

From: Nick Small <Nick.Small@stagecoachbus.com>
Sent: 23 March 2020 11:46
To: Linda Griffiths <Linda.Griffiths@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Cc: Harrison, Dave - Communities <Dave.Harrison@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>; Martin Gibbon <Martin.Gibbon@stagecoachbus.com>
Subject: I9/01037/REM South of Salt Way Bodicote

Linda

This is an especially important application inasmuch as it provides for the eastern portion of a future bus route, which may well be provided in whole or in part as a longer-distance service rather than being merely an entirely local affair. Achieving a spine road design that facilitates safe and efficient bus operations, without unduly or unacceptably impacting on residential amenity, is therefore a significant consideration if NPPF paras 102-03; 108-109 are to be satisfied, among other things. This design approach ultimately consented for this application also represents a precedent for the larger balance of the Salt Way allocation - the largest in Banbury - under L+Q control to the west.

I see that the application has evolved very substantially over that initially submitted and I note your further comments in your correspondence to the applicants of 14 January 2020. In it I note that you refer to the need for wider verges, the provision of off-carriageway bays to allow for incidental parking along the Main Street, and some other matters, related to the nature of the Main Street frontage and the way it is treated. There is a very challenging tension to be achieved between achieving a "tight urban form" along this street as stated in your post-submission advice in August 2019, and maintaining an appropriate movement function serving the whole allocation, further consented allocated land west of Bloxham Road, and achieving the wider traffic mitigation that the Main Street is intended to address.

I am afraid that I have yet to see any response from County Highways DM, on the public access system, so what I offer below is to an extent lacking the context that I would typically like to see when there are multiple trade-offs to be achieved. Clearly bus operations are just one element that needs to be factored in.

I concur entirely with the broad thrust of your advice and in particular:

- I would reinforce in particular the need to ensure the Main Street is not populated with large numbers of parked cars. Accordingly parking bays should be provided as you advise. Continuous or near-continuous frontage makes this more rather than less important. A 6.75m minimum width does not in and of itself make the street more permeable by buses. In fact, because it encourages parking on both sides of the street, it is actually more prone to becoming effectively single carriageway barely capable of a large vehicle passing between parked cars; or even blocked to buses. The tighter bends are, and the higher density of immediately adjoining development, the more likely this problem is to arise.
- The approach to street trees in line with County guidance is also important. We see no reason why such an approach should not be compatible with bus operations.

I would also add that:

1. A pair of bus stops on the spine road at the sports facility car park would be appropriate, not least to augment sustainable access to the CDC offices and school, as well as the easternmost plots on the development. I seem to recall we raised this in our initial comments.
2. Plots fronting the Spine Road on the southern side will all have habitable windows within 5m of the kerbline. Even all-electric buses are far from silent. It is highly likely that in Summer in particular residents will have multiple windows open in the front elevation to night-purge internal heat gains. The effects of buses and other passing traffic on the internal acoustic environment is going to require more careful consideration here as Building Regulations continue to tighten.
- 3: The whole road is significantly more sinuous and organic in form than initially submitted. The lozenge feature in particular should be tracked in both directions for a 12.2m Scania K230UB bus as set out in our national residential design guidance. We do operate exactly this type from the Banbury depot.
4. In addition the effects of buses stopped at the stop by plot 80-81 on adjoining occupier amenity is likely to be considered detrimental, by virtue of vehicle proximity to windows in plot 81. The amenity impact of traffic in general on residential amenity could well prove unacceptable. The stop looks unable to be materially adjusted without simply moving the issue. Plot 81 is an affordable 1-bed. It might be the case that this is the only achievable solution, given the lozenge feature that precludes its relocation abeam of the open space corridor.

I appreciate this has been under determination for quite a while; however I also note that quite a number of matters still feature in your advice that the applicant needs to consider.

Do please contact me to discuss any of the above.

Yours sincerely

Nick Small

Head of Strategic Development and the Built Environment



This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. All messages are scanned for viruses, but we cannot accept liability for any viruses that may be transmitted in or with this email. If you have received this email in error please notify the IT department at it.support@stagecoachbus.com.

Company Name: Stagecoach Group plc
Registered Address: 10 Dunkeld Road, Perth, PH1 5TW
Registered Number: 100764 in Scotland

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..