

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 16/02446/F-2

Proposal: Erection of 296 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) comprising a mix of open market and affordable housing, together with associated works including provision of new and amended vehicular and pedestrian accesses, public open space, landscaping, utilities and infrastructure, and demolition of existing built structures and site clearance works

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5HD.

Response date: 6th July 2018

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.

Assessment Criteria **Proposal overview and mix/population generation**

OCC's response is based on a development as set out in the table below. The development is taken from the application form.

Residential	No.
1-bed dwellings	22
2-bed dwellings	60
3-bed dwellings	105
4-bed & larger dwellings	109
Extra Care Housing	
Affordable Housing %	30%
Development to be built out and occupied out over	4 years

Based on the completion and occupation of the development as stated above it is estimated that the proposal will generate the population stated below:

Average Population	597
Primary pupils	98
Secondary pupils	54
Sixth Form pupils	7
SEN pupils	1.8
Nursery children (number of 2 and 3 year olds entitled to funded places)	17.1
20 - 64 year olds	344
65+ year olds	54
0 – 4 year olds	61

Application no: 16/02446/F-2

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5HD.

Strategic Comments

OCC support this application and the delivery of Local Plan Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford. Since OCC's initial response to this application dated 6th March 2017, good progress on the site allocation masterplan and mitigation package has been made; for this reason OCC withdraw its previous objection concerning the absence of a wider masterplan.

There remains an OCC transport objection to the application with a number of technical issues that require further work to resolve them.

The transport response also maintains its objection on the grounds of incomplete strategic mitigation for the Policy Villages 5 allocation as a whole, pending completion of the Transport Assessment for the masterplan area. However, good progress has been made and mitigation measures are agreed. Further work is required however to identify mitigation solutions for Middleton Stoney, and for Junction 10 and its surrounding junctions. Funding from the Oxfordshire Growth Deal has been released for this financial year to help identify solutions to the impact on the B430 in order to avoid housing delivery being delayed. It is expected that this work will be complete in the autumn. Whilst OCC would normally insist on this work being carried out prior to the application going to planning committee, it is considered that the release of Growth Deal funding towards infrastructure solutions constitutes exceptional circumstances. Therefore, if CDC are minded to approve this application, any resolution to grant planning permission should be subject to resolving OCC's technical transport objection and to agreeing a mechanism to cover S106 contributions for the elements of the masterplan mitigation package that are still to be finalised.

All comments in OCC's response of 6th March 2017 continue to apply other than where addressed in this update.

Officer's Name: Jacqui Cox

Officer's Title: Locality Lead (Cherwell)

Date: 06 July 2018

Application no: 16/02446/F-2

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5HD

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 given an opportunity to make further representations.

Outline applications and contributions

The number and type of dwellings and/or the floor space may be set by the developer at the time of application, or if not stated in the application, a policy compliant mix will be used for assessment of the impact and mitigation in the form of s106 contributions. These are set out on the first page of this response.

In the case of outline applications, once the unit mix/floor space is confirmed by the developer a matrix (if appropriate) will be applied to assess any increase in contributions payable. The matrix will be based on an assumed policy compliant mix as if not agreed during the s106 negotiations.

Where unit mix is established prior to commencement of development, the matrix sum can be fixed based on the supplied mix (with scope for higher contribution if there is a revised reserved matters approval).

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.
- **Security of payment for deferred contributions** – An approved **bond** will be required to secure payments where the payment of S106 contributions (in aggregate) have been agreed to be deferred to post implementation and the total County contributions for the development exceed £1m (after indexation).

Administration and Monitoring Fee - £10,706

This is an estimate of the amount required to cover the extra monitoring and administration associated with the S106 agreement. The final amount will be based on the OCC's scale of fees and will 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 an s106 agreement is completed or not.

CIL Regulation 123

Due to pooling constraints for local authorities set out in Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), OCC may choose not to seek contributions set out in this response during the s106 drafting and negotiation.

That decision is taken either because:

- OCC considers that to do so it would breach the limit of 5 obligations to that infrastructure type or that infrastructure project or
- OCC considers that it is appropriate to reserve the ability to seek contributions to that infrastructure type or that infrastructure project in relation to the impacts of another proposal.

The district planning authority should however, take into account the whole impact of the proposed development on the county infrastructure, and the lack of mitigation in making its decision.

Application no: 16/02446/F-2

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5HD.

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reasons:

- It is not possible to fully assess the impact of traffic and the mitigation required based on the Transport Addendum provided, due to its dependency on the site-wide Allocation Transport Assessment and agreement on its associated mitigation package, which is not yet complete.
- The proposed bus loop within the site is too constrained and could prejudice the sustainable transport strategy for the Policy Villages 5 Allocation site.
- Various aspects of the proposed layout pose a potential highway safety risk, as well as being prejudicial to the provision of attractive sustainable transport opportunities.
- The connections to the cycle network on Camp Road are inadequate and likely to adversely affect the take up of sustainable travel within the Policy Villages 5 Allocation site.

If despite OCC's objection permission is proposed to be granted then OCC requires prior to the issuing of planning permission a S106 agreement including an obligation to enter into a S278 agreement to mitigate the impact of the development plus planning conditions and informatives as detailed below.

S106 Contributions

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Highway works	TBC – proportionate contribution	TBC	Baxter	Mitigation package for Policy Villages 5, which will include improvements to a number of junctions off site and traffic calming in villages. Other measures may also be recommended.
Public transport services	TBC – proportionate contribution	TBC	RPI-x	Provision of new bus services linking the site to Oxford and Bicester, in accordance with the public transport strategy yet to be finalised for the Policy Villages 5 Allocation.

				Provision of mini-bus link to Heyford station.
Public transport infrastructure (<i>if not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement</i>)	TBC		Baxter	An additional pair of bus stops on Camp Road serving the development.
Travel Plan Monitoring	TBC proportionate contribution		RPI-x	Monitoring of the site wide residential travel plan for Policy Villages 5
Public Rights of Way	TBC Proportionate contribution		Baxter	Off site rights of way improvements required for Policy Villages 5 masterplan.
Total				

The S106 will also need to make provision for the bus loop within the site.

Key points

- The Transport Assessment Addendum relies on the findings of the Allocation TA, which is not yet complete. Therefore we cannot agree the conclusions of the TA Addendum
- OCC has not completed its review of the incomplete Allocation TA, so reserves its right to comment further on this application once that review is complete.
- There are a number of issues with the design that need to be resolved, in particular concern over the bus loop and the likelihood that buses will be delayed in it.
- The travel plan requires improvement.
- The parameter plan needs updating to show pedestrian (and equestrian) connections.
- Improvements are needed to cycle connectivity with/along Camp Road
- Impact of construction traffic – assumptions are questioned
- Drainage strategy is inadequate in relation to infiltration testing and pond size.

Comments:

A Transport Assessment Addendum has been provided with this amendment to the application. It should be noted that there have been no scoping discussions for this Addendum. Table 2.1 in the Addendum sets out OCC's previous points of objection and how these are addressed with this amendment.

Taking each of the points in turn:

- 1. Lack of strategic mitigation for the Policy Villages 5 allocation as a whole.**
Table 2.1 says that Policy Villages 5 has now been assessed in full and strategic transport mitigation for the full allocation has now been considered. Whilst a TA for the allocation (the 'Allocation TA') has been submitted in support of a Hybrid planning application for the full allocation, and as an Appendix to the TA Addendum

submitted to support this application, it is known to be incomplete at the time of writing. Strategic modelling is still being undertaken to establish the necessary mitigation for congestion at Middleton Stoney, junctions in Ardley have yet to be assessed, and mitigation solutions for the M40 and A43 junctions have yet to be agreed with Highways England. Therefore, while we appreciate this work is ongoing and expect it to be completed in early autumn, we are not yet able to agree it, and the mitigation package has not been fully established. *For this reason, the Highway Authority maintains its objection, pending completion of the Allocation TA.*

2. The application only addresses the transport impact of this development.

Table 2.1 again cites the Transport Assessment work being carried out for the allocation planning application. *OCC maintains its objection for the reason stated above.* Moreover, the TA Addendum seeks to isolate the impact of this development, by not including anything else in the Policy Villages 5 allocation as committed development. It concludes that this development does not in itself trigger the need (by 2022) for any of the highway mitigation being discussed as needed for the wider allocation. The Allocation TA does not yet set out any proposed triggers for the highway mitigation, but this will need to be established cumulatively. The impact of this development must be recognised as part of the cumulative impact of the Policy Villages 5 allocation in 2031 and must contribute proportionately to the mitigation package once agreed. *Until the mitigation package and triggers for it are established, the Highway Authority maintains its objection.*

3. Applications not part of Policy Villages 5.

The TA addendum now correctly states that the following applications are not considered to be part of the Policy Villages 5 allocation:

- 13/01811/OUT - Dow Street permission: 60 dwellings
- 16/00263/F – Demolition of Buildings 485 and 488 and the erection of 43 dwellings

However, the addendum states that these applications “*should be considered as windfall development that fall outside of both the original consented scheme (1,075 dwellings) and the current allocation of 1,600 homes.*”

This is not correct; these applications should be considered as part of the original consented scheme. Deeds of variation to the S106 agreement for 10/01642/OUT have been completed to amend the cap on development and secure the necessary mitigating infrastructure. The same principle applies to 16/01000/F (village centre south).

4. Public transport proposals must be seen as not prejudicial to the development of a public transport mitigation strategy for Policy Villages 5 as a whole.

Table 2.1 states that a public transport strategy for the site as a whole has been agreed in principle with OCC. It is indeed the case that a suitable level of provision has been offered, but the detail of the strategy, including bus stops and routing through the site, has not been agreed because the Allocation TA and masterplan are still under consultation with OCC. The Addendum TA states that

the site would be served by the 25A service from an existing stop on Camp Road and one soon to be installed. This is acceptable in the short term.

However, this application would need to provide the bus loop required to terminate services at Heyford under the masterplan public transport strategy, and the revised layout shows a proposed bus loop, and swept path analysis around the loop for a 12m bus. I consider this loop to be unsuitable for this use due to the constrained road layout and the likelihood of on-street parking. The tracking shows large vehicles crossing the centre line in several places, and taking up almost the whole carriageway, leaving no space for oncoming vehicles to wait, with the likelihood of stand-offs where one vehicle is forced to reverse. Any on-street parking would necessitate very slow manoeuvring by buses, with the result that buses could be significantly delayed and unable to meet their timetables. This would adversely affect the potential for the routes to become commercially viable, and this would be prejudicial to the development of a public transport strategy for the allocation as a whole. Reason for objection pending a review of the design.

- 5. Minimal parking provision for flats and smaller dwellings leading on on-street parking.** There does not appear to have been an increase in parking levels and Table 2.1 seeks to justify this by saying that there is enough space on many roads within the site for on-street parking. The vehicle swept path analysis drawing shows that there is very little scope for on-street parking not to be problematic, and there is a high likelihood that footways will become obstructed. I also notice that much of the parking is tandem parking, the owners of which will be inclined park on street to avoid the inconvenience of 'juggling' family vehicles. While on street parking is more likely to be a nuisance rather than a safety hazard, its impact on walking routes and the passage of buses will make sustainable travel less attractive and the new bus services less commercially viable. *Reason for objection, pending a review of the design.*
- 6. Trip generation and distribution:** Table 2.1 says that this has now been agreed as part of the assessment for the wider allocation. Without prejudice to OCC's response to the Hybrid application for the allocation site, I confirm that the principles were agreed as part of preapplication discussions. However, the trip generation would have taken into account the facilities on the wider site and the level of trip containment. If this site were to come forward in isolation, the same criteria would not apply. This principle will only be accepted if there is a firm commitment for this site to contribute proportionately to the mitigation required for the allocation site as a whole. Additionally it should be noted that the distribution in the TA for the Allocation site will be informed by the strategic modelling work currently being undertaken, rather than the census-based approach used in the Addendum.
- 7. Future year assessment:** The Highway Authority queried why the future years of 2026 and 2031 had not been assessed. Table 2.1 says that a forecast year of 2031 has been used to test the full allocation, as set out in the Allocation TA. For the TA Addendum 2022 has been used, as this is when the application development is expected to have been built out. There is an assumption that only the 296 dwellings of this application will be built out between now and 2022 and nothing from the rest of the allocation. A phasing strategy for the allocation with

triggers for infrastructure has not been developed yet in the submission for the hybrid application and so if this application was approved, it would be superseded by what is agreed through the master planning process.

The 2022 assessment has been used to try to demonstrate that no capacity mitigation is required in connection with this development. However, Table 2.1 refers to the threshold testing that will be done as part of the Allocation TA work (it has not yet been done). This will consider the cumulative impact of the whole site and it is this piece of work that is necessary to demonstrate the thresholds – we cannot accept that this development requires no infrastructure mitigation on the basis of the TA Addendum since it is an integral part of Policy Villages 5. See point 2 above.

The modelling of the 2022 'with development' scenario confirms that pressure would be added to junctions that will be over capacity at Middleton Stoney and Hopcrofts Halt, although at Hopcrofts Halt, increasing the cycle time flattens out the capacity, increasing the DOS on some arms that are nearing capacity to reduce the overcapacity arm to below 90%.

8. 9 and 10: TEMPRO methodology for growing background traffic: In response to OCC's query, Table 2.1 cites the methodology agreed for the wider Allocation site. This methodology is being superseded by the modelling work currently being undertaken.

9. See above

10. See above

11. And 12: Trip distribution – dataset not presented so not possible to verify: This methodology is being superseded by the modelling work currently being undertaken.

12. See above

13. Study area too limited: The TA Addendum now considers the study area agreed for the Allocation TA. However, I do not agree with the conclusions regarding mitigation – see points 2 and 7 above.

14. And 15: Junctions not included in assessment: These have now been included but see point 13 above.

15. See above

16. Junction modelling can't be relied on due to shortcomings with the methodology: Table 2.1 refers to the Allocation TA, but this is not yet complete – see Point 1 above.

17. Travel plan: a residential travel plan has been submitted in connection with the discharge of conditions (long overdue) and obligations on the current consent. This travel plan is intended to cover the residential elements of the current consent

and the new allocation. OCC's Travel Plans team has reviewed the document and identified a number of areas for improvement. The document in its current form is not acceptable. In view of the importance of sustainable travel particularly in reducing car trips within Heyford, and of achieving a good public transport modal share for external trips, as well as the substantial delay in achieving a satisfactory travel plan for the current consented development, I am loathe to recommend that the travel plan is conditioned for this development. Rather, progress should be made to achieving a document which is acceptable as part of any planning approval, with a condition to update it within a reasonable timescale following first occupation.

18. Portway bridleway works: The layout now shows the route through the site, taking into account OCC's comments, but some further detail is necessary and could be required by condition. It is understood the bridleway will be permissive and managed as part of the open space. The access points need to be marked on the Parameter Plan.

- The layout is acceptable, although we question why the footpath, rather than the bridleway, is adjacent to the hedge – could the roots interfere with its construction?
- Further clarification is requested on the detail of what 'grassed bridleway' means. If it is the developer levelling/mowing the existing established grassland then that should be acceptable if it is reasonably level – but if it is reseeding/establishing a new sward on disturbed land then the specification for this will need to be agreed.
- It is noted that the bridleway runs close to the edge of the private road along the western side of the development. This road is very narrow and there could well be parking on the grass/landscaping. Unless there is some kind of barrier, there is a risk that vehicles could encroach on the bridleway or close enough to spook horses.
- Further detail is needed on the junction with internal and external roads. These access points and co-use need to be horse and non-motorised user 'friendly' with good visibility and appropriate surfacing and signage

19. Lack of footpath connection to the south east corner of the site: A footpath to the boundary is shown on the planning layout. However, the Parameter Plan should be updated to show this as a pedestrian access point. There needs to be a firm commitment to provide gated access at the boundary here. Likewise, the northern and southern access point of the bridleway/footpath along the western edge of the site onto the adjacent roads needs to be marked on the parameter plan.

Points 21 to 28 and 33 below, include issues with the layout, which do need to be addressed. As this is a full planning application, in order to ensure that they are addressed, as they no-doubt can be, I maintain my objection until they are resolved.

20. And 21 and 22: Concern over the design of the one-way section of the main road loop through the site and its approach from shared space areas. This has not been amended, save for the removal of some trees, and remains a concern, particularly as part of this arrangement will now form part of the bus loop.

I am particularly concerned about the continuity of cycle facilities at the shared space areas. These areas risk becoming a 'free for all' and visibility could be made worse by indiscriminate parking. The 'free for all' nature of a shared space does not sit well alongside the necessarily strictly regulated nature of one-way traffic and the need for vehicles to enter the correct arm of the junction. Table 2.1 says that a safety audit will be carried out at technical approval stage (which would be necessary anyway) but given our concerns, and that fact that this is a Full planning application, I would like to see a Stage 1 RSA at planning stage. A successful audit could provide assurance that the layout could be made safe. The compliance/enforcement of one way traffic here is a very valid concern, given the fact that there would be little traffic during the day. The need for residents to make U turns in the shared space areas should also be considered.

23 and 24. Trees in shared surface areas – this point has been addressed by the removal of the trees

25. Parking spaces in visibility splays. I cannot see internal visibility splays marked on the revised layout. A plan should be provided showing visibility splays and forward visibility envelopes.

26. Visibility splays at site access junctions. Visibility splays of 2.4 x 70m are shown onto Camp Road, which I consider to be acceptable given that Camp Road is/will be traffic calmed. However, some of these splays will require removal of parts of the hedge. It is noted that the land between the proposed footway and Camp Road, including the hedge, is intended to be dedicated as highway. Any S278 agreement will require adequate clearance of hedge. These accesses must be laid out and appropriate visibility splays cleared prior to first use.

27. Concern with pedestrian access over rumble strips. This appears to have been addressed and will be subject to technical approval.

28. Lack of pedestrian access across the central verge of the boulevard. In response, the designer has provided access paths to the parking bays. This rather misses the point – we need to see options for pedestrians to cross the road safely as we consider neighbours across the street will want to interact. Providing a path leading into an occupied parking bay does not provide additional crossing options. Crossing paths should be added between the parking bays.

29 to 32, 34 and 35: These are matters of detail which will be subject to technical approval.

33: Vehicle tracking – Table 2.1 makes a point regarding the type of refuse vehicle used, which I accept. However, I note that the swept path analysis shows the vehicle overrunning kerbs/landscaping in places, and overhanging front gardens in some places. *The design will need to be adapted to ensure this does not happen.* It should be noted that the road loop at the western edge of the site is not proposed to be offered for adoption, but it is intended that the refuse vehicle will traverse it. This road must be built to adoptable standard.

Also I reiterate the point I made earlier in connection with the bus loop and parking – the swept path analysis shows that there is very little scope for on-street parking not to cause a problem for the refuse vehicle. This means that it is very likely that footways will be parked on and kerbs and landscaping will be damaged by overrunning vehicles.

Further points not listed:

Cycle connectivity: The parameter plan shows a number of cycle routes through the site, and it is noted that 3-m wide paths are provided alongside some of the roads, allowing for shared use, which is welcomed. However, some more consideration is needed as to how these will link in with the allocation-wide cycle network, and importantly, onto Camp Road. On Camp Road, I note that it is proposed for the cycle route to transfer from south to north, immediately east of the site. It is not clear what crossing arrangements are proposed. However, I question why the cycle route cannot continue on the south side (in addition to the north side) so that residents of this site can easily connect to the eastbound cycle route on Camp Road. I consider that the proposed footway inside the hedge on Camp Road through this site (which is proposed to be offered for adoption) could be widened to allow for cycling. In any case, crossing points, and links across the verge, will need to be provided to link to the cycle route on the north side of Camp Road. *In order to ensure that this is addressed, this is an objection until the point is resolved.*

Construction phase and HGV traffic

I have also reviewed the Environmental Statement Chapter 6, which covers the impact of traffic throughout the day (in contrast to a TA, which only considers peak hour traffic). In particular this is relevant to HGV traffic. The ES looks at road links including through villages, assessing the environmental impact of the traffic throughout the day.

I question some of the assumptions regarding construction phase traffic:

- It is assumed 50-100 construction staff will be on site based on the works currently being undertaken. This seems very low for a site of this size and some justification needs to be provided comparing the build out rates, perhaps backed up by a survey of construction worker parking on sample sites.
- It is assumed that 50% of all demolished materials will be reused on site. Further information is required to explain how this will be achieved
- It is assumed that there would be 22 two-way construction trips (across the full site – 11 each way) throughout the day. This seems very low and further information is requested to show how this has been calculated. I would also like to know what type/weight vehicles this is composed of and how this traffic has been distributed.

The ES relies on the Allocation TA for part of its methodology in respect of the operational stage, and this has not yet been finalised. Therefore the findings of Chapter 6 relating to operational stage cannot yet be fully accepted.

Drainage

It is a disappointment that the watercourses and swales envisaged adjacent to the highways proposed during master planning appear to be absent from the current surface water management proposals.

The applicant has not yet confirmed whether infiltration testing has been undertaken at the site to inform the SuDS infiltration component designs, such as the permeable paving proposed. I cannot find any record of specific infiltration testing to BRE 365 standard for this specific site provided with the application. A point I objected on following the previous consultation for this site. (*Reason for Objection*)

With reference to the micro-drainage calculations for the infiltration pond provided with this application (provided in April 2017) , these show that that the pond size required to contain the critical 100 year + Climate Change allowance storm to be 3,273.6 cubic metres. However, the pond size shown the drawing supplied with this application ' Drainage Strategy Plan ' is (REF : 0521/PH9/320) sized at 2,775 cubic metres. Perhaps a typo on the drawing , Please could accurate dimensions be provided with up to date micro-drainage calculations. (*Reason for Objection*)

Please could the applicant provide details of the treatment device upstream of the pond – Is this the downstream defender (or similar) proposed during the master planning stage.

A SuDS Management and Maintenance Plan will be required for this site. This can be secured by way of a planning condition.

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

The site is part of Policy Villages 5 and as such must contribute proportionately towards the mitigation strategy required to mitigate the cumulative impact of development on the full Allocation site. The final mitigation package has yet to be agreed. Amounts and full justification for each element will be provided once it is agreed.

S278 Highway Works:

An obligation to enter into a S278 Agreement will be required to secure the site access junctions with Camp Road and Izard Road, plus a bus layby on Camp Road to provide for terminating buses, hardstanding and ducting for new bus stops on Camp Road, traffic calming and crossing points on Camp Road.

Notes:

This is secured by means of S106 restriction not to implement development 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.

S278 agreements include certain payments that apply to all S278 agreements including commuted sums for maintenance and any necessary fee for TROs.

S38 Highway Works –

An obligation to provide a bus loop for terminating buses will be required for the development. The S106 agreement will secure delivery via future completion of a S38 agreement.

The S106 agreement will identify for the purpose of the S38 agreement;

- Location, width and other characteristics
- Timing

Planning Conditions:

In the event that permission is to be given, the following planning conditions should be attached (recommendation on full wording to follow as we would like this to be consistent across the Allocation site):

- Construction traffic management plan including routing agreement
- Full details of bus route through the site as part of first reserved matters application
- Full details of bridleway and its connections to adjacent roads, with timetable for its delivery
- Drainage strategy and SUDS maintenance and management plan prior to first reserved matters
- Cycle parking
- Details of footpath connection point to SE of site and timetable for its implementation

Informative:

The Advance Payments Code (APC), Sections 219 -225 of the Highways Act, is in force in the county to ensure financial security from the developer to off-set the frontage owners' liability for private street works, typically in the form of a cash deposit or bond. Should a developer wish for a street or estate to remain private then to secure exemption from the APC procedure a 'Private Road Agreement' must be entered into with the County Council to protect the interests of prospective frontage owners. Alternatively the developer may wish to consider adoption of the estate road under Section 38 of the Highways Act.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 3 July 2018

Application no: 16/02446/F-2

Location: Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HD.

Education

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)
Nursery & Primary education	£2,346,857	2Q2017	PUBSEC	A new 1.5 form entry primary school, including a 75 place nursery, in addition to expansion of nursery provision at Heyford Park Free School through one additional class for 3-year-olds (26 pupils).
Secondary	£957,190	2Q2017	PUBSEC	Expansion of Heyford Park Free School's secondary phase, subject to the approval of the Regional Schools Commissioner; otherwise expansion of a secondary school in Bicester.
SEN	£107,998	2Q 2016	PUBSEC	A planned new project to expand Bardwell Special School in Bicester by 32 places.
Total	£3,412,045			

	Use
Land (remediated and serviced)	2.22 ha of land is required for a new primary school. The school site is to be fully remediated, serviced and fit for school use prior to transfer. This application should contribute in a proportionate manner towards the cost of providing the 2.22ha site at no charge to the County Council

Comments

Following the submission of the masterplan application for Heyford Park, 18/00825/HYBRID, the education capacity and contributions requirements in this location have been reassessed, taking into account the education capacity already provided at Heyford Park by the Heyford Park Free School and the Old Station Nursery, and identified the scale of deficiency expected as a result of all parcels of the Heyford Park strategic development area. As the Free School currently provides more primary and secondary capacity than is required solely for the permitted development, there is an element of “spare” capacity, the benefits of which have been distributed across the forward pipeline of applications. The cost of the necessary additional education capacity has been equalised across developments pro rata to their expected pupil generation.

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

£2,346,857 Nursery and Primary Contribution indexed from 2Q2017 using the PUBSEC Index

Towards: a new 1.5 form entry primary school, including a 75 place nursery, in addition to expansion of nursery provision at Heyford Park Free School through one additional class for 3-year-olds (26 pupils).

Justification:

Comparing current nursery and primary capacity at Heyford Park with the total generation expected from all 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.

In addition, Heyford Park Free School currently only offers 26 Nursery places, but as a 2-form-entry primary school would be expected to offer 52 nursery places. Expansion of this school through adding another nursery class would provide 26 places, bring the total additional nursery places to 101.

The combined provision of the additional nursery class and the new school is therefore broadly in line with the expected total pupil generation from all parcels of Heyford Park.

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

Calculation:

Estimated cost of a new nursery class at Heyford Park Free School: calculated as 26 places at the OCC primary school extension rate of £15,256 per place = £396,656.

Estimated cost of a new 1.5 form entry primary school = £9,666,414

Total cost of primary and nursery provision required = £396,656 + £9,666,414 = £10,063,070

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

Cost per pupil (based on 499 pupils) = £10,063,070 / 499 = £20,162

Primary and nursery generation from this development: 116.4

Primary and nursery contribution required from this development = 116.4 * £20,162 = £2,346,857.

£957,190 Secondary School Contribution indexed from 1Q2017 using PUBSEC Index

Towards: expansion of Heyford Park Free School's secondary phase, subject to the approval of the Regional Schools Commissioner; otherwise expansion of a secondary school in Bicester.

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 Free School.

Calculation:

Cost per place of expanding a secondary school: £23,086

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

Total cost of expansion for 192 places = 192 * £23,086 = £4,432,512

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

Cost per pupil (based on 301 pupils) = £4,432,512 / 301 = £14,726

Secondary pupil generation from this development: 65

Secondary contribution required from this development = 65 * £14,726 = £957,190

£107,998 SEN School Contribution indexed from 2Q2016 using PUBSEC Index

Towards: a new project to expand Barwell Special School in Bicester by 32 places.

Justification:

1.1% of school pupils in Oxfordshire attend county special schools. Special school capacity is insufficient to meet the scale of growth planned in this area, and a large-scale programme of expansion across the county is underway. The nearest special school to this development is Bardwell School.

Calculation:

Options Appraisal estimated cost for expanding Bardwell School by 32 places = £1,919,963

Cost per place = £1,919,963 / 32 = £59,999

Estimated SEND pupil generation from this development = 1.8

Required contribution = 1.8 * £59,999 = £107,998

Officer's Name: Barbara Chillman

Officer's Title: Pupil Place Planning Manager

Date: 2 July 2018
