

Chris Wentworth
Principal Planner Major Projects (North)
Development Management Division
Communities Directorate
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Banbury
OX15 4AA

Garden Court
Harry Weston Road
Binley Business Park
Coventry CV3 2SU

Tel: 024 7643 8000
Fax: 024 7643 8299

BY EMAIL
2nd June 2023

Dear Chris,

Reserved Matters Application Reference: 23/00667/REM

Site: OS Parcel 6372 South East of milestone Farm, Broughton Road, Banbury

Proposal: Reserved matters application, pursuant to the outline planning permission granted under reference 21/03644/OUT for the erection of up to 49 dwellings.

I refer to the latest comments received from Oxfordshire County Council's (OCC) Transport Planner dated 29th June 2023 in response to the detailed design and hereby provide further comments on behalf of Orbit Homes.

The OCC officer has continued to raise an objection on the grounds that the proposal still does not comply with OCC's residential parking standards. These require one off-street parking space for dwellings comprising one and two bedrooms. The proposal provides two off-street spaces for all two-bedroom dwellings, and this is fully justified.

As I mentioned in my covering letter of 2nd June 2023, the rationale behind OCC's revised parking standards is understood however, I would question whether it is appropriate for the standards set out in Table 4(a) to be applied as these relate to sites within 'town' locations.

It is not clear from Cherwell's interactive proposals map where Banbury's development boundary ends but it could be argued that the site falls outside of this in which case it would be more appropriate to apply the standards set out in Table 4(b).

I think we can agree that the site sits somewhere in the middle and rather than spend time debating whether it should be classed as either 'town' or 'country' for the purposes of the parking standards, it would be better for us to take a more flexible approach.

In doing so, I would add that this is an affordable housing scheme, and the two-bedroom dwellings are designed to be occupied by three and four persons. It is highly likely that some of these dwellings will, at some point in time, be occupied by families with more than one car.

We have considered the opportunity to reduce the number of off-street spaces for these dwellings but, in Orbit's experience, providing one off-street space will only increase demand for on-street parking. Not only does this tend to give rise to neighbour disputes and subsequent management issues but, it will also impact on highway safety and the

appearance of the streetscene. This would conflict with Orbit's place making policies and vision for the site.

Without wanting to lean too heavily on the scheme approved on the adjacent Phase I land, as every application needs to be assessed on its own merits, I note that OCC raised no objection to the provision of two off-street spaces for the two-bedroom dwellings for this scheme, despite the current parking standards being extant at the time of the decision. The sites are obviously similar and there is nothing that has been put forward by OCC that would justify a different conclusion from being reached with this application.

In terms of the comments relating to Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure, we would contend that the provision of four points would be excessive for a scheme of this size and bearing in mind that Condition 14 of the outline permission requires ducting to be provided to allow for the future installation of on-plot charging points.

The on-street EV points will therefore most likely result in an increase in members of the public entering the site to charge vehicles and there is a concern that this would give rise to management and highway issues, particularly as the scheme is designed as a large cul-de-sac.

On the basis that there was no requirement to provide any on-street EV points within the adjoining Phase I scheme, it is considered that the provision of two points on the site is more than a reasonable compromise.

Finally, in response to the comments on cycle storage, it is contended that the provision of sheds comprising Sheffield standards to accommodate two bicycles, is more than sufficient to meet the needs of future occupiers and fully accords with OCC's standards. This is Orbit's preferred storage solution and one that works well on many other residential sites that it owns and manages. I hasten to add that sheds were approved under the Phase I scheme and so it must follow that they are acceptable for this scheme.

I hope that you can accept the points made to address the latest transport comments and in doing so you can now proceed to determine the application without further delay and without the need to reconsult with the relevant OCC officer whom, despite having raised an objection, has helpfully set out conditions should you be minded to approve the application.

If you would like to discuss any of the points further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Matthew Druce
Consultant Planning Manager
Orbit Homes Midlands