

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

**District:** Cherwell

**Application No:** 18/01309/RM

**Proposal:** Reserved matters application for 14/02156/OUT - appearance, landscaping and layout (including the layout of the internal access roads, footpaths and cycleways) for 58 dwellings.

**Location:** Land South Of Cotefield, Business Park Phase 2 Adj To Blossom Field Road, Bodicote.

**Response date:** 05 September 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: 18/01309/RM**

**Location:** Land South Of Cotefield Business Park, Phase 2 Adj To Blossom Field Road, Bodicote.

---

## **Transport Schedule**

### **Recommendation**

#### **Objection for the following reasons**

- The parking strategy requires amendment.
- Highway layout requires amendment.
- Drainage strategy requires amendment.

### **Key points**

- The parking strategy requires amendment.
- Highway layout requires amendment.
- Drainage strategy requires amendment.

### **Comments**

There is a discrepancy between plot numbering on Drawing Nos.5692:P500G and 5692:P91A and other plans in the submission. Comments set out below should be reviewed in relation to the specified drawing number where relevant.

#### **Transport Development Control**

Comments in relation to the parking strategy shown on **drawing No.P18-1568\_14**, are as follows.

Plot Nos.43 and 44 show parking spaces shaded in green but these do not appear on the key and should be defined. **Reason for objection.**

The allocation of parking spaces for plot Nos. 47 – 52 and 60 – 62 is not clear. It is possible that some units have no allocated space or an allocated space which is not adjacent. This will lead to on street parking. **Reason for objection.**

Plot Nos.71 and 72 do not appear to have any allocated parking spaces. This will lead to on street parking. **Reason for objection.**

Secure cycle parking is shown for units that do not have a garage but no details are given. **Reason for objection.**

#### **Road Agreements**

The forward visibility to the main site access is not shown. The County requires to see the visibility splays for both accesses, existing and proposed, the inter-visibility between the two and the forward visibility to both from both approaches. **Reason for objection.**

**Drawing No. 5692:P500G.** Forward visibility opposite plot No.87 around bend goes through a visitor parking bay. This is not acceptable and the parking bay should be removed from the splay. It is noted that gaps are shown between this provision of visitor parking bays. Capacity would be better used if bays are butted up to each other as per the standard practice. **Reason for objection.**

**Drawing No. 5692:P500G.** The County would not adopt the area in front of Plot Nos.79 and 80. **Reason for objection.**

**Drawing No. 5692:P500G.** The footway link to the side of plots 43 and 53 stops at the red line boundary and it is not clear whether it ties in with any existing provision. The County would not adopt this link if it does not link to highway. **Reason for objection.**

**Drawing No. 5692:P500G.** Parking outside plot No.62 is not ideal on the bend. Cars reversing out will have difficulty in peak times. **Reason for objection.**

There are serious concerns over the levels shown on the long sections plan. A gradient of 1:12 is the absolute maximum allowed and only in circumstances where it is unavoidable over short lengths. **Reason for objection.**

### **Drainage**

The outline application for this site (14/02156/OUT) included a Flood Risk Assessment by Forge Engineering. Testing demonstrated an average rate of  $3.15 \times 10^{-6} \text{m/s}$  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. The groundwater table was not encountered in 5 of the 6 trial pits, which were excavated to a maximum depth of 2.250m.

The drainage proposals accompanying this Reserved Matters application (18/01309/REM) highlights the risk of slip planes and springs to occur between limestone and clay layers at the site if infiltration were used due to site gradients. The current application proposes a conventional drainage system and underground attenuation tank to manage surface water.

However, the County considers infiltration may be possible in some areas of the site. It is understood that a neighbouring Cala Homes site does use infiltration techniques where practicable. The County considers some infiltration may be possible on lower areas of the site, and expects that the Applicant seeks the advice of a geotechnical specialist to confirm the assertion that slip planes could develop if infiltration were used on higher areas of the site. Given the proposed absence of the use of any infiltration at the site, the County objects to the application. **Reason for objection.**

### **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 the following 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.

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.

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.

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.

**Officer's Name:** Chris Nichols

**Officer's Title:** Transport Development Control

**Date:** 5 September 2018

---