

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

District: Cherwell

Application No: 18/00193/REM-2

Proposal: Reserved matters application to 14/02156/OUT - for appearance, landscaping and layout (including the layout of the internal access roads, footpaths and cycleways) for 44 dwellings

Location: Land South Of Cotefield Business Park Oxford Road Bodicote

Response date: 7th June 2018

This report sets out the officer views of Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) on the above proposal. These are set out by individual service area/technical discipline and include details of any planning conditions or informatives that should be attached in the event that permission is granted and any obligations to be secured by way of a S106 agreement. Where considered appropriate, an overarching strategic commentary is also included. If the local County Council member has provided comments on the application these are provided as a separate attachment.

Application no: 18/00193/REM-2

Location: Land South Of Cotefield Business Park Oxford Road Bodicote

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the same reasons as in our previous response:

- Parking layout likely to lead to obstruction
- No cycle parking
- Drainage – proposals not in accordance with agreed FRA

Additionally, some footways of insufficient width and lack of a safe crossing point at plot 24.

If the LPA is minded to approve, I recommend that the conditions set out in my previous response are applied.

Parking layout

In terms of avoiding obstructive parking on the roads, the parking provision for some properties has effectively increased by creating a space in front of the marked parking spaces, that could provide additional non-marked parking spaces. This creates triple tandem parking, however, which means there will potentially be a lot of manoeuvring in the street. In some cases, however, this space is not long enough which means vehicles are likely to overhang the footway (e.g. plots 36 and 37). I note that two new parking courts have been introduced. These provide less attractive and more inconvenient parking for the dwellings they serve and are more likely to lead to parking on street around the main access junction and the first curve to the south. Overall I do not think there is a significant improvement between this and the previous layout, and there are still places where on street parking could create an obstruction to vehicular traffic or pedestrian movement.

Refuse strategy and tracking

My comments regarding collection points still apply. In practice people would drag their bins further, to the front of curtilage. The situation at the junction of Road 1 and Road 4 has been improved. A tree has been moved, which would provide extra visibility across the front of plot 44, but a visibility splay would need to be adoptable if the roads are to be adopted.

Pedestrian (and cycle) connectivity

My previous comments still apply. Additionally I note that the path that connects with the path running through the development (via the LEAP) is not wide enough for use as a shared footway/cycleway. As previously, I recommend that the details of this key connection are secured by condition.

The layout now appears to show some footways that are only a metre wide – this is unacceptable. Also outside plot 24, the 2m footway must continue around the corner to a point where pedestrians can safely cross to the footway on the other side.

Cycle Parking

This is still not shown, and again, I recommend that this is secured by condition.

Drainage

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) associated with the outline application (14/02156/OUT) was undertaken by Forge Engineering Design Solutions (Doc Ref : FEDS- 214026). The surface water drainage condition to the outline application for the site (Condition 12) makes specific reference to this FRA. This outline FRA is the approved document.

In our previous response, we commented that the ‘Sustainable Construction Statement(SCS)’ (Hodkinson Jan 2018), referred to a different FRA prepared by the consultant Banners Gate (Para 8.1 of the SCS) . The Sustainable Construction Statement has not been revised. However, the updated Drainage Strategy Plan refers to the Forge Engineering FRA.

In our previous response, we commented that the Drainage Strategy Plan did not reflect the original FRA proposals, which reported that infiltration testing had been undertaken at the site and identified an average soil permeability rate of 3.15×10^{-6} m/s, which is a moderate infiltration rate and suitable for infiltration techniques such as soakaways, porous paving, infiltration basins and grass swales. We commented that it showed a more conventional drainage system proposed for use, and reported in the drawing notes that the substrata is unsuitable for infiltration, which appears to be in contradiction to the drainage strategy outlined in the approved FRA at the outline application stage. The Strategy still shows this, so in our view it is not in accordance with the agreed FRA. Moreover, surface water drainage from the individual plots appears to drain into highway drainage, which is unacceptable.

The applicant’s covering letter states that the drainage strategy has been designed in accordance with the agreed FRA, but this is clearly not the case. The letter also suggests that drainage will be dealt with in a forthcoming application to discharge Condition 12. We object to the Drainage Strategy Plan being approved. We would also recommend that the layout of this parcel should not be approved until the matter is resolved, in case it need to accommodate alternative drainage features.

Adoption strategy – I would like to see visibility splays marked on this plan, as they will need to be adopted.

Officer’s Name: Joy White

Officer’s Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 6 June 2018
