ID	Criterion	Description	0 (FAIL)	1 (PASS)	Rating	Appraiser Comments
ATEPAF_101	**TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Quantitative analysis**	Transport Assessments should forecast the multi-modal movements generated by a development, quantifying the additional trip generation and the distribution and assignment	No Transport Assessment submitted; or the submitted Transport Assessment has failed to provide a suitable analysis upon which to consider movement to and from the site by active modes	Transport Assessment provides a quantitative analysis of the multi-modal trip generation of the development, considering the routing of those trips to inform further considerations about the impacts and quality of existing routes within and outside of the development	1	Original TA includes multi modal trip generation.
ATEPAF_102	**TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Qualitative analysis**	Transport Assessments must provide a qualitative analysis of the current infrastructure of the surrounding area, taking into account how additional movements across all modes of transport will impact upon the capacity of public transport, walking wheeling & cycling networks.	The submitted Transport Assessment has failed to provide a sufficient evaluation the quality of the walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure of the surrounding area which will be impacted by the development	The Transport Assessment provides a qualitative analysis of the accessibility of the site and highlights deficiencies in surrounding infrastructure in line with policy and guidance provided in LTN 1/20	1	Original TA includes accessibility assessment.
ATEPAF_103	**Local Amenities**	A mix of local amenities is provided within an 800m walking distance of all properties (either within the site or outside but accessed via an accessible walking network). Examples of local amenities include: - A food shop which sells fresh fruit and vegetables - A park or green space - An indoor meeting place (pub, café, community centre, place of worship) - A primary school - A post office or bank - A GP surgery	There are few or no useful amenities (i.e. such as those listed in the description) within an 800m (10 minute) walking distance of the whole site via an accessible walking route.	There are a sufficient number and range of essential local facilities (as listed in the description) within an 800m (10 minute) walking distance all areas of the site via an accessible walking route.	More info needed	The development will provide a mix of uses long term. Bicester Village Railway Station and Bicester North are located approximately 2 miles from the Site which provides services to destinations including London Marylebone, Oxford and High Wycombe. A new bus stop is provided south of the site on the B4030. The closest primary school is Kings Meadow Primary School located approximately 700 metres to the north east, however a new primary school has been approved as part of the Outline planning permission for Himley Village. There are no existing shops in the local area.
ATEPAF_104	**Walking routes to a primary school**	A high-quality walking connection should be provided (or already exist) from the site to a primary school. Refer to Manual for Streets and CIHT Designing for Walking for details but, as a minimum, routes must be: - 2m wide (with limited pinch points of 1.5m due to street furniture) and localised widening to accommodate peak usage. - step-free - has a smooth, even surface - has street lighting - includes appropriate crossings in compliance with LTN 1/20 Table 10-2 N/A for sites which do not include residential land uses	A section of the route does not meet the minimum criteria	100% of the route meets the minimum criteria along its entire length	More info needed	A primary school will be provided. Kings Meadow existing with current walking route being poor, via Howes Lane roundabout.
ATEPAF_105	**Walking routes to a food shop**	A high-quality walking connection should be provided from the site to a food shop selling fresh fruit & veg or services which benefit the community e.g. medical services. Refer to Manual for Streets and CIHT Designing for Walking for details but, as a minimum, routes must be: - 2m wide (with limited pinch points of 1.5m due to street furniture) - step-free - has a smooth, even surface - has street lighting - includes appropriate crossings in compliance with LTN 1/20 Table 10-2	A section of the route does not meet the minimum criteria	100% of the route meets the minimum criteria along its entire length	More info needed	Shop will be provided but currently nothing in local area.
ATEPAF_106	**Suitability for walking and wheeling (external to the site)**	All walking routes surrounding the site must be accessible to all users (access controls, widths, steps, ramps, materials)	Some or all external pedestrian routes are not accessible or do not have adjacent accessible alternatives (i.e. ramps alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths etc)	All external pedestrian routes are accessible or have adjacent accessible alternatives such as ramps alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths in accordance with Inclusive Mobility section 4.2 -4.4	More info needed	All currently shared use routes. Middleton Stoney Rd has advisory white lines east of roundabout. Pavement is fairly poor and narrow. This is the quickest route into the centre of Bicester at 37 min walk time 1.8 miles
ATEPAF_107	**Safety at junctions (off-site)**	All new or improved off-site junctions should be designed in line with the movement hierarchy: pedestrians, followed by cyclists, public transport users and private motor vehicles The Junction Assessment Tool from LTN 1/20 should be used for the design of all junctions except priority junctions between minor roads with flows below 500vpd	Any of - Some side roads are not treated - Priority junctions have radii that is inappropriate. - Signalised junctions do not have pedestrian aspects on some arms - There are red movements (0 scores) in the JAT	All side roads are treated Priority junctions have appropriate radii as recommended in MfS 2 paragraphs 9.4.10 - 9.4.16 Signalised junctions have pedestrian aspects on all arms There are no red movements (0 scores) in the JAT	More info needed	Lack of provision is made for active travel at the roundabout junction between Howes Lane, Vandee Drive and Middle Stoney Road. Potentials critical issues exist in relation to traffic volumes, uncontrolled crossings and in relation to the width of shared provision. In light of the trip generation for active modes predicted in the TA, this level of provision is unlikely to be suitable.
ATEPAF_108	**Cycle routes to key destinations**	The development should provide off-site LTN 1/20 compliant routes to relevant destinations such as schools, local centres, employment centres, railway stations and the existing cycling network	The development does not propose to deliver or benefit from existing LTN 1/20 compliant off-site cycle routes to key destinations proportionate to its size and impacts	The development either proposes to deliver or benefits from existing LTN 1/20 compliant off-site cycle routes to key destinations proportionate to its size and impacts	More info needed	Currently limited options into town centre. On road cycling, high volume, high speed road. S278 OFFSITE HIGHWAY WORKS, PEDESTRIAN/CYCLE LINK, GENERAL ARRANGEMENT SHEET 3 stretch of proposed route is immediately adjacent to the carriageway. This does not appear to be in compliance with LTN 1/20 where Table 6-1 on page 54 would suggest a desirable minimum separation from the carriageway (40mph) should be 1m.
ATEPAF_109	**Cycle Safety on links (off-site)**	All new or improved infrastructure off-site should conform to the 5 Core Design Principles in addition to the criteria outlined in Figure 4.1 and geometry requirements as required by LTN1/20	One or more of the new or improved streets off-site are "not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns" (i.e. orange and pink criteria from Figure 4.1) OR The geometry of proposed cycle lanes does not meet minimum requirements (Table 5-2) OR Where people cycling are mixing with motor vehicles, traffic lane widths are 3.2-3.9m wide	All new or improved streets off-site are safe for cyclists of all abilities, ages and mobility needs, satisfying the criteria of LTN 1/20 in relation to the type of provision (Fig. 4.1) geometry requirements (Table 5.2), avoiding traffic lanes between 3.2m and 4m in width. All new or improved streets must be in alignment with the 5 'Core' Design Principles as stated in LTN 1/20, being demonstrably Coherent, Direct, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive.	More info needed	As above. Proposed off site is minimal.
ATEPAF_110	**Crossings (external to the site)**	Where appropriate, the provision of crossings to an appropriate type and specification (signalised / zebra / uncontrolled / continuous footway) must be provided along forecasted desire lines, including away from vehicular junctions Crossings should be evenly spaced and at regular intervals and provided on most streets in accordance with the movement patterns of the development Crossings must be accessible to all and comply with standards set out in LTN 1/20 and Inclusive Mobility	Insufficient or infrequent crossings have been provided and / or fail to match desire lines outside of the development and towards key external routes and facilities Crossings fail to meet standards set out in design guidance contained in MfS and Inclusive Mobility	The appropriate crossing type (see LTN 1/20 Table 10-2) is provided on predicted desire lines. All crossings are designed to meet highway standards	More info needed	New crossing associated with distribution development. Pedestrian access to the westbound bus stop on B4030 Middle Stoney Road and uncontrolled crossing via a pedestrian refuge is proposed in the plans. There are potential critical issues related to pedestrians being required to use uncontrolled crossings on 'busy' roads and the information in relation to traffic data suggests traffic flows could be close to the relevant figures at this location, especially given the 40mph speed limit. On this basis, suitability of this type of provision should be sought and preferably consideration of improved provision (such as a signalised crossing) is made.
ATEPAF_111	**Shared use routes (external to the site)**	Shared use routes (i.e. a path or surface which is available for use by both pedestrians and cyclists) must be avoided along all new or improved off-site streets, unless they fit within the limited acceptable situations listed in LTN 1/20	Any of - Shared use paths are provided in areas of medium/high pedestrian or cyclist flows - Shared use paths are below 3m wide (<300 cyclists per hour), or below 4.5m elsewhere, as per Table 6-3 of LTN1/20 - Pedestrians and cycle users are separated, but only by a painted line	Shared use routes are only provided in the situations listed at para 6.5.6 and section 1.6 (2) of LTN 1/20 and meet the recommended minimum width set out in Table 6-3 of LTN 1/20 (3m when <300 cyclists per hour, 4.5m elsewhere. Flows take account of future generated by nearby growth proposals and allocations).	More info needed	Off site shared use route only. It is not considered these are well designed given deviance of desire line and proximity to high speed carriageway.
ATEPAF_112	**Physical barriers for cycle users (on and off-site)**	All new or improved cycle routes (within the site or outside it) must be fully accessible	The presence of steps or barriers on-site or within a reasonable distance off-site that would reduce the ease of access for a Cycle Design Vehicle (as per LTN 1/20) or the presence of situations that would require users to dismount.	No steps or barriers within the site which would reduce ease of access for Cycle Design Vehicle (as per LTN 1/20). No requirement for users to dismount at any point.	More info needed	Some segregated routes internal which are welcomed. Off site is poor.
ATEPAF_113	**Lighting (on and off site)**	Streets, footways and cycle routes are adequately lit at night to provide safety and security for all users	Not all routes within the boundary of the site or externally where appropriate to the users of the site are lit	All routes within the boundary of the site and off-site where required by users of the site are lit in accordance with LTN 1/20 paragraphs 8.7 and 15.3 (Urban lighting) & paragraph 8.7 (traffic free routes)	1	Lighting plan submitted and this is welcome.

ATEPAF_114	**Walking routes to nearest transport nodes**	A high-quality walking connection should be provided from the site to a transport node (a regular public transport service which enables people to carry out daily duties such as employment and education). Refer to Manual for Streets and CIHT Designing for Walking for details but, as a minimum, they must be: - 2m wide (with limited pinch points of 1.5m due to street furniture) - step-free - has a smooth, even surface - has street lighting - includes appropriate crossings in compliance with LTN 1/20 Table 10-2	A section of the route does not meet the minimum criteria	100% of the route meets the minimum criteria along its entire length	More info needed	Train station is a significant walk. Two new bus stops built and one existing.
ATEPAF_115	**Access and provision of public transport**	Effective and convenient public transport should be available either through proximity to existing routes or through the provision of new or extended routes	There are locations within the site for which pedestrian access is in excess of a 400m walking distance of a public transport station or stop, and / or none of the public transport routes to serve the site are secured or proposed to be fully operational upon first occupation of the development (including demand-responsive public transport as development is phased.)	All locations within the site are within a 400m walking distance of a public transport station or stop and on larger sites then at least one public transport route is secured or proposed to be fully operational on the first day of occupation or in accordance with the phasing of the development (including demand responsive or shuttle bus services).	More info needed	Only bus stops are conveniently located. New bus stop will be built within the site too. No other transport options.
ATEPAF_116	**Active Travel infrastructure enabling use of public transport**	Bus stop and rail station (where applicable) facilities that enable ease of access by active travel modes, including secure and overlooked cycle parking and facilities, seating provision, lighting, adequate shelter to accommodate likely demand, service information (including RTI) & raised kerbs at bus stops.	either streets are wide and straight, encouraging high speeds, or they are signed above the 20mph and 30mph thresholds	Bus stop and rail station (where applicable) facilities already exist (or are provided) that enable ease of access to public transport by active travel modes, including secure and overlooked cycle parking and facilities, seating, lighting, adequate shelter to accommodate likely demand, raised kerb access for wheelchair users, service information (including RTI), dropped kerbs for accessing bus stops and an identified bus cage / layby (where applicable).	More info needed	Bus stop external are accessible however current B4030 is fast and uncontrolled crossing potentially dangerous, especially in darker months.
ATEPAF_117	**TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Proposed Infrastructure**	Transport Assessments must provide detail (and justification) of proposed improvements to infrastructure and any other supporting strategies which seek to enable an increase in walking and cycling rates.	The submitted Transport Assessments have not proposed improvements to infrastructure and/or not explained how the proposed development will enable an increase in walking and cycling rates.	The Transport Assessment clearly proposes improvements to infrastructure and details how they will enable an increase in walking and cycling rates.	More info needed	Good networks proposed internally, poor off site.
ATEPAF_118	**Site permeability**	Within the site, routes for walking and cycling should be shorter and more direct than the equivalent by car. This could be achieved, for example, through filtered permeability and the provision of car-free routes.	Journeys within the site by walking, wheeling and cycling are equal to or longer than by car	Journeys within the site by walking, wheeling and cycling are demonstrably shorter than those used by motor vehicles (excluding emergency accesses)	More info needed	Permeability is reliant on 'potential' links coming forward. Current proposals do not achieve good permeability.
ATEPAF_119	**Walking and cycling access**	All opportunities for safe, step-free, fully-accessible walking and cycling site access points have been maximised AND are greater in number than the number of access points for motor vehicles (except where additional accesses would provide no benefit to people walking and cycling). A motor vehicle access point with safe provision for both walking and cycling counts as a walking and cycling access point	There are fewer or the same number of accessible walking and cycling access points as access points for motor vehicles and/or not all opportunities have been taken to provide high quality and convenient access points for walking and cycling.	There are more accessible walking and cycling access points than motor vehicle access points and/or all reasonable opportunities have been taken to provide a greater number of high quality and convenient access points for walking and cycling.	More info needed	Pg 108 and 109 of the design code. The same accesses for cars and pedestrians and currently only potential future links
ATEPAF_120	**Future-proofing and safeguarding**	The proposals should not prejudice existing and future development and connectivity to and from adjoining sites. Where such potential may exist, development should progress within a comprehensive masterplan framework or enable a co-ordinated approach to be adopted towards the development of adjoining sites in the future	Development makes no attempt to enable, provide or safeguard walking and cycling connections to adjoining sites up to the site boundary where adjoining sites are either anticipated, planned, proposed or allocated in the local plan	Development enables and proposes the adoption of walking and cycling routes up to the site boundary to provide direct connections to existing or future development where sites are either anticipated, planned, proposed or allocated through the local plan.	More info needed	Many potential future links. These must be conditioned
ATEPAF_121	**Through traffic**	The site accesses must be arranged to prevent private vehicle drivers from using the site as a shortcut while undertaking longer journeys. This is best achieved through filtered permeability, or by ensuring all general traffic accesses are taken from the same main road	It is convenient for car drivers to cut through the site while undertaking longer journeys	It is either impossible or of considerable inconvenience for car drivers to cut through the site while undertaking longer journeys	More info needed	Limited risk for through traffic however risk should be managed as future sites come forward.
ATEPAF_122	**Safety at junctions (internal to the site, including site accesses)**	All new or improved on-site junctions (including the site access) should be designed in line with the movement hierarchy: pedestrians, followed by cyclists, public transport users and private motor vehicles The Junction Assessment Tool from LTN 1/20 should be used for the design of all junctions except priority junctions between minor roads with flows below 500vpd	Any of - Some side roads are not treated - Priority junctions have radii that is inappropriate. - Signalised junctions do not have pedestrian aspects on some arms - There are red movements (0 scores) in the JAT	All side roads are treated Priority junctions have appropriate radii as recommended in MfS 2 paragraphs 9.4.10 - 9.4.16 Signalised junctions have pedestrian aspects on all arms There are no red movements (0 scores) in the JAT	More info needed	Raised Table incorporating pedestrian & cycle crossing welcomed. The route check tool identifies potential critical issues if more than 2500 vehicles per day cross the main pedestrian and cycle flows and these remain untreated. From the trip generation presented, it appears that this may be the case but confirmation should be sought. Preferably though, further consideration as to prioritising pedestrian and cycle movements at these locations, in line with options presented in Figure 10.3 in LTN 1/20 should be made.
ATEPAF_123	**Design speed of new streets**	Within the red line boundary - Any new or improved residential/local streets should be designed (no centre line, horizontal deflection, narrow width) and signed for vehicles to travel at a speed of max 20mph. - No new or improved streets should be designed and signed for speeds above 30mph	Either streets are wide and straight, encouraging high speeds, or they are signed above the 20mph and 30mph thresholds	The geometry of the streets ensures drivers will not exceed 20mph on residential / local streets and will not exceed 30mph anywhere within the site	More info needed	20mph welcomed. Traffic calming measures needed to achieve this.
ATEPAF_124	**Crossings (internal to the site)**	Within the red line boundary of the proposed development, the appropriate crossing type (signalised / zebra / uncontrolled / continuous footway) must be provided along forecasted desire lines, including away from vehicular junctions Crossings should be evenly spaced and at regular intervals and provided on most streets Crossings must be accessible to all and comply with standards set out in LTN 1/20 and Inclusive Mobility	Insufficient or infrequent crossings have been provided and / or fail to match desire lines within the development and towards key external routes and facilities Crossings fail to meet standards set out in design guidance contained in MfS and Inclusive Mobility	The appropriate crossing type (see LTN 1/20 Table 10-2) is provided on predicted desire lines. All crossings are designed to meet highway standards	More info needed	Raised Table incorporating pedestrian & cycle crossing welcomed. Suitability of crossing from care home to commercial area should be considered.
ATEPAF_125	**Suitability for walking and wheeling (internal to the site)**	All walking routes within the red line boundary must be accessible to all users (access controls, widths, steps, ramps, materials)	Some or all internal pedestrian routes are not accessible or do not have adjacent accessible alternatives (i.e. ramps alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths etc)	All internal pedestrian routes are accessible or have adjacent accessible alternatives such as ramps alongside steps, bound paths next to unbound paths in accordance with Inclusive Mobility section 4.2 -4.4	More info needed	Commercial areas should be pedestrianised and the current arrangement for these areas will discourages walking and cycling.
ATEPAF_126	**Cycle safety on links (Internal to the site)**	Cycle infrastructure should be provided on site in compliance with the 5 Core Design Principles and the criteria outlined in Table 4.1 and accompanying geometry requirements as confirmed in LTN1/20	One or more of the new or improved streets are "not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns" (i.e. as shown orange and pink in LTN Figure 4.1) OR The geometry of proposed cycle lanes does not meet minimum requirements (Table 5-2) OR Where people cycling are mixing with motor vehicles, traffic lane widths are 3.2-3.9m wide	All internal streets are safe for all users to cycle along, satisfying the criteria of LTN 1/20 (ref: Fig. 4.1), geometry requirements (Table 5.2) and are in alignment with the 5 'Core' Design Principles as stated in LTN 1/20 and therefore must be demonstrably: Coherent, Direct, Safe, Comfortable and Attractive for cyclists of all abilities, ages and mobility needs.	More info needed	Majority of internal cycle infrastructure is adequate. Care should be taken to achieved continuation of cycle routes at junctions so the cycle does not have to yield.
ATEPAF_127	**Shared use routes (internal to the site)**	Shared use routes (i.e. a path or surface which is available for use by both pedestrians and cyclists) must be avoided along all new or improved streets within the site, unless they fit in the limited acceptable situations listed in LTN 1/20	Any of - Shared use paths are provided in areas of medium/high pedestrian or cyclist flows - Shared use paths are below 3m wide (<300 cyclists per hour), or below 4.5m elsewhere, as per Table 6-3 of LTN1/20 - Pedestrians and cycle users are separated, but only by a painted line	Shared use routes are only provided in the situations listed at para 6.5.6 and section 1.6 (2) of LTN 1/20 and meet the recommended minimum width set out in Table 6-3 of LTN 1/20 (3m when <300 cyclists per hour, 4.5m elsewhere. Flows take account of future generated by nearby growth proposals and allocations).	More info needed	Framework Plan P 2 2-3 0 9 3 _ D E _ 0 0 3 _ C _ 01 shows . Indicative segregated two-way cycle only route is shown on this plan but PG 10 OF CA10 suggests they will be shared.
ATEPAF_128	**Car parking layout**	The proposed street design should remove opportunities for indiscriminate and obstructive parking that would cause safety hazards and prevent access by active modes of travel by either designing in protected or marked parking bays and accompanying street furniture, planting or other features and restrictions that prevent footway parking, the mounting of kerbs, damage to green infrastructure and blockage of crossing points and sightlines.	There is no parking management strategy or contribution. The proposed layout may lead to parked vehicles blocking footways, crossing points and cycle routes either on or off-site	The site layout, parking management strategy or contribution demonstrably and physically discourage the blockage of footways, crossing points and cycle routes on and off-site	More info needed	Appears adequate however parking should not take place in commercial areas.

ATEPAF_129	**Cycle Parking**	Cycle parking should be secure, covered and provided in line with Table 11.1/Table 11.2 of LTN 1/20 (incl requirement of 5% of spaces to be accessible for larger cycles) or local planning policy, where the local plan is more onerous. Where appropriate, secure external cycle parking should be provided where off-street parking does not exist. Facilities must also be suitable for a range of cycle types including cargo bikes, tandems and tricycles.	Development fails to meet the criteria set out either in LTN1/20 or meet the Local Plan minimum standards, if those are more onerous	Cycle parking exceeds the suggested minimum from LTN 1/20 Table 11.1, or the requirements of local policies, if those are more onerous	More info needed	No figures within application. Needs to be addressed.
ATEPAF_130	**Trip end facilities for cycling (Destinations)**	High-quality facilities including showers, lockers, changing facilities and drying areas should be provided to facilitate use of active travel modes	Development fails to propose at least one of the facilities referenced in pass criteria	Development proposes all of the following: 1 shower per 10 (long-term) cycle parking spaces, 2 lockers for 3 (long-term) cycle parking space, changing facilities and a drying area	More info needed	Nothing identified.
ATEPAF_131	**TRAVEL PLAN**	Travel Plan / Framework Travel Plans must clearly outline the mode share targets, proposed measures, monitoring strategy and the remedial measures in the event that these are not met	No Travel Plan submitted or TP submitted fails to sufficiently identify measures, targets and monitoring	Travel Plan includes mode share targets, monitoring and remedial measures / actions in the event that modal share targets are not met	1	Condition 18 requires the application to be accompanied by a Travel Plan setting out how the development will enable at least 50% of trips originating within the development to be made by non-car means, increasing over time to 60%. The submitted Travel Plan prepared by Hydrock explains how this is to be achieved.