

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

18 January 2018

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
11.	(Pages 1 - 3)	Written Update

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Aaron Hetherington, Democratic and Elections aaron.hetherington@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 227956

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 January 2018

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 8 17/01824/OUT Banbury Museum, Spiceball Park Road

Oxfordshire County Council Highways:

Further comments have been received from OCC, maintaining their objection. The comments state:

Further to OCC's objection on the grounds of:

- Lack of transport assessment
- Insufficient assessment of parking
- Inadequate arrangement for deliveries, with potential severe impact on road safety and obstruction of access along Spiceball Park Road.
- No cycle parking

A TS has been submitted, but it is not sufficient to enable me to remove my objection. This response should be read in conjunction with my response of 7 November.

Traffic Impact

The TS says that the proposals do not add to the existing facilities but enhance them. Whether it is 'adding to' or 'enhancing', the proposals are nevertheless for an additional 2815sqm of additional gallery space, enhanced café and lecture space – more than doubling the existing space - which does have the potential to generate additional trips. The Design and Access Statement says that the extension will allow the museum to become an even more significant cultural centre for the region, which does suggest that there is an aspiration to attract more visitors. However, the TS does not attempt to put a figure on the number of additional trips generated.

Some basic information is provided on existing footfall per day, with daily trips to the existing museum generally between 300 and 600 individuals per day, and more in school holidays and Saturdays. Although the TS says that a large proportion will be linked trips, which I accept, no attempt is made to translate the basic footfall information into an existing number of car trips, estimate the number of additional trips, and the proportion of these that are new trips. Without attempting to calculate this myself, I still cannot concur with the assumptions of the TS that the traffic impact will be minimal. It should be for the applicant to provide some estimate of the number of additional trips, and from that I will be able to form a view on the traffic impact.

In terms of conventional transport assessment, doubling the floor area would double the number of trips generated, and the TS needs to provide a convincing explanation of why this won't happen.

Additionally, the TA suggests that there is some evidence that visits are linked with other trips. This evidence should be provided in order to justify the claim for a high proportion of linked trips.

It is accepted that weekday trips are likely to be off-peak. However, the data shows higher footfall on Saturdays, which would coincide with the busiest time on the local network.

Parking

Because the trip generation has not been quantified, it is not possible to confirm that the impact on parking demand will be minimal. Although there are public car parks in the vicinity, the demands on these at peak times will be high and the Castle Quay 2 planning application provided detailed assessments of the adequacy of parking. Insufficient parking could lead to queueing obstructing the road network, and additional circulation of traffic contributing to congestion.

Deliveries

The application proposes building on the loading bay. Although I accept that deliveries will be infrequent, when they do arrive, it is likely the lorry will need to be parked for some considerable time. The proposed delivery arrangements will only be possible once Spiceball Park Road is realigned, as part of the future Castle Quay 2 development. It will not be possible for the lorry to park on Spiceball Park Road in its current alignment for reasons of highway safety. In response to my concerns about the access for deliveries, the TA points out that the application is in Outline, with all matters reserved including access. However, this must be considered at Outline stage because a condition would be required preventing the development from opening before the road is realigned.

Further the red line has not been amended and needs to include the area of works needed to realign Spiceball Park Road, as the realignment is necessary to the development.

Cycle Parking

The TS says that cycle parking can be dealt with as a reserved matter or condition. I would recommend that consideration is given to it at this stage. Although in Outline, there is a reasonable level of detail and given the constraints of the site, some cycle parking should be incorporated within the design, otherwise it will be difficult to fit it in at a later stage.

If notwithstanding this objection the Council is minded to approve the application they seek conditions concerning the servicing arrangements (detailed below), along with for cycle parking, a construction traffic management plan, and a travel

plan. They also advise that A section 278 agreement will be necessary for carrying out alterations to Spiceball Park Road

Suggested servicing arrangements condition:

- *No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied or brought into use before a scheme of highway improvements to realign Spiceball Park Road and to provide a loading bay on Spiceball Park Road (drawing ref: xxxx) has been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority [or similar wording].)*

Officer Comments:

The applicants agents have indicated that if we do not feel able to approve the scheme at this time the applicant is happy to agree to an extension to allow their highway consultants (Glanvilles) and your highways department to correspond and for the applicant to provide additional transport data.

In response to the above comments from OCC your officers consider that as the museum is located in the town centre car borne visitors to the museum will be able to use existing and proposed town centre public car parks and will probably be making linked trips to other town centre facilities, and therefore the number of additional visitors will not be significant in terms of additional numbers of vehicles on the network or using the car parks.

Members will recall that as part of the consideration of the CQ2 proposal a detailed assessment of the town's car parking was requested and considered (discounting the entirety of the Bolton Road car park that was due for demolition at the time of that assessment). The conclusion at that time was that at that time, and following the completion of the CQ2 development, adequate town centre car parking was and will be available. With no change in circumstances other than the availability of the land at Bolton Road for surface level car parking we consider that those conclusions are still right.

Turning to the issue of deliveries our assessment based on conversations with the museum management is that the servicing of the museum by large vehicles is a rare event (maybe 4 times a year) so the incidence of difficulty for the manoeuvring servicing vehicles to the future adjacent food store will also be infrequent and can be managed by liaison between the two operators. The issue of the red-line can be corrected before any permission is issued.

With regards to conditions, it is considered that proposed condition 6 in the committee report can be amended to deliver the same as the OCC proposed condition in their comments set out above. A construction management plan condition is agreed to be added. Cycle parking can be applied at reserved matters stage if considered necessary. A travel plan is considered unnecessary for an extension of this scale.