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

District: Cherwell Application no: 22/00747/OUT

Proposal: Outline planning application for the development of up to 370 homes, public open space (including play areas and woodland planting), sports pitches and pavilion, drainage and engineering works, with all matters reserved (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) except for vehicular and emergency accesses to Bicester Road. **Location:** Land At Bicester Road Kidlington

Response date: 13th May 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.

Assessment Criteria Proposal overview and mix /population generation

OCC's response is based on a development as set out in the table below. The development is based on a SHMA mix.

Residential	
1-bed dwellings	45
2-bed dwellings	127
3-bed dwellings	141
4-bed & larger dwellings	57

Based on the completion and occupation of the development as stated above it is estimated that the proposal will generate the population stated below:

Average Population	900.64
Nursery children (number of 2- and 3-year olds entitled to	funded
places)	24.73
Primary pupils	109.96
Secondary pupils including Sixth Form pupils	85.8
Special School pupils	2.25
65+ year olds	94.58

Strategic Planning

Our first response on this application is dated 28th April 2022. Please refer to that response in addition to this one.

Attached to this response are: Transport - additional comments to the objection lodged with the first response Lead Local Flood Authority – additional comments to the objection in the first response Education - repeated comments Minerals and Waste - no further comments to those in first response Archaeology - repeated comments Healthy Place Shaping - additional comments which are an objection

See also the following from our first response: Strategic Planning - comments Property - comments Waste Management - comments Landscape/Green Infrastructure - no comments Specialist Housing - comments

The current amendment to the application was lodged at the same time as we prepared our initial response and includes a Design & Access Statement, an Energy Note and a Technical note in response to Stagecoach's comments. Given that we are raising objections we expect that there will be a further amendment which we will respond to in due course.

Officer's Name: Lynette Hughes Officer's Title: Principal Planner Date: 13 May 2022

General Information and Advice

Recommendations for approval contrary to OCC objection:

If within this response an OCC officer has raised an objection but the Local Planning Authority are still minded to recommend approval, OCC would be grateful for notification (via planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk) as to why material consideration outweigh 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 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.

Transport Schedule

The comments in here are in response to Technical Note 6 by Brookbanks dated 8th April 2022 which has been written in response to observations raised by Stagecoach on this application.

<u>Comments</u>

OCC welcomes the applicant's willingness to provide an additional pair of bus stops to maximise trips by public transport, as indicated in Para 3.10 of Technical Note 6: Response to Stagecoach. The additional pair of bus stops will need to be located around the secondary access that would directly serve the parcel of land to be brought forward by Hill Residential Ltd. An updated masterplan and access plan shall need to be submitted indicating the location and links to this stop.

With this in mind, the applicant needs to be drawn to OCC's consultation response dated 28th April 2022 where we identified the need to provide a new pedestrian crossing at the northern end of the site. Details of this crossing must be presented at the outset, to assess its suitability on matters such as type of crossing, adequate visibility, land availability, desired speeds on the approach and lighting. Again, it is difficult to resolve without the understanding of the comprehensive plan of the entire PR7a site.

Para 3.12 appears to acknowledge significant improvements on the Kidlington roundabout, bffut no attempt was made in the TA to assess the development impact based on the proposed improvements. Given that the improved roundabout design is to greatly elevate the level of service of sustainable travel modes at the expense of car trips, it is reasonable to assume increased delays to car trips particularly on approach arms in order to enhance reduced journey times for public transport on the A4260 corridor.

Para 3.16 – 3.24... see OCC's consultation response dated 28th April 2022.

Officer's Name: Rashid Bbosa Officer's Title: Senior Transport Planner Date: 09 May 2022

Lead Local Flood Authority

Recommendation:

Objection

<u>Key issues:</u>

- Phasing plan to be provided which the reserved matter applications will adhere to.
- Existing watercourse capacity and ownership details to be provided.

Detailed comments:

Previous comments not addressed, see below for further details.

Phasing plan to be provided which the reserved matter application will follow, clearly stating the boundary of each phases. Each phase should consider flood risk and should have its own drainage strategy in place without relying on the other phases. It's understood so far that there will be two phases however this will need to be made clear on the phasing plan to ensure its followed during the reserved matter applications.

Existing watercourse capacity to be confirmed and whether it can take the proposed surface water discharge rates. Ownership details needs to be provided and consent to make the proposed drainage connection.

Officer's Name: Kabier Salam Officer's Title: LLFA Engineer Date: 11 May 2022

Education Schedule

No additional comments necessary as a result of the amendment of 28/04/2022. Original response restated for clarity.

Recommendation:

No objection subject to:

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

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Primary education	£ 1,699,020	327	BCIS All-In TPI	Primary education capacity serving the development
Secondary education	£ 2,670,150	327	BCIS All-In TPI	Secondary education capacity serving the development
Secondary education land	£ 233,023		RPIX Nov-20	Cost of land acquisition for a new secondary school
Special education	£ 260,248	327	BCIS All-In TPI	Special school education capacity serving the development
Total	£ 4,862,441			

<u>S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community</u> Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):

£1,699,020 Primary School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327

Justification:

Pupil generation from developments within PR7a and PR7b is expected to be accommodated through the expansion of Edward Field Primary School to 2 forms of entry (capacity of 420 primary pupils). The PR7 strategic sites are required to fund the construction of additional permanent accommodation sufficient for a 2 form entry school. The school currently has 11 primary classes in permanent accommodation, and to be 2 forms of entry it would require 14, i.e. three new classrooms would be required. The cost of these classrooms has been estimated on the basis of the DfE-advised cost of expanding primary schools of £18,878 per place multiplied by the 90 additional places which would be provided, giving a total of £1,699,020.

At this time, we do not have certainty that further parcels of the PR7 strategic allocation will come forward, and therefore require full funding of the expansion from this application.

Should other parcels within the strategic allocation be implemented, the cost would be shared proportionally between them. The mechanism for this will need to be agreed during the s106 negotiation.

£ 2,670,150 Secondary School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327

Justification:

All the CDC Local Plan Partial Review (PR) sites are required to contribute in a proportionate manner towards the additional secondary education capacity required.

To address the complexity of planning secondary school provision equitably across all the PR sites, the approach taken is that credit for any existing surplus places in the Woodstock-Begbroke-Kidlington area should be distributed across the PR sites in proportion to the number of dwellings allocated in the Local Plan. When the individual planning applications are assessed, the site's share of the surplus places will not be subject to secondary education contributions. A per-pupil cost rate will be applied to the remaining pupil generation. This cost will be based on the cost of building a new school in Begbroke of the scale needed to meet expected population growth, currently assumed to be 900-places.

The scale of surplus capacity has been assessed as a total of 200 places.

PR7a has an allocation of 430 dwellings in the Local Plan, which is 10% of the total allocated dwellings. It therefore benefits from 20 of the surplus places.

However the current application is for only part of PR7a, and proposes only 370 dwellings, or 86% of the allocation. It therefore benefits from 86% of the 20 surplus places allocated to PR7a, equivalent to 17 places. The other 3 surplus places will be allocated to any future application within the PR7a boundary.

The estimated gross secondary pupil generation from the current application is 92. Deducting the 17 surplus places, the estimated net secondary pupil generation from the current application is 75.

The net pupil generation is charged at the per pupil cost of building a 900-place school on the Begbroke site, which is £35,602 excluding land (at BCIS TPI=327).

Calculation:

Number of secondary pupils expected to be generated net of surplus places	75
Estimated per pupil cost of building a new 900 place secondary school	£35,602
Pupils * cost =	£ 2,670,150

£233,023 Secondary School Land Contribution (RPIX Nov-20)

Justification:

A contribution is also required towards secondary school site acquisition land costs, proportionate to Local Plan allocated dwelling numbers.

Calculation:

The required site area for a 900-place secondary school is 6.77ha. Based on an educational land value of $\pounds409,761/ha$ @ TPI=327 this gives a total cost of $\pounds2,774,082$.

This application accounts for 370 of the total PR allocation of 4,400 dwellings, or 8.4%. It should therefore contribute 8.4% of the land value, which is £233,023.

£260,248 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 <u>https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/schools/our-work-schools/planning-enough-school-places</u> 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	2.9
Estimated per pupil cost of special school expansion	£89,741
Pupils * cost =	£ 260,248

The above contributions are based on a unit mix of:

60 x 1 bed dwellings 106 x 2 bed dwellings 143 x 3 bed dwellings 60 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:** 28 April 2022

Archaeology

Recommendation:

An archaeological evaluation has taken place across the site and further investigation will need to take place to fully mitigate the archaeological remains recorded.

Conditions:

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

1 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 programme of archaeological 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).

Detailed comments:

The proposal site lies in an area of archaeological potential, with small scale Roman occupation in the central field revealed through a geophysical survey and a subsequent archaeological evaluation. A report has been approved for the archaeological evaluation and a further phase of archaeological mitigation will need to take place prior to development of the site.

Officer's Name: Victora Green Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist Date: 29th April 2022

Minerals & Waste

Detailed comments:

No further comments to be made on this application in light of this additional information.

Officer's Name: Naomi Woodcock Officer's Title: Minerals & Waste Planner Date: 10 May 2022

Healthy Place Shaping

Recommendation

Objection: The Health Impact Assessment does not fully assess and recommend adequate mitigations to protect and promote health and wellbeing. It needs to be amended as set out in the comments below.

<u>Comments</u>

Our original response, dated 14th April 2022, was sent with the County Council's single response on 28th April 2022.

Further to those comments, which should be referred to in addition to that below, we have reviewed the submitted HIA.

Section 1 : Description of the project being assessed:

The description of the development is good but does not provide any information on the operational phases of the development. It would be helpful to understand which elements will be brought forward in the first phase of development so that it is clear when key infrastructure such as walking/cycling routes and access to green spaces will be provided.

Section 2: Identification of population groups affected by the development

This accurately describes the population affected by the development but fails to identify that the increased proportion of older people in Kidlington are a particular group whose needs should be considered by the HIA

Section 3: Identification of geographical area and associated health priorities

This is adequate but we would expect reference to the PR7a development brief and the healthy place shaping principles outlined in it. In addition relevant national guidance could be noted:

PHE 2021 A place based approach to addressing health inequalities

PHE 2017 Spatial planning for health

NHSE 2019 Putting health into place

Section 4: Assessment of health

There are some gaps in terms of potential mitigations that could be made to address the negative impacts of the development and to maximise the positive opportunities to promote health and wellbeing. The following additional recommendations should be included in relevant tables and the summary.

Mitigations and Recommendations

Physical activity

This does not note the importance of active travel (cycling and walking) to promote physical activity and reduce obesity. An important recommendation is that cycling and walking connections from the site to the existing community need to be provided in the first phase of development.

Healthy Food Environments

Opportunities for smaller scale community growing spaces such as through the planting of fruit trees and provision of planters in public spaces are not identified.

Air Quality

The potential negative impacts of construction traffic are identified – mitigation is expected in terms of a Dust Management Plan.

Traffic and Transportation

Given the importance of sustainable travel which is identified, it is expected that Travel Planning advice (not just information on public transport) will be provided to residents moving into the development to support modal shift to active travel. Use of Healthy Streets design guidance should be referenced to promote walking and cycling within the development. The proposed speed limit of 30mph for the primary route should be dropped to 20mph to promote safety and encourage walking and cycling.

Economy & Employment

Given that this part of Kidlington has not benefited from recent employment growth it is important that the development supports active travel to employment areas in the surrounding settlements.

Access to local services.

GP surgeries. The HIA identifies that the nearest practice has the highest patient to GP ratio and that the development will increase pressure on local healthcare provision. The mitigation proposed is that the site will provide healthcare services but this is unlikely to boost GP capacity. Additional financial contribution will need to be provided as part of S106 agreements to meet the increased demand for GP services from the new population. This is noted in the recommendations but should also be included in the summary

Further information should be provided which considers the impact of the development on:

- older residents and how it can maximise their health and wellbeing specifically in terms of how the public realm will be accessible for older people and enable social interaction.
- the mental wellbeing of young people notably in the opportunities to access and connect with nature across the site as well as to participate in sports that can promote mental as well as physical health.

Summary

While the main health challenges are summarised, this needs to identify the specific actions that the developer will address through the design and delivery of the development.

Officer's Name: Rosie Rowe

Officer's Title: Head of Healthy Place Shaping **Date:** 10 May 2022