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

District: Cherwell

Application No: 20/03702/REM-2

**Proposal:** Reserved Matters to 14/01932/OUT: Spine Road including landscaping and associated infrastructure.

Location: OS Parcel 7400 Adjoining and South Of, Salt Way, Banbury

Response date: 19th May 2021

This report sets out the officer views of Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) on the above proposal. These are set out by individual service area/technical discipline and include details of any planning conditions or informatives that should be attached in the event that permission is granted and any obligations to be secured by way of a S106 agreement. Where considered appropriate, an overarching strategic commentary is also included. If the local County Council member has provided comments on the application these are provided as a separate attachment.

## Transport Development Control – Revised response

### **Recommendation:**

Objection

There are various design points that need addressing at planning stage.

### Comments;

This is a reserved matters application for the detail of the spine road through the Wykham Park Farm development. The road will connect to the spine road in the adjacent development to the east, forming a continuous route between White Post Road and Bloxham Road, as required by the S106 agreement relating to the outline planning permission.

Overall I am satisfied that the design represents a good balance between the aim for a road that can operate effectively as a bus route and to distribute traffic locally, and one that, subject to S38 technical audit, is suitable and safe to be a spine road through the heart a residential development.

However, we note representations from Stagecoach, who have asked that the bus stops at the local centre are in pull-ins (like the one at the western end of the road) due to possible waiting time leading to dangerous manoeuvres by drivers of other vehicles. We request that this change is made.

Also relating to bus stops, the dimensions of the shelters likely to be provided are  $4.5m \ge 1.5m$ . The hardstanding area should therefore be increased to  $5 \ge 2m$  to allow for this. Additionally, the footway connecting the easternmost bus stop to the footway/cycleway should be a minimum of 4m wide.

The applicant has supplied a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response to the issues raised. Some of the issues relate to an ancillary road which is the subject of a separate planning application. Taking the issues that apply to this application, we agree with the Designer's response except on the following points:

3.3 – dropped kerbs for cyclists to access the shared use cycleway from the carriageway. Whilst we agree with the principle, the geometry is too severe and the cycle access points need to be tapered.

3.7 – we agree with the response, but this point will be monitored through the further Road Safety Audit stages as part of the S38 technical approvals.

Additional points:

- Equestrian 'holding areas' should be provided behind the footway/cycleway at the bridleway crossings. Further detail is required.
- The parallel crossing south of the roundabout should be moved slightly closer to the roundabout to be closer to the designer line – there is less chance of waiting vehicles on this arm blocking the circulatory, than on the spine road arms.
- The pedestrian refuges should be widened slightly to 2.4m (though not at the expense of the carriageway width). This is to allow sufficient space for people pushing buggies, wheelchairs and bicycles.
- The swept path analysis for large vehicles passing one another is extremely tight at some points, particularly around the curves at the eastern end of the road. The carriageway should be widened slightly to avoid the chance of vehicles having to slow to a crawl to pass one another safely.
- There will need to be additional informal tactile crossing points at the eastern end of the road.

### Advice from Road Agreements Team:

- A long section indicating the vertical alignment will be required to determine appropriate carriageway and footway gradients. They will need to be DDA compliant i.e. maximum 1:20 or 5%.
- Any vertical deflection along bus route to be subject to agreement with Bus operators (table tops etc.).
- No private drainage is to discharge onto any area of existing or proposed adoptable highway. The drainage proposals will be agreed at the Section 38 Agreement stage once the drainage calculations and detailed design are presented.
- Foul and surface water manholes should not be placed within the middle of the carriageway, at junctions, tyre tracks and where informal crossing points are located.
- Trees must not conflict with streetlights and must be a minimum 10 metres away and a minimum 1.5m from the carriageway. Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection. Given the number of trees indicated it would be helpful that the proposed street lighting is provided as trees will have to be located at least 10 metres away to ensure the streetlights can perform effectively.
- Trees within the highway will need to be approved by OCC and will carry a commuted sum. No private planting to overhang or encroach the proposed adoptable areas.
- No property should be within 500mm to the proposed highway. No doors, gates, windows, garages or gas/electric cupboards should open onto the proposed highway.
- No Highway materials, construction methods, adoptable layouts and technical details have been approved at this stage. The detailed design and acceptable adoption standards will be subject to a full technical audit.

• OCC require saturated CBR laboratory tests on the sub-soil likely to be used as the sub-formation layer. This would be best done alongside the main ground investigation for the site but the location of the samples must relate to the proposed location of the carriageway/footway.

Officer's Name: Joy White Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner Date: 19 May 2021 **Application No: 20/03702/REM-2 Location:** OS Parcel 7400 Adjoining And South Of, Salt Way, Banbury

## <u>Drainage</u>

### **Recommendation:**

Objection

### **Detailed comments:**

The LLFA believe the drainage strategy proposed in not in full compliance with Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage on Major Development in Oxfordshire.

With the scale of site, LLFA believe more SuDS can be implemented at source adjacent to the carriageway. The width of carriageway proposed has more than enough capacity to accommodate SuDS such as filter drain and swales.

Officer's Name: Sujeenthan Jeevarangan Officer's Title: LLFA Planning Engineer Date: 23 February 2021

# **Archaeology**

## **Recommendation:**

No objection

### Key issues:

Permission **14/01932/OUT** has been granted with conditions attached that require a phase of archaeological mitigation in advance of development.

As such there is no necessity to attach further requirements at this reserved matters stage.

### Legal agreement required to secure:

## **Conditions:**

### Informatives:

### **Detailed comments:**

Permission **14/01932/OUT** has been granted with conditions attached that require a phase of archaeological mitigation in advance of development.

As such there is no necessity to attach further requirements at this reserved matters stage.

Officer's Name: Richard Oram Officer's Title: Lead Archaeologist Date: 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021