

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 16/00627/REM

Proposal: Reserved Matters to 13/01811/OUT - Erection of 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Location: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596 Dow Street Upper Heyford

Purpose of document

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

This report contains officer advice in the form of technical team responses. Where local members have responded these have been attached by OCCs Major Planning Applications Team (planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk).

Officer's Name: David Flavin

Officer's Title: Senior Planning Officer

Date: 04 May 2016

District: Cherwell

Application no: 16/00627/REM

Proposal: Reserved Matters to 13/01811/OUT - Erection of 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Location: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596 Dow Street Upper Heyford

Transport

Recommendation

Objection

Key issues

- Parking provision is generally adequate.
- Swept path analysis shows overhang on footways and verges.
- A Travel Information Pack will be required.
- Amendments to the road layout are required.
- Further drainage information is required.

Conditions

Prior to first occupation a Travel Information Pack shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The first residents of each dwelling shall be provided with a copy of the approved Travel Information Pack.

Informatives

The Advance Payments Code (APC), Sections 219 -225 of the Highways Act, is in force in the county to ensure financial security from the developer to off-set the frontage owners' liability for private street works, typically in the form of a cash deposit or bond. Should a developer wish for a street or estate to remain private then to secure exemption from the APC procedure a 'Private Road Agreement' must be entered into with the County Council to protect the interests of prospective frontage owners. Alternatively the developer may wish to consider adoption of the estate road under Section 38 of the Highways Act.

Prior to commencement of development, a separate consent must be obtained from OCC Road Agreements Team for the design and layout of roads within the development under S278 of the Highway Act. Contact: 01865 815700; RoadAgreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk.

Detailed comments

Transport Development Control

The level of car parking provision at each dwelling is adequate and acceptable. Garages must have minimum internal dimensions of 3.0m x 6.0m.

The inclusion of garden sheds for cycle parking at dwellings with no garage is welcomed.

The refuse vehicle swept path analysis shows overhang of verges and footways in some locations. This will need to be rectified. **Reason for objection.**

Travel Plans

As there is a site wide travel plan a Travel Plan Statement will not be required. However, a Travel Information Pack will be required in discharge of a condition of planning consent.

Road Agreements

The footpath link opposite plot 288 should be widened to match the required emergency access width of 3.0m and removable bollards should be installed at the location where shared surface commences. **Reason for objection.**

The junction opposite plot 282 should be re-aligned to accommodate refuse vehicles manoeuvring within the carriageway without overhanging footpath and verges. Tracking analysis for refuse vehicles will require re-submission. **Reason for objection.**

As refuse vehicles will be accessing the shared carriageway, the carriageway width of the shared surface should be at least 6.0m wide with a service strip either side to provide a level of safety for pedestrians and parked vehicles. **Reason for objection.**

Drainage

The planning decision notice in respect of 13/01811OUT introduces a number of requirements to be met in terms of design statement for surface water. These include in para 4 iii) of the decision the following requirement.

“Surface water control, including design standards and methodology for sustainable drainage systems, details of specific features, including appropriate options for Sustainable Urban Drainage, swales, together with adoption arrangements and extent.”

Additionally, in the section entitled ‘Planning Notes’ a number of points relating to advice from the EA are referred to such as the need to produce a surface water drainage strategy for the site and include this within the Flood Risk Assessment and address flood risk in exceedance events.

In terms of a sustainable drainage strategy for the site OCC would usually require a spread of soakage and infiltration tests across the whole site at the outline planning stage to inform infiltration potential. Section 3.8 of the Waterman Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) confirms that infiltration should be viable across the site, but observes that localised infiltration tests have not been carried out. These need to be carried out at the site to inform the drainage strategy. Additionally the FRA advises that confirmation of areas of contamination be required and the potential for remediation if required assessed. **Reason for objection.**

The consideration of infiltration should not be allowed to carry through to detailed design stage, as the compliance document suggests in 2.12.1 para 4. Planning law requires SUDS to be properly planned at the onset of planning for a development. **Reason for objection.**

The planning decision notice in 4 iii) included the requirement for 'swales' and details of SUDS specific features to be provided. The compliance note does not provide these details. The SUDS specific features should be described with the aid of drawings. Although in 2.12.3 of the compliance note a swale is mentioned, it is thought this location described relates to the whole site and is not specific to the location covered by the planning application 13/01811OUT. This requires clarification. **Reason for objection.**

Table 1 on page 9 of the FRA points to a range of SUDS techniques that would be applicable, however there is limited carry through of these techniques into the proposals. **Reason for objection.**

In terms of drawings the drainage details supplied are inadequate. Outline SUDS drawings of the proposed system should be supplied. Currently a sketch of what appears to be drains and chambers is seen in the landscape proposals. **Reason for objection.**

In terms of maintenance of SUDS details supplied, these are inadequate. A SUDS management plan for the development should be provided including maintenance plan that would cover the lifespan of the development. **Reason for objection.**

Officer's Name: Chris Nichols

Officer's Title: Transport Development Control

Date: 03 May 2016

District: Cherwell

Application no: 16/00627/REM

Proposal: Reserved Matters to 13/01811/OUT - Erection of 60 dwellings and public open space with associated works

Location: Land And Former Buildings UH11 442 465 466 467 468 470 471 481 492 493 529 593 596 Dow Street Upper Heyford

Ecology

Recommendation:

Key issues:

The District Council should be seeking the advice of their in-house ecologist who can advise them on this application.

In addition, the following guidance document on Biodiversity & Planning in Oxfordshire combines planning policy with information about wildlife sites, habitats and species to help identify where biodiversity should be protected. The guidance also gives advice on opportunities for enhancing biodiversity:

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/planning-and-biodiversity>

Legal agreement required to secure:

N/A - For the District Council to comment

Conditions:

N/A - For the District Council to comment

Informatives:

N/A - For the District Council to comment

Detailed comments:

Officer's Name: Tamsin Atley

Officer's Title: Ecologist Planner

Date: 27 April 2016
