

## **OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West Way Botley

**This report sets out Oxfordshire County Council's view on the proposal.**

**Annexes to the report contain officer advice and the comments of local members.**

---

### **Overall view of Oxfordshire County Council:-**

The county council **objects** to this application for the reasons set out below.

#### **Comments:**

In principle, the county council supports the redevelopment of West Way shopping area in Botley. However, due to the scale of this proposal and its subsequent impact upon the highway, the county council objects to this particular proposal for the following reasons:

- the development will have a negative traffic impact on surrounding junctions and the application offers no mitigation measures to address this;
- there is no enforceable regime proposed for ensuring that the student accommodation remains car free. The county council is concerned at the likelihood of the development generating on-street parking in nearby residential streets. It should be noted that there is no guarantee of a controlled parking zone being implemented to mitigate the impact of the parking problems in nearby residential streets; and
- the county council disputes the level of pass-by trips assumed in the traffic assessment.

However, should the district council be minded to approve the application, the proposal will impact upon various infrastructure and services provided by the county council. Therefore contributions would be required towards public transport and associated infrastructure, cycle paths, potential Controlled Parking Zones, improvements to junctions as well as other county council services such as libraries.

The county council's full comments are contained within Annex 1 of this report.

**Officer's Name:** Daniel Round

**Officer's Title:** Locality Manager - Oxford

**Date:** 13 October 2014

---

**ANNEX 1**  
**OFFICER ADVICE**

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West Way Botley

---

### **Transport**

#### **Recommendation**

Objection

#### **Key issues**

1. An interim response was supplied by the county council to the district council in April 2014.
2. The county council disputes the level of pass-by trips assumed in the traffic modelling.
3. The development will have a negative traffic impact on surrounding junctions and no mitigation is offered.
4. There is no demonstrated regime for keeping the student accommodation car free.
5. The county council is concerned at the likelihood of development generated on-street parking, and it may not be politically possible to introduce a controlled parking zone.
6. Provisions will need to be made for the improvement of bus infrastructure.
7. The county council agrees with the conditions identified by the district's Drainage Engineer and these need to be adhered to.

#### **Legal Agreement required to secure**

If the district council is minded to approve the application then a Section 106 Agreement must include the following.

- Contribution of £25,000 towards the physical bus stop infrastructure required at existing and relocated bus stops in Westway and Westminster Way, to comprise 3 new shelters, 3 real-time information signs, the costs of electrical disconnection and reconnection and three relocated pole/flag/information case units.
- Improvements to the Westway/Westminster Way and Westway/A420 junctions so that traffic conditions are at least no worse than now.

- Improvements to bus priority at the Eynsham Rd/B4044 junction and also along the B4044 in front of the development.
- Improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure for users accessing the development.
- Design and implementation of a controlled parking zone in the area of approximately a one mile radius around the development, with exact scope to be agreed with the county council.
- Cycle parking surveys to be undertaken every six months for the first two years of occupation to determine whether cycle parking provisions are adequate.
- Contribution of £9,400 to cover the cost of travel plan monitoring for 5 years after occupation. This figure is assembled as follows: Framework Travel Plan £2,040; Supplementary Travel Plan for A1 food store £2,040; Supplementary Travel Plan for Cinema £2,040; Supplementary Travel Plan for hotel £1,240; Supplementary Travel Plan for student accommodation.

If the district council is minded to approve the application then a Section 278 Agreement must include the following.

- Agreed improved bus priority measures described in the conditions of consent, to include a bus priority arrangement from the Eynsham Road into Westway.
- Off-site highway works as set out on drawing No.JNY7538-11.

### **Conditions**

Should the local planning authority decide to grant planning permission, then the following conditions should be applied.

HY1 – Access

HY3 – Visibility splays

HY7 – Car parking

HY12 – New estate roads

Prior to the commencement of the development the developer should submit plans for the design of the main highway adjoining and nearby to the site that ensure buses are protected from any adverse impact of this development on bus journey speeds. This will need to be approved by the county council. These plans should include specific improved bus priority measures, including the extension of the eastbound bus lane back to Eynsham Road and Cumnor Hill and providing wider bus lanes.

Prior to the commencement of the development the developer should submit a plan showing improved infrastructure at the pair of Elms Parade bus stops, comprising high-specification shelters at least 6 metres long for passenger comfort and containing electronic real time information and seating. This plan must be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority in consultation with the county council.

Prior to the commencement of the development the developer should identify a new location for the existing northbound Westminster Way bus stop and provide a new site plan, showing how this relocated stop integrates into the overall scheme design. This plan must be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority in consultation with the county council.

Prior to the commencement of the development a plan showing options for improving cycling infrastructure for people accessing the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority in consultation with the county council.

Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Traffic Management Plan complying with the county council's standards and guidelines must be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority in consultation with the county council. The construction works must be carried out in accordance with the details approved in the construction traffic management plan.

Prior to the commencement of the development, a fully designed scheme utilising a sustainable drainage system for the surface water drainage of the development needs to be submitted and once approved the scheme needs to be implemented prior to occupation of any part of the site to which the scheme relates. This is to ensure the effective and sustainable drainage of the site and to avoid flooding.

Prior to the occupation of the development a Car Park Management Plan, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority. The Car Park Management Plan must be implemented immediately on occupation of the development.

Prior to the occupation of the development a Service and Delivery Management Plan, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority. The Service and Delivery Management Plan must be implemented immediately on occupation of the development.

Prior to the occupation of the development a CCTV Plan, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority. The CCTV Plan must be implemented immediately on occupation of the development.

Prior to the occupation of the development the Framework travel plan is up dated to cover any units that fall below the thresholds for needing a full travel plan, and supplementary travel plans will be required for any land use that is over the thresholds set out in Oxfordshire County Council's Guidance – Transport for New Development: Transport Assessments & Travel Plans (March 2014) or any updated document.

### **Informatives**

The Advance Payments Code (APC), Sections 219 -225 of the Highways Act, is in force in the county to ensure financial security from the developer to off-set the frontage owners' liability for private street works, typically in the form of a cash deposit or bond. Should a developer wish for a street or estate to remain private then to secure exemption from the APC procedure a 'Private Road Agreement' must be entered into with the county council to protect the interests of prospective frontage owners. Alternatively the developer may wish to consider adoption of the estate road under Section 38 of the Highways Act.

All works in and immediately adjacent the highway will be subject to a separate agreement with the county council under Section 278 of the Highways Act.

### **Detailed Comments**

The revised scheme together with a Transport Assessment Addendum was received by THE COUNTY COUNCIL on 8 September 2014 with a deadline for response to VOWH of 13 October 2014. The information received is comprehensive and represents a departure from the previous scheme and its supporting transport submission.

### **Transport Assessment and Transport Assessment Addendum**

The planning application was accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA). A review of this document by the county council revealed significant shortcomings in the case presented which affected the overall magnitude of the findings, and pointed to an outcome that could be more favourable than that which may actually prevail. In particular the analysis relied on some doubtful assumptions and data, and there were some significant omissions. These related to both the traffic and parking analysis and suggested that the traffic impact on the surrounding road network may be worse than presented, and that the car parking proposals may not be adequate and may result in overspill parking on the surrounding streets.

A comprehensive list of these concerns was supplied by the county council to the district council in the form of an interim response in April. Consequently, the county council entered into a dialogue with the developers transport consultant in an effort to resolve the issues highlighted.

The result of this process was the submission of a Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) which was submitted with the revised scheme in September. The TAA satisfactorily addresses a number of the county council's concerns in whole or in part. However, it has employed a different set of assumptions regarding the proportion of retail trip types which has resulted in a significant reduction in the demonstrated traffic impact.

The principal change is the assumption of 40% pass-by trips and the rationale for this assumption is that this figure was agreed by the county council for the now permitted Waitrose development on Botley Road. However, the county council disputes the applicability of this figure in the case of this development and believes it should be lower, because:

- The retail offer at Waitrose is likely to be more specialized and therefore to attract more pass-by trips;
- The supermarket proposed at this development is far larger and more likely to attract single purpose bulk shopping trips.

As a result of previous comments by the county council the modeling exercise also employs a different form of trip distribution gravity model. The form of model and data input appears acceptable, and the results seem intuitively reasonable.

### **Traffic Impact**

The proposed development is in a location where there is already severe congestion on the highway network at peak times during the week and for long periods of the day at the weekend. The figures presented in the Transport Assessment show that the proposals would notably worsen conditions in the weekday pm peak and on a Saturday. This would have a knock on detrimental impact on people accessing the development and the immediate surrounding area in Botley. More widely, it affects the movement of people in and out of Oxford city centre. This development as proposed could therefore negatively impact on the economic growth of Oxford given the importance of the Botley Road as its access. This impact would be demonstrated as greater if a more realistic level of pass-by trip making was assumed.

No mitigation is proposed as part of the development for the junctions negatively affected by the development. This lack of mitigation, especially at the junction of Westway/A420 is not acceptable. As a minimum, the developer should be proposing improvement schemes to ensure conditions are made no worse at the junctions. Funding to implement such proposals would also need to be secured through a S106 agreement.

## **Student Accommodation**

The original TA asserted that the 525 student rooms at the development would be car free with residents entering in to an undertaking not to bring cars to the site. This position was reiterated in a Student Management Plan (SMP) which was submitted in June 2014 and which stated that:

*“No car parking will be provided for students on site (except for a small number of disabled spaces in the main car park) and students will be required to sign up to a Restrictive Covenant in their tenancy agreement to legally bind them not to bring cars to the accommodation and not to park in the adjacent areas.”*

In relation to parking, the SMP further stated that:

*“This will be monitored by on site staff and if it is found to be abused financial penalties will be applied until the offence is rectified and following continual abuse then GMS will have the ability to terminate the offender’s tenancy.”*

Whilst this is the stated intention the county council has serious doubts about whether such a regime can be practically monitored and enforced. This position was set out in the county council’s interim response to district council, but no information has been received that demonstrates that an effective set of monitoring and enforcement procedures can be introduced. The situation is complicated by the fact that at the time of writing, an operator for the student accommodation has not been identified.

It will not be practicable for facilities management personnel at the student accommodation to establish whether students living there are using a car and therefore parking it in the vicinity. Even if a report by a local resident points to a specific car as belonging to a student, the operator of the accommodation is not allowed to gain the relevant information from the DVLA to find out who does in fact own it.

In the absence of such an effective regime, it is entirely possible that student residents will own cars and park them on the surrounding streets. In this respect it is worth noting that the SMP states that “over 50% of the accommodation is likely to be occupied by a mature student base...” It is logical to assume that mature students are more likely to be in a financial position to own and operate a car, and that the overspill effect on surrounding streets could be significant. Even if only 10% of people living in the student accommodation owned cars, this would result in an additional 50 cars being parked on local residential streets.

## **Car Parking**

The county council has serious concerns regarding the potential for overspill parking from this development onto the immediately surrounding streets. It is believed that this could realistically occur for the following reasons:

- The pass-by factor applied in the modelling is considered to be too high and more cars may access the development than the modelling suggests.
- There is no effective set of monitoring and enforcement procedures to prevent students resident at the student accommodation from owning cars and parking them on-street.
- According to the application form there will be some 530 additional full time equivalent employees. These are likely to generate additional demand for parking which is unlikely to use the paid car park on site, and therefore is likely to park on the surrounding streets.

If a controlled parking zone (CPZ) were introduced in the local area, this would go a long way to addressing the county council’s concerns by preventing undesirable on-street parking.

However, the introduction of a CPZ requires a formal consultation process and a political decision on the proposal in the light of the feedback received during the consultation. It is entirely possible that a CPZ would not be agreed at the relevant committee meeting. This would then leave the local streets unprotected and open for development related parking. The county council is not willing to take this risk.

### **Public Transport**

West Way is an extremely important bus corridor, with various inter-urban and intra-urban routes linking country towns and suburban areas with the centre of Oxford. Buses already suffer from significant delay caused by congestion when passing through Botley, resulting in extremely long passenger journeys and also extreme variations of arrival time from day to day.

The county council has various policies supporting the establishment of an effective public transport network, especially on routes accessing Oxford city centre where bus travel accounts for up to 50% of journeys into the centre. Given the obvious lack of road space, the economy of Oxford depends on the delivery of an effective and frequent network of buses along the main arterial routes.

The Elms Parade pair of bus stops serves a number of main bus routes which provide a combined service of up to 15 buses per hour between the development and Oxford city centre. It is possible that these services may become more frequent as a consequence of new residential development in the western part of Oxfordshire. The Elms Parade bus stops are very well used, and will increasingly be used by residents and users of the proposed development. Improvements to infrastructure at these bus stops would therefore be required as part of the proposed development. Unloading goods at these stops and in the adjacent bus lanes will not be permitted.

The Westminster Way pair of bus stops serves the route between Harcourt Hill and Wheatley via Oxford city centre with a frequency of between 2 and 3 buses per hour. The northbound stop on Westminster Way is manifestly inadequate for its future use by students living in the proposed residential facility. This stop should be relocated nearer to the development, and be provided with a shelter including a real-time information facility.

The layout and location of the improved bus stops should be agreed with the county council. The type and design of bus shelters should be agreed with North Hinksey Parish Council along with an agreement for on-going maintenance arrangements.

### **Framework Travel Plan**

The Framework Travel Plan submitted in December 2013 (Project Number/Document Reference: MP/JT/ed/JNY7538-05) was acceptable for the application submission but it will need to be updated prior to the occupation.

Supplementary travel plans will be required for any land use that is over the thresholds set out in Oxfordshire County Council's Guidance – Transport for New Development: Transport Assessments & Travel Plans (March 2014) or any updated document. In the case of this application these land uses are: the A1 food store, cinema, hotel, student accommodation. Contributions will be required to cover the cost of monitoring all travel plans.

<b>Officer's Name</b>	:	Chris Nichols
<b>Officer's Title</b>	:	Transport Development Control
<b>Date</b>	:	08 October 2014

---



## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West way Botley

---

### Archaeology

#### Recommendation:

No objection subject to conditions

#### Key issues:

The current land use of the application area makes any predetermination evaluation very difficult.

The area will have previously been extensively truncated.

Some elements of the original Elms Farm may survive and such features will require recording.

There is no evidence that features that are demonstrably of equivalent importance to a scheduled monument are present within the application area.

#### Conditions:

1. The applicant, or their agents or successors in title, shall be responsible for organising and implementing an archaeological watching brief, to be maintained during the period of construction/during any groundworks taking place on the site. The watching brief shall be carried out by a professional archaeological organisation in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation that has first been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To safeguard the recording of archaeological matters within the site in accordance with the NPPF (2012)

2. Following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 1, no development shall commence on site without the appointed archaeologist being present. Once the watching brief has been completed its findings shall be reported to the Local Planning Authority, as agreed in the Written Scheme of Investigation, including all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication.

Reason - To safeguard the recording of archaeological matters within the site in accordance with the NPPF (2012)

**Detailed Comments:**

The current land use of the application area makes any predetermination evaluation very difficult.

The area will have previously been extensively truncated.

Elements of the original Elms Farm may survive and such features will require recording. There is no evidence that features that are demonstrably of equivalent importance to a scheduled monument are present within the application area.

The county council would, therefore, recommend that, should planning permission be granted, the applicant should be responsible for ensuring the implementation of an archaeological monitoring and recording action (watching brief) to be maintained during the period of construction. This can be ensured through the attachment of suitable negative conditions.

**Officer's Name:** Hugh Coddington  
**Officer's Title:** Archaeology Team Leader  
**Date:** 15 September 2014

---

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West way Botley

---

### Economy and Skills

#### Key issues:

- Paragraph 14.11 of the Botley District Centre EIA Vol 3: Non-Technical Summary confirms that around 600 construction jobs will be created on site, which is considered a **Moderate Beneficial** effect of a temporary duration.
- Paragraph 14.12 states that the net additional operational employment opportunities arising as a consequence of the proposed development, over and above the baseline of existing employment on the site, is an estimated total of 483. This is considered to be a **Major Beneficial** effect, at the sub-regional level

#### Conditions:

The developers will be required to prepare and implement, with local agencies and providers, an Employment & Skills Plan (ESP) that will ensure, as far as possible, that local people have access to training (including apprenticeships) and employment opportunities available at the construction and end user phases of this proposed development. The commitment of the developers to prepare an ESP needs to be clearly articulated in the EIA.

The ESP might typically cover the following outcomes (both construction & end use phases):

- Number of apprenticeships
- Employment/training initiatives for all ages, including work tasters and work placements
- Traineeships for younger people, including those who are not in employment, education or training (NEET)
- Best endeavours to maximise local labour
- Local procurement agreement – potential for local businesses to be included in tender lists
- Support for local skills and training events – i.e. Careersfest, National Apprenticeship Week etc
- School, college and university engagement initiatives such as site visits, school visits and project support

#### Detailed Comments:

Recent policy initiatives relating to skills development are contained in:

- The Oxfordshire City Deal
- Oxfordshire European Structural Investment Fund (ESIF) Strategy
- Strategic Economic Plan

The recently launched **Oxfordshire Skills Strategy** has five strategic priorities:

- SP1: To meet the needs of local employers through a more integrated and responsive approach to education and training: developed in partnership with our provider network, to encourage more training provision in priority sectors - both current and projected - to meet the needs of employers or to train future entrepreneurs, particularly in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).
- SP2: Creating the 'skills continuum' to support young people through their learning journey: the ambition is to develop integrated, seamless services that support young people through school and on into training, further education, employment or business, where they understand the full breadth of career options, including local demand, and the training path to succeed in that career.
- SP3: Up-skilling and improving the chances of young people and adults marginalised or disadvantaged from work, based on moving them closer to the labour market.
- SP4: To increase the number of apprenticeship opportunities, particularly those offered by small to medium sized businesses.
- SP5: To explore how we can better retain graduates within Oxfordshire to meet the demand for the higher level skills our businesses need.

### **Employment and skills planning justification**

A better, appropriately skilled local workforce can provide a pool of talent to both developers and end the county councilupiers. This will reduce the need to import skills, and in doing so reduce congestion and unsustainable travel to work modes, reduce carbon emissions and the pressure on the local housing infrastructure.

Seeking skills and training planning obligations or conditions to maximise the potential of the existing population to compete for the jobs being created, whether during the construction phase or end user phase, through improving their skills levels, is necessary to ensure that future development is economically and socially sustainable, and that barriers to employment for those marginalised from the workforce are removed.

Developers often identify projected training and employment outcomes as part of the justification for development. It is important therefore that the impacts of economic development are mitigated and the economic benefits of new development in terms of improved local skills and employment outcomes are realised.

Not only is it clear that skills levels are a key determinant of a sustainable local economy, but they also have an impact on employment opportunities and thus an individual's economic prosperity. Up-skilling the area's labour force will be key to maintaining economic competitiveness.. Securing obligations for skills development and employment of local people will be necessary to enhance social inclusion by reducing the potential for economic and social disparity, another key policy driver at the local level.

**Officer's Name:** Dawn Pettis  
**Officer's Title:** Economic Development Strategy Officer  
**Date:** 06 October 2014

---

## **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West way Botley

---

### **Education**

#### **Recommendation:**

No objection

#### **Key issues:**

Based on the information provided within the application it is unlikely that the development will lead to any additional demand for school places in the area.

If the planning application alters in any way the mix, type or tenure of accommodation then this position may change and the opinion of the county will be revised.

#### **Detailed Comments:**

Parents with children at Botley Primary School who bring their children by car are currently advised to park at Botley Parade to avoid congestion in Elms Road. It will be important that the layout of the new development does not make parking (here) and crossing to the school any less convenient.

**Officer's Name:** Barbara Chillman / Peter Gilkes

**Officer's Title:** PPP Manager / School Organisation Officer

**Date:** 23 September 2014

---

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West way Botley

---

### Property

#### Recommendation:

No objection subject to conditions

#### Key issues:

- The county council considers that the effect of the application forming this development will place additional strain on its existing community infrastructure.
- The following development mix has been used to calculate contributions
  - 460 No. x net one Bed student dwellings: accounting for demolition of existing residential buildings

It is calculated that this development would generate a net increase of:  
**460 additional residents including:**

#### Legal Agreement required to secure:

- Local Library infrastructure - Removal of existing facilities to be mitigated by delivery of new enhanced library facility, including temporary provision between the closure of one facility and the opening of the new.
- Local library book stock                   £9,200
- Central Library remodelling           £7,889
- Museum                                       £2,300
- Waste infrastructure                   £29,440
- TOTAL                                       £48,829**
  
- Administration                           £5,000

\*Total to be Index-linked from 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2012 Using PUBSEC Tender Price Index

### Conditions:

The county council as Fire Authority has a duty to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available for fire-fighting purposes. There will probably be a requirement to affix fire hydrants within the development site. Exact numbers and locations cannot be given until detailed consultation plans are provided showing highway, water main layout and size. We would therefore ask you to add the requirement for provision of hydrants in accordance with the requirements of the Fire & Rescue Service as a condition to the grant of any planning permission

### Informatives:

Fire & Rescue Service recommends that new dwellings should be constructed with sprinkler systems

### Detailed Comments:

#### **Central Library**

Central Library in Oxford serves the whole county and requires remodelling to support service delivery that includes provision of library resources across the county.

Remodelling of the library at 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2013 base prices leaves a funding requirement still to be secured = £4.1 M

60% of this funding is collected from development in the Oxford area. The remainder 40% is spread across the four other Districts. 40% of 4.1M = £1,604,000.

Population across Oxfordshire outside of Oxford City District is forecast to grow by 93,529 to year 2026.  $£1,604,000 \div 93,529 \text{ people} = £17.15 \text{ per person}$

**£ 17.15 x 460 (The forecast number of new residents) or £41.16 per dwelling = £7,889**

#### **Local Library**

The county council is supportive of expansion and relocation of the library as proposed within the application subject to no increase in consequential revenue implications due to costs of occupation as has been agreed in principal with the developer.

The new library will need to be fitted out and fully operational from 'day 1' all at the developers cost including works, fit-out, furniture, ICT, professional fees, legal costs and the like.

The county council will also require the provision of a temporary library facility of a floor area equivalent to that of the existing library from when the existing has to close and until the relocated one has opened.

All of the above would be at no cost to Oxfordshire County Council beyond that which it incurs in operation of the existing library.

The proposal would also generate the need to increase the core book stock held by the local library by 2 volumes per additional resident. The price per volume is £10.00. This equates to £20 per person at 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2012 price base



The full requirement for the provision of library infrastructure and supplementary core book stock in respect of this application would therefore be based on the following formula:

$$\mathbf{\pounds 20 \times 460 \text{ (the forecast number of new residents)} = \pounds 9,200}$$

### **Strategic Waste Management**

Under Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, County Councils, as waste disposal authorities, have a duty to arrange for places to be provided at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of that waste.

To meet the additional pressures on the various Household Waste and Recycling Centre provision in Oxfordshire enhancements to these centres are either already taking place or are planned, and, to this end, contributions are now required from developers towards their redesign and redevelopment.

Costs are based on a new site serving 20,000 households costs in the region of £3,000,000; this equates to £64 per person at 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2012 price base.

$$\mathbf{\pounds 64 \times 460 \text{ (the forecast number of new residents)} = \pounds 29,440}$$

### **County Museum Resource Centre**

Oxfordshire County Council's museum service provides a central Museum Resource Centre (MRC). The MRC is the principal store for the Oxfordshire Museum, Cogges Manor Farm Museum, Abingdon Museum, Banbury Museum, the Museum of Oxford and the Vale and Downland Museum. It provides support to these museums and schools throughout the county for educational, research and leisure activities.

The MRC is operating at capacity and needs an extension to meet the demands arising from further development throughout the county. An extended facility will provide additional storage space and allow for increased public access to the facility.

An extension to the MRC to mitigate the impact of new development up to 2026 has been costed at £460,000; this equates to £5 per person at 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2012 price base.

$$\mathbf{\pounds 5 \times 460 \text{ (the forecast number of new residents)} = \pounds 2,300}$$

### **Administration**

Oxfordshire County Council require an administrative payment of £5,000 for the purposes of administration and monitoring of the proposed S106 agreement.

### **Indexation**

Financial contributions have to be indexed-linked to maintain the real values of the contributions (so that they can in future years deliver the same level of infrastructure provision currently envisaged). The price bases of the various contributions are covered in the relevant sections above.

### **General**

The contributions requested have been calculated where possible using details of the development mix from the application submitted or if no details are available then the county council has used the best information available. Should the application be amended or the

development mixed changed at a later date, the Council reserves the right to seek a higher contribution according to the nature of the amendment.

The contributions which are being sought are necessary to protect the existing levels of infrastructure for local residents. They are relevant to planning the incorporation of this major development within the local community, if it is implemented. They are directly related to this proposed development and to the scale and kind of the proposal.

**Officer's Name:** Oliver Spratley

**Officer's Title:** Asset Strategy Support Officer

**Date:** 03 October 2014

---

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West way Botley

---

### Ecology

**Key issues:**

The District Council should be seeking the advice of their in-house ecologist who can advise them on this application.

In addition, the following guidance document on Biodiversity & Planning in Oxfordshire combines planning policy with information about wildlife sites, habitats and species to help identify where biodiversity should be protected. The guidance also gives advice on opportunities for enhancing biodiversity:

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/planning-and-biodiversity>

**Officer's Name:** Tamsin Atley

**Officer's Title:** Ecologist Planner

**Date:** 02 October 2014

---

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West way Botley

---

### LOCAL MEMBER VIEWS

---

**Cllr:** Janet Godden

**Division:** North Hinksey

**Comments:**

Many local residents have contacted me with their concerns about this application. The revisions announced last month are felt to make little or no difference.

The proposed development is unanimously seen as far too tall and far too large for its tightly enclosed site in a residential area. This is the crux of the matter. The visual impact would be overwhelming to those who would be living in close proximity to the development, or have it dominating their skyline. Little or no architectural merit is perceived. Residents are particularly disappointed that no 3D scale-model has so far been produced showing the proposed new buildings together with existing houses both behind (Arthray Road) and opposite. It is notoriously difficult to judge height and dominance from drawings.

As residents see it, the new facilities are not designed for, but would be imposed upon, the population of Botley with users drawn from a wide area: customers for a supermarket of the size proposed and 6 cinemas cannot be drawn from Botley. Yet neither the EIA nor the main application acknowledge adverse effects from any increase in traffic. The under-croft car park is of particular concern, both as a gloomy and unfriendly place, and because the number of spaces is seen as grossly insufficient. The idea of car-free student accommodation is thought wholly unrealistic. The requirements of the hotel seem underestimated. Surrounding residential roads already suffer badly from commuter and other on-street parking and there is no room for overspill. There is a strong feeling that the number of parking places required should be accurately calculated and fully provided.

There is firm local loyalty to the independent traders who serve the community well, and help to make 'Botley shops' the friendly environment that it is.

The demolition and construction phase, of 3 years anticipated duration, is a further cause of anxiety in terms of noise, dust and dirt and local congestion caused by construction lorries. Temporary accommodation for local shops and services, including the library, sounds rudimentary.

For these reasons and others there is a large body of local resistance to these proposals, reflected in objections at every stage, and increasing rather than decreasing with every fresh announcement. The residents of Botley realise that improvements are needed. They have resented being dismissed as having their heads in the sand and being resistant to change. They have repeatedly asked for renewed consideration of the plans put forward by the district council in 2012. They know that the redevelopment of West Way will affect their community for generations. They desperately want the new development to be the right one, and they do not see that in the proposals in front of them. I agree with them.

**Date:** 08 October 2014

---

## RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

**District:** Vale of the White Horse

**Application no:** P13/V2733/FUL

**Proposal:** Environmental Impact Assessment Addendum and amended plans and further information submitted on 5th September 2014 in connection with 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), crèche, cinema, gymnasium, covered car parking and access, public square, landscaping and associated works (amended plans and description)

**Location:** Botley District Centre West way Botley

---

### LOCAL MEMBER VIEWS

---

**Cllr:** Susanna Pressel

**Division:** Jericho and Osney Ward

**Comments:**

I do worry about anything that would increase traffic in Botley Road, which is already horrendous.

**Date:** 09 September 2014

---