

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

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

Sent: Friday, October 4, 2019 11:56 AM

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 George Bennett

Address:

94 Charlotte Avenue, Bicester, OX27 8AN

Comment type:

Comment

Comments:

Dear Cherwell District Council Planning Committee Members, Re Planning Application:

19/01746/OUT Land Adj To Promised Land Farm Wendlebury Road, Chesterton In my capacity as chair of the Bicester Bike Users Group (BicesterBUG), I am writing to raise my concerns regarding the inadequate provision of active travel network connectivity with regard to the above outline planning application.

As an NHS England 'Healthy New Town', Bicester aims to be an attractive and affordable place for people of all ages to live healthy, sustainable lifestyles, applying a place-based population-wide prevention programme (1). The town is also the location for the first Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) in Oxfordshire; a key Government initiative to provide evidence for prioritised investment in walking and cycling infrastructure provision.(2) Active Travel is supported at County level through LTPs but this focus is not reflected in the proposed connectivity arrangements for this development. The CLP allocation Policy Bicester 10 places several obligations upon local development, including a requirement for 'provision and encouragement for sustainable travel options as the preferred modes of transport rather than the private car'.

In addition, cycling to work is recognised to deliver multiple public health benefits for the mental and physical and health of employees including a 15% in employee's productivity, reduced sickness absence (average 2 days) and improved punctuality (4), the benefits of active travel are already being enjoyed by other business parks in Oxfordshire such as Milton Park, with the employment of Sustainable Transport Advisors to drive the change resulting in increased attractiveness to business tenants. Therefore the active travel mindset should be hardwired into this development.

I therefore object to these existing proposals, in their current form, which are not in alignment with our goals as BicesterBUG to improve cycling provision and levels in the town and with the policy ambitions to achieve seamless active connectivity to transport hubs and housing development sites. Specifically, I wish to raise the following areas of concern on behalf of our members:

1) Proposed connections to Bicester Village and Bicester North stations are inadequate to achieve modal shift to sustainable modes of travel. The Park and Ride side is within close proximity to the proposed business park; yet provision is not been planned for safe, for safe crossings of the A41, which would facilitate access for those of all ages (including those with disabilities). There are no planned links to the Graven Hill or Kingsmere housing developments, representing a lost opportunity to provide safe active travel to employment an amenities offered by the development to local employees and residents.

2) The development includes a significant section of NCN51 along Wendlebury road. The plans claim to improve the cycling provision but indicate only a mixed use path of 2.5 m width without cycle

priority at side junctions; therefore not in accordance with the Cycling Design Standards.(6) We believe this is a significant impediment to the current situation which would result in increased cycling times and discourage active travel along this section.

3) Given the additional car and HGV traffic (quoted as being 600-1800 cars per hour and 1000-3000HGVs 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', new and unsure cyclists would be actively discouraged by the planned changes and increases in traffic from travelling in the area.

4) 250 car parking spaces and only 20 cycle spaces are described, and is likely to contravene the OCC guidelines of 1 space per 150m². We would request that more ambition is shown rather than hitting minimum standards. The security and accessibility of the cycle parking is also a concern.

5) 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.

I therefore hope that you consider the above concerns in your detailed consideration of this outline application.

Yours faithfully George Bennett

Chair of BicesterBUG

03.10.19

1) <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ourwork/innovation/heahy-new-towns/demonstrator-sites/eco-bicester/>

2) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plans-technical-guidance-and-tools>

3) <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-and-transport/connecting-oxfordshire/policy-and-overall-strategy>

4) Celis-Morales et al. British Medical Journal 2017; 357 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j1456> (Published 19 April 2017)

5) Paffenbarger R et al (1986), Physical activity, all-cause mortality and longevity of college alumni. New England Journal of Medicine, vol. 314(10); pp 605-613

6) Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards. <https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/file/oxfordshire-cycling-design-standards>

Case Officer:
Clare O'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..