**From:** Goddard, Andrew - Communities [mailto:Andrew.Goddard@Oxfordshire.gov.uk]
**Sent:** 03 September 2018 18:26
**To:** Caroline Ford
**Subject:** RE: Conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69 NW Bicester Exemplar - phases 3 and 4 17/00600/DISC

Hi Caroline

Regarding the swales do you wish me to check with our road agreements team about the Section 38 agreement? The main point of objection is the uncertainty over infiltration potential – Some of these soakage tests are coming back negative.If there are such areas where infiltration is poor, and the failure of some of the soakage tests appears to suggest that there are, then an alternative drainage strategy is required for those residences – other than using underground geo-cellular soakaways. We seek clarification on this point.

Conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69 NW Bicester Exemplar - phases 3 and 4 17/00600/DISC

Condition 63

OCC (drainage) does not object to the approval of this condition.

Condition 65 & 69 – Drainage Strategy

OCC (drainage) does object to the approval of these conditions.

Swales

In an update to this application, the Applicant’s consultants, Reuby and Stagg Ltd., have provided design details and corresponding calculations for four swales. On the accompanying submitted drawings,  Swale numbered 1 to 3 are labelled highway swales, and Swale 4 is a private swale. The gradient of the side of the highway swale is shown as 1:2 gradient , and the maintenance plan confirms that the swales will be maintained by strimming the grass and that these are to be adopted by the Highways Authority.  OCC ( drainage) would seek confirmation that strimming has been agreed with the Highways Authority as the form of maintenance method. Please confirm that the proposed swales and permeable paving are to be adopted by the Highways Authority and the status of the S38 agreement with respect to any changes that need to be made to it.

Infiltration testing at the site

Additional new soakage testing has been undertaken by the consultant, Wilson & Bailey, at proposed carriageway locations and areas proposed gardens and parking.

However, some of the recent test results appear to show failure of the infiltration test or that the infiltration test was not possible to be carried out. E.g. Trial Pit (TP) 3, TP4, TP5, TP7, TP9, TP11, TP12, TP13, TP14, TP15, TP16.

Therefore, OCC (drainage) maintains an objection to the approval of the conditions. Further clarification is required to identify where it will not be viable to use infiltration at the site for private residences – those areas where it will not be viable to use underground geo-cellular soakaways. If there are such areas, and the failure of some of the soakage tests appears to suggest that there are, then an alternative drainage strategy is required for those residences.

Maintenance Plan

The Maintenance Plan appears outline in nature. It does state the party responsible for the maintenance and frequency of some activities. We recommend as a minimum the plan contains the following information.

* + *Details of which organisation or body will be responsible for vesting and maintenance for individual aspects of the drainage proposals (individual properties/curtilages, roads, special areas etc) with evidence that the organisation/body has agreed to such adoption. Where the agreement is subject to other legalities, it may be acceptable to provide agreement-in-principle.*
	+ *Details of which organisation or body will be the main maintaining body where the area is multifunctional (e.g. open space play areas containing SuDS) with evidence that the organisation/body has agreed to such adoption.*
	+ *A Maintenance Schedule setting out which assets need to be maintained, at what intervals and what method is to be used.*
	+ *A Site Plan identifying the location of each element of the drainage scheme, including access points, maintenance access easements and outfalls. Maintenance operational areas are to be identified and shown on the plans, to ensure there is room to gain access to the asset, maintain it with appropriate plant and then handle any arisings generated from the site for example by providing a silt deposit area and cut weed composting area for large ponds.*
	+ *Any health and safety information required to manage identified residual risks associated with maintenance activities*

Condition 67 – Groundwater flooding

OCC (drainage) does not object to the approval of this condition.

In an update to this application, the Applicant’s consultants, Reuby and Stagg Ltd., referred to a 32 trial pit site investigation and monitoring study previously carried out by the consultant, Enzygo, which failed to find evidence of high groundwater levels across the site. Additional new work by Wilson & Bailey Consultants states that provided connectivity can be established through the superficial clay soils into the underlying weathered limestone, the site can be considered as having ‘low ground water’ level and free draining, due to the permeable nature of the limestone. Further exploratory design work is being undertaken to consider the implementation of an underfloor sump, to mitigate any potential for groundwater ingress.

OCC (drainage) confirms the status of no objection to the approval of this condition.

Andrew Goddard

Engineer

Design & Safety Improvements

Operations

Oxfordshire County Council
County Hall
New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND

Telephone (mob) : 07972073941

[www.oxfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/)

**From:** Caroline Ford [mailto:Caroline.Ford@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk]
**Sent:** 29 August 2018 11:48
**To:** Goddard, Andrew - E&E
**Subject:** FW: Conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69 NW Bicester Exemplar - phases 3 and 4 17/00600/DISC

Hi Andrew,

Further to your comments on the above referenced discharge of condition application, I have now received the attached through – is it possible to have your comments please? Would you prefer me to send this through the formal channels instead?

Thanks

Caroline

**Caroline Ford** BA. (Hons) MA MRTPI
**Principal Planning Officer – Major Projects Planning Team
Development Management Division**

**Place and Growth Directorate
Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire District Council**

Tel: 01295 221823

Email: caroline.ford@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk

Web: [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/) or [www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil) or [www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil](http://www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil or @SNorthantsCouncil

**From:** Estelle Hutchinson [mailto:Estelle.Hutchinson@struttandparker.com]
**Sent:** 29 August 2018 11:43
**To:** Caroline Ford
**Subject:** FW: Conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69

Hi Caroline,

Please see the email below and attached documents regarding conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69.

The additional soakage testing will be carried out once the location of the bunds have been finalised so that we can locate new soakage tests to suit.

Thank you.

**Estelle Hutchinson BSc (Hons)**

Graduate Planner

Strutt & Parker, 269 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 7LL

Direct: 01865 366 646 | Mobile: 07342949947



**From:** Mike Dewson [mailto:mdewson@reuby-stagg.co.uk]
**Sent:** 22 August 2018 12:41
**To:** Estelle Hutchinson <Estelle.Hutchinson@struttandparker.com>
**Cc:** Chris Gardiner <Chris.Gardiner@crestnicholson.com>; Andrew North <Andrew.North@crestnicholson.com>; Drew Patterson <Drew.Patterson@crestnicholson.com>; Daniel Cook <dcook@reuby-stagg.co.uk>
**Subject:** RE: Conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69

Hi Estelle

It seems that the consultees are having difficulties interpreting the information that may have been sent to them for discharge of conditions, we have therefore prepared targeted statements for each condition to ensure the correct information gets through and to avoid further confusion.

With regards to conditions 65 and 69 further clarification has been requested regarding the soakage testing and this will require another site visit by the Geotechnical Engineers to complete the work previously requested, however we have provided two additional documents in direct response to the request for a maintenance schedule and confirmation of highway swale design.

With regards to the use of silt traps, the soakaways will only be receiving runoff from roofs therefore we view silt traps as being unnecessary, however we still proposing to use them in lei of inspection chambers on the drainage as an added precaution of silt entering the soakaways.

We would suggest that the attached documents are sent to the planners, with a note regarding the additional testing.

Regards

Mike

Mike Dewson

Associate Director



Tel:          +44(01425) 484400

Mob          07867 474467

Email:      **mdewson@reuby-stagg.co.uk**

*Please see our website:* [*www.reuby-stagg.co.uk*](http://www.reuby-stagg.co.uk/)



*This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed and may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for delivering the e-mail to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.  Please reply to this e-mail and highlight the error to the sender. Although we have taken steps to ensure this e-mail and attachments are free from viruses we advise that you carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment*

**From:** Estelle Hutchinson <Estelle.Hutchinson@struttandparker.com>
**Sent:** 15 August 2018 16:24
**To:** Daniel Cook <dcook@reuby-stagg.co.uk>
**Cc:** Mike Dewson <mdewson@reuby-stagg.co.uk>
**Subject:** Conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69

Hi Dan,

Unfortunately, we have received another objection from OCC drainage and highway regarding the above conditions at Elmsbrook. The case officers comments summarise below:

Conditions 63, 65, 67 and 69 (drainage) – I have received a further objection from OCC as the Drainage and Highway Authority in relation to the drainage information submitted. Their comments are attached to this email for your information but to summarise, it is understood that the note provided by Reuby and Stagg in April 2018 provided the results of infiltration testing which demonstrated that whilst most results were favourable, there were two locations which failed. Additional testing to be undertaken at the site was requested so that it could be better understood those areas of the site that could not be drained through infiltration techniques. No additional test results have been provided. In addition, a highway swale has been included but no calculations have been provided for the sizing of this swale. In respect of the drainage standard details, it is queried whether it is proposed to use silt traps/ maintenance chamber upstream of the proposed soakaways at this site? It is understood that this will reduce silting up of the soakaway and reduce maintenance requirements of the structure. A SUDs Maintenance Plan has also been requested. Information is also sought regarding ground water flooding and confirmation of any measures to prevent flooding occurring of the adjacent highway (such as cut off drains). Any queries in this regard are best directed to OCC.

Please can you review all that you have done to date to see if you think these issues have been addressed already. If they haven’t could you advise how we best proceed? This is a matter of urgency as Crest are already on site and could effect the build.

Please do be in touch if you have any queries.

Many thanks,

**Estelle Hutchinson BSc (Hons)**

Graduate Planner

Strutt & Parker, 269 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 7LL

Direct: 01865 366 646 | Mobile: 07342949947



This email is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient it may be unlawful for you to read, copy, distribute, disclose or otherwise make use of the information herein. If you have received this email in error please contact us immediately. Strutt & Parker will accept no liability for the mis-transmission, interference, or interception of any email and you are reminded that email is not a secure method of communication.

Strutt & Parker is a trading style of BNP Paribas Real Estate Advisory & Property Management UK Limited, a private limited company registered in England and Wales (with registered number 4176965) and whose registered office is at 5 Aldermanbury Square, London EC2V 7BP.

For further details of Strutt & Parker please visit our web site

<http://www.struttandparker.com>.
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Strutt & Parker is a trading style of BNP Paribas Real Estate Advisory & Property Management UK Limited, a private limited company registered in England and Wales (with registered number 4176965) and whose registered office is at 5 Aldermanbury Square, London EC2V 7BP.
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This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action.

This email, including attachments, may contain confidential information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender by reply and delete it immediately. Views expressed by the sender may not be those of Oxfordshire County Council. Council emails are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. [email disclaimer](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer). For information about how Oxfordshire County Council manages your personal information please see our [Privacy Notice.](https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/aboutyourcouncil/corporateovernance/GenericPrivacyNotice.pdf)
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