

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 21/01630/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning application for residential development (within Use Class C3), open space provision, access, drainage and all associated works and operations including but not limited to demolition, earthworks, and engineering operations, with the details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for later determination

Location: Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2
Caversfield

Response Date: 24th June 2022

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: 21/01630/OUT

Location: Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2
Caversfield

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 to be given an opportunity to make further representations.

Outline applications and contributions

The anticipated number and type of dwellings and/or the floor space may be set by the developer at the time of application which is used to assess necessary mitigation. If not stated in the application, a policy compliant mix will be used. The number and type of dwellings used when assessing S106 planning obligations is set out on the first page of this response.

In the case of outline applications, once the unit mix/floor space is confirmed by reserved matters approval/discharge of condition a matrix (if appropriate) will be applied to establish any increase in contributions payable. A further increase in contributions may result if there is a reserved matters approval changing the unit mix/floor space.

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 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 a 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).

A bond will also be required where a developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure.

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

Application no: 21/01630/OUT

Location: Land at North West Bicester Home Farm, Lower Farm and SGR2 Caversfield

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reasons:

- The assessment of the traffic impact is not reliable

If despite OCC's objection permission is proposed to be granted then OCC requires prior to the issuing of planning permission a S106 agreement plus planning conditions and informatives as set out in our previous responses. An additional S106 contribution would be required for widening works on Charlotte Avenue - amount to be confirmed. (See discussion below).

Comments

TN008 seeks to address the issue raised in my previous response, that the queues in the PICADY model of the junction of Howes Lane/Bucknell Road did not validate with the observed traffic count queues.

The manufacturer of PICADY (Junctions 10) software, TRL, ([Queues are longer \(or shorter\) than ARCADY predicts - TRL Software](#)) advocates that in this situation the traffic counts should be investigated first of all. In this case they were done on one day, 2 February 2022, which on the face of it is a neutral, mid-week day. However, on investigation I have found that the counts on this day are very likely to be atypical, particularly in the afternoon peak, due to the A34 being closed in both directions all afternoon and over the evening peak. This would have had wide reaching effects including delaying traffic heading north, which could have caused lower than expected pm peak counts at the junction.

The applicant has now agreed to repeat the traffic counts on a neutral day in June.

Additionally, the method used to 'calibrate' the model, by reducing the flows on one arm, is not one that is recommended by TRL, and is not considered acceptable. The flows are what they are - it is the model parameters that should be checked and intercepts adjusted if necessary.

TN009 seeks to address concerns about the suitability of the Elmsbrook spine road. I accept the argument that the traffic volumes on Braeburn Avenue are unlikely to trigger the need for segregated cycle facilities, according to LTN 1/20.

I remain concerned about the width of Charlotte Avenue north of the school. At only 4.1m this is definitely not suitable for the amount of additional traffic from the development, as there would be a high risk of vehicles overrunning the footway when passing one another. The applicant has proposed a potential scheme of widening. However, we are concerned about widening the carriageway right up to the tree pits. Widening may be required on both sides. A contribution has been offered to allow OCC to carry out widening works. I will confirm the amount as soon as possible. However, it would be better if the works could be done by agreement between the applicant and A2 Dominion, as the road is not yet adopted by OCC.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 23 June 2022