

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

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 16/01000/F

**Proposal:** Development of the Village Centre (south) comprising a Hotel and associated facilities (involving the partial demolition and the refurbishment and extension of Building 455 and its change of use); Bar/Brasserie (involving the partial demolition and refurbishment and extension of Building 457) and a Covered Market (canopy link between Buildings 455 and 457) with associated landscaping and car parking

**Location:** Building 455 And 457 Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford

---

## **Purpose of document**

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

**This report contains officer advice in the form of technical team responses. Where local members have responded these have been attached by OCCs Major Planning Applications Team ([planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk)).**

**Officer's Name:** David Flavin

**Officer's Title:** Senior Planning Officer

**Date:** 08 July 2016

---

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 16/01000/F

**Proposal:** Development of the Village Centre (south) comprising a Hotel and associated facilities (involving the partial demolition and the refurbishment and extension of Building 455 and its change of use); Bar/Brasserie (involving the partial demolition and refurbishment and extension of Building 457) and a Covered Market (canopy link between Buildings 455 and 457) with associated landscaping and car parking

**Location:** Building 455 And 457 Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford

---

## **Transport**

### **Recommendation**

Objection

Objection is made on the grounds of highway safety.

### **Key issues**

- The quantum of car parking needs to be justified.
- Provisions for cyclists require improvement.
- Loading and unloading provisions require improvement.
- Pedestrian provisions require improvement.
- The scheme may benefit from a 20mph speed limit.
- A road safety audit is required.
- Improvements to the road layout are required.

If the LPA is minded to grant permission, the following legal agreement and conditions would be required.

### **Legal agreement required to secure**

This application would need to be linked to the S106 for the outline planning permission.

### **Conditions**

It is suggested that the detail of access arrangements is conditioned. Sufficient detail has not been provided to demonstrate safe access, as set out below, so further detail is required and should not be left to condition.

The following should be required by condition:

- Delivery and servicing plan
- Construction traffic management plan

Following a resubmission which addresses the highways points raised below, OCC could recommend what further detail could be left to condition.

There is no objection on drainage grounds, subject to the condition below.

### **Drainage Condition 1**

The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) OCT 2010 Waterman and update in MAY 2016 Woods Hardwick (Ref: 16871 REV 2) by and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

- *Limiting the surface water run-off generated by the 1 in 100 year + 30% allowance for Climate Change critical storm so that it will not exceed the run-off from the existing site and not increase the risk of flooding off-site.*
- *Underground Storage Cells and Oversized pipes. (As shown on drawing HEYF- 5-219E and para 6.3.2 of FRA update)*

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority

### **Drainage Condition 2**

Prior to commencement of the development the Applicant shall submit to the Local Planning Authority a SUDS Maintenance and Management Plan for the development. This will include:

- *A maintenance schedule, A site plan showing location of SUDS features and details, Maintenance areas, and Outfalls. Responsibility for the management and maintenance of each element of the SUDS scheme will be detailed within the Management Plan and a health and safety plan where risks are involved in the maintenance activity will be required.*

### **Drainage Condition 3**

Prior to commencement of the development the Applicant shall submit to the Local Planning Authority a revised Flood Route and Storage Plan for exceedance flows at the site:

- *This will update the existing drawing (Ref: HEY- 5-148C) to reflect any revised microsimulation modelling results, as built constructed site changes, and storage areas.*

## **Detailed comments**

### **Transport strategy**

The principle of development has been permitted for this site through planning application 10/01642/OUT and in the approved Heyford Park Design Code. Although this is a full application and not reserved matters, the application does not intend to make any significant departure from these principles in transport terms.

Transport Strategy has little comment relating to this application, subject to it complying with the transport conditions contained within the Decision Notice, transport obligations contained within the agreed Section 106 and compliance with the approved Heyford Park Design Code, relating to application 10/01642/OUT.

Clause 14 in the legal agreement for 10/01642/OUT dated 22/12/11 sets a ceiling of 1075 dwellings (or 1,135 as varied by the agreement for 13/01811/OUT). Any development over and above this ceiling will be expected to contribute to a transport mitigation package for allocation covered by Policy Villages 5. Moreover, a comprehensive masterplan that sets out the transport mitigation package required to mitigate the additional growth should be in place prior to the determination of applications that will exceed the ceiling.

### **Traffic impact**

The Transport Statement sets out how overall the proposals would generate fewer trips than the consented use for both buildings. OCC disagrees with the use of surveys from edge of town locations, but even if the trip generation were adjusted the trip generation from these two buildings and the canopy link would not be very significantly above the consented uses, therefore there are no significant concerns about the impact of traffic generated by these elements of the village centre. In this respect it must be noted that this application only forms part of the village centre and does not include retail except for the 'market' area.

### **Traffic calming scheme and alterations to Camp Road**

The planning application reflects the information submitted to discharge condition 21 of the outline planning application, and the response below is in line with our response to the consultation on the application to discharge that condition.

The traffic calming features are noted together with references pointing to likely approach and exit speeds. A 20mph zone together with a suitable signage plan would help to reinforce this scheme, and it is recommended that this is extended to include the residential areas of the Heyford Park development.

It is not clear whether a 20mph limit is being proposed. While the calming features and horizontal alignment in the centre in particular should help manage speeds, it could well be helpful to reinforce this with a 20mph speed limit. Under DfT guidance this should be a minimum of 300m length.

The ramps look to be sufficiently well spaced to avoid discomfort for bus passengers, but the gradient needs to be maximum 1:20.

The bus laybys are not big enough for buses to pull up to the kerb properly. Also, the bus that has been used for tracking is too small. A 12m bus is required. In fact, laybys here for the buses are not really necessary and the scheme might be better without them. Buses are not expected to stop for long in the village centre.

Shelters will need to be provided and are not shown. They need to be considered in the design. Also the TS states, and tracking shows, buses routing south through the residential area. In practice this is likely to reduce the commercial viability of the route.

The proposed pedestrian crossing point between the proposed bus stops and parking bays would seem to presents the risk that visibility for pedestrians would be masked by buses and parked vehicles. It is also unclear if this is meant to be a formal zebra or a courtesy crossing arrangement.

There do not appear to be any specific on or off road provision for cyclists. The road narrowing as shown would not be ideal for cyclists.

### **Shared Surface Area (Village Square)**

There are safety concerns regarding the shared surface section of Camp Road through the square. A 6m wide carriageway is not wide enough to have pedestrians, buses, delivery vehicles and cars weaving in and out of each other. It is unlikely that there will be the continuous even flow of pedestrians required to enforce the concept of a shared surface 24 hours a day 7 days a week. There are safety concerns about the "grey" square as a single colour doesn't provide the required definition for visually impaired pedestrians. The carriageway needs to be better defined, and further detail is required to assess the safety of this area for pedestrians.

## **Other Design Issues**

- The forward visibility over the Western kink in Camp Road would be obstructed by buses parked in the lay-by.
- The Western kink in Camp Road increases the difficulty of manoeuvring a bus into the lay-by.
- Is it proposed to introduce a 70mm step/ramp in the footways surrounding the square to achieve the reduction in kerb upstand? This would not be acceptable particularly in a blank canvas situation. A reduction in kerb upstand would normally be achieved with a continuous kerb level and ramped raised table in the carriageway. It is not clear how it is proposed to level the Eastern edge of the square to achieve the transition from 50mm to 120mm upstand
- For maintenance reasons OCC would not accept a spray and chip surface treatment on the crossing due to the bus manoeuvres.
- For maintenance reasons OCC would prefer to see a black top finish to bus laybys. The proposed red brick paving will not stand up to the required manoeuvres.
- For maintenance reasons OCC will not accept slot drains in adoptable areas. OCC would not wish to adopt the whole of the square, and private areas should not drain on to the highway.
- The raised tables constructed on Camp Road to date have taken a battering from heavy speeding vehicles. Blockwork isn't an ideal material for such a road, and particularly not so for the ramps.
- The junction to the west of the bus lay-bys is different to all of the other significant new junctions on Camp Road. There is no blockwork raised table. This and the deflection of Camp Road may confuse priority. It is not clear whether it is proposed to use road markings.
- Visibility from the Western junction may be restricted by buses parked in the lay-by, and the kink in Camp Road may provide an illusion of safety and encourage drivers to edge out in to danger.
- The junction with the Northern access road to the East of the Square is different to all other significant new junctions on Camp Road. There is no raised table. This and the change in carriageway surface material through the square may confuse priority. It is not clear whether it is proposed to use road markings.
- It is not desirable to encourage pedestrians to cross the Northern Access to the East of the square in a diagonal direction.
- The visibility for cars turning out of the Eastern car park may be obstructed by vehicles using the Delivery Drop Off Point.

Generally, there is no plan supplied showing the areas intended for adoption. Non standard materials, street furniture and planting would attract higher commuted sums. Footways adjacent to adopted roads would need to be adoptable.

## **Parking and Cycle Parking**

Analysis of likely parking accumulation at different times of day different days of the week would need to be presented to demonstrate that parking provision is adequate but not excessive. This does not seem to appear in the Transport Statement, although it is referred to. It is also not clear whether any of the parking is allocated to the flats immediately to the south of Camp Road. There appears to be no obvious car parking nearby for these flats, and if the spaces were used by residents, this would significantly reduce the car parking available for the village centre uses.

The plans show some cycle parking in the village centre. However, this is generally not well located for access to facilities. Cycle parking should be placed near the entrance to buildings for maximum convenience. The Transport Statement refers to low levels of cycling to

destinations outside the settlement. This may be the case, but it is vital that the development is designed to positively encourage cycling as opposed to driving to local facilities. The current proposals seem at odds with the Local Plan policy referred to in Para 2.5.5 of the TS. Also note that the cycle parking south of the echelon car parking area would not be accessible within the red line boundary of this application.

There are no major concerns about the use of echelon parking bays. However, the manoeuvring is very tight indeed and may not be possible for large cars and vans to exit in forward gear.

For information, the perpendicular and echelon parking areas would not be adoptable.

### **Servicing and Delivery Arrangements**

Delivery arrangements are unsuitable for the following reasons:

- Designated bays are too far from buildings. In practice delivery drivers are likely to try to get closer, using unsuitable areas and making dangerous manoeuvres.
- Delivery bays are proposed to be part time, used at other times by general parking. This would be extremely difficult and potentially impossible to enforce here.
- Delivery bays are not sized for large articulated vehicles, which could well be used to service the buildings depending on who eventually occupies them.
- Tracking does not appear to work, and for the bay to the west of the buildings, it is unclear how the lorries would route back to Camp Road safely without reversing.
- The D&A statement appears to be contradictory, specifying loading strategy but also suggesting the village square would be used for loading. No tracking is provided for the latter, and is likely to be incompatible with other uses and pedestrian safety. It also suggests that delivery vans will enter the canopy link area, which could be highly dangerous.

### **Refuse Collection Arrangements**

The collection points on the adjacent roads are some considerable distance from the buildings. This may present operational difficulties. However, of greatest concern is that the commercial bins will be large bins and could present an obstruction and affect highway safety. Suitable hardstanding areas need to be identified.

### **Safety Audit**

In view of the unconventional design and the level of safety concerns, it is recommended that a further submission includes a Stage 1 Safety audit. This will provide reassurance that safety has been fully considered as part of the design process. In this instance it is not considered appropriate to wait for the S278 process to trigger this.

### **Drainage**

OCC have reviewed the updated Flood Risk Assessment by Woods Hardwick and have no objection to the proposal.

It is proposed that the existing plan (Ref: HEY – 5-148C) showing flood routes in exceedance events and storage areas is updated to reflect the revised FRA and any changes.

The maintenance schedule provided within the revised FRA should form part of a more comprehensive 'SUDS Site Management and Maintenance Plan' for the development. The scope of this document should be based on the advice given in 'The SUDS Manual' (Ref: Ciria 753) Chapter 32 - Operation and Maintenance. ( and deal with any health and safety issues)

It is proposed that the production of a more comprehensive SUDS Maintenance and Management Plan and updated drawing should form part of a planning condition for the development.

**Officer's Name: Joy White**

**Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner**

**Date: 07 July 2016**

---

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 16/01000/F

**Proposal:** Development of the Village Centre (south) comprising a Hotel and associated facilities (involving the partial demolition and the refurbishment and extension of Building 455 and its change of use); Bar/Brasserie (involving the partial demolition and refurbishment and extension of Building 457) and a Covered Market (canopy link between Buildings 455 and 457) with associated landscaping and car parking

**Location:** Building 455 And 457 Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford

---

## **Ecology**

### **Recommendation:**

Comments

### **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>

### **Legal agreement required to secure:**

N/A - For the District Council to comment

### **Conditions:**

N/A - For the District Council to comment

### **Informatives:**

N/A - For the District Council to comment

### **Detailed comments:**

**Officer's Name:** Sarah Postlethwaite

**Officer's Title:** Protected Species Officer

**Date:** 05 July 2016

---