

**URGENT BUSINESS AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION****Planning Committee****14 July 2022**

| Agenda Item Number | Page | Title | Officer Responsible | Reason Not Included with Original Agenda |
|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| 6 | (Pages 2 - 6) | *Urgent Business (added with the agreement of the Chairman) Application 21/01454/F - Former Rodney House Private Drive, Off Graven Hill Road, Ambrosden. | Senior Manager Development Management | Matter arose after agenda publication and a decision is required before the next scheduled Planning Committee meeting |
| 6 | (Pages 7- 9) | *Urgent Business (added with the agreement of the Chairman) – Application 21/03177/F - Axis J9 Phase 3, Howes Lane, Bicester | Senior Manager Development Management | Matter arose after agenda publication and a decision is required before the next scheduled Planning Committee meeting. |
| 8 | (Pages 10 and 11)_ | OS Parcel 5700 South West of Grange Farm, Street through Little Chesterton, Chesterton | Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects Team) | Report updated and finalised after publication |

*As this application has already been considered by Planning Committee, Public speaking will not be allowed.

If you need any further information about the meeting, please contact Lesley Farrell / Aaron Hetherington, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221534

Agenda Item 6

URGENT BUSINESS

**Former Rodney House Private Drive Off Graven Hill Road
Ambrosden**

21/01454/F

Case Officer: David Lowin

Applicant: Mr Richard Drew

Proposal: Proposed Bicester Health and Wellbeing Hub

Ward: Bicester South & Ambrosden

Councillors: Cllr Cotter, Cllr Pruden and Cllr Sames

Reason for Urgency: The Applicant has advised that the development may not proceed if a decision is not issued by the 22 July 2022. Issues arising after publication deadline are considered to necessitate amendments to the delegated powers previously given to officers.

Expiry Date: 31 January 2022

Committee Date:

14 July 2022

AGENDA ITEM 6 – URGENT BUSINESS

1. Reason for Referral as Urgent Business

- 1.1 The application was previously considered by Planning Committee at meetings on 13 January 2022 and 10 February 2022 after which Committee Members resolved to delegate powers to the Assistant Director for Planning and Development to grant permission, subject to: (i) conditions, (ii) a s106 deed of variation to the extant s106 to address the revised biodiversity mitigation; and (iii) a s106 to secure a contribution to improve public transport (bus) provision to the site.
- 1.2 Since the Committee resolutions in February 2022, Officers have been unable to proceed to determine the application due to outstanding matters which it has not been possible to resolve within the scope of the powers delegated to officers in their resolution to approve the scheme.
- 1.3 The Council has been contacted by the GP Partner representing Montgomery-House Surgery and the GP Partner representing The Alchester Medical Group about their (joint) deep concern for the planned delivery of the new Bicester ‘Super Surgery’ Health Hub project. They highlight that the projected costs of the Hub have been escalating fast since the Ukraine war began and that the development may be financially unviable unless they lock in an agreed price with contractors before the end of the month. They state that providing this deadline can be hit then a start on building will be possible during October 2022.
- 1.4 This report is therefore presented as a late and urgent item to seek the necessary delegation for the Committee to enable the outstanding issues to be resolved and a decision made by the 22 July 2022 deadline identified by the applicant.

2. Outstanding Issues

Red Edge Plans:

- 2.1 Members initially resolved ([January 2022](#)) to delegate authority to the Assistant Director to approve this application subject to conditions and the prior completion of a S106 agreement to provide an increased public transport contribution for the additional public transport movements to Graven Hill generated by the health hub proposal. However, whilst the January Committee report correctly identified need also for consequential changes to parts of the approved Masterplan and specific clauses of the existing S106 that required a Deed of Variation (DoV), the recommendation and resolution erroneously omitted those other requirements. Consequently, the application was reported back to the [February Committee](#) for a further resolution, also including a revised red-edge drawing (defining the application site boundary) to be submitted and consulted upon. This was to include both a required cycle and pedestrian link and two areas of off-site biodiversity enhancement elsewhere in the wider Graven Hill site to be included as part of the application proposals and required as part of the Masterplan and S106 DoV alterations and the new S106. The revised plan that was considered at the February 2022 meeting failed to include all the original red-edge boundary. Specifically, it excluded the access road, which was an error.
- 2.2 Accordingly, in advance of finalising the S106 Agreement and issuing the planning permission by the 22 July deadline, it is necessary for a corrected red-edge plan to show the application boundary includes all of the former Rodney House site, plus the access road, the new combined cycle and pedestrian link and the two areas of off-site biodiversity enhancement in a single composite plan.
- 2.3 The plan now presented simply combines the two plans previously reported (and consulted upon) but in a single composite drawing, with no other land included. On this basis officers do not consider that further public consultation is required.
- 2.4 Officers are therefore seeking to amend the powers delegated to them to insert reference to the new composite red-edge drawing, reference [BHWH-IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-100003 Rev 8](#), which is to be referenced in the eventual planning permission and S106.

Planning Condition 22 – Path upgrade

- 2.5 The proposals include the upgrading of an existing pathway to a shared cycle/pedestrian route that will extend westward from the application site towards the private road that links to Anniversary Avenue and Graven Hill Road.
- 2.6 In the [Written Update](#) published in advance of the February Planning Committee, the Planning Committee was advised that it had been agreed that the upgrading of this footway would be delivered by the applicant, rather than the Highway Authority, and the provision of the footway upgrade was therefore best secured via a planning condition rather than a s106 contribution payment. The wording of the suggested condition was set out the written update and agreed by the Planning Committee when they resolved to grant planning permission.
- 2.7 The wording of suggested Condition 22 required that the cycle route link the site with the existing and proposed cycle network. It has come to light that this is not feasible. The existing footway can be upgraded as anticipated in the details presented to the Planning Committee in February. A new plan was received in May 2022, reference [BHWH-IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-100104 Rev P3](#), which proposes that the path would be: re-laid with bituminous course; it would have no linings as it is a shared footway cycleway; it would have signs at each end; and would have bollards incorporating

lighting every 10 linear meters. The upgraded footway cycleway would then terminate in the same location as the existing footway at the point it reaches the private road which in turn links to Anniversary Avenue and Graven Hill Road. This submitted plan demonstrates that it is feasible to upgrade the footpath, but it has not been agreed with the Council's Landscaping Team and therefore a condition requiring a scheme for the upgrading works remains necessary. A revised wording for Condition 22 has been suggested below.

- 2.8 The applicant's position is that the upgraded pathway runs through an amenity space which the S106 for the wider Graven Hill development envisages being passed to the District Council for adoption in due course. The future maintenance of this land and the original footway was to be included in the commuted sum to be paid by the Developer to the Council, but this figure is capped in the existing S106. Therefore, the increased cost of maintenance for the upgraded footway/cycleway and associated lighting would fall upon the District Council.
- 2.9 Officers advise that these increased costs should be paid by the applicant, in addition to any capped commuted sums, via an additional commuted sum to be added into the original S106. The increased cost for the maintenance of the shared footway/cycleway would be £803.25 (index linked), and there would also need to be additional provision for the cost of providing and maintaining 16 low-level LED lights alongside the proposed 175m cycleway/path. This cost has not yet been identified.

S106 Matters:

- 2.10 As part of the S106 negotiations, the applicant has now provided landscape details for the requisite biodiversity enhancement of the two areas of land identified and agreed for that purpose beside the woodland and the proposed planting is shown on the plan attached below.
- 2.11 GHVDC suggested that the commuted sums to be paid to the District Council to cover landscaping at the point the land is transferred to the District Council should remain capped at the same level as specified in the existing S106 for the wider site. However, the calculated costs for the additional planting is £7,000 (index linked) and the extra maintenance costs associated with the two biodiversity enhancement areas is a further £7,000 (index linked). Seeking to include these elements within the existing cap on commuted sums would result in these costs falling upon the District Council.
- 2.12 The purpose of these biodiversity enhancement areas is to compensate for the loss of open space and biodiversity on the land now to be developed for the health hub on the former Rodney House site. Officers therefore consider that it is important that these areas be recognised as providing an additionality of provision over and above what was anticipated under the wider planning permission for the Graven Hill site. On this basis it is recommended that the costs for the additional planting and the extra maintenance costs are secured, in addition to any capped commuted sums, via an additional commuted sum to be added into the original S106.

Surface Water Drainage:

- 2.13 An objection to the development was received from the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) on the 14 January 2022 (after the January Planning Committee). This was not highlighted in the subsequent February Planning Committee report.
- 2.14 Officers have sought to deal with this objection, which relates not to the principal of development but to an amplification of the information submitted. The applicant is intending to submit further details but at this time the LLFA objection stands. It is hoped however that the submission of the additional information requested would

allow this objection to be withdrawn prior to the determination of the application.

- 2.15 In light of the urgency for a decision to be issued, it is proposed that delegated powers be given to officers to impose a condition to address the LLFA concerns. This would allow, if the objection has not been overcome in the time available, a decision to be issued whilst continuing to ensure that the concerns of the LLFA are addressed prior to the commencement of development.

3. RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION – DELEGATE TO THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT TO GRANT PERMISSION, SUBJECT TO:

- i. THE CONDITIONS SET OUT IN THE AGREED [MINUTES](#) FROM THE FEBRUARY 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE (AND ANY AMENDMENTS TO THOSE CONDITIONS AS DEEMED NECESSARY) WITH ALTERATIONS TO CONDITIONS 2 (APPROVED PLANS) AND 22 (FOOTWAY/CYCLEWAY) AS SET OUT BELOW; AND**
- ii. A S106 DEED OF VARIATION TO THE EXISTANT S106 TO ADDRESS THE REVISED BIODIVERSITY MITIGATION AND THE FOOTWAY/CYCLEWAY AS PER THE S106 HEADS OF TERMS BELOW (AND ANY AMENDMENTS AS DEEMED NECESSARY);**
- iii. THE COMPLETION OF A PLANNING OBLIGATION UNDER SECTION 106 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, AS SUBSTITUTED BY THE PLANNING AND COMPENSATION ACT 1991, TO SECURE THE S106 HEADS OF TERMS BELOW (AND ANY AMENDMENTS AS DEEMED NECESSARY); AND**
- iv. IN THE EVENT THAT THE LLFA OBJECTION IS NOT RESOLVED, POWERS TO ADD THE ADDITIONAL CONDITION 23 (FLOOD) (AND ANY AMENDMENTS TO THAT CONDITIONS AS DEEMED NECESSARY)**

New Section S106 Heads of Terms

- a) £310,262 index linked – Payment of a contribution to improve public transport (bus) provision to the site;
- b) £2,336 index linked – OCC Travel Plan Monitoring Fee; and
- c) £4,550 – S106 monitoring fee.

Section S106 Deed of Variation

- a) An additional commuted sum for the additional planting and the extra maintenance costs of the biodiversity enhancement areas, in addition to any capped commuted sums, of £7,000 (index linked) and associated extra maintenance £7,000 (index linked) or any amendments to those figures deemed necessary; and
- b) An additional commuted sum for the maintenance of the footpath/cycleway upgrade works, in addition to any capped commuted sums, of £803.25 (index linked) for the maintenance of the re-surfaced footway/cycleway, and an appropriate figure (to be confirmed) for the maintenance of the lighting, or any amendments to those figures deemed necessary.

Conditions

Compliance with Plans

2. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following plans and documents: **[BHWH-IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-100003 Rev 8 – Red Edge Plan]**; IBI-AR-XX-XX-PL-100-004 Rev 17 – Proposed Site Masterplan; WIE11386-HHA-05-001 Rev A01 – Health Hub & Western Spine Road Vis.; **WIE-16470-ZZ-XX-DR-L-74-101 Rev T02 – Biodiversity Net Gain Offset Plan**; 122447-IBI-XX-WS-PL-A-100-005 Rev 7 – Existing Site Location Plan; IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-200-005 Rev 18 – Proposed Site Plan; 16470-WIE-100-74-XX-ZZ-000 Rev A – Colour Masterplan; 122447-IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-200-5010 Rev P4 – Ground Floor Plan; 122447-IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-200-5011 Rev P4 – First Floor Plan; 122447-IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-200-5012 Rev P4 – Second Floor Plan; 122447-IBI-XX-XX-PL-A-200-5013 Rev P1 – Roof Plan; 122447-IBI-XX-XX-EL-A-200-5020 Rev P1 – North & West Elevations; 122447-IBI-XX-XX-EL-A-200-5021 Rev P1 – East & South Elevations; 122447-IBI-XX-XX-EL-A-200-5022 Rev P1 – Courtyard Elevations; 8757-MCP-V1-XX-DR-E-9000 Rev P01 – External Lighting Strat. & PV Plan; 16470-WIE-100-74-XX-ZZ-100 Rev P03 – Illustrative Landscape Plan; Design & Access Statement, March 2021; Planning Statement, April 2021; WSI for Archaeological Investigation, February 2021; Technical Note – Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, April 2021; Supplemental Tech. Note – Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, August 2021; Ecological Impact Assessment, March 2021; Building Regs Part L Compliance Report, March 2021; Geotechnical Desk-Study Report – Part 1, February 2021; Geotechnical Desk-Study Report – Part 2, February 2021; Geotechnical Site Investigation Report, June 2021; Arboricultural Impact Assessment, April 2021; Arboricultural Survey Schedule, August 2020; Arboricultural Briefing Note, December 2021; Flood Risk Assessment & S/W Drainage Strategy, March 2021; Travel Plan, March 2021; Transport Assessment – Part 1, April 2021; Transport Assessment – Part 2, April 2021; Transport Assessment – Part 3, April 2021; Supplemental TRICS data for GP Surgeries with Pharmacies; Transport Tech. Note – Primary Health Care Hub proposals, July 2021. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following plans and documents:
22. The development shall not be brought into use until the footway running from the south of the building and linking to the east to connect to a private road leading to Anniversary Avenue, has been upgraded to a shared footway/cycleway in full accordance with a Scheme of upgrade works that shall include details of lighting, surfacing and signage. This Scheme shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of sustainability, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

23. Prior to commencement of development a surface water drainage management strategy shall be submitted to and approved the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include details of the management of the proposed system. Thereafter the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with this strategy, including calculated micro drainage results and clarification that the site can be satisfactorily drained to the adjoining watercourse and details of arrangements should the surface water system fail.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable and adequate surface water drainage scheme for the development that complies with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and associated Planning Policy Guidance.

URGENT BUSINESS

Axis J9 Phase 3 Howes Lane Bicester

21/03177/F

Case Officer: Caroline Ford

Applicant: Albion Land

Proposal: Full planning application for employment development (Use Classes E(g)(iii), B2 and/or B8) comprising 5 units within 3 buildings and associated parking and servicing, landscaping and associated works

Ward: Bicester North and Caversfield/ marginally Bicester West

Councillors: Councillors Mawer, Pratt and Slaymaker (Bicester North And Caversfield)
Councillors Broad, Sibley and Webster (Bicester West)

Reason for Urgency: Legal advice received after the publication deadline identified a need for additional delegated powers to be sought from the Committee. This is urgent in order to minimise the Council's exposure to costs in an expected appeal

Expiry Date: 29 July 2022

Committee Date: 14 July 2022

AGENDA ITEM 6 – URGENT BUSINESS

1. Reason for referral as Urgent Business

- 1.1 At the 16 June 2022 Planning Committee, Members resolved to refuse application 21/03177/F. Officers have been working on the wording of the identified reason since the meeting. Officers have been advised that the applicant intends to submit an appeal against the decision of the Planning Committee to refuse the application at its [16 June 2022 meeting](#).
- 1.2 Legal advice has indicated that officers require additional powers to be delegated from the Planning Committee to allow them deal with any S106 issues within an appeal. It is understood that the appeal is to be lodged soon, it is within the Council's interests to ensure that this delegation is in place, and that its refusal reasons are defined and available to the applicant so that their appeal can be lodged against those specified reasons. Should this matter have been delayed to the August Planning Committee, there is a risk that an appeal could be lodged on the grounds of non-determination. In that scenario the applicant would need to prepare their appeal submission to address the application as a whole and would likely seek to prepare evidence on matters that could later be confirmed as unnecessary then the Council issues its formal decision, which could result in the risk of an award of costs against the Council for this unnecessary work.
- 1.3 A risk of an award of costs would always remain in any appeal, but by ensuring that the reasons for refusal are defined and that Officers have the necessary delegation to complete a S106 pursuant to the appeal so that the necessary infrastructure is secured in the event that the appeal is allowed, this would put the Council at the best chance of avoiding any substantial award of costs against it.

2. Updated Matters since the application was considered

- 2.1 Through the written updates, Officers identified three main outstanding issues:
1. That the LLFA continued to hold an objection to the drainage arrangements for the site.
 2. That an air quality assessment had been received and that a re-consultation was underway with the Environmental Protection Team.
 3. That an updated noise assessment had been received and that a re-consultation was underway with the Environmental Protection Team.
- 2.2 In response to these points, Officers can advise as follows:
1. Following the receipt of additional information, the Lead Local Flood Authority have confirmed that they have No Objection subject to conditions.
 2. The Environmental Protection Officer considered the updated Air Quality report and confirmed that the methodology and findings were satisfactory. A planning condition was recommended.
 3. The Environmental Protection Officer considered the noise technical note and confirmed that he is happy with the methodology and confirmed that there was no reason to object to the application on noise grounds. This was based upon the report indicating that there will be no or negligible change to the noise climate with the changes to the site as proposed.
- 2.3 A further response has been received from the Environment Agency since the last Planning Committee, which confirmed that they have no comments to make in respect of the proposed development.

3. Reasons for refusal

- 3.1 Reason for refusal 1 as set out below has been formulated based upon the Officer understanding of the reason Members discussed and resolved against at the 16 June 2022 meeting. This includes highlighting specific parts of the referred to Policies to ensure the reasons are clear and to avoid other matters needing to be argued at appeal. Officers seek Member agreement to this reason including the specific parts of the named policies. Members are asked to highlight any other policies/ specific paragraphs of the named policies should there be further points that Officers have not referred to.
- 3.2 Reason for refusal 2 as set out below is considered to be a necessary reason to ensure that it is clear that the Local Planning Authority considers the requirement for a Planning Obligation to be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development. In the absence of this, the application is therefore considered to be unacceptable.
- 3.3 Reasons such as reason 2 are often overcome through an appeal process by a S106 being negotiated and secured. This is necessary to ensure that should any appeal be allowed that the necessary S106 is therefore in place to mitigate the impacts of the development. In addition to the reasons for refusal, Officers have also been advised this week (following the publication of the main agenda for the 14 July 2022 Committee) that delegation from the Planning Committee is required to allow Officers to complete a S106 pursuant to any appeal that might be submitted. This is important because should the application proceed to appeal and, should that appeal be allowed, the requirement for a S106 would be a matter that would be necessary to ensure the development is acceptable by mitigating its impacts.

4. RECOMMENDATION

- i. THAT POWERS BE DELEGATED TO THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, HAVING REGARD TO THE HEADS OF TERMS SET OUT WITHIN THE WRITTEN UPDATES TO THE 16 JUNE 2022 PLANNING COMMITTEE, TO NEGOTIATE AND COMPLETE AN AGREEMENT CONTAINING OBLIGATIONS PURSUANT TO S106 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED) RELATING TO ANY PLANNING APPEAL SUBMITTED AGAINST THE DECISION ISSUED UNDER 21/03177/F.**
- ii. THAT PLANNING PERMISSION IS REFUSED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:**
 1. The proposed development introduces unanticipated commercial uses onto a site identified for housing via the Masterplan included within the North West Bicester Supplementary Planning Document 2016. The development proposed would be incompatible with the existing residential uses to the east of Howes Lane and would have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of those nearby residential occupiers. The proposal is therefore not considered to be sustainable development and is contrary to Policies SLE1 (in particular paragraph 6, bullet point 7 (with respect to land uses and residents only), ESD15 (in particular bullet points 3 and 11 (but not related to privacy, natural lighting, ventilation or indoor and outdoor space)) and Policy Bicester 1 (paragraph 2 and bullet points 1 and 25 under the section titled 'Key site specific design and place shaping principles') of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 2011-2031, Policy C31 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, the North West Bicester Supplementary Planning Document 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
 2. In the absence of a satisfactory completed S106 or other planning obligation, the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that the necessary infrastructure required both on and off site as a result of this development to mitigate the impact of the development will be provided. This would be contrary to Policies INF1, SLE4, and Policy Bicester 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 2011-2031, the North West Bicester Supplementary Planning Document 2016, the Council's Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (February 2018) and the advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

| Planning obligation | | | Regulation 122 Assessment |
|---|--|---------------------|--|
| Detail | Amounts (all to be Index linked) | Trigger points | |
| Public transport services contributions, including contribution towards bus stop infrastructure | £1,130,000 index linked from 2Q22 (RPI-x) Lower figure TBC due to the reduced scheme. | June 2022 Baxter | <p>Necessary – The contribution is necessary to provide sustainable transport options to the site and as part of the overall public transport strategy for Bicester.</p> <p>Directly related – The proposal provides for commercial uses which should be reasonably accessible via public transport modes to ensure employees have options to use sustainable modes of transport. It is therefore directly related to the development.</p> <p>Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind – An enhancement to the public transport service between Oxford and the development site to meet required shift times. Also, A public transport service between the site and West Oxfordshire to enable existing staff to travel to the site sustainably.</p> |
| Traffic Regulation Order (if the matters are not dealt with under S278/S38 agreement). | £3,320 | April'22 RPI-x | To consult on the implementation of a new / extended speed restriction on the A41 between the M40 J9 and Vendee Drive junctions. |
| Provision of a safe and suitable pedestrian / cycle route to the site from Bicester. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of a direct 3m wide shared route alongside the A41 between the site access and the Bicester Park and Ride at Vendee Drive. | £2,800,000 | June 2022 Baxter | <p>Necessary – The contribution is necessary to support the provision of sustainable transport options to the site and as part of the overall cycle and walking strategy for Bicester.</p> <p>Directly related - The proposal provides for commercial uses which should be reasonably accessible via cycleways and footpaths to ensure employees have options to use sustainable modes of transport. This is infrastructure to support the cycle and pedestrian networks. It is therefore directly related to development.</p> <p>Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind – The level of contribution sought is proportionate to the scale of development.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Travel Plan Monitoring contribution towards the cost of monitoring the framework and individual travel plans over the life of the plans</p> | <p>£1,558 index linked from December 2021 (RPI-x)</p> | <p>TBC - Delegated Authority is sought to enable Officers to negotiate this</p> | <p>Necessary – The site will require a framework travel plan. The fee is required to cover OCCs costs of monitoring the travel plan over 5 years. Directly related – The contribution is directly related to the required travel plans that relate to this development. Monitoring of the travel plans is critical to ensure their implementation and effectiveness in promoting sustainable transport options. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind – The amount is based on standard charging scales which are in turn calculated based on the Officer time required at cost.</p> |
| <p>Public right of way improvements</p> | <p>£30,000 index linked from April 2022 (Baxter)</p> | <p>TBC - Delegated Authority is sought to enable Officers to negotiate this</p> | <p>Necessary – The contribution is necessary to ensure that the site continues to pay a proportionate contribution to the overall public rights of way improvements required for Bicester. Directly related – Development would allow greater public access and use of local public rights of way by local residents and employees of the development. The contribution is therefore directly related to the development. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind – Surface upgrades to local public rights of way connecting with the site.</p> |
| <p>CDC and OCC Monitoring fee</p> | <p>CDC: TBC OCC: TBC</p> | <p>On completion of the S106</p> | <p>The CDC charge is based upon its recently agreed Fees and Charges Schedule which sets out that for developments of between 10,000-75,000sqm floorspace that a bespoke charge will be based upon the number of obligations and triggers with a minimum charge of £5,000. A registration charge of £500 is also applicable. As the development has few obligations and triggers for CDC, the minimum charge plus registration charge is required. The need for a monitoring fee is to ensure it can appropriately monitor that development is complying with its S106 including the high standards sought at the site.</p> |