

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

District: Cherwell

Application No: 18/00193/REM

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: 10th March 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

Location: Land South Of Cotefield Business Park Oxford Road Bodicote

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection:

- Parking layout is likely to lead to obstruction of visibility splays and footway parking with consequent risk to highway safety
- No cycle parking is shown, which means the application does not maximise the opportunity for sustainable travel.
- Drainage – the proposals do not seem to be in accordance with the agreed Flood Risk Assessment.

Key points

- This reserved matters application applies only to the layout of part of the site covered by the outline permission. It is difficult to assess pedestrian permeability without considering the layout of the whole site.
- Parking levels are very tight and rely on garages being counted as parking spaces.
- There is therefore a risk of on-street parking which could obstruct vehicular access and/or footways
- Refuse vehicle tracking at junction of Road 1 and Road 4 – vehicle uses whole of opposing carriageway when making the turn from Road 1 into Road 4, which may require vehicles waiting to exit Road 4 having to reverse, causing a safety risk.

If the LPA is minded to approve the application, the following conditions should be applied:

D19 Cycle Parking Provision

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.

[Reason DR4](#)

Pedestrian/cycle connection

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the pedestrian and cycle route leading across the open space and providing a link with the continuation of the route through the development to the north, including layout, surface details and lighting, together with a timetable for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the pedestrian and cycle route shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason DR6

Parking layout

On the basis of OCC's Residential Road Design Guide, the parking court only provides sufficient parking for the dwellings it serves, on the basis that only one space is allocated to individual properties – the remainder being unallocated and free for anyone to use, including visitors. However, there are two disabled spaces and it is not clear which property or properties these would be allocated to.

The same is true of the other areas of houses without garages – only one space per dwelling could be allocated.

Three and four bed properties with garages all seem to have two allocated spaces, with one being the garage itself. Since most garages are never used for parking, it is inevitable that there will be on street parking. Some of these properties do not have visitor bays located near the frontages, so there is very likely to be on street/on footway parking, which could obstruct pedestrians or the movement of large vehicles, and could obstruct visibility splays. The access road into the parking court is particularly vulnerable, as is the area in front of plots 31-35, where it looks possible to provide an additional visitor space. The parking for plot 34 looks particularly inconvenient in terms of the distance to the front door.

Refuse strategy and tracking

The refuse strategy shows how residents would move their bins to collection points, so that the standards for bin drag and bin collection distances are met. However, some of these collection points are too constrained and it is not likely that people would leave their bins there (also for the reason that they would be afraid the bins would be missed as they are not visible from the street).

The vehicle tracking has been carried out using a large refuse vehicle. There is an issue with the turn from Road 1 into Road 4 as described above. Additional visibility should be provided across plot 44 to reduce the risk.

Pedestrian connectivity

The wider site offers connections through to adjacent permissive leisure paths, as well as a pedestrian/cycle route through the centre of the site and the adjoining site, towards Molyneux Drive. The connection through the centre of the site runs through the proposed LEAP area. It is recommended that details of this connection are secured by a condition.

Cycle parking

Properties without garages require covered cycle stores, which are not shown. It is recommended that this is required 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.

This reserved matters application (18/00193/REM) makes reference to a completely new FRA in the 'Sustainable Construction Statement(SCS)' (Hodkinson Jan 2018), one prepared by the consultant Banners Gate (Para 8.1 of the SCS) . This 'new' FRA document was not submitted with the REM application.

The approved outline application FRA (Forge Engineering Design Solutions) reported 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. However, the drawing submitted with the REM application (Proposed Drainage Strategy Plan – No. 5692:P70 – MJA Consulting) , do not reflect the original FRA proposals, and show a more conventional drainage system proposed for use, and reporting in the drawing notes that the substrata is unsuitable for infiltration. This appears to be in contradiction to the drainage strategy outlined in the approved FRA at the outline application stage.

Comments from Road Agreements Team

OCC will not be adopting the SW sewers beneath the roads as the private house water is discharging into them. TWA will need to approve and adopt these. The basic drainage layout looks feasible though

The access road to the new development to the north will need to be adopted before OCC can adopt these roads.

- If there is not a footway adjacent to the carriageway a 1.5m maintenance margin is required if street lighting design to be incorporated.
- Trees within the highway will need to be approved by OCC and will carry a commuted sum. No private planting to overhang or encroach the proposed adoptable areas.
- Trees that are within 5m of the carriageway or footway will require root protection, trees must not conflict with street lights.
- Visitor parking bays parallel to the carriageway, can be adopted but accrue a commuted sum. Any other bays (echelon or perpendicular) or private bays will not be considered for adoption.
- Shared surfaces width is to be a minimum of 6m (localised narrowing's are permitted). A minimum of 800mm maintenance margin is required either side of the shared surface.
- Service corridors are to be 2m wide.
- Roads, apart from spine road, that are straight for over 70m will require some form of traffic calming.
- No property should be within 500mm to the proposed highway. No doors, gates, windows, garages or gas/electric cupboards should open onto the proposed highway.

- Foul and surface water manholes should not be placed within the middle of the carriageway, at junctions, tyre tracks and where informal crossing points are located.
- Minor residential roads that serve four or less properties will not be considered for adoption. Roads serving 5 or more houses can be considered for adoption but will need to meet adoptable criteria.
- Informative note: OCC require saturated CBR laboratory tests on the sub-soil likely to be used as the sub-formation layer. This would be best done alongside the main ground investigation for the site but the location of the samples must relate to the proposed location of the carriageway/footway.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 2 March 2018
