

TECHNICAL NOTE

Job Name: Heyford Park
Job No: 50659
Note No: 008 Rev B
Date: 29th April 2022
Prepared By: Phil Rawlins
Subject: **Richborough Estates and Lone Star Land – TA Review**

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Stantec have been commissioned by Dorchester Group to undertake an independent review of a Transport Assessment (TA) produced for Richborough Estates and Lone Star Land in support of a planning application for land to the north of Camp Road and west of Chilgrove Drive at Heyford Park, Oxfordshire.
- 1.2. The proposed development sits adjacent to the Heyford Park development that forms Policy Villages 5 (PV5) in the Cherwell Local Plan.
- 1.3. At the time of writing a response to the planning application from Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) has not been received. We reserve the right to make further comments following receipt of OCCs consultation response.

2. Development Proposals and Context

- 2.1. The proposed development sits on land to the North of Camp Road and west of Chilgrove Drive at Heyford Park, Oxfordshire. The development lies east of land proposed for residential development by Pye Homes and south of land proposed for commercial development by Dorchester Group.
- 2.2. The proposals are for the development of 230 residential dwellings and construction of a new access onto Camp Road. For the purposes of the assessment set out in the report 250 dwellings have been assumed. The report suggests that this would allow for a small change in dwellings at reserved matters stage if required.
- 2.3. The TA has been prepared by Hub Transport Planning and includes several chapters setting out the baseline conditions, a policy review, information on access to the development and a review of the proposed impact of the development as would be expected for a report of this type.
- 2.4. This note is focussed on the impact assessment undertaken and the transport strategy for the site.

3. Assessment of Development

- 3.1. The impact of the development has been assessed using OCCs Bicester SATURN Model. This was the same assessment tool used to assess the impact of the proposed bus gate at Middleton Stoney agreed as part of the PV5 mitigation proposals.
- 3.2. The assessment has been based on a 2021 update of the model referred to as the '2031 Kingsmere Update' and has a forecast year of 2031. 2031 was the forecast year assessed in the PV5 TA.
- 3.3. The impact has been assessed at the following junctions.
 - M40, J10

TECHNICAL NOTE

- A43 / B4100
- B430 / Unnamed Road
- B430 / B4030 (Middleton Stoney)
- A4095 / B430
- A4095 / B4030
- B4030 / Unnamed Road
- Camp Road / Kirklington Road
- Camp Road / Somerton Road
- B4030/ Port Way
- B4030 / Station Road
- A4260 / Somerton Road
- A4260 / B4030 (Hopcrofts Holt)
- A4260 / Unnamed Road
- A4260 / Banbury Road / Unnamed Road
- A4260 / B4027
- A4095 / Portway
- A4095 / Bletchington Road
- A4095 / B4027
- Camp Road / Chilgrove Drive
- Camp Road / Site Access

- 3.4. These junctions were all assessed within the TA for the PV5 allocation, however, it is notable that an assessment of the B430 / Ardley Road junction has not been made. An assessment of the B430 / Ardley Road junction was requested by OCC for the PV5 allocation and mitigation has been agreed for this location as a result of this. On this basis we would consider that an assessment of this junction should be made.
- 3.5. The vehicular trip rates set out in the assessment are the same as the sensitivity test trip rates used within the TA for the PV5 allocation.
- 3.6. No assessment has been made of the predicted multi-modal trip generation of the development.
- 3.7. Distribution and assignment of the trips is derived from the Bicester SATURN model which is considered appropriate.
- 3.8. The modelling undertaken includes the full PV5 allocation and its associated highway mitigation measures. A new zone for the proposed development has been included within the modelling.

TECHNICAL NOTE

- 3.9. A review of the proportional impact of the development has been undertaken which has demonstrated that traffic impacts are less than 1% at 14 of the junctions tested. No further testing of these junctions was undertaken which is considered appropriate.
- 3.10. Due to the predicted proportional impact of development, the following junctions have been tested using industry standard junction modelling software
- B4030 / Unnamed Road
 - B430/B4030 (Middleton Stoney)
 - A4095 / B430
 - B430 / Unnamed Road
 - Camp Road / Kirtlington Road
 - Camp Road / Somerton Road
 - A4260 / Somerton Road
 - A4095 / Portway
 - Camp Road / Chilgrove Drive
- 3.11. Of the modelling undertaken the following is of note:
- 3.12. **B430 / B4030 Middleton Stoney** – It is not clear whether the junction has been assessed with or without the bus gate proposed as mitigation for the PV5 allocation in place, however, based on the results of the junction modelling set out in the TA it is assumed that it has been assessed with the bus gate. It is considered that an assessment of the junction without the bus gate should be made because at the current time a decision has not been made on whether the bus gate will be implemented.
- 3.13. The Middleton Stoney junction is predicted to operate over capacity in all of the scenarios tested with small increases in Degree of Saturation, Queuing and Delay at the junction in both peak hours on some arms. There are also some minor reductions in these measures on some arms which the report assigns to redistribution in the model. This redistribution is likely due to the increase in delay at the junction as a result of the proposed development. Traffic flow increases due to the development are predicted to be 17 (0.8%) in the AM peak and 5 (0.2%) in the PM peak, however, it is considered that the development would have a significantly larger impact in this location if redistribution effects were not being taken into account.
- 3.14. **A4260 / Somerton Road / North Aston Cross Roads** – The junction is predicted to operate over capacity in the AM peak hour in both the Reference and Test Case scenarios on the Somerton Road arm of the junction. Traffic flow increases on this arm are predicted to be 7 (5.5%) although it is likely that the model is redistributing traffic away from this junction due to the predicted delay. On this basis it is likely that the impact would be greater if the redistribution was not accounted for.
- 3.15. The TA sets out that the impact of the development on these junctions is small and therefore no further mitigation, beyond that proposed as part of the PV5 allocation, is considered necessary. However, on the basis that there is no guarantee as to when or if the proposed PV5 mitigation will come forward, we would consider that the impact of the development should also be tested against the current baseline position (rather than just with the PV5 mitigation in place) in order to identify the mitigation that would be required to support the development should the proposal come forward in isolation.

TECHNICAL NOTE

- 3.16. We would also consider it reasonable that the development is asked to undertake an assessment of its impact on local villages, as was undertaken for the PV5 allocation. This assessment should account for the direct impact of traffic associated with the proposed development and also traffic re-assigning as a result of congestion on the network in order to identify if mitigation is required in these locations.

4. Transport Strategy

Vehicular Access

- 4.1. The proposed vehicular access into the development is considered appropriate.
- 4.2. Generally, for a site of this size it is considered best practice to include an emergency access location and this is not mentioned in the TA. However, this is likely achievable through the proposed ped / cycle connection onto Chilgrove Drive bridleway.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access

- 4.3. A pedestrian and cycle path is to be provided east from the site access junction towards the Chilgrove Drive junction to the north side of the existing hedgerow providing access to the Chilgrove Drive bridleway.
- 4.4. A footway is proposed to run west from the site access junction to connect to the Pye Homes pedestrian proposals.
- 4.5. Pedestrian and cycle links are also proposed to connect directly into the Chilgrove Drive bridleway to the east of the development site.
- 4.6. Minor changes are proposed to the traffic calming / crossing facility proposed on Camp Road to the west of the access junction.

Public Transport

- 4.7. The TA commits the development to a contribution towards public transport provision of £1,051 per dwelling or a total of £262,750 based on 250 dwellings. It is not clear how this figure has been calculated, however no further improvements to the service (15 min frequency) over those proposed by PV5 are proposed.
- 4.8. As a comparison a contribution totalling £2.88M has been requested from the PV5 allocation. This totals £1,800 per dwelling.
- 4.9. The proposed site will benefit from the investment in services proposed as part of the PV5 allocation and therefore it is considered reasonable that either an equivalent contribution per dwelling is sought from this development or on the basis that no further improvements are proposed (and therefore the cost of providing the service remains the same), that the contribution secured from PV5 is reduced to take into account the contributions delivered by this development.

Other

- 4.10. A Travel Plan for the development has been prepared but has not been reviewed as part of this assessment.
- 4.11. The report does not include any information on the proposed car and cycle parking arrangements for the development.

TECHNICAL NOTE

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. This Technical Note comprises of a technical review of a Transport Assessment produced in support of a planning application for the development of 230 residential dwellings on land to the North of Camp Road and west of Chilgrove Drive at Heyford Park, Oxfordshire.
- 5.2. The following points were noted:
- An assessment of the B430 / Ardley Road junction has not been undertaken. An assessment of the B430 / Ardley Road junction was requested by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) for the PV5 allocation and mitigation has been agreed for this location as a result of this. On this basis we would consider that an assessment of this junction should be made.
 - A review of the multi-modal trip generation of the site has not been undertaken.
 - It is not clear whether the Middleton Stoney junction has been assessed with or without the bus gate proposed as mitigation for the PV5 allocation in place, however, it is assumed that it has been assessed with the bus gate. It is considered that an assessment of the junction without the bus gate should be made because at the current time a decision has not been made on whether the bus gate will be implemented.
 - On the basis that there is no guarantee as to when or if the proposed PV5 mitigation will come forward, we would consider that the impact of the development should also be tested against the current baseline position (rather than just with the PV5 mitigation in place) in order to identify the mitigation that would be required to support the development should the proposal come forward in isolation.
 - We would consider it reasonable that the development is asked to undertake an assessment of its impact on local villages, as was undertaken for the PV5 allocation. This assessment should account for the direct impact of traffic associated with the proposed development and also traffic re-assigning as a result of congestion on the network in order to identify if mitigation is required in these locations.
 - The proposed site will benefit from the investment in services proposed as part of the PV5 allocation and therefore it is considered reasonable that either an equivalent contribution per dwelling is sought from this development or on the basis that no further improvements are proposed (and therefore the cost of providing the service remains the same), that the contribution secured from PV5 is reduced to take into account the contributions delivered by this development.
 - The car and cycle parking proposals for the development have not been included within the TA.

DOCUMENT ISSUE RECORD

Technical Note No	Rev	Date	Prepared	Checked	Reviewed (Discipline Lead)	Approved (Project Director)
Heyford Park TN008	-	27/04/22	PR	-	-	NT
Heyford Park TN008	A	27/04/22	PR	-	-	-
Heyford Park TN008	B	29/04/22	PR	-	-	-

This report has been prepared by Stantec UK Limited ('Stantec') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which Stantec was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). Stantec accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.