

Caroline Ford

From: Mark Kirby <mkirby@velocity-tp.com>
Sent: 22 November 2022 16:45
To: joy.white; Caroline Ford
Cc: Alex Chrusciak; JacquiCox (OCC); Manku, Amrik - Oxfordshire County Council; Paul Martin; emusgrove@firethorntrust.com; Hannah Leary; Claudio Ricci; Rob Bolton
Subject: RE: NW Bicester - Further Junction Modelling
Attachments: RE: NW Bicester; Diag 3 - Distribution Profile (TA).pdf; Howes Lane Route.jpg; Town Centre route.jpg; Eastern Route.jpg; B4100 Route.jpg; Howes Lane Route (B).jpg; Town Centre route (B).jpg; Eastern Route (B).jpg; B4100 Route (B).jpg

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Joy,

Thank you for your email below and apologies for not coming back to you sooner. I set out below a response you to your concerns raised in relation to the Uncertainty Logs for the BTM, and in relation to your further queries that you emailed across in relation to the re-distribution of traffic and the calibration methodology, in your email dated the 16th of November at 17:36. I have attached a copy of this email for the benefit of those copied.

BTM Data

I have reviewed the information in your email below with regards to the Uncertainty Logs and it would appear that we had referenced the 2026 Albion Land Reference Case within TN011 and not the 2026 Updated Reference Case when reviewing the number of residential dwellings at Graven Hill and Wretchwick Green that are considered to be completed by 2026. I accept that the Updated 2022 BTM does reflect the housing numbers predicted to be delivered by 2026, as set out within the December 2021 AMR. I would note that upon further reviewed of the 'correct' Updated Reference Case, I still have concerns over the level of development predicted to be delivered by 2026, but I am not in a position to undertake a forensic review of this information at this time. If I had to identify a single site whereby I think an over estimation of completed development by 2026 is still included in the most recent update of the BTM, I would suggest that the 38,646sqm of employment floorspace (B1c & B8) predicted to be completed by 2026 in relation to the Wretchwick Green site (Emp 106) is, in my view, a little ambitious as this site only achieved an outline planning consent in May 2022. Whilst I accept that the 150 residential units might be completed by 2026, as the employment uses are identified as being in later phases of the development and a Reserved Matters application would still have to be consented, I would maintain that the inclusion of this substantial amount of employment development would not be completed by 2026.

However, as you note in your email, we have used the correct version of the BTM to undertake our assessment and our conclusions within the Technical Note remain the same, i.e. we do not consider that the impact associated with the traffic from the Firethorn scheme would have a severe impact prior to the implementation of the A4095 SLR.

Development Traffic Distribution:

The originally agreed distribution profile for the development traffic was identified on Diagram 3, which was included with the original TA. I have attached a copy for ease of reference. This distribution profile was originally agreed for the SGR1 Home Farm scheme (Planning Ref 18/00484/OUT), and OCC confirmed that we should adopt the same for our assessment. Whilst this distribution profile has been used to assess the potential impact of the Firethorn development on the wider highway network in the 2031 scenario, which it is accepted OCC are not objecting to, this distribution profile reflects a situation whereby the A4095 SLR is implemented.

You have acknowledged that in the 2026 interim scenario prior to the implementation of the A4095 SLR that there is scope to consider a redistribution of the Firethorn traffic from the previously identified 53% that would pass along

this part of the network with the A4095 SLR in place, to the suggested 30% prior the implementation of the SLR. Whilst I appreciate your point that the alternative routes might be further impacted by the redirected traffic from the Firethorn scheme, it must stand to reason that if the 2026 BTM SATURN Model is distributing development traffic across the wider network in Bicester proportionately, then all routes in and around Bicester would become more congested, particularly the route through the town centre and along the A4421 Eastern Perimeter Road.

Your email suggests that if we reduce the Firethorn traffic at the Howes Lane junction to 30% then the town centre routes would increase from 22% to 45%. The attached diagram identifies that the town centre route was only predicted to take 10% of the development traffic and the A4421 Eastern Perimeter Road was predicted to take 12.3% of the traffic, equating to a combined total of 22.3%. whilst I appreciate that some of this 22% of traffic might be heading to destinations within the town centre, as these routes will also become more congested in the 2026 scenario without the A4095 SLR, I would suggest that less development traffic would use these routes and not more. Nevertheless, let's assume that all of this development traffic is heading for local destinations as Diagram 3 identifies that only 53.3% of the development traffic gets to the M40 J9. As such, the identified distribution of 15.6% of traffic that uses the B4100 towards the north will increase as I expect that this route will become a far quicker route to get to the M40, including Junction 9 of the M40, albeit I accept it would be a longer route in distance.

To demonstrate this point, I have attached a series of google maps extract showing the journey time from the existing Elmsbrook development (Charlottes Avenue) to the M40 J9. These journeys are all identified as departing from Elmsbrook at 08:30 on the morning of Thursday 17th November 2022. The journey estimations are as follows:

- Via the A4095 Howes Lane – 10 to 18 minutes
- Via the Town Centre – 10 to 20 minutes
- Via the Eastern Perimeter Road – 14 to 24 minutes
- Via the B4100 and M40 J10 – 14 to 24 minutes

For completeness, I have also reviewed the journey times from Braeburn Avenue to Junction 9 of the M40 for the same period and the estimations are as follows:

- Via the A4095 Howes Lane – 10 to 20 minutes
- Via the Town Centre – 10 to 22 minutes
- Via the Eastern Perimeter Road – 14 to 26 minutes
- Via the B4100 and M40 J10 – 12 to 22 minutes

Based on the estimated journey times, there is very little difference between these routes in the current situation. However, if the Howes Lane, Town Centre, and A4421 Eastern Perimeter Road routes were all to become more congested (which they will in the 2026 scenario), and therefore the journey times were to increase, I would expect that the vast majority of residents from the Firethorn scheme would change their travel patterns to use the B4100 to the north of the site. As such, I maintain that a 30% redistribution profile through the Howes Lane junction prior the implementation of the A4095 SLR is actually robust, and we could reduce this substantially more to as little as 10% (or even less). This is particularly relevant as the 53.3% of traffic using this route is all identified as reaching the M40 J9 and any local trips would be via the town centre route or the A4421 Eastern Perimeter Route.

Calibration:

I note that you accept the calibration methodology that we have adopted, i.e. to reduce traffic flows through the existing junction so as to reflect observed queues (section 3.2 of TN011). We acknowledge your view that the junction should not be calibrated to reflect an RFC of 1.0, which we maintain could be an acceptable methodology of calibration. Whilst I accept that the calibrated model does reduce the RFC's on nearly all approaches in all scenarios to less than 1.0, it is worth noting that the Bucknell Road right turn movement still has an RFC of 1.03. I can confirm that these results were generated from the calibration of the junction to reflect observed queues and not RFC's.

- For the approach from the north, paragraph 2.3.3 of TN011 notes that the queue was observed as being between the A4095/Trefoil Drive junction and the termination point of the pedestrian/cycle link
- For the approach from the south, paragraph 2.3.5 of TN011 notes that the maximum observed queue in the PM was 18 PCUs, which would extend to the point prior to the junction with Avonbury Business Park.

Based on the above, I would be grateful if you could accept the redistribution profile of Firethorn development traffic through the Howes Lane junction to reflect 30% of the development traffic, which is considered to be robust, and the calibration methodology, which does reflect the maximum observed queues and not RFCs of 1.0.

This email is sent without prejudice.

Kind regards,

Mark Kirby

Associate Director, Velocity Transport Planning

Mob: 07385 382 701

DDI: 020 3336 7320

From: White, Joy - Oxfordshire County Council <Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>

Sent: 16 November 2022 17:24

To: Mark Kirby <mkirby@velocity-tp.com>; Caroline Ford <Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: Alex Chrusciak <Alex.Chrusciak@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; Cox, Jacqui - Oxfordshire County Council <Jacqui.Cox@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>; Manku, Amrik - Oxfordshire County Council <Amrik.Manku@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: NW Bicester - Further Junction Modelling

[EXTERNAL] This message was sent from outside your organization

Hi Mark and Caroline

I am in the process of reviewing this note but wanted to make an important point about the Bicester Transport Model. In section 2.2 of TN11 you say that the latest version of the BTM reference case has housing numbers in it that do not correspond to the 2021 AMR. In particular you flag up Graven Hill and Wretchwick green, saying that the 2026 housing numbers should be 846 and 150 respectively. In fact these are the figures in the updated reference case, which Sacha Pearson sent to you on 2 November (email attached) and which you have used for this latest assessment. The extract below is from the relevant uncertainty log – the ‘post 22 update’ files in the attached email.

While this doesn’t affect your assessment, which has used the updated reference case anyway, I’m concerned that section 2.2, and the ‘Uncertainty Logs’ document dated 15 November now on the CDC website, has the effect of unjustifiably casting doubt on the BTM. I’d be grateful if you could confirm the error.

ID	Name	Description / Planning Reference / Notes	Dev
Res101	Bicester Community Hospital Kings End	12/00809/F	C3D1
Res102	Former Oxfordshire County Council Highways Depot	Completed by mid 2016 so traffic is in the base model traffic counts	C3D1
Res103	Gavray Drive (Bicester 13)	15/02074/OUT. 17/01253/REM	C3D1
Res104	Graven Hill (Bicester 2)	11/01494/OUT. 17/02107/LDO	C3D1
Res105	Kingsmere (South West Bicester) - Phase 1	06/00967/OUT. 14/010207/OUT. 16/00192/REM. 11/01840/F. 13/00433/OUT. 17/01849/F. 18/01721/OUT.	C3D1
Res106	Land at Skimmingdish Lane	14/00697/F	C3D1
Res107	Land South of Church Lane (Old Place Yard and St Edburgs)	16/00043/F. 20/02405/F	C3D1
Res108	Land South of Talisman Road	09/01592/OUT. 13/01226/REM	C3D1
Res109	North West Bicester Eco-Town Exemplar Project	10/01780/HYBRID. 21/01227/F.	C3D1
Res110a	North West Bicester Phase 2 (Himley Village)	14/02121/OUT. 21/02339/REM	C3D1
Res110b	North West Bicester Phase 2 (remainder)	17/00455/HYBRID. 14/02121/OUT. 14/01641/OUT. 14/01384/OUT. 21/01630/OUT.	C3D1
Res111	South East Bicester (Wretchwick Green) (Bicester 12)	16/01268/OUT	C3D1
Res112	South West Bicester Phase 2 (Bicester 3)	13/00847/OUT. 18/00647/REM. 18/01777/REM. 19/02225/REM.	C3D1
Res113	St Edburg's School, Cemetery Road	17/01578/OUT	C3D1
Res114	Winners Bargain Centres, Victoria Road	Completed in late 2016 so traffic will not be in the base traffic counts	C3D1
Res115	Windfall Allowance (<10 dwellings)	Note: This allowance cannot be included in the model due to lack of location details.	C3D1
Res116	Land at Bessemer Close / Launton Road	15/02074/OUT. 17/01253/REM.	C3D1
Res117	Cattlemarket	01/00073/CDC	C3D1
Res118	Former RAF Upper Heyford	Local Plan allocation (2015) - Villages 5. 10/01642/OUT. 13/01811/OUT. 16/00627/REM. 16/00263/F. 16/00627/REM. 16/02446/F. 19/00446/F. 15/01357/F. 18/00825/HYBRID.	C3D1
Res118a	Upper Heyford	These two sites (represented by different zones in the BTM) comprise the total dwellings detailed in the AMR reports for	C3D1
Res118b	Heyford Park Allocation		C3D1
Res119	Transco Depot, Launton Road	Completed by mid 2016 so traffic is in the base model traffic counts	C3D1
Res120	West of Chapel St. & Bryan House	Completed by mid 2016 so traffic is in the base model traffic counts	C3D1
Res121	Inside Out Interiors, 85-87 Churchill Road, Bicester	16/02461/OUT. 19/01276/REM.	C3D1
Res122	Kings End Antiques, Kings End, Bicester	19/02311/OUT	C3D1
Res123	Bicester Gateway Business Park, Wendlebury Road, Bicester (Phase 1B)	20/00293/OUT	C3D1
Res124	The Paddocks, Chesterton	14/01737/OUT. 16/00219/REM.	C3D1
Res125	Land East Of Jersey Cottages Station Road, Ardley	18/01881/F	C3D1
Res126	Land North Of Oak View, Weston On The Green	13/01796/OUT. 16/00574/REM. 17/01458/OUT. 18/02066/F.	C3D1

Bicester Transport Model Uncertainty Log 2022 Update Residential Developments

Kind regards

Joy

From: Mark Kirby <mkirby@velocity-tp.com>

Sent: 14 November 2022 09:01

To: Caroline Ford <Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Cc: Alex Chrusciak <Alex.Chrusciak@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>; Hannah Leary <Hannah.Leary@bartonwillmore.co.uk>;

Rob Bolton <rb@reviewpartners.uk.com>; Paul Martin <pmartin@firethornttrust.com>;

emusgrove@firethornttrust.com; White, Joy - Oxfordshire County Council <Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>; Claudio Ricci <CRicci@velocity-tp.com>

Subject: NW Bicester - Further Junction Modelling

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Morning Caroline,

Further to our recent discussions and following the presentation to Members last week, please find attached a Technical Note presenting our further technical assessment of the A4095 Howes Lane/Bucknell Road junction.

Should you have any queries in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Mark Kirby | Associate Director

Tel: 020 3336 7310

DDi: 020 3336 7320

Mob: 07385 382 701

Mail: MKirby@velocity-tp.com

Web: www.velocity-tp.com



 Building 2, Guildford Business Park, Guildford, Surrey GU2 8XG

Sent Remotely

Velocity Transport Ltd is a company registered in England and Wales. Registered number: 10748463.
Registered office: 77 Chapel Street, Billericay, Essex, CM12 9LR

This email, including attachments, may contain confidential information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender by reply and delete it immediately. Views expressed by the sender may not be those of Oxfordshire County Council. Council emails are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. [email disclaimer](#). For information about how Oxfordshire County Council manages your personal information please see our [Privacy Notice](#).