

Application no: 23/00977/OUT

Location: OS Parcel 9195 North Of, Claydon Road, Cropredy

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reasons:

- Further information required on access arrangements drawing
- No provision for safe cycle access to the site

If despite OCC's objection permission is proposed to be granted then OCC requires prior to the issuing of planning permission a S106 agreement to mitigate the impact of the development plus planning conditions and informatives as detailed below.

The planning obligations required are as per our previous response unless alternative measures for safe cycle access can be agreed - see below.

Amendments to the previous conditions are recommended - see below.

Key points

- Trip generation has been clarified
- Access arrangements drawing needs amendment to show traffic calming feature and pedestrian connection
- Mitigation to provide safe cycling access required but could take the form of traffic calming
- Clarification needed on proposed bridge over canal
- Alterations proposed to recommended conditions

Comments:

In response to the previous highways objection, a response has been submitted by Glanvilles on behalf of the applicant, reference 010_8210439_AD_LHA_Response. This seeks to address our objection and requests for clarification as follows:

Clarification on trip generation of proposed surgery:

Clarification has been provided that the vehicle trip generation prediction includes both staff and patients and amounts to 506 per day, not 306 as set out in the TS. 40 of these would be in the am peak and 20 in the pm peak.

Access arrangements

A revised plan has been provided, annotated to show that levels within the site would be made up to ensure a gradient no steeper than 1:20 on the access road. This plan also

shows the new footway from the access to link with existing footway, which the developer will be required to deliver as part of the S278 works.

It is also noted that a pedestrian access is proposed at the southern corner of the site, which should be labelled as such.

The TS proposes (para 4.9) a village gateway feature. Given the high approach speeds, this should be a stronger feature. In accordance with OCC policy, a 20mph limit for Cropredy has been consulted on and is due to be implemented, although no physical measures to enforce it are planned. The access plan should be amended to show indicatively a build out north of the site access, in the position of the speed limit change. This would be subject to consultation, along with the speed limit change.

The condition for access full details should be amended to include the footway and pedestrian connection, as well as the traffic calming feature:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the means of vehicular and pedestrian access between the land and the adopted highway, including new footway linking the site access to existing footway in the village, dropped kerb crossing of Kyetts Corner, and traffic calming feature on Claydon Road to the north of the site access, including position, layout, construction, drainage and lighting, in broad accordance with indicative plan XXXXX shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to first occupation these works shall be constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details.

The response document justifies the swept path of the refuse vehicle entering the opposing lane at the site access, based on the low traffic volumes on Claydon Road. With the speed limit reduction, I am satisfied that this will be acceptable, albeit slight tweaks to the layout may be required at S278 technical audit stage.

In terms of access to the local PRow network, I note that a potential pedestrian bridge over the Oxford Canal is proposed, to link to the towpath. This would be a welcome connection and the offer should be clarified. However, I note the comments on this from Canal and River Trust. If it is deemed to be a requirement then appropriate conditions would be required, but it would be for CRT to approve the detail. The nearest connections to the towpath appear to be at Red Lion Street.

S106 contributions

The applicant accepts the public transport and public rights of way contributions requested. However, they dispute the highway works contribution towards a shared pedestrian/cycleway through the village.

Providing safe cycle access to the development is a requirement of NPPF, and also the Oxfordshire LCTP Policy 2b 'We will ensure that all new developments have safe and attractive walking and cycling connections to the site ...'. Cherwell Policy SLE4 requires

development to facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport. Therefore provision for cyclists is a policy requirement.

Given the coming speed limit reduction to 20mph (which was not known at the time of our previous response) and the low traffic volumes, assuming the speed limit is adhered to, on-carriageway cycling would be acceptable. However, without traffic calming features, and given the current approach speeds and the nature of the road through the village, I consider it unlikely that there will be consistent adherence to the 20mph speed limit. Therefore further traffic calming features should be provided in addition to the one north of the site access, to ensure safe cycle access between the school and the site. This could be a series of pairs of speed cushions, which could be delivered by the developer under S278, subject to statutory consultation. An indicative plan should be provided, with details required by condition as follows:

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of a scheme of traffic calming between the site and School Lane, including position, layout, construction, drainage and lighting, in broad accordance with indicative plan XXXXX shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, together with a timetable for its implementation. Thereafter and prior to first occupation these works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

Review of other conditions

In addition to the conditions above, I would recommend the following changes from those recommended by my former colleague:

Car park layout plan, and swept path analysis As this is an outline planning application we would expect this detail to be provided with a reserved matters planning application and therefore these conditions may not be required. We will also assess the layout against our Oxfordshire Street Design Guide and our Parking Standards.

Accesses, layout, turning areas for cars and service vehicles, parking for cars and cycles As above - may not be required, as these are things we will be looking for in the reserved matters application for layout.

Cycle parking

I recommend that the standard cycle parking condition is attached, instead of the wording proposed by my former colleague. We will expect cycle parking to be in accordance with our Parking Standards.

New permanent public footpaths

I am not aware that the developer is offering to create new public footpaths so this condition is not needed. If this refers to the footway to be created along Claydon Road, then this is covered in the above recommended condition regarding access arrangements.

Bus service improvements

The developer has agreed to a contribution for OCC to procure improvements, so this condition is not required.

Cycle and pedestrian connectivity and PRow

See comments above regarding the proposed potential pedestrian bridge over the Oxford Canal to link to the PRow along the towpath. I'm not aware that any other connections from the site to adjacent land and PRow are achievable, so any condition would need to be specific to this connection over the canal and probably best recommended by CRT.

Travel Plan

The site is below the requirement for a travel plan. The condition needs only to require a Travel Information Pack to be submitted for approval prior to first occupation.

Joy White
Principal Transport Planner
23 August 2023