

From: Enquiries_THM <enquiries_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 January 2018 13:09
To: Peter Brooks
Subject: RE: THM_70557 - Flood risk assessment Product 4 enquiry
Attachments: Product 4_THM_70557.pdf; Thames Area Climate Change Guidance Jan 17.pdf

Dear Peter

Thank you for your request for the attached Product 4 flood data package.

Please be aware that the Environment Agency supply data, but we do not interpret it for use in a Flood Risk Assessment. Flood Risk Assessment's should be completed by a suitably competent and qualified person.

You may be interested in the following guidance / information publically available:

- **'Planning Practice Guidance'** - provides information about planning considerations in areas at risk of flooding. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>
- **'Planning applications: assessing flood risk'** - information about completing Flood Risk Assessments. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications>
- **'Site specific flood risk assessment: Checklist'** – a checklist to help ensure you have considered all the relevant factors in your flood risk assessment. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#Site-Specific-Flood-Risk-Assessment-checklist-section>

We recommend that you discuss your proposals with the Local Planning Authority at the earliest opportunity. They will be able to advise you on a wide range of planning matters in addition to flood risk.

Please note: Due to recent changes in guidance on the allowances for climate change, the 20% increase in river flows should no longer to be used for development design purposes. The data included in this product can be used for interpolation of levels as part of an intermediate level assessment. For further advice on the new allowances please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances>

Please refer to the table below for the permitted use of the supplied information.

Licence	Open Government Licence
Information Warnings	<i>The mapping of features provided as a background in this product is © Ordnance Survey. It is provided to give context to this product. The Open Government Licence does not apply.</i>
Attribution	Contains Environment Agency information © Environment Agency and/or database rights. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright 2017 Ordnance Survey 100024198.

Did you know that many of our datasets are available online? Simply visit environment.data.gov.uk

We respond to requests for recorded information that we hold under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the associated Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR).

Please get in touch if you have any further queries or contact us within two months if you would like us to review the information we have sent.

Kind regards

Julia Hewitt
Customers and Engagement Officer
Customers and Engagement
Environment Planning and Engagement
Environment Agency
Thames Area
Red Kite House, Howbery Park, Wallingford, OX10 8BD
Telephone: 020302 59673

From: Peter Brooks [<mailto:Peter.Brooks@bjh.co.uk>]
Sent: 18 December 2017 08:41
To: Enquiries, Unit <enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk>
Subject: Flood risk assessment Product 4 enquiry.

S1358/171218em/PAB/EA



FAO: Enquiries - Environment Agency

Dear Sirs

Re: **Promised Land Farm. Wendlebury Road. Bicester. OX25 2PA.**

We are acting for a Developer who is seeking to establish what area of land might be available for building development on the above site, much of which is located in Zone 3; a plan is attached showing the site boundary in red.

We anticipate that Product 4 might assist in defining the extent of functional floodplain and modelled flood levels etc?

Please contact the undersigned if you wish to discuss, or require payment over the phone.

Yours sincerely

Peter Brooks
Bailey Johnson Hayes

Grange House
John Dalton Street, Manchester
M2 6FW

Tel: 0161 279 7777
Fax: 0161 236 3552
peter.brooks@bjh.co.uk
Website: www.bjh.co.uk

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses as we accept no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

This message has been scanned and no issues were discovered.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender.

We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it.

We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or :

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

From: Geoff Nokes <geoff.nokes@thameswater.co.uk>
Sent: 18 July 2018 11:14
To: Wb
Subject: RE: THE PROMISED LAND FARM, WENDLEBURY ROAD, BICESTER OX25 2PA

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Will

The rising main would be likely be plastic 100mm dia. And does go to treatment works from P/S in Caravan Park. Hopefully would have a tracer cable to locate it and normally less than 2 metres deep. A S185 application would be needed to divert, unless development can miss the main.

Regards Geoff Nokes

Developer Services – Sewer Adoptions Engineer
Office: 0203 5779 228 Mobile: 07747 640 228
geoff.nokes@thameswater.co.uk
Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, RG1 8DB



From: Wb [<mailto:Wb@bjh.co.uk>]
Sent: 18 July 2018 09:28
To: Geoff Nokes <geoff.nokes@thameswater.co.uk>
Subject: THE PROMISED LAND FARM, WENDLEBURY ROAD, BICESTER

S1358/180718em/WB/LDD



Geoff Nokes
Thames Water

Dear Geoff

Re: THE PROMISED LAND FARM, WENDLEBURY ROAD, BICESTER

Further to our telephone conversation last week I confirm that I am working with my Client, Albion Land, to redevelop the existing Chicken Farm and a part of The Promised Land Farm and attach my Plan numbered S1358-Ext -02A and also a Google Map.


As discussed I understand that there is a rising Foul Main passing through the Site, presumably towards the Thames Water Treatment Works on the other side of the Langford Brook.

Are there any details that you can let me have? I presume that the Main will need to be diverted.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards.

Yours sincerely



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing as a single, slightly curved line.

W. Bailey
Bailey Johnson Hayes

Suite 4, Phoenix House
63 Campfield Road
St. Albans, AL1 5FL

Tel: 01727 841172
Fax: 01727 841085
wb@bjh.co.uk
www.bjh.co.uk

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses as we accept no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Visit us online www.thameswater.co.uk , follow us on twitter www.twitter.com/thameswater or find us on www.facebook.com/thameswater. We're happy to help you 24/7.

Thames Water Limited (company number 2366623) and Thames Water Utilities Limited (company number 2366661) are companies registered in England and Wales, both are registered at Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB. This email is confidential and is intended only for the use of the person it was sent to. Any views or opinions in this email are those of the author and don't necessarily represent those of Thames Water Limited or its subsidiaries. If you aren't the intended recipient of this email, please don't copy, use, forward or disclose its contents to any other person – please destroy and delete the message and any attachments from your system.

Application no: 18/CH0010/Preapp

Location: Land at Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Rd, Bicester OX25 2PA.

Transport Schedule

Transport Development Control

As you may be aware, Oxfordshire County Council is a consultee of the local planning authority and provides advice on the likely transport and highways impact of development where necessary.

It should be noted that the advice below represents the informal opinion of an Officer of the Council only, which is given entirely without prejudice to the formal consideration of any planning application, which may be submitted. Nevertheless, the comments are given in good faith and fairly reflect an opinion at the time of drafting given the information submitted.

At this stage in the process, I set out the main issues/information that will need to be considered with the proposal, and these are:

Legal agreement required to secure:

An agreement will be required under Section 106 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 to:

- Mitigate the developments local highway impact under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to enable completion of off-site highway improvements.
- Provide infrastructure and contributions in line with Bicester Policy 10
- Make payment towards a workplace travel plan monitoring fees of £1240

Informatives:

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

Detailed Comments:

Comments below are in response to both the transport pre-application enquiry made directly to OCC and the CDC pre-application (Ref: 18/00287/PREAPP).

Policy

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.”

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.”

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.”

At present the western section of the proposed South East Perimeter Road 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 contribution amount will be determined following guidance in the Cherwell Developer Contributions SPD (February 2018)

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.”

Access and connectivity

Vehicular and principal pedestrian/cycle access is proposed to come off Wendlebury Road with a formation of a new 4-arm roundabout. 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.

The proposed Master Plan Site Layout illustrated by Drwg no. **18022-SK-002 Rev B**, which is indicative only shows footpaths alongside the development internal roads right up to the site access and frontage of the site along Wendlebury Road. Details of the infrastructure such as crossing points will be required at subsequent applications.

Although provision has been provided for those walking immediately out and into the site, the application needs to provide continuous pedestrian facilities/routes from the existing highway: directly towards the bus stops on the A41, and northwards along Wendlebury Road to its junction with the A41.

Wendlebury Road is a Sustrans cycle route (NCN51) and consideration will need to be given to how the development proposals would tie into the existing cycle and pedestrian infrastructure without compromising safety and operation of the NCN51,

taking into account the increased volume of traffic. I suggest that the application considers a cycle infrastructure provision along the site frontage to mitigate for the increased traffic. A cycle and pedestrian link should also be provided directly into the proposed John Lloyd centre from Wendlebury Road, to minimise walking and cycling distance for users and staff, thereby encouraging sustainable travel.

For more information about the layout of developments, please see Oxfordshire County Council’s Walking and Cycling Design Standards which can be accessed at: <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/transport-development-control-tdc>

Conveniently located and secure cycle parking, catering for both staff and customers, should be incorporated into the design: These should be in accordance with OCC cycle parking standards for the different class uses as shown below.

Table 2		Cycle Parking Standards - Minimum Levels									
	Residential	Food Retail	Non Food Retail	A2 - Banks and Professional	B1 -Offices	B2 - General Industry	B8 Warehousing	D2 Assembly and Leisure	Cinema & Conference	Hotel and Guest Hse	Ho
Long stay/ employee/ resident	1 bed - 1 space; 2+ beds - 2 Spaces ***	1 stand per 12 staff *	1 stand per 6 staff *	1 stand per 12 staff **	1 stand per 150 sqm	1 stand per 350 sqm	1 stand per 500 sqm	1 stand per 12 staff **	1 stand per 12 staff **	1 stand per 12 staff **	1 stand per 12 staff **
Visitor	1 stand per 2 units where more than 4 units	1 stand per 200sqm	1 stand per 200sqm	1 stand per 100sqm	1 stand per 500 sqm	1 stand per 500 sqm	1 stand per 1000 sqm	1 stand per 20 sqm	1 stand per 20 sqm	1 stand per 10 beds	1 stand per 10 beds
Notes											
a) where number of staff is not known:-											
* 1 staff per 50 sqm											
** 1 staff per 7 sqm											
*** b) Garages should be designed to allow space for car plus storage of cycles in line with the District Council’s design guides where appropriate											
c) 1 stand = 2 spaces : The number of stands to be provided from the calculations to be rounded upwards. The preferred stand is of the 'Sheffield' type											

Traffic Impact

The scale of the proposed development will require a full transport assessment and travel plan to accompany any outline or full application. The traffic impact on the local network should be assessed within a full Transport Assessment, considering travel by all modes. Guidance on what to include in this can be found in Oxfordshire County Council’s guide “Transport for new Developments: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans,” that can be found in the following link:

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/travel-plans-statements-and-advice>.

A Transport Assessment Scoping Note – Additional Information (TASN-AI) document has been submitted in support of this pre-application. The TASN-AI aims to provide a forecast of the developments traffic on the local highway network where assessment is undertaken to predict trip generation and distribution, including access strategy.

TASN-AI

Paragraph 3.1 of the TASN-AI estimates the development to cover 37,000 sqm of employment floor area. It is reasonable to assume that 25 percent of the floorspace would be office ancillary to the principle use. However, I have failed to understand

how this section has derived the 34,500 sqm and 2,500 sqm of B1(c) and B1(a) respectively from the initial 37,000 sqm. Clarification on this is required.

Table 1 is a summary of trip rates obtained after TRICS interrogation and Table 2 is the corresponding vehicular trip generation based on 35,000 sqm floor space. I am nonetheless concerned by the absence of the TRICS output in the appendix where the tables referenced above have been derived.

Cross references to Tables 7 and 8 need to be checked as they have been applied incorrectly in Para 3.7 and 5.1 of the TASN-AI.

Also, the trip generation has not given an estimation of the modal split of trips to the development site. This needs to be done, taken from 2011 Census journey to work data for workers of MSOA (Cherwell 015). It is agreeable to use census data for trip distribution for the site and we would suggest that the same is applied to the David Lloyds development for consistency especially if the argument of linked trips, diverted and pass-by trips is upheld.

Para 5.3 refers to a survey undertaken on similar David Lloyds establishments for which we shall require supporting evidence to be submitted. More clarity is also sought for the basis of assumptions made in Para 5.4.

- I do not think that 10 per cent of people would rather drive from within Bicester 10 allocation to yet again park at David Lloyds rather than leave their vehicles parked at work and walk if it is nearby.
- Also, the assumption that 14% of trips would be diverted from Bicester 4 allocation needs justification – as these would be additional trips onto Vendee Drive roundabout
- Is this 25% of the 54% mentioned in para 5.3? This would need to correlate with the distribution in terms of the origin of trips to work at the site. If 25% of all trips this is really high, as I expect a large proportion of people would be coming from Bicester itself.

Para 8.4 suggests that the proposed roundabout that would form access onto Wendlebury Road has already been capacity tested which has confirmed that traffic can be accommodated at the roundabout. Modelling results are hence required for this roundabout.

Scoping note

The pre-application planning report by Quod describes the development as provision of circa 37,000sqm of employment (Use Classes B1/B2/B8) floorspace, comprising circa 16,000 sqm of Use Class B1 floorspace. This is at odds with the Transport Scoping note, which describes it as 34,500m² B1(c) with ancillary office and 2,500m² B1(a). It must be shown in the Transport Assessment that a robust worst case for traffic generation can be accommodated on the network.

Wendlebury Road is part of the local rural road network and so access along it for traffic generated should be carefully investigated. The model appears to be utilising the A41 junction with Wendlebury Road for access to the site from traffic from the north via the LILO junction, past Bicester Avenue. Wendlebury Road from the A41 does not appear suitable to accommodate likely trips generated by this scale of

development due to its width and apparent construction. For this to be acceptable, an upgrade of Wendlebury Road will be required between the A41/Wendlebury junction and the proposed site access. The upgrade shall be required to make it suitable for the increased traffic and also provision for pedestrian and cycle access.

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.

Vendee Drive junction with A41 is nearing, if not at capacity, and so will be a key junction to assess and provide appropriate mitigation for. A stage 3 safety audit has recently been carried out for the junction now that the P&R is operational. Indeed, there have been a number of accidents at the A41/Vendee Drive roundabout in the last 5 years, mainly minor and near misses. Northbound vehicles appear to occasionally fail to give way to vehicles on the roundabout circulatory. Bicester Gateway is likely to generate up to 3,500 jobs, putting further pressure on this junction. The proposals for this phase are to deliver up to circa 1,070 jobs, in addition to the employment opportunities generated by the health and fitness centre, and so it is unclear whether there will be any further phases in the future, which will need to be clarified.

At our meeting on 14th December, we sought that the TA should have 2031 as the assessment year, with modelling scenarios to include an interim year as 2026. This would make us understand the situation in 2026 because it could be that some level of mitigation shall be required prior to the 2031 assessment year.

For 2031, OCC has provided traffic flows and turning movements from the recently updated Bicester highway model excluding Bicester 10 phase 2. This scenario does not include the SEPR and Eastern Perimeter dualling. (Previous versions did have 2031 scenario with SEPR/EPR dualling in place but they are not up to date).

It is also thought that using traffic flows and turning movements from a 2031 scenario that does include the SEPR and Eastern perimeter dualling should also be explored. For both of these scenarios, a model run without Bicester 10 phase 2 would need to be run, to produce traffic flows and turning movements for you to add your own traffic onto.

Depending on the site layout and position of buildings, it is likely that some part of the development shall be beyond the recommended walking distance to bus stops from new developments. The development will have to consider provision of a bus stop so that it can be served by a new bus service (preferably as an extension/link with the proposed new bus service to serve Bicester Office Park. This would only be possible if a single bus layby can be created on the southern side of the link road between the Vendee Drive/A41 roundabout and the proposed roundabout from which access shall be taken.

Other comments based on the indicative layout are:

- Vehicle swept path analysis will be required to demonstrate that delivery vehicles can enter and exit each individual unit in forward gear.
- Sufficient car parking will need to be provided to ensure that there is no overspill parking onto the adjacent roads or inappropriate parking into the Park and Ride site.
- The size of the parking spaces should be 2.5m x 5m. There should be 6m between rows of parking. There is no indication of circulation direction for larger units – there needs to be sufficient space for vehicles to pass one another.
- The proposals have not made any reference to the provision of cycle parking facilities. This must be included in subsequent applications in recognition of the potential for sustainable travel.
- The layout cannot be confirmed as acceptable until the drainage strategy is established, and therefore the size of any SUDS areas can be confirmed as acceptable. The site must not drain onto highway land.

Drainage

Oxfordshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) would strongly object to the proposals if they were submitted as part of a full or outline application.

The majority of the site is shown to be in flood zone 3 and is also shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. A scheme to provide flood compensation is proposed which will need approval from the Environment Agency.

However the LLFA have significant concerns to the proposals as the compensation is being provided by significantly lowering the existing ground levels which are likely to be below existing groundwater levels.

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are a requirement from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) where proposed development is located in an area at risk of flooding; Development must only be considered in areas at risk of flooding if *“it gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems”* (NPPF Paragraph 103)

Therefore we will expect a surface water management strategy to be submitted to support the application which gives priority to an adequate sustainable drainage scheme in line with the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.

To maximise the benefits of SuDS, C753 expects surface water management to be considered from the beginning of the development planning process and throughout – influencing site layout and design. The proposed drainage solution should not be limited by the proposed site layout and design.

Wherever possible, runoff should be managed at source (i.e. close to where it falls) with residual flows then conveyed downstream to further storage or treatment components, where required. The proposed drainage should mimic the existing drainage regime of the site. Therefore we will expect existing drainage features on the site to be retained and they should be utilised and enhanced wherever possible.

The current proposals show existing ditches and an existing well established pond to be removed. The LLFA cannot support the removal of these features. The ditch that flows west to east through the site from the Wendlebury Road is likely to provide a drainage function for the highway drainage and potentially other offsite land. The existing drainage regime needs to be fully understood.

With the removal of the existing pond and ditches there will be a significant loss of existing biodiversity habitat which cannot be supported.

We will expect source control measures to be incorporated within the development wherever possible. The current proposals are proposing limited source control features and the attenuation is mainly being provided by a deep swale adjacent to the proposed flood plain. The proposed level is significantly below exiting flood levels and therefore will not be acceptable.

As well as addressing the above, the Surface Water Management Strategy will need to be developed in line with the Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage on Major Development in Oxfordshire which can be found at the following link;

<https://www.oxfordshirefloodtoolkit.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/LOCAL-STANDARDS-AND-GUIDANCE-FOR-SURFACE-WATER-DRAINAGE-ON-MAJOR-DEVELOPMENT-IN-OXFORDSHIRE.pdf>

However, we cannot support the application until an adequate flood compensation scheme has been provided and approved by the Environment Agency, which demonstrates the development and proposed attenuation will be outside of the proposed flood plain and will not be compromised by the fluvial flood levels.

Officer's Name: Rashid Bbosa
Officer's Title: Senior Transport Planner
Date: 07 January 2019
