Comment for planning application 20/00293/OUT

Application Number 20/00293/OUT

Location

Bicester Gateway Business Park Wendlebury Road Chesterton

Proposal

Outline application (Phase 1B) including access (all other matters reserved) for approximately 4,413 sqm B1 office space (47,502 sqft) GIA, approximately 273 residential units (Use Class C3) including ancillary gym, approximately 177 sqm GIA of café space (Use Class A3), with an ancillary, mixed use co-working hub (794 sqm/ 8,550 sqft GIA), multistorey car park, multi-use games area (MUGA), amenity space, associated infrastructure, parking and marketing boards

Case Officer

Caroline Ford

Organisation

Name

Address

Type of Comment

Type

Comments

Jane Burrett

The Laurels, Main Street, Wendlebury, Bicester, OX25 2PJ

Comment

neighbour

As a frequent user of the Wendlebury Road in order to access Bicester via Charles Shouler Way and the Vendee Drive Roundabout I make the following comments. 1. The 273 proposed residential units on an area previously categorised in the local plan as commercial will generate a lot more traffic movements onto the Wendlebury Road than purely commercial buildings users. The arguments put forward by the applicant are that the small flats will help to contribute to the housing need of Oxford City and be used by an educated demographic who will commute. What about the need for affordable housing? Why should 273 units be jammed into this small area with roads on all 4 sides? Why is there no parking for some of them? 2. TRAFFIC: Between the access from Chesterton to the Wendlebury Road and the proposed mini roundabout to access Charles Shouler Way proposed site would have TWO splayed entrances. The drainage ditches on either side of the Wendlebury Road are essential to avoid flooding across the single carriageway, before the proposed development. Thus, how will the increased traffic movements be accommodated without frequent jams? The Vendee Drive roundabout (VDR) is already a problem. I read that the Accident Traffic Analysis data on the A41 from J9 M40 to the VDR is taken from 01/01/2001 to 31/08/2016 data. It is 2020 now and there have been more accidents in the last 5+ years including 2 fatalities at the VD roundabout. 3. FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT & DRAINAGE supporting document: on page 15/97 the list of proposed structures on the site DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY REFERENCE TO 273 residential units. viz.: "4.1 The proposals include the construction of a commercial development to include the following: - 6 commercial office blocks, Covered Car Park, Car parking and site roadways, Multi-Use Sports Area, Footpaths and Paved Areas, Street Furniture, Landscaping." I thought that flood risk assessment and drainage for residential units is different from that for commercial buildings. Am I incorrect? The supporting document mentions the need to raise the land of the site and to introduce 'a package pumping station for drainage' to control the rate of discharge from the site. This is in relation to Page 18/97 5.2.6.2 because usual sewers and man holes cannot be used to drain the area arising from archaeological factors on the site. 4. THAMES WATER supporting document has WATER COMMENTS which refer to the possibility of 'no/low water pressure' available in the proposed buildings and a firm request to the planning authority to consult further with Thames Water should CDC be minded to give approval. Fresh water supply and foul water treatment considerations for this proposed development merit serious consideration. Thank you

Received Date

29/04/2020 12:40:18

Attachments