 19539-11-02 Rev A) the termination of the shared use facility raises safety concern particularly for southbound cyclists and/ or pedestrians running past the roundabout towards Wendlebury. These shall be forced to abruptly re-join the carriageway while still within the roundabout envelope – which is not considered safe. It is thus recommended that termination of this shared use facility should extend a safe distance away from the roundabout (as shown in the RSA Stage1 report) for the entire frontage of the development, west of the access. This is partly due to the changing character of Wendlebury Road to an urban form.

Failure to provide a safe and suitable access for these users would be contrary to NPPF (safe and suitable access AND opportunities for sustainable travel).

The [Active & Healthy Travel Strategy](#) within OCC's [Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031](#) states that (paragraph 3.28, p.12):

“Developers must demonstrate through master planning how their site has been planned to make cycling convenient and safe, for cyclists travelling to and from major residential, employment, education, shopping and leisure sites within 5-10 miles, and also within and through the site.”

Further to this, the [Bicester Area Strategy](#) refers to the [Bicester Sustainable Transport Strategy](#), which recommends pedestrian and cycling improvement schemes for the town.

Any walking and cycling schemes developed should follow guidelines in the [Oxfordshire Walking and Cycling Design Standards](#) and [Residential Road Design Guide](#).

Public Transport – OCC's overarching concern with this site in terms of its impact on public transport is the peak travel demand by car which will create severe pressure on the A41, especially on the Vendee Drive roundabout affecting access to the Park and Ride site.

This type of development tends to have significant peak car demand, matching start and finish times. Modifications will be required to the A41 and the roundabout to ensure that the trunk bus route can continue to flow through the peak demand period, including the egress from the Park and Ride site.

The s5 bus route operates four times per hour between Oxford and Bicester and must be considered the main alternative to the car, since the site is a considerable walking distance from the rail stations. However, people will only be encouraged to use public transport if the buses stop within a convenient walking distance.

Increased accessibility to the S5 bus can be provided by creating a bus stop on either side of the link road between Vendee Drive roundabout and the site access roundabout on Wendlebury Road. On each side, a single bus stop (on-carriageway) with a shelter is considered sufficient.

The bus company may be prepared to divert certain work-related s5 journeys along this link road, instead of diverting into the Park and Ride site. The s5 bus route would give reasonably good access from central and north Oxford and from Gosford. This route passes Oxford Parkway rail station.

However, in addition to this, the site would need to be served by a local bus service where contributions have already been sought from Bicester Business Park, to the north. In principle, the additional bus journeys to and from the Bicester Business Park could be extended to the proposed new stop on the link road between the roundabouts. Currently, the Bicester Business Park service is conceived as a morning and afternoon peak service, which would be cross-linked to one of the new Bicester residential areas. Depending on the exact mix of uses on this site, then shift-change buses will be required at certain times outside the standard morning and afternoon peak times. These could be provided either by the proposed local service bus, or by additional journeys on route s5.

Parking

The number of parking spaces intended to be allocated within the outline application has not been specified, but we would expect parking levels to be suitably justified so as to prevent the likelihood of overspill parking either onto Wendlebury Road and

neighbouring parking facilities such as the Bicester Park and Ride site or Bicester Avenue's car park.

However, it is proposed to provide 246 car parking spaces for The David Lloyd club without any justification. The application has not provided the gross floor area from which we can match this to parking standards. However, taking a comparative approach to the David Lloyd in Oxford which has a provision of 190 parking spaces, I am inclined to consider this parking level to be appropriate with respect to the setting.

Trip Generation and Distribution

In order to derive the trip rates for the proposed development, the TRICS database has been interrogated. In addition to this, the trip generation for the B1 use is the same as recently agreed on the adjacent planning applications for B1 use, which I think is reasonable as shown in Table 5 of the TA.

The TA assumes that only 35% of the gross B1 floorspace to be delivered would be B1a (office floorspace). This would be acceptable if the applicant is willing to accept a condition limiting the quantum of B1a (office) floorspace of the development to 35% to comply with the underlying traffic impact assessment. Otherwise, an assessment of the worst-case scenario for traffic generation must be undertaken.

The trip rates for the technology/ science park element of the site have been derived primarily from TRICS database for a survey on the Cambridge Science Park. These were then compared to the Begbroke Science Park trip rates for corroboration. The peak hour trips were then applied to the total development gross floor in order to acquire a trip rate for the site (as presented in Table 6).

I do not consider that the vehicle trip rates from either Begbroke or Cambridge sites are appropriate to apply at this site.

The Cambridge Science park is in a setting that is not comparable to the setting and context of this development in Bicester. The Cambridge park abuts a guided busway across which lies a residential zone where a proportion of residents are likely to be employed within the 90+ companies on the science park and likely to walk/cycle due to the proximity. As a whole this science park is equipped with unrivalled amenities such as a full-time nursery for employees on site, a health club, two centres for conferences, trainings and exhibitions etc., hairdressers, places to eat amongst others. These amenities are likely to retain employees on site after the normal working hours. Besides that, there are transport initiatives aimed at promoting sustainable travel such as free taxi service for commuters using the Cambridge North Station, provision of shared bicycles between the site and train stations.

Begbroke science park is wholly owned and managed by the Oxford University with organisations on site promoting research led employment to university students. This science park offers free and frequent minibus service for members and staff on site, including visitors.

In this regard, I feel there has been an unrealistic comparison in trips in the process. I therefore conclude that a robust and satisfactory assessment has not been done of the impact the associated vehicle trips will have in the future on the network.

(Reason for objection)

In deriving trip rates for the Health and Racquet club, TRICS database was again utilised. However, it is questionable where the following parameters have been applied, which I feel should be not representative of the development site. These are;

- Under primary filtering, Residential Zones should have been deselected as this development does not lie in or is close to a residential zone.
- Under secondary filtering, surveys carried out in areas with populations of over 500,001 or more within 5 miles of the site does not represent Bicester. So that too should have been deselected.

I therefore consider that the vehicle trip rate proposed for the Health and Racquet club in the TA using the industry standard TRICS database could have been reached with unrealistic survey categories which should be revisited. In this regard, I conclude that a robust and satisfactory assessment has not been done of the impact the associated vehicle trips will have in the future on the network. **(Reason for objection)**

50% in the AM peak traffic is assumed to be linked/ secondary trips. This is based on a survey undertaken from other David Lloyd establishments as shown in the TA. However, looking at Table 21, I am more concerned about the weekday peaks than weekend peaks where it shows that the average linked trips amount to about 44%. Nevertheless, I am less inclined to agree to this as the David Lloyd Survey only provides a percentage of linked trips by journey types but fails to draw into perspective the location of the origin/destination with respect to the site i.e. shops, homes, workplace. Even if these were linked trips, these could still be new trips to the immediate highway.

Paragraph 4.4.6 asserts that the development would generate about 10 HGV movements in the peak hour, but it is not clear how this number has been derived.

Besides the Health and Racquet club trip assignment in Table 24, the TA has not demonstrated how trips are distributed and assigned from the rest of the development, which it is assumed that the B1 element shall likely have a bigger impact on the network. No explanation is given for the trip assignment presented under Table 24.

It is unclear what distribution of development traffic has been assumed at the proposed new roundabout between Wendlebury Road and the link to Vendee Drive junction. It is feared that a significant proportion of flows could be routed via Wendlebury Road which allows an overly optimistic distribution of traffic flows and inappropriate route selection. It is reasonable to assume that the majority of employees during the PM peak time shall distribute via the Vendee Drive roundabout rather before they disperse to Vendee Drive, A41 south and A41 north. Only when this access becomes highly congested would drivers choose to use the left-in/left-out junction. As such, this traffic along this section of link road between the two

roundabouts is likely to be overly congested as reflected in the first phase application, which assumed that the link between Vendee Drive junction and the proposed Wendlebury Road Roundabout would require dualling of that link for stacking. Notwithstanding this, demand for all development traffic should be assumed through Vendee Drive junction and so that is what the development should be designing for to mitigate the impact.

Diagrams showing development traffic distribution throughout the network must be provided for all development scenarios and time periods assessed. **(Reason for objection)**. It is not clear from the current assessment what the distribution of traffic to and from the development is along the Wendlebury Road and whether the development traffic from the left turn out on to the A41 is being considered when it routes back through the Vendee Drive/A41 junction in the Vendee Drive junction assessment. Wendlebury Road is part of the local rural road network and so access along it for traffic generated should be discouraged through measures to this effect.

Impact on Local Transport Network

Junctions have been modelled using appropriate industry standard software where assessment is undertaken for 2026 and 2031. However, we consider the flows informing this assessment including the movements/distribution on the network to be insufficient as already mentioned above. Modelling assessment is further classified into base scenarios with and without development and the SEPR.

Junction Capacity Assessment

Modelling output summaries for Scenarios 1, 2 and 4 are presented in Table 32 for 2026 and 2031 assessment years at the site access junction/roundabout. The junction assessments conclude that the junction shall still operate within its capacity under the development scenarios. However, OCC wish to raise the following issues with respect to capacity assessment on this junction.

As detailed in the section above titled 'Scope of the Development' The impact of the development on the highway network has been assessed on scenarios that are not ascribed to the development proposals. Although the applicant has assumed the critical flows, they in turn are unrepresentative of the development in question. A scenario reflecting the development covered by this application has not been modelled. **(Reason for objection)**

The TA's assessment of traffic beyond the access roundabout, particularly for traffic heading to Vendee Drive roundabout (which the majority would be) does not take into account proximity of the Vendee Drive junction. Instead the modelling assumes that all the traffic that shall be discharged from this access roundabout would be equally be dissipated away which shall not be the case as there is likelihood that this traffic shall be held at the Vendee Drive roundabout.

There is a risk of the Vendee Drive Link Road becoming over capacity during peak times owing to its limited length between the roundabouts where queues shall likely extend back to the Vendee Drive roundabout in the AM peak and into the site during the PM peak which would be a safety issue.

Notwithstanding the above points, the modelling scenario outputs indicate that on the A41/ Vendee Drive certain arms of the junction would be just below capacity in 2031 when the development is factored in. The necessity of the SEPR is demonstrated where significant junction operation improvements are observed between scenarios without and with the SEPR, as such the 2031 modelling should only be used to show that the SEPR is necessary and provides benefit to the development. The 2026 modelling without the SEPR is required to demonstrate the development's impact on the local road network and develop mitigation to demonstrate safe and suitable access.

As such, the A41/ Wendlebury Road junction has been modelled together with other junctions along the A41 corridor. Considering that operation of this access is critical to the proposed development in both AM and PM peaks, OCC would like to see its review carried out in isolation of the rest of the A41 corridor.

As part of the consented development proposals for Kingsmere Retail, Bicester 4 Office Development and Bicester Village Phase 4 a package of highway works is/shall be implemented covering the following junctions:

- Oxford Road / Pingle Drive roundabout;
- A41 Oxford Road / Oxford Road signalised roundabout (Esso roundabout);
- A41 Oxford Road (A41) / Lakeview Drive signalised junction;
- A41 Oxford Road (A41) / Kingsmere signalised junction;

As such, it is not clear whether junction capacity assessments along the A41 corridor have taken the above highway improvements into account. The appendices of the A41 corridor modelling work have not included a network diagram that shows how the lanes and junctions are linked across this corridor. OCC would like corridor modelling to include the associated network diagram.

Bicester Gateway (Bicester 10) is expected to generate up to 3,500 jobs, as per the Cherwell Local Plan. A masterplan and comprehensive studies illustrating the relationship of this application with the potential development in the remaining area (land within the allocation but not currently proposed for development) is considered key to ensuring that the impact of the site in its totality has been considered in full.

It is again unclear whether any future phases at Bicester 10 will be proposed subsequent to the development outlined in this planning application, but the traffic impact of the full allocation should have been assessed, to understand the cumulative impact of the incremental planning applications. Proportionate and appropriate levels of contribution and direct mitigation to be delivered through this planning application could then be established.

An assessment of the full allocation would likely demonstrate the need for a more substantial mitigation package greater than if applications are assessed piecemeal, such as signalisation/reconfiguration of the A41/Vendee Drive roundabout, for example.

The A41 from which the site is accessed is heavily trafficked. This was recognised by Bicester Village in their application for Phase 4 of their development, where they have proposed major highway improvements at and between the Esso roundabout

and Pingle Drive junctions, as well as the provision of a Bicester Park and Ride facility. Bicester 4 and Kingsmere Retail will also be delivering substantial mitigation schemes.

A Stage 3 safety audit has recently been carried out at the junction now that the P&R is operational. 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. Northbound vehicles appear to occasionally 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.

Required measures from this development allocation are likely to include speed reduction measures on the A41 southern arm, with longer term measures such as relocation of the Park & Ride access, signalisation of the junction and/or changing the geometry of the junction. Any mitigation requirement should be considered a direct local mitigation requirement and separate from the strategic mitigation contribution required for relief to the A41 by 2031. It is not a case of one or the other, due in part to the development opening year likely being in advance of the strategic scheme.

Consideration also needs to be given as to how the highway works on A41 secured through Phase 1 (16/02586/OUT) will be integrated any further mitigation proposals. A crossing of A41 and bus stop provision will need to be retained in the design. A more holistic approach to reducing congestion on this corridor is therefore required. These junctions will be sensitive to relatively low-level increases in traffic flow and so a full assessment is required of each junction, as opposed to the summary presented. Appropriate mitigation measures can then be developed to reduce this allocation's impact."

The assessment of the A41 junctions to the north of Vendee Drive junction clearly shows these junctions to be nearing, at or over capacity in the 2026 opening year. A more holistic approach to reducing congestion on this corridor is therefore required. These junctions will be sensitive to relatively low-level increases in traffic flow and so a full assessment is required of each junction, as opposed to the summary presented. Appropriate mitigation measures can then be developed to reduce this allocation's impact; a sustainable transport strategy for the corridor incorporating measures such as bus lane (s), bus priority measures, and cycling facilities segregated from footways is likely to be required.

Even for the level of development proposed, the assessment makes some suggestions for improving the corridor. However, the assessment also shows a reliance on the delivery of the SEPR, when it should be focusing on the 2026 opening year, as the impact of the development will be experienced in advance of this strategic infrastructure.

In view that this application has been submitted alongside another for similar B1 development on adjacent land (also referenced as Site B) it is OCC's view that there should be a scenario that considers both applications together should they both be granted. For robustness this should be 33,600 square metres of B1a development

and 5869 square metres of Assembly and Leisure. None of the scenarios are therefore sufficient to cover this. **(Reason for objection)**

The interaction of car parking with Bicester Park and Ride does not appear to have been considered. How will overspill parking from the development be prevented from using the P&R site? A robust car parking management plan must be included in the Travel Plan.

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 = £2,362,842.83 (estimated held or secured s106 contributions)

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

E = Bic 10 (remaining) and Wretchwick Green, amounting to 5431 peak hour trips in total (Wretchwick Green = 1773 and Bicester 10 (remaining) = 3658 based on floor space compared with Bicester 4).

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.

Contribution per unit trip that should be made towards relief to the A41 is therefore = £874.86. This contribution rate shall be applied to the peak hour trips when an agreed trip generation assessment has been reached.

In terms of provision for Public Transport, Policy BIC 2 states:

“BIC2 – We will work to reduce the proportion of journeys made by private car through implementing the Sustainable Transport Strategy by: Improving Bicester’s bus services along key routes and providing improved public transport infrastructure considering requirements for and integrating strategic development sites.

Bus connectivity improvements may be required at anticipated pinch points within the town as future developments come forward. This will include connections between North West Bicester and the town centre and consider the need for bus lanes along the A41 to connect with the Park and Ride scheme.”

Consideration for bus lanes connecting with the Bicester Park and Ride have not been considered by these development proposals to improve sustainable access to the site but could be instrumental in providing relief to the A41.

Bicester Area Strategy Policy Bic 4:

“To mitigate the cumulative impact of development within Bicester and to implement the measures identified in the Bicester area transport strategy we will secure strategic transport infrastructure contributions from all new development”

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

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):

£TBC Highway Works Contribution indexed from XX using Baxter Index. Towards the South East Link Road – to be confirmed as the number of trips generated by the site is not agreed. See further details above.

£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 Vendee Drive

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 quantum of development to 35%
2. Condition for detailed site access
3. CTMP
4. Cycle parking
5. electric vehicle charging?
6. Estate roads, parking and turning areas

Officer's Name: Rashid Bbosa

Officer's Title: Senior Transport Planner

Date: 22 October 2019

Application no: 19/01740/HYBRID

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

Archaeology Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reason/s:

Comments:

We have previously provided archaeological advice on pre application consultations for this scheme. In December 2018 we advised that an archaeological evaluation would be required ahead of the determination of any planning application for the site (18/00287/Preapp). This archaeological evaluation, consisting of a geophysical survey and a trenched evaluation, has now been undertaken.

Following the agreement of these evaluation reports, we were then consulted on a further pre application consultation for the site in April 2019 (19/00069/PREAPP) where we recommended that the results of these investigations would need to be incorporated into the desk based assessment '*which will need to examine the significance of these archaeological features identified on the site and in context of features recorded within its environs.*' We also advised that the desk based assessment would need to assess the impact of any development on these identified heritage assets and on the setting of the scheduled monument.

This has not been undertaken and neither the evaluation report itself or the desk based assessment attempts to assess the significance of the identified archaeological features on the site within the context of the wider environs.

There has also been no archaeological investigation of the area of the current farm and lakeside cottages and as such the significance of any archaeological deposits on this site has not been assessed. It is therefore important that the assessment considers the identified archaeological deposits within their wider context to be able to assess the potential for significant archaeological deposits being present on this currently un-investigated section of the site.

The site is located immediately north of the scheduled monument of Alchester Roman Town (SM?) and the impact of this development on the setting of this designated site will need to be adequately assessed in line with the NPPF (2019). This development has a potentially significant impact on a designated site and an appropriate assessment of the impact, along with the impact on the below ground archaeological deposits, will need to be included in the desk based assessment.

The Heritage Statement submitted with this application does contain a section on the setting of the scheduled Roman Town, but this was undertaken ahead of the evaluation works and without specific reference to the detailed plans and proposals included in the application. This section concludes that further investigation would

need to be undertaken to confirm any association between the features on the site and the scheduled monument but does not attempt any assessment of the potential setting issues at the time of its production.

These investigations have now been completed and the assessment will need to be updated to address this and to include a full assessment of the impact of this development upon the setting of the monument.

Any consideration of the cultural heritage and the setting of the designated Roman Town that forms the southern boundary of the application area has been scoped out of the EIA. We would not agree with this approach for the assessment of the cultural heritage. The applicant's documentation states that no scoping opinion was sought for this development and we therefore have had no opportunity to highlight this prior to the submission of this application.

We would therefore recommend before any planning permission can be granted for this application that the desk based assessment should be updated, as we have previously advised, to incorporate the results of the archaeological evaluation and assess the significance of the identified deposits within the wider archaeological context.

This updated desk based assessment should then be used to inform a cultural heritage chapter within the EIA. Once this EIA has been updated then we will be able to provide further archaeological advice on the impacts of this proposed development.

As this development directly affects the setting of a scheduled monument then the advice of Historic England should be sought as we would strongly support their advice on this proposed development.

Officer's Name: Richard Oram

Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist

Date: 2nd October 2019
