

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01811/OUT

Proposal: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596
Dow Street Upper Heyford

Location: OUTLINE - Up to 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

This report sets out Oxfordshire County Council's view on the proposal.

Annexes to the report contain officer advice and the comments of local members.

Overall view of Oxfordshire County Council:-

Thank you for consulting the County Council on the further information submitted by the applicant.

It is the view of the County Council that the proposed 60 dwellings could be considered contrary to policy H2 which states that – “land at RAF Upper Heyford will provide for a new settlement of a maximum of about 1000 dwellings and necessary supporting infrastructure, including a primary school”. Although not specifically defined as a number, the County Council would typically consider a 10% above or below figure as a standard interpretation of ‘about 1000’, which in this case is 1100. This application raises that figure to 1135. In addition it is also contrary to previous appeal decision for this site, where the Inspector required a planning condition limiting the number of dwellings at Heyford to no more than 1,075.

The county council would view the ‘overage’ in this case, as not a significant breach of the standard rule of thumb warranting an objection. However, for any further increase in the number of dwellings on this site (to take the total above 1135), the Council will necessarily consider that in breach of the H2 policy.

There is a further consideration for compliance with policy H2 listed in section C which states that – “the new settlement should be designed to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport rather than travel by private car. Improvements to bus and rail facilities and measures to minimise the impact of traffic generated by the development on the surrounding road network will be required”.

In addition to that, the officers have provided technical views on this revised submission (see annex 1).

Officer's Name: Lisa Michelson

Officer's Title: Locality Manager

Date: 09 May 2014

ANNEX 1
OFFICER ADVICE

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no:13/01811/OUT

Proposal: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529
593 596 Dow Street Upper Heyford

Location: OUTLINE - Up to 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Transport

Additional information received 22nd April 2014:

- PBA Technical Note 001 – Response to Transport Comments Made in Planning Response 12th February 2014

Main issues:

1. No mitigation is proposed for the 60 dwellings. Financial contributions were secured from the original/ extant application at Heyford Park (715 additional dwellings plus other use classes) towards highway mitigation schemes, improved public transport services, travel plan, traffic calming measures as well as other non-transport developer funding measures. Any additional development at Heyford will need to contribute towards mitigating its cumulative transport and access impacts as required from other smaller scale development.
2. The proposal does not properly demonstrate the impact of the 60 dwellings, rather it seeks to provide a *comparative* impact of 2006 traffic levels from the Arup TA for the wider Heyford site with 2013 traffic levels. This approach is not acceptable. The TA in question is seven years old, some data (e.g. the 2006 extant development traffic – see point 3) is not clearly available, am and pm peak periods are not defined. This application does not consider committed developments that have been granted consent since 2007. For the A4260/B4030 junction that is reported to show 230 additional vehicular movements in 2013 compared to 2006, this junction has not been assessed to see whether there are any network capacity, delay or safety issues, and no mitigation is proposed as a result of this application.
3. The Heyford Park 2006 traffic generation is not available in isolation, and has been calculated by subtracting data from two different flow diagrams from the 2007 TA. However, this still leads to negative traffic flows and also traffic disappearing along a route between junctions. For example:
 - a. Subtracting Arup Figure 7 data from Figure 5 gives -29 development related trips eastbound on Camp Road past the main Heyford Park entrance in the 2006 am peak. Similarly, for the pm peak (i.e. Arup Figure 6 minus Figure 8), the 2006 extant development flows are negative in three locations (Somerton Road-Camp Road left turn, Camp Road eastbound past the main Heyford Park entrance and Camp Road westbound past the main site entrance). These negative flows make no sense.
 - b. Due to these negative flows, the 2006 estimated extant development traffic turning left out of the main Heyford Park access along Camp Road is shown to decrease by the time the traffic reaches the next junction.
 - c. 2006 extant traffic flows estimated for the pm peak turning right out of the site do not add up to the totals at the next westbound junction.

- d. The estimated extant 2006 development traffic arriving at Heyford Park site access from the west in the am peak does not match the flows at the Kirtlington Road junction further to the west.
4. The applicant has used '2006+Heyford Park traffic' data to demonstrate that 2006 traffic flows at five junctions are generally lower in 2013. However section 3 above raises concerns with the ability to actually establish what the extant flows at Heyford were in 2006. If one does a similar comparison of the 2006 Arup base traffic data with 2013 surveys this indicates that for most cases cases 2013 peak traffic junction levels are generally higher. Given the above ambiguities over the exact level of traffic generation at Heyford in 2006, I request that a standard approach to assessing the impact of these 60 dwellings is taken and the application assessed on its merits.
5. Concerns were previously raised that only one traffic survey (Tue 25th June 2013) had been carried out, and on a day when roadworks were advertised for Camp Road. Whilst a second set of survey data has now been submitted, this is incomplete as it only comprises three of the five junctions for a partial am peak period (0730-0830). There is a concern that the surveys are not representative.
6. For reference, OCC has annual traffic survey data for site 336 (Camp Road East) and site 51(B4030 West of Middleton Stoney).
7. TRICS surveys – as expected, it is difficult to find a comparable survey site to Heyford in the TRICS database. The applicant proposes to use 0.8 trips per dwelling in the peak hours as a robust approach. This is acceptable.
8. The net traffic impact of the proposed 60 dwellings will depend on whether the applicants intend to still provide a care home/ conference centre site (now one of the Free School sites) as currently approved in the overall Heyford Park site masterplan for the overall Heyford Park site. This should be clarified.

Summary and Recommendations:

It is not relevant to compare 2006 data with 2013 data to establish what the impact of 60 new dwellings will be. There are concerns with some of the historic data in any case, as outlined above. A standard assessment should be carried out for the 60 dwellings, and the impact of these dwellings mitigated by way of an appropriate financial contribution towards highways and transport improvements in the vicinity.

There is an extant planning consent for Heyford Park, and measures and triggers in the extant 2011 S106 agreement for works such as the extensive Camp Road highway scheme being completed prior to the occupation of the 100th new build dwelling. It would be appropriate to ensure that these 60 dwellings are covered by a Deed of Variation to the extant S106 to ensure the appropriate infrastructure is delivered at an appropriate time for new residents and provides a satisfactory and safe standard of development and living environment.

As indicated in my response of 10th January, if the LPA is minded to approve this application, planning conditions including highway access, site layout, parking, drainage, travel plan and construction management, as well as appropriate informatives (e.g. works on highway) and planning obligation would be required.

Officer's Name: Judy Kelly
Officer's Title: Senior Engineer
Date: 8 May 2014

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01811/OUT

Proposal: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596
Dow Street Upper Heyford

Location: OUTLINE - Up to 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Education

Key issues:

Contributions have been sought in line with those agreed for the main Heyford Park development to mitigate against the additional costs to the county council of accommodating children moving into the development of ages not yet catered for by the Free School, until it is accepting pupils in all year groups. It is not currently the case that other schools would need to physically expand in order to be able to accommodate such children; however, the county council may incur additional transport costs for these children. If additional cost is incurred as a direct result of this development, we consider it CIL compliant that it is funded by the developer.

Officer's Name: Barbara Chillman / Diane Cameron

Officer's Title: Service Manager / School Organisation Officer

Date: 08 May 2014

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01811/OUT

Proposal: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596
Dow Street Upper Heyford

Location: OUTLINE - Up to 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Drainage

Recommendation:

Approval subject to the conditions

The application is outline and therefore the drainage strategy is indicative at this stage.

Key issues:

The surface water drainage has certainly been thought about on this application and the FRA documents go some way to laying the foundations for a surface water drainage system, however it is indicative and does not contain a layout plan.

The calculation figures for Green field and proposed run-off / discharge rates look quite high for a development of this size. I will need to run these through Windes to check they are correct.

Legal Agreement required to secure:

Not at this stage due to the lack of a drainage design / layout.

Conditions:

A full surface water drainage design will need to be submitted to the Lead Flood Authority (OCC) and approval given prior to the commencement of the development on site.

Informatives:

The developer will need to adhere to the requirements of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 when they design the surface water drainage.

Full Suds will be required.

Detailed Comments:

Officer's Name: Gordon Kelman

Officer's Title: Senior Engineer (Drainage)

Date: 17 April 2014

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01811/OUT

Proposal: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596
Dow Street Upper Heyford

Location: OUTLINE - Up to 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Property

Recommendation:

Approval subject to the conditions

Key issues:

- The proposed site is adjacent to a County Council operational base. The County Council require conditions to be met that ensure the uninterrupted delivery of services in the proximity of the proposed site. Service delivery in proximity include the following services:

Upper Heyford Children's Centre
Oxfordshire Playbus, Activities Centre Building
549 Brice Road
Upper Heyford
Bicester
Oxfordshire
OX25 5TE

For further information see Conditions Section below.

- The County Council considers that the effect of the application forming this development will place additional strain on its existing community infrastructure.
- Because incomplete development mix details have been provided in the application the following preliminary assessment mix has been used based on Cherwell District Council Policy Compliance calculations:
 - 1 No. x One Bed Dwellings
 - 17 No. x Two Bed Dwellings
 - 33 No. x Three Bed Dwellings
 - 9 No. x Four Bed Dwellings

It is calculated that this development would generate a net increase of:

- **163 additional residents including:**
- 12 resident/s aged 65+
- 111 resident/s aged 20+
- 15 residents/s aged 13-19

Legal Agreement required to secure:

• Waste Management	£	10,432
• Libraries	£	13,855
• Museum Resource Centre	£	815
• Social & Health Care	£	13,200
• Adult Learning	£	1,776
• Total*	£	40,078

*Total to be Index-linked from 1st Quarter 2012 Using PUBSEC Tender Price Index

• Administration & Monitoring	£	5,000
-------------------------------	---	-------

The County Councils legal fees in drawing up and/or completing a legal agreement will need to be secured.

Conditions:

The developer must ensure the uninterrupted operation and safety of users at the Children's Centre. The County Council would welcome consideration of restricted working hours and a requirement to liaise with managers of the centre regarding operations that may have a detrimental effect on delivery of services such as piling work and disruption of electric supplies and the like.

- The County Council as Fire Authority has a duty to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available for fire-fighting purposes. There will probably be a requirement to affix fire hydrants within the development site. Exact numbers and locations cannot be given until detailed consultation plans are provided showing highway, water main layout and size. We would therefore ask you to add the requirement for provision of hydrants in accordance with the requirements of the Fire & Rescue Service as a condition to the grant of any planning permission

Informatives:

- Fire & Rescue Service recommends that new dwellings should be constructed with sprinkler systems

Detailed Comments:

Strategic Waste Management

Under Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, County Councils, as waste disposal authorities, have a duty to arrange for places to be provided at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of that waste.

To meet the additional pressures on the various Household Waste and Recycling Centre provision in Oxfordshire enhancements to these centres are either already taking place or are

planned, and, to this end, contributions are now required from developers towards their redesign and redevelopment.

A new site serving 20,000 households costs in the region of £3,000,000; this equates to £64 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base

$$\mathbf{£64 \times 163 \text{ (the forecast number of new residents)} = £10,432}$$

Library

Oxfordshire County Council has an adopted standard for publicly available library floor space of 23 m² per 1,000 head of population, and a further 19.5% space is required for support areas (staff workroom, etc), totalling 27.5 m². Bicester library is significantly under-size in relation to its catchment population and this development will therefore place additional pressures on the library.

The current cost of extending a library is £2,370 per m² at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. The proposal would also generate the need to increase the core book stock held by the local library by 2 volumes per additional resident. The price per volume is £10.00. This equates to £85 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base

The full requirement for the provision of library infrastructure and supplementary core book stock in respect of this application would therefore be based on the following formula:

$$\mathbf{£85 \times 163 \text{ (the forecast number of new residents)} = £13,855}$$

County Museum Resource Centre

Oxfordshire County Council's museum service provides a central Museum Resource Centre (MRC). The MRC is the principal store for the Oxfordshire Museum, Cogges Manor Farm Museum, Abingdon Museum, Banbury Museum, the Museum of Oxford and the Vale and Downland Museum. It provides support to these museums and schools throughout the county for educational, research and leisure activities.

The MRC is operating at capacity and needs an extension to meet the demands arising from further development throughout the county. An extended facility will provide additional storage space and allow for increased public access to the facility.

An extension to the MRC to mitigate the impact of new development up to 2026 has been costed at £460,000; this equates to £5 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base.

$$\mathbf{£5 \times 163 \text{ (the forecast number of new residents)} = £815}$$

Social & Health Care - Day Care Facilities

To meet the additional pressures on day care provision the County Council is looking to expand and/or improve day care facilities in the locality: Bicester Health & Wellbeing Centre.

A new Day Care centre offering 40 places per day (optimum) and open 5 days per week costs £11,000 per place at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. Based on current and predicted usage figures we estimate that 10% of the over 65 population use day care facilities. Therefore the cost per person aged 65 years or older is £1,100.

$$\mathbf{£1,100 \times 12 \text{ (the forecast number of new residents aged 65+)} = £13,200}$$

Adult Learning

The County Council is looking to improve and provide a more sustainable Adult Learning facility in Bicester.

A new 2 classroom facility costs £440,000 at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. This facility will provide for 1,350 learners per annum; this equates to £326 per learner. At least 5% of the adult population are likely to take up adult learning; this equates to £16 per person.

£16 x 111 (the forecast number of new residents aged 20+) = £1,776

Administration

Oxfordshire County Council require an administrative payment of £5,000 for the purposes of administration and monitoring of the proposed S106 agreement.

Indexation

Financial contributions have to be indexed-linked to maintain the real values of the contributions (so that they can in future years deliver the same level of infrastructure provision currently envisaged). The price bases of the various contributions are covered in the relevant sections above.

General

The contributions requested have been calculated where possible using details of the development mix from the application submitted or if no details are available then the County Council has used the best information available. Should the application be amended or the development mixed changed at a later date, the Council reserves the right to seek a higher contribution according to the nature of the amendment.

The contributions which are being sought are necessary to protect the existing levels of infrastructure for local residents. They are relevant to planning the incorporation of this major development within the local community, if it is implemented. They are directly related to this proposed development and to the scale and kind of the proposal.

Officer's Name: Oliver Spratley
Officer's Title: Asset Strategy Support Officer
Date: 17 April 2014
