

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Proposal: Erection of 79 dwellings, creation of new access from Camp Road, creation of new open space, hard and soft landscaping and ancillary works

Location: Land East Of, Larsen Road, Upper Heyford

Date: 17 November 2021

This report sets out the officer views of Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) on the above proposal. These are set out by individual service area/technical discipline and include details of any planning conditions or Informatives that should be attached in the event that permission is granted and any obligations to be secured by way of a S106 agreement. Where considered appropriate, an overarching strategic commentary is also included. If the local County Council member has provided comments on the application these are provided as a separate attachment.

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Location: Land East Of, Larsen Road, Upper Heyford

General Information and Advice

Recommendations for approval contrary to OCC objection:

If within this response an OCC officer has raised an objection but the Local Planning Authority are still minded to recommend approval, OCC would be grateful for notification (via planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk) as to why material consideration outweigh OCC's objections, and to be given an opportunity to make further representations.

Outline applications and contributions

The anticipated number and type of dwellings and/or the floor space may be set by the developer at the time of application which is used to assess necessary mitigation. If not stated in the application, a policy compliant mix will be used. The number and type of dwellings used when assessing S106 planning obligations is set out on the first page of this response.

In the case of outline applications, once the unit mix/floor space is confirmed by reserved matters approval/discharge of condition a matrix (if appropriate) will be applied to establish any increase in contributions payable. A further increase in contributions may result if there is a reserved matters approval changing the unit mix/floor space.

Where a S106/Planning Obligation is required:

- **Index Linked** – in order to maintain the real value of S106 contributions, contributions will be index linked. Base values and the index to be applied are set out in the Schedules to this response.
- **Administration and Monitoring Fee - TBC**
This is an estimate of the amount required to cover the monitoring and administration associated with the S106 agreement. The final amount will be based on the OCC's scale of fees and will be adjusted to take account of the number of obligations and the complexity of the S106 agreement.
- **OCC Legal Fees** The applicant will be required to pay OCC's legal fees in relation to legal agreements. Please note the fees apply whether a S106 agreement is completed or not.

Security of payment for deferred contributions - Applicants should be aware that an approved bond will be required to secure a payment where a S106 contribution is to be paid post implementation and

- the contribution amounts to 25% or more (including anticipated indexation) of the cost of the project it is towards and that project cost £7.5m or more
- the developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure costing £7.5m or more
- where aggregate contributions towards bus services exceeds £1m (including anticipated indexation).

A bond will also be required where a developer is direct delivering an item of infrastructure.

The County Infrastructure Funding Team can provide the full policy and advice, on request.

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Location: Land East Of, Larsen Road, Upper Heyford

Strategic Comments

This response relates to the latest submission of revised drawings and updated documents dated September 2021.

Application 18/00825/HYBRID has been submitted for the comprehensive development of Heyford Park and remains undetermined.

It is noted that the number of dwellings in the proposal has increased to 89 and as such contributions sought towards mitigation agreed as part of 18/00825/HYBRID will increase to take account of this.

The County Council is raising a Local Lead Flood Authority objection. Also attached are Transport, Education, Infrastructure Funding and Waste Management comments.

Officer's Name: Jonathan Wellstead

Officer's Title: Principal Planner

Date: 17/11/2021

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Location: Land East Of, Larsen Road, Upper Heyford

Transport Schedule

Recommendation

No objection subject to the following.

- S106 Contributions as set out below.
- An obligation to enter into a S278 agreement as set out below.
- Planning Conditions as detailed below.
- Note should be taken of the informatives stated below.

S106 Contributions

This development, together with the adjacent Phase 2 (21/03523/OUT), will need to contribute proportionately to the off site mitigation measures for Heyford Park as agreed in the main Policy Villages 5 planning application under reference No.18/00825/HYBRID. Specifically, This will include contributions towards the following measures.

- M40, Junction 10
- Bus service contribution
- Junction safety improvements A4260 / B4027
- HGV restrictions on the B4030
- Capacity improvements at Hopcrofts Holt
- Middleton Stoney Bus Gate or other scheme to relieve congestion
- Cycle link between Camp Road and B430
- Bridleway upgrade between B430 and Bicester
- Signalisation of Ardley Road/Bucknell Rd/B430 junction
- Signalisation of B430/unnamed road junction
- Junction of Chilgrove Drive and Camp Road
- Upgraded Chilgrove Drive and masterplan bus route
- Village traffic calming
- Junction safety improvements A4260/North Aston Road
- Camp Road improvements
- Crossing by school

The precise methods by which the proportionate share will be determined are still to be confirmed.

Comments

Transport Development Control

The amended documents are accompanied by a Transport Appraisal. The following is noted.

- Paragraph 1.6 lists a number of schemes that are identified in the Transport Assessment Addendum of the Policy Villages 5 planning application under reference No.18/00825/HYBRID. This list has since been superseded during the course of further negotiations. The current list of schemes to which this development will need to contribute is set out above under the heading **S106 Contributions**.
- Paragraph 3.5.2 states that: "*A summary of bus services within Linton is provided in Table 1.*" It is not clear what Linton is.
- Paragraph 4.2.3 states: "*For the full details of the footway along the frontage of the site along Camp Road, please see Woods Hardwick drawing 16871-SK381.*" The drawing referred to does not appear to be included in the planning application documents.
- Section 4.4. Parking provision complies with the Heyford Park Design Code, but there are some inconsistencies as noted below.
- Table 3. Trip rates have been taken from the Transport Assessment that accompanied the original planning application whereas they should have been taken from the transport modelling work which accompanied the Policy Villages 5 planning application. Notwithstanding this inconsistency it is unlikely that trips generated by the additional units will have a significant impact on the highway network and the mitigation package identified for Heyford Park.

Coleman Hicks drawing No.002 appears to contain some inconsistencies. Plot 51 is allocated no parking spaces, whereas plot 53 is allocated four parking spaces. Similarly plot 60 is allocated no parking spaces, whereas plot 62 is allocated four parking spaces. It is assumed that these are errors in annotation, but this should be clarified.

Coleman Hicks drawing No.006 shows the location of cycle storage facilities and it is noted that all dwellings are provided for either with separate cycle facilities or with a garage. However, no details of the cycle storage facilities are provided. This information can be provided in discharge of a condition of planning permission.

Transport Strategy

The number of proposed dwellings on the site has increased to 90. Therefore the proportional contribution sought from this site towards the list of mitigation measures that were agreed as part of the Policy Villages 5 planning application (18/00825/HYBRID) must increase to take account of the additional dwellings.

The County would reinforce the importance of sustainable transport connections and ensuring that not just pedestrian connectivity is considered, as suggested in 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 of the Transport Appraisal, but that cycle connectivity to Camp Road and on Camp Road has also been considered and that this ties in with provision either side of the development. This is indicated on the maps provided, it is not always clear what will be provided.

Travel Plans

The development will need to come under the influence of a Travel Plan. This could be achieved in one of two ways, as follows.

- The site could be included in the emerging Heyford Park Travel Plan currently being developed by the Dorchester Group.
- A stand alone Travel Plan for the site could be developed. This would need to align closely with the emerging Heyford Park Travel Plan.

To support active travel for the new residents a Travel Information Pack should be produced. Guidance on the requirements for this document can be obtained from the Travel Plans team at Oxfordshire County Council.

The Design and Access Statement does not provide details of how the site will link to wider off site walking and cycling networks. This information is needed for the travel plan to show how walking and cycling will be encouraged for local trips.

Rights of Way

There is a need for residents of this parcel to be able to access the rest of the Heyford Park site and wider area, with Camp Road being main access point. The site's frontage to Camp Road should therefore provide the space to construct a standard County specification cycleway / footway inside its boundary to include a connection to the parcel adjacent to Chilgrove Drive. This site therefore needs to provide a pro-rata contribution to the cycleway / footway extension.

Road Agreements

There have been some issues along the same stretch of road where there have been land boundary issues. It would be important for the developer to thoroughly check their title with the actual highway boundary for any Section 278 applications to check if there are any gaps.

The County would want full highway adoption for the vision splays for the main junction.

It looks like there would be some S278 works necessary to amend the current Camp Road island which currently would hinder traffic turning right from the new development.

Footway link should be proposed between site and existing highway.

It is unclear what and for whom the 6.0m on the Proposed Site Plan is for. This information could be supplied at the S278 stage, but the County would prefer to receive it as soon as possible beforehand.

General adoptability comments are as follows.

- Where there is not a footway adjacent to the carriageway i.e. a shared surface carriageway, a minimum 800mm maintenance margin is required.
- A long section indicating the vertical alignment will be required to determine appropriate carriageway and footway gradients. These will need to be DDA compliant i.e. maximum 1:20 or 5%.
- The Service corridor will need to be a minimum 2.0m wide under the footway or verge.
- There are no visibility splays indicated. Junction and Forward Visibility Splays must be in accordance with the County's Residential Design Guide Second Edition (2015) and dedicated to the County if they fall out of the existing highway boundary.
- The County requires a swept path analysis for an 11.6m refuse vehicle for all manoeuvres in forward gear passing an on-coming or parked family car throughout the layout. The swept path does not indicate how an oncoming or parked car and evidence will be required if this layout is to be adopted. The carriageway will also require widening on the bends as indicated in the County's Residential Design Guide Second Edition (2015) Para 6.28.
- Shared surfaces width will be a minimum of 6.0m and a minimum of 800mm maintenance margin is required either side of the shared surface. A blocked paved surface or similar will be required for shared surfaces.
- Provide a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit in accordance with GG119 (5.46.1) including a designers response.
- No private drainage is to discharge onto any area of existing or proposed adoptable highway. The drainage proposals will be agreed at the Section 38 Agreement stage once the drainage calculations and detailed design are presented.
- Foul and surface water manholes should not be placed within the middle of the carriageway, at junctions, tyre tracks and where informal crossing points are located.
- Trees must not conflict with streetlights and must be a minimum 10 metres away and a minimum 1.5m from the carriageway. Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection. Given the number of trees indicated it would be helpful that the proposed street lighting is provided as trees will have to be located at least 10 metres away to ensure the streetlights can perform effectively.

- Trees within the highway will need to be approved by the County and will carry a commuted sum. No private planting to overhang or encroach the proposed adoptable areas.
- Minor residential roads that serve four or less properties will not be considered for adoption. Roads serving five or more houses can be considered for adoption but will need to meet adoptable criteria set out in the County's Residential Design Guide Second Edition (2015).
- The Highway boundary needs to be checked with the County's Highway Records (highway.records@oxfordshire.gov.uk) to determine whether or not it coincides with the site boundary at the proposed access junction. The highway boundary is usually identified along the roadside edge of the ditch.

S278 Highway Works

An obligation to enter into a S278 Agreement will be required to secure highway works including the site access onto Camp Road and a footway / cycleway connection to Chilgrove Drive.

This is to be secured by means of S106 restriction not to implement development (or occasionally other trigger point) until S278 agreement has been entered into. The trigger by which time S278 works are to be completed shall also be included in the S106 agreement.

Identification of areas required to be dedicated as public highway and agreement of all relevant landowners will be necessary in order to enter into the S278 agreements.

Planning Conditions

Planning conditions as set out in the County's response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply.

Informatives

Informatives as set out in the County's to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply.

Officer's Name: Chris Nichols

Officer's Title: Transport Development Control

Date: 8 November 2021

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Location: Land East Of, Larsen Road, Upper Heyford

Lead Local Flood Authority

Recommendation:

Objection

Key Issues

Whilst we have no concerns over the principles used in the strategy, the infiltration rates used in the calculations and strategy must be backed by infiltration testing results.

Soakage tests to BRE 365 should be carried out to confirm that infiltration is feasible for the soakaway SuDS intent for the proposed development.

Officer's Name: Sujeenthan Jeevarangan

Officer's Title: LLFA Planning Engineer

Date: 15 October 2021

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Location: Land E of Larsen Road Upper Heyford

Education Schedule

Recommendation:

No objection subject to:

- **S106 Contributions** as summarised in the tables below and justified in this Schedule.

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Primary and nursery education	£639,375	327	BCIS All-In TPI	Primary education serving the development
Primary school land contribution	£60,158	Nov-20	RPIX	Contribution towards primary school land
Secondary	£281,860	327	BCIS All-In TPI	Secondary education capacity serving the development
SEN	£37,757	327	BCIS All-In TPI	SEN capacity serving the development
Total	£1,019,150			

The total development proposed and underway within the Heyford Park masterplan area, including the developments outside this application, have been assessed to estimate the total pupil generation which is expected for each age range.

Part of this provision is already delivered through the existing Heyford Park School and, for early years education, the Old Station Nursery. The balance of provision required has been calculated and the cost equalised across the different developments on a pro rata basis. In making this calculation, an allowance has been included for the expected pupil generation from the parcel not yet submitted for planning permission (Parcel 15) to avoid those applications currently under consideration being over-burdened.

S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):

£639,375 Primary and Nursery School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327

Justification:

Comparing current nursery and primary capacity at Heyford Park with the total generation expected from all masterplan parcels shows a deficit of provision equating to 103 nursery places and 300 primary places.

This scale of provision requires a new school. A new 1.5 form entry primary school will provide 75 nursery places and 315 primary places.

The cost has been calculated pro-rata, taking into account the current surplus places at Heyford Park School.

Calculation:

Estimated cost of a new 1.5 form entry primary school = £9,668,000 (TPI = 327)

Total pupil generation expected from new/future applications: 499 (some of whom will benefit from surplus places previously provided at the existing school)

Cost per pupil (based on 499 pupils) = £9,668,000 / 499 = £19,375

Number of primary and nursery pupils expected to be generated	33
Estimated per pupil cost of a new 1.5 form entry primary school	£19,375
Pupils * cost =	£639,375

£60,158 Primary School Land Cost Contribution

This development should contribute in a fair and proportionate manner to the land required for the primary school.

Oxfordshire County Council's standard land requirement for a 1.5 FE primary school is 2.22 ha, and standard education land value per ha = £409,761 (Nov-20). The total school land value is £909,669 (£409,761 x 2.22).

This application is expected to generate 33 nursery and primary pupils. This equates to 6.6% of the expected pupil generation from current and expected future applications.

6.6% of £909, 669 is £60,158.

£281,860 Secondary School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327

Justification:

Comparing current secondary and sixth form capacity at Heyford Park with the total generation expected from all parcels shows a deficit of provision equating to 192 secondary places. There is no deficit in sixth form places, and therefore no sixth form contribution is required.

The cost has been calculated pro-rata across all proposed developments, taking into account the current surplus places at Heyford Park School.

Calculation:

Cost per place of expanding a secondary school: £25,992 (TPI=327)

Additional number of places required to meet the needs of all parcels of Heyford Park:
192

Total cost of expansion for 192 places = $192 * £25,992 = £4,990,485$

Total pupil generation expected from new/future applications: 301 (some of whom will benefit from surplus places previously provided at the existing school)

Cost per pupil (based on 301 pupils) = $£4,990,485 / 301 = £16,580$

Secondary pupil generation from this development: 17

Secondary contribution required from this development = $17 * £16,580 = £281,860$

Number of secondary pupils expected to be generated	17
Estimated per pupil cost of secondary school expansion	£16,580
Pupils * cost =	£281,860

£37,757 Special School Contribution indexed from TPI = 327**Justification:**

Government guidance is that local authorities should secure developer contributions for expansion to special education provision commensurate with the need arising from the development.

Approximately half of pupils with Education Needs & Disabilities (SEND) are educated in mainstream schools, in some cases supported by specialist resource bases, and approximately half attend special schools, some of which are run by the local authority

and some of which are independent. Based on current pupil data, approximately 0.9% of primary pupils attend special school, 2.1% of secondary pupils and 1.5% of sixth form pupils. These percentages are deducted from the mainstream pupil contributions referred to above, and generate the number of pupils expected to require education at a special school.

The county council's Special Educational Needs & Disability Sufficiency of Places Strategy is available at <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/schools/our-work-schools/planning-enough-school-places> and sets out how Oxfordshire already needs more special school places. This is being achieved through a mixture of new schools and expansions of existing schools.

The proposed development is expected to further increase demand for places at SEN schools in the area, and a contribution towards expansion of SEN school capacity is therefore sought based on the percentage of the pupil generation who would be expected to require places at a special school, based on pupil census data.

Calculation:

Number of pupils requiring education at a special school expected to be generated	0.5
Estimated per pupil cost of special school expansion, as advised by Government guidance "Local Authority School Places Scorecards 2019" (June 2020)	£75,513
Pupils * cost =	£37,757

The above contributions are based on a unit mix of:

- 10 x 1 bed dwellings
- 29 x 2 bed dwellings
- 42 x 3 bed dwellings
- 8 x 4 bed dwellings

Officer's Name: Louise Heavey

Officer's Title: Access to Learning Information Analyst

Date: 15 November 2021

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Location: Land E of Larsen Road Upper Heyford

Infrastructure Funding

Recommendation:

No objection subject to S106 contributions

Legal agreement required to secure:

No objection subject to:

- S106 Contributions as summarised in the tables below and justified in this Schedule.

Contribution	Amount	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Library	£9,559	2Q 17	PUBSEC	Funding of Bicester library

S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):

£9,559 Library Contribution to be indexed linked from 2Q 17 using the PUBSEC index

Towards: Repaying the cost of forward funding the new Bicester library

Justification: A new library has been provided in the Franklins Yard development in Bicester. Part of the cost of the project was forward funded in advance of contributions being received from development. A contribution is required from this development toward repaying the cost of forward funding the delivery of Bicester library.

Calculation:

There is £487,205 still to be secured from the total £1.2 M capital cost of the project at 2nd Quarter 2017 price base index.

Population forecasts show a population increase of 20,257 to 2026 for the Bicester Library Service catchment area.

Current contribution requirement is £487,205 ÷ by 20,257 = £24.05

The development 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 = £20 per person.

The full requirement for the provision of library infrastructure and supplementary core book stock in respect of this application is: £ 44.05 x 217 (the forecast number of new residents) = **£9,559**

Officer's Name: Richard Oliver

Officer's Title: Infrastructure Funding Negotiator

Date: 11 November 2021

Application no: 15/01357/F-3

Location: Land E of Larsen Road Upper Heyford

Waste Management

Recommendation:

No objection subject to S106 contributions

Legal agreement required to secure:

No objection subject to:

- S106 Contributions as summarised in the tables below and justified in this Schedule.

Contribution	Amount	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Household Waste Recycling Centres	£8,362	327	BCIS All-In TPI	Expansion and efficiency of Household Waste Recycling Centres (<u>HWRC</u>)

S106 obligations and their compliance with Regulation 122(2) Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):

£8,362 Household Waste Recycling Centre Contribution indexed from Index Value 327 using BCIS All-in Tender Price Index

Towards:

The expansion and efficiency of Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) capacity.

Justification:

1. Oxfordshire County Council, as a Waste Disposal Authority, is required under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (Section 51) to arrange:

“for places to be provided at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of waste so deposited”;

and that

“(a) each place is situated either within the area of the authority or so as to be reasonably accessible to persons resident in its area;

“(b) each place is available for the deposit of waste at all reasonable times (including at least one period on the Saturday or following day of each week except a week in which the Saturday is 25th December or 1st January);

“(c) each place is available for the deposit of waste free of charge by persons resident in the area;”.

2. Such places are known as Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) and Oxfordshire County Council provides seven HWRCs throughout the County. This network of sites is no longer fit for purpose and is over capacity.
3. Site capacity is assessed by comparing the number of visitors on site at any one time (as measured by traffic monitoring) to the available space. This analysis shows that all sites are currently ‘over capacity’ (meaning residents need to queue before they are able to deposit materials) at peak times, and many sites are nearing capacity during off peak times. The proposed development will provide 89 dwellings. If each household makes four trips per annum the development would impact on the already over capacity HWRCs by an additional 356 HWRC visits per year.
4. Congestion on site can reduce recycling as residents who have already queued to enter are less willing to take the time necessary to sort materials into the correct bin. Reduced recycling leads to higher costs and an adverse impact on the environment. As all sites are currently over capacity, population growth linked to new housing developments will increase the pressure on the sites.
5. The Waste Regulations (England and Wales) 2011 require that waste is dealt with according to the waste hierarchy. The County Council provides a large number of appropriate containers and storage areas at HWRCs to maximise the amount of waste reused or recycled that is delivered by local residents. However, to manage the waste appropriately this requires more space and infrastructure meaning the pressures of new developments are increasingly felt. Combined with the complex and varied nature of materials delivered to site it will become increasingly difficult over time to comply with the EU Waste Framework Directive 2008, enacted through the Waste Regulations (England and Wales) 2011 (as amended), maintain performance and a good level of service especially at busy and peak times.

Calculation:

Space at <u>HWRC</u> required per dwelling (<u>m²</u>)	0.18	Current land available 41,000 <u>m²</u> , needs to increase by 28% to cope with current capacity issues. Space for reuse requires an additional 7%. Therefore, total land required for current dwellings (300,090) is 55,350 <u>m²</u> , or 0.18 <u>m²</u> per dwelling
Infrastructure cost per	£275	<u>Kidlington</u> build cost/ <u>m²</u> indexed to 327 <u>BCIS</u>

m ²		
Land cost per m ²	£247	Senior Estates Surveyor valuation
Total land and infrastructure cost /m ²	£522	
Cost/dwelling	£93.96	
No of dwellings in the development	89	
Total contributions requested	£8,362	

Detailed comments:

Oxfordshire councils have ambitious targets to reduce the amount of waste generated and increase the amount recycled as demonstrated in our Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2018-2023. Enabling residents of new dwellings to fully participate in district council waste and recycling collections is vital to allow Oxfordshire's high recycling rates to be maintained and reduce the amount of non-recyclable waste generated.

Bin storage areas must be able to accommodate the correct number of mixed recycling, refuse and food recycling bins; be safe and easy to use for residents and waste collection crews and meet the requirements of the waste collection authority.

Given the pressing urgency of climate change and the need to embed the principles of the circular economy into all areas of our society, we encourage the applicant to consider including community spaces that help reduce waste and build community cohesion through assets such as community fridges, space for the sharing economy (library of things), refill stations, space for local food growing etc.

The development will increase domestic waste arisings and the demand for all waste management services including Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs).

Conditions:

In the event that permission is to be given, the following conditions should be attached:

N/A

Officer's Name: Mark Watson

Officer's Title: Waste Strategy Projects Officer

Date: 11 November 2021

