

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

From: [planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk) <[planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk)>

Sent: Sunday, October 6, 2019 5:06 PM

To: Planning <[Planning@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto: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 Monica Mehers

Address:

2 Queens Court, Bicester, OX26 6JX

Comment type:

Objection

Comments:

1 There is an absence of suitable connections from the business park to stations.

From the Business Park to the railway stations there is an insufficient network to ensure easy active travel, taking into account the size of the Business Park and its impact. Now is the time to integrate easy active travel for all. 4 minutes to the P&R is impossible because of the lack of paths and pedestrian light crossings. Much improved infrastructure is needed to guarantee active travel from between these hubs. Graven Hill and Kingsmere have no active travel link to the Business Park and this needs sorting before development continues. Overall there is a lack of active travel in the current plans.

## 2 POOR CYCLING PROVISION ALONG NCN51/WENDLEBURY RD

The Business Park development encompasses a long section of NCN51 along Wendlebury Rd. The plans claim to improve cycling provision but in fact break up the flow of cycle traffic with the side roads by providing a mixed use path with no priority (a requirement of OCC guidelines). Bicester Social Cycling believes the current flow for cycling on this route will decrease the use and effectiveness for cycling.

## 3 INSUFFICIENT CYCLE PARKING PROVISION

250 car parking spaces have been allocated but only 20 cycle spaces, this indicates insufficient ambition towards Active Travel and could well contravene the OCC guidelines of 1 space per 150m<sup>2</sup>.

## 4 NEW ROUNDABOUT SHOULD PROVIDE A PROTECTED CYCLE LANE.

In line with the additional car and HGV Traffic (quoted as being 600-1800 cars/hr and 1000-3000HGV's per day) then a segregated cycle path with priority over adjoining roads in a 'dutch style' roundabout not only should be considered but should be of paramount importance. Bicester Social Cycling along with BicesterBUG reject 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 unnecessarily 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.

Relevant links from the APPLICATION:

Site Overview

Foot/cycle path enhancement

Detail of the new roundabout:

Vehicle tracking

Design and Access statement

Details of Transport Plan

Sorry I am unable to upload the links.

Overall Looking at the Design and Access Statement, it talks about "a knowledge based, high tech companies to locate within an accessible and highly sustainable multi-use site....situated within the Oxford Cambridge corridor..... provision and encouragement for sustainable travel options as the preferred modes of transport rather than the private car"

That should, at the very least, mean a continuous, high quality cycle route from the development to Bicester Village station and any development should improve that - rather than making it worse as per recent development, It's reasonable for a large development like this to contribute to improvements outside the site envelope via Community Infrastructure Levy. The draft plans seem to exacerbate the "bitty" provision on this section of the NCN51. Cyclists are continually changing between shared-use and on carriageway provision at difficult and slow crossings.

At a minimum there should be a continuous path, ideally on the east side of Wendlebury Road, from well before the start of the site and as far as the cycle path approaching Tesco. This should be clearly marked with priority over side roads. The current Bicester Avenue turn is an example of how NOT to do it and could be addressed as part of this.

Yours sincerely

Monica Mehers

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..

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..