

Application no: 23/01496/DISC

Location: Proposed Himley Village North West Bicester, Middleton Stoney Road, Bicester

Transport Development Control

Recommendation:

Objection

Key issues:

- Cycle connectivity requires improvement
- Street design not in accordance with LTN 1/20 and Oxfordshire Street Design Guide

Detailed comments:

My comments focus on Chapter 6 of the Design Code – Access and Movement Codes

6.5-6.7: Context and access to facilities: This should reference facilities within the wider NW Bicester, including the new secondary school and local centre, which will be important destinations for residents. The development must be designed so that walking and cycling are modes of choice for travel to these destinations. It should be noted that the position of the secondary school and local centre within Aldershot Farm is currently under discussion.

6.15: Access arrangements are intended to be compliant with core design principles of LTN 1/20: With the key destinations in mind, I have highlighted routes that need to be considered primary cycle/pedestrian routes, and should have protected space for cycling and walking, and be continuous and direct. See separate document.

LTN 1/20 guidance is that routes for cycles and pedestrians should preferably be more direct than for motor vehicles (filtered permeability). This element of the Framework Plan could be improved, particularly in the north of the site, where motor vehicle permeability could be reduced.

6.19 A Mobility Hub is mentioned at the local centre. As Himley Village contains no local centre it is assumed this is meant to be in the Aldershot Farm site. However, cycle parking should be provided at bus stops, particularly around the main site access.

6.20-6.12 Vehicular access points 1 to 5 are as agreed in the outline permission, though it should be noted that point 3 is to be bus, pedestrian and cycle access only. Access points 3-5 are listed as 'potential' but they are required to be provided by trigger points as set out in the S106 agreement. This should be referenced here.

Please note that the detailed design of the accesses onto Middleton Stoney Road has not been agreed with OCC. A S278 submission was made by a previous developer but technical approval has not been granted.

On P109 the descriptions of the ped/cycle facilities on the access roads does not match the descriptions later on in the Design Code (see below for comments on those).

6.26 this mentions sign-posting. Directional signposting to local facilities should be a commitment within the design code.

6.27 - see figure below for N-W and E-W cycle/ped routes that need to be primary routes with continuous high specification. Again, in this paragraph the descriptions do not match the descriptions in the street hierarchy (see comments below). Also to note that the table extracted from LTN 1/20 shows widths of paths for protected space for cycling, i.e. not shared with pedestrians.

Comments on Strategic Cycle Access Strategy Plan: - see separate document

Pedestrian access strategy: The above routes (see plan in separate document) need to be reflected also in the pedestrian access strategy. Additionally, to maximise pedestrian permeability, routes should connect around the periphery of sites, which will largely end in driveways – there should be a connecting route that does not rely on the use of private driveways.

Public transport strategy: The bus stop locations are as agreed. For the early phases, beyond 400 dwellings, there will need to be a facility for the bus to enter the site and turn round, so provision should be made for a temporary turning head. This should be indicated on the plans.

Street hierarchy

The main comment here is that the proposed cycle facilities are not in accordance with LTN 1/20, the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide, or the preapp advice given. Cycle lanes are required on both sides of the street, in the direction of traffic, segregated from footways, which are also required on both sides of the street. In accordance with the OSDG, they should go round the back of bus stops and parking bays.

Only where there is no development on one side of the road, is it acceptable to have 3m 2-way cycle track on one side of the road only. Please refer to the OSDG.

Other comments on street hierarchy:

There isn't a category for Primary Road, which is shown in the reserved matters—please provide this.

Spine Road:

- Cycle provision not acceptable – see above.
- Junction radii at junctions with secondary streets – there's no reason why these couldn't be 6m, subject to swept path analysis. It's important to have level, continuous footways and cycleways crossing over on the desire lines, with priority for cycles and pedestrians.
- MfS visibility compatible with speed limit will be acceptable.
- Footway surfacing could be block paved to distinguish it from the cycle lane.
- Verge surfacing – maintenance regime in adoptable areas will need to be considered – generally OCC will only be able to maintain grassed areas and highway trees.

Strategic secondary streets:

- Cycle provision not acceptable – see above.
- MfS visibility required
- Footway surfacing – see above.

Secondary Streets

- As these are expected to have a low volume of traffic, cycling on carriageway would generally be acceptable.
- Footway surfacing – see above
- Carriageway width on cross section is wider than in table – 5.5m is acceptable.
- Footpaths should be 2m wide
- MfS visibility required

Shared surface/mews streets

- Cross section shows 4.5 to 5m carriageway. Note 4.8m is required for two cars to pass so 4.5 would be considered a narrowing.

Tertiary streets

- Table says footway accommodated within shared surface but cross section shows footways
- Footways should be 2m wide
- Perpendicular parking – note OSDG page 41.
- There are two tables headed Tertiary Streets – please clarify.

Parking Strategies

Allocated cycle parking is insufficient – it must be in accordance with Oxfordshire Parking Standards, which require two cycle spaces per bedroom.

Allocated car parking is in excess of the updated Oxfordshire Parking Standards [Parking standards for new developments \(oxfordshire.gov.uk\)](https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/parking-standards-for-new-developments) for towns other than Oxford City, which specify one parking space for up to 2 bed dwellings, and 2 spaces for 3 bed and above. They also require provision for motorcycle parking.

Visitor and non-residential parking should make reference to the updated Oxfordshire Parking Standards, not the CDC residential design guide. Note that the Parking Standards state that if garages are to be counted as parking spaces, they should have conditions to ensure continued use for that purpose.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 21 July 2023