

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

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 21/04275/OUT

**Proposal:** OUTLINE - with all matters reserved except for Access - Mixed Use Development of up to 3,100 dwellings (including extra care); residential and care accommodation(C2); mixed use local centre (comprising commercial, business and service uses, residential uses, C2 uses, local community uses (F2(a) and F2(b)), hot food takeaways, public house, wine bar); employment area (B2, B8, E(g)); learning and non-residential institutions (Class F1) including primary school (plus land to allow extension of existing Gagle Brook primary school); green Infrastructure including formal (including playing fields) and informal open space, allotments, landscape, biodiversity and amenity space; burial ground; play space (including Neaps/Leaps/MUGA); changing facilities; ground mounted photovoltaic arrays; sustainable drainage systems; movement network comprising new highway, cycle and pedestrian routes and access from highway network; car parking; infrastructure (including utilities); engineering works (including ground modelling); demolition

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

**Response date:** 9th March 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: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords 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](mailto: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: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## **Strategic Comments**

The site is located within an allocation identified in the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan as Policy Bicester 1 for up to 6,000 homes and associated infrastructure. The Northwest Bicester SPD (2016) sets out further detailing for the comprehensive development of the site.

This application seeks outline planning permission for 3,100 homes, mixed use local centre, employment area learning and non-residential institutions including primary school and other infrastructure. It is noted that the application site boundary extends beyond the Local Plan allocation boundary to the north, towards the settlement of Bucknell.

The application assumes that the Strategic Link Road/A4095 diversion will be in place in 2024 and argues that there is sufficient capacity in the local road network for the development to be occupied before the SLR is open. This point has not yet been established because OCC's Cabinet has removed the housing and growth deal funding from this scheme, therefore the delivery of the SLR has been paused subject to finding alternative ways of funding, which means that a resultant severe congestion impact could last some years.

The County Council is raising Transport and Local Lead Flood Authority objections. Also attached are Education, Property, Archaeology, Minerals and Waste, Waste Management and Green Infrastructure comments on this proposal.

**Officer's Name: Jacqui Cox**

**Officer's Title:** Infrastructure Locality Lead Cherwell

**Date:** 04 March 2022

**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## Transport Schedule

### Recommendation:

### Objection for the following reasons:

- The sustainable travel and parking strategies are not considered strong enough to result in the low external vehicle trip generation predicted in the TA.
- Elements of the bus and access strategy are not in accordance with the NW Bicester SPD's Access and Travel Strategy.
- There is insufficient detail to assess the safety of accesses from the highway, for all users.
- It is not possible, from the transport assessment provided with the application, to fully assess the traffic impact of the development

If despite OCC's objection permission is proposed to be granted then OCC requires prior to the issuing of planning permission a S106 agreement including an obligation to enter into one or more S278 agreement and S38 agreements to mitigate the impact of the development plus planning conditions and informatives as detailed below.

### **S106 Contributions - please note this list is provisional dependent on further transport assessment work.**

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Amount £</b>	<b>Price base</b>	<b>Index</b>	<b>Towards (details)</b>
Highway works 1	£276,596	Dec 2020	Baxter	Improvements to junction of Charlotte Ave and B4100
Highway works 2	£1,551,614	Dec 2020	Baxter	Improvements to junction of Banbury Rd and A4095
Public transport services	£2,994,962	Feb 2022	RPI-x	New bus service serving development N of railway
Public transport infrastructure ( <i>if not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement</i> )	£26,712	Feb 2022	Baxter	Real time information displays at bus stops serving the site
Ped/cycle infrastructure	TBC		Baxter	Upgrade of public footpath linking Lords

				Land and Banbury Rd adjacent railway to a segregated ped/cycle route plus other local improvements
Travel Plan Monitoring	£4,960 (provisional depending on no of plans)		RPI-x	To cover the cost to OCC of monitoring the travel plans over their life
Public Rights of Way	£292,453	Dec 2020	Baxter	Towards public rights of way improvements to Aldershot Farm bridleway and public rights of way to the north/northeast of the site
<b>Site wide major infrastructure</b>	<b>TBC</b>			<b>Towards the major transport infrastructure at North West Bicester including the realignment of the A4095 and the railway bridges</b>

Other obligations:

- Off-site highway works – Access junctions, Bucknell traffic calming
- On site highway works – Access road (forming part of future A4095 realignment), Spine road including bridge(s), strategic cycle routes, bus stop infrastructure, cycle parking
- Delivery of travel plan(s)
- On-site parking restrictions

### Key points

- Modelling of traffic impact required
- Additional information on accesses required
- Access strategy requires construction of part of A4095 realignment
- Some aspects of access strategy not in accordance with masterplan
- Improvements required to walking and cycling network
- Parking provision needs to be restricted to support low external trip generation
- Junction designs need further work
- Changes needed to proposed cross sections in street hierarchy

- Contributions required to **NW Bicester site wide major infrastructure**, off site highway, walking and cycling infrastructure, plus public rights of way and bus stop infrastructure
- Travel plan requires further development

### **Comments:**

### **Introduction**

This application is for 3100 dwellings plus local centre and other uses on part of land previously brought forward under a 2014 application for 2600 units, ref 14/01384/F. This would result in a significant increase in the amount of housing at NW Bicester compared with the policy. The majority of the site is within the area of Policy Bicester 1 (NW Bicester) but some of it extends northwest towards Bucknell village, outside the policy area. This part of the site includes a large area of open space and a solar farm as well as some dwellings.

### **Access arrangements**

Two main vehicular accesses are proposed:

- Onto existing Lords Lane opposite Germander Way. A signalised junction is proposed. In the NW Bicester Masterplan that accompanied the SPD, this was envisaged as a secondary access
- Onto the realigned A4095 north of the railway at the proposed local centre - again, a signalised junction is proposed. This would form a crossroads with a secondary access leading into a development parcel between the realigned A4095 and Lords Lane.

The application proposes a bus loop through the main part of the site between these two accesses.

An access into Elmsbrook (the Exemplar site), in the position indicated in the NW Bicester Masterplan, is shown as 'potential'.

A secondary access is proposed onto Bucknell Road between the local centre and the school, linking to the spine road. Bucknell Road would be closed to traffic south of this point, forming a ped/cycle route only, with a toucan crossing of the realigned A4095. It is proposed to introduce traffic calming northwards along Bucknell Road to deter ratrunning.

Other accesses onto Bucknell Road are mentioned but no details are provided. This includes accesses into residential parcels, a business centre and a new cemetery. Also an access is proposed off Bainton Road but no details are provided. There are no details of pedestrian/cycle accesses into the site other than at the vehicular access points.

There are several issues with this access strategy which need addressing:

1. There are no additional cycle and pedestrian access points into the site. Filtered permeability is necessary to make walking and cycling the most convenient and direct ways to leave the site and thereby realise the low car trip ambitions. These must be

secured through the planning permission and detail provided, as the application is for access in detail. These need to include

- Along Lords Lane - at least one to connect with the circular pedestrian/cycle route, together with a crossing of Lords Lane
- At the southern end of Bucknell Road as it passes the site, together with a crossing point giving access to the footpath along the railway, which is to be upgraded for cycling.
- Into Elmsbrook, including one between the vehicular access and Banbury Road
- Into the Firethorn application site, corresponding with the position proposed in their application
- Across the open space and alongside the solar farm, to Bainton Road - this provides onward links to the countryside on quiet roads
- Along Bucknell Road - as required to connect the development on either sides of Bucknell Road, including primary routes towards the railway underpass, and to the cemetery

2. A further access is proposed on Lords Lane but it is not clear where and there are no details - this needs to be clarified,

3. The access from the realigned section of the A4095. It can no longer be assumed that this will be delivered by OCC, due to a recent change in the funding programme. The developer would need to deliver the realignment from Lords Lane west to their accesses and the Bucknell Road sustainable travel route. As part of the access from the existing highway, full details of this road and its junction with Lords Lane will be required. **The connection of this road under the railway and the completion of the realigned part of the A4095 is necessary to distribute traffic from the development, so there would need to be a restriction on development before this connection is made.**

4. The secondary access off Bucknell Road is much further south than in the NW Bicester Masterplan and as such it would be less effective at deterring rat running through Bucknell. The application proposes traffic calming all the way along Bucknell Road. Upgrades to traffic calming in Bucknell village would also be required. This would need to be sufficiently deterrent, yet designed sensitively bearing in mind funeral corteges accessing the new cemetery. Further details are required.

5. No details are provided of the proposed accesses off Bucknell and Bainton Road - as the application is for access in detail, scale drawings must be provided showing visibility splays.

6. The access into Elmsbrook, shown as 'potential' must be provided for bus, cycle and pedestrian access.

7. The main access onto Lords Lane is not in accordance with the masterplan, which instead had the spine road continuing into Charlotte Ave, to the B4100. The junction, and the adjacent Banbury Road junction, will need to be modelled and designed to ensure it can accommodate the traffic movements. Both these junctions will be on the bus route and



delays to traffic will also delay the bus service that is necessary to promote sustainable travel.

8. Drawings are shown of the main access junctions. These are not approved and will need to be the subject of further discussions with OCC including the traffic signals team. The junctions will also need to be modelled for traffic capacity. Crossings should be straight across rather than staggered, and segregated cycle facilities will need to be provided on both sides of all arms. A simultaneous green ped/cycle phase design should be considered.

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit in accordance with GG119 (5.46.1) will be required for all highways works. This will be required in advance of planning permission being granted as the findings may result in the red line boundary having to change due to road safety remedial measures being required.

### **Walking and cycling routes**

Please note the comments above regarding connections off site. The internal pedestrian cycle network, including routes across Bucknell Road and the realigned section of the A4095, is critical to ensuring uptake of sustainable travel and keeping car trip generation low. Therefore this network must be included in the Development Framework Plan. Routes need to be safeguarded and conditions applied to ensuring they are delivered in a timely fashion. The routes must include all those set out in the NW Bicester Walking and Cycling strategy, including off site connections.

Specifications need to be agreed so that the corridors are of a sufficient width, taking into account the need to preserve hedgerows, swales etc. All routes must be compliant with LTN 1/20, which means in urban areas pedestrian and cycle routes must be segregated. Priority should be given to pedestrians and cyclists over minor roads. These commitments should be made in the walking and cycling strategy.

The route alongside Bucknell Road within the Green Infrastructure should be provided to a high standard and segregated (i.e. not a rural path), as this is an important route for cyclists north from Bicester, and is a critical link within the development, including to the cemetery and primary school. Further details are required showing the corridor, including how it passes Hawkwell Farm, which is not within the site. At the proposed secondary street junction adjacent to the school, cyclists should have priority. The layout of the junction does not give adequate consideration for cyclists.

### **Public rights of way**

The link to Bicester Bridleway 129/9, must be considered as part of the cycling network, as this provides access to the countryside for residents of the the site, including onward connections to the Oxford Canal.

The public rights of way network outside of the site will be placed under greater pressure as a result of the development. A s106 contribution is required to allow OCC's Countryside Access Team to plan and deliver improvements with third party landowners in a

reasonable time period and under the Rights of Way Management Plan aims. The contribution would be spent on improvements to the public rights of way in the vicinity of the development – in the ‘impact’ area up to 5km from the site, predominantly to the west, and north of the site. Primarily this is to improve the surfaces of all routes to take account of the likely increase in use by residents of the development as well as new or replacement structures like gates, bridges and seating, sub-surfacing and drainage to enable easier access, improved signing and protection measures such as anti-motorcycle barriers. New short links between existing rights of way would also be included. This request is separate to the list of measures identified in s5.6.3 of the ES Chapter 5

There are some public footpaths within the site. Note that it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure that their application takes account of the legally recorded route and width of any public rights of way as recorded in the definitive map and statement. This may differ from the line walked on the ground and may mean there are two routes with public access. The Definitive Map and Statement is available online at [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/definitivemap](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/definitivemap). Routes must remain useable at all times during a development’s construction lifecycle

### **Major infrastructure**

**The NW Bicester SPD sets out a requirement for the development to provide the major transport infrastructure at North West Bicester, principally the realignment of the A4095 and railway bridges. It is anticipated that the developer will need to enter into an agreement to contribute proportionately to this infrastructure, along the same lines as sites at NW Bicester that already have planning permission.**

### **Site layout**

See comments above regarding walking and cycling network.

The concentration of density of housing around the public transport route is welcomed. However, I question the lower density between the spine road and Lords Lane, as this area has better potential for walking and cycling than the extremities of the site.

The internal road layout should be designed in accordance with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide (Nov 210 The Design and Access Statement should reference this document, and LTN 1/20.

The use of stepped cycle tracks on the primary street are supported but note that the Street Design Guide requires these to be 2m wide. This is to allow cyclists to overtake one another.

The primary street will be a bus route, which needs to be a minimum of 6.5m wide, not 6.3m as shown in the DAS. Trees within the verge will need to be of a species that will not grow to overhang the footway or cycleway. Noting that the verge is 2.5m wide, this will restrict the type of tree. A mixture of species is required, to avoid vulnerability to disease.

It’s assumed that a 20mph speed limit should apply throughout the development, so

dedicated cycle facilities are probably not required on secondary or tertiary streets, (see LTN 1/20 regarding traffic volumes) with the exception of the street adjacent the local centre and school. In any case the bi-directional cycle route shown is not wide enough to meet LTN 1/20 standards – should be 3.5m and have a dividing strip between the cycleway and footway. The exception is where strategic cycle routes run along secondary and tertiary streets – there we would expect the cycle route to be segregated from traffic. There should be no straight sections of road more than 70m without traffic calming. Please refer to the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide for more details.

### **Car and cycle parking**

To achieve the low levels of external car trips predicted, a more restrictive approach to car parking is required, with lower overall parking and a higher proportion of unallocated parking. To deter car use there needs to be a mixture of carrot (excellent sustainable travel options) and stick (reduced car parking). Reduced car parking also reflects the trend towards lower car ownership in the future. Please see the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide for a discussion of innovative approaches to parking, to minimise on plot parking.

The threat of obstructive on street car parking should be mitigated through the introduction of a permit controlled parking zone. Once streets are adopted the county council will have powers to enforce this, but it would need to be provided by the developer in the meantime.

The Oxfordshire Cycle Design Standards for cycle parking are minimum standards. To achieve the low levels of external car trips predicted, every member of each household old enough to ride a bike should have space to park it securely. This means the amount of cycle parking needs to be greater than in the above standards. Cycle parking should also be provided for visitors and other land uses at the site including the burial ground, play areas, allotments, open space etc. The school should have cycle parking scooter parking and buggy parking, as well as nearby off-site cycle parking for parents to use when dropping children off.

Electric vehicle charging should be in accordance with the Oxfordshire EVI Strategy, which it is expected will be reflected in the updated Local Plan.

The mobility hub at the local centre is welcomed, though further information should be provided to demonstrate that this can be accommodated alongside the other uses, plus bus stops, parking, delivery bays etc. It needs to be considered that the local centre is at the extreme southern corner of the site, a considerable walking distance from some parts of the site.

Recognising that the school may at first attract pupils from a wider area, there should be sufficient on-street or local centre parking in the vicinity to cater for parking whilst parents take and collect children to/from school. Despite best efforts, a proportion of children will be brought to school by car.

## **Public Transport**

### Public transport strategy

The proposal for a 10-minute daytime frequency service between the development site and Bicester Village station, utilising four buses, is acceptable to the Council. Evening and Sunday services should also be provided from a later stage of development at least at a 30-minute frequency.

The route to be taken by the bus service is expected to be that shown in Figure 7.6 of the Transport Assessment as the “alternative bus route”, in order to maintain connectivity to areas of the existing and Firethorn developments. It is therefore essential that a connection for buses and active travel modes is made between the developments, and at an early stage to allow penetration into initial phases of the application site (see below).

Figure 7.6 indicates walk distances between bus stops and the residential areas of the development. The Council accepts that for a high quality, high frequency service users are prepared to walk further than 400 metres but is concerned that these are shown as crow-fly distances and without direct active travel routes to bus stops these distances could be considerably greater. Care should be taken to ensure that stops are well-located for connecting active travel routes and that such distances are kept to a minimum.

Ideally, the spine road would penetrate slightly further to the west to allow the westernmost fringes of the development greater access to the bus service.

The applicant is urged to place all areas of higher density housing in immediate or close proximity to the bus route, and to locate the lowest density housing on the fringes of the development, to maximise attractiveness and relevance for local residents.

The mobility hub concept referred to in paragraph 7.4.1 is most welcomed.

### Phasing and spine road

It is imperative that the spine road is open and available for buses at the earliest possible opportunity. In terms of serving the development by bus, it would be advantageous to occupy initial phases of the development at the eastern side and closest to the Firethorn and exemplar sites, so as to maximise the opportunities to take advantage of existing bus routes and/or to minimise additional time taken by new services.

Appropriate temporary turning facilities – and potentially bus stops, dependent on location – will be required for buses within the development should the spine road not be fully completed at an early stage. The spine road must be available for buses (i.e. have a suitable wearing course) at the earliest possible opportunity, to ensure that best value for contributions is achieved and sustainable travel patterns can be formulated.

The connection between the application site and the exemplar site must be provided for buses (ideally not for general traffic) and the section of spine road between this and the eastern side of Lords Lane should be completed at an early stage so that buses can use this connection at the earliest opportunity. The bus stop proposed in this area could serve a significant proportion of the emerging site without the need for costly additional buses, but must be placed in a location where it will not be compromised at a later stage by changes to the route (i.e. it could be at the southern end of the connecting route from the exemplar development).

The spine road must be free of on-street parking on the carriageway line and have minimal or no vertical deflections.

### Costs and contributions

Paragraph 7.3.7 of the Transport Assessment refers to the Council's response to the 2014 application, including costs. Costs have risen in the bus industry since this time and the figure of £160,000 per bus per annum is no longer appropriate. In any case these costs refer to Monday to Saturday daytime services, with no account taken of operation in the evenings and on Sundays which is essential to develop sustainable travel patterns on a site of this size

Taking the Confederation of Passenger Transport's annual Cost Index of annual cost increases for England, the equivalent 2022 value is £192,560. The Council therefore will require this value as the starting point for each of the four buses required to operate the service.

For a Monday to Saturday daytime service, the total cost for each bus over the 8-year declining subsidy basis is therefore £866,520. As four buses are required, the total cost of these is £3,466,080 at 2022 prices.

For evening and Sunday services requiring two buses, the cost is an additional £225,000 at 2022 prices.

Minus the contribution requested from the Firethorn development, the total sum required for provision of public transport services from this application would be **£2,994,962** at 2022 prices and will be subject to further indexation. Note this is provisional as it depends on a contribution that has not yet been secured.

The developers are required to provide three bus stops on the site through a S278 obligation, and for these to include a Premium Route flag, pole and timetable case to Council specification, incorporating plates for clearways and SMS timetable information.

A three-bay shelter, to agreed Council specification, is to be installed at each stop with appropriate seating and lighting. Footways are not to be obstructed. The shelters must be capable of having a Real Time Information (RTI) screen installed, so appropriating ducting and cabling will be necessary. The Council will procure and install the RTI screens, for

which a public transport infrastructure contribution is required. The total contribution for RTI screens at three stops is **£26,712** at 2022 prices.

### **Traffic impact**

The ES states that the transport effects of the proposals have been carefully modelled, but this is not borne out in the TA. The ES and TA rely on an out-dated version of the Bicester Transport Model from 2014. The BTM has been updated since then, including development set out in the Local Plan adopted in 2015, including development at Heyford Park, which was not taken into account in the earlier version. Further work will be required to test the traffic impact of the development using the updated 2031 reference case of the BTM, and to ensure that the site access junctions provide adequate capacity (important for bus access).

The TA (and the ES) assume that the A4095 realignment is in place. However, as stated above, the programme for this scheme is no longer certain. For the purposes of modelling it could be assumed to be in place in 2031, but not before 2026. Should the developer propose that some of the development is occupied ahead of the A4095 realignment, the impact of this will need to be tested using an updated 2026 BTM reference case, which can be made available.

The TA argues that the number of external vehicle trips generated by development north of the railway in 2031 would be lower than those assumed in the original modelling of NW Bicester, despite the number of dwellings proposed being significantly more. The TA argues that a 'worst case' estimate of the number of vehicle trips can result in over provision of traffic capacity (e.g. through road widening at junctions), and sets out reasons why the number of external trips in 2031 would be less per dwelling than surveys in the TRICS database (the national database of surveys typically used to estimate likely number of trips per dwelling). While I accept that trends in travel are showing a downturn in the number of trips, I don't think some of the assumptions are realistic.

Starting with TRICS data from actual surveys, the prediction of external trips (trips entering and leaving the site) is reduced for a number of reasons;

- Internalisation of trips - people using on-site facilities, education and employment rather than going off site
- Innovation and home working
- Behavioural change due to the Travel Plan and sustainable transport infrastructure and bus services

I do not accept the predicted trip generation, and am in discussion with the applicant regarding the scale of the above reductions. However, notwithstanding what predicted number of trips is agreed, our position is still that the total impact (not the net impact compared to a previous assessment) on the network should be tested using the updated Bicester Transport Model.

If we are to accept substantial reductions in the prediction of external vehicle trips, there will need to be a stronger vision for sustainable transport, taking into account the issues raised above, and the travel plan.

### **Travel Plan**

The travel plan is critical to achieve the low car usage predicted. The TA assumes a 15% reduction in external car trips as a result of the travel plan. A draft framework travel plan has been included with the application but OCC do not consider it to be sufficiently robust to support this reduction and further discussions are recommended with the OCC Travel Plans team.

Because the travel plan is critical to reducing car trip generation, it will need to be agreed before planning permission is granted, and attached to the S106 agreement. Payments will need to be secured in the event that the travel plan measures are not delivered, to allow OCC to step in and deliver the plan.

A Travel Plan Co-ordinator for the site (to promote initiatives across the development as soon as the elements are occupied) should be provided. This would be in addition to TPC's for the individual land use elements triggering the need for a travel plan.

A Framework Travel Plan for the site has been submitted but it is missing some of the required information, especially regarding detail about the various elements of the site. This document also stipulates that it should be read alongside the submitted transport assessment. A Travel Plan should be a stand-alone document including all the required information, relevant to the development. Whilst it is fairly easy to consult subsidiary documents during the planning process, it can be more problematic for individuals progressing the content of the document at a later stage.

Confirmation as to the exact sizing of some of the elements (especially those within the mixed-use local centre) are required before definitive travel plan requirements can be specified. However, based on the initial information the likely requirements are

- Framework Travel Plan for the development and associated monitoring fee of £2,379 (RPI index linked).
- Residential Travel Plan and associated monitoring fee of £2,379 (index linked).
- A Residential Travel Information Pack is required prior to first occupation and then distributed to all residents at the point of occupation. Reason – to ensure all residents are aware of the travel choices available to them from the outset.
- Travel Plans or Travel Plan Statements for the employment elements of the site with associated monitoring fees.
- A travel plan for the care provision element of the site – monitoring fee will be dependent on the number of beds

- School Travel Plan for the new primary school and associated monitoring fee of £1,446 (index linked)
- A School Travel Plan is required for the proposed Gagle Brook expansion and associated monitoring fee of £1,446
- The requirements for the local centre will be determined once further information is known but it is likely that either Travel Plans (with associated monitoring fees) or statements will be required.

Further information about exacting travel plan criteria can be found within appendices 4, 5, 7 and 8 of the OCC guidance documents 'Transport for New Developments – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans March 2014'.

Both this and the Travel Information Pack guidance can be found on the Travel Plan pages of the OCC website.

All travel plans and statements should be updated:

Residential element - 50% of the site/ 1550<sup>th</sup> dwelling

Education provision – 3 months post occupation of the site

Employment element – 3 months post occupation of the site

Care provision – 3 months post occupation of the site

Local community use - dependant on final occupancy levels

### **Road Agreements**

- All works on the highway will require a S278 agreement with OCC. The Highway boundary needs to be checked with OCC Highway Records ([highway.records@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:highway.records@oxfordshire.gov.uk)) to determine whether or not it coincides with the site boundary at the proposed access junctions. The highway boundary is usually identified along the roadside edge of the ditch. I note there are ditches either side of Bucknell Road.
- If on-site bridges are proposed for adoption they will require AIP and structural sign off.
- Where the site is tying in to the existing Exemplar Phase, this should be covered within the Section 38 application.
- If the main spine road is proposed to be a bus route we would ask that there is no blockwork surfacing
- The on site roads applications will need to comply with OCC Street Design Guide.
- Offsite works will need to be designed in accordance with DMRB.
- All new developments will need a 20mph speed limit and supporting Traffic Regulation Order and self-enforcing measures.



- The carriageways that are straight for over 70m will require some form of traffic calming to ensure vehicle speeds are less than 20mph.
- OCC require a swept path analysis for an 11.6m in length refuse vehicle passing an on-coming or parked family car throughout the layout. The carriageway will require widening on the bends to enable this manoeuvre.
- Minimum width of carriageway width within 15m of a junction is 5.5m within phases.
- The footway width adjacent to the carriageway will need to be a minimum of 2m.
- Cycling facilities must accord with LTN1/20.
- Where there is not a footway adjacent to the carriageway a 6 metre wide shared surface block paved carriageway with a minimum 800mm grass margin on either side is required.
- A long section will be required to ensure compliance with the Equalities Act 2010. This must include details of the vertical alignment to determine appropriate carriageway and footway gradients. They will need to be DDA compliant i.e. maximum 1:21 or 5%.
- Junction and Forward Visibility Splays and dimensions must be in accordance with the OCC Street Design Guide and dedicated to OCC if they fall out of the existing highway boundary.
- Any vertical deflection along bus route to be subject to agreement with Bus operators (table tops etc.).
- No private drainage is to discharge onto any area of existing or proposed adoptable highway. The drainage proposals will be agreed at the Section 38 Agreement stage once the drainage calculations and detailed design are presented. Oxfordshire County Council have published the "[Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage on Major Development in Oxfordshire](#)" to assist developers in the design of all surface water drainage systems, and to support Local Planning Authorities in considering drainage proposals for new development in Oxfordshire. The guide sets out the standards that we apply in assessing all surface water drainage proposals to ensure they are in line with National legislation and guidance, as well as local requirements.
- Foul and surface water manholes should not be placed within the middle of the carriageway, at junctions, tyre tracks and where informal crossing points are located.
- Trees must not conflict with streetlights and must be a minimum 10 metres away and a minimum 1.5m from the carriageway. Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection.
- Trees within the highway will need to be approved by OCC and will carry a commuted sum. No private planting to overhang or encroach the proposed adoptable areas.

- The visitor parking bays parallel to the carriageway, can be adopted but accrue a commuted sum. Any other bays (echelon or perpendicular) or private bays will not be considered for adoption.
- No property including balconies should be within 500mm to the proposed highway. No doors, gates, windows, garage doors or gas/electric cupboards must open over the proposed highway.
- No Highway materials, construction methods, adoptable layouts and technical details have been approved at this stage. The detailed design and acceptable adoption standards will be subject to a full technical audit.
- OCC require saturated CBR laboratory tests on the sub-soil likely to be used as the sub-formation layer. This would be best done alongside the main ground investigation for the site but the location of the samples must relate to the proposed location of the carriageway/footway.
- Minor residential roads that serve four or fewer properties will not be considered for adoption. Roads serving 5 or more houses can be considered for adoption but will need to meet adoptable criteria set out in the OCC Street Design Guide (2021)

**S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):**

**Highway works contributions as detailed above**

**Towards:** Off site highway works needed to provide capacity to support the wider development (including this site) north of the railway.

**Justification:** The works were identified as part of the transport assessment carried out to inform the NW Bicester Access and Travel Strategy, which supports the NW Bicester SPD. The site is part of the NW Bicester development north of the railway, and would only be acceptable in the context of that development, and therefore must make a proportionate contribution to the cost of the works necessary to support this development.

**Calculation:** The amounts of the contributions are proportionate based on the number of dwellings compared to the contributions requested from 21/01630/OUT (Firethorn site)

**Public Transport Service Contribution as detailed above**

**Towards:** the cost of serving development at NW Bicester north of the railway by bus.

**Justification:** The bus service was identified as part of NW Bicester Access and Travel Strategy, which supports the NW Bicester SPD. This site must make a proportionate contribution to the cost of the public transport necessary to support this development.

**Calculation:** See Public Transport section above.

### **Public Transport Infrastructure as detailed above**

**Towards:** the cost of real time information displays at new bus stops.

**Justification:** Real Time Information is needed to provide the reassurance needed for people to feel confident using the bus. Needed to support the uptake of non-car modes.

**Calculation:** See above. Based on standard costs to OCC of installing Real Time Information displays.

### **Pedestrian and cycle improvements as detailed above**

**Towards:** The provision of high quality walking and cycle links between the development and Bicester.

**Justification:** Required to support the predicted low car trip generation by encouraging a high level of walking and cycling.

**Calculation:** An estimate will be prepared of the cost of providing the upgrade to the footpath alongside the railway, described above, together with related localised infrastructure improvements.

### **Public Rights of Way Contribution as detailed above**

**Towards:** Off site public rights of way improvements, in the vicinity of the site

**Justification:**

These are considered necessary to provide opportunities for leisure/health walking and connections to the nearby village of Bucknell, for residents of the wider NW Bicester development north of the railway, as well as opportunities to connect to the wider countryside to the north west via the Aldershot Farm bridleway. The routes will be easily accessible by residents of this site.

**Calculation:** Further details will be provided.

### **Travel Plan Monitoring Fee as detailed above - provisional depending on the number of travel plans required**

**Towards:** The cost of monitoring the travel plan over a its life.

**Justification:** The travel plan requires surveys to be carried out and revisions to be made as appropriate over its life. To be effective, this requires monitoring by council staff.

**Calculation:** The fee is based on an at-cost estimate of the staff time required.

### **S278 Highway Works:**

An obligation to enter into a S278 Agreement will be required to secure mitigation/improvement works, including all the accesses onto the public highway and the traffic calming on Bucknell Rd and in Bucknell village.

#### **Notes:**

This is to be secured by means of S106 restriction not to implement development (or other trigger point) until S278 agreement has been entered into.

The trigger by which time S278 works are to be completed shall also be included in the S106 agreement.

Identification of areas required to be dedicated as public highway and agreement of all relevant landowners will be necessary in order to enter into the S278 agreements.

S278 agreements include certain payments, including commuted sums, that apply to all S278 agreements however the S278 agreement may also include an additional payment(s) relating to specific works. An **additional payment** as set out below has been identified in relation to this development:

- Traffic regulation orders

### **S38 Highway Works :**

An obligation to provide on side roads, including the spine road and secondary street adjacent the school, plus strategic cycling routes will be required for the development. The S106 agreement will secure delivery via future completion of a S38 agreement.

The S106 agreement will identify for the purpose of the S38 agreement;

- Approximate location of the road/cycle route and information as to provision eg minimum width of carriageway, footways etc as appropriate, plus bus stops, shelters and flagpoles to be provided.
- Timing – this may be staged.
- Additional facilities/payments e.g. on-site bus infrastructure and related payments.

### **Planning Conditions:**

In the event that permission is to be given, the following planning conditions should be attached. Note that this is list is not exhaustive and other conditions may be recommended.

**Cycle parking:** Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted, covered cycle parking facilities shall be provided on the site in accordance with details which shall be firstly submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the covered cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development.

*Reason - In the interests of sustainability, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Construction Traffic Management plan:** Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved CTMP.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Travel Information Pack:** Prior to first occupation the development a Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the first residents of each dwelling shall be provided with a copy of the approved Travel Information Pack.

*Reason: To ensure all residents and employees are aware from the outset of the travel choices available to them, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

**Restriction on occupations prior to the opening of the Strategic Link Road (A4095 diversion) - wording TBC**

**Conditions** regarding phasing and provision of infrastructure are likely to be recommended.

### **Informative**

Please note, the Advance Payments Code (APC), Sections 219 -225 of the Highways Act 1980, is in force in the county to ensure financial security from the developer to off-set the frontage owners' liability for private street works, typically in the form of a cash deposit or bond. Should a developer wish for a street or estate to remain private, then to secure exemption from the APC procedure, a 'Private Road Agreement' must be entered into with the County Council to protect the interests of prospective frontage owners. For guidance and information on road adoptions etc. please visit our website.

**Officer's Name: Joy White**

**Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner**

**Date: 20 February 2022**

**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## **Lead Local Flood Authority**

### **Recommendation:**

Objection

### **Key issues:**

- Surface water drainage strategy plans to be provided.
- Surface water Catchment plans to be provided.
- Surface water flood flow routing plans to be provided.
- Windes calculations and modelling results to be provided.
- Infiltration report to be provided

### **Detailed comments:**

Thanks for providing the documents. These have all been reviewed, there are outstanding drawings and documents that needs to submitted.

The FRA explains the surface water drainage strategy however a surface water drainage drawing is required to demonstrate the surface water strategy. Proposed SuDS features and drainage infrastructure needs to be shown indicatively. Outfall locations to be shown, storage details of proposed SuDS features and infiltration rates if applicable.

The catchment areas have been broken down in the FRA, however a Catchment plan is required to highlight the extent of the areas. Stating the total impermeable area and the impermeable area including urban creep.

Surface water exceedance flow plans required to demonstrate how the site is draining to ensure all surface water is being picked up by the proposed drainage infrastructure.

Windes calculations and modelling of the proposed SuDS features to confirm capacity for the 1:100 year storm event plus 40 CC.

The FRA makes reference to an infiltration report however this has not been provided. If discharging surface water via infiltration, infiltration testing needs to be conducted according to BRE 365

**Officer's Name: Kabier Salam**  
**Officer's Title: LLFA Engineer**  
**Date: 14 January 2022**

**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## Education Schedule

**Recommendation:**

**No objection subject to:**

- **A planning condition** that no more than 500 dwellings could be constructed prior to the site transfer of the secondary school
- **S106 Contributions** as summarised in the tables below and justified in this Schedule.

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
<b>Primary and nursery education</b>	<b>£18,342,280</b>	<b>327</b>	BCIS All-In TPI	Primary education capacity serving the development
<b>Temporary Secondary School capacity</b>	<b>£896,484</b>	<b>327</b>	BCIS All-In TPI	Temporary secondary education capacity serving the development
<b>Secondary education</b>	<b>£18,313,587</b>	<b>327</b>	BCIS All-In TPI	Secondary education capacity serving the development
<b>Secondary school land contribution</b>	<b>£1,836,483</b>	<b>Nov-20</b>	RPIX	Land for a new secondary school serving the area
<b>Special education</b>	<b>£1,606,364</b>	<b>327</b>	BCIS All-In TPI	Special school education capacity serving the development
<b>Total</b>	<b>£ 40,995,198</b>	<b>327</b>	BCIS All-In TPI	

	ha	Use
<b>Land</b> (remediated and serviced)	3.01	Provision of 2.5 form entry primary school
<b>Land</b> (remediated and serviced)	0.79	Expansion of Gagle Brook Primary School to 2FE



**S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):**

**£18,342,280 Primary and Nursery School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327**

**Justification:**

Primary school provision for the northern portion of the strategic development at NW Bicester development was in the first instance delivered through a new primary school - now opened (in 2018) as Gagle Brook Primary School - built on the exemplar development. In order to provide sufficient capacity for the exemplar site, Gagle Brook Primary School was forward-funded as a 1-form entry school by Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire County Council, and planned for future expansion to 2 forms of entry. Pupil generation from other planned and permitted sites is already expected to fill the existing 1 form entry capacity, and therefore this development would be expected to fully fund the expansion to 2 forms of entry, which will provide an additional 236 primary and nursery places.

For the whole strategic NW Bicester development there are expected to be at least two, and up to three, further new primary schools. One of these schools is to be delivered via this development (as is the land required for the expansion of Gagle Brook Primary School.)

Based on the information provided, the housing included in this application has been assessed as generating 823 additional pupils requiring state school primary and nursery education provision.

The primary education contribution from this application therefore comprises two elements:

1. Land and funding to expand Gagle Brook Primary School from 1 form entry to 2 form entry, providing 236 of the additional primary and nursery places required. Financial contributions will be based on the estimated cost per pupil of expanding a primary school, as advised by the Department for Education. The land necessary for this expansion has been previously identified, and must be provided at zero cost to the council.

2. The balance of need (587 places) must be met through a new primary school of a scale sufficient to fully meet the pupil generation expected. The smallest scale of primary school which would meet this need is a 2.5 form entry school (630 primary and nursery places). The estimated cost of a 2.5 form entry primary school is £13,887,000, and the full cost of this would need to be met by this development; the county council is willing to consider the developer directly delivering the school. A 3.01ha site is required at zero cost from this development for a 2.5 form entry school.

To ensure primary school places are available within easy walking/cycling distance of these proposed new homes, it will be important for the additional primary school capacity included within its boundaries to be provided in a timely manner. It would be expected that the expansion of Gagle Brook Primary School would happen first, but the timing and details of both the expansion and the new school will be subject to further discussion.

**Calculation:**

Number of places provided by expanding Gagle Brook to 2FE	236
Estimated cost of expanding a primary school	£18,878
Pupils * cost =	£4,455,280
Estimated cost of a 2.5 form entry primary school with nursery places	£13,887,000
Total primary contributions required (Gagle Brook expansion + New primary school) =	<b>£18,342,280</b>

**£18,313,587 Secondary School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327**

**Justification:**

The secondary education needs of the NW Bicester strategic development will be met through a new secondary school, due to be delivered within application 14/01641/OUT. This application should make a proportionate contribution towards this new school. To allow phasing of the school construction, in the first instance, a 600-place secondary school is expected to be built, the cost of which is estimated to be £19,942,200 (TPI=327). A proportionate share of this cost for 551 pupils would therefore be £18,313,587.

**Calculation:**

Number of secondary pupils expected to be generated	551
Estimated per pupil cost of a new 600-place secondary school	£33,237
Pupils * cost =	<b>£ 18,313,587</b>

**£1,836,483 Secondary School Land Contribution indexed from RPIX (Nov-20)**

**Justification:**

The proposed secondary school site is on land that forms part of the planning application reference 14/01641/OUT. This development would be expected to contribute proportionately towards the cost of this land.

**Calculation:**

Number of secondary (including sixth form) pupils expected to be generated	551
Estimated per pupil cost of land for the new secondary school (using Nov 20 prices)	£3,333
Pupils * land cost per pupil =	<b>£1,836,483</b>

**£896,484 Secondary School Temporary Unit Contribution indexed from TPI = 327**

**Justification:**

In the event that the first occupation at this development is before the building of the planned new secondary school, a financial contribution will be required towards three double unit temporary classrooms to provide off-site early secondary school places for pupils generated by the development.

**Calculation:**

Number of double unit temporary classrooms required	3
Cost per double unit temporary classroom (TPI = 327)	£298,828
Number of classrooms * cost =	<b>£ 896,484</b>

**Planning condition required**

As it is yet to be confirmed when the planned new secondary school will be constructed, we would require a planning condition that no more than 500 dwellings could be constructed prior to the site transfer of the secondary school.

**£1,606,364 Special School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327**

**Justification:**

Government guidance is that local authorities should secure developer contributions for expansion to special education provision commensurate with the need arising from the development.

Approximately half of pupils with Education Needs & Disabilities (SEND) are educated in mainstream schools, in some cases supported by specialist resource bases, and approximately half attend special schools, some of which are run by the local authority and some of which are independent. Based on current pupil data, approximately 0.9% of primary pupils attend special school, 2.1% of secondary pupils and 1.5% of sixth form pupils. These percentages are deducted from the mainstream pupil contributions referred to above and generate the number of pupils expected to require education at a special school.

The county council's Special Educational Needs & Disability Sufficiency of Places Strategy is available at <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/schools/our-work-schools/planning-enough-school-places> and sets out how Oxfordshire already needs more special school places. This is being achieved through a mixture of new schools and expansions of existing schools.

The proposed development is expected to further increase demand for places at SEN schools in the area, and a contribution towards expansion of SEN school capacity is therefore sought based on the percentage of the pupil generation who would be expected to require places at a special school, based on pupil census data. (This amount of pupils has been deducted from the primary and secondary pupil generation quoted above.)

**Calculation:**

Number of pupils requiring education at a special school expected to be generated	17.9
Estimated per pupil cost of special school expansion	£89,741
Pupils * cost =	<b>£ 1,606,364</b>

**Justification:**

The above contributions are based on a unit mix of:

398 x 1 bed dwellings  
789 x 2 bed dwellings  
1,346 x 3 bed dwellings  
568 x 4 bed dwellings

It is noted that the application is outline and therefore the above level of contributions would be subject to amendment, should the final unit mix result in an increase in pupil generation.

**Officer's Name:** Louise Heavey

**Officer's Title:** Access to Learning Information Analyst

**Date:** 04 March 2022

**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Land and SE of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## Property

### Recommendation:

#### **No objection subject to:**

- **S106 Contributions** as summarised in the tables below and justified in this response.

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Use of Community Building provided as part of community hub	N/A	N/A	N/A	The County Council expects that a community building will be required by Cherwell District Council and there will be opportunities for ad hoc use of rooms by the County Council e.g. renting rooms on an occasional basis to deliver some of its services.
Library	£164,742	TPI 327	BCIS	Towards the Bicester Library including book stock
Children's Services	£25,114	TPI 327	BCIS	Increased provision at Childrens Homes.

### Detailed Comments:

The County Council considers that the impacts of the development proposal (if permitted) will place additional strain on its existing community infrastructure.

#### **Community Building**

It is recognised that the needs of the development will likely result in the demand for a community building as part of a community hub captured under the District Council's infrastructure requirements. Any community building must include accommodation that is flexible and capable of being used to deliver support services particularly in respect of family safeguarding.

The County Council would therefore request that the community building provision includes:

- a community hall
- secure hall storage for multiple groups
- 'changing spaces' toilet facilities (12m<sup>2</sup>)

- a large meeting room (25m<sup>2</sup>)
- a small meeting room (10m<sup>2</sup>)
- kitchen / café / foyer facilities

The County Council would wish to be engaged regarding the design and specification of the community building to help ensure it holds the flexibility and durability in light of the multiple uses.

It is anticipated that agreement will be reached with the District Council for use of the community building as appropriate for ad hoc activities run by the County Council.

### **Library Provision**

**£164,742 Library Contribution** indexed from BCIS All-in Tender Price Index Value 327

#### **Towards:**

Towards the Bicester Library including book stock

A new library has been provided in the Franklins Yard development in Bicester. Part of the cost of the project was forward funded in advance of contributions being received from development. A contribution is required from this development toward repaying the cost of forward funding the delivery of Bicester library.

#### **Calculation:**

The Bicester Library project had a total cost of £1,450,000 to the County Council. Of this there is £262,233 still left to be secured.

$£262,233 \div 8,100$  (housing growth remaining for Bicester area) = £32.37 (per dwelling)

$£32.37$  (per dwelling) x 3,100 (number of dwellings proposed by this application) = £100,347

The development proposal would also generate the need to increase the core book stock held by the local library by 1.2 items per additional resident. The price per volume is £7.50 = £9 per resident.

$£9$  (per person) x 7,155 (number of people estimated to be generated by the development) = £64,395

Total Contribution (£100,347 + £64,395) = **£164,742** (BCIS All-in Tender Price Index Value 327)

## **Children's Home Provisions arising from Growth**

**£25,114 Children's Home Contribution** to be indexed linked from BCIS All-in Tender Price Index Value 327

The number of children in Oxfordshire is set to increase from 152,476 in 2017 to a forecasted 192,983 in 2031.

There is a rise nationally and locally in the number of children becoming looked after. There is also an increase in the number of children living in residential children's homes. The growth in the use of residential care is led by societal factors including the increased awareness of child sexual exploitation, the increased complexity of need and entry into care occurring later in childhood.

Both the local and national policy is to keep children in county where at all possible. Placing children away from their locality makes placements hard to monitor and can put children at additional risk. Feedback from the Children in Care Council indicated children wanted to remain in county wherever possible. They were also more likely to go missing if placed further afield. Stable school placements were also shown to be critical for the positive future outcomes of LAC's.

There is a strong national driver for Local Authorities to avoid placing children out of county as there is growing evidence that they are more prone to going missing and to being vulnerable to issues such as child sexual exploitation. There are also considerable challenges around transitions for young people into adult services which are only exacerbated when young people are placed out of county. Care pathways are more effectively managed when there is integrated working between the Local Authority, schools, health and housing partners in one locality. There are frequent difficulties in accessing suitable education and mental health provision for children placed out of county. This has led OCC to increase its capacity to look after their own children who require residential provision

Residential care is targeted mainly at children whose needs are unable to be met, at that time, in a family home setting. This predominantly affects children over the age of 12.

The County Council currently place 101 children and young people in care homes within Oxfordshire. The Council's population forecasts estimate 66,631 people aged 10-17, giving a rate of 15.16 children in every 10,000 who require residential accommodation.

The capital costs of a children's home for 4 children has been estimated to cost £2.1m (BCIS All-in Tender Price Index Value 327)

345 children have left the cared for system since April 2018, who were aged between 10-17. They had been cared for on average for 864 days or 2 years 4 months.



A building delivered is anticipated to provide 60 years of use therefore it can accommodate 102.85 placements during its period of use ( $60 / 2.333 \times 4$ )

The capital costs per child are therefore  $2.1m / 102.85 = \text{£}20,418$  per child

The number of children resulting from the housing development aged between 10 and 17 at any one time are forecast to be 811

15.16 in 10,000 children will demand residential care in Oxfordshire.

The number of children needing accommodation arising from this development will therefore be 1.23

**The capital contribution required is therefore  $20,418 \times 1.23 = \text{£}25,114$**

## **Fire Service**

Generic Requirements of Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service

### 1. Water Supplies for Fire Fighting

The requirements for water supplies for residential developments:

No residential property should be more than 150 (un-obstructed) metres from a fire hydrant on a water main of no less than a 90-millimeter nominal diameter. The location and number of fire hydrants will be determined by Oxfordshire County Council's Fire and Rescue Service *following a risk assessment once a water scheme has been received or once a copy of the existing water infrastructure has been supplied.*

The requirements for water supplies for commercial developments:

New developments will be required to be within and as a minimum, have a distance of no more than 100 metres from an existing hydrant, otherwise a new hydrant should be provided within 90 metres of an entry point and not more than 90 metres apart unless stated as otherwise within the guidelines on flow requirements for firefighting below. Generally and where a planning condition is imposed, the location and number of fire hydrants will be determined by Oxfordshire County Council's Fire and Rescue Service *following a risk assessment once a water scheme has been received or once a copy of the existing water infrastructure has been supplied.*

Where no piped water supply is available or there is insufficient pressure and flow in the water main, or an alternative arrangement is proposed, the alternative source of supply should be provided in accordance with the following recommendations:

- A charged static water tank of at least 45,000 litre capacity; or

- A spring, river, canal or pond capable of providing or storing at least 45,000 litres of water at all times of the year, to which access, space and a hard standing are available for a pumping appliance; or
- Any other means of providing a water supply for firefighting operations considered appropriate by the fire and rescue authority.

## 2. Guidelines on flow requirements for fire fighting

The following flows represent the ideal requirements on new developments and during permanent system changes. In some locations it is accepted that the existing distribution system will not allow the delivery of such flows.

### Housing

Housing developments with units of detached or semidetached houses of not more than two floors should have a water supply capable of delivering a minimum of eight litres per second through any single hydrant.

### Multi occupied housing developments

With units of more than two floors should have a water supply capable of delivering a minimum of 20 to 35 litres per second through any single hydrant on the development.

### Transportation

Lorry/coach parks - multi-storey car parks - service stations: all of these amenities should have a water supply capable of delivery a minimum of 25 litres per second through any single hydrant on the development or within a vehicular distance of 90 metres from the complex.

### Industry

In order that an adequate supply of water is available for use by the fire and rescue service in case of fire, it is recommended that the water supply infrastructure to any estate is as follows with the mains network on site being normally at least 150mm nominal diameter –

- Up to one hectare 20 litres per second.
- One to two hectares 35 litres per second.
- Two to three hectares 50 litres per second.
- Over three hectares 75 litres per second.

### Shopping, offices, recreation and tourism

Commercial developments of this type should have a water supply capable of delivering a minimum flow of 20 to 75 litres per second to the development site.

### Education, health and community facilities

#### Primary schools and single storey health centres

Should have a water supply capable of delivering a minimum flow of 20 litres per second through any single hydrant on the development or within a vehicular distance of 70 metres from the complex

Secondary schools, colleges, large health and community facilities

Should have a water supply capable of delivering a minimum flow of 35 litres per second through any single hydrant on the development or within a vehicular distance of 70 metres from the complex.

Village halls

Should have a water supply capable of delivering a minimum flow of 15 litres per second through any single hydrant on the development or within a vehicular distance of 100 metres from the complex.

However, these requirements may be lessened with the provision of suitable suppression systems within the dwellings/premises (see below).

### 3. Fire Suppression Systems

Fires in the home still account for the greatest number of fire deaths and injuries each year and, therefore, the installation of automatic fire suppression systems, such as sprinklers, in domestic premises is something that Oxfordshire County Council's Fire and Rescue Service strongly advocate. More and more vulnerable people with less mobility are remaining in their own homes and the evacuation policy of "get out, stay out, call 999" is becoming increasingly less appropriate as a result of an ageing demography. Additionally, automatic fire suppression systems can increase the sustainability and life expectancy of buildings by limiting fire development and significantly reducing the amount of smoke, CO<sub>2</sub> and other pollutants.

For any system that has the potential to improve safety in the communities, we will provide a commitment of early dialogue with developers to explore the potential use and the level of compensatory features this would provide. This will include financial contributions that we might otherwise require by virtue of Section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy.

#### Arson & Deliberate Fires

Oxfordshire County Council's Fire and Rescue Service supports the UK Police's 'Secured by Design' principles and design guides in aiming to minimise opportunities for antisocial behaviour (ASB) through good design and layout that can also reduce arson and deliberate fire setting.

Deliberate fires have a significant impact on communities. Whilst the financial cost for all public services, can be calculated, what is more difficult to quantify is the wider adverse impact on communities. Types of fires and their causation range from; anti-social behaviour (ASB) of small refuse fires through to vehicle fires and property fires.

Areas for consideration within the design scope should include the following:

- Security of premises both internal and external
- Disposal of refuse and location of refuse bins
- Lighting and movement of people through the complex

- CCTV in public spaces
- Open spaces, layout, construction (type of materials used) and community equipment placed into them
- Visibility designing out secluded locations
- Through-roads and cul-de-sacs

**Officer's Name: Richard Oliver**

**Officer's Title: Infrastructure Funding Negotiator**

**Date: 16 February 2022**

**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## **Archaeology**

### **Recommendation:**

No objection subject to conditions

### **Key issues:**

The site is located in an area of archaeological interest as identified by a desk-based assessment, a geophysical survey and a trenched evaluation. A further programme of archaeological investigation and mitigation will need to be undertaken ahead of any development. This can be secured through a condition on any resultant planning permission.

### **Legal agreement required to secure:**

### **Conditions:**

4. Prior to any demolition and the commencement of the development, a professional archaeological organisation acceptable to the Local Planning Authority shall prepare an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, relating to the application site area, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To safeguard the recording of archaeological matters within the site in accordance with the NPPF (2021).

2. Following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 1, and prior to any demolition on the site and the commencement of the development (other than in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation), a staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority within two years of the completion of the archaeological fieldwork.

Reason – To safeguard the identification, recording, analysis and archiving of heritage assets before they are lost and to advance understanding of the heritage assets in their

wider context through publication and dissemination of the evidence in accordance with the NPPF (2021).

**Informatives:**

**Detailed comments:**

The site is located in an area of archaeological interest as identified by a desk-based assessment, a geophysical survey and a trenched evaluation. The geophysical survey and evaluation identified a number of areas of surviving archaeological features including a Neolithic Pit, an area of Bronze Age activity including two possible 'burnt mound' deposits, a number of areas of Iron Age activity and a number of areas of Roman activity. This development will therefore disturb these surviving features and a further programme of archaeological investigation and mitigation will need to be undertaken ahead of any development.

We would, therefore, recommend that, should planning permission be granted, the applicant should be responsible for ensuring the implementation of a staged programme of archaeological investigation to be maintained during the period of construction. This can be ensured through the attachment of a suitable negative condition as suggested above.

If the applicant makes contact with us at the above address, we shall be pleased to outline the procedures involved, provide a brief upon which a costed specification can be based, and provide a list of archaeological contractors working in the area.

**Officer's Name: Victoria Green**

**Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist**

**Date: 20th January 2022**

**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## **Minerals & Waste**

### **Recommendation:**

No objection

### **Detailed comments:**

Thank you for consulting the Minerals and Waste Team on the above application. The application site does not fall within a Mineral Strategic Resource Area, nor is it close proximity in Waste Safeguarded Area. We therefore have no objection to the proposal.

However, we do have a number of comments.

The Environmental Statement Chapter 13, states that a Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan (CEMP) will address any construction effects arising from the proposed development. We hope this will include detail on the sources for the material used on site, and that they are sourced locally where possible. We would also hope that recycled materials are considered and used on site wherever possible. We would be interested to know more about how the development proposes to consider the Circular Economy in its construction.

The CEMP states that it will also include a Site Waste Management Plan which will be prepared for the construction phase prior to the development's commencement. We would be interested to know more about what is proposed to do with Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste arisings from the construction phase. We hope it sets out how the development proposes to minimise these arisings. We would also like to know more detail how the minimisation of waste has been considered once the site is occupied.

In addition, for note, to the North West of the site, on the other side of the M40, there are two proposed site nominations for mineral extraction (CR13 and CR19) which are being considered for possible inclusion within the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations. There is already mineral extraction taking place at Dewars Farm which is around a mile away to the nearest point to the site.

There are also, again around a mile away from the proposed site, a number of waste operations taking place at Ardley, including Ardley Energy from Waste Facility, Ardley

landfill and Ardley HWRC. These are not mentioned in Appendix 12.1 of the Environmental Statement.

If further detail is required on either of these Minerals or Waste sites these, please do not hesitate to get in touch

**Officer's Name: Charlotte Simms**

**Officer's Title:** Minerals and Waste Local Plan Principal Officer

**Date:** 21 January 2022



**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## **Waste Management**

### **Recommendation:**

No objection subject to S106 contributions

### **Legal agreement required to secure:**

#### **No objection subject to:**

- S106 Contributions as summarised in the tables below and justified in this Schedule.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Price base</b>	<b>Index</b>	<b>Towards (details)</b>
Household Waste Recycling Centres	<b>£291,276</b>	327	BCIS All-In TPI	Expansion and efficiency of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC)

### **S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):**

**£291,276** Household Waste Recycling Centre Contribution indexed from Index Value 327 using BCIS All-in Tender Price Index

#### **Towards:**

The expansion and efficiency of Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) capacity.

#### **Justification:**

5. Oxfordshire County Council, as a Waste Disposal Authority, is required under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (Section 51) to arrange:

*“for places to be provided at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of waste so deposited”;*

*and that*

*“(a) each place is situated either within the area of the authority or so as to be reasonably accessible to persons resident in its area;*

*(b) each place is available for the deposit of waste at all reasonable times (including at least one period on the Saturday or following day of each week except a week in which the Saturday is 25<sup>th</sup> December or 1<sup>st</sup> January);*

*(c) each place is available for the deposit of waste free of charge by persons resident in the area;”*

6. Such places are known as Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) and Oxfordshire County Council provides seven HWRCs throughout the County. This network of sites is no longer fit for purpose and is over capacity.
7. Site capacity is assessed by comparing the number of visitors on site at any one time (as measured by traffic monitoring) to the available space. This analysis shows that all sites are currently ‘over capacity’ (meaning residents need to queue before they are able to deposit materials) at peak times, and many sites are nearing capacity during off peak times. The proposed development will provide 3,100 dwellings. If each household makes four trips per annum the development would impact on the already over capacity HWRCs by an additional 12,400 HWRC visits per year.
8. Congestion on site can reduce recycling as residents who have already queued to enter are less willing to take the time necessary to sort materials into the correct bin. Reduced recycling leads to higher costs and an adverse impact on the environment. As all sites are currently over capacity, population growth linked to new housing developments will increase the pressure on the sites.
9. The Waste Regulations (England and Wales) 2011 require that waste is dealt with according to the waste hierarchy. The County Council provides a large number of appropriate containers and storage areas at HWRCs to maximise the amount of waste reused or recycled that is delivered by local residents. However, to manage the waste appropriately this requires more space and infrastructure meaning the pressures of new developments are increasingly felt. Combined with the complex and varied nature of materials delivered to site it will become increasingly difficult over time to comply with the EU Waste Framework Directive 2008, enacted through the Waste Regulations (England and Wales) 2011 (as amended), maintain performance and a good level of service especially at busy and peak times.

**Calculation:**

Space at HWRC required per dwelling (m <sup>2</sup> )	0.18	Current land available 41,000m <sup>2</sup> , needs to increase by 28% to cope with current capacity issues. Space for reuse requires an additional 7%. Therefore, total land required for current dwellings (300,090) is 55,350 m <sup>2</sup> , or 0.18m <sup>2</sup> per dwelling
Infrastructure cost per m <sup>2</sup>	£275	Kidlington build cost/m <sup>2</sup> indexed to 327 BCIS
Land cost per m <sup>2</sup>	£247	Senior Estates Surveyor valuation
Total land and infrastructure cost /m <sup>2</sup>	<b>£522</b>	
Cost/dwelling	£93.96	
No of dwellings in the development	<b>3,100</b>	
Total contributions requested	<b>£291,276</b>	

**Detailed comments:**

Oxfordshire councils have ambitious targets to reduce the amount of waste generated and increase the amount recycled as demonstrated in our Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2018-2023. Enabling residents of new dwellings to fully participate in district council waste and recycling collections is vital to allow Oxfordshire's high recycling rates to be maintained and reduce the amount of non-recyclable waste generated.

Given the pressing urgency of climate change and the need to embed the principles of the circular economy into all areas of our society, we encourage the applicant to consider including community spaces that help reduce waste and build community cohesion through assets such as community fridges, space for the sharing economy (library of things), refill stations, space for local food growing etc.

At the reserved matters application stage, we expect to see plans for how the developer will design the development in accordance with waste management policies in Cherwell District Council's waste planning guidance.

Bin storage areas must be able to accommodate the correct number of mixed recycling, refuse and food recycling bins; be safe and easy to use for residents and waste collection crews and meet the requirements of the waste collection authority.

The development will substantially increase domestic waste arisings and the demand for all waste management services including Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs).

**Conditions:**

In the event that permission is to be given, the following conditions should be attached:

N/A

**Officer's Name: Mark Watson**

**Officer's Title:** Waste Strategy Projects Officer

**Date:** 7 January 2022

**Application no: 21/04275/OUT**

**Location:** Adj Lords Lane And SE Of Hawkwell Farm, Lords Lane, Bicester

---

## **Landscape / Green Infrastructure**

### **Recommendation:**

Consult District Council Landscape Officer.

### **Comments**

I have no comments to make. The Landscape Officer within the District Council should be consulted, and his comments taken into account.

**Officer's Name: Haidrun Breith**

**Officer's Title:** Landscape Specialist

**Date:** 28 January 2022