

APPLICATION WEB COMMENTS FORM

Information available for public inspection and available on our website

Location : Botley District Centre West way Botley

Proposal : Demolition of a mix of existing buildings and the erection of mixed use development comprising retail, restaurants and cafes, offices/business starter units, hotel, student accommodation and ancillary facilities, 50no. apartments, library, place of worship (Baptist Church), community hall, crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works, supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment, amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014.

Application Reference : P13/V2733/FUL - 952

Please complete

Your name :	Judy Roberts
Your address :	1 STONE CLOSE BOTLEY OXFORD OX2 9SQ
Date :	12 October 2014

Use the space below for your comments

Application Ref :-P13/V2733/FUL

Response from District Councillor for Cumnor and Appleton

12.10.14 Response to amended plans

The closing date for this consultation is 13.10.14 and there is still no response on the website from The Oxfordshire County Council so this inevitably means that my response to traffic, highways and school provision is my own.

Size - The main objection to this proposal after two amendments to the original application is its over-dominance, massing and poor design. Even though the Vale and the Design panel have requested a 3D model in relation to the surrounding existing buildings, all that has been provided is 2 videos that fade out before any existing buildings are visible. In my opinion, the perceived need for this level of retail provision, especially the size of supermarket, does not accurately reflect that currently existing within the city boundaries, nor that which is planned and approved (Waitrose and Westgate).

Design - The Design panel were neutral as to the retention of Elms Parade but did want a building of equal architectural merit. The NPPF also requires buildings to be in context with their current surroundings but there is no reflection of the 1930s architecture of Elms Parade, nor of the suburban low-

rise 1950-60s buildings. I do not think these amended plans have sufficient architectural merit.

Noise The Environmental Protection team of the Vale have restated (2/10/14) the need for a noise contour assessment so that the impact of the noise at each proposed level of the development can be assessed. The original figures were measured 26/7- 2/8 2013 (during the summer holidays) and, if the individual measurements at night (7pm-7am) are viewed rather than the averages, it can be seen that, even with triple glazing and insulation taken into account, in nearly every night time hour throughout the week the acceptable level of 30 dB LAeq is exceeded.

These levels include the fact that the windows will not be allowed to open and an air provision unit is to be used. Therefore each room in the hotel and student accommodation should have the ability to cool the room to 16 degrees C as well as heat it. This has not been specified.

Student Accommodation The planning officers have not yet stated whether any of this accommodation will count towards the 5-year housing provision. As it has specified that there will be no parking available for this accommodation, it is likely it will not. It currently shows 47% studio units and 53% 7-8 cluster units. As all of the universities in Oxford provide their own first year accommodation, there is no demonstrable need for 53% cluster units. There is no assessment for any child education provision even though they are aimed at postgraduates

Current Housing Provision The current housing provision in the area is 66 extra care flats plus 29 residential flats plus the Vale House flats and the Vicarage. Given the extremely large redevelopment scheme, there is only re-provision for 50 care home units. The extra care housing provision which currently supports people living in the community has been labelled care home which is not independent living. This leaves a deficit of 50 housing units towards the 5-year supply as there has been no replacement for any of the current residential flats or the Vicarage, which is now no longer relocated just completely eradicated.

Traffic The current vehicle movements have been over-estimated so that when compared to the predicted levels there is no significant increase. Again the model they have used does not correctly predict the effect the A34 has on local traffic movements and we await OCC's reply to confirm this.

Parking The number of 525 car spaces provided for in this development is questionable even in their own report: This standalone demand which includes a large element of long-stay staff parking reaches ca. 94% of car park capacity on weekdays and ca. 113% of car park capacity on Saturdays. They adjust these figures by adding in linked food-store journeys to other venues. This seems overestimated owing to the fact that food-store supplies frequently need correct storage conditions and as such would require an immediate return home.

With no designated spaces, 525 is supposed to be adequate for 1000 employees, 100 bed hotel, 8000 sq. metre food-store, many retail and restaurant facilities, school run parents, 6-screen cinema and 525 students. The control of these spaces is by 3 hours free parking with no control from 6pm to 8 am. This system is wholly inadequate.

Service Vehicle Access There is a shared service yard originally designated wholly for the superstore. The positioning of this yard makes it very difficult to

transfer goods to most of the retail units as it is on the first floor when they are on the ground floor. The only other provision is a layby shared with the bus stop and one positioned by the library. As these will be the sites of choice, it seems inevitable that they will interfere with traffic and bus flow. There is also a safety aspect to consider.

Pedestrian Access - Pedestrian access across the entrances and exits from the car park and the service yard have barriers to restrict the vehicle flow but without the provision of pedestrian lights how will that protect pedestrians? A different surface material will not stop a vehicle.

Sunlight/ Daylight Report In the original documents there were some graphic pictures showing the mass of the proposed buildings and their effect upon the daylight provision to the housing in West Way. The stated effect upon numbers 60-76 was a material planning consideration. In these amended plans they have altered the heights of the main block and Care Home but no amended sunlight assessment has been provided so the material planning objection stands.

The emerging Local Plan has not been approved by the Inspector and as such does not carry as much weight as existing policies and the NPPF. I object to these proposals on the basis that they contravene the NPPF on the grounds of not being in harmony with the existing buildings and policies S1 and S12 in causing harm to the area.