

**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 contains officer advice and the comments of local members when
submitted.**

Submission Date: 27 January 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 Development Control

Recommendation:

Objection

Comments

Introduction

The application seeks consent for 60 new dwellings at Upper Heyford on the site of the previously approved primary school (ref. Application 10/01642/OUT).

All matters are reserved, therefore 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.

Existing Heyford Consent (10/01642/OUT) and S106 Agreement

Should the 60 dwelling proposed under this application form part of the approved 1075 dwellings at Heyford, the Local Highway Authority would have no objections in principle to

this proposal, subject to suitably worded planning conditions. In such a case, the 60 dwellings would be subject to the existing pre-commencement conditions and obligations for the settlement.

However, this application appears to propose 60 new dwellings in addition to the previously approved 1075 dwellings, which would take the total number of dwellings at Heyford Park to

1135. As stated in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 Policy H2, "*Land at RAF Upper Heyford will provide for a new settlement of a maximum of about 1000 dwellings...*" This application therefore does not comply with policy.

No additional or proportionate mitigation is proposed in line with that previously agreed for the Heyford settlement area in the S106 Agreement of 2011. This application refers to previously negotiated improvements to pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and bus services, however if this development is to come forward independently of the wider settlement area, then appropriate mitigation and trigger points for this will need to be considered through a new or varied S106 Agreement.

Transport Statement

The Transport Statement submitted with this application seeks to justify why the proposal will have no material impact on the highway. The main argument centres around the recent economic downturn, stating that actual 2013 traffic levels are less than previously forecast in the 2007 Arup TA and that the traffic generation of these 60 new dwellings can be accommodated on the highway within the traffic thresholds previously predicted.

It is worth noting that the 2007 Arup TA application included the Flying Field employment area and the Settlement Area to the south of the flying field, and that 2013 was assumed to be the Year of Opening. The later application 10/01642/OUT applied to the Settlement Area only. 2013 has not proved to be the Year of Opening. It is unclear what the Year Of Opening is likely to be, and indeed whether the economy may have recovered by that stage.

Having reviewed the Transport Statement (TS), I note the following concerns:

- The parking standards referred to are those for Oxford City and must be revised to use the appropriate standard - 'all areas in Oxfordshire (other than Oxford and Cherwell Urban Areas)'
- Whilst the TS relies heavily on data from the Arup 2007 TA, this data is not replicated in this document, making it difficult to compare and check figures and assumptions.
- The 2007 Arup TA originally reviewed 12 junctions in the vicinity and identified six of these to be tested. This TS only looks at five of those six junctions and for the purposes of robustness should consider all six.
- The manual 2013 traffic surveys carried out at the five junctions (ref. Section 5.3) only comprise one day of data and refer to roadworks occurring on that day. This is not considered a representative survey. At least two days should be surveyed in normal traffic conditions.
- Although reference is made to an additional survey carried out on Thursday 27th June, this data has not been included for consideration.
- Section 5.2 is flawed for a number of reasons:
 - '2013 Existing Situation' traffic has been calculated using Arup 2007 TA data, specifically by deducting 2006 traffic flows in Figures 5/6 from Figures 7/8 and adding to Figures 15/16.
 - Deducting 2006 traffic flows in Figures 5/6 from Figures 7/8 actually provides negative data. Clearly this cannot be a correct means of determining the level of traffic generated by Heyford Park in 2006.
 - Figures 15/16 actually refer to traffic flows at Junction 10 of the M40, clearly irrelevant to this exercise.
 - The above flawed approach is a convoluted way to determine existing traffic flows that would be more reliably obtained by simply carrying out an up-to-date survey of traffic to the site. An up-to-date survey would also enable a direct comparison of operations at Heyford Park in 2006 and 2013. I am unclear whether the site was more heavily used in 2006, particularly the flying field site but also potentially the existing residential element.
- Table 5.1 has a number of errors, however in light of the above comment ref Section 5.2, the methodology is flawed in any case.
- Section 6.3 uses the same trip rates in the Arup 2007 TA to estimate the traffic generation of the proposed 60 dwellings. Whilst there may not be much difference, I would like to see use of the TRICS database which will hold more up to date survey data and could therefore provide a more up to date likely traffic generation.

- Figures 4 and 5 in the TS appendix have a number of errors when compared with the manual count data. Also Figure 5 repeatedly refers to AM peak when actually it is looking at the PM peak, which is confusing.

Conclusion

In light of the above concerns, including inadequate Transport Statement and S106 Heads of Terms, on behalf of the Local Highway Authority I am not in a position to recommend approval of this application.

Officer's Name: Judy Kelly

Officer's Title: Senior Engineer

Date: 10 January 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: 09 January 2014

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01811/OUT

Proposal: 60 dwellings

Location: Dow Street Upper Heyford

Education

Recommendation:

Objection

Key issues:

- The proposed development is for the site originally identified to provide a new primary school for the Upper Heyford development.
- Following the opening of the Heyford Park Free School, the county council is negotiating a Deed of Variation to the December 2011 Section 106 Agreement with the developers of Heyford Park, which envisages release of this site, but not until the new Free School (Refurbished) has been “built” and open to pupils by a given longstop date.
- Currently, the original Primary School site is protected under the December 2011 Section 106 Agreement, and is not available for housing development.
- Until the Deed of Variation is agreed, the county council objects to residential development on this site.

Legal Agreement required to secure:

If the Free School were to fail or close (and no alternative academy provider found to operate the facility) then the county council would be left with a need to provide additional school capacity for both primary and secondary pupils.

Therefore, should this planning application be approved, any S106 agreement should include appropriate mitigation against this eventuality. Contributions should also be 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.

Conditions:

Deed of Variation required to be agreed, as above.

Informatives:

December 2011 Section 106 Agreement.

Detailed Comments:

The primary and secondary pupil generation from this development can be accommodated at the Heyford Park Free School, assuming its continuation. In these circumstances no developer contributions towards primary or secondary education would be sought.

However, if the Free School were to fail or close (and no alternative academy provider found to operate the facility) then the county council would be left with a need to provide additional school capacity for both primary and secondary pupils.

Should the planning application be approved, any S106 agreement should include appropriate mitigation against this eventuality. Contributions would also be 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.

Officer's Name: Barbara Chillman / Diane Cameron

Officer's Title: Service Manager / School Organisation Officer

Date: 17 January 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.

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 December 2013
