

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 22/01488/OUT

Proposal: Construction of up to 140,000 sq m of employment floorspace (use class B8 with ancillary offices and facilities) and servicing and infrastructure including new site accesses, internal roads and footpaths, landscaping including earthworks to create development platforms and bunds, drainage features and other associated works including demolition of the existing farmhouse

Location: OS Parcel 5616 South West Of Huscote Farm And East Of, Daventry Road, Banbury OX17 2BH

Response Date: 15th July 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 taken from the application form.

Commercial – use class	m²
B8	140000

Application no: 22/01488/OUT

Location: OS Parcel 5616 South West Of Huscote Farm And East Of, Daventry Road, Banbury OX17 2BH

General Information and Advice

Recommendations for approval contrary to OCC objection:

If within this response an OCC officer has raised an objection but the Local Planning Authority are still minded to recommend approval, OCC would be grateful for notification (via planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk) as to why material consideration outweighs OCC's objections, and to be given an opportunity to make further representations.

Outline applications and contributions

The anticipated number and type of dwellings and/or the floor space may be set by the developer at the time of application which is used to assess necessary mitigation. If not stated in the application, a policy compliant mix will be used. The number and type of dwellings used when assessing S106 planning obligations is set out on the first page of this response.

In the case of outline applications, once the unit mix/floor space is confirmed by reserved matters approval/discharge of condition a matrix (if appropriate) will be applied to establish any increase in contributions payable. A further increase in contributions may result if there is a reserved matters approval changing the unit mix/floor space.

Where a S106/Planning Obligation is required:

- **Index Linked** – in order to maintain the real value of S106 contributions, contributions will be index linked. Base values and the index to be applied are set out in the Schedules to this response.
- **Administration and Monitoring Fee - TBC**
This is an estimate of the amount required to cover the monitoring and administration associated with the S106 agreement. The final amount will be based on the OCC's scale of fees and will be adjusted to take account of the number of obligations and the complexity of the S106 agreement.
- **OCC Legal Fees** The applicant will be required to pay OCC's legal fees in relation to legal agreements. Please note the fees apply whether a S106 agreement is completed or not.

Security of payment for deferred contributions - Applicants should be aware that an approved bond will be required to secure a payment where a S106 contribution is to be paid post implementation and

- the contribution amounts to 25% or more (including anticipated indexation) of the cost of the project it is towards and that project cost £7.5m or more
- the developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure costing £7.5m or more
- where aggregate contributions towards bus services exceeds £1m (including anticipated indexation).

A bond will also be required where a developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure.

The County Infrastructure Funding Team can provide the full policy and advice, on request.

Application no: 22/01488/OUT

Location: OS Parcel 5616 South West Of Huscote Farm And East Of, Daventry Road, Banbury OX17 2BH

Strategic Comments

This outline planning application seeks permission for the construction of up to 140,000 sqm of B8 employment floorspace with ancillary offices and facilities.

The application site is located on unallocated land to the east of Junction 11 on the M40, on the eastern edge of Banbury. It is also adjacent to Banbury 15 allocated in the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 for Employment Land West of the M40.

The Planning Inspector's Report on the Examination into the Cherwell Local Plan commented on Banbury 15, which originally extended from the boundary with the M40 and across the A361 to the fields east of the A361. The Inspector concluded that only the smaller portion of the site bound by the M40 to the west and the A361 to the east (now known as "Frontier Park") would be appropriate for development in this Plan period. The Inspector also highlighted the severe congestion and air quality issues at Junction 11, along Hennef Way in particular.

The County is raising Transport Development Control and Lead Local Flood Authority objections. Also attached are detailed Archaeology comments.

Officer's Name: Jonathan Wellstead

Officer's Title: Principal Planner

Date: 15/07/2022

Application no: 22/01488/OUT

Location: OS Parcel 5616 South West Of Huscote Farm And East Of, Daventry Road, Banbury OX17 2BH

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reasons:

- The site is in an unsustainable location for walking and cycling
- The primary access roundabout is too close to the M40 Junction 11 as it will cause occasional severe congestion
- Any further development around Junction 11 of the M40 will add to the severe congestion and air quality problems on the A422, particularly along Hennef Way – this development does not demonstrate how it would reduce its impact on these issues through adequate sustainable travel connections or by highway improvements
- Safe and suitable operation of affected highway junctions has not been demonstrated by the use of a suitable analysis tool.

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 a S278 agreement, to mitigate the impact of the development plus planning conditions as detailed below.

S106 Contributions

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Strategic Transport (1)	1,069,970	March 2019	Baxter	A highway improvement scheme to relieve congestion on Hennef Way
Strategic Transport (2)	To be confirmed		Baxter	Delivery of the A422 to Overthorpe Road link road, or alternative scheme
Public transport services	600,000	May 2022	RPI-x	To establish a bus service to the site
Travel Plan Monitoring	2,563	May 2022	RPI-x	Monitoring of the Framework Travel

				Plan
Admin Fee	To be confirmed			Administration of the S106
Total				

Other obligations:

- Off-site highway works –
 - a signalised crossing of the A361
 - widening of the A361 to incorporate a right-turn filter lane at the priority junction access
 - modifications to the alignment of the A361 at the roundabout access
- On site highway works –
 - two new vehicular access points to the A361

Comments:

Introduction

This application is for up to 140,000 sqm of B8 Employment floorspace located between the A361 and A422, close to Junction 11 on the M40.

It is an Outline application with all matters reserved. However, access needs to be considered at this time as it is fundamental to the determination of this application. Comments are also made on the layout as significant changes will be required before the reserved matters stage.

Principle of Development and required mitigation

The proposed site is not allocated for development in the Cherwell District Council Plan. The Planning Inspector’s Report on the Examination into the Cherwell Local Plan commented on Banbury 15, which originally extended from the boundary with the M40 and across the A361 to the fields east of the A361. The Inspector concluded that only the smaller portion of the site bound by the M40 to the west and the A361 to the east (now known as “Frontier Park”) would be appropriate for development in this Plan period. He commented:

‘In addition, for the whole site to be developed as a mainly road based B2/B8 employment scheme, major contributions are likely to be necessary to other transport and highway improvements, especially to the motorway junction itself. There is no clear evidence that an acceptable programme of works could viably and practically be delivered, taking into account the impacts of other developments committed in the plan.’
 (Para. 203, Page 41 of Inspector’s Report).

The Inspector highlighted the severe congestion and air quality issues at Junction 11, along Hennef Way in particular, and also made this comment regarding traffic generation:

'Moreover, there are acknowledged barriers to delivery of the whole Ban 15 site at J11, including that the traffic movements likely to be generated would trigger the need for the new South East relief road through the town.' (Para. 202, Page 41 of Inspector's Report).

The South East relief road is discussed in the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4), which also includes other mitigation measures for Banbury.

LTP4 states *"The increase in Local Plan growth to the south of Banbury has renewed the need to investigate the opportunities, costs and benefits of a link road over the railway for the post 2024 period, to manage traffic movements within the town."*

No decision has been taken to date on the requirement for a SE relief road or the route it may take. In principle, such a road would relieve existing pressure on Junction 11 in order to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development. However, as the Inspector has pointed out, *there is no clear evidence that an acceptable programme of works could viably and practically be delivered*, so there is no certainty that a South East relief road could proceed.

Area strategies for Transport, including for the Banbury region, will soon be compiled to accompany the new Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP), which was approved by OCC Cabinet on 21 June 2022 and goes to full Council for adoption on 12 July 2022. This strategy will outline whether OCC will continue to investigate the potential for a South East relief road.

There is greater commitment in LTP4 for a link road to the east of the M40 J11:

13. In the longer term (post 2024), there is likely to be a need for additional road capacity to manage anticipated traffic growth at M40 Junction 11.

- **A new link road east of Junction 11** will provide a strategic solution to helping mitigate the impact of traffic travelling to/from Banbury from surrounding areas including from the M40.

This is clarified in the Policy BAN1 with the following confirmed measure:

- Provision of a link road east of M40 Junction 11 (Overthorpe Road to A422).

The Local Plan Inspector viewed this link as the northern part of the south east link road and in reducing the size of the employment allocation acknowledged that this would remove the need for the link in the shorter term. This potential link road has, therefore, not been designed or costed to date and will be considered within the Local Plan Review and LTCP area strategy in terms of need and strategic fit.

If planning permission is to be granted, OCC will require a contribution to fund delivery of the link road or an alternate, unspecified scheme that will have a similar impact in reducing or reallocating local traffic flows to the Junction 11 roundabout, in order to create capacity for the proposed development traffic. The amount of this contribution is to be determined.

OCC will also be requiring a contribution towards measures along Hennef Way and adjoining roads, given the severe issues already experienced and the additional traffic to be generated by the site. This will be proportionate to the sum being paid by Frontier Park.

Access arrangements

The site would be connected to the existing highway network via two junctions with the A361, one either side of the junction being constructed for Frontier Park on the west side of the road.

The primary access would be a three-arm roundabout located just a little over 100m from the A361 exit on to the Junction 11 roundabout. This proximity is likely to cause occasional severe congestion issues and is a reason for objection. See further discussion below under Traffic Impact. It has not been demonstrated that there is sufficient distance to accommodate the necessary direction signage.

The secondary access would be a priority junction, approximately 450m north of the primary access and approximately 200m north of the Frontier Park junction. A filter lane would be added to the A361 for right-turning inbound vehicles.

DMRB GG 119 recommends that a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be undertaken before planning consent is applied for, but this has not been included. Given the scale of the development and the changes required to the highway layout, a Stage 1 RSA would have been informative.

Active transport connectivity

OCC considers that there is inadequate connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists, which means that a safe and suitable access to the site cannot be achieved for all users. This is contrary to paragraph 110 of the NPPF and, therefore, a reason for objection.

Pedestrians would, realistically, only be able to reach the site from the Banbury Gateway shopping centre, via the underpass below the M40 and along the paths within the Frontier Park development to the A361, a distance of approximately 800m. As the site is roughly 500m wide, east to west, the majority of employees would have a walk of at least 1km to the nearest facilities. Furthermore, it is approximately 1600m to the

nearest residence, so the catchment area of north Grimsbury within the commonly accepted 2km maximum distance for a walking commute is relatively very small. This means that walking to work is not an option for nearly every potential employee.

As the walking route would entail crossing the busy A361, a signalised crossing will be required, on the desire line between Frontier Park and the site access, to ensure pedestrian safety along the only available route.

Any cyclists would also follow the same route from Banbury to the site. The only part of the route from the shopping centre that is designated for use by cyclists is a 3m wide cycle link, approximately 160m long, to the west of Frontier Park Zone A. Footways alongside roads in Frontier Park and the A361 are not cycletracks, meaning that cyclists will have to stay on road, which is not considered to be appropriate here as there will be a high proportion of HGVs and a large number of turning vehicles.

Public transport

Section 3.4 of the Transport Assessment refers to the existing public transport accessibility at the site. Unfortunately, since this was produced the Council has received notice from Stagecoach that service 200 will be withdrawn entirely in August 2022 and at the same time service 500 will no longer route via Chacombe, therefore taking it away from the stops on the A361.

Consequently therefore, whilst the Frontier Park application is delivering bus stops on the A361, as things stand at the time of writing this response there will be no bus services to this development other than those which can be secured by the £100,000 contribution. This is likely to be little or nothing in reality given the cost of bus service provision.

Section 4.3 of the Transport Assessment refers to Frontier Park and states that public transport accessibility was found to be acceptable. At that time, two buses per hour, six days per week, passed the site and both are currently scheduled to be withdrawn. Consequently:

- this applicant cannot rely on this previous decision to show the development is acceptable; and
- proportionality of contributions as set out in section 8.1 is not automatically acceptable.

In order to make this development acceptable a bus service will need to be provided at least for all shift and office hours change times for a prolonged period. A proportional contribution based on floor space for Frontier Park would result in a contribution of £280,000, which in the event there is no background level of service this would only be sufficient to maintain a new service for a maximum of two years.

Given the present situation OCC consider that a contribution of £600,000 would be appropriate in this instance, which could provide a sufficient level of service for four years. The £100,000 contribution from Frontier Park should be disregarded as it will almost certainly be exhausted prior to occupation of this development. Without such a contribution the site is likely to be inaccessible by public transport and should not be permitted.

No public transport infrastructure contributions are necessary as these are being dealt with by Frontier Park.

Site layout

Final layout of the development will be determined at the Reserved Matters stage. However, the design shown in the Illustrative Site Layout drawing (no. 05001 Rev. P8) is unlikely to be acceptable.

The internal street layout is simple, with each industrial unit being accessed directly from the distributor road which terminates at the primary and secondary access points. All footways must be 2.0m wide and car parking spaces at least 5.0m x 2.5m.

The County Council is concerned about the lengths of straight road that will encourage speeding. New *residential* developments in Oxfordshire must be designed for 20mph (ref. Decisions by the County Council, 8 December 2020). Although there are likely to be fewer pedestrians than on a typical residential street, there will be on-carriageway cyclists (unless a network of cycle routes is designed in) and a high proportion of HGVs. Therefore, consideration must be given to designing the street layout in order to restrict speeds to appropriate levels.

The Site Layout shows the road leading from the primary access to be a straight length of 460m, and directly serving only three of the ten Units. Many vehicles will therefore be travelling the full length, so are likely to do so at speed if not calmed somehow. Deviations or features are typically placed at a maximum spacing of 70m to reduce speeds. All three links of the distributor road have excessive straight lengths so a major adjustment to the road layout will be necessary before it may be considered acceptable.

An internal network of pedestrian and cycle paths should be incorporated to keep active travellers clear of the road network and to encourage these modes of transport. The network should emerge on the A361 at the location of the signalised crossing (to be provided by this development).

Traffic generation and trip distribution

The TRICS database has been used to determine the vehicle movements generated by the relevant land uses, which are reasonably estimated to be proportioned as 80% warehousing and 20% parcel distribution.

Appendix I of the TA incorrectly includes TRICS Category D - Industrial Estate rather than F – Warehousing. It is, therefore, not possible to verify the traffic generation for this land use.

Distribution of light and heavy vehicles is considered separately. Light vehicles are primarily linked to commuting journeys and local parcel distribution, so it appears reasonable that only 21% of these trips are on the M40. Conversely, the majority (67.5%) of HGV trips are on the motorway. (The HGV assignment in Table 10 does not add up to 100% as the split of the 5.5% to SW England in Table 9 is incorrect).

Traffic impact and modelling

The Transport Assessment (TA) acknowledges that six junctions need to be assessed. As they will all be within 2.4km of each other, there will be interaction between adjacent junctions. This can only be accurately represented and tested by use of the VISSIM microsimulation model, which has not been carried out.

Three standalone junctions have been assessed and these are considered individually below.

A361 / Proposed site access priority junction

Base case traffic flows are taken from a one-week survey in December 2021. This is not a “neutral” month so these flows cannot be taken as typical. Sect. 3.3.1 of the TA says that the survey data is for vehicle speeds only, but the Base Year flow in the PICADY assessment tallies with this data and there is no indication of any other source.

35% of traffic to/from the site is assumed to use the northern access, based on floor area, which appears to be reasonable.

There are discrepancies in some of the vehicle numbers in the Junction Matrix. For example, the TEMPRO Growth Factor for 2022-2032, AM, is calculated as 1.0917. Total vehicles for the A361 S to A361 N is given as 335 (Base Year + Committed + Development) and 357 (2032 + Committed + Development). This is equivalent to a growth factor of 1.0657, which is only 72% of the TEMPRO growth. Uplift factors used are not consistent and are generally less than the TEMPRO value, meaning that the future years analysis is unreliable.

A361 / Proposed site access roundabout

Again, the base case traffic flows are taken from a one-week survey in December 2021. This is not a “neutral” month so these flows cannot be taken as typical. Sect. 3.3.1 of the TA says that the survey data is for vehicle speeds only, but the Base Year flow in the ARCADY assessment tallies with this data and there is no indication of any other source.

There are discrepancies in some of the vehicle numbers in the Junction Matrix. For example, the TEMPRO Growth Factor for 2022-2032, AM, is calculated as 1.0917. Total vehicles for the A361 S to A361 N is given as 550 (Base Year + Committed + Development) and 571 (2032 + Committed +Development). This is equivalent to a growth factor of 1.0382, which is only 42% of the TEMPRO growth. Uplift factors used are not consistent and are generally less than the TEMPRO value, meaning that the future years analysis is unreliable.

M40 Junction 11 grade separated roundabout

Base case traffic flows are taken from a one-day survey in March 2022. This is not a “neutral” month so these flows cannot be taken as typical.

The first sheet of survey data in Appendix E gives queue lengths at the roundabout. There are two tables, although Arms D and E are missing from the right-hand table. Both sets of data are timed from 07:00 to 09:55, but it is assumed that the right-hand table should apply to the evening peak period.

Queue lengths on Arm A (A361) are misleadingly given for Lanes 1 and 2, even though there are two lanes over a distance of about 35m only. It is noted that the maximum queue length on Arm A is recorded as 19 vehicles at 07:45. Given the breakdown of vehicle types across the hour (79% cars, 17% LGV, 4% OGV 1 & 2/PSV), I estimate that a 19-vehicle queue will be at least 130m long. This means that the back end of the queue would be across the proposed site access roundabout and would impede the free flow of traffic into and out of the site. This, in turn, may block northbound A361 traffic and lead to congestion back to the Junction 11 roundabout.

The scenario described above is possible with the current, as surveyed, flows. If considered to be an average day, then queue lengths will be longer on half of all other weekdays.

From the Junction Matrix (Appendix H), A361 southbound flows, AM peak:

Base Year	489 vehs.	
Base Year + Committed + Development	773 vehs.	
2032 + Committed + Development	844 vehs	(773 x 1.0917 TEMPRO)

Therefore, it is predicted that there will be 73% more traffic (in 2032 c/w 2022) on the A361 entering the J11 roundabout in the AM peak. This will have a very significant impact on the length of queues and the resulting congestion in the area. It has not been

demonstrated in a VISSIM simulation that widening the A361 to two lanes between the proposed and existing roundabouts, and increasing the gyratory entry flare to three lanes, is sufficient to mitigate for the effect of the additional vehicles. Also, it has not been demonstrated that these proposed highway modifications are feasible, considering the level differences between the carriageway and the surrounding land. Indicative cross-sections and the relation to the highway boundary should be included.

Total flows to and from some of the roundabout arms have a maximum AM peak hour between 07:00 to 08:00, while others are between 08:00 to 09:00. The Trip Rate for Parcel Distribution Centres over the 7-8 period (1.046) is more than double that for the 8-9 period (0.445). Comparative trip rates for Warehousing are not known as that data has not been included in Appendix I but is similarly expected to be much higher over the earlier period. Therefore, analysis of the J11 roundabout, and other junctions, must include both AM time periods.

Travel Plan

This is a large site, currently without the necessary local infrastructure to support sustainable, active modes of travel. This is demonstrated by the fact that there are currently no bus stops in the vicinity of the site (paragraph 2.3.1 Framework Travel Plan), and no footpaths along the A361 (paragraph 2.4.1 Framework Travel Plan). If 1,900 employees are to visit the site daily, significant mitigating measures need to be put in place to reduce the reliance on the car. The success of the travel plan will depend on the initial infrastructure provided to support it.

A pedestrian link is provided under the M40 to access the Banbury Shopping Centre, but how long will it take for a member of staff employed at the furthest point of the development, to access it? Pedestrian and cycling routes throughout the development should be considered to enable pedestrians and cyclists to move quickly through the site without having to follow the road network.

Unfortunately, the Information submitted as part of this application is not detailed enough to provide a definitive list of travel plan requirements. It is advised that the applicant consults the thresholds contained within the OCC guidance document ('Transport for New Developments – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans March 2014') to determine what is required once exact sizes of each of the units are known. A copy of the guidance has been attached with this response for ease of reference. **It is likely that subsidiary travel plans (and associated monitoring fees) or travel plan statements will be required for each of the 10 individual units.**

It can be confirmed that a Framework Travel Plan and £2,563 monitoring fee will be required for the site. This is required prior to first occupation and should then be updated within 3 months once adequate survey data is available. A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted but this does not contain the level of detail required and so it is advised that the applicant consults the criteria within appendix 7 of the OCC guidance

document (referred to earlier in this response) to ensure all the required information is included before revising and resubmitting.

Cycle parking and EV charging for both vehicles and bicycles should be provided within the boundary of each unit.

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

£1,069,970 Strategic Transport Contribution (1) indexed from March 2019 using Baxter Index

Towards: a highway improvement scheme to relieve congestion affecting the A422 between M40 Junction 11 and Southam Road.

Justification:

The A422 and adjoining roads are already affected by severe congestion and consequent air quality issues, so the proposed development will intensify these problems. A contribution towards the cost of a scheme has previously been accepted as being necessary to make the Frontier Park development acceptable and the same would apply to this proposed development.

Calculation:

The Frontier Park contribution was based on the proportion of AM peak trips on Hennef Way generated by local plan allocated sites, extracted from the Banbury SATURN model. This proposal is not an allocated site so the same method of calculation cannot be used.

The most appropriate calculation is a comparison of the AM peak trips on the A422 (west of J11) generated by Frontier Park and the proposed development. These figures are taken from Appendix H of the TA.

Frontier Park	97 vehicles (55 eastbound, 42 westbound)
Proposal	138 vehicles (74 eastbound, 64 westbound)
FP contribution	£752,081

Contribution required = $(138/97) \times 752,081 = £1,069,970$

£To Be Confirmed Strategic Transport Contribution (2) indexed using Baxter Index

Towards: delivery of the A422 to Overthorpe Road link road, or alternative scheme

Justification:

LTP4 recognises that “*In the longer term (post 2024), there is likely to be a need for additional road capacity to manage anticipated traffic growth at M40 Junction 11.*”

Policy BAN1 says:

“BAN1 – We will seek opportunities to deliver transport schemes which will support the regeneration and growth of Banbury to 2031 and protect the historically sensitive areas of the town through:

- Provision of a link road east of M40 Junction 11 (Overthorpe Road to A422).”

Delivery of this link road, or an alternative scheme that will have a similar impact on the capacity of Junction 11, is necessary to make this proposal acceptable by creating additional capacity at the roundabout to accommodate traffic generated by the site.

Calculation:

The contribution is to be determined at a later date.

£600,000 Public Transport Service Contribution indexed from May 2022 using RPI-x

Towards: Establishment of a bus service to the site.

Justification:

Existing bus routes past the site are to be withdrawn. Therefore, to restore a feasible public transport option, which is necessary to make the proposal acceptable, the development must fund a bus service for a four-year period. The service must cover all shift and office hour changes.

Calculation:

Estimated cost per year = £150,000 x 4 years = £600,000

£2,563 Travel Plan Monitoring Fee indexed from May 2022 using RPI-x

Justification:

To cover the cost of monitoring the travel plan over a five-year period. A travel plan is a bespoke document and requires regular review and update in order to ensure that the measures are succeeding in delivering targets for sustainable travel. Without this monitoring the plan would not be effective.

Calculation:

The amount is based on the cost of OCC staff time, at cost, over the five-year period.

S278 Highway Works:

An obligation to enter into a S278 Agreement will be required to secure mitigation/improvement works, including:

- A priority junction site access from the A361, including widening to incorporate a right-turn filter lane
- A roundabout site access, including realignment of the A361
- A signalised crossing of the A361
- Repositioning of the speed limit to suit the northern site access

Notes:

This is to be secured by means of S106 restriction not to implement development (or occasionally 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. This will include the cost of making the TRO required to reduce the speed limit past the site.

Planning Conditions:

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

Site Access: Full Details

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the means of access between the land and the A361 and bus and pedestrian facilities on the A361, including position, layout, drainage, lighting, visibility splays and footways shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no obstruction of the visibility splays above 0.6m high. Thereafter and prior to the first occupation of any of the development, the means of access shall be constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details. *Reason - In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework*

Site Roads, parking and Turning Areas

Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development hereby approved, full specification details of the site roads, parking and turning areas including bus turning area to serve the development, which shall include swept path analysis, construction, layout, surfacing, lighting and drainage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by

the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to the first occupation of each phase of the development, the site roads and turning areas shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details. *Reason - In the interests of highway safety, to ensure a satisfactory standard of construction and layout for the development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Cycle Parking

The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until cycle parking spaces to serve the development have been provided according to details that have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All cycle parking shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking of cycles at all times thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by the local planning authority. *Reason: To ensure appropriate levels of cycle parking are available at all times to serve the development, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Pedestrian/cycle connection

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the pedestrian/cycle connections within the site and from the site to the A361 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the connections will be provided in accordance with the agreed details prior to occupation of the development. *Reason: To ensure safe and suitable access to the development for all people.*

Framework Travel Plan

Prior to occupation, a Framework Travel Plan meeting the requirements set out in the Oxfordshire County Council guidance document, "Transport for New Developments; Transport Assessments and Travel Plans" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. *Reason – to encourage occupiers to use sustainable modes of transport as much as possible in line with the NPPF*

Delivery and Servicing plan

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, a delivery and servicing plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Site deliveries and servicing shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plan. *Reason In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Government guidance within the NPPF.*

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. The CTMP shall include a commitment to deliveries only arriving at or leaving the site outside peak traffic periods. Thereafter, the approved CTMP shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details. *Reason - In the interests of highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.*

Officer's Name: Roger Plater
Officer's Title: Transport Planner
Date: 11 July 2022

Application no: 22/01488/OUT

Location: OS Parcel 5616 South West Of Huscote Farm And East Of, Daventry Road, Banbury OX17 2BH

Lead Local Flood Authority

Recommendation:

Objection

Key issues:

- Provide surface water catchment plan.
- Provide surface water drainage strategy drawing.
- Provide pond references which should correlate with the calculations.
- Provide consent from the relevant party to discharge surface water.
- Provide infiltration testing to confirm feasibility of infiltration systems.
- Provide existing culvert conditions.

Detailed comments:

Provide surface water catchment plan showing the extent of the areas and state the areas. Clearly show which areas drain to the relevant SuDS features. Allow additional 10% urban creep to the areas. Clarify the percentage build up assumed for the hard standing areas.

Provide pond references on the drainage strategy drawing which should read in line with the calculations.

Provide a drainage strategy drawing, showing the attenuation volumes, discharge rates based on Q_{bar} and outfall locations.

Provide consent from the relevant party to discharge surface water.

Provide infiltration testing to confirm feasibility of infiltration systems.

Provide existing culvert conditions.

Officer's Name: Kabier Salam

Officer's Title: LLFA Engineer

Date: 22/06/2022

Application no: 22/01488/OUT

Location: OS Parcel 5616 South West Of Huscote Farm And East Of, Daventry Road, Banbury OX17 2BH

Archaeology

Recommendation:

The site is in an area of archaeological potential, as defined in the submitted Desk Based Assessment, with the site immediately to the west recording Romano British remains during an archaeological evaluation. The proposal site should be subject to an archaeological evaluation prior to the determination of any planning application.

Key issues:

Legal agreement required to secure:

Conditions:

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021) paragraph 189, we would therefore recommend that, prior to the determination of this application the applicant should therefore be responsible for the implementation of an archaeological field evaluation.

This must be carried out by a professionally qualified archaeological organisation and should aim to define the character and extent of the archaeological remains within the application area, and thus indicate the weight which should be attached to their preservation. This information can be used for identifying potential options for minimising or avoiding damage to the archaeology and on this basis, an informed and reasonable decision can be taken.

Informatives:

Detailed comments:

The site is located in an area of archaeological interest and potential, with an archaeological evaluation immediately to the west of the proposed site recording features dating to the 2nd and 3rd Centuries AD (EOX6926), and a watching brief 1km south west of the site found the remains of Saxon boundary ditches (EOX2099). In the vicinity, Neolithic pits and a large Neolithic linear feature recorded 1.5km to the north west of the site, along with a Roman

settlement. A Bronze Age enclosure has also been excavated 1km northwest of the site and Bronze Age settlement evidence has been recorded 900m west of the proposed site. Iron Age settlement has also been recorded west of this proposal in the same area. A large enclosure has been identified from aerial photographs 1.2km north west of the proposed site which is thought to be of later prehistoric date, based on its form (MOX4535).

The proposed site itself contains relatively well preserved ridge and furrow which form part of a larger system of medieval and post medieval field systems crossing the county boundary into Northamptonshire. 700m to the south of the proposed development is the site of Nethercote Deserted Medieval Village (MOX26804). The extant ridge and furrow contribute to the setting of Nethercote DMV and suggest what the landscape could have looked like before the village was deserted.

An archaeological desk-based assessment has been submitted along with the application which highlights the archaeological features recorded in the surrounding area, as was recommended in the Pre-app advice.

The archaeological potential of the site will need to be investigated through fieldwork prior to the determination of this application, with the first phase of work comprising a geophysical survey.

Officer's Name: Victora Green

Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist

Date: 13th June 2022