

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

**District:** South Oxfordshire

**Application no:** P21/S0917/O-3

**Proposal:** Outline application for access only for the construction of up to 57 dwellings (Class C3) with associated landscaping and open space

**Location:** Reserve Site C Thame

**Response Date:** 1st July 2021

---

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

---

## **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 mix provided by the developer. It is noted that the application is outline and may be subject to amendment; should the final mix change then the level of contributions would need to be adjusted accordingly.

<b>Residential</b>	<b>No.</b>
1-bed dwellings	9
2-bed dwellings	17
3-bed dwellings	22
4-bed & larger dwellings	9
Extra Care Housing	
Affordable Housing %	40%

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	139.90
Nursery children (number of 2 and 3 year olds entitled to funded places)	3.45
Primary pupils	16.57
Secondary pupils including Sixth Form pupils	12.12
Special School pupils	0.30
65+ year olds	14.85

**Application no: P21/S0917/O-3**

**Location:** Reserve Site C Thame

---

## **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](mailto:planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk)) as to why material consideration outweighs OCC's objections, and to be given an opportunity to make further representations.

### **Outline applications and contributions**

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

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

### **Where a S106/Planning Obligation is required:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Application no: P21/S0917/O-3**

**Location: Reserve Site C Thame**

---

## **Transport Development Control**

### **Recommendation:**

No Objection

### **Legal agreement required to secure:**

As outlined in my response dated 31 March 2021 and copied below.

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Amount £</b>	<b>Price base</b>	<b>Index</b>	<b>Towards (details)</b>
Public transport services	£59,907 (£1,051 per dwelling)		RPIX	Bus services in the vicinity of the development, which would either operate on Wenman Road itself or on Howland Road and Chinnor Road

<b>S278 Works</b>	<b>Details</b>
Pedestrian crossings	Two new pedestrian crossings, in the form of dropped kerbs, on Wenman Road to connect with the proposed pedestrian access into the site.

### **Conditions:**

As outlined in my response dated 31 March 2021

### **Informatives:**

As outlined in my response dated 31 March 2021

## **Detailed comments:**

### **Development Proposals**

The development proposals are for the construction of upto 57 dwellings on land south of Wenman Road, Thame. The site is currently undeveloped agricultural land. The site is located approximately 1.8km to the south east of Thame town centre. The site is known as 'Reserve Site C' in the Thame Neighbourhood Plan.

The size of the proposed dwellings is not known at this stage.

### **Refuse**

In my previous response I raised my concerns that the applicant had provided tracking for a 11.6m refuse vehicle which appeared to utilise the footways as over-runnable areas (e.g. the areas shown below on the plan) which is not considered acceptable.

The applicant has clarified that the masterplan had been layered onto a dwg plan which gave the appearance that the refuse tracking was overrunning the footways which the applicant has confirmed is not the case.

As this is an outline application, refuse tracking can be provide as part of the Reserve Matters application when the internal layout is developed.

As part of the Reserved Matters application the applicant is requested that the applicant submit swept paths for a 11.6m refuse vehicle for all the internal roads with the tracking showing that a refuse vehicle can pass a parked or oncoming car at several locations throughout the development. The refuse tracking must not overrun onto the footway.

### **Agriculture Vehicles**

I understand concerns have been raised from Thame Estate Residents Association regarding agriculture vehicles accessing the fields to the south of Wenman Road and to the south of Blackthorne Grange. I understand there is access to the fields directly from Wenman Road for agriculture vehicles, however agriculture vehicles access the fields from Warren Mead and Hode Garth which some residents have raised their concerns.

When adopted Warren Mead and Hode Garth will be public highway of which agriculture vehicles are permitted to use.

Following the proposed development, the number of agriculture vehicles movements will be reduced as the area for agricultural land is reduced.

It is also important to note that agriculture vehicles movements are infrequent trips and a dedicated excess for infrequent trips when an existing network exists would be unjustified.

### **Vehicular Access**

I understand Thame Estate Residents Association have raised concerns regarding vehicles access to the proposed development from Warren Mead and Hode Garth and

have requested that a feasibility study is undertaken in relation to access directly from Wenham Road.

We have accessed the application on the information that was submitted, i.e. access from Warren Mead and Hode Garth.

Based on the trip rates for the site the vehicular trip generation for the proposed development of 57 dwellings is expected to be 31 trips during the AM Peak hour (08.00-09.00) and 34 trips during the PM peak hour (17.00 – 18.00).

As part of the application for the Site C application ((P14/S1619/O) junction capacity assessments were undertaken for the Wenman Rd /Warren Mead junction for the '2019 scenario with development' scenario.

The junction capacity software programme calculated the ratio to flow capacity (RFC), maximum queuing and delay for a junction. An RFC of 0.85 or below is the desirable threshold, but a junction would be considered to operate adequately between an RFC of 0.85 and 1.00. Any RFC values exceeding 1.00 indicate the junction would operate over maximum capacity and would become saturated with queuing concerns.

For the Wenman Rd /Warren Mead junction the results show the RFC for the Wenham Road arm was 0.01 for the AM Peak hour and 0.02 for the PM Peak hour for the '2019 scenario with development'. For the Warren Mead arm the RFC was 0.07 for the AM peak hour and 0.04 for the PM peak hour. The results found that for the proposed Site C development the Wenman Rd /Warren Mead junction would operate with spare capacity.

We can therefore conclude that the Wenman Rd /Warren Mead junction would have the capacity to carry the impact of the additional 31 trips during the AM Peak hour (08.00-09.00) and 34 trips during the PM peak hour (17.00 – 18.00) that this application would generate.

As can be seen from the above information, the impact on the local highway network for the proposed development is not considered 'severe'. Any refusal, based on highway impact, would require a 'severe' impact, of which this development does not result in.

Based on the findings there is no reason for Oxfordshire County Council to request such a study as the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed access from Warren Mead and Hode Garth is safe, suitable and has the capacity to accommodate the vehicle trips generated by the proposed development.

We are also of the opinion that access from Hode Garth is preferable as opposed to access directly from Wenham Road. Wenham Road forms part of the strategic highway network and introducing a new access directly from Wenham Road could result in a highway safety issue and could compromise the function of the strategic highway network. Introducing a new access directly from Wenham Road would also compromise the shared cycle/footway that runs along Wenham Road.

**Officer's Name: Judith Goodwin**  
**Officer's Title: Senior Transport Planner**  
**Date: 30th June 2021**

---