

Public Document Pack



URGENT BUSINESS AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

11 March 2010

Title
Written Update

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Michael Sands, Legal and Democratic Services michael.sands@cherwell-dc.gov.uk (01295) 221554

Agenda Item 16

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 March 2010

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 7

09/01811/F

Land S Milton Rd. Bloxham

1. Oxfordshire County Council highways has undertaken further negotiations with regards to details of the internal road format, visibility splays and parking spaces. These issues are approaching satisfactory conclusion, and any permission will be based on the receipt of plans indicating these agreed changes.
2. Further to para. 5.9 of the report agreement has now been reached with the developers with regards to the funding of play provision and all other necessary community infrastructure payments. The recommendation remains subject to the completion of an appropriate Section 106 agreement.

Agenda Item 8

10/00023/TWA Bicester to Oxford Rail link

1. **Oxfordshire County Council** has commented to the Secretary of State in the following way:-
 - They support in principle and welcome the improved passenger rail service and facilities. The improvements will allow the growth of Bicester and the eco development proposed there to take place in a sustainable way and reduce impact upon already congested trunk roads
 - They have some areas of concern which they hope and believe will be resolved by negotiations. They are
 - The inappropriate development in the Green Belt will have to demonstrate very special circumstances- not yet demonstrated
 - A proposed road runs near to Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument and may adversely impact upon it
 - The proposed Water Eaton station appears likely to cause unacceptable increases in traffic levels and or queues at junctions on the surrounding road network
 - The proposed car park at Bicester Town station appears likely to cause unacceptable increases in traffic levels and or queues at junctions on the surrounding road network. Insufficient information on the measures Chiltern propose to actively encourage travel to the station by other than the private car.
 - The proposed large increase in time which the London Rd Bicester level crossing will be closed to road traffic and consequent delays
 - The junctions accessing the stations may not be able to accommodate the new traffic flows
 - Chiltern Rail's proposals for Oxford station do not contribute to the developing masterplan for the station
 - The car parking regimes at stations are unclear
 - The car park at Water Eaton is not designed to protect the current established park and ride , and could cause capacity issues

- especially as this P&R serves the hospitals as well as the town centre
 - Use of CPO powers to acquire OCC land
 - Stopping up of some highways is envisaged
 - Maintenance of future bridges?
 - Stopping up/Diversion of a bridleway and footpath because of the excessive distances of alternative routes
 - Many proposals still only illustrative and may have impact on Council owned land or highway impacts

2. **Islip Parish Council** wishes to express support in principle. It wishes to see the level crossing closed and replaced by a pedestrian bridge , but is opposed to the bridge as shown because of its siting, loss of agricultural land impact on adjacent cottage, loss of privacy to nearby houses and out of scale. This may be driven by the assumed need to retain equestrian access, but they do not believe such a demand exists
3. The Council's Environmental Protection Officer has no objections to the scheme from an air quality or land contamination point of view but notes that air quality from altered traffic patterns may need assessment as the project progresses . Further detailed work may be necessary at Water Eaton station site and with regards to possible hydrocarbon contamination

Agenda Item 9

- Arncott Parish Council raises no objection to the proposal, but raises the following observations:
 - Drainage Ditch and pooling of water at the lower end of the site. While the Arncott PC accepts the points made concerning road construction to County Council standards and improvements to the drainage ditch parishioners remain unconvinced that the drainage ditch will be able to cope with the water runoff during periods of moderate to heavy rainfall. Therefore, the Arncott PC wishes that as part of the development the construction company is tasked with ensuring that the drainage ditch is clear to the point where it joins the stream/sewer. Additionally, the Arncott PC wishes to know the proposed maintenance plan for the drainage ditch on an annual basis.
 - Parking. The proposed development shows clearly the additional parking to be provided and Cherwell District Council (DC) has reiterated the point during recent email exchanges. However, paragraph 11, Vehicle Parking, of the Application for Planning Permission shows that 8 disability spaces are to be provided. These cannot be located on the development plan. As disability spaces tend to be larger than normal parking spaces Arncott PC wishes to understand what impact this is likely to have on the proposed parking allocation.
 - Street Lighting. Arncott PC is concerned that there is no allowance for a street light adjacent to parking area 1. We would have expected at least one street light near or on parking area 1.

- Line-of-sight on exiting the development site. Arncott PC remains concerned that the line-of-sight assessment does not take account of the vehicles that tend to be parked on the right as an individual exits the development site. The laws of parking opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction are understood but Arncott PC wishes to be reassured that vehicle parking on Buchanan Road was considered when the line-of-sight assessment was made.
- Three additional letters of objection have been received. One additional material consideration was raised:
 - Access to existing properties for fuel delivery.
- The Strategic Housing Officer in the Housing Services Dept. has confirmed that a Section 106 agreement is not required as nomination rights can be achieved by a separate agreement with the RSL.

Agenda Item 11

1. Amended description – now reads
“Single storey rear extension (as amended by side elevations and floor plans received 24.2.10 and additional roof plan received 1.3.10)”
2. A letter has been received from a neighbour who expresses concern about loss of light to conservatory and windows and about proximity of foundations/guttering to their property.
3. OCC highways recommend conditions re parking and garaging, but these conditions are considered inappropriate in these circumstances .
4. Banbury Town Council raise no objections