**District:** Cherwell

**Application No**: **17/00600/DISC-2**

**Proposal:** Discharge of Conditions 8,10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 30, 31, 33, 63, 65, 67, 69 and 80 of 10/01780/HYBRID

**Location:** Bicester Eco Town Exemplar Site, Banbury Road, Bicester.

Transport Development Control

**Recommendation:**

**Condition 8: Day-lighting**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 10: Over-heating**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 14: Boundary Enclosures**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 17: Parking - Objection**

I am unable to comment on whether this condition should be discharged because I have not seen a plan which shows how many bedrooms each dwelling has. Once I have this plan I can comment on whether the vehicular parking standards for urban areas of Cherwell District set out in Oxfordshire County Council’s Residential Roads Design Guide which can be accessed at: <https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/roadsandtransport/transportpoliciesandplans/PARKINGS.PDF>

Oxfordshire County Council’s Residential Roads Design Guide also states that there needs to be a gap of at least 6m in width behind any perpendicular vehicular parking space to allow a motorist to sing into and reverse out of that space safely. On Drawings 1479T0TA – 3201 Revision T8 and 1479T0TA – 3202 Revision T8 show that, for example, plots 226, 215, 108-110, 124,125, 195 and 34 do not have a gap this size. This could impede safe access to individual vehicular parking spaces and lead to overspill parking on surrounding roads which could impede safe access for refuse and emergency service vehicles.

**Condition 18: Streetscape - Objection**

For the same reason that I am unable to recommend the discharge of condition No. 17, I am unable to recommend the discharge of Condition No. 18.

**Condition 20: Construction and Planting of Green Roofs and Maintenance Programme**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 24: Access Routes Details**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 25: Final Surface Treatment**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 30: Rainwater Harvesting**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 31: landscape Design Scheme**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 33: Open Space/Play Space**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Condition 63: discharge of Surface Water on to the Highway – Objection**

In his Single Transport Response of 30 January 2018 my colleague Rashid Bbosa asked for confirmation that any measures such as cut-off drains prior to construction, or phasing of the construction, that will prevent flooding occurring of the adjacent highway. I have not received this information so cannot recommend that the condition is discharged.

**Condition 65: Drainage Strategy - Objection**

The strategy to dispose of surface water to ground by infiltration using soakaways and permeable paving is acceptable to the Lead Local Flood Authority in principle. However, it appears some areas of the site may not be suitable to use this method. Therefore, I cannot recommend that this condition be discharged.

**Condition 67: Scheme to avoid the Risk of Ground Water Flooding**

No information has been received regarding this condition so I cannot recommend that it is discharged.

**Condition 69: Surface Water Drainage Strategy**

The Lead Local Flood Authority received a compliance note (Planning Condition 69 Compliance Statement Surface Water Drainage / Reuby & Stagg Limited / April 18) in respect of Condition 69, which demonstrated how the applicant complies with the additional requirements set out. The results of infiltration testing were included within the note, most of these results being favourable. However, this soakage testing demonstrates that 2 test locations failed – (Ref location: SA6 and SA7). The notes of the test record the failure due to ‘insufficient uptake’. Therefore, in a previous consultation response the Lead Local Flood Authority requested additional testing to be undertaken at the site, 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 with the applications.

A highway swale has been included within the proposals, but no calculations have been provided for the sizing of the swale.

Drainage standard details have been provided. Is it proposed to use silt traps/ maintenance chamber upstream of the proposed soakaways at the site? This will reduce silting up of the soakaway and reduce maintenance requirements of the structure.

No SuDS Maintenance Plan has been provided. It is not clear who the party responsible for maintenance of SuDS at the site is. This Plan should include

* + *Details of which organisation or body will be responsible for vesting and maintenance for individual aspects of the drainage proposals (individual properties/curtilages, roads, specific 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 80: Tree Pits and Associated Ground Level Surfacing Materials**

The Local Highway Authority has no objection to this condition being discharged.

**Officer’s Name:** Will Marshall

**Officer’s Title:** Senior Transport Planner

**Date:** 26 July 2018