

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: 08/09/2022

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 traffic congestion impact of the development prior to the construction of the A4095 realignment would be severe. The assessment of the impact of the proposed interim (mini roundabout) traffic mitigation scheme is not reliable, and the scheme is unlikely to provide any significant benefit.

If despite OCC's objection permission is proposed to be granted then OCC requires prior to the issuing of planning permission a S106 agreement as set out in our response of 11 May 2022, plus conditions as set out in our previous responses.

Comments:

The application seeks to demonstrate that the traffic impact of the development can be accommodated on the network, if necessary through a interim mini roundabout scheme at the junction of Howes Lane and Bucknell Road, prior to the construction the A4095 realignment. (The A4095 realignment would pass under a rail bridge - already constructed - thereby bypassing that junction.)

An updated version of Technical Note 8 has been submitted 'A4095 Junction Modelling Rev B'. We have concluded that the PICADY modelled 2026 scenarios of the existing junction arrangement which allows for calibration by reducing demand flows on Bucknell Road north by 14%, is a reasonable prediction of traffic conditions at the junction of Lords Lane/Bucknell Road/Howes Lane.

This calibrated output shows that in 2026 the junction will already be operating over capacity; however the addition of the development traffic would significantly increase queuing and delay. In the am peak, the delay per vehicle on Howes Lane would reach over 13 minutes, which is double what it would be without the development. In the pm peak the delay per vehicle would increase over the period to 17 minutes, compared to about 10 minutes without the development. The Highway Authority considers this to be a severe impact on the traffic network, and therefore it cannot support the development being brought forward ahead of the A4095 realignment, which is required key infrastructure for NW Bicester.

To mitigate the impact of the development on the junction, a mini roundabout scheme has been proposed by the applicant and has been assessed using a calibrated ARCADY model. The results have been used to compare the capacity against the

existing arrangement. However, the ARCADY model has been adjusted to reflect the same calibration applied to the PICADY model of the existing junction arrangement, namely by reducing the demand flows on Bucknell Road by 14%. This is inappropriate, first because with a new, theoretical junction arrangement, calibration does not apply since there are no measured queue lengths to calibrate against, and second because there is no rationale for applying the same factors when the type of junction has fundamentally changed. No reason is given in the technical note for why the calibration factors have been applied to the new junction.

Therefore the conclusion that the mini roundabout would offer mitigation, is unreliable. It is more appropriate to compare the mini roundabout modelled output which uses *unadjusted* flows, with the performance of the existing arrangement (calibrated PICADY output) . The findings suggest that the implementation of a new mini roundabout scheme (as proposed) would only marginally improve capacity at the junction and would not provide a nil detriment mitigation for the development traffic. On some approaches, the queues generated by the roundabout are longer than the predicted queues at the existing junction. The Highway Authority would not accept this scheme as mitigation for the development.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 06/09/2022