

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

District: Cherwell

Application No: 17/02534/OUT

Proposal: OUTLINE - The construction of a business park of up to 60,000 sq.m (GEA) of flexible Class B1(a) office / Class B1(b) research & development floorspace; parking for up to 2,000 cars; and associated highways, infrastructure and earthworks

Location: Land North Of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre Oxford Road Bicester

Response date: 27th February 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

Commercial – use class	m²
B1	58,200

Application no: 17/02534/OUT

Location: Land North Of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre Oxford Road Bicester

Strategic Comments

This application covers the majority of the Local Plan allocation site Bicester 4: Bicester Business Park. The application site covers a modified area to that consented for office use in 2010 (07/01106/OUT), in part due to the implementation of the Tesco site to the north (12/01193/F).

Whilst the principle of the development with B1(a) office / B1(b) research & development floorspace is supported, there are a number of issues with the current planning submission as outlined below.

Transport Development Control object for the following reasons:

- The Transport Assessment has not given adequate information about the traffic impact on the local network, in particular key committed development traffic is omitted;
- The proposed highway works are not considered safe and sufficient to mitigate the possible impact of the development;
- The drainage information submitted is insufficient.

There is also an archaeology objection because the site is located in an area of archaeological interest and the results of an archaeological evaluation are required prior to determination of this application.

Any new Section 106 or Deed of Variation agreed for this development site will need to maintain the remaining contributions in the existing S106 associated with permission 07/01106/OUT (as varied in November 2013) proportionately to the scale of new development.

Further details are provided in the officer responses below.

Officer's Name: David Flavin

Officer's Title: Senior Planning Officer

Date: 27th February 2018

Application no: 17/02534/OUT

Location: Land North Of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre Oxford Road Bicester

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 outweighs 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**
An administration and monitoring fee will be 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 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 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: 17/02534/OUT

Location: Land North Of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre Oxford Road Bicester

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection (for the following reasons):

- The Transport Assessment has not given adequate information about the traffic impact on the local network, in particular key committed development traffic is omitted.
- The proposed highway works are not considered safe and sufficient to mitigate the possible impact of the development
- The drainage information submitted is insufficient

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 as detailed below.

S106 Contributions

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Highway infrastructure	TBC	TBC	Baxter	The South East Perimeter Road or scheme of similar benefit.
Strategic rail contribution	TBC	TBC	TBC	Rail improvements between Bicester and Milton Keynes
Public transport services	TBC	TBC	RPI-x	Provision of a bus service linking the development with Bicester Town Centre/station
Public transport infrastructure (<i>if not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement</i>)	TBC		Baxter	Provision of bus stop infrastructure within the site and on Oxford Road.
Travel Plan Monitoring	£2,040	January 2018	RPI-x	Monitoring and review of travel plan
Total	TBC			

Comments:

Highway Capacity Assessment

Trip generation

The proposed trip generation is considered to be sufficiently robust.

Committed Development

As part of the pre-application discussions, it was recommended that any assessment of the highway network be carried out as per the Bicester Transport Model (BTM) traffic flows.

The Transport Assessment presented as part of this application has however left out a vital committed development which did not form part of the BTM and neither was its proposal envisaged at the time pre-application scoping discussions were held.

An application for the development of a two-storey drive-through restaurant (class A3/A5) including car park has recently been permitted adjacent to the Tesco filling station (Planning Ref: **17/00889/F**). Although relatively small in scale (to the developments around) it is expected to have a significant degree of impact on the operation of the local network. Also not included in either the BTM or this TA is the recently approved development (Kingsmere Retail) on land adjoining Pioneer Way and A41/Oxford Road (planning Ref: **16/02505/OUT**). Both of these, by virtue of their proximity to the proposed development cannot be ignored in any traffic impact assessment. **(Reason for objection)**

Further to that, I am unconvinced by the applicant's approach of assessing the development impact on the local network. I would have expected a robust assessment to show the impact on the local network with and without the traffic from the complete proposed development.

The Transport Assessment should be revisited, and the following should be noted regarding the Bicester Transport Model 2026 scenario:

- Kingsmere Retail and the drive through restaurant mentioned above are NOT included (see above)
- Bicester 4 office development is NOT included
- Tesco IS included

Trip distribution

The distribution of development traffic on the local road network has been done based on Travel to Work Census data, from the MSOA Cherwell 015 output area. Paragraph 5.17 of the TA gives the expected distribution of vehicle trips in reference to the travel to work census data. However, since the 2011 Census, housing development has taken place at Kingsmere, which could affect the distribution, which could have an impact on the distribution. It is noted that the TA does not include the census data tables. **(Reason for objection)**

Trip assignment

The assumptions regarding trip assignment are not provided in the TA **(Reason for objection)**

Junction modelling and mitigation

Section 6.0 of the TA presents highway capacity assessments undertaken to inform of the likely impacts of the development on the network, together with a proposed highway mitigation strategy. Junction analysis carried out utilising the industry standard modelling packages for each type of junction demonstrated that some shall operate within the designed capacity. However, the A41/Oxford Road junction and the Middleton Stoney Road/Oxford Road/Kings End junction showed that junctions would operate over and above the theoretical capacity in the 2026 baseline scenario.

The A41 Oxford Road/Lakeview Drive mitigation measures do not appear to fully alleviate the development impact. Oxford Road NB right AM and SB left/ahead in the AM and PM at the junction are left at or over capacity. Lakeview Drive left/right is brought over capacity in the PM. There is also a residual large impact on some of the movements. At the Vendee Drive/A41 Oxford Road junction, the A41 in the PM peak is at capacity and worsened further by the development. **(Reason for objection)** However, it should be noted that these capacity assessments may vary when the TA is revised.

A41 Oxford Road

The site is accessed from Lakeview Drive via the signal controlled junction with the A41 Oxford Road. The A41/Oxford Road section between Vendee Drive and the Middleton Stoney Road junction comprises of sets of traffic signals which have been modelled using LINSIG. Model results/output files have been attached as Appendix F. However, corresponding .lsg files have not been submitted to enable us to thoroughly check the validity of the modelling work. Without the .lsg files, model parameters such as road geometry and input flows cannot be fully assessed. Until this information is submitted, the modelling results cannot be relied on. **(Reason for objection)**

The highway mitigation arrangement proposed in **Drawing 170211-02** presents a number of design issues that I consider would increase safety risk on what is already a very busy section of A41 Oxford Road. Observed notably are;

- The scheme proposes to include an additional right turning lane from A41 Oxford Road into Lakeview Drive. Lakeview Drive currently has a single flow-in lane from the northbound A41 traffic. Although the scheme attempts to create an additional flow-in lane at its mouth, lane continuity is unclear. The presence of the triangular island pedestrian refuge between the A41 Oxford Road (SB) and Lakeview Drive prevents a balance between the exit and entry lanes. The number of straight ahead entry and exit lanes for a traffic stream should be balanced to reduce conflict caused by traffic merging or diverging within the junction intervisibility zone. Where it is necessary to reduce the number of lanes on the exit arm this should be carried out beyond the junction intervisibility zone, over 100 metres for a single lane reduction, measured from the limit of the junction intervisibility zone, according to Figure 2/11 of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Vol 6 Sec 2, Part 3 TD/04). **(Reason for objection)**
- No vehicle tracking has been provided to demonstrate safe passage of the vehicles particularly on the turn in and out of Lakeview Drive. With the significant narrowing of carriageway lanes along the A41 Oxford Road and

bearing in mind that Lakeview Drive also serves as access to Tesco deliveries, the application must demonstrate by tracking analysis that gives consideration to long and articulate vehicles besides cars that they can reasonably use the junction. **(Reason for objection)**

- The current A41 Oxford Road layout requires some motorists to change lanes over very short distances. With the development proposing to add lanes on top of what is in existence, that leaves me concerned that this would likely lead to increased conflicts in the immediate vicinity of the development. In the event that the proposed highway works requiring carriageway widening along the A41/Oxford Road are agreed, these should be carried as per OCC specifications. We would require the surface course in the adjacent area / lane to be replaced with a stepped joint in the layers below as illustrated in drawing **HSD 700/025** via <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/highway-standard-details>
- The mitigation layout plan is not scaled to enable a comprehensive review of the dimensions of the proposed highway. **(Reason for objection)**
- *Triangular island pedestrian refuge* – Pedestrian refuges and traffic islands help pedestrians by enabling them to deal with one lane or direction of traffic at a time. This appears to be significantly reduced, and I would like to be certain that this is deep enough to accommodate a reasonable number of pedestrians including bicycles and/or a wheelchair – noticing that this is a busy intersection likely to be used by platoons of pedestrians such as at peak times.
The central reservation – The proposed scheme also intends to significantly reduce the width of the central reservation along the southern arm of the A41 Oxford Road. In its existing layout the A41 Oxford Road ranges between 4.2m- 6m in width. A further reduction in width shall likely make it impossible for erection of the associated street furniture such as signage, lamp posts and traffic signal posts. These structures are accommodated within highway land between/adjacent to carriageways and it is required that any placement of such posts should be clear by 0.45m from any face of the kerb. The proposed layout does not appear to have given consideration for this. It goes without need to say that such a busy section of highway shall require significant signage and traffic signal heads to give information to motorists and control traffic respectively.

Such significant highway changes need to be accompanied by a Stage 1 Safety Audit as part of the application.

Oxford Road / Middleton Stoney Road / Kings End

This is a mini-roundabout that has been modelled using ARCADY and model output/results for the existing junction operation show that Kings End approach operates over the theoretical capacity in the AM peak period while Middleton Stoney and Oxford Road approaches operate over the recommended RFC threshold in the PM peak period.

The application proposes to make improvements to this mini-roundabout as mitigation which would involve increasing the entry width from the Kings End approach. **(Drawing No. 170211-04)**. The modelling predicts an improvement in the operation of the Kings End approach in the AM peak period in 2016. However, the same model shows a general deterioration in RFC values for all other approach arms in both peak periods. The Middleton Stoney Road and Oxford Road are seen to have rising RFC values, reading just below the recommended threshold.

Public Transport

Discussions during the original Bicester Business Park application identified the need for a bus service to this site, as some parts of the site are more than 400 metres from bus stops on the A41 Oxford Road. The amount 'agreed' in discussion was subsumed into an overall sum for the site. The understanding was to allow for a new bus service to enter the site, which would also require a new bus stop on Lakeview Drive. This service would link Bicester North to Bicester Village along Pingle Drive, London Road and into the site.

It is likely that the bus would not need to run all day, but would be needed in the peaks and lunchtimes, as at Milton Park, a similar development in Oxfordshire. Most of the cost of a bus is in the need for a 'peak vehicle'. It's probable that this service would be operated in conjunction with another service, but we still need the 'peak bus'.

As part of the Bicester Gateway Retail Park planning consent it was proposed to include a southbound bus stop adjacent to the site along the A41 Oxford Road as part of the highway improvements. However, to allow for the possibility that that consent is not implemented either wholly or earlier than this proposed development, then we will require a commitment from this development to install the same bus stop with associated infrastructure.

Pedestrian / Cycle routes

The design and access statement mentions that bicycle routes are linked into the scheme. Apart from the pedestrian and vehicular accesses, the application has not demonstrated a direct connectivity to any dedicated cycle routes. National Cycle Route 52 abuts the site along its boundary with the A41 Oxford Road. This cycle route provides a cycling infrastructure connecting south towards Wendlebury, Kidlington and Oxford. North of the application site, the route connects to Bicester Village and Bicester Town Centre.

Much as am convinced that the development is well placed for future employees and visitors to utilise this route to and from the site by foot and/or cycle, I am concerned by its width for a shared pedestrian/cycle route. On the merge to the A41/Oxford Road from Lakeview Drive, the shared infrastructure is seen to considerably narrow in width as it runs past the proposed bus stop layby. We would like to see a 3metre provision being extended further south right up to the pedestrian crossing that leads to Pioneer Way. The need for such an improvement is in part driven by the growth of the town and the need to link residential areas to employments. This is a pedestrian/cycle desire line into the wider Kingsmere residential development via Pioneer Way from the site which must be improved. **(To be incorporated into s278)**

We would like the development to provide a pedestrian/cycle only access onto the A41, along its western boundary. This connection should be informed by the pedestrian desire line that aims to enhance pedestrian connectivity and reduce walking distances. It is also thought that this would enhance multimodal travel for visitors and staff arriving by public transport from the bus stop. Rather than walking along Lakeview Drive pedestrians crossing the A41 Oxford Road from Kingsmere, and from areas south such as the Bicester Park and Ride and Wendlebury would directly access the development via this access.

Parking Strategy

The parking strategy that the TA presents is informed by OCC maximum parking level standards. Although the application sets to provide the maximum provision for the scale of the proposed development, there needs to be a careful balance between meeting the demand for parking without unduly encouraging car use, particularly given the potential for sustainable travel to the site. I strongly recommend that the level of parking provision be supported by a parking accumulation study.

That being said, it is important that the development does not lead to overspill street parking. It is thus important that the Framework Travel Plan sets off with robust measures that promote multi modal travel choices.

Consideration of the interaction of car parking with other sites in the area e.g. acting as an overspill car parking area for Bicester Village (rather than Bicester Village visitors using the P&R) has not been made. A robust car parking management plan should be included.

Personal Injury Accident Data

The TA has presented Personal Injury Accident data of reported collisions in the immediate vicinity of the site obtained from Thames Valley Police (TVP). This data reportedly covers the period between 01/07/2012 and 01/07/2017 and is appended to the TA. Although am not questioning the presented dataset, I would like clarification on how the applicant managed to retrieve information such as how a particular accident was linked to the causation factor and its location from the TVP report. Unless there is more to that report than presented here, I am not convinced by how the applicant has reached this conclusion. Could this please be clarified.

Further review of the personal injury accident data held by OCC has revealed 5 injury collisions. These incidents occurred between Pioneer Way and Lakeview Drive junctions with A41 Oxford Road (excluding Bicester Avenue and Esso Roundabout).

Three out of five of these incidents involved vehicles making right manoeuvres either into Pioneer Way or Lakeview Drive. Although these recorded incidents are of the slight category I am concerned that any additional lanes created would increase the likelihood of conflicts during lane changing manoeuvres. Should you require more detailed information on the most recent Personal Injury Accident data, please contact our Road Safety Officer on Anthony.Kirkwood@Oxfordshire.gov.uk

Transport Strategy

Policy Bicester 4 of the Cherwell Local Plan relating to the site requires:

- Layout that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing development particularly the mixed use urban extension at South West Bicester to the west, the garden centre to the south, and, to the north, Bicester town centre and Bicester Village retail outlet.
- Provision for safe pedestrian access from the A41 including facilitating the crossing of the A41 to the north and west, and the provision and upgrading of footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks to improve connectivity generally and to develop links between this site, nearby development sites and the town centre.
- Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for, including the accommodation of new bus stops to link the development to the wider town.
- A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to accompany development proposals.

As indicated at the pre-application stage, the A41 from which the site is accessed is heavily trafficked and will be put under further pressure from Cherwell Local Plan growth allocations, including the allocation on this site (Bicester 4).

This was recognised by Bicester Village in their application for Phase 4 of their development, where they have now delivered major highway improvements at and between the Esso roundabout and Pingle Drive junctions, having also provided a Bicester Park and Ride facility.

The highway improvements on the A41 related to the expansion of Bicester Village have delivered a new bus layby on the northbound side of the A41. The highway works which are related to the construction and use of the permitted Bicester Business Park would also have needed to provide a northbound and southbound bus layby; however, the northbound layby is now delivered and the southbound layby will now be delivered by **16/02505/OUT** – Bicester Gateway (Kingsmere Retail).

Planning consent was granted in November 2013 for the construction of a Tesco food store of 8,135 square metres and petrol filling station on part of the consented office park site (Planning Ref: **12/01193/F**). The S106 Deed of Variation in relation to the consented Tesco store and office park allows for the construction of up to 45,000 square metres of the B1(a)/B1(b) office space being delivered on the remainder of the site, as part of the previous outline planning consent for an office park.

The November 2013 deed of variation to the original Section 106 agreement (dated 26 October 2010 associated with planning permission **07/01106/OUT**) set out appropriate contributions/mitigation schemes required in order to make the development acceptable. Any new Section 106 or Deed of Variation agreed for this development site will need to maintain the remaining contribution requirements proportionate to the scale of new development and amend how these are allocated against schemes where necessary, to fit the present context.

The cumulative impact of Local Plan growth development in Bicester will be severe if appropriate contributions are not secured from all development sites towards the strategic transport infrastructure required to mitigate the increase in transport movements.

The varied Section 106 was made prior to the current adopted Cherwell Local Plan, which includes increased growth and additional infrastructure requirements within the plan period, such as a South East Perimeter Road (SEPR). The SEPR is also now detailed in Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4, as a scheme to ease congestion on the A41, and will therefore directly contribute towards mitigating this development proposal's impact. The scheme is partly funded, but currently requires contributions to fund the western section proposed. This development will therefore be expected to contribute towards the SEPR or a scheme of similar benefit.

The varied Section 106 made provision to support rail service improvements, now partly implemented by East West Rail phase one. Oxfordshire County Council continue to support rail improvement schemes, making this sustainable form of travel more attractive and in turn reducing single occupancy car travel. The rail contribution carried forward in the new Section 106 or Deed of Variation must therefore be allocated against supporting East West Rail Phase 2.”

Strategic transport modelling demonstrates the benefits that the SEPR will bring to the A41 /Oxford Road:

- The A41 Oxford Road is a key corridor in Bicester where junctions along its length are impacted significantly as a result of the growth of Bicester, including Bicester 4. The Application Site will increase the proportion of peak hour traffic through this corridor.
- The SEPR has been identified as a key piece of strategic infrastructure that will bring direct relief to the A41 corridor, thereby facilitating improved operation of junctions directly impacted by Bicester 4.
- Modelling has demonstrated the benefits that the SEPR would bring to the A41. In the AM peak:
 - Over 1000 vehicles (pcu's) that would otherwise use the A41 Oxford Rd northbound through Vendee Drive would route via SEPR (eastbound)
 - Around 930 vehicles (pcu's) that would otherwise use A41 Boundary Way and turn left on A41 Oxford Rd southbound past Bicester 4, would route via SEPR (westbound)
 - Therefore, over 1930 vehicles (pcu's) would use the SEPR that would otherwise route along A41 past the Bicester 4 site.

It is acknowledged however, that the capacity released on the A41 by the SEPR will itself encourage some traffic that might otherwise choose NOT to use the A41, to divert along the corridor. When taking diverted traffic into account, the net reduction in traffic on the A41 in the vicinity of the Bicester 4 site would be around 1130 pcu's.

Drainage

The drainage strategy is presented in Appendix F of the Flood Risk Assessment, which is itself contained in Appendix 13.1 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement. It is proposed to use SuDS to manage surface water runoff across the development.

OCC as Lead Local Flood Authority considers 'soft' SuDS (e.g. Ponds, Swales etc) preferable to 'hard' SuDS (e.g. Underground Storage Tanks). The images represented in the Design and Access statement (Bennets Associates – Dec 2017) on Page 9 would be representative of the type of the amenity value that can be added to the development by the use of these 'soft' SuDS.

OCC considered that the drainage proposals were not adequately described within the strategy document. For an outline application, the proposal needs to describe the attenuation storage volumes that are required to provide mitigation and achieve compliance with the proposed allowable discharge rates. Typically the applicant must show by way of a sketch, which describes the SuDS features and demonstrates that they fit within the red line application boundary. A supporting calculation needs to be provided and for initial sizing calculations in support of outline application the toolkit provided by the 'UK Suds' website is acceptable to OCC. These considerations were absent from the application. **(Reason for objection)**

The drainage strategy will need to comply with the Defra 'Non – Statutory Technical Standards' and good practice such as the ' Preliminary rainfall runoff management for developments ' (Defra/EA R&D Technical Report SC030219 Revision E), and 'The SuDS Manual' (CIRIA C753).

In terms of the allowable discharge rates for the site, it will be required to consider the need to control and mitigate the additional runoff 'volumes' (Technical Standards S4 – S6) and 'rates' (Technical Standards S2 – S3). Therefore, QBAR greenfield rate for the site will be appropriate for the site or alternatively 'long term storage' should be provided.

The proposals to use permeable paving for parking spaces and rainwater harvesting for the site were very welcomed. Especially so, as the proposals will need to demonstrate a 'treatment train' approach is being achieved at the site, so that SuDS water quality is achieved.

No soakage testing results were provided with the application. Part infiltration in some areas of the site may be possible, therefore infiltration testing should be carried out at the site, which may form part of a condition.

A SuDS Management and Maintenance Plan will also be required for the site

Travel Plan

A framework travel plan has been submitted for the Business Park which has been checked against our guidance.

It should be noted that at this stage the submitted travel plan does not include enough detail to satisfy our guidance or to be fully assessed. For this reason, comments are very general.

This framework travel plan will act as an umbrella plan for the site as a whole and will set the travel aspirations for the site. Future occupiers will either make a commitment to take on the objectives of this travel plan or if their business is over travel plan thresholds they will be develop their own travel plan using this framework travel plan as the basis for their plan. If their individual site is above travel plan thresholds they will also be expected to pay the appropriate monitoring fees.

- It has not been explained what the purpose of this framework travel plan is i.e. that it will act as an umbrella plan for the site and that it will be the basis nor any future travel plans that future occupiers develop. Or that this plan will be adopted by future occupiers who will be expected to work towards the overall goals and targets of this plan. Further to this it is not clear from the travel plan what is being planned for this site and the makeup of the site once the project is completed. No idea of the number of employees that are likely to be based at this site, clearly the 2,00 car parking spaces are going to be used to someone?
- Para 3.2 One of the main objectives of the travel plan should be to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips made to and from the site. It should also be noted that car share is one way of reducing SOV trips made to and from the site. Oxfordshire County Council recommends Oxfordshire Lift Share as the car share provider of choice <https://liftshare.com/uk/community/oxfordshire>.
- Section 4 travel plan coordinator, should note that it will be the TPC's responsibility to ensure that future occupiers are informed of the framework travel plan and their travel plan responsibilities, and to ensure that they work towards the aims and targets of this plan.
- If they have to develop their own travel plans it will be the TPC's responsibility to ensure that this happens within the required timescales and to inform them of the need to use the FTP as a basis for their own plans.
- Para 4.3 TPC contact details will need to be sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council.
- The FTP contains no measurable targets for the site. The FTP contains no information which can be used to set initial FTP targets such bas the 2011 Census travel to work data.
- A target will be required for each mode of travel in percentages and numbers for each year in which a survey will take place. We will be looking for a 5-10% SOV reduction over the first five years of the FTP's operation.

Action plan requires further development. It should have a mixture of short, medium and longer term actions all with a completion date under headings such as measures to reduce the number of SOV journeys made to and from the site and measures to increase cycling and car sharing.

S278 Highway Works:

An obligation to enter into a S278 Agreement will be required to secure mitigation/improvement works, including:

- Site accesses

- Pedestrian footway improvements along the A41/Oxford Road
- Bus stop adjacent to the development on the eastern side of the A41 Oxford Road subject to the event that the consented development which the bus stop forms a part of is not implemented
- Junction capacity improvements as appropriate

Notes:

These highway works shall be secured by means of S106 with 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.

S38 Highway Works

An obligation to provide a spine road as part of the highway network or an on-site right of way may be required for the development. The S106 agreement will secure delivery via future completion of a S38 agreement.

Planning Conditions:

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

Site Access: Full Details

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the means of access between the land and the highway including position, layout, and vision splays shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall be no obstruction of the vision splays above 0.6m high.

Thereafter and prior to the first occupation of any of the development, the means of access shall be constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework

Cycle Parking

The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until a plan for the car parking spaces to serve the entire development has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All car parking shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles at all times thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate levels of cycle parking are available at all times to serve the development, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Car Parking

The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until a plan for the car parking spaces to serve the entire development has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All car parking shall be retained unobstructed

except for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles at all times thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate levels of car parking are available at all times to serve the development, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Drainage

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

- Discharge Rates
- Discharge Volumes
- Maintenance and management of SUDS features (this maybe secured by a Section 106 Agreement)
- Sizing of features – attenuation volume
- Infiltration in accordance with BRE365
- Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers
- SUDS – (list the suds features mentioned within the FRA to ensure they are carried forward into the detailed drainage strategy)
- Network drainage calculations
- Phasing

Reason - To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site in the interests of public health, to avoid flooding of adjacent land and property and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Travel Plan

The submitted travel plan will be revised in line with comments received and resubmitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval before first occupation.

Construction traffic management plan

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP shall include a commitment to deliveries only arriving at or leaving the site outside local peak traffic periods. Thereafter, the approved CTMP shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details. *Reason - In the interests of highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.*

Officer's Name: Rashid Bbosa

Officer's Title: Transport Engineer

Date: 23 February 2018

Application no: 17/02534/OUT

Location: Land North Of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre Oxford Road Bicester

Archaeology Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reason/s:



The site is located in an area of archaeological interest and the results of an archaeological evaluation will need to be submitted along with this planning application prior to the determination of this application.

Comments:

The site is located in an area of archaeological interest as shown by an archaeological evaluation over part of the site which recorded a range of archaeological deposits dating from the prehistoric to Roman periods. The site is located 650m north of the site of the Roman Small Town of Alchester and is located along the line of the Roman Road heading north from this town. Iron Age and Roman settlement evidence has been recorded along the route of this road in the vicinity of this site including 300m south and 260m north east of the proposed site. A further Iron Age and Roman settlement has also been recorded 280m north of the site.

Prehistoric archaeological deposits have been recorded in the immediate area and two Bronze Age barrows are recorded 280m north east of the proposed site. The proposed site is also located immediately to the south and west of an area of Bronze Age settlement identified through archaeological excavation.

This excavation revealed a number of Bronze Age roundhouses either side of a braided river channel. An oven was also recorded associated with one of the roundhouses along with a number of larger postholes or pits. Three cremation burials were also recorded on the site. A Roman channel was cut along the line of the braided channel. Bronze Age settlement sites such as this are relatively rare within the District and as such are of significance.

Only part of the proposed site was subject to an archaeological evaluation undertaken as part of a separate planning application. The area that was not investigated is immediately east of the line of the Roman road and immediately south of the area of Bronze Age settlement recorded by the excavation. It is therefore very likely that further aspects of this significant settlement could survive within this previously un-investigated area of the proposed development and archaeological deposits from the Roman period could survive along the line of the road as recorded elsewhere in the vicinity.

This is recognised in the submitted EIA which states in 10.64 that,

'It is likely these remains will extend somewhat beyond the trenching area and therefore the potential for further prehistoric and Roman finds or features is considered high.'

The EIA sets out proposed mitigation for the site. This mitigation only proposes to undertake a strip map and recording action within areas where the previous evaluation recorded archaeological deposits (10.73). The remaining area of the site, presumably including the portion of the site that was not subject to this evaluation, would only be subject to a topsoil watching brief.

As this includes the area that is likely to contain further aspects of the identified Bronze Age settlement as well as any previously unidentified Roman settlement along the line of the Roman road this proposed mitigation would not be appropriate.

A programme of archaeological evaluation will need to be undertaken on this un-investigated part of the site ahead of the determination of any planning application for the site in order to identify whether or not archaeological deposits related to the Bronze Age settlement and Roman road survive and to provide the information required to assess the significance of any surviving archaeological deposits.

The EIA also states that we were asked whether or not any archaeological investigations could be conditioned on the 15th August 2017 (10.9). The EIA states that a decision is awaited. This is not true and we responded to this email on the 18th August 2017 to Nuala C. Woodley of AOC where we stated,

'I cannot agree that this can simply be undertaken as a condition on any planning application and I certainly do not agree with your proposal that the areas which have not been evaluated can be dealt with through a watching brief.'

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), we would therefore recommend that, **prior to the determination** of this application the applicant should therefore be responsible for the implementation of an archaeological field evaluation. This must be carried out by a professionally qualified archaeological organisation and should aim to define the character and extent of the archaeological remains within the application area, and thus indicate the weight which should be attached to their preservation.

This information can be used for identifying potential options for minimising or avoiding damage to the archaeology and on this basis, an informed and reasonable decision can be taken.

This evaluation must be undertaken in line with an agreed written scheme of investigation as set out in the ClfA standards and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation (2014, para 3.1.11). We will need to produce a design brief which will set out the requirements for this evaluation.

Planning Conditions:

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

Officer's Name: Richard Oram

Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist

Date: 11th January 2018

Application no: 17/02534/OUT

Location: Land North Of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre Oxford Road Bicester

Minerals & Waste

Recommendation:

No objection

Key issues:

This site is within 400m of a waste management facility safeguarded in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy (Bicester Sewage Treatment Works (STW)). Therefore, any potential effects of the proposed development that may directly or indirectly prevent or prejudice the operation of Bicester STW should be addressed.

Legal agreement required to secure:

N/A

Conditions:

N/A

Informatives:

N/A

Detailed comments:

Officer's Name: Elise Kinderman

Officer's Title: Principal Minerals and Waste Policy Officer

Date: 19th January 2018
