Decide and Provide Methodology Checklist				
Date: 09/06/25	Assessed by: RJM (DTA)	App ref: **25/01510/OUT**	Site: Land South Of Perdiswell Farm, Shipton Road, Shipton On Cherwell	Site description: Outline planning application for the erection of up to 500 dwellings and commercial floorspace (Use Class E) with associated access, open space and infrastructure - All Matters Reserved except for Access.
Step (these correspond with the steps detailed in Implementing Decide & Provide)	Question(s)	Completed (YES/NO)	Notes (approach taken), plus references to appropriate section of the submitted TA/TS	Has suitably detailed **justification and evidence** been provided for this step of the methodology and its inclusion/exclusion? (text in italics below is for guidance and can be deleted)
1: Creating the vision (p.18)	What is the vision for the site? How has the transport vision been informed by the overall vision for the proposed development? How will people and goods travel to and from (and within) the site? How does the vision align with other relevant visions*? How is the vision to be achieved and how has this been articulated through the masterplan, design code, and off-site connectivity strategies?	**YES**	The development has been planned using a vision-led approach that prioritises walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport in accordance with the NPPF, Oxfordshire LTCP and Active Travel England guidance. The movement strategy is reflected in the site masterplan, proposed active travel connections, bus-only Park View connection, public transport contributions and Travel Plan measures. Refer TA Sections 3, 4 and 7; ATE Assessment.	
2: Scoping scenarios for	Has more than one multi-modal trip rate scenario been modelled?	**YES**	The scale of development (up to 500 dwellings and local centre) warranted detailed multi-modal assessment. Future year Reference and Design scenarios were assessed, together	

modelling (p.22)	Has Table 1 (p.21) been reviewed to establish which steps should be followed depending on the scale of the development? Have the characteristics of sensitivity and complexity also been considered and do these warrant the inclusion of other steps?		with mitigation testing and additional sensitivity testing. Scale, sensitivity and complexity were considered throughout the assessment process. Refer TA Sections 6 and 7 and subsequent technical notes.	
3: Establishing committed and planned growth assumptions (p.23)	Has background growth been taken into account? Have alternative scenario(s) of background growth been evidenced and modelled?*	**YES**	Background traffic growth and committed development have been incorporated within future year modelling through the Reference Case. Alternative growth assumptions were considered through sensitivity testing and subsequent technical work. Refer TA Section 6.2 and later modelling notes.	
4: Reference case modelling (p.23)	Has a suitable reference case been modelled?	**YES**	A future year Reference Case was prepared incorporating background growth and committed development, providing the baseline against which development impacts were assessed. Refer TA Section 6.2.	
5a: Assessing proximity characteristics (residential) (p.24)	**For residential sites**: Has a 20-minute walk assessment been carried out assessing the walk time to the facilities and services listed in Implementing Decide & Provide?	**YES**	The TA and ATE Assessment include detailed accessibility assessments to schools, healthcare, shops, employment opportunities, public transport and Woodstock town centre. Walking, cycling and public transport accessibility have been assessed using journey time and route quality analysis. Refer TA Sections 3.5–3.9 and ATE Assessment.	
5b: Assessing proximity characteristics (employment) (p.25)	**For employment sites:** Have existing employment sites of similar scale to proposed development been identified, with comparable proximity and scale of nearby settlements and travel options?	**N/A**	The proposal is predominantly residential with ancillary local centre uses. This step is therefore not directly applicable.	
5c: Mixed-use development - internalisation	**For mixed use developments only:** Has internalisation of trips been	**YES**	The scheme includes a local centre and community facilities intended to reduce external trip demand. Internalisation has been considered within the assessment and further tested	

and localisation (p.25)	considered in overall trip generation, and is this evidenced and if necessary, applied appropriately to future year scenarios, taking into account different phases of the build out?		through subsequent sensitivity testing excluding local centre demand. Refer TA Sections 2 and 5 and subsequent technical notes.	
6: Assessing connectivity characteristics (p.26)	Has an assessment (i.e. an audit) been carried out of the quality of walking, wheeling, and cycling routes and public transport connectivity to the locations in 5a and 5b? How does this quality accord with applicable standards, including LTN1/20?	**YES**	Detailed audits of walking, cycling and public transport connectivity have been undertaken, including Active Travel England Assessment work, WRAT assessments, route quality reviews and consideration of LTN 1/20 principles. Public transport accessibility, route directness and severance have also been assessed. Refer TA Section 3, ATE Assessment and technical notes.	
7: Comparison sites in TRICS and using alternative evidence (p.27)	Have comparable sites been selected from TRICS, taking account of accessibility characteristics in steps 5 and 6? Or has alternative evidence been used? Has supporting text been provided to explain the suitability of the evidence used?	**YES**	Trip generation has been derived using accepted TRICS-based evidence. The methodology was agreed through the assessment process and supported by accessibility and settlement context analysis. Refer TA Section 5.	
8: Modelling the 'do-minimum' scenario (p.28)	Has an appropriate 'do-minimum' scenario been modelled (i.e. without the connectivity improvements)? Has justification for the acceptability of the supporting evidence been provided?	**YES**	A future year Reference Case was modelled without development traffic. A separate development scenario excluding the proposed connectivity improvements was not considered necessary as the active travel, public transport and connectivity measures form an integral component of the proposed development and movement strategy. The assessment therefore compares the development against the future year Reference Case. Refer TA Section 6.	

9: Identifying connectivity improvements (p.29)	What connectivity improvements have been identified, with evidence of deliverability and, in the case of public transport services, their ongoing viability? Has the adequacy and quality of these improvements been reported?	**YES**	Connectivity improvements include active travel routes, crossing improvements, links to Park View, public transport enhancements, bus service contributions, Travel Plan measures and wider accessibility improvements. Deliverability has been demonstrated through the proposed application package and associated contributions. Refer TA Section 4, ATE Assessment and Highway Response Note.	
10: Evidencing new trip rates (p.30)	Have comparison sites in TRICS* been identified that more closely reflect similar proposed provision for sustainable modes *and* have the same proximity characteristics as identified in steps 5 and 6? Has suitable evidence been provided to justify the adjusted trip rates†?	**YES**	Trip generation was derived using accepted multi-modal TRICS evidence. Accessibility, active travel connectivity, public transport provision and local facilities were considered as part of the assessment. A separate accessibility-adjusted TRICS site set was not prepared; instead a robust assessment approach was adopted without applying modal shift reductions. Refer TA Section 5 and Section 7.2.19.	
11: Modelling the 'with connectivity improvements' scenario (p.31)	Has the 'with connectivity improvements' scenario been modelled?	**YES**	The development scenarios assessed incorporate the proposed active travel, public transport and connectivity improvements that form part of the scheme design. Future year assessments therefore reflect the development as proposed. Refer TA Sections 4 and 6.	
12: Determining the requirement for further improvements (p.33)	Should the proposed improvements modelled in the previous scenario prove inadequate in addressing the impacts of the development, has consideration been given to the need for further improvements and their modelling? Have highway capacity schemes for private vehicles	**YES**	Where future year assessments identified constraints, additional mitigation measures were developed and tested. Sustainable transport interventions were considered alongside highway mitigation. Subsequent technical notes include further modelling and mitigation testing. Refer TA Section 6 and ARCADY calibration/validation note.	

	only been considered after all other options have been explored?			
13: Considering sensitivity scenarios and extrapolating trends (p.34)	Has the need for any sensitivity scenarios (for example, to capture the potential impacts of strategic schemes delivered by OCC) been considered? Have trip generation trends been extrapolated from the TRICS database, and another scenario modelled to reflect the trends?	**YES**	Sensitivity testing has been undertaken through subsequent technical work, including testing of local centre assumptions and mitigation scenarios. Future travel behaviour and uncertainty have therefore been considered within the assessment. Refer subsequent technical notes.	
14-16: Monitoring and managing outcomes (p.36-37)	With appropriate reference to the TRICS Standard Assessment Methodology, has a monitoring and evaluation plan for the S106/S278 agreement been scoped and agreed with OCC officers?	**YES**	A Travel Plan accompanies the application and includes monitoring, surveys, targets, review mechanisms, remedial actions and appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator. Monitoring and management would be secured through planning obligations and Travel Plan implementation. Refer Travel Plan Sections 6–8.	