

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

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

**This report sets out Oxfordshire County Council's response to the proposal.**

**Annexes to the report contain officer advice and the comments of local members.**

---

### **Overall view of Oxfordshire County Council:-**

This application forms part of the strategic site allocation Bicester 1 within the emerging Cherwell Local Plan. Oxfordshire County Council support the delivery of the North West Bicester site which has been the subject of on going joint working between OCC, Cherwell District Council and the Eco Bicester Strategic Delivery Board.

There is no transport objection to the application subject to conditions a legal agreement to include mitigation. Further investigation and proposals for mitigation are required at, inter alia, Shakespeare Drive, Field Street/Bucknell Road junction, Middleton Stoney Village and cycle scheme along Middleton Stoney Road. Due to the impact on the current Howes Lane / Bucknell Road junction, the strategic link road is required by the 900 homes (across entire allocation site and including Exemplar).

Bicester Members have expressed concern over access onto the Middleton Stoney road. The proposed vehicular accesses include two junctions to Middleton Stoney Road. Whilst the County Council would prefer not to see further accesses onto this arterial route, Transport Development Control consider there is no technical reason to object to this.

There is an ecology objection based on failing to demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity and on inconsistency with the off-site compensation agreed as part of the masterplan.

Further, **OCC has serious concerns about the uncertainty of delivering key infrastructure across the wider masterplan site caused by the piecemeal nature in which applications are coming forward.** The funding and phasing of infrastructure across the site is dependent on if and when individual site applications come forward and are implemented. For example, mitigation for this development is dependent on delivery of the

secondary school which is part of Application 2. Further, with the absence of a Community Infrastructure Levy in Cherwell, it is unclear how the County will be able to seek contributions to county wide schemes that will be put under strain by this development. This puts the County Council at significant financial risk. **Until it is clear how infrastructure will be delivered across the masterplan site, OCC maintains a holding objection.**

**Officer's Name: Lisa Michelson**

**Officer's Title: Locality Manager**

**Date: 20 May 2015**

---

**ANNEX 1**  
**OFFICER ADVICE**

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

### **Transport**

#### **Recommendation:**

No objection subject to conditions and the completion of a satisfactory S106 Agreement applicable to the application site and broader North West Bicester site, Local Plan Allocation Bicester 1.

#### **Key issues:**

The development must support, through financial contributions and highway works, the provision of high quality sustainable travel infrastructure and travel planning measures to promote sustainable travel that will ensure achievement of relevant targets of the PPS1 Supplement. This includes direct mitigation specific to this site and wider schemes associated with the development of North West Bicester. Whilst many of these issues are discussed within the submitted Transport Assessment detailed schemes and the mechanism for delivery have not been determined.

Further investigation and proposals for mitigation are required at, inter alia, Shakespeare Drive, Field Street/Bucknell Road junction, Middleton Stoney Village and cycle scheme along Middleton Stoney Road.

Traffic Impact - due to the impact on the current Howes Lane / Bucknell Road junction, the strategic link road is required by the 900 homes (across entire allocation site and including Exemplar)

The proposed vehicular accesses include two junctions to Middleton Stoney Road which subject to detailed design would not lead to any significant delay or harm to highway safety. Three other points of vehicular access link to new highway infrastructure beyond the application site boundary and will be reliant upon 'third party' provision.

## **Legal Agreement required to secure:**

### **Section 106 Town & Country Planning Act - Planning Obligations**

Provision of sustainable transport infrastructure and services will be required both directly from this development and in partnership with the other developments forming allocation Bicester 1. Transport obligations will include infrastructure, services and travel planning.

### **Section 278 Highways Act – Works in the Highway**

All works in the highway are subject to agreement with Local Highway Authority under Section 278.

### **Section 38 Highways Act – Highway Adoption**

Roads for adoption will be subject to agreement with Local Highway Authority under Section 38. Furthermore; 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.

## **Conditions:**

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the means of vehicular accesses between the land and the highway, including, position, layout, construction, drainage and vision splays shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the means of access shall be constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details. Reason - In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the means of footway and cycleway links between the land and the local highway network, including, position, layout, construction, drainage and street lighting shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the means of footway and cycleway links shall be constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details. Reason - In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

No development shall commence on site for the development until a Construction Traffic Management Plan providing full details of the phasing of the development has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. This plan is to include wheel washing facilities, a restriction on construction & delivery traffic during the peak traffic periods and an agreed route for HGV traffic to the development site. The approved Plan shall be implemented in full during the entire construction phases and shall reflect the measures included in the Construction Method Statement received.

Reason – In the interests of highway safety and to safeguard the residential amenities of local residents in accordance with Government Guidance in the NPPF.

No development shall commence on site for the development until a full drainage design for the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Oxfordshire County Councils Drainage Team).

Reason - In the interests of highway safety and flood prevention and to comply with Policy NRM4 of the south East Plan 2009 and Government advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Overview:**

The site is located to the West of Bicester, off the Middleton Stoney Road and is approximately 2 miles from the town centre. The proposed site has been allocated as strategic site Bicester 1 within the current draft Cherwell Local Plan submission for development up to 2031. The submitted planning application is for up to 1700 dwellings, retirement village, education, community, and commercial floorspace/land uses. The application is one of several sites that form the larger plan allocated site. The other associated development sites are subject to separate planning submissions which include an application for the provision of a strategic link road and railway tunnel.

The development must support, through financial contributions and highway works, the provision of high quality sustainable travel infrastructure and travel planning measures to promote sustainable travel that will ensure achievement of relevant targets of the PPS1 Supplement. This will include direct mitigation specific to this site and wider schemes associated with the development of North West Bicester. Whilst many of these issues are discussed within the submitted Transport Assessment detailed schemes and mechanism for delivery have not been determined and S106 negotiations are on-going.

A comprehensive Transport Assessment has been submitted and I consider it provides a fair analysis of transport impact and required mitigation associated with the proposed development. The Transport Assessment asserts and it is accepted:

*'The development of the wider allocation site will generate approximately 12,000 movement trips every day. Around 30% of these trips will be within the wider NW Bicester development with the vast majority of these being undertaken by sustainable modes including walking, cycling and by bus. Schools, employment, and local shops and services will be a maximum of 800m or a 10 minute walk from any dwelling within the Himley Village development. Walking will be the dominant mode for trips within the Site. 30% of trips will be within wider Bicester town with around half these being by sustainable modes. The remaining 40% of trips will to destinations outside of Bicester with three quarters of these being by private car.'*

It is imperative that the site contributes towards provision of essential highway infrastructure, including the new vehicular tunnel under the railway at Bucknell Road and a proportional amount towards other peripheral route schemes within the town where there is a level of impact. While such mitigation measures are discussed within Transport Assessment, details are inadequate and will be required within the Heads of Terms. Due to the expected congestion, this key piece of infrastructure is required prior to the 900<sup>th</sup> residential occupation of the allocation site. (NB this figure includes those dwellings constructed at the Exemplar site). In addition the realigned Howes Lane will provide access to the secondary school, which I understand is required at a similar stage in the development.

Given the distance from the Town Centre and transport hubs, the provision of attractive pedestrian and cycle routes will be essential and again greater detail will be required within the Heads of Terms. Mixed land uses will aid containment of trips and further reduce the need to travel, especially by private motor car.

Public transport routes and stops have been identified within the site; however the delivery of a commercially sustainable bus service to this development is a more complex matter, given future build-out rates, take-up rates of bus use, the availability of roads to connect different parts of the development and the length of time that buses will require to make a round-trip to Bicester Town station. The severance of the allocation site by the Birmingham-London railway results in a two-route solution, with consequent operational inefficiencies and cost implications for service delivery. The eventual service level for the wider site south-west of the railway has been assessed as requiring 4 bus vehicles to fulfil the previously discussed eventual service level. This is based on the delivery of a 10 minute frequency (6 buses per hour) with a round-trip journey time from Bicester Town station, around the development and back to Bicester Town, of between 30 and 40 minutes. The initial bus service from the first completion would commence with a single vehicle and then the frequency of the service would be increased at agreed trigger-points, to a two-bus service and so on.

Use of sustainable transport modes will be encouraged through travel planning. The target for the allocation site is that 50% of all trips originating from the site will be made by non-car modes. This is a stretching target and will need to be monitored as part of the on-going travel plan monitoring requirements. The developer will be required to provide relevant surveys, typically bi-annually, to show that the travel plan objectives are being achieved and that the actions have been updated to take in to account the survey results.

In addition to the Framework Travel Plan, a monitoring fee will be required for each of the supplementary travel plans over the threshold set out in Oxfordshire County Council's guidance document. Further monitoring and fees may be required if the 50% target is not achieved.

The proposals include two new vehicular accesses to Middleton Stoney Road, classified route B4030, facilitated by priority junctions with separate right turning provision. The submitted plans and junction analysis provide sufficient confidence that these junctions could operate in a safe and convenient manner without causing undue delay along the important arterial route. Detailed design of these vehicular access points is required by condition and works will be subject to S278 agreement, including construction specification and Road Safety Audit. The detailed design will need to consider pedestrian and cycle provision along Middleton Stoney Road. Further vehicular, pedestrian and cycle accesses are shown with links beyond the development boundary to the proposed realigned Howes Lane. Phasing for these routes is shown but I note these links will be subject to the third party provision. These links will be essential to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport.

The illustrative layout of the site sets out a grid with an appropriate street hierarchy. A high level of permeability, for those on foot or cycle, is demonstrated. Walking and cycling distances to local shops, schools and public transport links would be within relatively short walking distances via attractive lit and overlooked routes. Bus stops are identified within 400m of every dwelling excepting a handful. Bus services are an essential element of sustainable merits of the site and it is imperative they are not delayed through the site. Appropriate consideration to the movement of buses must be included within the detailed design of the street and junction layouts.

A full surface water drainage design with full calculations needs to be submitted and approved by the Lead Flood Authority (Oxfordshire County Council) prior to the development commencing on site. It is noted that in recent years there has been some flooding near to this site and therefore run-off rates must be minimised to an appropriate level.

The County Council as Local Highway Authority operates Advance Payment Code and it is advised that all streets are subject to adoption or private road agreement. The applicant should consult with the County's Road Agreements Team at an early stage to ensure detailed design is compatible with relevant specifications.

Construction of the proposed development will generate a significant number of vehicular trips, including heavy goods vehicles. To ensure residential and other sensitive areas are avoided and protected during the build out period a Construction Traffic Management Plan is required and must include a routing agreement for HGV construction vehicles.

### **Detailed Comments:**

The following detailed commentaries have been provided by relevant County Council transport teams and are relevant to detailed design, Heads of Terms and S106 negotiation.

#### **Transport Strategy**

OCC Transport Strategy contact – Principal Infrastructure Planner Jacqui Cox

The County Council's SATURN model was used for the masterplan assessment and that work is reflected in this TA. This model was re-based in 2012, and officers have accepted that it is a suitable tool for these assessments. Officers have been closely involved with technical work for the proposed development as it has evolved.

This TA's assessment of the split by sustainable modes is pretty much in line with the Hyder assessments for the masterplan. Hyder carried out some very detailed assessments and assessed that 58% of trips contained within Bicester over a 12 hour period could realistically be expected to be by sustainable modes. The weakest point of the day is the p.m. peak because of the high proportion of commuter trips in this period (25%) and this highlights the lower impact that sustainable modes have for these trip purposes.

The transport strategy for Bicester has since 2000 been based around maximising use of the peripheral routes and minimising the amount of traffic travelling through the central corridor which is not visiting the town centre. The recently revised area strategy in the Local Transport Plan (LTP3) states that the county council will seek opportunities to improve access and connections between key employment and residential sites and the strategic transport system; work with strategic partners to develop the town's walking, cycling and bus networks and links between key development sites and the town centre and railway stations, and will work to get the most out of Bicester's transport network by investigating ways to increase people's awareness of the travel choices available in Bicester. These principles remain within the draft LTP4 strategy and each of these principles is vital for this development, given the overall scale and also the eco-principles that need to be met.

Good to see use made of the extensive cycle audit that was undertaken as part of the masterplan work. Primary routes along Middleton Stoney Road and the route past the Community College will be fundamental (primary routes 1 and 2) and the secondary route along Shakespeare Drive (secondary route 9 and 6) is also important. Pleased to see it acknowledged that these will form part of the section 106 negotiations, although the primary routes will need to be directly delivered by the developments to the south of the railway to mitigate the impact and provide the mode share opportunities that are fundamental to these sites.

P60 – internal destinations – important to also recognise the importance of cycle connections through to the parts of the masterplan that lie to the north of the railway so that these southern sites also pay into the provision of a pedestrian / cycle connection under the railway line. This will be essential to the overall connectivity of the site – for residents to gain access to the Country Park, the leisure route and facilities at the Cross and for people to be able to visit the attractions within the Himley application site.

P61 – agree with the comment that use of Bucknell Road as the bus route would be preferable because other vehicles will be concentrated on the alternative routes, but there are considerable concerns from the County Council about the ability to deliver bus priority on Bucknell Road at the town centre end – or at least to provide improvements that prevent the bus from being impeded by heavy congestion. The masterplan work has not been able to demonstrate a solution. Across the various applications there needs to be the funding towards a solution – or the ability to switch this funding to an alternative route if no acceptable solution is found. This will be negotiated through the S106 discussions.

P62 – access off of Middleton Stoney Road – this is mostly a technical engineering matter, but from a strategy point of view it is important to lessen the impact on Middleton Stoney Road by minimising accesses as this will remain an important artery into the town for surrounding villages.

P91, Middleton Stoney village should be included in the list of areas to be considered for mitigation measures as there is a clear and significant impact.

P91, last paragraph – accept the point that the developers have made use of the County Council's Local Plan evidence runs from the model. If they wish to utilise the model for further runs we would make this available via the consultants that have been running the model for the authority.

P98, Field Street / Bucknell Road junction – select link analysis would be a more effective method for assessing the amount of traffic that is predicted to use this junction from the North West development. As the model is overloaded in the 2031 scenario there is a lot of re-routing shown as soon as any changes are made. However, the fundamental point is that this is the corridor proposed to be used for the bus service from the development and there is concern that this will not be a very attractive service. Having a viable bus service and one that makes a difference to mode share will be crucial in achieving the development's objectives and could help to reduce some of the other negative impacts that are predicted for the town centre areas.

Delivering a strategic perimeter route around the town is the key component of the LTP area transport strategy. A4421 / Skimmingdish Lane junction – the work carried out is finding similar issues / solutions to work that the County Council has been carrying out in relation to the Local Plan development and the LTP4 area strategy. Given the growing importance of the eastern peripheral corridor (partly as a result of the decreased use of the western corridor once the NW Bicester development is developed out) it will be important for this application to be considered for a proportional contribution towards the emerging solutions.

P109, 11.6 – Shakespeare Drive Area – the crucial point here is that there is likely to be an issue with local people cutting through this route to get into the town in the future and therefore mitigation should be offered, but it should be noted there are a lot of sensitivities around traffic calming. The preference voiced so far is to improve cycle facilities through

here, but there is also concern that Shakespeare Drive is a more appropriate route than the smaller cut-through roads that are available and the problem should not be shifted to these.

Bottom of p111, 11.8 – Eastern Peripheral Route – it is acknowledged that the need for the eastern peripheral route improvements is not brought about by the NW Bicester development proposals, but the increased local trips as a result of a significant amount of development off of Howes Lane and Lord's Lane is predicted to reduce the distributor road function of the western corridor, thus putting more emphasis on the eastern corridor than previously expected.

P112, 11.9 M40 Junctions 9 and 10 – happy to discuss any contribution requirements with P3 Eco Group and the Highways Agency.

P110, 11.10 Summary of Full NW Bicester Mitigation – direct mitigation for this site needs to include a cycle scheme for Middleton Stoney Road and measures for Middleton Stoney village.

Contributions towards:

- It needs to be clear that “town centre access improvements” needs to cover two areas:
  - Measures to aid bus access – preferably from Bucknell Road, but alternatively another corridor if no solution is found
  - Measures to increase sustainable access through the central corridor whilst enabling vehicular access to the town centre but not straight through the central corridor.

P116/117, Howes Lane / Bucknell Road junction – if only Himley Village is added into the network on top of the Exemplar, Kingsmere etc then phases 1 and 2 would be acceptable as the trigger for the new vehicular tunnel under the railway. However, application 1 to the north of the railway line has been approved (subject to conditions and S106) and therefore the trigger point has to apply across the masterplan site (two other sites from the masterplan area also have applications in the system at the moment). A site wide trigger point of 900 houses (including the exemplar site) has been assessed as the appropriate trigger point. There are capacity issues through the central corridor and on the eastern corridor already and the Highway Authority would not want to encourage these to be worsened.

### Public Transport

OCC Public Transport contact – Senior Transport Planner David Taylor

The developer is required to contribute proportionately to funding a commercially sustainable bus service, linking the site with Bicester Town Centre and rail station. Onwards connections by bus and rail to other destinations will be available from these destinations.

There is an understanding that the North West Bicester site will require two separate bus services, one for each side of the railway line. Therefore the public transport response to this application will deal only with the land South West of the Railway Line.

Oxfordshire County Council does not have any access to general revenue funding to provide, or contribute towards, bus services to and from this site. The developer is required to deliver an attractive, but commercially viable, bus service, which will operate without any form of subsidy, once the period of time of agreed financial support, or amount of money made available by the developer, has been exhausted.

The developer must design the bus route around the development to be a suitable standard for bus operation in terms of carriageway width, depth of road construction and avoidance of vertical deflections.

The developer must reinstate the bus route linking the realigned Howes Lane with the proposed Primary street, in other words re-designate the Secondary Street parallel to Middleton Stoney Road as a Primary Street.

The developer must provide a 'temporary' bus turning circle at the northern end of the Primary Street, to facilitate bus operation until such time as it is possible to operate buses through the adjoining land to the north.

The developer must provide bus stops around the site, comprising hard-standing areas, shelters, electronic information, pole/ flag/ information units, in agreed locations which reflect the proposed footway layout. Ideally all residential units should be within 400 metres walk distance of bus stops and certainly no further than 500 metres. These must be marked on plans before submission of subsequent Full or Reserved Matters planning applications.

The developer will contribute towards the cost of establishing an effective bus priority route into the Town Centre along the Bucknell Road, especially at the junction with Field Street and St Johns Road. This intervention will be critical, to deliver attractive journey times.

The delivery of a commercially sustainable bus service to this development is a complex matter. As this is a greenfield site on the edge of the urban area and not on an existing transport corridor, any bus route will be new. The severance of the site by the Birmingham-London railway and the reluctance of the developer to provide a crossing towards the north-west edge of the site has resulted in a two-route solution, with consequent operational inefficiencies and cost implications for service delivery (more buses required, fewer passengers per bus).

In addition, there is considerable uncertainty regarding future build-out rates, take-up rates of bus use, the availability of roads to connect different parts of the development and the length of time that buses will require to make a round-trip to Bicester Town station, regardless of developer statements regarding modal share.

The cost of procuring bus services is also unknown, and is almost impossible to estimate over 25 years or more. Whilst a model can be created of predicted costs and revenues, bus operators will provide tender prices based on their own perception of risk (costs and revenues) which is likely to be more conservative (ie higher cost) and will be at a flat subsidy or support rate for the duration of the contract.

The proposed designation of the southerly 'secondary street' is not in accordance with previous versions of the North West Bicester masterplan. Routeing buses along Middleton Stoney Road will result in increased journey times, especially at peak times when queues of vehicles will form on Howes Lane and the Primary Street. The avoidance of such queues of cars is of fundamental importance in ensuring the bus service can operate without delays, and thus be attractive to the new residents. This road must be widened, ideally to 6.5 metres. Earlier versions of the masterplan showed a bus gate to the eastern end of this road, and this should be retained, to ensure buses make effective progress along this street.

A 'temporary' turning circle designed for full-size 12 metre buses should be provided towards the northern end of the Primary Street. This could be located at the south-east corner of the field proposed for sports pitches.

The primary road adjoins a proposed school. It's fundamentally important that the main pedestrian access to the school does not adjoin the primary street. Parking for school buses and parental cars should be arranged on either the eastern, northern and/or southern edge of the school site. Schools often cause significant problems for bus services, causing significant delays due to ill-considered parking of vehicles. This potential conflict should be designed out at the Masterplan stage.

### Travel Plans

OCC Travel Plans contact - Senior Transport Planner Mark Gregory

Himley Village Outline Application Travel plan (December 2014), was submitted with the application documentation. This document sets out the overarching objectives and targets for the site and is acceptable, however it will need to be updated as the site builds out to take in to account of the various land uses. The document also needs to set out how it will link with the wider allocation site.

Detailed supplementary travel plans and travel plan monitoring fee will be needed for each of the land use in accordance with the Oxfordshire County Council Travel Plan Guidance – Transport for New Developments: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans (March 2014) and submitted to the Travel Plans Team for approval prior to occupation. These plans will need to reference the site wide framework travel plan objective and outline how the end occupiers will implement the actions in their plans to achieve the overall objectives for the whole site.

The target for the whole eco town site is to have 50% all trips originating from the site by non-car modes; this is a stretching target and will need to be monitored as part of the on-going travel plan monitoring requirements. The developer will be required to carry out bi-annual surveys (years 1 3 and 5 post occupation) to show that the travel plan objectives are being achieved and that the actions have been updated to take in to account the survey result.

A travel plan monitoring fee will be required for each of the supplementary travel plans over the threshold set out in Oxfordshire County Council's guidance document. The on-going monitoring of the travel plan for a period 5 years post final occupation. Further monitoring and fees may be required if the 50% target is not achieved.

To support sustainable travel to and from the site the developer will need to contribute to

- the running cost if they chose to use Oxfordshire Liftshare or set up their own liftshare programme.
- the setting up and running of car clubs in the larger market town will be required. (2 central parking spaces for a car club and membership for the first year provided to new residents – costing can be obtained from Co-Wheels)
- measure to support and encourage cycling (on and off site)

The layout of the site should be set out to provide direct walking and cycling links across the site and should be linked in to the existing walking and cycling networks, the Access statement supplied with the application set out how the developer will achieve this.

Housing on the site should be within 400m of a high frequency bus stop with good direct walking access to them.

Currently the travel plan does not give any indication of where parents who chose to drive will be expected to park. The applicant will need show how any parking for the primary school will be managed to prevent congestion around the school gate, the preferred option is for parking at the local centre to be made available for parental parking if it is within walking distance of the proposed primary school.

**Officer's Name: Geoffrey Arnold**

**Officer's Title:** Principal Engineer

**Date:** 20 May 2015

---

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

### **Archaeology**

#### **Recommendation:**

No objection subject to conditions

#### **Key issues:**

The site is located in an area of archaeological interest as identified by a desk-based assessment, a geophysical survey and a trenched evaluation. A further programme of archaeological investigation and mitigation will need to be undertaken ahead of any development. This can be secured through a condition on any resultant planning permission.

#### **Legal Agreement required to secure:**

None

#### **Conditions:**

- F6** Prior to any demolition on the site, the commencement of the development and any archaeological investigation, a professional archaeological organisation acceptable to the Local Planning Authority shall prepare a first stage archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, relating to the application area, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological importance on the site in accordance with Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

- F11** Prior to any demolition on the site (other than in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation) and prior to the commencement of the development and following the approval of the first stage Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition [F6], a programme of archaeological evaluation, investigation and recording of the application area shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological

organisation in accordance with the approved first stage Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason - In order to determine the extent, character and significance of the surviving remains of archaeological interest and to safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological importance on the site in accordance with Policy BE6 of the South East Plan 2009 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Informatives:**

None

**Detailed Comments:**

The site is located in an area of archaeological interest as identified by a desk-based assessment, a geophysical survey and a trenched evaluation. The geophysical survey and evaluation identified a number of areas of possible archaeological features. The evaluation recorded a number of archaeological features across the site including a Neolithic Pit, an area of Bronze Age activity including two possible 'burnt mound' deposits, a number of areas of Iron Age activity and a number of areas of Roman activity. The evaluation in this specific area recorded a number of linear features and pits mainly dated to the Iron Age or Roman period. This development will therefore disturb these surviving features and a further programme of archaeological investigation and mitigation will need to be undertaken ahead of any development.

We would, therefore, recommend that, should planning permission be granted, the applicant should be responsible for ensuring the implementation of a staged programme of archaeological investigation to be maintained during the period of construction. This can be ensured through the attachment of a suitable negative condition as suggested above.

If the applicant makes contact with us at the above address, we shall be pleased to outline the procedures involved, provide a brief upon which a costed specification can be based, and provide a list of archaeological contractors working in the area.

**Officer's Name: Richard Oram**

**Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist**

**Date: 14 January 2015**

---

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

### **Education**

#### **Recommendation:**

Approval subject to the conditions

#### **Key issues:**

The following housing development mix has been used in the contribution calculations:

- 168 no. x One Bed Dwellings
- 680 no. x Two Bed Dwellings
- 568 no. x Three Bed Dwellings
- 284 no. x Four/+ Bed Dwellings

Based on the above mix, this section of the eco-town development is estimated to generate 405 primary school pupils, 328 secondary school pupils, and 8.2 pupils attending special educational needs provision (SEN).

This section of the eco-town development is to include a primary school, and to contribute towards the cost of primary, secondary and SEN school provision. The mechanism for apportioning costs towards these services between the separate applications which comprise the eco-town development is to be agreed.

#### **Legal Agreement required to secure:**

An acceptable site of 2.22ha for a 2 form entry primary school.

Financial contributions towards the necessary primary and secondary school capacity; the mechanism for apportioning these costs across the separate applications is to be decided.

£863,624 Section 106 developer contributions towards new Special Educational Needs school capacity by a total of 8.2 pupil places. This is index linked to 1st Quarter 2014 using PUBSEC Tender Price Index.

### **Conditions:**

Planning permission to be dependent on a satisfactory agreement to secure the resources required for the necessary expansion of education provision. This is in order for Oxfordshire County Council to meet its statutory duty to ensure sufficient pupil places for all children of statutory school age.

### **Informatives:**

Page 41 of the Planning Statement states “The new primary school will be a farm school with an emphasis on local horticulture, and will support wider community uses.” It should be noted that the education specification for this school has not yet been consulted on or finalised, and the exact nature of the school will depend on the academy sponsor selected. This selection process would not commence until a clear timescale for the school’s opening is available.

### **Detailed Comments:**

Demand for Bicester primary school places has risen rapidly in recent years. Bicester secondary schools currently have spare capacity, but this will be filled as the higher numbers now in primary school feed through. A strategic approach to expanding primary and secondary school capacity across the town will be required to meet the demands of the local population and housing growth. For the eco-town development at NW Bicester, this includes up to four new primary schools and a new secondary school.

This section of the eco-town development is estimated to generate 405 primary school pupils, 328 secondary school pupils, and 8.2 pupils attending special educational needs provision (SEN).

Primary school provision for the eco-town development will in the first instance be through the new primary school being built on the exemplar development. In time, this will grow to accommodate 420 pupils age 4-11, plus nursery pupils, and be followed by at least two, and up to three, further new primary schools. One of these schools is to be delivered via this development.

To ensure primary school places are available within easy walking/cycling distance of these proposed new homes, it will be important for the primary school included within its boundaries to be provided in a timely manner. The timing and details of this school will be subject to further discussion. A 2.22ha site is required at zero cost from this development for a 2 form entry school.

The estimated cost of a 2 form entry primary school, delivering 420 places, is £8.334m at 3rd Quarter 2012 prices.

Secondary school provision will be through the new secondary school included within this section of the eco-town development. This application should make a proportionate contribution towards this school. To allow phasing of the school construction, in the first instance, a 600-place secondary school is expected to be built, the cost of which is estimated to be £14,205,000 at 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2012 prices. A proportionate share of this cost for 328 pupils would therefore be £7,765,400.

The mechanism for apportioning costs towards primary and secondary school provision between the separate applications which comprise the eco-town development is to be agreed.

Based on the current number of children being educated in Special Educational Needs (SEN) schools in Oxfordshire 1.11% of the estimated pupils will need to be educated in a SEN school (the majority of pupils with a statement of special educational needs are educated in “mainstream” schools). This development generates an estimated 8.2 pupils who will need to be educated in a SEN school.

The scale of proposed / planned /approved housing growth across Oxfordshire is such that extension of existing SEN schools will not be sufficient, and one or more new SEN schools will be needed. Mitigation of larger housing developments, such as this application, needs to be met through new school provisions.

The delivery of SEN pupil places is based upon the specialist requirements related to the nature of needs rather than geographical relationship of the development. The County Council must therefore provide appropriate specialist spaces in multiple locations. It has identified sites for new school provisions and estimated costs which result in the cost / pupil place.

The new SEN school is expected to cost £10,532,000 (1Q 2014 prices)  
The school will provide accommodation for 100 SEN pupils at a cost per pupil place of £105,320

The proportionate SEN school contribution from this development is therefore:  
 $8.2 \times £105,320 = £863,624$  (@1Q 14)

**Officer's Name: Barbara Chillman**  
**Officer's Title: Pupil Place Planning Service Manager**  
**Date: 07 January 2015**

---

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

### **Property**

#### **Recommendation:**

No objection subject to conditions

#### **Key issues:**

- The County Council considers that the impacts of the development proposal (if permitted) will place additional strain on its existing community infrastructure.
- The following housing development mix has been used in the following contribution calculations
  - 168 no. x One Bed Dwellings
  - 680 no. x Two Bed Dwellings
  - 568 no. x Three Bed Dwellings
  - 284 no. x Four/+ Bed Dwellings

It is calculated that this development would generate a net increase of:

- **4080 additional residents *including:***
- 3011 residents aged 20+
- 518 residents aged 65 +
- 339 residents aged 13-19

#### **Legal Agreement required to secure:**

- |                                     |                  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| • Bicester new Library              | <b>£ 187,884</b> |
| • Central Library                   | <b>£ 76,786</b>  |
| • Waste Management                  | <b>£ 442,000</b> |
| • Adult Health & Wellbeing Day Care | <b>£ 109,956</b> |
| • <b>Total*</b>                     | <b>£ 816,626</b> |

\*Contributions are to be index-linked to the relevant price bases (detailed below).

- Administration & Monitoring £ 20,000

The County Councils legal fees in drawing up and/or completing a legal agreement will need to be secured.

Conditions:

- The County Council as Fire Authority has a duty to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available for fire-fighting purposes. There will probably be a requirement to affix fire hydrants within the development site. Exact numbers and locations cannot be given until detailed consultation plans are provided showing highway, water main layout and size. We would therefore ask you to add the requirement for provision of hydrants in accordance with the requirements of the Fire & Rescue Service as a condition to the grant of any planning permission

Informatives:

- Fire & Rescue Service recommends that new dwellings should be constructed with sprinkler systems

Education site requirements: Guidance Provided by Jane Farrow, Principal Strategy Officer

School sites must be shown on site plans: School development subject to overall S106 delivery plan across the Ecotown development tbc

The housing developer is to provide off-site parking capacity prior to the completion of the Primary School. Off-site parent parking facilities to be provided for 50 vehicles or such other number as required by the Highways Authority based on a verifiable 'drop-off' assessment provided by the developer, suitable for dropping off and collecting children attending the Primary School which is freely available for such use and which affords safe, convenient and free flowing access to the Primary School Site [and where this is not reasonably practicable in time for the opening of the school to use reasonable endeavours to provide temporary drop off facilities as aforesaid and which are freely available for such use and which afford safe and convenient and free flowing access to the Primary School Site until the permanent area is available}. NB No parent drop will be permitted within the school site itself.

An offsite 2 coach drop-off/pick up layby facilities will be required adjacent to the entrance to the school; this facility can be utilised for parental drop-off and pick-up at the start and end of the school day and be utilised for other purposes outside the school day.

**Primary schools**

- No dead end roads should be situated adjacent to schools and the road layout should allow for circular routes to prevent the need to reverse in the road.
- To encourage sustainable travel initiatives schools should be accessible from at least two sides of the school site.
- Ideally there will be 3 vehicular entrances located strategically around the perimeter
- Noise generation around school sites should be minimal. For example proximity to the railway, major roads, energy centres etc. should be avoided. The noise level on the boundary of a school playing field should not exceed 50 dB LAeq, 30 min.
- Sites should generally be rectangular with the minimum site frontage being 110m. This may need to be increased, as might the site area, if the site is irregular in shape.

- The design of school sites is bespoke such that the location of buildings or proximity of buildings to the boundary cannot be unreasonably constrained. However, the school would ideally be at the front of the site to ensure that each area of the site is fully utilised, has a defined function and meets OCC educational, safeguarding and management requirements.
- Hedgerows/ditches across sites should be avoided as they have the potential to compromise the economical layout of the school site, restrict supervision and restrict long term site flexibility (for example expansion).
- School sites should be as level as possible to limit the need for Abnormal cost
- No existing services are to cross the site and overhead high voltage power lines [ie greater than 1000 V (1000 V = 1 kV)] are not to be within 200 metres of any school site.

### Specialist Housing

25 units of Specialist Housing are required across the Bicester Ecotown development. The breakdown across the development per application is to be confirmed with the District.

### **Local Library**

Oxfordshire County Council has an adopted standard for publicly available library floor space of 23 m<sup>2</sup> per 1,000 head of population, and a further 19.5% space is required for support areas including staff workroom, totalling 27.5 m<sup>2</sup>. The Bicester library provision is significantly under-size in relation to its catchment population and this development will therefore place additional pressures on the library. A new library is planned for Franklins Yard development and contributions are required from all development in the locality to fund this community infrastructure with £487,205 still to be secured from the total £1.2 M capital cost at 1st Quarter 2014 price base index.

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

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

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 £11.00 = £22 per person.

The full requirement for the provision of library infrastructure and supplementary core book stock in respect of this application is: **£ 46.05 x 4080 (the forecast number of new residents)** or £105.72 per dwelling = **£ 187,884**

### **Central Library**

Central Library in Oxford serves the whole county and requires remodelling to support service delivery that includes provision of library resources across the county.

Remodelling of the library at 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2014 base prices leaves a funding requirement still to be secured = £4.4 M

60% of this funding is collected from development in the Oxford area. The remainder 40% is spread across the four other Districts. 40% of 4.4M = £1,760,000.

Population across Oxfordshire outside of Oxford City District is forecast to grow by 93,529 to year 2026. £1,760,000 ÷ 93,529 people = £18.82 per person

**£ 18.82 x 4080 (The forecast number of new residents) = £76,786**

## Strategic Waste Management

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

The proposed residential development will increase demand for recycling facilities in the area. The nearest household waste recycling centre (HWRC) we provide is Ardley HWRC.

The HWRC strategy, which included a proposal to close Ardley HWRC and open a new site at Kidlington, was agreed by Cabinet on 19 April 2011 following a formal consultation. However, in light of wider changes our countywide plans for the long-term future of HWRCs are currently under review while we consider a number of factors. These include significantly higher levels of planned growth in Bicester as well as the decision not to go ahead with a new recycling centre based at Kidlington. The outcome of reuse trials currently underway at Alkerton and Stanford HWRCs will also play a significant part in defining future plans for the service.

Regardless of the review of HWRC provision, in view of the additional demand that would be generated by the proposed development for reuse, recycling and composting facilities in Bicester we will seek contributions towards meeting the increased demand.

A HWRC designed with capacity for 17,650 households has an estimated project build cost of £3,400,000 (@1Q 14 prices)

This equates to a capital cost per household of £193

The HWRC requires a site area of 16,000m<sup>2</sup>(equating to 0.91m<sup>2</sup> per household)

Using an estimated land value of £300,000/acre =£74.14/m<sup>2</sup>

This equates to land cost per household of £67 (£74.14\*0.91)

### **Total m<sup>2</sup> cost/household**

£193+£67= £260 (@1Q 14 prices)

**£260 x 1700 (the number of new dwellings) = £442,000**

## Adult Health & Wellbeing Resource including Day Care Facilities

To meet the additional pressures on Health & Wellbeing provision the County Council is planning to expand day care facilities at Bicester Health & Wellbeing Resource Centre. Current demand is above service provision capacity of 40 places per day at the current site accounting for ward –based catchment areas in terms of population. This proposal will increase pressures on the current service.

Contributions are based upon a 230 m<sup>2</sup> expansion providing an additional 10 places to the existing service at Launton Road. Cost of expansion at 1st Quarter 2014 price base is £845,000.

Secured contributions amount to £260K, with the remainder, £585,000 outstanding.

Population forecasting to 2026 based on build out since 2011 census and allocated housing projections including the SHMA within the catchment wards for this Health and Wellbeing Resource = 21,704 people

£585,000 divided 21,704 = £26.95 x 2.4 average house occupancy in Bicester area = £  
64.68  
**£64.68 x 1,700 (the number of new dwellings) = £ 109,956**

## **Other Services**

### **Highways Depots**

The development will bring maintenance pressures upon highways depots as a consequence of the increased highway network. The provision of highways depots is under review in order to meet the increased demands which could result in the need for contributions.

### **Administration**

Oxfordshire County Council requires an administrative payment of £20,000 for the purposes of administration and monitoring of the proposed S106 agreement, including elements relating to Education.

### **Indexation**

Financial contributions have to be indexed-linked to maintain the real values of the contributions (so that they can in future years deliver the same level of infrastructure provision currently envisaged). The price bases of the various contributions are covered in the relevant sections above.

### **Security/Bonds**

Given the scale of the contributions, where the triggering of payment of financial contributions is deferred to post implementation of the development, it will be necessary for the S106 agreement to include provisions for appropriate security by the landowner/developer for such payments.

### **General**

The contributions requested have been calculated where possible using details of the development mix from the application submitted or if no details are available then the County Council has used the best information available. Should the application be amended or the development mix changed at a later date, the Council reserves the right to seek a higher contribution according to the nature of the amendment.

The contributions which are being sought are necessary to protect the existing levels of infrastructure for local residents. They are relevant to planning the incorporation of this major development within the local community, if it is implemented. They are directly related to this proposed development and to the scale and kind of the proposal.

**Contributions required to mitigate the impact of the development on infrastructure but which due to Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) OCC cannot require a s106 obligation in respect of:**

- Museum Resource Centre **£ 20,400**

Oxfordshire County Council is **not** seeking a contribution towards extending the museum resource centre from this application due to the pooling restrictions contained within Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) which took effect from the 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015. Nevertheless the detail of how this contribution would have been calculated is set out below.

### **County Museum Resource Centre**

Oxfordshire County Council's museum service provides a central Museum Resource Centre (MRC). The MRC is the principal store for the Oxfordshire Museum, Cogges Manor Farm Museum, Abingdon Museum, Banbury Museum, the Museum of Oxford and the Vale and Downland Museum. It provides support to these museums and schools throughout the county for educational, research and leisure activities.

The MRC is operating at capacity and needs an extension to meet the demands arising from further development throughout the county. An extended facility will provide additional storage space and allow for increased public access to the facility.

An extension to the MRC to mitigate the impact of new development up to 2026 has been costed at £460,000; this equates to £5 per person at 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2012 price base.

**£5 x 4,080 (the forecast number of new residents) or £12 per dwelling = £ 20,400**

**Officer's Name: Oliver Spratley**

**Officer's Title:** Corporate Landlord Officer

**Date:** 08 January 2015

---

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

### **Ecology**

#### **Recommendation:**

Objection

#### **Key issues:**

- It is very disappointing that the application does not appear to be following the Masterplan approach for the NW Bicester Eco Town site or the Biodiversity Strategy (Appendix 6J) that should apply to the whole Eco Town.
- Application 14/02121/OUT fails to demonstrate that it would be part of the NW Bicester Masterplan approach and deliver a net gain in biodiversity (in line with NPPF paragraphs 9, 109 and 118).
- A recognised biodiversity metric was used to demonstrate how the combined development over the whole NW Bicester Eco Town Masterplan site should deliver a net gain in biodiversity. However, in order to achieve a net gain in biodiversity this relied on the delivery of biodiversity mitigation and enhancements over the whole Eco Town site.
- Application 14/02121/OUT does not reference to the need for off-site farmland bird compensation or for contributions to this for all developments on the NW Bicester Ecotown. I consider that each application within the NW Bicester Ecotown should be providing a proportionate contribution by area for off-site compensation as part of the Masterplan approach. The work for the Eco Town concluded that the impact on farmland birds could not be mitigated on the Eco Town and that therefore offsite compensation was necessary.

**Officer's Name:** Tamsin Atley

**Officer's Title:** Ecologist Planner

**Date:** 19 January 2015

---

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

### Waste Management

#### Recommendation:

No objection

#### Key issues:

Meeting statutory requirements to provide facilities for residents to dispose of waste and maintaining and increasing high rates of recycling and composting in Oxfordshire which are currently the best in the country.

The proposed development will increase demand for waste management facilities and use of household waste recycling centres. The nearest HWRC experiences capacity issues and its planning consent expires in 2019.

Contributions towards increasing capacity for re-use, recycling and composting will be required to ensure the additional demand generated by the development can be met and recycling and composting rates are maintained at high levels (see Property response above).

The provision of a heat network for the development is supported and essential to enable connection to the Ardley ERF in the future if this is demonstrated to be feasible. The energy strategy for the proposed development states that a site wide district heating network will be installed served by an on-site energy centre. This also refers to the possibility of connection to the Ardley energy recovery facility (ERF) for the supply of heat should this be feasible. This statement is supported and implementation of the development should be carried out in way that keeps this possibility open should this be demonstrated to be technically and financially feasible in the future.

**Officer's Name:** Frankie Upton

**Officer's Title:** Waste Project Manager

**Date:** 16 January 2015

---

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 14/02121/OUT

**Proposal:** Development to provide up to 1,700 residential dwellings (Class C3), a retirement village (Class C2), flexible commercial floorspace (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1 and C1), social and community facilities (Class D1), land to accommodate one energy centre and land to accommodate one new primary school (up to 2FE) (Class D1). Such development to include provision of strategic landscape, provision of new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, infrastructure and other operations (including demolition of farm buildings on Middleton Stoney Road)

**Location:** Himley Village North West Bicester Middleton Stoney Road Bicester

---

### LOCAL MEMBER VIEWS

---

**Cllr: Catherine Fulljames**

**Division: Ploughley**

**Comments:**

I do object to this application.

I am extremely concerned about the volume of traffic that will be accessing/ egressing on to the Middleton Stoney Road. If this traffic goes towards Middleton Stoney, the OCC Atkins survey on the crossroads in the village is currently over capacity particularly at peak times. There will obviously be many motorists, commercial drivers who will be going in that direction for the M40, A34 and A43.

**Date:** 21 January 2015

---