

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

Statutory Consultee	Comment	Consultant Team Response
Bioregional	<p>Building footprint/GIA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. P6 Table 3.1 provides the proposed non-residential uses in the local centre. The total GIA of these uses adds up to 3,066 m², 350 more than the 2,716 m² stated. The Energy Centre GIA appears to have been omitted from the total. 2. No assumptions are provided for translating the total floor area of building types to GIA in table 3.1. Different land uses have different ratios of GIA to Total Area, presumably due to outdoor space and multi-storey buildings. It would be helpful if the assumptions were stated. 	<p>Response issued to CDC in w/c 13 July 2015.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

Bioregional	Energy demand baseline (p6) <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Hyder has used CIBSE TM46 benchmarks to calculate the CO2 emissions from each of the proposed uses. This is appropriate. However, as the energy statement does not state which specific benchmarks are being used for each business use Bioregional are unable to re-perform the calculation of predicted CO2 emissions.2. Hyder has used CIBSE Guide F to calculate the energy demand. As above, the specific benchmarks used from CIBSE Guide F for each business use are not provided. This means Bioregional are unable to re-perform the calculation of estimated energy demand. The specific benchmarks used would need to be provided to gain a better understand of the accuracy of the projected energy demand.3. Bioregional are unsure why Hyder are using two different benchmarks sources from two different documents to calculate energy demand (kWh) and	Response issued to CDC in w/c 13 July 2015.
--------------------	---	---

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>carbon emissions (CO₂). Bioregional suggest that Hyder could have used CIBSE guide F to calculate the energy demand and then multiplied this by a carbon factor to obtain the predicted emissions.</p> <p>4. As stated above, without knowing the individual benchmarks used, Bioregional are unable to reperform Hyder's calculations and see how Hyder has arrived at an estimate of total energy consumption and total carbon emissions. However, using a best estimate as to which benchmarks have been used, Bioregional have calculated that the estimated energy demand could be considerably higher. This would have implications for the amount of renewable energy required on site.</p> <p>5. Checking table 6.1, The sub total for the BR2013 Building Emissions (111,086 plus 70,082) should be 181,167 kgCO₂ not 188,051 kgCO₂, a difference of 6,884kg.</p>	
Cherwell District Council	Energy	Please refer to the enclosed statement from Higgs Young Architects.

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>How have over heating and day lighting been considered in this proposal?</p>	
<p>Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>Design</p> <p>CDC is not convinced that the pitched roof over the community centre works particularly well in design terms due to the contrast between this and the flat roof (with parapet) that is proposed for the rest of the local centre buildings. This introduces a more traditional arrangement that I feel will appear awkward taking into account the design of the rest of the local centre as a whole. I consider that it should follow the overall design concept that is being proposed and in these terms, the roof line would be more appropriate to follow the proposed across the rest of the proposed building. The Council's Community Development Officer has no objection in principle to this, however, would be interested in the material to be used from a future maintenance perspective.</p> <p>The current design for the southern arcade does not appear to work so well in design terms as the northern arcade does not appear to work so well in design terms as the northern arcade. CDC thinks that the reason could be the step in the ridge line where</p>	<p>We suggest that sloping roof should be retained and not changed to flat roof with parapet as suggested by CDC. We think the sloping roof contributes quality to external design as the points 1.1 to 1.3 and contributes quality to internal design as point 1.4.</p> <p>The sloping roof provides a step in eaves which follows the original Farrell elevation design concept to reflect the sloping site. The step in eaves is a carefully considered design and complements the step in height of ground floor openings on south arcade.</p> <p>The step in eaves is a good way to create variety in elevations whilst allowing the upper floor to be level with windows to be a similar scale to provide flexibility.</p> <p>The sloping roof allows a higher ceiling and north light into the interior of the community hall. This provides an opportunity for a quality of internal space which would not be achieved with a flat roof.</p> <p>The materials of the community hall are stated as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) slate on north side which is more steeply sloped and includes velux type rooflights ii) metal finish on south less steep and includes PV solar panels. <p>We suggest keep to brick design and we will provide additional options for contrast in colour and details (which could be conditioned) rather than add timber which at high level has durability and maintenance issues.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>the community centre pitched roof is proposed. If the pitched roof were removed, and the parapet line raised to be the same level as the parapet line over the B1 office space, then CDC thinks that this would overcome concerns. Whilst the building would not be broken up by a step, the proportions around the windows would be better and would improve the visual effect. The downpipes that are indicated should then be removed.</p> <p>CDC is concerned about the brick contrast vent opening features at the bookend areas of the building, as well as the textured brick work and the visual impact of these as currently proposed. CDC would like to minimise the material palette and draw to a greater degree on the materials used within the housing scheme. CDC suggests the introduction of timber on the local centre in place of the contrast and textured brickwork or alternatively a different form of contrast brick. CDC suggests a small study of options for these features, and would be happy to comment.</p>	
<p>Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>Hard Landscaping</p> <p>It is disappointing that the opportunity for a small seating/gathering area has not been</p>	<p>In the amended layout plan (revision 14058 (P) 101 Ground Floor Rev N), south of the spine road the disabled parking bay has been moved eastwards and a seating area introduced to the west. To the north, an on-street parking bay has been removed and a seating area introduced to the west.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>taken. CDC suggests that consideration is given to the movement of the disabled parking bay to the front of the convenience store slightly westwards, with the cycle parking provision rationalised to one location which may provide some space to have a bench and perhaps some soft landscaping (tree/ planter alongside of the road). This would create an informal area where users of this space could gather that sites outside of the convenience store and community hall.</p> <p>CDC has proposed conditioning details of the retaining walls to the side of the pub/ nursery that front onto the NEAP and the river corridor area.</p>	<p>A2Dominion accepts the proposal to deal with details of the retaining walls to the side of the pub/ nursery that front onto the NEAP and the river corridor area by way of planning condition.</p>
<p>Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>Community Hall</p> <p>Comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with the proposal to have a mezzanine above for a plant room. This would cause issues in respect to maintenance and access. • Concerns with the door that is shown that leads onto the stairwell in the pub restaurant area. Is this a fire/ emergency exit? 	<p>Please see the revised community hall layout plan (14058 (P) 200 Community Hall Layout Rev A) and addendum Design and Access Statement prepared by Higgs Young.</p> <p>Amendments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kitchen and storage relocated to be in closer connection with main room. 2. Toilet provision increased. 3. Small room and main room positions reversed. <p>Within the Addendum Design and Access Statement, possible design options for the community centre pitched roof are shown.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The office should be the first room adjacent to the foyer. This will allow for monitoring etc. The meeting room needs to be relocated.• The community hall and smaller room should be one area with a partition that can be moved to create two smaller areas or one large hall.• The cleaning area (with a cleaning store facility that should include a sink that can take a bucket etc.) should be located by the toilet facilities.• The kitchen should be adjacent to the large hall enabling a servery facility into the hall.• One large storage area should be located within the large hall for easy access.• Given that there will be a first floor facility is the assumption that refuse will need to be removed from the premises daily – and where in location to the facilities are the refuse/ bin areas? Will they be a shared facility or allocated for individual premises?	
--	---	--

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

<p>Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>Landscaping</p> <p>Comments are made in relation to the species of trees proposed within the street scene (the Carpinus Betulus – Frans Fontaine) that are the same as the street trees through the rest of the local centre and suggestions are made as to an alternative to provide a complimentary variation, to encourage species diversity and to improve bio-security on-site. Suggested alternatives are Liquidamber styraciflua ‘Worplesdon’, Gleditsia triacanthos ‘sykline’ or Ginkgo biloba ‘Lakeview’. Can we consider alternatives and update landscape plans or justify current proposals and why other options have been discounted.</p> <p>Comments relating to tree pits should be noted. CDC proposes that these are addressed by way of a planning condition unless we can provide detail now.</p> <p>Can the retained hedgerow buffer to the south arcade be drawn accurately as per the tree and hedgerow survey? It is considered that a close mown grass edge close to the kerb would be tidier and define a clear separation between the trees and kerb. Proposed trees within this</p>	<p>Landscaping: We propose that hard and soft landscaping and tree pits are dealt with by way of planning conditions.</p> <p>Cycling: Secure cycle compounds are generally of this type of appearance, as the use of metal mesh means they can be secure whilst transparent enough to afford good visual surveillance/not feel intimidating to enter.</p>
----------------------------------	---	---

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>hedgerow require revision. The <i>Fagus sylvatica</i> (Beech) are too large for the allocated space and should be replaced within the smaller <i>Carpinus betulus</i> (Native Hornbeam). It is also considered that the <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> (Native Alder) is not usually a hedgerow tree and should be replaced with <i>Sorbus aucuparia</i> (Mountain Ash).</p> <p>Concerns about the timber benches which look uncomfortable.</p> <p>The tiered secure cycle compounds are not attractive and should be submitted for something more sympathetic.</p>	
<p>Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>Ecology</p> <p>The Council queries the number of habitat boxes/ swift bricks proposed in the Landscape and Green Infrastructure Strategy (and their exact locations) which are needed and how this fits in to the overall proposal for the site. CDC recalls earlier discussions where a 'final' plan was drawn up which removed habitat boxes from the local centre and redistributed them elsewhere in the Exemplar. Has this changed or are these additional boxes?</p>	<p>In the final plan for the wider scheme boxes that were to be located on the local centre were relocated. The boxes that are now shown in this application are additional boxes to ensure that this element of the scheme when considered in isolation delivers a net gain in biodiversity.</p>
<p>Cherwell District Council</p>	<p>Section 106 Agreement</p>	<p>Details confirmed.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>CDC considers it necessary to link the agreement to this current full application given that there are clauses relating to the local centre and the community centre, which need to carry forward to this proposal. CDC also seeks to add to this agreement the requirement for securing apprenticeships in the same form as being sought for the outline applications.</p> <p>Can A2Dominion confirm their solicitor's details?</p>	
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Conditions</p> <p>Proposed conditions are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full specification details of the spine road through the development including construction, surfacing, layout, drainage and road markings, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to the first occupation of any of the buildings in the local centre the road shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details. 2. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full specification 	<p>1) Can be addressed post planning through condition, spine road construction details to adoptable standards</p> <p>2) Can be addressed post planning through condition, road geometry and construction details to adoptable standards</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>details (including construction, layout, surfacing and drainage) of the turning area and parking spaces within the curtilage of the site, arranged so that motor vehicles may enter, turn round and leave in a forward direction and vehicles may park off the highway, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Thereafter, and prior to the first occupation of the development, the turning area and car parking spaces shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles at all times thereafter.</p> <p>3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, and notwithstanding the application details, full details of refuse, fire tender and pantechnicon turning within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p>	<p>3) Can be addressed post planning through condition, swept path analysis</p>
--	---	---

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>4. Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted, covered cycle parking facilities shall be provided on the site in accordance with details which shall be firstly submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the covered cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development.</p> <p>5. Travel Plan – condition requiring individual site travel plans – detail to follow.</p> <p>6. Construction traffic management plan – will be required if not already covered by the Hybrid consent for the Exemplar Site as a whole.</p> <p>7. Parking management plan for the centre - will be required if not already covered by the Hybrid consent for the Exemplar Site as a whole.</p> <p>8. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of a drainage strategy for the entire site, detailing all on and off site drainage works required in relation to the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning</p>	<p>4) Can be addressed post planning through condition, location & type of cycle parking to be confirmed/agreed</p> <p>5) No comment, standard condition</p> <p>6) No comment</p> <p>7) No comment</p> <p>8) Can be addressed post planning through condition, drainage construction details to adoptable standards in line with drainage strategy</p>
--	--	--

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>Authority. Thereafter, the drainage works shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved strategy, until which time no discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system.</p> <p>9. The developers will be required to prepare and implement, with local agencies and providers, an Employment & Skills Plan (ESP) that will ensure, as far as possible, that local people have access to training (including apprenticeships) and employment opportunities available at the construction and end user phases of this proposed development.</p>	<p>9) An Employment and Skills Plan typically covers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how many jobs will be created by the development, the timeline for these jobs, and the sectoral and occupational breakdown of these jobs • the skills requirements of these jobs • the extent to which local residents (new and existing) are expected to take these jobs and the evidence to support this (i.e. the skills match between the new jobs and the skills held by residents) • the measures that will be put into place to ensure that local people, and particularly the workless and underemployed, can compete for suitable jobs. <p>There is already an employment and skills plan included within the NW Bicester Economic Development Strategy, The Economic Development Strategy addresses the matters set out above. We therefore query whether a separate planning condition is required.</p> <p>With regard to end user, developers have little scope to influence what occupiers of the premises do or do not do in relation to their employment practices. They can encourage the adoption of certain policies and practices through the community and business associations and networks formed on the site; they can set up or support through funding measures to encourage employment and training of local people, and they can set an exemplary example in relation to their own employment practices.</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Reduction in Class 'B'</p> <p>The reduction of the currently approved class 'B' employment use could result in an increase in out commuting from Bicester</p>	<p>The trip generation assessment in the Transport Assessment is accepted by OCC. No further action required.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>reducing the potential sustainability benefits of the approved site.</p> <p>Notable changes in usage are significant increases in the size of the nursery, and the pub. This is likely to attract more users in from outside the development and beyond Bicester.</p> <p>However, the Transport Assessment provides a comparison between the trip generation associated with the consented land use and the proposed land use, which shows a reduction in peak hour trips, based on trip generation rates per floor area used in the assessment of the hybrid planning application. Therefore there is not considered to be any additional impact on peak hour traffic.</p>	
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Car Parking</p> <p>The parking provision is well below the maximum parking standards. The TA argues that the various uses do not generate demand at the same time. Notwithstanding the parking accumulation survey which has been provided seeking to demonstrate that the parking would be adequate, and the overall future sustainability of the site and strong travel plan</p>	<p>It is suggested that a parking management plan could be prepared as a condition on the development.</p> <p>This could include the monitoring of the parking demand.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>measures, OCC has concerns that in reality parking would not be adequate and inappropriate overspill parking would be a problem.</p> <p>A total of 37 spaces are proposed to be available to the public, with the remaining 46 allocated for staff at all the various uses. The CDC max parking standard for the Eco Business Centre and Nursery (which would be very largely intended for staff) alone would be 84, so there is a significant risk of all-day staff parking spilling into the public parking spaces or into nearby residential areas. The Travel Plan states that there will be a 'need for a strict parking management regime' and 'enforcement of inappropriate overspill parking' but no details are provided in the TA. It is also not clear in whose ownership the car park will be. Further details including a parking management scheme will be required.</p> <p>Uses other than the Eco Business Centre and Nursery are likely to have demand at the same time, albeit the peaks may differ. Staff taking up spaces for customers/users of the pub, community centre and shops will add to the pressure on spaces for daytime users and people</p>	
--	---	--

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	dropping children off at the nursery.	
Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Car Parking Size</p> <p>Parking spaces should be 5m x 2.5m – they appear shorter.</p>	In the amended layout plan (revision 14058 (P) 101 Ground Floor Rev N), 5m x 2.5m parking spaces are shown.
Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Car Sharing</p> <p>The Travel Plan says there would be car sharing spaces but OCC cannot see any of these.</p>	We propose that the allocation of car sharing spaces be dealt with in the Parking Management Plan.
Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Cycle Parking</p> <p>There appears to be confusion over 'stands' and 'spaces'. The cycle parking standards set out a requirement for stands, and are clear that one stand equals two spaces. Therefore on the basis of the cycle parking standards, the overall proposed provision is inadequate.</p> <p>The Travel Plan states that cycle parking would be of the Sheffield stand type. All of the staff cycle parking, and some of the visitor parking is in rack arrangements, some double deck. This is not considered appropriate for visitor cycle parking, given its short term nature, the variety in types of user and the fact that it would</p>	<p>The cycle space standards applied in the Local Centre Transport Assessment are based on provision for each land use as a stand-alone development. This leads to requirement for 100 stands or 200 cycle spaces. There will, however, be considerable numbers of linked trips within the Local Centre, with users of the community centre also visiting the convenience store for example. This relationship is included in the trip generation calculations. As such it is considered that the provision of 120 cycle spaces serving the local centre as a whole is expected to provide sufficient cycle parking. We recommend that the demand for cycle spaces is monitored as the local centre builds out and additional stands are provided if required.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment lists the provision as stands in line with the standards, as did the original Transport Assessment for the Exemplar. This issue seems to have got confused as original plans referred to 'parking' rather than spaces or stands. The plans now identify spaces.</p> <p>In the eco town, visitor parking on racks may be acceptable as it is becoming more commonplace at stations.</p> <p>The revised layout provides cycle stands such that there will be locations where bikes with trailers can be accommodated</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>likely seem daunting to new cyclists. Also, for the staff cycle parking, further details or specifications of the arrangements are required to assess whether adequate space in and around the racking has been provided.</p> <p>Further, the Travel Plan says that stands for the commercial and shop units would have extra space around them to accommodate trailers, and I can see no evidence of that.</p>	
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Tracking</p> <p>Tracking has been provided showing how delivery lorries would enter and exit the service yard for the pub and convenience store. However, this needs to extend to show the vehicles turning off and onto the street. It will not be acceptable for them to over-run the space indicated for pedestrians as proposed to be demarcated by setts.</p> <p>Tracking should also be provided for refuse vehicles into the yard behind units 5 and 4 (assuming the gates to the service yard are closed).</p> <p>OCC notes that there is an aim to provide future servicing access from the south. This would be</p>	<p>Tracking shown in plan 7704-UA001881-02 Commercial Centre Vehicle Accessibility and Parking.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>much preferable as it would keep it separate from pedestrians and cyclists, but it cannot be guaranteed. It is unfortunate that the car and servicing accesses are directly opposite each other, in the middle of the parades</p>	
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>High Street</p> <p>1) The spine road for the Exemplar Site is covered by an existing S38 agreement, which specifies the design and materials. The planning application shows a street that is very different from the one agreed under S38.</p> <p>2)The materials shown on the Landscape Masterplan differ significantly from that what were approved in the spine road technical audit. Whilst there were expected to be some changes in the local centre material palette, none of the materials shown have yet been approved for use on the spine road.</p> <p>3)There are also significant changes in the layout with on street parking, trees and benches being introduced.</p> <p>4)The S38 layout includes traffic calming to the West of the local centre which is not shown on the application landscape masterplan.</p>	<p>(1) Noted, works to the adoptable highway would be undertaken in line with S38 adoptable standards and necessary agreements.</p> <p>(2) If approved the S.38 would be amended.</p> <p>(3) If approved the S.38 would be amended.</p> <p>(4) Not within the red line of this application therefore remains as current S.38 approved dwgs.</p> <p>(5) The application proposes gullies and oversized pipes.</p> <p>(6) Noted, Street lighting poles can be protected by localised kerbed "islands" as necessary.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>5)There are also open drainage channels in the local centre area to the South of the spine road at the road edges.</p> <p>6)The street lighting positions may have also changed and the street light in to the North of retail unit 4 now looks to be in a vulnerable location, where it is likely to be hit by manoeuvring vehicles.</p> <p>7)The 'formal' crossing points in fact appear to be informal. Also they only show a change in paving element size rather than a change in colour. Unless there is significant contrast in the road surface colour or some other warning, vehicle drivers will assume priority. They need to be very clearly differentiated or not marked on the carriageway at all. Particularly given the HGV use, OCC would prefer to see them further away from the turning into the service yard/car park.</p> <p>8)The paving appears to be flush all the way across the adoptable areas. Kerb upstands would help prevent parking outside the designated bays and if there are no upstands some bollards or other deterrent may be required to prevent vehicles accessing the non-vehicular areas. The area in front of the nursery and directly</p>	<p>7)The change in materials at 'formal' crossings is subtle as this whole space should appear as a shared surface street, where pedestrians feel confident to cross at any location. Introducing a starkly different material at 'formal' crossing points would have the reverse affect – it would signal to vehicle users that these are the only locations where caution is required. The crossings are 'formal' in that they are subtly identified as crossing points – by the change in paving unit size, use of tactile paving and in becoming flush.</p> <p>8)There is a 50mm upstand kerb</p> <p>(9) Services bay is minimised in keeping with the street environment but is smaller than normal standard.</p>
--	--	--

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>opposite it could be especially vulnerable to use by goods vehicles and parents parking for the nursery. Along with the risk to pedestrian safety, consideration needs to be given to the risk of damage of the footway by goods vehicles.</p> <p>9)The service bay appears to be too shallow and to have an inadequate taper. This should be redesigned with the size of intended vehicles in mind, and tracking provided. It may be more appropriate to switch the parking and servicing bays due to proximity of the service bay to the informal crossing and access to the car park (visibility concern).</p> <p>10)The proposal is to use Yorkstone paving, but the applicant has provided no details of the interface between that and the bituminous surfacing either side of the local centre.</p> <p>11)The proposed street design would need to be the subject of a revision to the S38 agreement, which would require further technical audit. It would be helpful for the applicant to confirm the areas proposed to be offered for adoption. The landscape masterplan appears to indicate a colonnade on both</p>	<p>(10) Can be dealt with as a condition</p> <p>(11) Preparation of street design detail to S38 standards for adoptable areas would be prepared post planning.</p>
--	---	--

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	sides – areas underneath this could not be adopted.	
Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Public Transport</p> <p>The combination of uses and risk of inappropriate parking and loading mean that the carriageway width will be tight at 6m and should be widened, preferably to around 6.75m. This is to allow buses to serve the development without delay.</p> <p>The developer must provide greater detail about the bus stopping area, including clearer information about the proposed style of bus shelter and the intended method of procuring the shelter and the adjacent pole/flag/information case unit. The bus stopping area between the formal crossing points is very tight, at 18 metres, and passenger movement is compromised by the cycle stands. The developer should provide a detailed plan of this area, showing the exact orientation of the suggested style of bus shelter, the location of the pole/flag/information case unit, and the clear walking route from the bus to the retail facilities.</p>	<p>The width of the spine road has been established and agreed at 6m. Deviation from this previously agreed and consented width would require significant redesign and impose yet more constraint onto the public realm.</p> <p>Bus stopping details can be addressed post planning through condition as per the Exemplar (reference 10/01780/HYBRID).</p>
Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Travel Plan</p> <p>A travel plan exists for the Exemplar Site as a whole, associated with the consented</p>	<p>We propose that the Travel Plan is updated by way of a planning condition.</p>

LOCAL CENTRE PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY 15/00760/F

	<p>hybrid planning application for the site. This is intended to be followed up by individual travel plans for each of the uses at the local centre once the occupier is known. The developer does not propose to update the framework travel plan, but since it contains specifics, for example parking and cycle parking figures relating to the previously consented floor areas of each use, and provides the framework for future travel planning, it should be updated to reflect the revised floor areas.</p>	
--	--	--