

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

District: Cherwell

Application No: 18/00193/REM-3

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 37 dwellings.

Location: Land South Of Cotefield Business Park, Oxford Road, Bodicote.

Response date: 09 August 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-3

Location: Land South of Cotefield Business Park, Oxford Road, Bodicote.

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reasons:

- The Surface Water Drainage Strategy does not include sustainable urban drainage (SuDS) infiltration techniques as previously agreed.
- Although the applicant has provided the correct total number of vehicular parking spaces as set out in Oxfordshire County Council's Residential Roads Design Guide, these are not evenly distributed in accordance with the number of bedrooms per house. This could lead to overspill vehicular parking on the internal roads which could prevent safe access to all parts of the development for refuse vehicles and emergency service vehicles.
- No cycle parking has been provided for plots 14-17 despite none of these plots having access to a garage.

Key points

- The layout and dwelling numbering on the amended layout and the highway adoption plans are different, as are the red line boundaries.
- The Surface Water Drainage Strategy does not include SuDS infiltration techniques.
- The forward visibility around the bend immediately north of the access (immediately north-east of Plot 1) to this part of the overall development needs to be shown for the Local Highway Authority to adopt the access road.
- The levels shown are far from desirable. 1:12 is the absolute maximum gradient allowed, and this is only allowed in circumstances where it is unavoidable over short lengths.
- Plots 14-17 have no cycle parking allocated to them.

Comments:

Surface Water Drainage Strategy

Infiltration testing at the site as reported in the FRA by Forge Engineering demonstrated an average rate of 3.15×10^{-6} m/s across the site. The original drainage proposals included permeable paving and soakaways to manage surface water. This was in accordance with the SuDS 'hierarchy' of disposal of surface water, infiltration of surface water to ground being preferred to off-site disposal.

It is not clear, the current proposals do not appear to include SuDS infiltration techniques, and appear to make use of underground tanks and a conventional piped system. The applicant has not provided any analysis of why this is the most suitable system for the site and has not said why a SuDS-based system is no longer acceptable. This is contrary to paragraphs 103 and 104 of the National Planning

Policy Framework. Therefore, The Lead Local Flood Authority objects to this application.

Layout of the Development

The applicant has submitted Drawing No. P16-1364_01 Rev. AD, an amended development layout, and Drawing No. 5692: P500 Rev. G, a highway adoption plan. The red line boundaries for the development are different on these two drawings. However, I will flag up issues that I think are relevant to both developments. Firstly, forward visibility splays that are in accordance with the design speed of the development and Manual for Streets need to be included on the bend immediately north of the access to plots 1-37 on Drawing No. P16-1364_01 Rev. AD.

The forward visibility splay for drivers travelling in a south-westerly direction immediately south of Plot 87 on Drawing No. 5692: P500 Rev. G points through a visitor parking space. This is not enabling safe access to all parts of the development in accordance with Manual for Streets, so the Local Highway Authority would not be able to adopt this stretch of the access road. The visitor space could be moved further eastwards by removing the gaps between visitor spaces within this batch which could be butted up.

The Local Highway Authority would not adopt the access road that serves plots 79 and 80 on Drawing No. 5692: P500 Rev. G as it only serves two dwellings.

Regarding the proposed levels, 1:12 is the absolute maximum gradient that the Local Highway Authority will accept, and this only over very short lengths of road where it is unavoidable. If the gradient is 1:12 or above over longer stretches of road, this will inhibit access to parts of the development for the elderly, disabled people, and parents with small children or who move pushchairs. Therefore, this is contrary to paragraph 32 of the NPPF and I recommend objection on these grounds.

Pedestrian Link East of Plot 37

The Local Highway Authority will not adopt this as it does not abut highway at both ends. It is also unclear where this pedestrian footway leads.

Vehicular Parking Spaces

If the spaces within the allocated garages are included, the applicant has provided a total of 77 vehicular parking spaces. Although, this number meets the standards set out in Oxfordshire County Council's Residential Roads Design Guide, the spaces are not correctly distributed. For example, plots with two-bedroomed open market houses appear to have two allocated perpendicular spaces, while plots with two and three bedroomed affordable houses have been allocated one perpendicular space, and might, depending on the number of visitors to the development by car at any one time, be able to use one of the visitor perpendicular spaces. However, these spaces may not be available to visitors if they are being used by residents, and could lead to visitors parking unsafely on access roads. The main access road through the site is 5.5m wide. Therefore, a lot of overspill parking could inhibit access to the development for refuse and emergency service vehicles.

Cycle Parking

Plots 14-17 displayed as 1BM on Drawing No. P16-1364_01 Rev. AD do not have any allocated cycle parking. The applicant needs to install either Sheffield stands or a secure cycle parking store for what I assume are one-bedroomed maisonettes to ensure that opportunities for travel by sustainable modes for short journeys are maximised in accordance with the NPPF.

S38 Highway Works – Spine Road/On-Site Rights of Way:

An obligation to provide a spine road/on-site right of way as part of the highway network will be required for the development. The S106 agreement will secure delivery via future completion of a S38 agreement.

The S106 agreement will identify for the purpose of the S38 agreement;

- Approximate location of spine road/right of way and information as to provision e.g. minimum width of carriageway, footways etc as appropriate.
- Timing – this may be staged.
- Additional facilities/payments e.g. on-site bus infrastructure and related payments.

Planning Conditions:

In the event that permission is to be given, the following planning conditions should be attached:

Layout

Prior to the commencement of the development, a plan showing the internal roads, footways, cycleways, and turning areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, and prior to the first occupation of the development, construction shall only commence in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Surface Water Drainage Strategy

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

- Discharge Rates
- Discharge Volumes
- Maintenance and management of SUDS features (this maybe secured by a Section 106 Agreement)
- Sizing of features – attenuation volume
- Infiltration in accordance with BRE365
- Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers

- SUDS (list the suds features mentioned within the FRA to ensure they are carried forward into the detailed drainage strategy)
- Network drainage calculations
- Phasing
- No private drainage into the public highway and adoptable highway drainage system.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Cycle Parking

Prior to the commencement of the development, a plan showing the cycle parking arrangements for the development should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, and prior to the first occupation of the development, construction should only commence in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of maximising the opportunities for travel by sustainable modes of transport in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Officer's Name: Will Marshall

Officer's Title: Senior Transport Planner

Date: 07 August 2018
