

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

District: Cherwell

Application No: 18/00825/HYBRID

Proposal: Demolition of buildings and structures as listed in Schedule 1; Outline planning permission for up to 1,175 new dwellings (Class C3); 60 close care dwellings (Class C2/C3); 929 m² of retail (Class A1); 670 m² comprising a new medical centre (Class D1); 35,175 m² of new employment buildings, (comprising up to 6,330 m² Class B1a, 13,635 m² B1b/c, 9,250 m² Class B2, and 5,960 m² B8); 2.4 ha site for a new school (Class D1); 925 m² of community use buildings (Class D2); and 515 m² of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2); 30m in height observation tower with zip-wire with ancillary visitor facilities of up to 100 m² (Class D1/A1/A3); 1,000 m² energy facility/infrastructure with a stack height of up to 24m (sui generis); 2,520 m² additional education facilities (buildings and associated external infrastructure) at Buildings 73, 74 and 583 for education use (Class D1); creation of areas of Open Space, Sports Facilities, Public Park and other green infrastructure; Change of Use of the following buildings and areas: Buildings 357 and 370 for office use (Class B1a); Buildings 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, and 3042 for employment use (Class B1b/c, B2, B8); Buildings 217, 3102, 3136, 3052, 3053, 3054, and 3055 for employment use (Class B8); Buildings 2010, 3008, and 3009 for filming and heritage activities (Sui Generis/Class D1); Buildings 2004, 2005 and 2006 for education use (Class D1); Buildings 366, 391, 1368, 1443, 2007, 2008 and 2009 (Class D1/D2 with ancillary A1-A5 use); Building 340 (Class D1, D2, A3); 20.3ha of hardstanding for car processing (Sui Generis); and 76.6ha for filming activities (Sui Generis); the continuation of use of areas, buildings and structures already benefiting from previous planning permissions, as specified in Schedule 2; associated infrastructure works including surface water attenuation provision and upgrading Chilgrove Drive and the junction with Camp Road.

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Response date: 18 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 based on a SHMA mix.

Residential	No.
1-bed dwellings	164
2-bed dwellings	304
3-bed dwellings	504
4-bed & larger dwellings	203
Close Care Dwellings (Class C2/C3)	60
Extra Care Housing	
Affordable Housing %	35%
Commercial – use class	m²
A1	929
B1	19,965
B2/B8	15,210
Development to be built out and occupied out over	10 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	2766
Primary pupils	294
Secondary pupils	213
Sixth Form pupils	35
SEN pupils	6.1
Nursery children (number of 2 and 3 year olds entitled to funded places)	41.2
20 - 64 year olds	1540
65+ year olds (figure includes Close Care Dwellings)	425
0 – 4 year olds	147

Application no: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Strategic Comments

OCC support the principle of this masterplan application and the delivery of Local Plan Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford. Further work is required to overcome the technical transport, education and ecology objections detailed in the officer responses below. In summary:

- There is a transport objection for the following reasons:
 - A strategic mitigation package is required – considerable work has gone into the mitigation package but further work is required 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 completed in the autumn.
 - The Transport Assessment requires revision and amendment.
 - Commercial and residential Travel Plans require revision.
 - The proposals for the alignment of Aves Ditch require amendment.
 - Further drainage information is required.

- There is an education objection as details of the proposed primary school site are still to be agreed.

- There is an ecology objection as further information is required.

OCC is committed to working with the applicant and CDC to resolve these outstanding issues and to utilising Growth Deal funding as detailed above.

Officer's Name: Jacqui Cox

Officer's Title: Locality Lead (Cherwell)

Date: 18th July 2018

Application no: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp 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 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 – to be confirmed

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 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: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Transport Schedule

Recommendation

Objection for the following reasons

- A comprehensive strategic transport mitigation package is required for the full Policy Villages 5 allocation, including details of funding, phasing and delivery.
- The Transport Assessment requires revision and amendment.
- Commercial and residential Travel Plans require revision.
- The proposals for the alignment of Aves Ditch require amendment.
- Further drainage information is required.

There are also numerous highway design items that will need to be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage.

If despite the County's objection permission is proposed to be granted then the County 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	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	Baxter	Mitigation package will include improvements to a number of off-site junctions, and traffic calming in surrounding villages. Other measures are also under investigation.
Public transport services	£3,600,000	To be confirmed	RPI-x	Provision of new bus services linking the site to Oxford and Bicester, in accordance with the public transport strategy.
Provision of mini-bus link to Heyford station	£1,000,000	To be confirmed	RPI-x	Towards cost of minibus service to Heyford station and/or around the flying field
Public transport infrastructure <i>(if not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement)</i>	£152,941.70	July 2017	Baxter	Enhanced and new bus stops around the site.
Travel Plan Monitoring	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	RPI-x	For residential and commercial Travel Plans.
Public Rights of Way	£400,000	To be confirmed	Baxter	Mitigation works to Oxford Canal towpath
Total	N/a			

Comments

Transport Strategy

Strategic Comments

By way of background, clause 14 in the legal agreement for the extant consent at the Upper Heyford site (10/01642/OUT) dated 22/12/11 sets a ceiling of 1075 dwellings. This cap was subsequently increased to 1,178 dwellings via deeds of variation associated with permissions 13/01811/OUT and 16/00263/F. Cherwell Local Plan Policy Villages 5 allocates an additional 1600 houses and 1500 jobs. The Transport Assessment submitted with this application sets out to make provision for the full additional 1600 houses and 1500 jobs. However, it should be noted that this planning application does not cover the whole allocation. At least four further applications have been made or are expected, all of which will need to contribute to the allocation masterplan mitigation package.

The Policy Villages 5 allocation received no objection from the Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Transport Strategy Team at the Cherwell Local Plan Examination in Public in December 2014, subject to an appropriate level of strategic transport mitigation being delivered at the earliest opportunity, as there are existing traffic pressures on junctions and villages in the area, such as Middleton Stoney. As a result, any application to deliver the allocation needs to consider not only the local transport mitigation required, but also the strategic mitigation that would be necessary to reduce the impact on the surrounding rural area. A site by site based assessment would not consider the cumulative impact of the allocation in its entirety and therefore would not identify the appropriate level of strategic mitigation required.

As the Local Plan allocation comprises multiple application sites, each site will be expected to contribute towards a strategic mitigation package, proportionate to their impact. If there are more than four additional application sites, consideration will need to be given to splitting up infrastructure between them to comply with CIL regulations. The cost can only be split proportionately between the sites once the full strategic mitigation package has been confirmed and the cost/deliverability determined. Submission of a comprehensive strategic transport mitigation package for the full Policy Villages 5 allocation is therefore required, including details of funding, phasing and delivery.

Although detailed transport modelling and design work has clearly been undertaken and many elements of the package are agreed, the full package has yet to be identified and so a contribution and delivery strategy cannot be developed for implementation across the sites yet. In this connection it is noted that further strategic transport modelling is being undertaken by the applicant in pursuit of identifying a strategic mitigation package. The application cannot be fully assessed until a strategic mitigation package has been identified as appropriate and deliverable. **Reason for objection.**

The following junctions have been surveyed at OCC's request, but an assessment has yet to be submitted.

- B430 / Ardley Road staggered crossroads.

- B430 / Somerton Road T-Junction.
- B430 / Church Road T-Junction.
- A4260 / A4095 staggered crossroads.

For completeness, assessment of these junctions is required, prior to the acceptance of the development proposals and mitigation by OCC. **Reason for objection.**

There are outstanding matters that require further consideration towards an agreed solution for highway capacity improvements at the following locations.

- M40 J10 (M40 southbound slip/A43)
- Baynards Green roundabout (A43/B4100)
- Middleton Stoney (B430/B4030)

Paragraph 6.2.2 of the transport assessment states that *“It is considered that an assessment will need to be undertaken of the development thresholds for any mitigation that is proposed to be delivered in support of the Heyford Park development.”* As the full mitigation package has yet to be confirmed, this assessment of mitigation thresholds has yet to be undertaken, but is necessary in order to feed into the contribution/delivery strategy. For clarity, infrastructure improvements associated with Chilgrove Drive and its junction with Camp Road should be regarded as a local infrastructure requirement providing access to development and so should not form part of strategic transport mitigation package.

In addition, the surrounding villages of Upper Heyford, Lower Heyford, Ardley and Middleton Stoney have been identified as appropriate to receive traffic calming and management measures as mitigation. However, it may be necessary to amend this list in the light of the further modelling work that is being undertaken. Fritwell and Somerton have been identified for monitoring and so the developer must fund this monitoring to record a baseline and future traffic flows, with a commitment to provide appropriate solutions at an agreed trigger. A revised TA will need to address village traffic calming in further detail. **Reason for objection.**

It is noted that access to employment will be available for light vehicles from the proposed priority junctions on Camp Road in the vicinity of the Village Centre and a “Secondary Commercial Access” is proposed within Heyford Park. An assessment of the vehicle type and frequencies, along with justification for this requirement, as opposed to access from Chilgrove Drive, should therefore be provided. **Reason for objection.**

In terms of walking and cycling infrastructure along the proposed spine roads and through the development, careful consideration must be given to the Oxfordshire Walking and Cycling Design Standards when developing proposals for these links.

There have been calls for a formalised crossing outside the free school on Camp Road, linking the facilities on the north and south sides. As the development proposals would add further traffic to Camp Road, it is considered necessary that a zebra crossing for the school is included in the final Strategic Transport mitigation package.

Although the proposed Public Transport strategy to provide an increased frequency service between Heyford Park and Bicester, as well as a community bus service to Lower Heyford Railway Station is acceptable in principle, details of how the service frequency between will increase and the introduction of the community bus service have yet to be agreed with OCC. This will be required in order to calculate the pump-priming contribution required to deliver the agreed service through to commercial viability. **Reason for objection.**

It is noted that agreement for use of Pingle Drive (Private Road) and Bicester Village Railway Station's bus stops has yet to be obtained and so OCC will need to see evidence of this in order to determine whether the routing and proposed timetable is deliverable. For clarity, the 25a bus service referred to in the Transport Assessment has now been rebranded as the 250 bus service.

Any outstanding conditions and obligations associated with the permitted development at Heyford Park need to be identified in order to understand what needs to be transferred or amended to fit with the new development proposals.

These matters must be concluded with an outcome agreed to by OCC in order to provide the reassurance that an appropriate level of mitigation will be provided at the right time.

Public Transport

Bus Strategy

The provision of a commercially-viable bus service to/from the Heyford Park site will be a huge challenge, a consequence of a wide scatter of origins and destinations and the difficulty of providing an attractive frequent bus service to this location.

It's considered that the Heyford Park to Bicester link offers the best opportunity for a frequent commercial service, as the distance is not so long and the bus can serve several interchange points for onward travel opportunities (Park & Ride site, the rail stations and the Manorsfield Road bus station). A frequent service, operating 4 times per hour eventually) is proposed, to provide credible interchange opportunities with other routes and to provide a turn-up-and-go frequency of service to the nearest service centre and for the residents of both communities.

The Heyford Park to Oxford bus service should be maintained at the current level, with an hourly schedule which can absorb peak-hour delays into the city.

The table below illustrates the requirement for the Developer to provide a contribution of £3.6 million towards the cost of delivering the Bus Service strategy, calculated on the cost of pump-priming five buses on a declining pump-priming basis over eight years, with the ninth year operating without financial support. This calculation is based on the current observation that one of the two buses currently operating on route 25 could be considered to be commercially viable, thus the net cost to the developer is calculated on this basis.

The number of buses to be used at any one time will increase as the development builds out. Once the new service pattern commences via Chilgrove Drive then four

buses will be required in the base service (hourly to Oxford, every 30 minutes to Bicester), increasing to five then six buses. The trigger point for increasing the Bicester service is to be determined, however an indicative build-out rate and bus service deployment is appended below, taking into account the current 'commercial' bus.

The assumed roll-out of enhanced frequency to Bicester after 2 and 4 years of the development is shown below.

Year	New Dwellings	Base service net cost	20 mins to Bicester	15 mins to Bicester	Total cost £m
1	160	480			480
2	320	420			420
3	480	360	160		520
4	640	300	140		440
5	800	240	120	160	520
6	960	180	100	140	420
7	1120	120	80	120	320
8	1280	60	60	100	220
9	1440	0	40	80	120
10	1600		20	60	80
11			0	40	40
12				20	20
13				0	0
				Total	3,600

Section 106 payments should be made on an annual basis to the County Council, in a manner that ensures that there is enough funding to secure the service. Suggested £600,000 at implementation, then six annual payments of £500,000 to follow, to ensure the Council has sufficient funds to procure the bus service.

Minibus service

A supplementary minibus service is proposed, to provide a link from the development to Heyford station, to connect with trains and also to provide a service around the flying field. Details of how such a service would be specified and procured have not been provided. There is a significant concern that such a service would never be commercially viable and would require ongoing financial support. It is possible that a lower-cost operating arrangement could be found, but this is not certain. It is suggested that such a service could cost £100,000 per annum to operate, given the long operating day to meet early morning and evening trains. As a consequence of this uncertainty, it is suggested that provision is made for £1.0 million to secure the operation of this service for at least 10 years.

Layout

The bus turning arrangement at the western end of Camp Road needs to be revised, ideally through localised widening of Camp Road, provision of mini-roundabout and then layby on northern side, accommodating the bus stop. Penetration of the residential neighbourhood should be avoided, due to the substandard design of these roads for buses.

An additional pair of bus stops is required on Chilgrove Drive, adjacent to the proposed 2.5Ha commercial site, to provide accessibility to this part of the site. Two temporary bus stops will be needed on the south side of the eastern end of Camp Road, to provide access until the Chilgrove Drive route is fully available. It may be necessary to continue through operation of the current 250 service between Oxford and Bicester, until the north-east loop becomes available, perhaps supplemented by an additional Bicester-Heyford service.

Bus stops

The developer must ensure that the basic bus infrastructure is provided at each stop. This will include a hard-standing area large enough to accommodate a bus shelter, a marked-out area on the highway, and connecting footways including dropped kerbs. Details of location, layout and materials must be submitted at the Reserved Matters stage of the process. The provision of bus stop infrastructure has not been required in previous planning approvals for this site, so this is the opportunity to bring bus stops across the site up to a modern accessible standard.

A section 106 contribution will then be required for all bus related infrastructure, namely 20 Premium Route Pole/Flag units at £1052.80, 12 shelters at £8942.64 each, 6 shelter-mounted real-time information signs at £4095.67, all at July 2017 prices. The provision of shelters needs to be discussed with the Parish Council, which will be expected to provide ongoing maintenance, using a portion of the amounts quoted to cover this cost.

Transport Development Control

Section 6 of the Environmental Statement (ES) deals with transport and access issues and draws on a Transport Assessment (TA) for the planning application which is included as an appendix. The County took part in a lengthy scoping exercise as part of the applicant's development of the TA. Comments on the TA are set out here.

Para 3.4.2. Notes the location of surveys undertaken in June 2013. This data is now only just within the generally accepted five year age limit. Any further work would need to be based on new surveys.

Para 3.5.14. Notes that the consented scheme (10/01642/OUT) includes the reinstatement of the Portway and Aves ditch public rights of way. It is noted here that this has still not been done.

Section 3.7 presents details of a number of land uses that have not been included in the subsequent trip generation estimates. It is accepted that some of these could be argued as ancillary to the residential and employment uses in the application. However, some are clearly not intended as ancillary. For example, the Flying Field Park, Control Tower Park and Visitor Destination Area will attract users from outside of Heyford Park and will generate additional trip making to that assessed in the TA. The trip generation estimates presented in Section 6 of the TA therefore require revision. **Reason for objection.**

Section 3.8 presents Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data analysis. The data presented in this section is at odds with that included in Appendix D which shows 644 PICs, whereas Section 8 only notes 171. No plan is included in the TA to show accident locations by severity and no attempt is made to identify PIC clusters which may point to specific road safety issues. **Reason for objection.**

Para 5.2.2. Details of the internal road referenced in relation to various parcel access arrangements in this section will need to be provided at the reserved matters stage.

Para 5.2.2. **Parcel 9.** With reference to drawing No.HEYF-SK346 Rev C the TA states *“In summary the main access to this plot will be directly from Camp Road via three priority junctions. There will also be four priority junctions onto Camp Road providing access to individual parking courts.”* However, the drawing appears to show only two priority junctions. Clarification is required. **Reason for objection.**

Para 5.2.3 – 5.2.5. The county considers that having a commercial access close to the village centre is inappropriate since this is adjacent to shared space which will be used by pedestrians and cyclists. It is not stated how HGVs will be prevented from passing through the village centre on Camp Road. **Reason for objection.**

Para 5.2.7. The “retail / health element of the development” is not shown on the Parameter Plan. It is not therefore possible to determine if access proposals are acceptable. **Reason for objection.**

Para 5.3.3. No pedestrian crossings are shown on the drawings referred to. This should be rectified. The pedestrian footway to the east of the Pye plot should be wider than 1.0m if possible. No mention is made of whether the possibility of narrowing the carriageway width on Camp Road to achieve this has been examined. This should be rectified. **Reason for objection.**

Para 5.3.7. Levels of cycle parking are not presented and should be agreed at the outline planning application stage. Detail and location of these provisions can be presented at the reserved matters stage.

Para 6.3.2. As already noted, June 2013 data is now only just within the generally accepted five year age limit. Any further work would need to be based on new surveys.

Para 6.3.3 and 6.3.4. The junctions listed will need to be included in the TA before it can be considered fit for purpose. **Reason for objection.**

Para 6.4.2. The County has consistently pointed out that use of traffic counts at Middleton Stoney and Hopcrofts Holt to derive background growth factors is likely to underestimate growth due to existing congestion at these junctions. TEMPro should be used. **Reason for objection.**

Table 6.17. Given the identified bottleneck at Middleton Stoney it would be useful if the main body of text included a specific statement of the percentage of development traffic passing through Junction 6.

Table 7.8. The traffic increase from reference case to test case on the B4030 (W) appears rather low.

Para 7.3.1 concludes that junctions 2a to 18 require further capacity testing. The County agrees with this conclusion.

Section 8. All base models appear to validate acceptably. However, it is noted that in the absence of a queue survey it has not been possible to validate the model for Junction 18. Queue surveys for this junction should be undertaken and a validation exercise carried out. **Reason for objection.**

Table 8.30. The traffic signal junction of B430 and B4030 is already at capacity in the AM peak 2016 base case. It is not clear whether this case includes the consented Section 278 scheme. This should be clarified. **Reason for objection.**

Paras 10.3.26 – 10.3.31. The proposed mitigation for Junction 5 is acceptable in principle.

Paras 10.3.43 – 10.3.46. The development proposal will not be acceptable to the County until suitable mitigation at Junction 6 and in the Middleton Stoney area has been identified and committed. **Reason for objection.**

Paras 10.3.105 – 10.3.112. The proposed mitigation for Junction 15 is acceptable in principle.

Paras 10.3.134 – 10.3.138. The proposed mitigation for Junction 18 is acceptable in principle.

Section 10.4. The approach set out in this section is acceptable to the County and the resulting four villages identified for traffic calming are agreed. However, it may be necessary to amend this list in the light of the further modelling work that is being undertaken. It remains for measures to be identified and costed such that a Section 106 contribution can be identified. **Reason for objection.**

Section 11. The County will need to undertake full technical review and approval of the strategic road network junctions that intersect with the County's road network.

Travel Plans

This is a large development with a varied range of travel plan requirements. These are outlined below. Abbreviations are identified in the Key.

- 1,175 new dwellings (Class C3): **RTP, TIP, MF.**
- 35,175 m² of new employment buildings comprising up to 6,330 m² Class B1a, 13,635 m² B1b/c, 9,250 m² Class B2, and 5,960 m² B8: **CTP, MF, and additional MFs for any site occupier whose business is above travel plan thresholds.**
- 60 close care dwellings (Class C2/C3): **TP, MF.**
- 929 m² of retail (Class A1): **TPS.**
- 670 m² comprising a new medical centre (Class D1): **TPS.**
- 2.4 ha site for a new school (Class D1): **TP.**
- 925 m² of community use buildings (Class D2) and 515 m² of indoor sports, if provided on-site (Class D2); 30m in height observation tower with zipwire with ancillary visitor facilities of up to 100 m² (Class D1/A1/A3); Possible **TP** requirement if everything specified is provided. **Further detail required to assess impact and potential TP requirement.**
- 1,000 m² energy facility/infrastructure with stack height of up to 24m (sui generis). **Further detail required to assess impact and potential TP requirement.**
- 2,520 m² additional education facilities buildings and associated external infrastructure at Buildings 73, 74 and 583 for education use (Class D1) and creation of areas of Open Space, Sports Facilities, Public Park and other green infrastructure. **TP**
- 20.3ha of hardstanding for car processing (Sui Generis). **Further detail required to assess impact and potential TP requirement.**
- 76.6ha for filming activities (Sui Generis). **Further detail is required to assess impact and potential TP requirement.**

Key

RTP	Residential travel plan
CTP	Commercial travel plan
TP	Travel plan
TPS	Travel plan statement
TIP	Travel information pack
MF	Monitoring fee

Residential and Commercial Travel Plans have recently been submitted for this site. Extensive comments have been provided by the County on both of these plans. These previous comments have not been fully acted on. All required revisions should be made so that the plans can be brought up to the required standard. For the avoidance of doubt previously submitted detailed comments are repeated below.
Reason for objection.

Commercial Travel Plan Comments

Recent surveys have shown that the commercial travel plan is not meeting its targets and a more proactive travel plan approach is required to start to turn this situation around.

The County's original comments are set out below and should be checked against the submitted plan and responded to accordingly. The following are required.

- An up to date site plan which shows business locations, routes through the site, both for vehicles and any routes that are suitable for walking and cycling, bus stops, cycle routes, cycle parking, site facilities such as banks shops etc., site shuttle services pick up and drop off points.
- Details about future development plans for the commercial part of the site.
- Inclusion of 2011 Census travel to work data for comparison purposes with the baseline survey results.
- Overall outcomes and targets for the entire site including maximum levels of car trips generated by the development per day.
- A commitment that each occupier will identify a representative who will liaise with the site Travel Plan Co-ordinator and implement Travel Plan measures specific to their employees and visitors.
- Details of how many subsidiary travel plans will be developed for the site, who will be responsible for these, how will the process be achieved, Steps that are proposed to ensure that subsidiary Travel Plans are consistent with the wider targets and requirements of the Framework Commercial Travel Plan.
- Clarification of the timescales for completion of individual Travel Plans and the implementation of specific measures within them as the development proceeds, including management and review.
- A commitment that each new occupier will conduct a travel survey for the development within 3 months of occupation and review the travel plan in light of the survey results.
- A commitment to send the results of all travel surveys to the Travel Plans Team at Oxfordshire County Council within one month of survey completion.
- As a large part of the commercial element of the site is already occupied details of how this commercial travel plan be promoted and taken up by existing site occupiers.
- Targets would be easier to monitor if they are set to coincide with each survey year. This will make it easier to see if progress is being made in achieving that target of whether new travel plan actions are required because progress is not being made.

Specific Travel Plan comments

- Paragraph 1.1.2. It should be made clear that this travel plan will only be concerned with the commercial side of the site. Residential travel plans and commercial travel plans are quite different and should be dealt with separately. So to clarify this travel plan will deal with the commercial part of the site. If there is a desire to deal with the residential element as well this would need to be done in separate sections with their own targets and associated actions.
- Paragraph 1.1.5. There is no reason why this should be an interim travel plan. The site already has a number of occupiers and this framework travel plan can deal with businesses that already occupy the site as well as new businesses that will occupy the site in the future. This framework travel plan will set the targets for the site which future occupiers will be expected to adopt as their own. Either through their own travel plans if their organisations are above the travel plan

threshold for their specific type of business or by adopting the overall aims and targets of the framework travel plan.

- Paragraph 1.2.3. Please supply more details on the current site uses and the companies that occupy the site, and whether this is still the same as is specified in this paragraph. This should include details of the size of their businesses in GFA and the number of employees. An up to date site plan which shows business locations, routes through the site, both for vehicles and any routes that are suitable for walking and cycling, bus stops, cycle routes, cycle parking, site facilities such as banks shops etc., site shuttle services pick up and drop off points. Please also specify if any of the organisation currently occupying the site currently have their own travel plans.
- Paragraph 1.2.4. The County would question this assumption and feel that these organisations are all trip generators. In some cases these trips might be limited to the site itself but with other would form part of another trip such as dropping off children at school or nurse on the way to work.
- Paragraph 1.3.3. Other advantages to businesses of a commercial travel plan can be managing business travel more effectively, reducing delays caused by congestion, questioning if travel which is part of work is necessary, reducing business costs,
- Paragraph 1.4. The reasoning for an interim travel plan is not correct please see paragraph 1.1.5.
- Paragraph 2.1. Signage, does the site have good signage highlighting key destinations such as the shops or banks? Ideally signs should also display times to get there by walking or cycling. Are there site plans placed at strategic locations throughout the site to help site users to find their way around the site?
- Paragraph 3.1.4. Has the Paragon Travel Plan adopted the targets of this framework travel plan? Cooperation between the site wide travel plan coordinator and the Paragon travel plan coordinator will be necessary.
- Paragraph 3.3. Mode share, please include the 2011 Census travel to work data for this area as it will be useful to compare with the mode share breakdown for the site. It will also help to show if targets are realistic.
- Paragraph 3.6. one of the barriers to car sharing was identified as being work patterns, but this was not what was shown in other parts of the survey. Clearly at present car sharing is not viewed as a viable option for travel to and from work the travel plan will need to consider how this attitude could be changed.
- Paragraph 3.7.3. A 40 minute walk is quite a substantial walk and persuading employees that it was a good way to travel to and from work could prove difficult
- Paragraph 3.8. Perhaps more realistically than walking, cycling could provide an alternative travel mode for a substantial number of employees if they have access to a suitable cycle and they have the confidence and fitness level required and a desire to cycle.
- Paragraph 5.2.1. As this is a commercial travel plan it should not be covering trips made by residents as is stated in this paragraph. So the travel plan should focus on reducing SOV vehicle travel by employees and visitors and focus on eliminating any necessary business trips associated with the day to day operations of the organisations involved.
- Paragraph 5.3. Indicators are not satisfactory from a travel plan point of view and although observations can be useful surveys should be used to monitor actual level as of traffic being generated by the site.

- Paragraph 6.1.4. Travel Information packs should be available either electronically or in a paper format whichever employees prefer. Electronic packs have the advantage of being able to include the most up to date information particularly things like timetables.
- Paragraph 6.1.16. As this paragraph states the majority of the site is occupied which further supports this travel plan not being an interim travel plan.
- Paragraph 6.1.28. The current dial a ride service does not sound ideal and it could be argued that a timetabled shuttle bus service would allow users to plan their journey more effectively. Demand would be more likely to increase if a regular service was provided and marketed. It is likely that the current provision is unlikely to lead to a more regular service.
- Paragraph 6.1.31. It will take a considerable amount of time to set up and maintain a car sharing database and there might be more to be gained from using one that is already established such as Oxfordshire Liftshare <https://oxfordshire.liftshare.com/>
- Action plan actions all need a completion or review date and a person who is responsible for seeing that action is carried out.
- Targets associated with the residential element of this development can be included in a separate table. Some may also be of benefit to the commercial element of the site but they are not part of actions for the commercial travel plan.
- A greater variety of short, medium and longer term actions should be developed which are directly linked to achieving the wider travel plan objectives. It would be nice to see actions grouped with their objective i.e. measures to increase cycling, measures to increase public transport use, measures to increase car sharing.
- Paragraph 8.3.3. It is recommended that any new businesses check with the Travel Plan Team to see if there will be a travel plan requirement. The information in this paragraph is not correct.
- Paragraph 9.2.1. Please note; Oxfordshire County Council no longer provide travel survey templates.
- Paragraph 9.3. Please specify the remedial measures trigger points for the site.
- Survey respondents post code plot map would be far more useful if it showed the locations where these employees are travelling from. Please include a more detailed map.

The comments below are additional comments on the updated commercial travel plan, please note there are also questions which will need to be responded to.

- Section 3.3. Table 3.2. At the moment, it is not possible to relate the survey results to travel plan targets please put them into percentages which can be more easily checked against specified targets.
- Para 3.3.2. A worrying development and in opposition to travel plan targets to reduce SOV travel to and from the site. We will need to see robust measures being introduced to counteract this worrying trend.
- Section 3.4. Using employees home postcodes to imitate a more targeted travel plan approach could be beneficial?
- Para 3.6.1. What is being done to provide employees with accurate information on car sharing and if it would work for them? What is being done to promote car sharing? Have you adopted Oxfordshire Liftshare <https://liftshare.com/uk/community/oxfordshire> as your car share provider of

choice? If not why not? Are employees guaranteed a lift home when they are car sharing if there is a problem or there chosen car sharer has had to leave? Are there dedicated car share spaces in advantageous locations on site? These not only offer dedicated parking but also have the dual purpose of advertising car share and reminding others that it might be an option for them.

- Graph 3.9. Is this a true reflection of the travel options available or just a perception amongst employee? Using the main residential cluster areas this should be checked and if it is not correct more accurate information targeted towards specific to residential clusters should be made available to employees.
- Section 4. Please compare our mode share breakdown with 2011 travel to work census data as a sense check. What does this show us? Currently around 96% of surveyed employees are travelling to and from the site by private motor vehicle.
- A SOV reduction target is required of between 5-10% and also a target for all other modes for every year in which a survey will take place in both actual numbers and percentages. It should also be noted that SOV reduction is a key travel plan objective. Please change the travel plan to reflect this.
- Para 5.2.1. Car share is a viable alternative when thinking about car travel to and from the site but is also a car mode please change the travel plan to reflect this.
- Para 5.3.2 Anecdotal evidence can have some value but for the purposes of following and assessing travel plan progress it is of less use. We prefer the use of statistical analysis to provide a fuller picture of whether the travel plan is working well towards achieving its targets.
- Para 6.1.4. Any focus of the proposed TIP (travel information pack) should be tailored to focus on the opportunities that are most accessible to employees currently working at the site, just sending out general information is unlikely to achieve much or do much to change employee travel behaviour. Please specify how are a more targeted approach will be developed and put into practice through this commercial travel plan.
- One of the best times is to catch employees before travel habits are developed. Any recruitment process should offer site related travel advice to all potential employees and where possible focus on local recruitment.
- Are the employees based at the site aware of the TPC existence and their location on the site. How is the personalised travel planning advice that the TPC should be offering disseminated and publicised?
- Para 6.1.8. Oxfordshire County Council recommends Oxfordshire Liftshare <https://liftshare.com/uk/community/oxfordshire> as the car share provider of choice, why reinvent the horse? You can always have a dedicated site group only for Heyford Park, has this been considered? Bearing mind that this appears to be one of the main ways of reducing SOV travel to and from site why is not more being done to promote car sharing to employees? I would expect to see more activity in this area with serious promotion being include within the travel plan. This would be regular activities focusing on signing up employees, such as car share weeks, there may be help available from Liftshare particularly if a dedicated group for the site is set up.
- Para 6.1.19. Home working, business travel to meetings, video conferencing etc.
- The Action table must contain a credible set of short, medium and longer term actions which will form a package of measures aimed at helping the travel plan to achieve its aims. These should be grouped under headings such as,

measures to reduce single occupancy car trips, measures to increase walking, measures to increase cycling, measures to increase bus use, measures to increase car share etc. Each action must have a completion or review date and a named person who will be responsible for ensuring that it is carried out. The current action table is limited and will need further careful development.

- Targets, a target for all modes is required for each year in which a survey will take place, usually years 1,3 and 5 in both numbers and percentages. There must be a site wide target to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips made to and from the site. We will need to see between a 5-10% in SOV trips for the site. Please revise the target for the site. Please also include 2011 travel to work census data as a sense check to your trip rate data.
- Table 7.1. Comments this might help but the biggest problem is likely to be the distance that site based employees live from the site.
- Para 7.1.5. Has this now be done.
- Para 8.3.3. The travel plan requirement for any site is based on the type of business and its size, further information on our travel plan thresholds is included in our approved guidance. It is based on the class of business and the GFA in m² of the enterprise concerned. Please change this paragraph to reflect this.
- The TPC for the site has the overall responsibility for ensuring that any business is informed of their travel plan responsibilities and ensuring that they buy into the overall aims and objectives of the commercial travel plan.
- Para 9.2.4. As the travel plan is not currently meeting its targets this is of matter of urgency and not a nicety. Please change the travel plan to reflect this. The County will also expect to see new measures being introduced in the travel plan with the aim of changing this situation.
- A copy of the travel survey that was used should be included in the appendices.

Residential Travel Plan Comments

- Please include details of the proposed housing mix for the site, the proposed build rate, and the approximate the number of future residents. Please also include site plans and location maps.
- Targets, a target for all modes is required for each year in which a survey will take place, usually years 1,3 and 5 in both numbers and percentages. There must be a site wide target to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips made to and from the site. We will need to see between a 5-10% in SOV trips for the site. Please revise the target for the site. Please also include 2011 travel to work census data as a sense check to your trip rate data.
- Para 4.2.1. Car sharing is one practical way of reducing SOV car journeys made to and from the site but is still car use. The reduction of SOV trips made to and from the site is what is important here and must be one of the main objectives of this travel plan.
- Para 4.3.2. Anecdotal evidence can have some value but for the purposes of following and assessing travel plan progress it is of less use. We prefer the use of statistical analysis to provide a fuller picture of whether the travel plan is working well towards achieving its targets.
- Para 5.1.3. Many residents will prefer an electronic version of the TIP since it cuts down on printing costs for the developer and allows them to directly access things like fare and timetable information. This should be an option for residents.

- The main purpose of the TIP is to help residents to access all the facilities and services that they will need on a day to day basis and to make informed travel choices about how they will access these facilities and services. A large-scale map with the Heyford site at the centre, showing where these services and facilities are located should be included in the TIP. Illustrative walking and cycling times to these facilities should also be included.
- The TIP will need to include details of how all residents can get personalised travel planning, who will provide it and what its purpose is.
- Details of home shopping, taxis services, OCC recommend Oxfordshire Liftshare as the car share provider of choice, <https://liftshare.com/uk/community/oxfordshire> it is much less effort than trying to establish your own car share database and they have far more experience of operating such a service.
- Travel plan coordinator details should be included in the travel plan and sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council TravelPlan@Oxfordshire.gov.uk
- Para 5.1.16. Please refer to my previous car sharing comments.
- The Action table must contain a credible set of short, medium and longer term actions which will form a package of measures aimed at helping the travel plan to achieve its aims. These should be grouped under headings such as, measures to reduce single occupancy car trips, measures to increase walking, measures to increase cycling, measures to increase bus use, measures to increase car share etc. Each action must have a completion or review date and a named person who will be responsible for ensuring that it is carried out. The current action table is limited and will need further careful development.
- Please revise targets in line with earlier comments.
- Para 6.1.6. For us to decide if conducting the baseline residents survey after the occupation of the 1000th dwelling, we will need to know the planned build rate for the development.
- The appendices need to include a copy of the resident's survey that will be used.
- Para 8.2.1. The County no longer provides templates or motioning report tools. We are the **Travel Plan Team** the **Travel Choices Team** was broken up many years ago when the government started introducing austerity measures.
- Para 8.2.3. Please change this in line with earlier comments associated with travel plan targets and monitoring.
- Please include walking and cycling isochrones for the development in the appendices.
- Did the transport assessment raise any issues which need to be addressed through the travel plan? If not, the travel plan should state this.

Rights of Way

Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) manages the legal record and access functions on the public rights of way and access land network. In addition to the statutory functions of recording, protecting and maintaining public rights of way, part of the authority's role includes securing mitigation measures from residential and commercial developments that will have an impact on the public rights of way and access land network in order to make those developments acceptable. This

representation helps meet the aims and outcomes of the adopted Oxfordshire Rights of Way Management Plan 2015-2025

The proposed additional development at Heyford Park/RAF Upper Heyford will have significant cumulative (in addition to consented development) impacts on the site and surrounding area, as well as on the residents, neighbours and visitors. We anticipate that the key ones to affect walkers, cyclists and equestrians will be as follows.

- Increases in volume, speed and frequency of traffic on all routes, impacting on non-motorised users safety and amenity.
- Increases in large vehicle use and impacts on the area and non-motorised users.
- Greater pressure on the area's public rights of way current and historical network for journeys and recreation.
- Increased demand for linking off-road routes from onsite residents as well as those from surrounding settlements.

The proposed masterplan and Composite Parameter Plan goes some way towards offsetting these impacts but there needs to be robust measures put in place to ensure that access infrastructure and mitigation measures are implemented in a reasonably short timeframe.

Aves Ditch routing around the full perimeter of the airfield

Aves Ditch might now no longer be regarded as a restoration of anything resembling its historical route or integrating that historical use in the setting of a historic airfield to give access for the public to enjoy the experience in an unrestricted and fully immersive way – anytime of day and any time of the year and passing through the site. Previous options for the route in the consented development included a route across the runway 'nib' at a point of elevation with viewing area that would maintain some visual access to the wider site. The current proposal removes this option. Given the proposed significant change in the focus for the use of Flying Field to commercial uses, and the proximity of residential and intense commercial development there seems no conservation justification why Aves Ditch cannot now be restored to something along its historical route with a double fenced wide route similar to that proposed for Portway. **Reason for objection.**

The enclosure of Aves Ditch perimeter route with landscape tree planting.

The proposal to enclose Aves Ditch bridleway within landscape buffer tree planting is objected to as it further undermines the association and amenity of this proposed route with the Flying Field as free access to the views and experience of the Cold War heritage will be lost. There will also be increased maintenance and safety liability. Any landscape planting should not take place on the Flying Field side of the bridleway to ensure visual amenity is maintained. **Reason for objection.**

The consented development has breached condition 30 from 2010 requiring the reinstatement of Aves Ditch and Portway routes as part of wider bridleway works. The current application references these restorations as part of wider access, sustainable transport and green infrastructure measures, but there is no schedule for implementing these. Additional guarantees therefore need to be put in place to

ensure these and all other on and offsite countryside access/rights of way measures are implemented so that public benefit and utility can be restored for residents and local communities. This matter can be addressed in discharge of a condition.

The proposed development will significantly increase pressures on rights of way and users in the vicinity. Additional mitigation in the form of a £400,000 Section 106 contribution to Oxford Canal Towpath and connecting routes should be made. A statement of justification is set out elsewhere in this consultation response.

The route of existing public rights of way in relation to the security fencing at the north and west sides of the Flying Field (footpath 349/13 and bridleway 349/9) needs clarifying and resolving, if necessary through a separate TCPA rights of way change process. This process needs to be started immediately in order to avoid delays or the necessity to open the security fence in a number of locations to accommodate the public rights of way. This matter can be addressed in discharge of a condition.

Onsite greenspace and access mitigation are noted. The Flying Field Park and access tracks, if deemed appropriate, should be provided and managed as public open space in perpetuity by the developer. This matter can be addressed in discharge of a condition.

The proposals for the Chilgrove Drive bridleway are fully supported provided that they are accompanied by a signalized NMU crossing of Camp Road and the two crossing points on the new Chilgrove Drive vehicle route, and are implemented alongside works to open the full length of the Aves Ditch and Portway routes across the Flying Field within 6 months of any grant of planning permission. This matter can be addressed in discharge of a condition.

Non-security fencing specification may need to be adjusted in order to prevent access to livestock outside of the secure zones. The simplest way to ensure this would be to affix wire stock netting to the post and rail fencing but without barbed wire on the bridleway side. This matter can be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

Clarification is required about proposals for the areas of land to the West of the proposed route of Portway (including the stub of bridleway 388/1) as the POL site is used for keeping horses and the wider area has potential for informal public open space. This matter can be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

Road Agreements

The following items will need to be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage.

- Tracking needs to be carried out with the below vehicle details
OCC require a swept path analysis for refuse vehicle for all manoeuvres in forward gear. All internal bends and junctions will need to be tracked with two vehicles (refuse vehicle and medium sized car) using the bend/junction at the same time. Refuse vehicle used should be Phoenix 2 – 23W with elite 2 6x4 chassis, with the following dimensions.

- Overall length – 11.6m, including bin lift;
- Overall Width – 2.530m;
- Overall body height – 3.205m;
- Min body ground clearance – 0.410m;
- Track width – 2.5m;
- Lock to lock time – 4.00s.
- Visibility Splays must be dedicated to the County if they fall out of the existing highway boundary.
- If there is not a footway adjacent to the carriageway an 800mm maintenance margin is required.
- Visitor parking bays should not interfere with internal visibility splays.
- No Highway materials, construction methods, adoptable layouts and technical details have been approved at this stage. The detailed design will be subject to a full technical audit.
- The County requires saturated CBR laboratory tests on the sub-soil likely to be used as the sub-formation layer. This would be best done alongside the main ground investigation for the site but the location of the samples must relate to the proposed location of the carriageway/footway.
- 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.
- No property should be within 500mm of the proposed highway. No doors, gates, windows, garages or gas/electric cupboards should open onto the proposed highway.
- 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.
- Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection, trees must not conflict with street lights.
- No private drainage to discharge onto existing Highway.
- No private drainage to discharge onto any area of proposed adoptable highway.

The following comments relate specifically to the mitigation measures put forward in the TA.

Junction 18 concept roundabout.

- Carriageway realignment on northbound approach to roundabout is not a smooth transition. The taper length should be increased to reduce the severity of the bend on the approach.
- Merging of traffic on southbound exit should not occur going into the bend. This should be extended or bend improved as per above comment.
- Concept is fine, subject to full technical audit.

Junction of Camp Road and Chilgrove Drive.

- On-carriageway cycle lanes should be 1.5m wide.
- 30mph limit should be extended further in advance of the junction.
- Equestrian crossing is too close to the junction and should not be on the radius.

- Consideration should be given to a user controlled equestrian crossing to combine with the pedestrian/cycle crossing and signalised junction as opposed to waiting and “chancing” the crossing.

All other mitigation proposals look acceptable in principle, but will be subject to full technical audits when submitted as part of the Section 278 procedure.

Drainage

The drainage strategy for the site is contained within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Ref: C-04583-C. Hydrock Consultants, September 2017.).

The infiltration potential for the site has not been verified at this stage and therefore the County recommends that this be informed through infiltration testing throughout the site, secured by way of a planning condition. Given that the site is underlain by an aquifer, it will be an important design consideration that the base of any proposed infiltration device maintains a one metre separation to the seasonal high ground water level, as well as avoiding the mobilisation of any existing contaminant present in the ground. Therefore, seasonal monitoring of ground water levels and soil testing may be necessary in areas where infiltration is viable.

The proposed strategy for surface water peak runoff and volume control is generally compliant with the DEFRA non-statutory technical standards. The proposed strategy to match the QBAR greenfield runoff rate in this respect will mitigate for increases in impermeable areas at the site. It will also be a requirement to match proposed runoff peak rates for the one year storm event to greenfield rates, and this matter should not be overlooked in the detailed drainage design for the site. A 10% increase in impermeable areas for Urban Creep was factored into the initial calculation in respect of attenuation storage volumes. However, the FRA did not clarify whether appropriate allowance for Climate Change had been factored into the calculations for attenuation storage volumes. This requires clarification. **Reason for objection.**

The SuDS proposals describe that the individual sites will connect to a swale and attenuation basin network prior to outfall to watercourses at the proposed restricted rates. Little further detail is given about these proposals other than the overall storage volumes to be provided. The individual sites are described in a similar fashion with proposed SuDS components, basins, swales and underground tanks. The proposals are not accompanied by an outline sketch to aid understanding, which is a typical requirement of the County for an outline application.

It is considered the strategy is too narrowly defined to encompass the wide variety of land uses included in the planning application for the site. Plans should show the existing site layout, topography, any water features, and how the site currently drains. Plans should also be provided of the proposed layout if available and demonstration that the proposed drainage system and other mitigation measures are achievable and that adequate space has been made for water. A surface water drainage drawing is referred to in the FRA (Ref: Appendix A; HPH-HYD-XX-XX-DR-C-2200/ Surface Water Drainage Strategy) however, this drawing does not seem to be included within the application documents. This information would also help

describe the extent to which the existing natural catchment regime is maintained.

Reasons for objection.

The outfalls for the development are considered to be insufficiently described, and although it is understood it is intended to make use of the existing arrangements, there appears no mention of their condition, capacity or connectivity. Evidence will need to be provided to ensure that the system can accept the proposed flows to an acceptable downstream point without increasing risk to others. **Reason for objection.**

The design of the site must ensure that, so far as is reasonably practicable, flows resulting from rainfall in excess of a 1 in 100 year rainfall event are managed in exceedance routes that minimise the risks to people and property. As well as the consideration of the modelled events, there should be a qualitative examination of what would happen if any part of the drainage/SuDS system fails, to demonstrate that flood water will have flow routes through the site without endangering property and where possible maintaining emergency access/egress routes. This should be supported by a flood exceedance route plan. This requirement 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)

£ to be confirmed Highway Works Contribution indexed from to be confirmed using Baxter Index

Towards

Mitigation of off-site highway impacts as identified in Transport Assessment and in ongoing analysis.

Justification

Mitigation of off-site highway impacts as identified in Transport Assessment and in ongoing analysis.

Calculation

Detailed costings from scaled drawings presented in Transport Assessment and resulting from ongoing analysis.

£4,600,000 Public Transport Service Contribution indexed from July 2017 using RPI-x

Towards

Provision of new bus services linking the site to Oxford and Bicester, in accordance with the public transport strategy.

Cost of minibus service to Heyford station and/or around the flying field

Justification

LTP policies in relation to new developments, Local Plan Policy Villages 5, assumptions in the Transport Assessment.

Calculation

Provision of new bus services is calculated on the cost of pump-priming five buses on a declining pump-priming basis over eight years, with the ninth year operating without financial support. This calculation is based on the current observation that one of the two buses currently operating on route 25 could be considered to be commercially viable, thus the net cost to the developer is calculated on this basis. See table below.

Year	New Dwellings	Base service net cost	20 mins to Bicester	15 mins to Bicester	Total cost £m
1	160	480			480
2	320	420			420
3	480	360	160		520
4	640	300	140		440
5	800	240	120	160	520
6	960	180	100	140	420
7	1120	120	80	120	320
8	1280	60	60	100	220
9	1440	0	40	80	120
10	1600		20	60	80
11			0	40	40
12				20	20
13				0	0
				Total	3,600

For the provision of the minibus service it is suggested that such a service could cost £100,000 per annum to operate, given the long operating day to meet early morning and evening trains. As a consequence of this uncertainty, it is suggested that provision is made for £1.0 million to secure the operation of this service for at least 10 years.

£152,941.70 Public Transport Infrastructure Contribution indexed from July using Baxter Index.

Towards

Enhanced and new bus stops around the site.

Justification

LTP policies, Local Plan Policy Villages 5, necessary to facilitate the bus service as assumed in the Transport Assessment.

Calculation

20 x Premium Route pole and flag units at £1052.80 each = £21,056;

12 x bus shelters at £8942.64 each = £107,311.68;

6 x bus shelter mounted realtime information signs at £4095.67 each = £24,574.02.

Total = £152,941.70.

£400,000 Public Rights of Way Contribution indexed from to be confirmed using Baxter Index

Towards mitigation works to Oxford Canal towpath.

Justification

(a) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;

There is expected to be an increase in numbers of residents and visitors using the rights of way network around the site – simply due to the size of the development in a rural environment. These uses will create more use pressures on the rights of way network as well as traffic pressure on rights of way. In addition, the roads network is expected to see a significant increase in traffic volumes and speed for service traffic as well as residential, commercial and visitors. Measures proposed for the Oxford Canal Towpath provides a means to mitigate these additional impacts alongside the consented development's contribution.

(b) directly related to the development;

The site has had a desk assessment to both assess the current situation and look at how public use could be protected and enhanced. With the development site at the centre, the logical and realistic public rights of way network likely to be affected is considered along with the range of measures needed to provide mitigation against the impacts of the development. In this case it is access to the surrounding countryside and key access roads serving the development that are the key drivers.

c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

The proposed measures are based on the desk assessment of likely costs for the measures. They are not based on a standard formula or any other kind of per-dwelling orer-m² tariff system. The proposed off-site measures are in the form of a reasonable financial contribution to allow the Canal and River Trust to plan and deliver improvements along with OCC in a reasonable time period and under the Rights of Way Management Plan aims. The contribution would be spent on repair and improvements to the Oxford Canal Towpath and connecting routes that give access to the development and Upper Heyford.

Calculation

Canal towpath works required to provide footway/cycleway link. This would take the form of a financial contribution towards mitigation measures on the towpath and access points from Bridge 204 (Allens Bridge) to Bridge 206a (Station Road Bridge). The towpath is coincidental with public footpath numbers 388/8, 364/10 and 289/12.

Works would cover approximately 2,150 metres of towpath and associated bank protection works based upon a 1.5-2 metre wide tar spray and chip towpath surface. Bank protection works will be included where necessary to address health and safety issues for increased usage of footway/cycleway between station and Upper Heyford.

Aggregated project costs of approximately **£400,000**. Estimated contribution breakdown by activity is as follows.

- site surveys, design & assessments 15%
- habitat survey & mitigation 5%

- Legal processes e.g. temporary works closures 5%
- Project/contract preparation & supervision 5%
- Materials, plant & equipment 60%
- Contingency/Follow-up repair works 10%

This is subject to further detailed costings assessment by Canal & River Trust and the County.

£ to be confirmed Travel Plan Monitoring Fee indexed from to be confirmed using RPI-x

Justification

To cover the cost to the County of monitoring progress of the various Travel Plans against their mode share targets to ensure that Travel Plans are either meeting targets or being adjusted to meet targets.

Calculation

The fees charged are for the work required by Oxfordshire County Council to monitor a travel plan related solely to this development site.

The work to be carried out by the monitoring officer is as follows.

- Review the survey data produced by the developer.
- Compare it to the progress against the targets in the approved travel plan and census or national travel survey data sets.
- Agree any changes, updated actions, and future targets in an updated travel plan.

Three biennial monitoring and feedback procedures to be undertaken at years 1, 3 & 5 following first occupation would require an expected 51 hours of officer time at £40 per hour. Total £2,040.

S278 Highway Works

An obligation to enter into a S278 Agreement will be required to secure mitigation/improvement works, to include the following. This list may be amended as a result of the is subject to change

- Signalisation of junction of Camp Road and Chilgrove Drive as shown on drawing No.39304/5501/SK26, Revision C. Final arrangement to be confirmed.
- Signalisation of B430 and minor road T junction as shown on drawing No.39304/101/SK04, Revision F. Final arrangement to be confirmed.
- Mitigation at Middleton Stoney in respect of overcapacity of traffic signal junction of B430 and B4030 to be determined.
- Mitigation at traffic signalised junction of A4260 and B4030 as shown on drawing No.39304/5501/SK18, Revision A. Final arrangement to be confirmed.
- Installation of a roundabout at the staggered cross road junction of A4260 and B4027 as shown on drawing No.39304/5501/SK01, Revision A. Final arrangement to be confirmed.
- Traffic calming in surrounding villages to be determined.

Notes

This is 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.

S278 agreements include certain payments that apply to all S278 agreements however the S278 agreement may also include an additional payment(s) relating to specific works.

S38 Highway Works

These can be identified at the reserved matters stage.

Planning Conditions

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

Prior to first occupation Residential and Commercial Travel Plans shall be further developed in line with comments received and resubmitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the Travel Plans shall be delivered in accordance with the agreed documents.

Prior to first occupation additional travel plan statements and travel plans shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval before first occupation or in the case of businesses within three months of occupation. Thereafter the Travel Plans shall be delivered in accordance with the agreed documents.

No development to be commenced until Portway and Aves Ditch are reopened across the Flying Field and along Chilgrove Drive. Reason – To ensure that these important routes are opened and available as a priority and to deliver public benefit.

Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant shall clarify routes of public rights of way and security fencing at the north and west sides of the Flying Field (footpath 349/13 and bridleway 349/9) and apply for order to change the rights of way or modify the definitive map and statement if necessary. Reason – To ensure that businesses within the development are not affected by having sections of the security fencing removed.

All publicly accessible open space and routes shall be included in the management plan in perpetuity. Reason – To ensure that these assets are suitably maintained in the future.

Chilgrove Drive bridleway works, its signalised Non-Motorised User crossing of Camp Road, and the two Signalised crossings of New Chilgrove Drive shall be implemented at the same time as Portway and Aves Ditch Bridleway works or within 6 months of grant of planning permission, whichever is sooner. Reason – To ensure

that these important routes are opened and available as a priority and to deliver public benefit.

Prior to the submission of any reserved matters 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.
- SUDS: Permeable Paving, Swales, Attenuation Basin, Underground Storage Tanks.
- Maintenance and management of SUDS features, to include provision of a SuDS Management and Maintenance Plan.
- Infiltration in accordance with BRE365, to include infiltration testing, seasonal monitoring and recording of groundwater levels.
- Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers.
- Network drainage calculations.
- Phasing.
- Flood Flow Routing in exceedance conditions, to include provision of a flood exceedance route plan.

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: Chris Nichols

Officer's Title: Transport Development Control

Date: 17 July 2018

Application no: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Education Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the reasons set out below. NB this objection could be removed if the applicant provides a revised or alternative primary school site to meet the requirements below.

In addition to meeting the school site requirements detailed below, the county council requires:

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

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Nursery & Primary education	£6,758,447	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	£3,136,628	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	£365,994	2Q2016	PUBSEC	A planned new project to expand Bardwell Special School in Bicester by 32 places.
Total	£10,261,069			

	ha	Use
Land (remediated and serviced)	2.22	A new 1.5 form entry primary school

Capacity Delivery Scenarios

The scale of development proposed in this application requires significant increase in school capacity. At this time, it cannot be confirmed precisely how that capacity will be delivered as there are two scenarios, and on the timescale of determining this application it may not be decided which applies.

Scenario 1: The Heyfordian School Trust, which operates the existing Heyford Park Free School could be granted permission by the Regional Schools Commissioner (RSC) to expand both primary and secondary education capacity.

- For the primary school this could be through splitting the existing primary phase onto another site or through setting up a separate primary school within the same trust.
- For the secondary school this would be an expansion of the existing secondary phase.

In this scenario, the design and specification of the new school site and accommodation would be a matter for the Heyfordian School Trust, the RSC and the Education & Skills Funding Agency (ESFA). Oxfordshire County Council's interest would be restricted to ensuring sufficient places can be provided.

Scenario 2: The Heyfordian School Trust is NOT granted permission by the RSC to expand either or both of the primary and secondary education capacity.

In this scenario, the county council would need to secure sufficient school capacity from other academies, and would need to receive satisfactory financial and/or in-kind contributions to achieve this.

- For primary education, this would require a new, separate, primary school to be opened at Heyford Park, and a new academy provider approved to run that school. The county council has responsibility for attracting potential academy providers, and would need to be confident that the school site and building which would be provided (funded by the development) would not deter potential providers.
- For secondary education, this would require expansion of an alternative school, most likely in Bicester.

Which scenario applies will depend on the decision of the regional Schools Commissioner. The county council understands that the Heyfordian School Trust has opened dialogue with the RSC, but unless and until a confirmed approval for Scenario 1 is granted, it is necessary to assume a default position of Scenario 2.

Proposed Primary School Site

The application proposes new primary school accommodation in the Education zone, which comprises the educational site (parcel 31) and is located adjacent to the airfield park, north of the southern taxiway and on the eastern edge of the linear link. The application proposes that the existing airfield hangers (buildings 2004, 2005 and 2006) within this zone will be retained and adapted for educational purposes. This proposal will not meet OCC's basic Primary School Design Criteria as attached;

those of the minimum BB103 standards or the ESFA's generic brief requirements
(Reason for Objection)

Potential Solutions

Under Scenario 1 whether this is satisfactory or not would be a matter for the Heyfordian School trust, the RSC and the ESFA. However, as the default assumption is that Scenario 2 applies, the county council would need to be satisfied that an appropriate solution exists. Such a solution would need to meet the above standards and attract a choice of high quality academy providers from which the eventual academy sponsor will be selected. **Assuming Scenario 2, therefore, the county council would need one of the following to be provided to be able to lift this objection:**

1) Confirmation that the hanger buildings can be demolished to allow a suitable new school building to be constructed, and that the site is fully free from contamination, and in all other ways meets OCC's requirements for a school site.

Attached Proving Layout 1 demonstrates the parameters that the school site needs to embrace to enable it to be laid out to meet OCC's school access, flexibility, management, education, environmental and safeguarding requirements. This sketch has slightly revised the boundary to meet layout requirements and assumes a clear unencumbered site¹ with all existing buildings removed. This is understood to require consent from Historic England, which would need to be confirmed before the school site could be approved. It also assumes that the site will be landscaped to provide a suitable outlook and shading to be created from trees. All adjustment to levels are to fall outside of the school site to ensure a level site with all vehicular access routes into the site to marry in with the proposed school site levels at the boundary of the school site. The school building would be two storeys high.

2) An alternative layout that could involve the retention of one hanger.

Attached Proving Layout 2 demonstrates the parameters that the school site needs to embrace to enable it to be laid out to meet OCC's school access, flexibility, management, education, environmental and safeguarding requirements. This sketch has slightly revised the boundary to meet layout requirements and assumes a clear unencumbered site¹ with all existing buildings removed apart from one hanger. This is understood to require consent from Historic England, which would need to be confirmed before the proposed school site could be approved. The retention of one hanger depends on appropriate levels being achievable; removal of all asbestos; removal of Eflux deflector; full refurbishment with maintenance free materials and a positive assessment of any health and safety risks. It also assumes that the site will be landscaped to provide a suitable outlook and shading to be created from trees. All adjustment to levels are to fall outside of the school site to ensure a level site with all

¹ Unencumbered means the removal of all services/drainage runs, buildings, contamination, substation, hard surfaces, fencing, foundations etc and the site made good to OCC standards. Fencing to the school site will be in accordance with OCC's maintenance and safeguarding requirements.

vehicular access routes into the site to marry in with the proposed school site levels at the boundary of the school site. The school building would be two storeys high.

3) An alternative site to be identified in the masterplan which meets the county council's requirements for new primary schools. This site would need to be safeguarded until the decision on the school has been approved. Should Scenario 1 then apply, the site could be released for other uses.

Additional comments on the proposed school site are provided below.

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

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 Free 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.

£6,758,447 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: 335.2

Primary and nursery contribution required from this development = 335.2 * £20,162 = £6,758,447.

£3,136,628 Secondary School Contribution indexed from 2Q2017 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: 213

Secondary contribution required from this development = $213 * £14,726 = £3,136,628$

£365,994 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 SEN pupil generation from this development = 6.1

Required contribution = $6.1 * £59,999 = £365,994$

Land:

2.22 ha of land required for a new primary school

Justification:

A new primary school is required, as detailed above.

Additional detailed comments on the proposed school site

Further known site issues that require mitigation are:

- Noise
- Pupil drop off
- Contamination

Further comments on drawing submitted

- Composite parameters plan – no highway frontage appears to be located to provide appropriate access to the school site. This will need to be remedied as demonstrated by the proving layout.
- Building height parameter plan - this doesn't include the area in which the school site is supposed to be located. School will be two storeys
- Demolition plan - this shows hangers being retained on the school site effectively compromising the delivery of a primary school on the site
- Design and access statement – This states that the development should be flexible enough to respond to future changes in use, lifestyle and demography. The current proposal for the primary school site clearly doesn't meet this aspiration.

If the school site cannot meet the requirements demonstrated by the attached proving layouts and conditions stipulated above, then the school site will need to be located to ensure that these basic requirements can be met.

Issues with the proposed site and retention of hangers

The main problems with the retention of existing buildings/features and the developers indicative design are:

Health and safety/safeguarding

- No clear site lines can be achieved to maintaining safeguarding. There are hidden areas created by the hangers and level changes all around the site.
- Metal eflux deflectors create a health and safety climbing risk.
- Assumed asbestos based cladding material is an inappropriate material to be maintained on any site.
- Inappropriate fixings to cladding could create an accident/impact risk
- Pupils would need to walk unsupervised, outside, in the rain, between 4 separate buildings.
- Early years and the main entrance to school both need to be accessed directly from the adopted highway frontage to ensure that unauthorised visitors do not enter the site. It is unclear how this could be achieved given the indicative design.
- Current chain link fencing with barbed wire is inappropriate for a primary school if this has to be maintained.

Layout restrictions

- An economical site layout is compromised by the ad hoc positions of hangers across the site creating small areas of undefined space between buildings.
- No space for required 8400m² playing field can be found. Only an area of 3500m² (42% of required area) is possible on site taking it well below even the old statutory minimum playing field provision
- Any layout is unlikely to be conducive to a clear progression through the Key Stages.
- 1000m² of new build will be required outside of the hangers creating the need for a 4th building further compromising available space.
- Layout of classrooms within hangers negates the possibility of creating appropriate environmental condition in line with the ESFA Generic Brief resulting in the potential for numerous derogations against appropriate environmental standards.
- Use of the hangers requires single storey building rather than the standard 2 storey building required to optimise the limited site area.
- Area of hangers restrict ability to meet room layout requirements.
- Current levels of hangers restrict the ability to adjust levels to appropriate gradients to create more usable site area.
- Not potential for long-term flexibility of school to adapt to change.

Compromises to learning and management

- No habitat area possible if there are restrictions to planting and trees
- Indicative design demonstrates how classroom layout will be compromised by misshapen classrooms
- Difficult to manage a school with hidden areas, outdoor routes to classrooms and separate access to main entrance and early years.
- Layout demonstrated doesn't reflect OCC area requirements particularly in the number of classrooms required for the Early Years.
- Basic area and layout requirements for a primary school cannot be met.

Practicalities

- Removal of all drainage and service runs, some of which are likely to run underneath the hangers, may create structural problems.
- Remediation in proximity to hangers may create structural problems
- Removal of assumed asbestos cladding will remove all but the structural frame to the hangers.
- The condition and robustness of the foundations and structural frame is unknown and may not be suitable to remain and/or be converted to school use in any realistic fashion.

Realistically, given all the limitations imposed and the unknowns above, any scheme would be:

1. Outside any available funding envelope.
2. Unable to achieve basic area, layout, safeguarding, environmental and management requirements for the essential provision of Primary education.

Further, the applicant's Design and Access statement states that the development should be flexible enough to respond to future changes in use, lifestyle and

demography. The current proposal for the primary school site clearly doesn't meet this aspiration.

It is also noted that the building height parameter plan provided this does not include the area in which the school site is supposed to be located

Direct Delivery of an Educational Facility:

If the school is built as an extension of the Free School, as per scenario 1, the construction of the school will be done directly by The Heyfordian Academy. If the facility is to be marketed to another academy trust, as per scenario 2, OCC would like to have further discussion on whether the school is delivered by OCC or directly by Dorchester, as OCC will be responsible for the facility and passing to an academy provider..

Officer's Name: Barbara Chillman

Officer's Title: Pupil Place Planning Manager

Date: 17 June 2018

Application no: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Infrastructure Funding

Recommendation:

No Objection subject to the s106 obligations below.

S106 Obligations are required as follows:

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

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Library	£121,842	2Q2017	PUBSEC	Funding of Bicester library
Strategic Waste Management	£95,575	2Q2017	PUBSEC	A new Household Waste Recycling Centre serving the site
Total	£217,417			

£121,842 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 $£487,205 \div 20,257 = £24.05$

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 2766 (the forecast number of new residents) = **£121,842**

£95,575 Strategic Waste Management Contribution to be indexed linked from 2Q 17 using the PUBSEC index

Towards: A new Household Waste Recycling Centre providing for this development site

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

The proposed residential development will increase demand for recycling facilities in the area. The nearest household waste recycling centre (HWRC) is Ardley HWRC. The long term future of the Ardley site is not secure as the owners do not wish to continue operating the site. It is currently leased to OCC and is being operated under OCC's HWRC management contract. Planning consent for this site expires in 2019 and a planning application has been submitted to retain the site until 2026 after which the site will be restored.

In the light of the significant levels of planned growth for the Bicester/Heyford area and the current levels of use of the HWRCs which are all over capacity a new centre will need to be provided in the Cherwell area with additional capacity for the planned growth.

A contribution towards the cost of increasing HWRC capacity in the Cherwell area is required from this development.

Calculation:

The cost of providing a new 3.6ha (14,642m²) HWRC facility is estimated at £8,500,000 (inc land) at a 2Q 2017 price base.

This equates to a cost per m² of £581 (£8,500,000 ÷ 14,642)

Based on the planned increase in HWRC capacity across the county and the forecast increase in number of households, each household generates the need for 0.14m² of HWRC capacity.

This equates to a contribution of £81.34 per new household (0.14 x £581)

The contribution required from the 1,175 households proposed as in this application is therefore **£95,575**

Officer's Name: Richard Oliver

Officer's Title: Infrastructure Funding Negotiator

Date: 06 July 2018

Application no: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Minerals & Waste Planning Schedule

Recommendation:

No Objection.

Comments:

Parts of the application site lie within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) for crushed rock, as shown on the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policies Map, to which policy M8 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Part 1 – Core Strategy applies. This policy safeguards mineral resources within MSAs from sterilisation by development, unless certain exceptional circumstances can be shown to apply. One of these exceptional circumstances is that the site has been allocated for development in an adopted local plan.

The application site is allocated for development in the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 (2015), under Policy Villages 5 (Former RAF Upper Heyford). This overrides the safeguarding of mineral resources within the site under Minerals and Waste Local Plan policy M8.

Planning Conditions:

None.

Officer's Name: Peter Day

Officer's Title: Minerals & Waste Policy Team Leader

Date: 22 May 2018

Application no: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Waste Management Schedule

Recommendation:

No objection subject to the S106 obligation and planning conditions below.

Comments:

Recycling and composting rates in Oxfordshire are amongst the best in the country and need to be maintained.

The proposed development will increase waste arisings in the county and the demand for waste management infrastructure including household waste recycling centres (HWRCs). The nearest HWRC to the proposed development site is Ardley HWRC which already experiences capacity issues at busy times.

Section 8 of the Sustainability and Energy Statement refers to ensuring waste arising from new development will be managed in line with Cherwell District Council's Waste and Recycling Guidance, and that sufficient space for bins will be provided and safe access to dwellings by refuse collection vehicles. This is supported although the details of how this will be achieved are to be developed at the reserved matters stage. No reference is made to home composting, which should be enabled as home composting reduces the environmental and financial impact of the collection, transport and processing of garden green waste.

Section 4 of the Sustainability and Energy Statement refers to a 2014 study investigating the potential to supply heat from Ardley ERF to Upper Heyford that concluded it would not be financially viable, and therefore the applicant has not considered this option further. It is also stated that the heat generating technology for the proposed energy facility is not yet designed.

Upper Heyford is currently the closest development of any significance to the ERF and is a potential source of heat and electricity from a renewable source for both domestic and commercial buildings. The opportunity for heat and/or electricity to be supplied by the ERF should be revisited by the applicant, as circumstances may have changed since the 2014 study was completed, particularly as the ERF has now been operational for over 3 years.

S106 Obligations are required as follows:

Contribution required towards Strategic Waste Management, details provided within the Infrastructure Funding comments above.

Planning Conditions:

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

The need to maintain and increase recycling and composting rates should be taken into account in the detailed design of the development. The design should facilitate waste collection, recycling and composting to enable residents to fully participate in Cherwell District Council collection schemes and allow high recycling and composting rates to be maintained. This should include adequate space for waste and recycling bins for all dwelling types and provision for home composting in properties that have gardens. The design of new roads should also allow sufficient space to enable refuse collection vehicles to access all new dwellings.

The feasibility of supplying the proposed development with heat and electricity from the Ardley Energy Recovery Facility should be investigated as part of the detailed design of the development and the energy facility, and submitted with the application for detailed planning permission.

Officer's Name: Frankie Upton

Officer's Title: Principal Officer – Waste Contracts

Date: 13 June 2018

Application no: 18/00825/HYBRID

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford.

Ecology

Recommendation:

Objection

Key issues:

- Loss of part of Upper Heyford Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Loss of lowland calcareous grassland (a UK Priority habitat)
- Impacts on a European & UK protected species (great crested newts) and breeding birds.

Legal agreement required to secure:

Yes, to secure habitat creation and appropriate long-term management of habitat and species compensation areas. For LA ecologist to advise.

Detailed comments:

Detailed information on the following is lacking:

- Provision of off-site compensation for loss of calcareous grassland and associated fauna. Further information on the selected site such as soil testing to determine suitability. Have yet to see the off-setting calculations.
- Provision of replacement great crested newt ponds and habitats.
- How the filming area will be managed to avoid causing harm to ground nesting birds (and the grassland). More information is needed on the proposed 'Project-specific environmental risk assessment' to be submitted for approval before any filming activity.
- Provision of a replacement badger sett. Currently to be located close to a proposed footpath, which is not ideal.
- Management of the Destination Park and other habitats within the site.
- Green infrastructure creation and management.
- Provision of other in-built ecological enhancements – such as swift nest boxes within suitable buildings, amphibian-friendly kerbing near Chilgrove Drive, bat boxes, hedgehog holes in fences.

The main concern is that the approximately 30ha of farmland earmarked as off-site compensation for the loss of part of the Local Wildlife Site is secured (and demonstrated to be suitable for conversion) before this application is approved. This is because if no replacement habitat is created, the application will not succeed in meeting its 'no net loss of biodiversity' target, and cannot demonstrate compliance with Local Plan policy and Policy Villages 5.

The other details mentioned above can be covered by a CEMP (construction environmental management plan) and LEMP (landscape environmental management plan) but would have been useful to have now in order that they could form part of any necessary legal agreements/S106.

Officer's Name: Sarah Postlethwaite

Officer's Title: Protected Species Officer

Date: 04 July 2018
