

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 21/01630/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning application for up to 530 residential dwellings (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: 02/12/2022

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:

No objection subject to planning obligations and conditions as set out in our earlier response.

Comments:

Further to my comments of 25 November, I have received clarification from Velocity in an email of 30 November.

The development traffic assumed in TN011 is consistent with the revised development traffic distribution, and having re-read TN008 Rev B, I now see that the disparity in queue lengths is because the previous, longer queue related to the earlier surveys which were not carried out on a typical day, whereas the shorter queue related to the repeat surveys carried out in July. A larger adjustment was required to the Junctions 10 model to calibrate it to the July surveys. Therefore I now accept that the predictions of queue length in delay in TN011 are reasonable.

The results show that in the worst case delay would increase by 50% from 6 to 9 minutes average delay per vehicle through the critical junction, comparing the situation in 2026 with and without the development. (This compares to earlier predictions of delays of up to 17 minutes.)

In the context of an increasingly urban setting, drivers will become accustomed to congestion on all routes into and around Bicester by 2026, where they may face similar delays. Whilst there is no definition of what constitutes a 'severe' impact, a doubling of delay would in my opinion be severe and even an increase to 9 minutes could be seen as unreasonable. However, although there is currently no certainty of the A4095 realignment being delivered via external funding, there are current development proposals on the land required for the scheme, which means the land can potentially be safeguarded and there is some likelihood of the road eventually being delivered by developers, particularly as the most challenging element of the project, namely the bridge under the railway, has already been delivered. Therefore although the impact of the development may be felt for many years, it is likely to be temporary, if long-term temporary.

As a result I can remove our highway objection on the basis that the traffic impact would not be considered severe, subject to planning obligations and conditions as previously set out.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 2 December 2022