



Planning Appeal by
CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd

In respect of
**Land at South Lodge, Fringford Road, Caversfield,
Bicester**

**Summary Proof of Evidence of Michael Fuller, BSc(Hons) IEng MCIHT
MSoRSA**

Planning Inspectorate Reference: **APP/C3105/A/13/2208385**

Local planning Authority Reference: 13/01056/OUT

February 2014

- 1.1 My name is Michael Fuller and I am a Principal Transport Planner in the firm of Transport Planning Associates. I have a Bachelor of Science Degree with Honours in Civil Engineering. I am an Incorporated Engineer and a Member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation. I am also a member of the Society of Road Safety Auditors
- 1.2 My evidence covers the transport issues associated with the Appeal Pite, and should be read in conjunction with the Statement of Common Ground (SCG) that has been signed by myself and the highway authority.
- 1.3 The SCG confirms that the highway authority has sought not to defend any of the reasons for refusal set out in the decision notice, subject to a package of agreed mitigation measures to be covered by planning conditions and planning obligations towards local transport infrastructure, including for the support of local bus services, enhanced pedestrian facilities and the provision of local highway works to be secured through a S278 Agreement. A more general contribution towards strategic highway infrastructure improvements has also been agreed.
- 1.4 Prior to agreement on the SCG the main transport issues that had been identified by the highway authority and also third parties were:-
- Whether the proposed site access arrangements are safe and appropriate in the context of existing traffic flows and the additional traffic arising from the Appeal Proposal;
 - Whether the existing Fringford Road junction with the Unnamed Road is safe and appropriate in the context of existing traffic flows and the additional traffic arising from the Appeal Proposal and whether the proposed improvements adequately mitigate the additional traffic arising from the Appeal Proposal;
 - Whether there are, or will be in the future, sufficient services, facilities and employment opportunities available in the locality of the Appeal Site to limit the need to travel further afield;
 - Whether the walking and cycling distances to the local services, bus stops, facilities and employment opportunities are acceptable;
 - Whether the standard of the walking and cycling distances to the local services, bus stops, facilities and employment opportunities are acceptable or could be made so through the provision of improvements delivered through a S278 Agreement and/or by the use of agreed financial contributions;
 - Whether existing accessibility to public transport is acceptable or could be made so through a S278 Agreement and/or by the use of agreed financial contributions; and

- Whether the proposed physical transport infrastructure improvements and other financial contributions paid by the Appellant to OCC are appropriate to mitigate the impacts of the Appeal Proposal.
- 1.5 My evidence considers and addresses the pertinent issues prior to the position where the highway authority sought not to pursue its objection and details that reasonable provision has been made by the Appellant to ensure that the Appeal Proposal represents a suitably sustainable proposition from a transport perspective, and future planned and committed development and infrastructure will only enhance this position. The Appeal Proposal will also contribute, through payment of a substantial financial contribution towards the strategic local transport objectives.
- 1.6 I have demonstrated that safe and appropriate access can be provided to the Appeal Site and that there are adequate pedestrian and cycle routes to services and facilities located within a reasonable walk and cycle distance that provide for local needs, and that in this regard the location of the site is sustainably located. The Appeal Proposal will provide improvements to the existing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on Fringford Road which further enhance the sustainability of the site and will encourage trips associated with the Appeal Proposal as well as existing development in the locality to be made on foot and by cycle.
- 1.7 I have concluded that the existing supported bus services provide a satisfactory level of provision to the site, and, owing to the current contract end date, there is no requirement to provide for additional support in this regard and the proposed development will add to the sustainability of the services. The Appeal Proposal will provide physical bus stops on Fringford Road in the vicinity of the Appeal Site where no such physical stops currently exist, to the benefit of residents of the Appeal Proposal and existing residents in the vicinity of the Appeal Site.
- 1.8 In sustainable transport terms it is necessary to consider the site in the context of its location, and to judge whether the choice of alternative transport mode to the car provided for the site is sufficient within that context. In my view I have demonstrated that the site is acceptable, and will be provided with an adequate and safe choice of transport modes.
- 1.9 I have also considered the concerns about the Unnamed Road junction with Fringford Road, and conclude that the safety record of the junction is not an issue, and that the visibility, which was of concern to the highway, can be improved by the authority under the provisions of existing legislation, and at no cost to the authority by simply trimming a hedgerow.

- 1.10 A physical improvement scheme for the Unnamed Road junction, comprising a junction build out and a reduction of speed limit on Fringford Road from 40mph to 30mph is offered by the Appellant as requested by the highway authority, as providing appropriate mitigation.
- 1.11 I have considered the transport matters raised by third parties and as I have already shown all of these issues have been addressed to the satisfaction of the highway authority in preparing the package of mitigation measures.
- 1.12 It is for these reasons that OCC as highway authority have withdrawn their objection. I therefore conclude that, in accordance with the clear guidance at paragraph 32 of the NPPF that there is no valid highways or transport reasons why the Appeal Proposal should not be allowed.