

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

**District:** Cherwell

Application no: 16/00219/REM-2

Proposal: Reserved matters to 14/01737/OUT - Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale

of 45 no. dwellings

**Location:** The Paddocks The Hale Chesterton

# **Purpose of document**

This report sets out Oxfordshire County Council's view on the proposal.

This report contains officer advice in the form of technical team responses. Where local members have responded these have been attached by OCCs Major Planning Applications Team (planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk).

Officer's Name: David Flavin

Officer's Title: Senior Planning Officer

**Date:** 16 May 2016

**District:** Cherwell

Application no: 16/00219/REM-2

Proposal: Reserved matters to 14/01737/OUT - Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale

of 45 no. dwellings

Location: The Paddocks The Hale Chesterton

# **Transport Development Control**

# Recommendation

Objection

# Key issues

- Improvements are required to the pedestrian provisions within the site.
- Further drainage information is required.

# Legal agreement required to secure

S106 contribution will be sought for the improvement and development of pedestrian and cycle connectivity in the village of particular interest is the development of the cycle link to Bicester Park and Ride.

## **Informatives**

Prior to commencement of development, a separate consent must be obtained from OCC Road Agreements Team for the new highway vehicular access and adoptable estate roads under S278 of the Highway Act. Contact: 01865 815700; RoadAgreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk.

# **Detailed comments**

#### **Transport Development Control**

It is noted that the footway at the site access now ties in with the existing footway on the A4095.

The site layout plan shows a path that runs to the allotments part way along the north-eastern boundary of the development. However, there is no public access across the allotments so there would be nowhere for this path to continue. However, there is an informal route along the south-eastern edge of the allotments which could be formalised to link with the route running through to the Alchester Road. This route would require access from the south-eastern end of the development. The footpath as shown on the site plan should be removed and shown in the south east corner of the site in alignment with the informal route. Formalisation of the route through the allotments would require liaison with the Parish Council. **Reason for objection.** 

The design and layout of visitor lay-bys is now acceptable.

Affordable housing plots now have a structure in the back garden labelled CS. It is assumed that this stands for "cycle shed". If this is the case then the provision of cycle parking for the affordable units is largely acceptable, although it is noted that plot number 37 has no such provision. These should be rectified on future plans.

There is now a small rectangular area immediately to the south of the LAP. It is assumed that this is visitor / public cycle parking for the LAP in response to OCCs previous comments. If this is the case then the provision of cycle parking for the LAP is acceptable. This should be labelled on future plans.

#### Drainage

Please contact Andrew Goddard (01865 815111) to arrange a convenient time to meet with the OCC Drainage team to discuss the proposed SUDS scheme. The below items are reasons for objection.

## Soakaway Factual Report

Table 1 identifies soakage tests having been carried out in 5 trial pits TP 9,10,11,12 and 13. Figure 2 shows that the distribution of the test pits are particularly skewed to the north eastern side of the site. Accordingly, the positioning of the soakage pits does not demonstrate a fair representation of the potential for SUDS infiltration across the whole site. To appraise potential an even spread of tests is carried out by the developer across the total site, unless access is not available and SUDS are clearly not an option.

The Figure 2 plan reveals that trial holes TP 1, 3, 6 are also pits where soakage test were performed, but no comment or log is provided on the results in the factual report. Please advise whether this is a mistake in the report or make the logs available.

It is considered that all the soakage test results in the factual report (TP 9-13) do not rule out the potential for infiltration techniques at any of the locations tested, as all meet the minimum OCC standard for infiltration rates to be not lower than  $1x10^{-6}$  m/s. Please explain why limited use has been made of infiltration techniques at the site, wholly confined to the south – east part of the site. Please advice and confirm.

#### Control of peak runoff

In order to comply with Non- Statutory Technical Standards S2 and S3 Please confirm the following information.

	Existing Rates (I/s)	Proposed Rates (I/s)	<u>Difference</u>
Greenfield QBar		N/A	N/A
1 in 1			
1 in 30			
1 in 100			
1 in 100 + 30 % CC	<u>N/A</u>		

To mitigate for climate change the proposed 1 in 100 + 30% must be no greater than the existing 1 in 100 runoff rate. Control of the 1 in 1 and 1/30 year peak discharge rate needs to be controlled to greenfield rates. This may require control structure such as orifice or weir. Please confirm.

#### Peak Discharge Volumes

Because the volume of run-off from the site can be as damaging to downstream flood as peak flow rates, it is necessary to ensure discharge volumes are controlled for storm events to greenfield volumes. Non - Statutory Technical Standards S4 to S9 apply. The SuDS Manual advises that ideally volumetric control should be achieved for all events. (Paragraph 3.3.1) and proposes a practical approach for dealing with the issue. Please confirm.

#### Site Flooding Criteria

Local Plan policy and non – statutory national technical standards apply. Policy EDS6 of the local plan is:

Developments will not flood from surface water up to and including the design storm event or any surface water flooding beyond the 1 in 30 year storm event, up to and including the design storm event will be safely contained on Site.

Please confirm that appropriate Microsimulation modelling has been undertaken to comply with the requirement.

Thank-you for submitting the initial outline maintenance proposal, this is sufficient at this time, but will need to be further developed into a Site SUDS Management Plan that can be signed up to by all the stakeholders.

Please indicate flood routes through the development in exceedance events.

### Outlet

Please provide section details of outlets to ponds.

#### Water Quality

Please provide details of any measure to improve water quality such as pre-treatment chamber to capture silts, and any pond planting proposals.

Officer's Name: Chris Nichols

Officer's Title: Transport Development Control

**Date:** 13 May 2016