

-----Original Message-----

From: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk <planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

Sent: Friday, October 4, 2019 5:50 PM

To: Planning <Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Subject: New comments for application 19/01746/OUT

New comments have been received for application 19/01746/OUT at site address: Land Adj To Promised Land Farm Wendlebury Road Chesterton

from Mrs S. Pollington

Address:

5 Merganser Drive, Bicester, OX26 6XT

Comment type:

Comment

Comments:

1. Absence of suitable connections to the network and stations The connection of the business park to the railway stations is not sufficient to ensure significant active travel, given the size of the business park and its impact this is the time to integrate it correctly into the active travel network. The claimed 4 minute walk to the P&R is simply not possible due to a lack of paths and crossings at the roundabout on the A41. Improved infrastructure is required to ensure that active travel is possible from these main hubs. There is no link to the Graven Hill or Kingsmere developments by active travel modes, this needs to be addressed to avoid unnecessary car travel to the business park and is indicative of the general lack of provision in the current plans for active travel.
2. Poor cycling provision along NCN51/Wendlebury Road The development encompasses a significant section of NCN51 along Wendlebury road. The plans claim to improve the cycling provision but in fact make break up the flow of cycle traffic with the side roads but providing only a mixed use path without priority (a requirement of OCC Guidelines). BicesterBUG believes that the current plans will seriously impact the flow for cycling along this route and will decrease its use for cycling.
3. Insufficient cycle parking provision
The proposals list 250 car parking spaces and only 20 cycle spaces, this shows insufficient ambition regarding active travel and may contravene the OCC guidelines of 1 space per 150m²
4. New roundabout should provide a protected cycle lane Given the additional car and HGV traffic (quoted as being 600-1800 cars per hour and 1000-3000 HGVs per day) then a segregated cycle path with priority over the adjoining roads in a 'dutch style' roundabout should be considered. BicesterBUG rejects the claim that the traffic level is below a supposed 'intimidation threshold'.
5. Additional access ways for cycling and walking could be provided Current plans show an access way to the leisure centre for all at the same point, this makes an unnecessary long route from some directions (e.g. the south and west). Additional access should be provided to ensure active travel is not hindered. A similar 'multi access for active travel' approach should be taken across the development.

Case Officer:
Clare O'Neil; Hanlon

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail (and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..