

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 15/01357/F-2

Proposal: Erection of 77 dwellings, creation of new access from Camp Road, creation of new open space, hard and soft landscaping and ancillary works

Location: Land East Of Larsen Road, 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).

This response relates to the latest submission of a revised layout and supporting information dated April 2017. All comments in OCC's response dated 15 September 2015 continue to apply other than where addressed in officer comments below.

An updated education response will follow.

Officer's Name: David Flavin

Officer's Title: Senior Planning Officer

Date: 01 June 2017

District: Cherwell

Application no: 15/01357/F-2

Proposal: Erection of 77 dwellings, creation of new access from Camp Road, creation of new open space, hard and soft landscaping and ancillary works

Location: Land East Of Larsen Road, Upper Heyford.

Transport

Recommendation

Objection

Key issues

Previous key issues, as set out in the County's response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply except where modified here.

Legal agreement required to secure

Previous agreement requirements, as set out in the County's response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply.

Conditions

Previous conditions, as set out in the County's response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply except where modified here.

Informatives

Previous informatives, as set out in the County's response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply.

Detailed comments

Transport Strategy

Previous Transport Strategy comments, as set out in the County's response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply except where modified here. **Reason for objection.**

Paragraph 4.2.5 of the submitted Planning Statement Addendum (April 2017) notes:

"A key comment received from the Council highlighted a concern that the application was pre-mature, as a masterplan had not been agreed for the wider allocation. This was particularly relevant to transport and contributions required by new development. Despite this the development of the site cannot be pre-mature by virtue of its allocation within the Local Plan Part 1, which sets out no detailed policy indicating the requirement for a masterplan or specific timescales for delivering new development. As set out in the previous paragraph, the mitigation required in respect of transport can be achieved through a Section 106 agreement. The application is therefore compliant with Policy Village 5 that sets out that significant contributions (toward Public Transport etc.) would be required toward the wider allocation."

The County does not agree with this claim, as the site falls under the “areas with potential for additional development identified under Policy Villages 5”. As a result, it must comply with Policy Villages 5 and the “comprehensive approach” required therein, which has yet to be completed. **Reason for objection.**

In addition it is noted that the revised plans propose a “pedestrian footpath and cycle link at the sites frontage that connects to the existing pedestrian routes on Camp Road that provides footpaths into the allocation centre”. It is not clear what this is connecting with at each end. It seems to terminate with a hedge on the east side when it may be that this section is required to connect through to Chilgrove Drive and up to the southern bomb stores.

Transport Development Control

Previous Transport Development Control comments, as set out in the County’s response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply.

It is noted that parking is in accordance with the minimum standards set out in the Heyford Park Design Code. However, this is a minimal provision, and is likely that this level provision will generate on street parking at the development.

Cycle parking provision is noted, although the precise nature of this provision is not stated.

It is noted that the revised plans include an additional secondary access on Camp Road, giving access to units 73 – 77. This therefore means that there are now two additional secondary accesses off Camp Road. The County would reiterate its strong preference to keep the number of access points on Camp Road to a minimum and would prefer these dwellings to be served using the main site access. **Reason for objection.**

Public Transport

Previous Public Transport comments, as set out in the County’s response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply.

Travel Plans

Previous Travel Plans comments, as set out in the County’s response to 15/01357/F of 14 September 2015, still apply.

Road Agreements

If the estate roads are to be adopted then they must be constructed to the standards set out in the Heyford Park Design Code and other standards set out by the County. The detailed design can be under taken as part of the Section 278 process.

Drainage

The scheme generally appears acceptable. However, the following should be noted.

The FRA accompanying this application does not appear to include calculations showing the amount of storage required for the SuDS proposals to cater to the proposed 1 in 100 year storm + Climate Change allowance standard.

Appropriate microdrainage calculations for the SuDS – Soakaways, Pond and Permeable Paving should be provided before the County can recommend that a condition can be applied to any subsequent approval.

The Application does not include a SuDS Maintenance and Management Plan. This can be secured by way of a condition to any subsequent full application approval.

Officer's Name: Chris Nichols

Officer's Title: Transport Development Control

Date: 30 May 2017

District: Cherwell

Application no: 15/01357/F-2

Proposal: Erection of 77 dwellings, creation of new access from Camp Road, creation of new open space, hard and soft landscaping and ancillary works

Location: Land East Of Larsen Road, Upper Heyford.

Archaeology

Recommendation:

No objection

Key issues:

We have previously advised that the results of an archaeological evaluation would need to be submitted along with this planning application, latter dated 7th September 2015. This evaluation has been undertaken in October 2015 and has shown that archaeological deposits do not survive on the site.

No further archaeological investigations will be required on this site but the results of this evaluation will need to be submitted along with the planning application as set out in our earlier response.

Legal agreement required to secure:

None

Conditions:

None

Informatives:

None

Detailed comments:

We have previously advised that the results of an archaeological evaluation would need to be submitted along with this planning application, latter dated 7th September 2015. This evaluation has been undertaken in October 2015 and has shown that archaeological deposits do not survive on the site.

No further archaeological investigations will be required on this site but the results of this evaluation will need to be submitted along with the planning application as set out in our earlier response.

Officer's Name: Richard Oram

Officer's Title: Planning Archaeologist

Date: 19 May 2017

District: Cherwell

Application no: 15/01357/F-2

Proposal: Erection of 77 dwellings, creation of new access from Camp Road, creation of new open space, hard and soft landscaping and ancillary works

Location: Land East Of Larsen Road, Upper Heyford.

Minerals & Waste

Recommendation:

Comments

Key issues:

The application site is to the immediate north of a Strategic Resource Area for crushed rock and therefore the application needs to be considered against Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan policy SD10 and policy M8 of the emerging new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy on safeguarding of mineral resources.

Whilst the application site is adjacent to deposits of crushed rock, the deposits are heavily constrained by adjoining residential development. Therefore, it is unlikely that the application would further constrain practically workable crushed rock deposits.

Therefore no objection should be raised to this application on minerals safeguarding policy grounds.

This application does not raise any significant waste planning issues.

Detailed comments:

The application site is adjacent to land underlain by deposits of crushed rock. It lies immediately adjacent to a mineral safeguarding area to which policy M8 of the submitted Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy, 2015 (as proposed to be modified in the County Council's Proposed Main Modifications to the Core Strategy, February 2017) applies. It is also adjacent to a strategic mineral resource area identified in policy M3 in the submitted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy as a principal location for crushed rock.

Proposals for development that could sterilise significant mineral deposits should 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 saved policy SD10, development which would prejudice the working of mineral deposits 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. Under saved policy SD11, development which is contrary to policy SD10 may be permitted if the mineral deposits are worked prior to the development taking place. Policy M8 on safeguarding mineral resources in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, as proposed to be revised under Main Modification MM27, February 2017, should also be taken into consideration.

The application site lies adjacent to existing development to the south, including the sewage works and caravan park. In view of these existing constraints, it is very unlikely that mineral working would be practically possible to the immediate south of the application site; and the proposed development does not significantly increase the existing constraints on mineral working within land adjacent to the application site due to the need for adequate unworked margins (buffer zones) between existing development and any mineral extraction.

I therefore consider it unlikely that the development proposed in this application would significantly increase the sterilisation of potentially workable mineral resources. Therefore, no objection should be raised to the development proposed in this application on minerals planning policy grounds.

This application does not raise any significant waste planning issues.

Officer's Name: Tamsin Atley

Officer's Title: Planning Policy Officer

Date: 15 May 2017
