

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01394/F

Proposal: Erection of 32 dwellings and associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure

Location: Land East Of Heyford Leys And Blds 400 500 And 400 To 410 UH12 And UH13
Camp Road Upper Heyford

This report sets out Oxfordshire County Council's view on the proposal.

Annexes to the report contain officer advice and the comments of local members.

Overall view of Oxfordshire County Council:-

- No overall comment – see professional comments in the annexes

Comments:

The county council considers this application to fall within the previously permitted development at Upper Heyford i.e. it is a Qualifying Development falling within the Site as defined in Appendix 7 of extant agreement UH08 dated 22 December 2011. Subject to confirmation of this by Cherwell District Council, the development should therefore comply with the terms of the extant agreements in terms of delivering works and/or payments of contributions.

Officer's Name: Daniel Round

Officer's Title: Locality Manager – Bicester/Banbury

Date: 08 October 2013

ANNEX 1
OFFICER ADVICE

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01394/F

Proposal: Erection of 32 dwellings and associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure

Location: Land East Of Heyford Leys And Blds 400 500 And 400 To 410 UH12 And UH13
Camp Road Upper Heyford

TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Recommendation

- Holding objection pending the receipt of further information from the applicant

Key issues:

- The application proposes 32 new dwellings at Heyford Park, which come under the scope of “Qualifying Applications” as defined in the extant Heyford Park S106 agreement dated 22 December 2011 (i.e. UH 08).
- It is appropriate to draw the applicant’s attention to the following requirements in this S106 Agreement, the first of which will be triggered by this development:
 - The Landowner shall not Start Construction until there have been submitted to the County Council and approved in writing by it: in principle drawings of the Camp Road Works, the Chilgrove Drive Works and the Middleton Stoney Works, and plans identifying the land to be dedicated as being highway (if any) in respect of such works and title to the freehold of and to all other interests in such land have been produced to the satisfaction to the County Council.
 - The Landowner shall not Occupy the 416th Dwelling or 100th New Build Dwelling (whichever is the earlier) until all the Camp Road Works have been completed in accordance with the Highways Agreement.
- The application proposes ten new vehicular accesses onto Camp Road, however some of these are too close to junctions on the opposite side of the road, i.e. the access to the Free School and the approved HGV route access. The spacing of any new junctions onto the public highway must accord with standards set out in Oxfordshire County Council’s Residential Road Design Guide.
- Some of the proposed parking spaces on the submitted layout are quite restricted and do not provide the required 6m parking spaces in front of garages and 6m reversing space. This is likely to lead to overrunning of verges or overspill parking which may have highway safety implications, particularly in proximity to the classified road (Camp Road) and the nearby Free School.
- Visitor parking spaces are not clearly defined/ shown on plans, which again is likely to lead to indiscriminate or overspill parking in the vicinity and potential highway safety issues.

- Tracking of refuse vehicles within the proposed development is not clearly demonstrated on an appropriately scaled plan and appears impractical. This information must be revised and submitted on a larger scale plan. The proposed estate layout may need to be subsequently amended.
- The number of parking spaces indicated on plans (75 spaces) does not match that on application form (95 spaces). The proposed car parking levels do not meet the necessary standards. Such an under-provision of car parking is likely to lead to overspill parking and subsequent highway safety and maintenance issues in the vicinity.
- Details of visibility splays at the new access points onto the highway have not been demonstrated on plans, and safe highway accesses have not therefore been confirmed.
- Revised information is requested to address the above concerns.

Officer's Name: Judy Kelly
Officer's Title: Senior Engineer
Date: 07 October 2013

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01394/F

Proposal: Erection of 32 dwellings and associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure

Location: Land East Of Heyford Leys And Blds 400 500 And 400 To 410 UH12 And UH13
Camp Road Upper Heyford

DRAINAGE

Recommendation

- No objection subject to the following conditions, legal agreement and informatives

Key issues:

- No drainage design.
-

Legal Agreement required to secure:

-

Conditions:

- Full drainage design and calculations will be required for checking by the Lead Flood Authority (OCC) prior to the development commencing.
-

Informatives:

- The developer needs take account of the requirements of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010
-

Detailed Comments:

The application will need to have a full drainage design and show by calculation that there will be no flood risk to the development or surrounding land.

Officer's Name: Gordon Kelman

Officer's Title: Senior Drainage Engineer

Date: 17 September 2013

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01394/F

Proposal: Erection of 32 dwellings and associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure

Location: Land East Of Heyford Leys And Blds 400 500 And 400 To 410 UH12 And UH13
Camp Road Upper Heyford

ARCHAEOLOGY

Recommendation

- No objection

Key issues:

- None

Legal Agreement required to secure:

- None

Conditions:

- None

Informatives:

- None

Detailed Comments:

The proposals outlined in in the proposal would not appear to have an invasive impact upon any known archaeological sites or features. As such there are no archaeological constraints to this scheme.

Officer's Name: Richard Oram

Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist

Date: 23 September 2013

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01394/F

Proposal: Erection of 32 dwellings and associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure

Location: Land East Of Heyford Leys And Blds 400 500 And 400 To 410 UH12 And UH13
Camp Road Upper Heyford

ECONOMY, SKILLS & TRAINING**Recommendation**

- No objection

Key issues:

-

Legal Agreement required to secure:

-

Conditions:

-

Informatives:

-

Detailed Comments:

None

Officer's Name: Dawn Pettis

Officer's Title: Economic Development Strategy Officer

Date: 01 October 2013

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 13/01394/F

Proposal: Erection of 32 dwellings and associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure

Location: Land East Of Heyford Leys And Blds 400 500 And 400 To 410 UH12 And UH13
Camp Road Upper Heyford

MINERALS & WASTE POLICY

Recommendation

- No objection

Key issues:

- The proposed development would sterilise deposits of limestone and therefore needs to be considered against Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan policy SD10 but in view of constraints on the possible working of these deposits it is unlikely that they constitute a potentially workable mineral resource such as to justify safeguarding against built development.
-

Legal Agreement required to secure:

-

Conditions:

-

Informatives:

-

Detailed Comments:

Published BGS mapping shows the application site to be underlain by deposits of limestone, which form part of an extensive outcrop of this mineral in this part of Cherwell District to the east of the River Cherwell valley. This limestone is currently worked at Dewars Farm (Ardley) Quarry to the east.

The proposed development needs to be considered against saved Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan policy SD10 on protection of mineral resources. This policy dates from 1996 but it is consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 143, bullet 3). Under policy SD10, development which would sterilise the mineral deposits within this site should not be permitted unless it can be shown that the need for the development outweighs the economic and sustainability considerations relating to the mineral resource.

The application site is bounded to the west, north and east by existing development at Upper Heyford. The need for unworked margins (buffer zones) between this existing development and any mineral working would be likely to rule out any extraction taking place within this site and therefore it is unlikely that these limestone deposits would constitute a workable mineral resource. The development of this site for housing would not significantly increase the effective sterilisation of limestone deposits within the land to the south of the site through the need for an additional buffer zone because of the buffer zones that would already be required for the existing development. Therefore, I consider there to be insufficient justification for these mineral deposits to be safeguarded from built development and, accordingly, no objection should be raised to this planning application on minerals policy grounds.

There are no significant waste planning issues relating to this application.

Officer's Name: Peter Day

Officer's Title: Minerals & Waste Policy Team Leader

Date: 19 September 2013
