

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 21/03177/F

Proposal: Full planning application for employment development (Use Classes E(g)(iii), B2 and/or B8) and associated parking and servicing, landscaping and associated works

Location: Axis J9 Phase 3 Howes Lane Bicester

Response Date: 17th 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: 21/03177/F

Location: Axis J9 Phase 3 Howes Lane 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 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: 21/03177/F

Location: Axis J9 Phase 3 Howes Lane Bicester

Transport Schedule

No new highways/transport information has been submitted, so there is nothing for me to comment on.

However, as the total floor area of the development has reduced since our original response, some S106 contributions may be reduced as shown below, to reflect a reduction from 16,942 sqm to 14,189 sqm (a reduction of 16%).

Please see revised table below, together with non financial asks.

The obligation to provide the cycle connection - now that this is shown in the site plan - could be replaced by a condition to deliver it prior to first occupation.

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Highway works	Need link to existing major infrastructure agreement		Baxter	
Public transport services	£134,375 £112,540	Q2 2017	RPI-x	Bus services serving NW Bicester
Public transport infrastructure (<i>if not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement</i>)	£19,460 Remains the same – still needs to provide a bus stop	April 2017	Baxter	Bus infrastructure at NW Bicester
Traffic Reg Order (<i>if not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement</i>)	n/a		RPI-x	
Travel Plan Monitoring	£5,271 Remains the same – only	Dec 2020	RPI-x	Towards the cost of monitoring the framework and

	the smaller units have been removed			individual travel plans over the life of the plans
Public Rights of Way	£2,846 £2,384	April 2017	Baxter	Improvements to Bridleway 9 and Bucknell Bridleway 4
Total				

- On site highway works –need to link to existing agreement in relation to the Strategic Link Road
- Obligation to provide a pedestrian/cycle link between the SLR and existing Howes Lane (although note that a lack of a ped/cycle connection to Howes Lane in the interim access proposals is a reason for objection), and for this to be dedicated as highway once the SLR is connected. **This is now shown on the site plan but a condition should require it to be constructed prior to first occupation.**
- Routing agreement ahead of the SLR being open, to prevent HGV traffic from using Howes Lane.
- Requirement to enter into a S278 agreement for the crossing and associated works on Howes Lane.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 15 June 2022

Application no: 21/03177/F

Location: Axis J9 Phase 3 Howes Lane Bicester

Lead Local Flood Authority

Recommendation:

Objection

Key issues:

- Surface water catchment plan not clear.
- No drainage strategy provided for the proposals within the application boundary.
- Further details required in regard to the existing culvert.
- Infiltration testing not provided.
- Phasing plan not provided.

Detailed comments:

There are still outstanding comments that needs to be addressed.

Surface water catchment plan does not include the whole site, for instance the main road has not been included.

There are proposals within the application boundary that has not been included in the drainage strategy. From the architects layout there are many hard standing areas that has no drainage strategy, for instance the road that is going around phase 1 and 2.

Plan drawing shows headwall discharging to an green hatched area. This has not been denoted on the key.

Ownership of culvert and permission to connect to be provided. Capacity of the culvert to be confirmed and the surface water that its currently taking .Also its mentioned the culvert will be upgraded, provide clarification of what the upgrade will include and when this will be done. Ideally it should be upgraded before phase 3 is developed to reduce the risk of flooding in neighbouring sites. Provide correspondence from the relevant party confirming the above.

Ground investigation report to be provided to confirm infiltration is not feasible on site. Infiltration testing to be conducted according to BRE 365.

Phasing plan to be provided to demonstrate the extent of each phase clearly. Each phase should have its own drainage strategy in place and be able to stand alone. On the phasing plan clearly shows the discharge rate from each phase and show the outfall location.

Officer's Name: Kabier Salam

Officer's Title: LLFA Engineer

Date: 07 June 2022