

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

District: Cherwell

Application No: 20/03638/F

Proposal: Variation of condition 1 (time limit) of 18/02169/F - proposed extension of temporary use of eastern part of southern taxiway for car processing

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester

Response date: *MPAT to complete*

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: 20/03638/F

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester

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.
- **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.

Security of payment for deferred contributions - Applicants should be aware that an approved bond will be required to secure a payment where a S106 contribution is to be paid post implementation and

- the contribution amounts to 25% or more (including anticipated indexation) of the cost of the project it is towards and that project cost £7.5m or more;
- the developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure costing £7.5m or more;
- where aggregate contributions towards bus services exceeds £1m (including anticipated indexation).

The County Infrastructure Funding Team can provide the full policy and advice, on request.

Application no: 20/03638/F

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester

Transport Development Control

Recommendation

No objection subject to conditions

Key issues

- The alignment of the Aves Ditch through the site should be safeguarded.

Conditions

Aves Ditch bridleway alignment protection. Temporary extension of the processing area shall include a provision for Aves Ditch bridleway to be routed safely through the site in the event of application 18/00825/HYBRID being refused and/or if the route through the processing site and flying field is deemed to be the best route for the restored route of Aves Ditch bridleway.

Reason: To protect a possible cross-flying field route for Aves Ditch from not being implemented during the temporary extension consent period.

Detailed comments

Rights of Way

It should be noted that the alignment of the Aves Ditch restoration has not been fully clarified and finalised so this extension of the temporary permission could preclude restoration to an alignment inside and across the Flying Field.

In this respect a condition is required that allows for the eventuality of a bridleway route to be established across the temporary processing area on a suitable alignment whilst the temporary processing permission is running. This can be limited to only being an option if the hybrid application is refused and/or if a route across the Flying Field is deemed to be the best solution for Aves Ditch. At the appropriate juncture this can be agreed between Dorchester, Paragon and the County.

Officer's Name: Chris Nichols

Officer's Title: Transport Development Control

Date :25 January 2021
