

**NW BICESTER
25 FEBRUARY 2016 – MEETING NOTE**

Attendees	
Tim Screen (TS)	Cherwell District Council
Rhodri Jones (RJ)	Cherwell District Council
Caroline Ford (CF)	Cherwell District Council
Leanne Turner (LT)	Cherwell District Council
Alex Wilson (AW)	Barton Willmore
Tim Giddy (TG)	A2Dominion
Ashley Coull (AC)	Silver
Daniel Smith (DS)	Silver
Ben Pope (BP)	Arcadis

ITEM	DISCUSSION
1.0	PROGRAMME
1.1	TG provided a programme update. Planning conditions need to be resolved as a matter of urgency as units will be occupied from late March 2016.
2.0	CONDITION 82 (BIRD/ BAT BOXES)
2.1	Eaves details must be present on site to allow for the location of Housemartin boxes. Unfortunately there are no eaves details on site. Boxes cannot be located on residential units. A2Dominion has therefore proposed starling boxes which do not require this level of detail.
2.2	A2Dominion to provide a response statement setting out why it is not possible to provide Housemartin boxes on site. A2Dominion to confirm the number of starling boxes proposed and the general location.
3.0	CONDITION 20 (GREEN ROOFS)
3.1	TS welcomed the sedum and wildflower mix. However, in order for CDC to discharge the condition, Officers require clarification of wildflower/ sedum mix and soil build up. Arcadis to liaise with provider for information.
3.2	It was agreed that no further information on structural integrity was required as this would be signed off under Building Regulations.
3.3	A2Dominion advised CDC that no irrigation would be provided as green roofs were on private properties. The green roofs have, however, been designed so as not to require irrigation. CDC accepted this.
4.0	CONDITION 80 (TREE PITS – INFRASTRUCTURE)
4.1	This condition was originally discharged in relation to the infrastructure phase on 5 th September 2014. The information had to be resubmitted as the tree pit depth has since changed and a recycled resin bound is proposed instead of tree grills.
4.2	RJ advised that 15 cubic metres of soil should be provided per tree. BP advised RJ that the scheme has made allowances for 6 cubic metres of soil per tree. RJ

	<p>advised that this was inadequate. RJ considers there to be too many trees, which are located too close together. CF advised that the tree locations had been agreed through the Section 38 Agreement. Furthermore, CDC has resisted the loss of trees in the infrastructure phase in the past. The number of trees will therefore not change in the infrastructure phase.</p> <p>4.3 Arcadis advised that currently Green Blue Urban Arbosoil soil is proposed. Arcadis to provide specification of soil to RJ for sign off. Specially, RJ requires information on stability and composition. Ideally, CDC requires a compacted/ partially stabilised soil.</p> <p>4.4 BP advised that the scale of tree pit sizes CDC has requested will not fit, when taking into consideration required servicing etc. Root trenches could not be provided due to servicing.</p> <p>4.5 RJ advised that 1m deep tree pits would be sufficient. RJ would welcome soil at a depth of 1200 cm without the clear wash stone layer. It was agreed that BP would remove the clear wash stone layer and show soil throughout.</p> <p>4.6 RJ queried the relationship between tree root barriers and SUDS. BP advised that root barriers are proposed. These are shown on Arcadis plans. CDC accepted this response.</p>
5.0	CONDITIONS 18, 24, 29, 31 AND 33 (INFRASTRUCTURE)
	<p>Primary Road General Arrangement 1 of 6</p> <p>5.1 RJ advised that CDC required 1.8m clearance. RJ requested a mix of tree types along the boulevard. Hornbeam is susceptible to disease, would be problematic for residents and is uninteresting.</p> <p>5.2 TG advised Hornbeam had a lower water requirement. BP advised CDC that Arcadis had used Hornbeam successfully elsewhere. The team expressed concern about late comments on tree species.</p> <p>5.3 The principle of the tree locations/ types has been established in the Section 38 Agreement with Oxfordshire County Council.</p> <p>5.4 RJ advised in that case, he would accept what was proposed, however, would prefer a species mix (thirty percent diversity) and considers the tree type to be the incorrect species.</p> <p>5.5 TS advised he considered the propose ground cover shrubs (Liriope Muscari and Bergenia Cordifolia) would become an eye sore over time. TG advised that A2Dominion would manage and monitor the ground cover shrubs. If amendments are required, these would be undertaken in the future. CDC accepted this. TS reiterated that the ground cover shrubs must have longevity and robustness.</p> <p>Primary Road General Arrangement 2 of 6 and 4 of 6</p> <p>5.6 It was agreed that the same would apply as set out under 'Primary Road General Arrangements 1 of 6' in relation to tree types.</p> <p>In terms of units 320-325, BP advised that root barriers would be in place. RJ/ TS queried the tree type. Arcadis confirmed that these were Franz Fontaine. RJ</p>

<p>5.5</p>	<p>advised that these were unsuitable but as they have been agreed with Oxfordshire County Council, would accept these. RJ advised that all trees should be containerised in the future phases.</p> <p>In relation to ground cover shrubs, again it was agreed that A2Dominion would manage and monitor these. If these are not suitable, they will be amended in the future. CDC accepted this.</p> <p>Farm Crossing/ Allotments General Arrangements</p> <p>5.6 TS confirmed that many of these comments related to area in which design was in abeyance. TG advised that these comments would be picked up in the redesign of phases 3 and 4. Root barriers will be shown for phase 3, once design has been taken forward (note it falls outside the infrastructure phase). TS accepted this.</p> <p>5.7 BP advised that all trees would be planted at least 2 metres from the edge of highways and footways. CDC accepted this.</p> <p>Primary Road Street Position 1 of 4 and 2 of 4</p> <p>5.8 BP confirmed that there was a space of 5 metres between each tree. CDC accepted this.</p> <p>5.9 A2Dominion confirmed that the timber steps would not be handed over for adoption. A2Dominion advised that the steps would remain timber but will be closely monitored. TS accepted this but advised that A2Dominion should look at the longevity of timber materials.</p>
<p>6.0</p>	<p>CONDITIONS 31, 33, 80 (RESIDENTIAL PHASE 1)</p>
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p>	<p>Condition 80 (Tree Pits)</p> <p>RJ requested 10-15 cubic metres of soil bulk per tree. The Council would like the scheme to move away from a monoculture of trees. CDC requested the specific cubic metres of each tree pit. For individual pits, the Council would expect 10-15 cubic metres of soil. For shared tree pits (2 plus), the Council would expect 10 cubic metres of soil. BP queried whether soft pits could utilise existing soil. RJ to confirm CDC position in terms of tree pits in soft areas by Friday 26th February.</p> <p>RJ raised concerned that water would run into tree pits and requested free drainage. TG advised that the drainage strategy allowed for infiltration across the site and would not run into tree pits. A2Dominion will be managing this. RJ accepted this.</p> <p>Condition 31</p> <p>RJ raised concerns over tree diversity and asked that A2Dominion moves away from the native cherry tree, which has many problems associated with it. RJ wants to reduce the number of single tree species as a broad concept and advised that Sorbus Aria were not suitable in residential areas. RJ requested that these be swapped if possible in urban areas.</p> <p>BP queried whether the CDC proposed replacement (Liquidamber Styraciflua) would drop sap and advised the Council it would assess whether this would be a suitable alternative. Arcadis to look at other options with A2Dominion if discussed trees cannot be sourced for planting.</p>

- 6.5 In terms of tree girths, CDC requested a girth of 12-14cm as smaller trees establish better. TG advised that A2Dominion would consider this, however, if trees are already purchased, A2Dominion would not be able to change this. CDC accepted this.
- 6.6 RJ requested that A2Dominion consider purchasing containerised stock for more urban areas. Root balls would be accepted for less urban areas, although not preferable. Arcadis to consider containerised stock/ 12-14cms. A2Dominion to review what has already been purchased.
- 6.7 It was agreed that Arcadis and A2Dominion would look at alternative trees to the south of units in line with RJ's previous comments.
- 6.8 When discussing the three trees south of the community centre, Officers realised that their comments were directed at the wrong area and the trees in question should remain as per the comments in item 5.6.
- 6.9 It was agreed that the double stemmed birch would be reduced to a single stem birch.
- 6.10 In terms of fruit tree stock, RJ requested that more suitable types are selected. Currently, RJ is concerned that proposed stock is too large/ high maintenance. CDC suggested that smaller and easier to manage stock were selected. CDC proposed Amelanchier Lamerkii and Ginko (thirty percent ratio). TG advised that some plots had already been purchased. These changes would impact on the aspect of the units. A2Dominion to discuss internally and advise whether possible to make these amendments. RJ requested that White Beam is removed.
- 6.11 It was agreed that Sorbus Aria at the frontage of plots 329, 330, 337, 338 and 339 would be removed and replaced with Amelanchier Lamarkii.
- 6.12 It was agreed that Acre Campestre 'Streetwise' at the front of plots 340 to 341 would be replaced with a mix of Betula Pendula and Amelanchier Lamarkii.
- 6.13 It was agreed that the Prunus 'Sunburst' south of plot 309 would be substituted for an alternative species (moving away from Prunus). Arcadis and A2Dominion to consider.
- 6.14 RJ advised that he wanted to avoid over shading near parking bays 301-1 and 305-1. He asked that one tree is provided either side (rather than two). RJ suggested Birch in these locations. Arcadis and A2Dominion to consider.
- 6.15 Near parking bays 303-2 and 304-1, RJ requested that the species was swapped to a birch/ keep three in. This applies to the other side also (thirty percent diversity). Arcadis and A2Dominion to consider.
- 6.16 In relation to walls adjacent to lot 371, RJ requested that White Beam is avoided. Something with greater illumination should be provided. Arcadis and A2Dominion to consider.
- Hedges**
- 6.17 It was agreed that Arcadis/ A2Dominion would consider an alternative hedge species near plot 315 (potentially Holly or Hazel).

- 6.18 It was agreed that the Carpinus Betulus hedge to the south of plot 308 would remain double.
 - 6.19 It was agreed that the Carpinus Betulus hedges near building foundations and walls would be switched to an alternative species. A2Dominion and Arcadis to consider.
- Shrubs/ Herbaceous**
- 6.20 A2Dominion advised that they would monitor the Bergenia Cordifolia adjacent to plot 339. If it requires replacing in the future, A2Dominion will pick this up. CDC accepted this.
 - 6.21 Again A2Dominion advised that they would monitor the Bergenia Cordifolia north of plots 304-308 and would replace in the future if necessary. CDC accepted this.
 - 6.22 It was agreed that A2Dominion would monitor and maintain the Laminium Masculatum and Lirope Muscari.
 - 6.23 All specified nursery sizes and planting density details will be provided on construction drawings. CDC accepted this.
- Plot frontages with amenity grass**
- 6.24 A2Dominion advised that an orchard was provided at the south east entrance. On this basis, CDC agreed that no further trees were required near lots 385-393.
- Gabions**
- 6.25 TS raised concerns over the use of gabions in playspaces. A2Dominion agreed to issue the ROSPA report to CDC. A2Dominion will be managing the gabions from a risk perspective. Gabions will be checked regularly. TS accepted this but advised that the gabions would require continued management/ checking.