

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

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 15/01777/REM-2

**Proposal:** All Reserved Matters relating to 05/01337/OUT - Parcels D/E for 116 dwellings

**Location:** Longford Park Parcel D And E Phase 3 Longford Park Road Bodicote

---

## **Purpose of document**

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

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

**Officer's Name:** David Flavin

**Officer's Title:** Senior Planning Officer

**Date:** 22 August 2016

---

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 15/01777/REM-2

**Proposal:** All Reserved Matters relating to 05/01337/OUT - Parcels D/E for 116 dwellings

**Location:** Longford Park Parcel D And E Phase 3 Longford Park Road Bodicote

---

## **Transport**

### **Recommendation:**

Objection

The plans do not show the location of the bus stops, which is a requirement of the reserved matters application, to ensure an adequate and safe bus route, which allows a bus to stop safely.

There is an inadequate amount of visitor parking.

Vision splays must be drawn onto the site plan.

### **Key issues:**

- Bus stops are not shown on the site layout plan and must be added.
- There is an inadequate amount of visitor parking spaces within the site, which must be addressed to ensure that cars are not parked in inappropriate places, potentially restricting the flow of traffic.
- Visibility splays must be drawn onto the site layout plan that demonstrate a 2.4m x 25m splay is achievable from the side roads out onto the spine road
- The positioning of rear accesses should be marked on the site layout plan, to ensure ease of movement between parking areas and dwellings.
- The link between the spine road footway and shared surface needs to be clarified.
- Service strips are required along some drives, for maintenance work.
- There are many issues with the layout, such as trees at the end of footways, grass strips in front of parking spaces and actual car parking space layouts to consider making more resident friendly.
- In some places, the potential bin drag distances are too long and clearer details are needed about where residents are expected to store or have their bin collected from.
- Cycle parking provision details are needed to ensure that enough provision is being provided for the flats in the central part of the site.

### **Legal agreement required to secure:**

### **Conditions:**

If Cherwell District Council is minded to grant planning consent, the following conditions are recommended by the county council:

## **Estate Roads, Accesses, Driveways and Turning Areas**

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full specification details of the estate roads, footways/footpaths, vehicular accesses, driveways and turning areas to serve the dwellings, which shall include construction, layout, surfacing, lighting and drainage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings, this infrastructure shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details. *Reason - In the interests of highway safety, to ensure a satisfactory standard of construction and layout for the development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

## **Drainage**

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

- Discharge Rates
- Discharge Volumes
- Maintenance and management of SUDS features (this may be secured by a Section 106 Agreement)
- Sizing of features – attenuation volume
- Infiltration tests to be undertaken in accordance with BRE365
- Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers
- SUDS (list the suds features mentioned within the FRA to ensure they are carried forward into the detailed drainage strategy)
- Network drainage calculations
- Phasing plans
- Flood Risk Assessment

*Reason - To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site in the interests of public health, to avoid flooding of adjacent land and property and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

## **Car Parking**

No dwelling or other buildings shall be occupied or implemented until car parking space(s) to serve them have been provided according to plans showing parking and the necessary manoeuvring and turning to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority. All car parking shall be retained at all times thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by the local planning authority. Car parking shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles at all times thereafter. *Reason - To ensure appropriate levels of car parking are available at all times to serve the development, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

## **Cycle Parking Provision**

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a plan showing the number, location and design of cycle parking for the dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shown on the agreed plan shall be provided for each phase of the development prior to first occupation of that phase of the development. The cycle parking will be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development. *Reason - To ensure appropriate levels of cycle parking are available at all times to serve the development, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

### **Construction traffic management plan**

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details. *Reason - In the interests of highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.*

### **Informatives:**

Prior to the commencement of development, a separate consent must be obtained from Oxfordshire County Council's Road Agreements Team for the proposed main point of access under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980. For guidance and information please contact the County Council's Road Agreements Team on 01865 815700 or email [road.agreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:road.agreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

It is noted that there are a number trees indicated within the scheme located in the highway proposed to be adopted. On this basis we will require the developer to pay a commuted sum towards maintenance of such items that have a higher maintenance cost compared with conventional items at a rate of £1,285 per tree. The commuted sum will generally be secured by way of a section 38 under the Highways Act 1980 (agreement with the county council as Highway Authority) post planning consent.

### **Detailed comments:**

It is assumed that the areas the developer wishes to be adopted correspond to the streets that have had tracking drawings for a refuse wagon submitted. This needs to be borne in mind in reading the following comments. For more details about the requirements for road adoption, I would urge the applicant to please get in touch with the Road Agreements Team on 01865 815700 or [road.agreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:road.agreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk), as there are parts of the layout that would need addressing for OCC to consider adopting the current layout.

Note: We would be looking to adopt visibility splays on roads proposed for adoption.

### ***Speed limit across the site***

Should there be a 20mph speed limit introduced across Longford Park, the developer would need to pay the £2500 fee for the Traffic Regulation Order admin / consultation when it is appropriate for this to be progressed.

### ***Bus stops***

Although not within the red line area of this application site, the bus stops that have been agreed along the spine road under a separate consent should be marked upon the site layout.

I believe that one stop is going to be placed to the front of plot 107, but this should be marked onto the plans, as well as the stops on the other side of the carriageway.

The pedestrian/cycle route leading from the south of the site is welcomed, as it will link the residents up to the bus stops near to Broad Gap too.

### ***Car parking***

Overall there are just about the right numbers of allocated car parking spaces for residents although, there is an over reliance on the use of rear parking courts across the whole site.

This is likely to result in residents and visitors parking informally in front of properties, including on landscaped areas, partially obstructing footways or overly narrowing the roadway. This would be to the detriment of the overall quality of the environment, to free pedestrian movement as well as the smooth passage of larger vehicles such as refuse wagons. You may see residents choosing to park in visitors spaces, leaving the parking court spaces vacant.

I have counted only 6 visitor parking spaces within the site, which is not including those on the spine road outside of the red line. This represents a huge under provision, if you compare it to the 45 spaces, which is what the OCC Residential Design Guide outlines for the number of visitor spaces, based on the dwelling sizes within the site.

There are opportunities to include more visitors spaces in a few areas, namely opposite plot 51 for example. The developer should consider the plans and ensure that more provision is made to reduce actual 'on street' parking, which will interfere with refuse vehicles and the general flow of traffic through the site.

### ***Shared surface***

The developer should supply more clarification about the way the footway from the spine road will connect into the shared surface of the side streets. Levels and surface finishes need to be clarified, so that pedestrians have ease of movement through this section.

We would require a 25mm edging along the edge of the shared surface for adoption.

From an adoption point of view, OCC feel that the quadrilateral features found along the roads for adoption, are not necessary. Are they to serve a purpose or for aesthetics? Are they raised in any way? From a maintenance point of view, we would prefer to see a change in surface or colour, rather than to have the four sided strip. The developer should send in further details of these areas for us to consider.

### ***Service strips***

A service strip is required along both sides of the drive between plots 79 and 75-78, to ensure there is adequate space to accommodate utilities.

I am not certain whether the drive up to plot 17 is going to be adopted, however, it is usual practice to place service strips along parts of a development like this, given that plots' frontages come right up to the drive. If we are to adopt this drive, we would need to see tracking for the refuse vehicle and a turning head at the top of the drive for manoeuvring of the vehicle.

### ***Layout***

There are a few issues with the layout that I feel need to be addressed, in order to benefit the development and the amenity value for the residents who go on to occupy it.

- The current layout plan should include the position of all rear accesses into each plot, to ensure that residents have easy access between their parking spaces and their properties. It is not exactly clear where some of the rear accesses will be.
- There is a tree positioned at the end of the footway linking the rear with the frontages between plots 40 and 41. The footway does not appear to reach the footway along the spine road, but would involve pedestrians walking onto the grass.

- There is an area of grass in front of the spaces allocated to plots 19 and 18, which should be an area of hardstanding, to prevent churning up of the grass and mud being transferred onto the carriageway.
- The developer should consider the allocation of the car parking for plots 73 and 71, which would benefit from being swapped over, given the accesses to the plots.
- For some plots, it is a very long drive around to reach their allocated parking spaces (plots 6/7 and 110-13, for example), which could potentially see residents parking on the road adjacent to the frontage of their property.
- Plot 8 has a long walk to reach their rear access, when there could be a footway positioned along more of the desire line that a pedestrian might walk along, running alongside the garage.
- Plot 11 does not appear to have any place where rear access could be taken from, due to the alignment of the fence, unless it is proposed to have a rear door on the garage?
- Plot 34 has a long way around to reach their parking in the rear court, when compared to other neighbouring plots.
- Why can't the footway that runs to the rear of plot 17, continue behind plot 18, so that plot 19 has a rear access point?
- The parking for plot 116 should be considered, as I feel that it could be positioned adjacent to the plot, as opposed to adjacent to plot 97 round the bend.
- Some plots seem to have a very tight space to access their rear accesses, once a parked vehicle was in situ. Plot 89, may well have to push past the parked vehicles of plot 90, which could cause some conflict. Plots 69, 72 and 73, seem to have the same problem and the layout should be reconfigured, so that residents have the space to move around parked vehicles, without having to squeeze up against fences.

### ***Visibility splays***

The visibility splays at the junctions with the spine road, should be detailed on the site layout plans. These should show that a 2.4m x 25m visibility splay is achievable in both directions, which is conducive to a 20mph speed limit along this road.

### ***Vehicle tracking***

A refuse vehicle of 12m in length has been tracked along what I presume are to be the adoptable roads within the development. As expected, its swept path is quite tight around the southern corners of the side roads, where it very much runs over onto the opposite side of the road. Whilst I recognise that the occurrence of a refuse vehicle and a car meeting on these corners is low, I would still recommend that a condition be attached to any approval that protects the forward visibility around these bends, by restricting boundary walls and fences over 0.6m in height.

This is indeed important for the meeting of two cars around these bends, which is likely to occur far more often.

### ***Bin drag distances***

The refuse tracking shows the refuse vehicle making a loop around the two side roads that come off the spine road. This means that residents would need to drag their bins over large distances, in order to reach the route of the refuse vehicle.

For example, plots 6 and 7 could potentially have to drag their bins up to 95m to reach the side road. Guidance states that residents should not have to drag their bins more than 25m and refuse operatives, not more than 30m. Are residents going to be required to place their bins along the spine road?

More details need to be submitted about bin storage/collection points for the whole site, especially, the more isolated plots.

***Cycle parking***

More details of the cycle parking that will serve the 12 flats should be submitted for approval. Our guidance specifies that there should be one cycle space per bed and therefore, for the 12 x 2 bed units, a total of 24 spaces (12 Sheffield stands) are required. Provision should also be made for visitors cycle parking, which would mean a further 6 stands (one stand per 2 units). In total this makes 18 stands/36 spaces.

***Drainage***

A surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development should be submitted for approval.

**Officer's Name: Kt Hamer**

**Officer's Title: Transport Planner**

**Date: 19 August 2016**

---