

Simon Newall

From: Tom Darwall-Smith <Tom@maddoxassociates.co.uk>
Sent: 25 October 2022 15:35
To: Simon Newall; Nichols, Chris - Oxfordshire County Council
Cc: Caroline Ford; Alex Chrusciak; Simon Newall
Subject: Re: 22/02025/REM - Bicester Gateway Phase 1B - RM - PPA

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chris

Thank you for getting in touch yesterday in regard to the final OCC highways objections. I copy Simon Newall for reference.

In relation to the item on the suggested Wendelbury Road cycle way extension, you have asked for a short note on our position. I set out the key points below:

1. We advise that the requested further cycle land works would not stand as a legitimate objection;
2. We ask highway officers to refer to Bicester Policy 10 and all the exchanges with the County during the consideration of the outline application;
3. It is clear, including from BP10 (bullet quoted below), that the main access to, and through, the site allocation for cycles was intended (by policy) to come from the A41. That is what we are proposing and is secured by S106 legal agreement in the outline consent;
4. There is no policy case for an extended cycle lane along the section of road in question;
5. There is no case by the approved outline consent ref: 16-02586-OUT, to provide an extended cycle lane;
6. Comments in the application ref: 16-02586-OUT from Transport officer, Joy White, dated 10 Feb 2017:
 1. Have explicit regard to BP10 bullet on A41 upgrade. Comments from officers on the current submission do not acknowledge this is the policy basis for these proposed upgrades;
 2. Identified no requirement for Wendelbury Road upgrade to segregate a cycle way. However, road safety enhancements were agreed, via a speed reduction from 60 mph to 30 mph on Wendelbury Road. This is paid for by the applicant. Currently officers do not acknowledge this;
7. The lack of any policy basis, the absence of this being identified as necessary at the outline stage, the omission from current comments on what has been agreed between OCC and the applicant before, and the delivery of significant other highways and cycle way upgrades and commitments that have arisen from those agreements, mean the current objection remains invalid,
8. A Road Safety Audit of the RM proposals, including the proposed new access on Wendlebury Road and the proposed improved shared footway/cycleway along the A41 frontage of the Phase 1b site, has been carried out. Any 'issues identified in the RSA can be addressed fully by the applicant as set out in the RSA Designer's Response. No cycle safety issues are raised in relation to Wendelbury Road, and;
9. Lastly, if these works were so important, why were they not a requirement of the Catalyst consent?

Policy Bicester 10

"Provision for safe pedestrian and cyclist access from the A41 including facilitating the provision and upgrading of footpaths and cycleways that link with existing networks to improve connectivity generally, to maximise walking and cycling links between this site and nearby development sites and the town centre".

Please do not hesitate to get in touch directly if you have any comments or queries.

Kind regards

Tom

Tom Darwall-Smith
Consultant

MADDOX PLANNING

0345 121 1706 | 07749 369 103

tom@maddoxassociates.co.uk | www.maddoxplanning.com

33 Broadwick Street, London, W1F 0DQ

Beehive Mill, Jersey Street, Manchester M4 6JG



This transmission contains information that may be confidential. It is intended for the named addressee only. Unless you are the named addressee you may not copy or use it or disclose it to anyone else. We cannot accept any liability for any loss or damage sustained as a result of software viruses and would advise that you carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Maddox & Associates Ltd Registered in England no. 6375151 Registered Office: Heathmans House, 19 Heathmans Road, London, SW6 4TJ