

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

District: Cherwell

Application no: 17/00559/F

Proposal: Variation of conditions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 21 of 14/02067/OUT to enable proper phasing of the development

Location: Land East Of Evenlode Crescent And South Of Langford Lane, Kidlington.

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).

District: Cherwell

Application no: 17/00559/F

Proposal: Variation of conditions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 21 of 14/02067/OUT to enable proper phasing of the development

Location: Land East Of Evenlode Crescent And South Of Langford Lane, Kidlington.

Transport

Recommendation:

Objection

Due to the fact that the extent to which the phases are inter-related and rely on one another for their access, circulation and drainage, is not known.

Key issues:

- Application seeks to vary conditions so that they only need to be discharged phase by phase, and to allow reserved matters applications for each phase to be made separately rather than as a whole.
- This includes conditions relating to access, parking, circulation and manoeuvring (condition 7), Construction Traffic Management Plan (condition 9) and Surface Water Drainage Scheme (condition 10).
- These matters should not be considered in isolation for each phase, as, based on indicative layout and a phasing plan previously submitted, there is likely to be interdependence between phases.

Legal agreement required to secure:

Obligations would be covered by the S106 agreement for 14/02067/OUT.

Detailed comments:

The indicative Site Layout plan submitted with the outline application showed that some units shared accesses and service yards. Access to each unit was from a central 'spine' access road. Additionally, the Transport Assessment considered parking for the development in terms of overall number of spaces, rather than having segregated, private parking areas for each building. For this reason it was considered appropriate to require the layout for the whole development to be considered holistically, i.e. in one reserved matters application. If split into separate applications, it could be difficult to work out whether one phase's layout would prejudice the ability to deliver the rest of the development.

A phasing plan has previously been submitted to discharge Condition 5. This followed the indicative layout and clearly shows that some units share accesses and service yards. The boundaries between phases cut across some of these sharing arrangements. Therefore it would not be possible to determine whether the access, circulation and surface water drainage for each phase was acceptable in isolation.

If a phasing plan were to be agreed and added to the list of approved plans and documents in Phase 4, and this phasing plan had very distinct phases that were not interdependent in the way described above, then it might be possible to agree that conditions 1, 7, 9 and 10 could be varied as proposed.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 27 April 2017
