# SGR 1 Bicester – Consultation – 25.05.18

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Consultee** | **Date** | **Comment** | **Response** |
| Oxfordshire CCG | 26.03.2018 | This will equate to c180 residents, who will likely seek to register with Alchester Medical Practice as the nearest surgery.  This increase in population, as a direct result of the housing increase, will put pressure on the surgery and therefore as per OCCG policy we will be seeking s106 funding in the region of £64,800 (final sum depending on house sizes). This funding will be to support the Alchester primary care infrastructure.  I look forward to hearing what the build out rate is anticipated to be so that we may plan our service timeline accordingly. | Case officer has queried S106 requested as this does not take account of the site being part of NW Bicester and the infrastructure planned here.Oxfordshire CCG have provided a further response including S106 funding, see rows below. |
| Environmental Protection Officer | 29.03.2018 | **Noise**: I am satisfied with the findings of the noise report provided with the application.  **Contaminated Land**: I recommend that the full contaminated land planning conditions (J12 – J16) are applied to this development as I am unable to see any details relating to this in the documents provided with the application.  **Air Quality**: Prior to the commencement of development, provision of ducting to allow for future installation of EV charging infrastructure will be required, in order to make resident parking places EV ready for future demand. The details and location of such provision should take into consideration the availability of electrical supply and should therefore be designed making reference to information held by the local distribution network operator. Subsequently, these details and designs should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall be formed, and laid out in accordance with these details before usage of the parking spaces commences and shall remain in place thereafter.”  **Odour**: No comments  **Light**: No comments | **Contaminated Land:** pre-commencement conditionsnoted**Air Quality:** pre-commencement conditions noted. |
| Strategic Housing Officer | 06.04.2018 | The site forms part of the NW Bicester urban extension. As well as providing the policy requirement of providing 30% affordable homes it will also need to comply with the additional standards and design criteria laid out in the NW Bicester SPD.  The proposal is for a total of 75 units, the planning contribution for affordable housing in Bicester is 30% and so we would require 23 of these units to be for affordable housing. The policy tenure split is for 70% of these to be affordable rent and 30% to be for shared ownership. We note that the affordable housing mix proposed in the Design and Access Statement is in line with the indicative mix requested in our memo dated 14th December 2017 and the split between rented and shared ownership would be as follows:  Affordable rent (70%)  2 x IB Maisonette  8 x 2B House  4 x 3B House  1 x 4B House  1 x 2B Bungalow  Shared Ownership (30%)  4 x 2BH  3 x 3BH  The standard we currently apply to affordable housing is that the rental housing should be at the nationally described space standard with 50% of the rental units meeting building regulations for accessible housing part M4(2). The shared ownership should meet the same design as market housing and be agreed with the District Council. The affordable housing should be dispersed in clusters of no more than 15 units (or 10 units if all the properties are for rent). All properties should benefit from parking provision with two spaces available for properties of 2 bedrooms or more. The Registered Provider for the affordable housing should be agreed with the Council. | Noted.The affordable housing mix can be addressed within the S106 agreement.The space standards can be addressed through an appropriate planning condition.The detailed designs of affordable housing properties will come forward under reserved matters applications.Car parking for each unit will be in accordance with the currently planning policy standards set out by Cherwell, which can be secured via a planning condition. |
| Landscape Officer | 10.04.2018 | I find the LVIA to be both comprehensive and proportionate.  The viewpoint locations are acceptable – no additional photo-views are required as the range provided gives a representation of visual receptor experience. In regard to the Table of Effects in Appendix 3 the Significance of landscape mitigation change at years 0, 15 (and even 25 years) has not been included. This judgment will provide evidence that the development’s visual harm should be positively mitigated over time. For example The historic settings of St Laurence’s Church, its graveyard and Caversfield House and Associated Buildings are deemed important enough by me to require an assessment of landscape mitigation effects at years 0- 15 and 25. A more ‘considered’ masterplan should be included within the LVIA document to show that these proposals have been assessed, and revised to ensure the landscape mitigation measures are deemed to be appropriate. An accurate visual representation based on a viewpoint from Home Farm highway access is required in order to reflect the built edge and mitigating ‘treescape’/ landscape within the public open space. Only native trees in informal arrangements are to be planting within this landscape setting for the purpose of screening the development from the road setting and amenity of the public open space. I would dispute whether the proposed orchard will provide the necessary visual mitigation and improvements to the setting of the church, especially when fruit trees will be on a root stock that limits growth and pruning techniques will be employed to reduce crown density to produce fruit (fruit and vegetable growing close to exhaust pollutants are not the best solution). The area proposed for an orchard would be put to better use with hedgerow retention and enhancement, along with native tree planting that allows for a view corridor of the church from the highway axis of the development, as proposed (refer below).  The allotments and associated car park are situated close to the Banbury road and will present visual harm the character of the landscape setting and increase to traffic through the Home Farm highway access.  The LEAP play area is sited inappropriately within the landscape buffer and setting of the church. An integrated design approach where the play area is located and connected with the development more successfully than shown, with the play area better connected, being safer because of visual ‘policing’ and also illuminated by adjacent highway street lights. A location around the eastern corner of the site adjacent to the Elmsbrook open space would possibly allow for an interconnecting footpath between the two open spaces. Enough space should be allocated for a combined LEAP and LAP (play for 2 to 6 year olds is required).  The trees proposed to be planted on the road aligned on the church is welcomed, however a tree on the north side will overshadow dwelling reduced light levels to windows and front gardens. I suggest the verge to the southern south of the street is widened to 3 metres and trees planted. A more accurate visual assessment of the ‘framed’ view of the church is necessary in respect of highway corridor depth and trees of project growth pattern of 25 years or more. I am concerned that the church will be obscured by tree canopies.  The ‘engineered’ balancing pond introduces an unnatural feature in to the landscape setting. There are more creative solutions for SUDs. The design of two of three individual ponds connected by swales will proved more interest and amenity, and associate more closely with the existing watercourse. | The Landscape Officer considers the LVIA comprehensive and proportional and that no further viewpoints are needed, but suggests assessing visual effects at Year 1, 15 and 25 in order to provide evidence of visual mitigation over time.  In response, the assessment of visual effects (within the Table of Visual Effects) has been clarified and updated to include visual assessment at Year 1 (construction) and Year 15 (maturation of planting). Given the lack of detail on landscape proposals, there is not sufficient information to allow an assessment of effect at Year 25 as recommended by the Landscape Officer. It is also considered that an assessment at Year 25 is not necessary given the fact that the planting adjacent to Banbury Road is designed to ‘soften’ the built edge and filter views rather than achieve a specific screening function.  The Landscape Officer also states that an ‘*accurate visual representation based on a viewpoint from Home Farm highway access is required in order to reflect the built edge and mitigating ‘treescape’/ landscape within the public open space*’.  In visual terms, the dominant proposed element is the built form and the LVIA has included photomontages showing the massing and heights of the houses. At this outline stage, the details of the positions and type of tree, shrub and hedgerow planting have not been finalised and therefore it would be potentially misleading to illustrate planting on the photomontages. A general assessment of visual change after the proposed landscaping has been included within the LVIA to demonstrate that they will have a function in complementing the existing trees along the road to Home Farm to create a green edge to the development which softens and filters views of the houses beyond.  The Landscape Officer stated that the proposed allotment and associated car park in the northeast corner of the site ‘*will present visual harm the character of the landscape setting and increase to traffic through the Home Farm highway’*. Given the small size of the allotment and car park, and their position behind the existing hedgerow, they would occupy a relatively unobtrusive position adjacent to the Banbury Road which, in my professional opinion, would not harm the visual setting. In comparison with the proposed housing, they would be a very modest component of the development and not be significant. The parking area can be sensitively designed with ‘soft’ materials such as bark chip or reinforced grass and associated planting to minimise its visual effect.  The Landscape Officer makes a range of other suggestions about the design and detail of the planting, play area and SuDs which are capable of being addressed within a Reserved Matters application once the principle of development in this locality has been established. The Design Codes within the DAS and the Open Space Parameter Plan will be amended to change the ‘community orchard’ to ‘informal native planting’. The full details of what this would comprise would come forward through reserved matters applications.The play space will be relocated to the southern corner of the site, within this area of open space adjacent to the neighbouring developments.The outline application only identifies the proposed area for the SuDS, the specific type of SUDs can be established during reserved matters applications. |
| Bicester Town Council | 24.04.18 | No comments / objection | N/A |
| Thames Water | 25.04.18 | * Will foul water be discharged by gravity or pump? The proposal currently it suggests either could be used.   If it will be by pump please confirm the pump rate.   * Please could you confirm the connection point, the size of the connection sewer and proposed date of connection? | This is correct, as this is outline we are not able to refine the design. There is opportunity at the moment for both gravity connection or pumped.  The pump rate will be dependent on the exact location of the pumping station (and as a consequence the head in metres to overcome), as this will be defined at the reserved matters stage it is difficult to provide this detail at this stage of planning.  If a pumped system is to be used then a connection into Charlotte Avenue is expected (by the site access). A gravity connection, if feasible, would look to be made into the existing network to the south west of the scheme. At the time that the report was produced Thames Water had not updated their records and could not provide detail on the existing invert levels. As such, a point of connection could not be assessed. A point of connection would look to be refined at the reserved matters stage.  In relation to size, the rising main diameter is dependent on the location of the pumping station and will be confirmed at the reserved matters stage. For the gravity scheme there has not been a foul drainage design undertaken, but I would expect it to be a 150mm pipe for this number of units.  The date of the connection is dependent on a number of factors (reserved matters, planning conditions and the developer’s aspirations) and as such cannot be confirmed at this stage. |
| Education Oxfordshire OCC | 02.05.18 | No objection subject to S106 contributions:   * Primary: £341,859 * Secondary: £316,183   Further details on calculation within response. | Noted.A separate response will be provided on the S106 obligations. |